

THE EPIGRAM

The purpose of this prefatory epigram is to introduce the second edition of the *Amores*. It provides, in fact, the only explicit testimony that the collection as we have it is a second edition. It informs us that Ovid is the author, that the collection has been reduced from five books to three, that Ovid prefers this second edition to the first and that it will be less of a burden to the reader. It says nothing about the subject-matter of the collection. That function is adequately served by the *titulus*, *Amores*; see Vol. 1, 103ff. It offers no grounds for supposing that the second edition contains poems which were not in the original books, or that any of the poems have been revised. The argument from silence against these possibilities is not, however, conclusive; see Vol. 1, 81.

The practice of prefacing a literary work with an epigram, usually announcing the contents and authorship and sometimes containing a dedication or an apologia for the work, developed in the Hellenistic period, when literature began to circulate widely in written form. For examples of such epigrams, see below and, for the corresponding practice of concluding works with a σφραγίς, see the introduction to 1.15. No other poetic work from the Augustan period bears such an introductory epigram. Ovid did, however, compose three couplets which he suggested might be used to preface the *Metamorphoses*:

orba parente suo quicumque uolumina tangis,
his saltem uestra detur in Vrbe locus.
quoque magis faueas, non haec sunt edita ab ipso,
sed quasi de domini funere rapta sui.
quicquid in his igitur uitii rude carmen habebit,
emendaturus, si licuisset, erat (*Trist.* 1.7.35ff.).

The *Metamorphoses*-epigram is the only other Ovidian epigram to survive intact. In a doubtful passage at *Gramm.* 2.149 Keil, Priscian quotes a line from Ovid in *Epigrammatis*, but nothing is otherwise known about such a work. For Ovidian fragments, some of which may be from epigrams, see Büchner (1982) 145f.

The epigram is addressed to the reader by the personified books of the *Amores*. For epigrams spoken by personified works of literature and which are, or may be, prefatory to copies of those works, cf. e.g. Asclep. *AP* 9.63 (Antimachus' *Lyde*), Call. *Epigr.* 6 (the ps.-Homeric

Capture of Oechalia), Antiph. Byz. *AP* 9.192 (the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as Homer's daughters, conversing with a reader), Crinag. *AP* 9.239:

βύβλων ἢ γλυκερὴ λυρικῶν ἐν τεύχεϊ τῷδε
 πεντὰς ἀμιμήτων ἔργα φέρει χαρίτων
 †Ἀνακρεϊόντος, ἃς ὁ Τῆιος ἡδὺς πρέσβυς
 ἔγραψεν ἢ παρ' οἶνον ἢ σὺν Ἱμέροις†.
 δῶρον δ' εἰς ἱερὴν Ἀντωνίῃ ἤκομεν ἡῶ
 κάλλεος καὶ πρατίδων ἔξοχ' ἐνεγκαμένη,

Mart. 10.1:

Si nimius uideor seraque coronide longus
 esse liber, legito pauca: libellus ero.
 terque quaterque mihi finitur carmine paruo
 pagina: fac tibi me quam cupis ipse breuem,

Anon. *AP* 9.191 (Lycophron's *Alexandra*), 210 (Orbicius' *Tactica*), 358 (Plato's *Phaedo*), Agath. Schol. *AP* 6.80 (his *Daphniad*) and possibly also Philetas *frg.* 10 Powell, which may introduce a work of his known as the Κλήθηρη (see McKay [1978]).

The endowment of inanimate objects with speech is a common feature of Hellenistic poetry, perhaps the most famous instances being Call. *frg.* 110 (the *coma Berenices*) and Catull. 67 and Prop. 1.16 (house-doors). The technique is, however, used most frequently in dedicatory epigrams; cf. e.g. Call. *Epigr.* 5, 34, 48, 49, 55, 56. This affinity with dedicatory epigrams is not accidental, given that the purpose of prefatory epigrams is often to dedicate the works which they introduce; cf. e.g. Meleager *AP* 4.1, Catull. 1, Crinag. *loc. cit.*, Philip *AP* 4.2, Agath. Schol. *AP* 4.3 and *loc. cit.*

Ovid is particularly fond of this type of personification. Most frequently, it takes the form of an address to his poems; see on 3.1.69 *teneri properentur Amores* (at the conclusion of his account of his meeting with the personified genres of Tragedy and Elegy); in *Trist.* 3.1, the book addresses its readers, in 5.4, the single poem addresses an unnamed friend.

In declaring that he prefers the briefer second edition to the first, Ovid may be wittily oversimplifying Callimachean poetic principles. Callimachus' belief that poetry should be subtle and carefully wrought led him to prefer small-scale genres to the more ambitious; cf. esp. *frg.* 1, *Ap.* 105ff., *Epigr.* 27, 28. Ovid takes no account of Callimachus' reason for preferring brevity, the cultivation of a Μοῦσα λεπταλή: there is no generic distinction between the two editions, the original books also having been collections of poems written κατὰ λεπτόν.

The humour of the epigram helps to set the tone for the *Amores*. In suggesting, however, that the second edition will be less of a burden to the reader, Ovid achieves the humour here in a highly untypical manner. Nowhere else in the *Amores*, or in any of the other works written before his exile, does he express such a depreciatory opinion of his poetic talent, even in this obviously ironic way. Elsewhere, he confidently asserts his belief in the immortality of the *Amores*; cf. 1.3.25f., 1.10.59ff., 1.15 *passim*, 2.17.27ff., 3.1.65, 3.15 *passim*. Moreover, in explaining why he does not write in the higher genres, he conspicuously does not make the conventional excuse that he lacks ability; see the introduction to 1.1. Such modesty is, however, normal in prefatory epigrams; cf. e.g. Catull. 1, Mart. 2.1, 9 Pref., 10.1 (quoted above), all of which emphasise the attractive brevity of the work which they introduce, and note also the epigram which Ovid himself proposed for the *Metamorphoses* (quoted above).

It seems probable that copies of the second edition of the *Amores* usually comprised three separate *uolumina*: referring to the corpus of his own works contained in his *scrinium*, Ovid describes the *Ars Amatoria* as *tres* (sc. *fratres Tristium libri primi*) *procul obscura latitantes parte* (*Trist.* 1.1.111) and the *Metamorphoses* as *ter quinque uolumina* (117). The scanty evidence which Ovid himself provides suggests that the epigram appeared with the *titulus*, *Amores* (see Vol. 1, 103ff.), on the outside of the first *uolumen*: at *Trist.* 1.7.33, Ovid recommends that the *Metamorphoses*-epigram be placed in *primi* (for the text, see Diggle [1980] 410f.) *fronte libelli*; at *Pont.* 4.13.7, he states that the *titulus* was on the *frons*: *ut titulum chartae de fronte reuellas*; it is clear from *Trist.* 1.1.109 that a *titulus* could be read without opening the *uolumen*: *cetera turba* (sc. Ovid's works other than the disgraced *Ars Amatoria*) *palam titulos ostendet apertos*. Kenney (1982) 31f., however, concludes a judicious but inevitably speculative review of this obscure aspect of Roman book-production with the reasonable observation that material which was not incorporated securely on the inside of a *uolumen* had no real prospect of survival. The most natural interpretation of Martial's statement in the preface to his ninth book, that the prefatory epigram addressed to Stertinius Avitus was *extra ordinem paginarum*, seems to be that it stood within the *uolumen*, by itself before the first regular column. Ovid may have accorded that position to this epigram.

For an interesting speculation that, just as 1.1.1 alludes to the genuine opening of the *Aeneid* (see the note), so this epigram echoes the content and structure of the spurious four-line preface (*Ille ego*

qui quondam ...), see Conte (1986) 84ff. and also La Penna (1985) 88.



1-2. Qui modo: the contrast between past and present is particularly common in sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams; cf. 1.11.28, Peek (1955) No. 4 ὃ ξείνε, εὐδρόν ποκ' ἐναίομες ἄστν Κορίνθου / νῦν δ' ἄμὲ Αἴαντος νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμῖς, Call. *Epigr.* 5.1f. κόγχος ἐγώ, Ζεφυρίτι, πάλαι τέρας· ἀλλὰ σὺ νῦν με, / Κύπρι, Σεληναίης ἄνθεμα πρῶτον ἔχεις, Buchheit (1962) 63, n. 3, Schulz-Vanheyden (1969) 86f., Fedeli on Prop. 1.16.1-5. For such a contrast in an epigram prefacing a collection of poems, cf. Artemid. *AP* 9.205 βουκολικαὶ Μοῖσαι σποράδες ποκά, νῦν δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι / ἐντὶ μιᾶς μάνδρας, ἐντὶ μιᾶς ἀγέλας. Note also *Fast.* 2.3f. (quoted below). For the formulaic opening with a relative pronoun and a temporal adverb, cf. e.g. Prop. 1.16.1, Mart. *Epigr.* 19.1, 12.5 *Quae modo litoreos ibatis carmina Pyrgos, / ite sacra — iam non puluerulenta — uia*, Claud. 19.1. In the equivalent Greek opening formulas, it is almost always the definite article, not the relative pronoun, which is used; cf. e.g. *AP* 5.234, 273, 6.159, 285, 7.172, 9.20, 102, 103.

Nasonis: as at 2.1.2, *Ibis* 4, *Pont.* 1.1.1 and 3.1.3, Ovid announces his authorship by naming himself at the beginning of the work. Such signatures could also appear at the end, as at e.g. *Ars* 2.744, 3.812. Ovid names himself much more frequently than does any other ancient poet but, given the epistolary nature of the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, which account for forty-one of the fifty-two occurrences of his name, this is not especially significant. Propertius names himself eight times, Tibullus twice, in their much smaller collections. Ovid always refers to himself as *Naso*, even though *Ovidius*, in the form *Ovidi*, could be accommodated in dactylic metres.

fueraus: 'had been (before we were re-edited)'. For this idiomatic use of the pluperfect to define a past state as prior to a past event which is not expressed, cf. *Trist.* 3.11.25 *non sum ego quod fueraus* (sc. before I died), Mart. 8.3.1f. *Quinque satis fuerant: nam sex septemue libelli / est nimium: quid adhuc ludere, Musa, iuuat?*, CE 1158.5 *modo quae fuerat filia* (sc. before she died), *nunc cinis est*, Fordyce on Catull. 64.158 and Verg. *Aen.* 8.358 and see also on 3.8.3.

libelli: *libellus* and *liber* are often used without distinction to denote a work in one book or a single book of a larger work; see *TLL* 7.2.1270.13ff., but contrast e.g. Mart. 10.1.1f. (quoted in the introduction). For the *Amores* as *libelli*, cf. 2.17.33, 3.12.7, as *libri*, *Ars* 3.343. The terms are used together without distinction at 3.8.5f.

cum pulchre dominae nostri placuere libelli, / quo licuit libris, non licet ire mihi. The same interchangeability is found between βίβλος and the much commoner βιβλίον; Callimachus' expression μέγα βιβλίον (*frg.* 465) is probably not intended to be an oxymoron, 'big booklet'. Here, the diminutive form may express affection.

fueraus quinque libelli, / tres sumus: the chiasmic word-order is very elegant and pleasing.

hoc illi praetulit auctor opus: Ovid refers to the two editions as if they were separate works; cf. *Fast.* 2.3f., where there actually is a distinction: *nunc primum uelis, elegi, maioribus itis: / exiguum, memini, nuper eratis opus* (sc. love-poetry). (Della Corte [1986] hypothesises, however, that the first edition may, in fact, have differed quite radically from the second, having contained poems in various metres other than elegiacs.) *auctor*: a paradoxical term to use in announcing the reduction of the collection; cf. Schol. Bern. Verg. *Georg.* 1.27 *auctor ab augendo dictus*.

3-4. ut iam nulla tibi nos sit legisse uoluptas: 'even granted that there is (still) no pleasure for you in reading us'. *ut iam*: a prosaic idiom, recurring in Ovid at 3.4.5, *Ars* 1.346, 3.89, *Met.* 9.620, 14.175, *Pont.* 4.8.5, but employed elsewhere in poetry only at Juv. 15.117; see H.-Sz. 647, K.-S. 2.251 (rather confused), *TLL* 7.1.128.49ff. Here, the prosaic *color* suits the matter-of-fact tone adopted by the *libelli*. As in the related expressions *iam ut, si iam* and *iam si, iam* serves primarily to emphasise, and its temporal sense is not strongly felt. Ovid is not contrasting the enjoyment derived from the first edition with a lack of such enjoyment in the second; see Newiger (1964). *tibi* balances *auctor* (2). *legisse*: for the perfect infinitive used aoristically, often simply for metrical convenience, cf. e.g. 2.11.31 *tutius est fouisse torum, legisse libellos*, Mart. 4.82.7f. *si nimis est legisse duos* (sc. *libellos*), *tibi charta plicetur / altera: diuisum sic breue fiet opus* and see also on 1.4.38. Here, in the combination with *uoluptas*, one may note that the usage is particularly frequent with verbs such as *iuuare*, as at e.g. 1.13.5, Tib. 1.1.45f. *quam iuuat ... uentos audire ... / et dominam ... continuisse*, Prop. 2.13A.11 *me iuuat in gremio doctae legisse puellae*. *uoluptas*: the word is used by Horace as a translation of ψυχαγωγία at *Ars* 338, in his discussion of the purpose of poetry: *ficta uoluptatis causa sint proxima ueris*. Some maintained that poetry should benefit its readers (ὠφελεῖν), others that it should give pleasure (ψυχαγωγεῖν); cf. 333 *aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae* with Brink's discussion of 333-46. Ovid's reference to *uoluptas* here is

perhaps an oblique programmatic statement that the *Amores* are intended simply as entertainment.

at, like δέ, is often used to introduce the apodosis to a (usually negative, as here) conditional clause; cf. 1.3.11, 1.4.68, 2.19.2, H.-Sz. 489, K.-S. 2.83, *TLL* 2.1005.65ff. For apodotic *at* following *ut iam*, cf. Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.36.

leuior demptis poena duobus erit: on one level, the meaning is 'your suffering will be lighter because two books have been removed'; for this uncommon, neutral, sense of *poena*, cf. e.g. 3.3.38, Sen. *Epist.* 5.5 *frugalitatem exigit philosophia, non poenam*, Plin. *Nat.* 2.27 *in tantis uitae poenis*, CE 1550A.7 *mori leuior poena est quam quaerere [mortem]*. Ovid has wittily polarised *uoluptas* with *poena*, rather than with an equivalent to ὀφελία. On another level, the meaning is 'the cause of your suffering will be lighter because two books have been removed'; for *poena* thus referring to the *Amores*, cf. Catull. 14.20, where books of bad poetry are called *supplicia*. On this second level of meaning, Ovid may be hinting at two senses of *leuior*, not only 'less burdensome' but also 'generically more modest', thus reinforcing the illusion created in the first couplet that there is a generic distinction between the two editions. For *leuis* as a literary critical term, see on 1.1.19 *numeris leuioribus*. For a similar play, cf. 3.1.36, where Elegy asks Tragedy if she can never be other than high-flown/irritating: *an numquam non grauis esse potes?*, with the note *ad loc.* On both levels of meaning here, the figurative expression *leuior ... poena* is humorously combined with the literal *demptis ... duobus*. A similar combination of the literal and figurative occurs, in a much less interesting manner, at Anon. *AP* 9.191.5f., where Lycophron's *Alexandra* declares εἰ ... σε φίλατο Καλλιόπη, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δὲ / νῆις ἔφυς Μουσέων, χερσὶ βάρος φορέεις.

1.1

[Reitzenstein (1935) 67ff.; Wimmel (1960) 300ff.; Korzeniewski (1964) 187ff.; Stroh (1971) 144ff.; Giangrande (1974) 24ff.; Morgan (1977) 7ff.; Dimundo (1985).]



I was intent on producing a martial epic, but Cupid mockingly stole a foot from my second line (1-4). I protested that he should not interfere in poetry (5-16), that my epic had been progressing nicely (17-18) and that, not being in love, I could not write love-elegies (19-20). Cupid responded by shooting me and imposing on me a subject for my poetry (21-24). Love-struck, I must abandon my epic and turn to love-elegy (25-30).



In this first elegy, Ovid announces and explains the genre and subject-matter of his poetry. In so doing, he is following in a long tradition, since the ultimate literary antecedent for the arrow with which Cupid shoots him in order to inspire him to write love-elegies is the bay-wood staff which the Muses gave to Hesiod when they inspired him to sing the *Theogony* (30f.). The particular form which the poem takes, however, with its antithesis between Ovid's weighty epic and his light love-elegies, owes most to the first prologue to the *Aetia*, in which Callimachus declined to attempt an epic about kings and heroes (1ff.), declaring that Apollo had commanded him to confine himself to more modest types of poetry:

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρῶτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
 γούνασιν, Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·
 '..... αἰδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅτι πάχιστον
 θρέψαι, τὴν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·
 πρὸς δέ σε καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι
 τὰ στείβειν, ἐτέρων ἵχνια μὴ καθ' ὅμα
 δίφρον ἑλᾶν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
 ἀτρίπτους, εἰ καὶ στεινότερην ἐλάσεις' (21ff.).

That passage is closely reworked by Vergil at *Ecl.* 6.3ff.:

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem

uellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen',

by Propertius in 3.3 *passim*, and by Horace at *Carm.* 4.15.1ff.:

Phoebus uolentem proelia me loqui
uictas et urbis increpuit lyra,
ne parua Tyrrhenum per aequor
uela darem.

Ovid's handling of the Callimachean scenario is highly original and idiosyncratic, in that he does not acknowledge the grand genre of epic to be beyond his powers. On the contrary, he protests that his epic would have been a success; cf. 17:

cum bene surrexit uersu noua pagina primo.

This disarming lack of modesty is typical of Ovid; cf. 2.1.11f.:

ausus eram, memini, caelestia dicere bella
centimanumque Gygen (et satis oris erat),

2.18.13f.:

sceptra tamen sumpsit curaue Tragoedia nostra
creuit (et huic operi quamlibet aptus eram),

3.1.29f.:

nunc habeam per te Romana Tragoedia nomen!
implebit leges spiritus iste meas.

It was conventional to acquiesce without demur or debate in the deity's injunction against attempting the more ambitious genres. Since, however, his epic had been progressing nicely, Ovid objects vehemently and at great length to such interference. This unprecedented failure to accept the deity's command in respectful silence is paralleled in 3.1, in which the conflicting commands of Tragedy and Elegy present Ovid with a dilemma and force him to strike a compromise between them.

Ovid's objection to divine interference in his choice of genre here is greatly facilitated by the fact that the interfering deity is not Apollo, the great god of poetry himself, nor indeed a Muse, but rather the little boy-god Cupid. Despite Ovid's protest that poetry is not his domain, however, Cupid is not incongruously portrayed as a deity who inspires poetry. He is portrayed as such by Euripides in *frg.* 663 Nauck:

ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα

Ἔρως διδάσκει κἄν ἄμουσος ἢ τὸ πρῖν,

a famous passage echoed by Nicias of Miletus in his riposte to Theocritus' *Idyll* 11 (*Suppl. Hell.* 566):

ἦν ἄρ' ἀληθὲς τοῦτο, Θεόκριτε· οἱ γὰρ Ἔρωτες
ποιητὰς πολλοὺς ἐδίδαξαν τοὺς πρῖν ἄμουσους.

Cf. also Bion *frgg.* 9 and 10. Cairns (1979) 25f. tentatively suggests that Philetas may have told how he was inspired to write poetry by a meeting with Eros. The conceit is hinted at by Propertius at 2.10.25f.:

nondum etiam Ascræos norunt mea carmina fontis,
sed modo Permessi flumine lauit Amor,

and is developed at length in the opening lines of 2.13A, which Ovid probably has in mind (see on 22 *spicula*):

Non tot Achaemeniis armatur tetrusca† sagittis,
spicula quot nostro pectore fixit Amor.
hic me tam gracilis uetuit contemnere Musas,
iussit et Ascræum sic habitare nemus,
non ut Pieriae quercus mea uerba sequantur,
aut possim Ismaria ducere ualle feras,
sed magis ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia uersu:
tunc ego sim Inachio notior arte Lino.

Ovid gives Cupid much the same role as here in 2.18, in which he recounts how that god prevented him from writing either epic or tragedy, and allows him to write only about love. In *Carm.* 4.1, Horace claims that Venus has forced him to return to lyric poetry by making him fall in love. His protest about the inappropriateness of her action, though much milder, has a certain affinity with Ovid's tirade against Cupid.

Although Cupid's essential function in the poem is to inspire Ovid to be a love-elegist, it is his obstruction to Ovid's epic which receives the greater prominence. For love as an obstacle to poetic creativity, cf. Posidippus *AP* 12.98 (perhaps noting especially the censure of the deity in the last line):

τῶν Μουσῶν τέττιγα Πόθος δήσας ἐπ' ἀκάνθαις
κοιμίζειν ἐθέλει πῦρ ὑπὸ πλευρᾷ βαλὼν·
ἢ δὲ πρῖν ἐν βύβλοις πεπονημένη ἄλλ' ἀθερίζει
ψυχὴ ἀνιηρῶ δαίμονι μεμφομένη,

Anon. *AP* 12.99 and 100, Hor. *Epod.* 11.1ff., 14.6ff.:

deus, deus nam me uetat
inceptos, olim promissum carmen, iambos

ad umbilicum adducere.

Ovid will have been influenced particularly by Prop. 1.7 and 9, which treat of the consequences to the epic poet Ponticus of falling in love; cf. esp. 1.7.15ff.:

te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu ...
longe castra tibi, longe miser agmina septem
flebis in aeterno surda iacere situ.

Ovid's unprecedented tirade against the inspiring deity, which is motivated by his unprecedented refusal to admit any limitation in his poetic ability, contributes greatly to the poem's humour, emphasising his ridiculous predicament as the impotent victim of the deity's interference. Despite the originality with which it is achieved here, however, such self-mocking humour is typical of the manner in which Augustan poets announced their espousal of light genres. Callimachus' attack on his critics in the first prologue to the *Aetia*, however elegant and witty it may be, is essentially a serious and perhaps embittered statement of literary principles; his refusal to attempt the higher genres, specifically epic, was absolute, and the criteria by which he made the refusal were strictly literary criteria. Catullus and, presumably, the other νεώτεροι adopted and endorsed Callimachus' principles without reserve or qualification; cf. esp. Catull. 95. The Augustan poets, however, could not justify their choice of the *genus tenue* simply by appealing to Callimachean aesthetic standards, for they felt themselves to be under peculiarly Roman social, moral and even political pressures to write in the higher genres, which were considered to have a practical value. They were therefore apologetic in rejecting the higher genres, not aggressive, as Callimachus had been. They adopted the pose of devotion to a life of *ignobile otium*, incapable of aspiring to genres which they admitted to be superior and preferable. Because this apologetic attitude was simply a pose to satisfy the demands of criteria which were not the poets' own, and was not born of conviction as Callimachus' unambiguous declaration of literary principles had been, it tended to find expression in humorously ironic self-depreciation. Callimachus did not claim to have attempted to write in the higher genres, so Apollo's command that he should not do so entailed no loss to his dignity. When, however, Vergil, Propertius and Horace rework that epiphany by Apollo (see above), they do suffer a humorous loss of dignity, since the god thwarts their ostensible aspirations to epic. Similarly, Horace emphasises his own

shortness in stature (cf. *Sat.* 2.3.308ff., *Epist.* 1.20.24, Suet. *Vita Hor.* p. 55ff. Rostagni) when he compares his humble poetic activities to the labour of a bee:

ego apis Matinae
more modoque,
grata carpentis thyma per laborem
plurimum, circa nemus uuidique
Tiburis ripas operosa paruus
carmina fingo (*Carm.* 4.2.27ff.);

serious Callimachean imagery (cf. *Ap.* 1.10ff. [bees], also *frg.* 1.29ff. [cicada]) is thereby turned to self-mocking effect, as a means of declining to attempt grand poetry in praise of Augustus. It is against this background that the tone of Ovid's poem is to be assessed: he is simply treating an inherently humorous theme in a more broadly humorous manner than usual.

Although there are no certain conceptual or verbal links between the two poems (but see on 25 *me miserum!*), one inevitably notes the sharp distinction between Ovid's light-hearted detachment here and the urgency and emotional intensity of Propertius' first elegy, which laments the suffering which his love for Cynthia causes him. Propertius elsewhere, however, in 3.3, gives an account of his *Dichterweihe* in much the same witty manner as Ovid displays here. It seems very probable, in fact, that Ovid wrote this elegy with Prop. 3.3 in mind; see Vol. 1, 75.



1-2. Arma ... uiolentaque bella parabam / edere: by beginning with the word *Arma*, Ovid arouses false expectations (see Vol. 1, 72 and 1.10.1-8 [n.]) that his poem is an epic; cf. *Anacreont.* 23.1ff. θέλω λέγειν Ἀτρείδας, / θέλω δὲ Κάδμον ἄδειν, / ὁ βάρβιτος δὲ χορδαῖς / ἔρωτα μούνον ἤχει and, more especially, *AP* 12.1, an introductory poem in which Strato, like Ovid, declares that love, rather than the Muses, provides his inspiration: ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, καθὼς εἴρηκεν Ἄρατος / ὑμῖν δ', ὦ Μοῦσαι, σήμερον οὐκ ἐνοχλῶ. / εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ παῖδάς τε φιλῶ καὶ παισὶν ὁμιλῶ, / τοῦτο τί πρὸς Μούσας τὰς Ἑλικωνιάδας; Ovid is here exploiting the convention of referring to poems and collections of poems by their opening word or words, thereby furnishing his *imbelles elegi* (3.15.19) with the paradoxical alternative title *Arma*; see Vol. 1, 106f. He is, in fact, alluding specifically to the *Aeneid*. (For an earlier, and considerably more

explicit, allusion to Vergil's opening words, cf. Prop. 2.34.63f. *Aeneae Troiani ... arma / iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus*.) Stroh (1971) 145, n. 19 observes that not only is the distribution of consonants in Ovid's first line closely comparable to that in Vergil's, but also the sequence of vowels in the first hemistich corresponds almost exactly (Verg.: *a, a, i, u, e, a, o* — Ov.: *a, a, a, i, u, e, o*; i.e. only an *a* has been displaced). The correspondence of vowels seems too precise to be coincidental, arising simply from a desire to employ all five vowels in the opening hemistich of the first book. That conscious artistry recurs in the *Remedia*, *Legerat huius Amor* (where, however, the *i* is only semi-vocalic), the *Metamorphoses*, *In noua fert animus*, the *Fasti*, *Tempora cum causis*, and the *Ibis*, *Tempus ad hoc lustris*; note also that the *Nux*, which I do not believe Ovid to have written, begins *Nux ego iuncta uiae*. For the technique of alluding to a model by sound-correspondence, see below, on Ἀνδρα/Arma, and also on 11, 1.2.31, 1.7.43, 1.8.19, 51-54, 1.12.1, 2.1.36 and 3.7.62.

The combination of *arma* and *bella* is fairly common in both verse and prose; see TLL 2.1853.68ff. Ovid may, however, be alluding to the second proem of the *Aeneid* (7.37ff.) as well as to the first; cf. *Aen.* 7.41 *dicam horrida bella*. This possibility is supported by 1.15.25 *Aeneia ... arma*, which more certainly alludes to the opening line both of *Aen.* 1 and of *Aen.* 7; see the note *ad loc.* Vergil himself offers a brilliantly economical precedent for such a play; his opening word, *Arma*, not only conveys the substance of the *Iliad* but also echoes the sound of the first word of the *Odyssey*, Ἀνδρα. *Arma ... uiolentaque bella*, like *reges et proelia* at Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3, is deliberately vague; we are not to take seriously Ovid's claim to have been working on an epic. The joke is played differently at 2.1.11ff., where Ovid is misleadingly specific about his no doubt equally fictitious *Gigantomachia*. *uiolenta*: the goddess Tragedy is so described in a similar context at 3.1.11. *parabam*: cf. *Rem.* 2 (Cupid to Ovid) *bella mihi, uideo, bella parantur*.

grauis numero: for *grauis* denoting generic grandeur, cf. 3.1.23, 35, 36, 3.15.17, Arist. *Poet.* 1459B τὸ γὰρ ἡρωικὸν στασιμώτατον καὶ ὀγκωδέστατον τῶν μέτρων ἐστίν, Brink on Hor. *Ars* 14, and see also on 19 below, *numeris leuioribus*. *numero* signifies rhythm, whereas *modis* in the pentameter refers to the metre; see Owen on *Trist.* 2.331f. *forsan ... numeris leuioribus aptus / sim satis, in paruos sufficiamque modos*. Despite Ovid's reference here to serious poetry in a grand style, the couplet is as light as it could be, being completely dactylic; see Vol. 1, 117f.

materia conueniente modis: for the idea that different metres suit different subjects, cf. 19 (n.), 3.1.42 (Elegy is speaking) *non sum materia fortior ipsa mea*, 3.9.3f., *Rem.* 381ff., *Fast.* 2.119ff., *Trist.* 2.331f., 5.1.5f. *flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen, / materiae scripto conueniente suae*, *Pont.* 3.4.85f., *Epist. Sapph.* 5f., *Prop.* 2.1.39ff., *Hor. Carm.* 3.3.69ff., *Ars* 73ff. By drawing attention to the metre here, Ovid prepares us for the important point made in the following couplet. *materia* (-es) is found predominantly in prose; it occurs at Verg. *Aen.* 11.328, *Hor. Carm.* 3.24.49, *Ars* 38 and 131, never in Tibullus or Propertius, but 47 (9) times in Ovid.

3-4. par erat inferior uersus: Ovid often describes the elegiac couplet as an unequal pair of lines; cf. 2.17.21f. *carminis hoc ipsum genus impar, sed tamen apte / iungitur herous cum breuiore modo*, 3.1.7f., 37, *Ars* 1.264, *Trist.* 2.220, 3.1.56, *Pont.* 4.5.3, 4.16.11, 36, also *Hor. Ars* 75 *uersibus impariter iunctis*. The closest parallel for this description of hexameter poetry as being composed in equal lines is *Mart.* 8.3.14, where the context is similar: *paribus bella tonare modis. inferior*: cf. *Porph. Hor. Carm.* 4.14.49 *per zeugma ex inferiore [uersu] tellus audit accipere debemus*, *Serv. Aen.* 1.120, 3.260, 359. Comparison with 2.17.14 *aptari magnis inferiora licet* and 21f. (quoted above) suggests that, as well as the literal meaning 'lower', the sense 'inferior (now)' may also be present; cf. also *uersus* / ... *minor* as a description of the pentameter at *Pont.* 4.12.7f.

risisse Cupido / dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem: I can cite no precedent for this conceit. In Statius' description of Elegy at *Silu.* 1.2.9 as *alternum furata pedem*, *furata* is Sandstroem's conjecture (*codd.*: *fultura, futura, factura*). If that reading is correct, Statius is probably inspired by this couplet and by the personification of Elegy in 3.1; cf. also 250f. *qui nobile gressu / extremo fraudatis opus*, 5.3.98f. *et quis lasciuia uires tenuare Thalia / dulce uel heroos gressu truncare tenores*. Eros is, however, often characterised as a thief. His theft of the arms of Heracles was a common motif in Hellenistic sculpture and painting; see Daremberg-Saglio (1877-1919) s.v. *Cupido* 1606. Secundus *APlan.* 214 and Philip *id.* 215 describe the plundering of the Olympian deities' weapons by the Erotes. There is a somewhat similar conceit to that here at *AP* 4.3.129ff., where Agathias, in the introduction to his collection of epigrams, describes the amatory poems as a theft by Aphrodite: ἐκταῖον δὲ μέλος κλέπτουσα Κυθήρη / εἰς ὁάρους ἐλέγοιο παρατρέψει πορείην / καὶ γλυκεροῦς ἐς ἔρωτα. The verbal similarity of *Fast.* 5.691f. *talía Mercurius*

poscenti ridet ab alto, / se memor Ortygias surripuisse boues suggests that the portrayal of Cupid here possibly owes something to the notorious thievishness of the baby Mercury. *risisse*: cf. 2.18.15f. *risit Amor pallamque meam pictosque cothurnos / sceptraque priuata tam cito sumpta manu* and note also Elegy's smile at 3.1.33, mocking Tragedy's pretensions. For Cupid's laughter, cf. also 1.6.11. *dicitur* is problematic. It cannot be an appeal to literary authority (see on 1.5.11f. *isse / dicitur*), because the experience here is personal. Nor can we compare the slight distancing which Propertius gives to his claim to inspiration on Mount Helicon in 3.3 through his opening words *Visus eram*, since Ovid's phrasing would then imply an element of scepticism not intended by Propertius and inappropriate here, where we are to be in no doubt that it was Cupid who sabotaged the epic.

5-20. For complaints against Cupid, cf. e.g. Posidippus *AP* 12.98 (quoted in the introduction), Theocr. 3.15ff., Ap. Rhod. 4.445ff., Meleager *AP* 5.176, Verg. *Ecl.* 8.47ff., Tib. 1.6.1ff., Prop. 2.12.13ff., *Am.* 2.9.1ff., *Met.* 1.454ff., Claud. 10.111ff. In the *Amores*, Ovid also criticises Aurora (1.13) and Ceres (3.10). Here, he begins (5-12) by exploiting a standard rhetorical *locus de indignatione*; cf. Rhet. Her. 2.48, Cic. *Inu.* 1.101 *tertius locus est per quem quaerimus quidnam sit euenturum si idem ceteri faciant*. That *locus* recurs at 2.14.9ff., where Ovid objects to Corinna's abortion: *si mos antiquis placuisset matribus idem* etc. For the argument that deities should stick to their own spheres of influence, an argument which colours *APlan.* 214 and 215 (cited on 3-4), cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.428ff. (quoted on 7-8), 21.481ff., Ar. *Ran.* 105, Verg. *Aen.* 1.138ff., Stat. *Theb.* 9.825ff., Marc. Aurel. 6.43, Lucian *Deor. Conc.* 16, Lact. *Epit.* 2.7, Nonn. *Dion.* 38.196ff., also *Fast.* 3.175f. At *Met.* 1.454ff., Apollo bids Cupid not to meddle in archery but, like Ovid here, he is made to fall in love, shot by Cupid's arrow. There is some affinity also with Tib. 2.5.105ff., where Tibullus curses archery, Apollo's sphere of influence, because it has been taken over by Cupid. Ovid was possibly inspired to employ this mode of argument here by Callimachus' observation at *frag.* 1.20 that thundering is Zeus' business, not his: βροντᾶν οὐκ ἔμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός. The tenor of the argument leads us to expect that Ovid will conclude by demanding that Cupid stop meddling in affairs which do not concern him, but in fact, by introducing the idea of Cupid's omnipotence, he allows the tirade to peter out and turns to the apparently reasonable objection that he cannot write love-poetry

because he is not in love; that is a tactical mistake, for Cupid quickly and easily resolves the difficulty by shooting him.

5-6. *quis tibi ...?*: in beginning his tirade thus, Ovid possibly recalls Apollo's opening words to Propertius at 3.3.15f. *quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te / carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?*

saeue puer: for Cupid's cruelty, cf. 1.2.8, 1.6.34, 2.9.1ff., 2.10.19, 3.1.20, Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.6. Ovid's use of the concept here is wittily unusual; Cupid's cruelty normally manifests itself in pangs of love, but here in his prevention of epic poetry. Ovid emphasises Cupid's youth both here and in line 13, where *puer* is placed within the phrase *magna ... nimiumque potentia regna*; in line 25, however, he is forced to concede that youth is no obstacle to the power of *puer ille*. Apollo is similarly unsuccessful in his attempt to intimidate Cupid by addressing him as *lasciue puer* at *Met.* 1.456; cf. also Claud. *Carm. Min.* 29.51 (to Cupid) *quae tibi, saeue puer, non est permissa potestas?* In Meleager *AP* 12.86.4, νικᾷ τὸ θρασὺ παῖδάριον is Aphrodite's acknowledgment that Eros has greater power than she does herself. At Tib. 1.6.3, addressed to Cupid, most mss offer *quid tibi, saeue puer, mecum est?*, but *saeue puer* may be an intrusion from this line. (For Postgate's *saeue, rei*, see Murgatroyd's critical appendix [p. 313].)

hoc in carmina iuris: this is the earliest occurrence of *ius* used with reference to a deity's jurisdiction; cf. 1.2.20 (of Cupid), *Epist.* 4.12 (of Cupid) *regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos*, *Met.* 6.270 (*superi*) *tantum iuris haberent*, 10.37, 725, *Fast.* 4.118, 6.546 *in portus nato ius erit omne tuo*, 758, *TLL* 7.2.694.42ff. See also on 10 *lege*. For *hoc* constructed with a partitive genitive by Ovid, cf. *Met.* 5.135f. *hoc ... / ... terrae*, 9.400 *hoc ... muneris*, 10.218 *hoc aeui*; with *iuris*, cf. Lucan 6.496f. *hoc iuris in omnis / est illis (sc. Thessalian witches) superos?*, 8.95f. *hoc iuris habebat / in tantum fortuna caput?* Despite the generally high stylistic level of the *Metamorphoses* and of Lucan's epic, the expression seems to be colloquial; see K.-S. 1.432, H.-Sz. 52f., *TLL* 6.2742.55ff. For the construction of *ius* with *in* and the accusative, cf. 1.7.30 *in dominam ius mihi maius erit?*, *Epist.* 4.12 and *Fast.* 6.546 (both quoted above), Lucan *locc. cit.*, *TLL* 7.1.748.57ff., 7.2.690.68ff. At *Trist.* 3.7.48 *Caesar in hoc potuit iuris habere nihil*, *hoc* is ambiguous but very probably an accusative; at *Met.* 13.918f. *nec maius in aequore Proteus / ius habet*, where *aequora* has some support from the mss, *in aequore* may mean simply 'in the sea' rather than 'with regard to the sea'.

Pieridum uates, non tua, turba sumus: *uates* is a dignified archaic term, adopted by the Augustan poets to emphasise the solemnity of their calling; see Newman (1967) 99ff., Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.35, Puelma (1982) 296, n. 109a. Here, it enhances the pompous indignation of Ovid's complaint. Ovid often plays on the incongruity between, on the one hand, the pretensions inherent in *uates* and similar terms and, on the other, the undignified life of the elegiac poet-lover; cf. 2.1.34, 2.4.21f., 2.18.18, 3.1.67, 3.8.23f. *ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos / ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores* (n.), *Ars* 3.547f. (It is amusing to note that *ofydd*, one of the Welsh terms for 'poet', is derived from Ovid's name.) This line may be pointedly echoed at 3.15.1 *Quaere nouum uatem, tenerorum mater Amorum* and at *Rem.* 3 *parce tuum uatem sceleris damnare, Cupido*. See also on 24 *uates*. For the Muses as *Pierides*, see Smith on [Tib.] 4.2 (= 3.8) 21, *RE* Suppl. 8.495f. Ovid uses the term elsewhere in his amatory poetry only at *Ars* 3.547f., in a similarly high-flown utterance: *uatibus Aoniis faciles estote, puellae: / numen inest illis Pieridesque fauent*. We are probably not to recall the legend that the daughters of Pieros attempted to outdo the Aonian Muses in singing (cf. *Met.* 5.302ff.), thereby usurping their sphere of influence, as Cupid does here. *tua*: for the prenominal adjective denoting devotion to a deity, cf. 15 *tuum est, tua sunt*, Sen. *Ag.* 342 *tua te colimus turba Mycenae*, 722 *recede, Phoebe; iam non sum tua*, Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.70 (the Amorini to Venus) *tua turba sumus*. For *turba* used of poets and other literary figures, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.67, Prop. 3.1.12, 4.1.136, *Trist.* 2.119, 5.3.47, *Pont.* 4.16.41f., Liv. Pref. 3, Val. Max. 6.9 *ext.* 1, Petron. 6.1; of the followers of a deity, cf. 1.2.36, *Ars* 1.542, *Trist.* 1.5.34 *cetera Fortunae, non mea, turba fuit*, Sen. *Ag.* 342 (quoted above), Stat. *Silu.* *loc. cit.* and 2.3.25f., Mart. 5.7.6, 7.32.3. Here, *turba* perhaps denotes clientship; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.13, Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.1 and Sen. *Epist.* 68.11 *turba clientium*, Catull. 1.9 (of the Muse) *o patrona uirgo*, Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.78. The staccato alliteration and assonance of *t* and *u* helps to convey Ovid's indignation.

7-8. The clearly antithetical pairing of Venus and Minerva gives the list of *exempla* an effective and emphatic opening. For Venus as an unwarlike goddess, cf. 1.10.19 *nec Venus apta feris Veneris nec filius armis*, Hom. *Il.* 5.428ff. (Zeus to Aphrodite) οὐ τοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, δέδοται πολεμῆια ἔργα, / ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἡμερόντα μετέρχεο ἔργα γάμοιο, / ταῦτα δ' Ἀρηϊοθεῶ καὶ Ἀθήνῃ πάντα μελήσει. (We are not to recall here that Julius Caesar's signet-ring bore an armed Venus

[cf. Dio Cass. 43.43.3] or that there were cults of Aphrodite ὄπλοφόρος in several Greek communities; Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 9.320, Antimachus *AP* 9.321, Leonidas of Tarentum *APlan.* 171, Julian *id.* 173, Anon. *id.* 174, Antipater of Thessalonica *id.* 176, Philip *id.* 177 treat of such cults as paradoxical.) That Minerva should brandish the torches of love is equally incongruous. She is a warlike goddess (cf. 2.6.35 *armiferae ... Mineruae* [n.]), but αἰετάρθενος and shy about sexual matters; cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. 3.32ff., Lucian *Dear. Iud.* 2 and see also on 1.7.18 *casta Minerua*. For the nexus of etymological plays which emphasises the incongruity of a reversal of roles by these two goddesses, see Vol. 1, 56ff. That *quid, si praeripiat ... arma?* recalls Cupid's interference with Ovid's *arma* gives this couplet further point. Aphrodite competes against Athena in a weaving-contest at Nonn. *Dion.* 24.242ff., but the speeches by Athena (279ff.) and Hermes (297ff.) lay stress on the paradoxical nature of her behaviour.

quid, si ...?: for the idiom, see on 3.6.89.

praeripiat: for the sense 'snatch away from under someone's very gaze', cf. e.g. Sen. *Contr.* 1.1.15 *indignaris praereptum tibi officium*, Sen. *Herc. F.* 65 *sceptra praeripiet patri*. The verb, which is not used by Horace, Tibullus or Propertius, occurs, in the past participle, at *Met.* 5.10, 11.310, Verg. *Aen.* 4.516, 9.138. For Ovid's liking for *prae-*compounds, see on 1.4.33 *praegustauerit*.

flauae ... Mineruae: *TLL* 6.889.1ff. cites *flaua* as an epithet for Minerva elsewhere only at *Met.* 2.749, 8.275, *Fast.* 6.652, *Trist.* 1.10.1, Stat. *Theb.* 3.507; cf. ξανθή, used as an epithet for Athena at e.g. Pind. *Nem.* 10.7, *frg.* 34 Snell-Maehler, Bacchyl. 5.92.

uentilet: cf. Prop. 4.3.50 *hanc Venus, ut uiuat, uentilat ipsa facem*.

9-10. A further strongly contrasting pair of deities, Diana being a virgin, Ceres the Earth-Mother. We are not to recall here that Ovid does in fact portray Ceres behaving in such an incongruous way at 3.10.35ff., spending her time in the woods on Cretan Ida during her love-affair with the huntsman Iasius.

quis probet ...?: Ovid elegantly varies the construction, with an active infinitive in the hexameter, a passive infinitive in the pentameter. Note also the variation from the surrounding couplets, *quid, si praeripiat ... / uentilet ...?* and *quis ... / instruat?*

in siluis ... regnare: cf. Stat. *Theb.* 9.627f. *quid in nostris, nemoralis Delia, siluis / Maenades hostiles Thebanaeque numina regnant?*, *Peruig. Ven.* 47 *regnet in siluis Dione; tu recede, Delia*.

iugosis: the word occurs elsewhere only at *Epist.* 4.85 *tu modo durtitiam siluis depone iugosis*, which introduces Phaedra's argument to Hippolytus that, although the woods are the haunt of Diana, they are also an appropriate place for love-affairs. For adjectives in *-osus* extant first or only in Ovid, cf. *fruticosus* (*Epist.* 2.121, *Met.* 6.344), *inambitosus* (*Met.* 11.765), *iuncosus* (*Met.* 7.231), *lucrosus* (*Am.* 1.10.35, *Trist.* 2.507), *prodigiosus* (*Am.* 3.6.17, *Met.* 9.727, 13.968); see also on 1.6.65 *pruinosis* and 2.6.44 *procelloso*. The nuance of such formations ranges from the colloquial to the highly poetic; see Ross (1969) 53ff., Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.70, Knox (1982) 76ff. and also the notes to 14 *ambitiose*, 1.5.11 *formosa*, 1.8.55 *inuidiosa*, 62 *ingeniosa*, 81 *spatiosum*, 111 *lacrimosa*, 112 *rugosas*, 1.9.46 *desidiosus*, 1.14.11 *cliuosae*, 1.15.19 *animosi*, 2.2.13 *furiosus* and 3.2.1 *studiosus*. *iugosus* may be among those adjectives coined in imitation of epic formations in *-οεις*; cf. *ὄφρυοεις* (Hom. *Il.* 22.411 etc.), *λοφόμεεις* (Nonn. *Dion.* 2.37).

lege: for *lex* used of the power of deities, cf. [Tib.] 3.9.19f. *lege Dianae / ... casta retia tende manu*, TLL 7.2.1249.37ff. and see also on 5 *iuris*. By referring to Diana in this way, Ovid is possibly hinting at her usurpation of Ceres' powers not only as a goddess of agriculture, but also as a law-giver; for Δημήτηρ Θεσμοφόρος, *Ceres legifera*, see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.58.

pharetratae: for this epithet for Diana, cf. *Epist.* 20.206, *Met.* 3.252, *Trist.* 4.4.64, Stat. *Theb.* 1.535, Sidon. *Carm.* 7.30, also Claud. 24.242. The epithet is applied equally often to Cupid himself (see on 2.5.1) and he is wearing his quiver during this interview (cf. 21). (Jupiter is the only other deity so described, at Stat. *Theb.* 4.294.) Nevertheless, the term possibly contains a hint at Cupid's trespass in Diana's preserves: at *Met.* 1.452ff., Cupid shoots Apollo, Diana's brother, in response to his taunt that he should not meddle in archery; note especially Apollo's words at 457: *ista decent umeros gestamina nostros. pharetratus* occurs first at Verg. *Georg.* 4.290, *Aen.* 11.649, Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.35 and 9 (2) times in Ovid. The scansion *pharētratus* predominates, *pharētratus* being found in Augustan poetry only at 2.5.1 and Verg. *Aen.* 11.649.

11-12. The antithesis is not so strong here for, although Mars is proverbially unmusical, Apollo is not an unwarlike deity: he fought against the Greeks at Troy, for Octavian at Actium, and his name was sometimes considered to be derived from ἀπολλύναι (see Diggle on Eur. *Phaeth.* 225). The contrast is not so much between the deities

themselves as between their attributes, the spear and the lyre. Apollo, the god of archery, is rarely represented with a spear, whereas it is Mars' favourite weapon and the *hastae Martis* were among Rome's most sacred treasures. Mars is often specifically dissociated from the lyre, which was given to Apollo by its inventor, the baby Mercury; cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 681 ἄχορον, ἀκίθαριν, δακρυογόνον Ἄρη, Arist. *Rhet.* 1412B ἡ ἀσπίς ... ἐστὶ φιάλη Ἄρεος, καὶ τόξον φόρμιγγος ἄχορδος, also Pind. *Pyth.* 1.10ff., *Fast.* 3.1ff., At Nonn. *Dion.* 5.93ff., Ares does play the σάλπιγξ in celebration of Harmonia's wedding, but that is represented as paradoxical behaviour.

crinibus insignem: for Apollo's lovely hair, see on 1.14.31f. Since he is not an unwarlike deity, it is not in point here that excessive attention to the hair was thought inappropriate in warriors (see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.15.14). When Apollo joins the fighting at *Il.* 20.39, Homer describes him as ἀκερσεκόμης; Ovid's phrase, which recurs at Stat. *Theb.* 9.758, is equivalent to some such compound adjective. *crinis* (Ov. 66 [46], Verg. 31 [28], Hor. 11 [10], Tib. 7, Prop. 8) is somewhat more elevated than either *capillus* (Ov. 160 [85], Verg. 2 [1], Hor. 18 [8], Tib. 11, Prop. 15) or *coma* (Ov. 156 [62], Verg. 27 [25], Hor. 12 [10], Tib. 24, Prop. 29); see Fedeli on Prop. 1.2.1.

acuta cuspidē: for the phrase, cf. *Epist.* 3.119, *Met.* 1.470 (the point of the arrow with which Cupid shoots Apollo), 4.299, 6.78, 7.131 (*praeacutae*), *Ibis* 481f., Verg. *Aen.* 5.208, Mart. 14.92.1. *cuspidis*: Ov. 36 (27), Verg. 12 (12), Hor. 2 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 4. Here, as often, the term is used as a rather grand metonymy for *hasta*. The harshness of the *c*-sounds helps to convey Ovid's indignation, and is perhaps inspired by Prop. 3.3.41f. (Calliope to Propertius) *nil tibi sit rauco praeconia classica cornu / flare, nec Aonium tingere Marte nemus* (cf. Ovid's *Aonium Marte* following immediately).

instruat: the primary meaning here is 'equip' (see TLL 7.1.2018.45ff.), but the sense 'draw up for battle' (see TLL 7.1.2016.36ff.) is also felt.

Aonium Marte mouente lyram: Ovid has in mind Prop. 1.2.27f. *cum tibi praesertim Phoebus sua carmina donet / Aoniumque libens Calliopea lyram* (note Propertius' line 30 *omnia quaeque Venus quaeque Minerua probat*) and perhaps also 3.3.42 (quoted above). For *lyram* (uel sim.) *mouere*, cf. *Met.* 5.112 *qui citharam cum uoce moueres*, 10.40 *neruos ... ad uerba mouentem*, Diggle on Eur. *Phaeth.* 71f. σύριγγας δ' οὐριβάται / κινούσιν ποιμνῶν ἐλάται. Ovid is here influenced by the expression *arma mouere*, for which see on 1.9.26.

13-14. magna ... nimiumque potentia regna: for Cupid's *regnum*, cf. e.g. 2.9.52f., *Epist.* 4.12 (quoted on 5), *Rem.* 24, *Pont.* 3.3.35, Eur. *Hipp.* 538 Ἐρωτα ... τὸν τύραννον ἀνδρῶν, *frg.* 136 Nauck. The idea recurs in line 26. *nimium* is perhaps to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, with *magna* as well as with *potentia*; cf. 1.2.17 *acrius ... multoque ferocius*, Prop. 2.34.11 *quid si non constans illa et tam certa fuisset?* and see also on 27 *sex ... numeris, in quinque*.

puer is emphatic by position; see on 5 *saeue puer*. A comparable effect is achieved by Callimachus at *Iou.* 32f. χρῶα παιδρύνασα, / ὦνα, τεδὸν σπείρωσε. For the antithesis between Cupid's small size and his great power, cf. Theocr. 19.7f. τὸ δ' οὐκ ἴσος ἐσσι μελίσσαις, / ὃς τυτθὸς μὲν ξεῖς τὰ δὲ τραύματα ἄλικά ποιεῖς, Naev. *Com.* 55 *edepol, Cupido, cum tu tam paucillu's, nimis multum uales*.

opus affectas: I have not noted this expression elsewhere. Ovid is influenced by the common *regnum affectare*, for which see on 3.8.51 *affectas caelum*.

ambitiose has connotations of electioneering, as does *petit* in a similar context at 3.1.60 *te (sc. Ovid) ... petit ista (sc. Tragedy)*; see the note *ad loc.* The word almost always has a pejorative nuance when used of those who are canvassing for *honores*; cf. e.g. Cic. *Flacc.* 42, *Epist.* 6.6.8 *cedit multorum iustis et officio incensis, non inanibus aut ambitiosis uoluntatibus*, also Sall. *Catil.* 11.1f. Common in prose from the late Republic onwards, it occurs 10 (3) times in Ovid, 3 (1) times in Horace, but not in Vergil, Tibullus or Propertius. Similarly, *ambitio* is found 5 (3) times in Ovid, 7 (*Sat.* 6, *Epist.* 1) times in Horace, but not in Vergil, Tibullus or Propertius. *inambitiosus* occurs only at *Met.* 11.765. For adjectives in *-osus*, see on 9 *iugosis*.

15-16. an, quod ubique, tuum est?: an indignant question expecting a negative answer; cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.7 *Verres quod ubique erit pulcherrimum auferet?* In fact, however, Cupid is all-powerful, as Ovid comes to recognise at 1.2.37 *superas hominesque deosque* (see the note). For universal power as an attribute of a deity, cf. e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 1268ff., Call. *Del.* 218ff., Lucr. 1.1ff., *Fast.* 4.117 (of Venus) *ubique potens*, Aristides *Orat.* 45.14 (to Sarapis) πάντα γὰρ πανταχοῦ διὰ σοῦ τε καὶ διὰ σέ ἡμῖν γίγνεται. For the omission of the verb in the subordinate clause, cf. e.g. 1.2.3, 3.10.5 *gentes, ubi quaeque, Ars* 1.267 *quisquis ubique. tuum est*; see on 6 *tua*. The indignant anaphora *tuum est, tua sunt* perhaps suggests the encomiastic 'Du-Stil' of

normal, hymnic, addresses to deities; see on 1.6.15f.

Heliconia tempe: for Helicon as the haunt of the Muses, see Bömer on *Met.* 2.219. Tempe, the name of the valley of the river Peneus between Ossa and Olympus, came to be a generic term for any valley; see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.477 *Heloria tempe* and *Met.* 7.371 *Cycneia tempe*. Ovid, in these three passages, is the first to use the word with non-Thessalian geographical epithets; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 1.485 *Teumesia tempe, Silu.* 5.3.209 *Boeota* (Baehrens' conj.) ... *tempe. Heliconius* occurs only here in Ovid, in earlier Latin only at Catull. 61.1. Ἑλικώνιος is used by Homer (*Il.* 20.404, with reference to Helice in Achaea), but is never common; it is an epithet for the Muses at Pind. *Isth.* 8.57. See also on 1.13.23 *feminei ... labores*.

uix ... iam: 'hardly any longer'; the combination occurs elsewhere in Ovid at *Met.* 2.863 and 4.350, *Pont.* 2.7.42 (cf. *Met.* 9.684f. and 10.62 *iam uix*), earlier only at Plaut. *Capt.* 504, Lucr. 4.402 and ten times in Cicero's prose; see *TLL* 7.1.100.54ff.

lyra ... sua: rhetorical blustering. Lyre-playing Cupids are, in fact, common in art; see e.g. Greifenhagen (1957) figg. 9-12, 18, 20, 22 and 23.

tuta: 'assured'; cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 2.2.21f. *regnum et diadema tutum / deferens uni propriamque laurum*, Val. Fl. 8.14f. *tu, precor, haec longa placidus mox sceptrum senecta / tuta geras*.

17-18. bene: for Ovid's lack of modesty about his ability, see the introduction. For *bene* in this context, cf. 2.1.16, Manil. 2.754 *bene de summa ueniat post singula carmen*.

surrexit ... pagina: cf. 27 *surgat opus (n.)*, *Trist.* 5.9.3f. *in ... libellis / creuisset sine te pagina nulla meis*, *Laus Pis.* 1, Stat. *Theb.* 10.445f. *quamuis mea carmina surgant / inferiore lyra*, Juv. 7.100 *millensima pagina surgit*, also *Pont.* 3.3.31f. (Ovid to Cupid) *nec me Maeonio consurgere carmine nec me / dicere magnorum passus es acta ducum*. See also on 2.18.14 *creuit*.

attenuat neruos ... meos: Ovid acknowledges the comparative weakness of the pentameter; cf. 27, Hermesianax 7.36 Powell μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα τὸ πενταμέτρου, Didymus p. 387 Schmidt πεντάμετρον τῷ ἡρωϊκῷ συνῆπτον, οὐχ ὁμοδραμοῦντα τῇ τοῦ προτέρου δυνάμει, ἀλλ' οἷον συνεκπνέοντα καὶ συσβεννύμενον ταῖς τοῦ τελευτήσαντος τύχαις. For the consequences of this principle for the construction of the couplet, see Vol. 1, 108ff. λεπτότης, *tenuitas*, was the Callimachean ideal; cf. e.g. *frg.* 1.23f. (quoted in the introduction), *Epigr.* 27.3f., Prop. 3.1.1ff. *Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra*

Philitae / ... / *dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro?*, 8 *exactus tenui pumice uersus eat*, Stat. *Silu.* 4.7.9 (of a lyric poem in contrast to the *Thebaid*) *carmen tenuare tempto*. See also on 3.1.9 *uestis tenuissima*. In conjunction with *neruos*, however, *attenuat* here bears the negative meaning 'weaken'. For *nerui* in the sense 'vigour', with reference to a literary work, cf. *Pont.* 2.5.69, Brink on Hor. *Ars* 26. Although found predominantly in prose and less common in poetry than the simple verb, *attenuare* is not perceptibly prosaic in tone; it occurs 8 (2) times in Ovid, and at Catull. 64.41, Lucr. 1.317, Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.13, *Epiced. Drusi* 342, Mart. 14.104.1. See also Knox (1986) 26, n. 67. Here, however, Ovid is influenced by the semi-technical use of *attenuatum* to denote the simplest style of oratory; cf. e.g. *Rhet. Her.* 4.11.16 *omne genus orationis, et graue et mediocre et attenuatum*.

proximus ille: i.e. the *inferior uersus* of line 3. For *ille* so used, referring back to something already mentioned, cf. e.g. 25 *puer ille*, referring back to *saeue puer* (5) and *puer* (13). (It has been suggested to me that *proximus ille* means rather 'that dreadful god, Cupid, coming right up to me'. The run of the couplet, however, favours a balancing contrast between the two types of line, and *proximus* does not suit an archer.)

Marg-Harder detect in this couplet the *Amores*' 'erste kleine obszöne Doppeldeutigkeit'. For *attenuare* used of the weakening effects of love, cf. e.g. *Met.* 3.489 *attenuatus amore*; for *neruus* meaning 'penis', cf. Hor. *Epod.* 12.19, *Priap.* 83.42, Juv. 9.34, 10.205, Apul. *Met.* 2.16, Adams (1982) Index 1 s.v. Since, however, Ovid emphasises in the next couplet that he has no beloved, such an undertone does not seem appropriate here.

19-20. nec mihi materia est numeris leuioribus apta: by echoing *grauis numero* ... / ... *materia conueniente modis* in the opening couplet of the poem, Ovid perhaps signals the conclusion of his speech. For *leuis* as a literary critical term, cf. 2.1.21, 3.1.41, *Trist.* 2.331f. *forsan ... numeris leuioribus aptus / sim satis*, Bömer on *Met.* 10.152ff. *nunc opus est leuiore lyra, puerosque canamus / dilectos superis inconcessisque puellas / ignibus attonitas meruisse libidine poenam* and see also on line 1 *grauis numero*. For *aptus* in such contexts, cf. 2.1.4, 2.17.21 (n.) and see also on line 2 *materia conueniente modis*.

aut puer aut longas compta puella comas: Ovid takes it for granted that love is the appropriate subject for elegy; see Vol. 1, 104. For this type of polarised expression, cf. e.g. Theocr. 2.44 εἴτε γυνὰ τήνῃ

παράκεκλῖται εἴτε καὶ ἀνὴρ, 150, Call. *Epigr.* 25.1f., Lucr. 4.1052ff., Verg. *Ecl.* 10.37f., Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.116f., 2.3.325, *Epod.* 11.3f., 27f. (quoted below), *Epist.* 1.18.72ff., *Carm.* 4.1.29f., Mart. 6.16.4 *puer et longis pulchra puella comis*, 8.73.9f.

Ovid's casual attitude to the sex of his beloved is apparently traditional, as is indicated by, in particular, Verg. *Ecl.*, Hor. *Epod.* and *Carm. locc. cit.*; cf. also Meleager *AP* 12.86. In fact, however, he seems to have been averse to homosexuality; cf. *Ars* 2.683f. *odi concubitus qui non utrumque resoluunt: / hoc est cur pueri tangar amore minus* and note the censorious tone of 1.524 *si quis male uir quaerit habere uirum* and of 3.437f. *femina quid faciat, cum sit uir leuior ipsa / forsitan et plures possit habere uiros?* Here, there may be a pointed change of emphasis from Hor. *Epod.* 11.27f., indicating Ovid's preference: *aut alius ardor, aut puellae candidae / aut teretis pueri longam renodantis comam*. Homosexuality is mentioned elsewhere in the *Amores* only by Dipsas, at 1.8.68 *quod det* (sc. *amator*), *amatorem flagitet ante suum*, Marathus being ignored in the lament for Tibullus in 3.9. Even in the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid makes very sparing use of the rich resources of Greek homosexual mythology, the greatest concentration of such stories being the brief accounts of Cyparissus, Ganymede and Hyacinthus at 10.106-219. Ovid is unlikely to be the author of the homosexual *Priap.* 3, which Seneca seems to attribute to him at *Contr.* 1.2.22; see Buchheit (1962) 15ff. This rejection of homosexual themes is matched by Propertius, who treats of homosexual love only in 1.20 and 2.4, on a non-personal level. Such a rejection, however, goes against the traditions of Hellenistic poetry, in which homosexuality features prominently (see Cairns [1979] 22). Catullus follows the Hellenistic fashion in his Juvenius-poems, as does Tibullus in his Marathus-elegies and in his account of Apollo's love for Admetus at 2.3.11ff. It may be reasonable to infer from Verg. *Ecl.* 10.37ff. that Gallus also wrote such poetry. On Roman attitudes to homosexuality and homosexual poetry, see Williams (1968) 549ff., Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.19, Bright (1978) 228ff., Griffin (1985) 24ff. and, for Ovid's attitude in particular, Verstraete (1975), Sabot (1976) 577ff.

compta ... comas: an etymologising jingle; cf. *Pont.* 3.3.16 *nec bene dispositas comptus ut ante comas*, [Tib.] 3.8.10 *seu compsit, comptis est ueneranda comis*, Hor. *Carm.* 2.11.23f., Verg. *Aen.* 6.48, Isid. *Orig.* 10.56 *comptus a coma dictus*. For the Hellenising construction with the accusative, cf. 29 (n.), 3.1.7, 3.6.48, 3.9.52, *Pont. loc. cit.*, Lucan 10.83 *simulatum compta dolorem*, K.-S. 1.289f. Given the common

ambivalence whereby a reference to an elegiac mistress could signify both the woman herself and the poetry written about her (see Vol. 1, 106), and given that Ovid refers to his mistress both here and at 1.3.19 as the *materia* for his poetry, the use of *comptus* as a critical term may be in play here; cf. e.g. Cic. *Part.* 19 *genus... orationis... comptum atque expolitum*, Sen. *Contr.* 2.2.8 (of Ovid) *habebat ille comptum et decens et amabile ingenium*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.79.

21-24. Elaborate descriptions of shooting with a bow are frequent in epic; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.105ff., *Od.* 21.404ff., Verg. *Aen.* 11.858ff. For Cupid in such descriptions, cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.278ff., Nonn. *Dion.* 7.110ff., 16.1ff. This scene is reworked at *Met.* 5.379ff., where Cupid shoots Dis in order to make him fall in love with Proserpina: *ille pharetram / soluit et arbitrio matris de mille sagittis / unam seposuit, sed qua nec acutior ulla / nec minus incerta est nec quae magis audiat arcum, / oppositoque genu curuauit flexile cornum / inque cor hamata percussit harundine Ditem*. Both passages are constructed as a single sentence, emphasising the speed of Cupid's action. Ovid is influenced at least as much by the plastic arts as by the literary tradition. For his indebtedness to, in particular, works in the style of Lysippus' bow-drawing Eros, see Bömer on *Met.* 5.383. Descriptions of, and allusions to, works of art are common in Ovid (cf. 1.2.31-6, 1.8.59f., 1.14.33f., 3.2.31f., 3.9.7-14 [nn.], Bartholomé [1935], Herter [1958], Benediktson [1985]) and in Hellenistic and Roman poetry in general (see Cairns [1979] 134, n. 48).

21-22. questus eram: for the pluperfect after direct speech, cf. e.g. 1.13.47, 3.1.61, 3.[5.]45, 3.6.67.

pharetra ... soluta: in his note on *Met.* 5.379f. (quoted on 21-24), Bömer suggests that, both in that passage and here, Ovid is describing Cupid taking his quiver from his shoulder. It seems preferable, however, to follow Burman's suggestion (on this passage) that he is describing Cupid undoing the $\pi\omega\mu\alpha$ (cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.116 etc.) which closes his quiver. For *soluere* in the sense 'undo', cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 1142f. *solue uidulum ... / — hoc habet, solutust. — aperi, OLD s.v. 2a.*

cum protinus: it is a quality of divinity to be able to accomplish things easily and quickly; cf. Hes. *Op.* 5ff. with West's note. Cupid works fast in such situations; cf. 1.6.13 *nec mora, uenit amor*, Nonn. *Dion.* 16.8 οὐ μὲν Ἐρως δῆθ' ἔθ' ἐκ βόλοιο. As at 1.8.109 (following a speech), the inverse *cum* construction helps to convey an impression of rapidity; see K.-S. 2.339, H.-Sz. 623 'hier enthält der *cum*-Satz den

Hauptgedanken und bezeichnet meist den Eintritt einer plötzlichen oder unerwarteten Handlung (daher oft mit *desubito* seit Enn. scaen. 375, *subito* seit Lutat. epigr. 2, *repente* seit Cic., bzw. mit entsprechenden Adj. *repens* [—*tinus*] seit Verg., Liv.)'. I have noted *protinus* in this construction elsewhere only at Stat. *Theb.* 1.533f.

legit: it was a common practice to inscribe the name of the intended victim on missiles; see Daremberg-Saglio (1877-1919) s.v. *glans* 1610, *RE* 7.1379. At *Dion.* 7.112ff., Nonnus recounts that Eros had written twelve lines on the back of his quiver, each naming one of the twelve women with whom he makes Zeus fall in love by shooting him. If we may assume that Ovid's name is on the arrow which Cupid shoots at him, that gives particular point to the precise description of the arrow as *in exitium ... facta meum* and perhaps endows *legit* with a double meaning, not only 'selected' but also 'read'.

in exitium ... facta meum: for the final construction of *in* with the accusative, a usage of which Ovid is inordinately fond, cf. Tib. 1.5.48 *uenit in exitium callida lena meum*, *Met.* 7.406, *Ibis* 520, *TLL* 5.2.1529.27ff., 7.1.767.4ff. and see also on 1.3.19, 1.6.5, 14, 1.7.25f., 1.8.81, 86, 1.9.41, 1.10.25, 1.13.46, 2.4.48, 2.6.30, 2.10.12, 25, 3.4.36, 3.7.3, 3.8.33, 3.9.51, 3.11.22.

spicula, like *sagittas* in 25 and *sagittae* at 1.2.7, is probably plural for singular. The emphatically delayed *opus* (24) has more point if we imagine it as coinciding with the release, or striking home, of a single arrow rather than with that of one of several. Ovid probably has in mind Prop. 2.13A.2 (quoted in the introduction), the only earlier occurrence of the word *spiculum* in Augustan elegy. (There, however, the plural is a true plural.)

23-24. lunauit: although the participle *lunatus* is fairly common, the finite verb occurs elsewhere in classical Latin only at Prop. 4.6.25 *aciem geminos Nireus lunarat in arcus*.

sinuosum ... arcum: cf. Germ. *frg.* 4.102f. *cum per sinuosa feretur / cornua Centauri rapida distincta sagitta*, Homer. 436 *sinuoso ... arcu*. *sinuosus* occurs first at Verg. *Georg.* 1.244, *Aen.* 11.753, Prop. 4.1.15 and 3 (1) times in Ovid, and continues to be found predominantly in poetry. For such formations, see on 9 *iugosis*.

fortiter: of drawing a bow, cf. *Rem.* 435 *attrahet ille puer (sc. Cupid) contentos fortius arcus*, Ammian. 24.2.13. For *fortis* (—*iter*) with reference to physical strength, a usage which is particularly common in Ovid, cf. 1.7.26, 38, 2.5.47, 2.10.28, 2.11.38, 3.1.42, 3.2.32, 3.7.42, *TLL* 6.1148.36ff., 1164.65ff.

Hexameters constructed of only five words are not uncommon (there are thirty-six examples in Book 1 [9.5%]). Such lines, however, tend to create a slow and dignified rhythm, which in some cases seems to serve a particular purpose. Here, it perhaps suggests the bending of the god's bow; cf. 3.3.29 *nobis flexibiles curuantur Apollinis arcus*, *Met.* 5.383 (quoted on 21-24).

'quod'que 'canas, uates, accipe' dixit 'opus': Cupid speaks a mere five words in response to Ovid's long tirade. An inspiring deity could hardly be more laconic. The Muses gave Hesiod a pipe and a staff as a symbol of his poetic inspiration (*Hes. Theog.* 30f., *Verg. Ecl.* 6.69f.), Archilochus, a lyre (see Tarditi [1968] p. 5.22ff.), Gallus, the pipe which they had once given to Hesiod (*Verg. loc. cit.*); Cupid shoots Ovid with an arrow. *quod ... canas*: cf. 3.1.27 (Tragedy to Ovid, attempting to turn him away from love-elegy) *quod tenerae cantent lusit tua Musa puellae* (n.). For *-que* connecting direct speech with what has preceded, see Housman (1897) 426f., Marouzeau (1958) 104f., Bömer on *Met.* 9.109. Although the device is very common in Ovid, I have not noted it in earlier Latin, nor does τε seem to be so used in Greek. The usage recurs occasionally in later Latin poets, perhaps most frequently in Valerius Flaccus, as at e.g. 4.387, 474, 6.305. For the double break in the direct speech, see on 2.9.25 *'uiue' deus 'posito' si quis mihi dicat 'amore'*. *uates*: the prototype in such contexts of divine inspiration is Apollo's ἀοιδέ at *Call. frg.* 1.23 (quoted in the introduction). Here, Cupid is sarcastically echoing Ovid's pompous use of the term in line 6. *accipe ... opus*: the expression seems not to occur elsewhere. Ovid may be playing with the common phrase *uulnus accipere*, and it is perhaps worth noting that δέξαι, λαβέ and *accipe* were frequently inscribed on missiles; see Daremberg-Saglio (1877-1919) s.v. *glans* 1610f. *Verg. Ecl.* 6.69 (Linus to Gallus) *hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae* suggests that Ovid may be alluding to a scene in which Gallus described his *Dichterweihe*. As at 3.9.5 *ille tui uates operis* and in the passages quoted below from the *Ars*, *Remedia* and *Fasti*, *opus* has religious connotations, the solemnity of which Cupid mocks. Ovid uses the form *opus* 186 times in his elegiac poetry, 114 times in this position and often with hyperbaton, as at 3.1.6 *quod mea, quaerebam, Musa moueret, opus*, *Ars* 3.770 (Venus to Ovid) *'praecipue nostrum est, quod pudet' inquit 'opus'*; cf. also *Rem.* 40 (Cupid to Ovid) *'propositum perforce' dixit 'opus'*, *Fast.* 4.16 (Venus to Ovid) *'coeptum perforce' dixit 'opus'*, *Trist.* 3.11.52. The effect of delaying this emphatic word here is to suggest the tension as Cupid draws back the bow-string and then

shoots at, or hits, Ovid.

25-26. me miserum!: Ovid uses this exclamation 45 (15) times. It is not found in Vergil, Horace or Tibullus (*heu miserum!* at 2.3.78), in Propertius only at 2.33B.35 and 3.23.19. It is fairly common in Comedy and rhetorical prose; see *TLL* 8.1105.84ff. For the exclamatory accusative in general, see Knox (1986) 56. Ovid favours the idiom because it helps to produce a lively style; see Vol. 1, 68. Here, he is perhaps echoing and dramatising Prop. 1.1.1 *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*.

certas ... sagittas: εὐστοχία is a natural attribute for a deity; cf. Prop. 1.7.15 (quoted in the introduction), 2.34.60 (*me*) *quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus* (sc. Cupid), Tib. 2.1.70 (of Cupid's skill in archery) *ei mihi, quam doctas nunc habet ille manus!*, *Met.* 1.519f. (quoted below), Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 536.

habuit: perhaps not a gnomic perfect (see on 1.10.27 *poposcit*), a means of stating an always prevailing condition. Here, Ovid may be acknowledging Cupid's εὐστοχία with particular reference to a moment in the past (ἄρ' ἔσχεν); cf. *haeserunt* (n.), in the corresponding passage at 1.2.7.

puer ille: echoing (see on 18 *proximus ille*) 5 *saeue puer* and 13 *puer*. For Cupid so described, cf. *Verg. Ecl.* 8.49, 50, [Verg.] *Ciris* 133, Prop. 3.10.28, *Ars* 3.515, *Rem.* 149, 168, 435, also Prop. 1.6.23 *puer iste*, 1.17.15 *puer hic*.

uror: for the image of love as fire, cf. 1.2.9, 43ff., 1.8.70 (n.), 1.9.33, 1.13.[33], 1.15.27, 2.1.8, 2.4.12, 2.8.11, 2.9.5, 27, 2.16.11f., 2.17.3, 2.19.15, 3.1.20, 3.2.33, 39f., 3.9.56, 3.10.27, *CE* 1405.5f. *urimur et proprias pertundis corde sagittas / et tuus in nostro pectore regnat amor*, Pease on *Verg. Aen.* 4.2, Kost on Musaeus 19, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.33.6.

in uacuo pectore regnat Amor: some take *uacuo* to mean 'fancy-free (until Cupid took possession)'. That interpretation accords well with 1.2.8 *possessa ferus pectora uersat Amor*. It may be, however, that Ovid is not yet thinking here of Cupid as *possessor*. The sense '(still) fancy-free' seems rather more pointed. It is a witty paradox that Ovid should be consumed with love even though he does not yet have a beloved. *uacuuus* would occur more naturally in an antithesis to *uri*, as at Hor. *Carm.* 1.6.19 *uacui, siue quid urimur*. Ovid may, in fact, be alluding to that passage, which stands at the end of a poem in which Horace tells how the Muse forbids him to write a martial epic and allows him to write only about banquets and love. This line is echoed

at *Rem.* 752 *dum bene de uacuo pectore cedit amor* (or *Amor?*) and at *Met.* 1.519f. (Apollo, when shot by Cupid) *certa quidem nostra est, nostra tamen una sagitta / certior, in uacuo* (i.e. before he fell in love with Daphne, his *primus amor* [452]) *quae uulnera pectore fecit*. For *uacuum pectus*, cf. also Prop. 1.10.30 *qui numquam uacuo pectore liber erit*, Lucke on *Rem. loc. cit.* For the *pectus* as the seat of love, cf. 1.2.8, 1.11.9, 2.9.52, 3.2.40, 3.3.42, 3.[5.]43f., 3.6.59, 3.10.18, 3.11.2 and 33, Pichon (1966) s.v., Bömer on *Met.* 7.55. Comparison with *possessa* at 1.2.8 suggests that *uacuo* here bears a legal *color*, denoting *sine possessore*; cf. Rhet. Her. 4.40 *necesse est ... istum fundum ... ostendas te aut uacuum possedissem aut usu tuum fecissem*, Ulp. Dig. 38.9.1 *ne bona hereditaria uacua sine domino diutius iacerent*, Stroh (1971) 146, n. 23, OLD s.v. 9a and b. *regnat* pointedly echoes *regna* in line 13, emphasising Ovid's acquiescence.

27-28. surgat opus: cf. *Fast.* 4.830, 5.111, *Trist.* 2.559f., Prop. 4.1.67, Manil. 1.113 and see also on 17 *surrexit ... pagina* and on *residat* below.

numeris and **in** are both to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, with both *sex* and *quinque*. For such postponement of *in* until the second phrase, see Bömer on *Met.* 6.190 *'hospita tu terris erras, ego' dixit 'in undis'*.

residat: cf. *Trist.* 3.1.11 *clauda ... alterno subsidunt carmina uersu*, Plin. *Epist.* 5.17.2 (*materia*) *scripta elegis erat fluentibus ... uarie nunc attollebatur, nunc residebat*.

ferrea ... bella echoes *uiolenta ... bella* in line 1, just as *modis* occurs in the same position as in line 2. (For such ring-composition, see on 1.5.26 *medii ... dies*.) A contrast is thus implied with the *bella amoris* which Ovid has now espoused; cf. e.g. 1.9.45, 2.18.12 *res ... domi gestas et mea bella cano*. Ovid shows his commitment to his new genre with a, perhaps distinctly Tibullan, condemnation of war; cf. Tib. 1.1.75f., 1.2.65f. *ferreus ille fuit qui, te cum posset habere, / maluerit praedas stultus et arma sequi*, 1.10.1f. *Quis fuit, horrendos primus qui protulit enses? / quam ferus et uere ferreus ille fuit!* *ferreum* occurs elsewhere as an epithet for *bellum* only at *Epist.* 13.64.

cum uestris ... ualete modis: cf. 2.1.35f. *heroum clara ualete / nomina, Anacreont.* 23.10ff. χαίροιτε λοιπὸν ἡμῖν, / ἥρωες: ἡ λύρη γὰρ / μόνους ἔρωτας ἄδει. The prototype for such dismissals of elevated genres is Call. *frag.* 1.17 ἔλλατε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος; see Wimmel (1960) 100, n. 3. The addition of *cum uestris ... modis* seems to strike a note of impatience, consonant with the censorious tone of *ferrea ... bella*; see on 1.8.66 *tolle tuos tecum, pauper amator, auos*.

Ovid may, in fact, be echoing a formula for the renunciation of a friendship; cf. Catull. 11.17 *cum suis uiuat ualeatque moechis* with Yardley (1981) 66f. He may also be inverting a kletic prayer-formula of the type *adesto, Tiberine, cum tuis undis*, quoted by Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 8.72.

29-30. cingere litorea flauentia tempora myrto: the myrtle was sacred to Venus; see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.15. It therefore symbolises love-poetry, as at e.g. 1.15.37 (in concluding the book, perhaps with an allusion to this line) and at 3.1.34. The invocation here seems to recall Verg. *Georg.* 1.26ff. *te maximus orbis / auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem / accipiat cingens materna tempora myrto*, where Vergil is invoking Octavian to assist the composition of his poem. Ovid's next elegy concludes with a more direct and more obviously frivolous allusion to the *Princeps'* divine ancestry (51f.). *cingere:* for such reflexive imperatives, cf. 2.6.9 *deuertere* (n.), *Met.* 7.47 *accingere*, 14.720 *nitida ... incingere lauro*, Verg. *Aen.* 3.405 *purpureo uelare comas adopertus amictu*, Bergh (1975) 17ff. For the Hellenising construction with the accusative, cf. 3.9.61f., *Met.* 13.894, *Trist.* 4.2.51 and see on 20 *compta ... comas*. *litorea* perhaps signals an allusion to the derivation of *myrtus* from *mare*; cf. Isid. *Orig.* 17.7.50 *myrtus a mare dicta, eo quod magis litorea arbor sit. unde et Vergilius: litora myrtetis laetissima* (*Georg.* 2.112) *et: amantes litora myrtae* (*Georg.* 4.124 [*myrtos*]). *litoreus* occurs first here and at Verg. *Aen.* 3.390 (= 8.43), 12.248, *Met.* 10.127, 15.369 and 725, in prose first in Ammianus. Most adjectives in *-eus*, apart from those denoting 'made of' (e.g. *ferreus* [28]), are stylistically elevated; see Ross (1969) 60ff. For such formations occurring first or only in Ovid, cf. *aesculeus* (*Met.* 1.449, 8.410), *bitumineus* (*Met.* 15.350), *flumineus* (see on 1.3.22), *papauereus* (*Fast.* 4.438), *pruniceus* (*Met.* 12.272), *spineus* (*Met.* 2.789), *turbineus* (*Met.* 8.557). *flauentia:* for deities and heroes with blond hair, cf. 7 and 8 (Minerva), 1.13.2 and 2.4.43 (Aurora), 1.15.35 (Apollo), 3.10.3 and 43 (Ceres), Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.590. Martinon suggests that Ovid emphasises the blond colour of the Muse's hair because blond hair was fashionable; that would certainly suit Elegy's sexy appearance at 3.1.7ff. See also on 1.13.2. *flauentia* is not distinguishable from *flaua*; cf. e.g. *Met.* 11.314 *candida de nigris et de candentibus atra* and Vergil's description of Dido's hair as *flauentis ... comas* at *Aen.* 4.590, as *flauum ... crinem* at 698.

The hexameter contains only five words; see on line 23. This enhances the dignity of the address to the Muse, as in the

corresponding valediction at 3.15.19 (quoted below). Note that Ovid's prayer at 1.15.37, concluding the book (see above), is also such a line: *sustineamque coma metuentem frigora myrtum*.

Musa per undenos emodulanda pedes: for the elegiac couplet as an eleven-foot unit, cf. *Fast.* 2.567f., *Mart.* 10.9.1 (of elegiacs and hendecasyllables) *Vndenis pedibusque syllabisque*. West, on Hes. *Theog.* 884, explains the unique elision at Call. *Epigr.* 41.1f. οὐκ οἶδ' / εἶτ' Ἐρως as a vestigial trace of the concept of the couplet as a single unit. He cites 'Simonides' *frg.* 76 Diehl Ἀριστο-/ γείτων, on which see now Page (1981) 188f. At *Pont.* 4.12.7f., Ovid declines to resort to that device in order to admit the name of his friend Tūtīcānus: *nam pudet in geminos ita nomen scindere uersus, / desinat ut prior hoc incipiatque minor*. It was much more usual to regard the couplet as a pair of lines; cf. e.g. 17f., 27f., 2.17.21f., *Pont.* 3.3.30 (Ovid to Cupid) *apposui senis te duce quinque pedes*. *Musa*: in the hexameter, the Muse is clearly personified; in the pentameter, the sense is rather 'poetic composition' (see *TLL* 8.1694.40ff.). This device, simultaneous personification and non-personification, which was to lead to such marvellously frivolous conceits as *excussit ... sibi se* (*Met.* 11.621, of Sleep waking up), is closely paralleled at 3.1.53ff., where Elegy describes the indignities which she tolerates in her non-personified form, and at 3.15.19f. *imbelles elegi, genialis Musa, ualete, / post mea mansurum fata superstes opus*. For further examples of this particularly Ovidian type of wit, see on 3.10.38. *undenos*: distributive for cardinal for metrical convenience; see H.-Sz. 212. *emodulanda*: an impressive and melodious ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. For the sense 'set to rhythm', see Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.143 *uerba ... fīdibus modulanda Latinis*. For verbs compounded with *e* occurring first or only in Ovid, cf. *eiaculari* (*Met.* 4.124, 6.259, *Fast.* 1.270), *emadescere* (*Trist.* 5.4.40), *ematurescere* (*Trist.* 2.124), *emoderari* (*Rem.* 130), *exasperare* (see on 2.11.27), *exspatiari* (*Met.* 1.285, 2.202, 15.454), *exstimulare* (*Met.* 5.165, 6.459, *Fast.* 6.588, *Trist.* 3.2.29), *exululare* (*Ars* 1.508, *Met.* 1.233, 4.521, 6.597, *Fast.* 4.186, 341, *Trist.* 4.1.42).

1.2

[Reitzenstein (1935) 73ff.; Phillips (1980).]



Why am I unable to sleep? (1-4). I must be in love (5-8). I shall not try to resist, for resistance makes the suffering worse (9-18). Cupid, parade me as a captive in your triumph (19-48), and be merciful to me (49-52).



The poem's basic theme, the lover's subjection to Cupid, is commonplace; see Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.4 *caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*. In presenting the subjection in terms of a triumph, Ovid may be developing (see on 23-48) a hint given by Prop. 2.8.40 *mirum, si de me iure triumphat Amor*? The concept recurs in the *Amores* at 2.9.15f. (to Cupid) *tot sine amore uiri, tot sunt sine amore puellae: / hinc tibi cum magna laude triumphus eat* and at 2.18.18 *de ... cothurnato uate triumphat Amor*. A triumphus Cupidinis is described at *Repos.* 6ff., and Lactantius refers to a poem of apparently considerable length on the subject:

non insulse quidam poeta triumphum Cupidinis scripsit: quo in libro non modo potentissimum deorum Cupidinem, sed etiam uictorem facit. enumeratis enim amoribus singulorum, quibus in potestatem Cupidinis dicionemque uenissent, instruit pompam, in qua Iuppiter cum ceteris deis ante currum triumphantis ducitur catenatus (*Inst.* 1.11.1).

For speculation about the possible date and authorship of that poem, see Ogilvie (1978) 18f. Nothing is known of its relation to this elegy.

Since the triumph is a peculiarly Roman institution, Ovid cannot be following any Greek model in detail. Nevertheless, the Hellenistic spirit of the poem is unmistakable. Cupid is normally characterised as a naked cherub, having nothing to do with war; see on 1.10.19 *nec Venus apta feris Veneris nec filius armis*. His portrayal here as a victorious military commander is incongruous. Incongruity is a prominent feature of much Hellenistic poetry, and is particularly prevalent in the portrayal of deities. In his hymn to Zeus, for

example, Callimachus emphasises some of the less majestic aspects of the god's childhood (cf. esp. 32f. [quoted on 1.1.13], 46ff.); in his hymn to Artemis, he presents the normally rather forbidding and austere virgin goddess of hunting as a toddler on Zeus' knee, wheedling him for eternal virginity and cult-titles (4ff.). In the *Amores*, this predilection for incongruity underlies the imagined exchange of roles by the various deities at 1.1.7ff. and the description in 3.10 of the *ἑρὸς γάμος* between Ceres and Iasius in terms of an elegiac love-affair.

Of particular significance here is the frequent portrayal in Hellenistic and Roman art of Amorini equipped with Bacchic attributes and driving a chariot drawn by wild beasts, in imitation of Dionysus as he celebrates his victory over the Indians; see Stuveras (1969) 13ff. The link with Dionysus is the stronger because the word *triumphus* was thought to be cognate with *θρίαμβος* and *διθύραμβος*, types of song apparently sung originally in honour of Dionysus; see Versnel (1970) 11ff. and see also on 47f., where Ovid explicitly compares Cupid with Dionysus. Just as, therefore, Cupid usurps the function of Apollo in 1.1 as the god who inspires poetry, so here he is portrayed in the role of Dionysus.

Augustus' triple triumph in 29 B.C. and the frequent military campaigns in the early years of the Principate made the triumph a common theme in Augustan poetry; cf. esp. Tib. 1.7 (Messalla in Aquitania), 2.5.115ff. (predicting a triumph [unspecified] for Messallinus), Verg. *Aen.* 8.714ff. (Augustus' triple triumph), Prop. 3.4 (predicting a triumph for Augustus over Parthia), 3.11 (Augustus' triumph over Cleopatra), Hor. *Carm.* 4.2 (Augustus in Germany), *Ars* 1.177ff. (predicting a triumph for C. Caesar over Parthia), *Trist.* 4.2 (Tiberius in Germany), *Pont.* 2.1 and 2.2 (Tiberius and Germanicus in Pannonia), also Prop. 3.17 (Bacchus' victory over the Indians; see on 47f.). It may be that Gallus provided an important and influential model for later elegists by celebrating the triumphs of Julius Caesar; see Du Quesnay (1976-7) 33f. and (1981) 80, n. 279. The exploitation of the theme by the elegists is discussed by Galinsky (1969).

A triumph by Augustus or a member of his family was the most splendid advertisement for one of the fundamental tenets of Augustan propaganda, the dependence of Rome's military greatness on the imperial house. Ovid refers explicitly to official propaganda only in the final couplet, where he cites Augustus' much vaunted clemency in support of his appeal to Cupid to deal mercifully with

him. Nevertheless, the whole conception of the elegy is a parody of conventional triumph-poetry. In transferring the triumph to a personal erotic context, whether with Cupid as the *triumphator* or, as in 2.12 (cf. Prop. 2.14), claiming a triumph for himself in celebration of his success as a lover, Ovid is using the grandeur of an important Augustan institution to throw into humorous relief the representation of his own *uita ignobilis*. His purpose in doing so is simply to amuse, and his naively irreverent humour should not be considered to be an expression of antipathy to the regime; see Vol. 1, 26ff.

Positioned between the first poem, in which Ovid announces that he is to be a love-elegist, and the third, in which he introduces the girl whom he wishes to immortalise as the subject of his poetry, this elegy is clearly programmatic, even though it contains no explicit statement about choice of genre or subject-matter. Ovid is here developing the theme of Cupid's omnipotence which the first poem established as the reason for his being a love-elegist. The close connection with the first poem is signalled by the echo of 1.25f.:

certas habuit puer ille sagittas:
uror, et in uacuo pectore regnat Amor

at 2.7f.:

haeserunt tenues in corde sagittae,
et possessa ferus pectora uersat Amor.

This echo, however, draws attention to a flaw in the dramatic continuity: whereas Ovid is fully aware in 1.1 that he is under Cupid's domination, he shows no such awareness in the opening lines of 1.2.

This inconsistency led Cameron (1968) 320ff. to speculate that 1.2 was the first poem in one of the later of the original five books, and that, being unwilling to excise it when the collection was reduced to three books, Ovid 'placed it as near the beginning of the first book as he could, immediately after its own introductory poem proper' (322). This seems unlikely. Since this elegy portrays Ovid as inexperienced in love and emphasises so strongly the recentness of his subjugation to Cupid (cf. 19 *noua*, 29f. *recens, modo, noua*), it would have been out of place in any book but the first. The inconsistency is not a serious flaw, and may be dismissed as symptomatic of Ovid's lack of interest in providing the collection with a coherent framework (see Vol. 1, 92ff.). It seems preferable to consider that 1.1-3 were written as a sequence based on Prop. 3.1-3 (see Vol. 1, 75).

Within that sequence, this elegy draws on Prop. 3.1. Propertius boasts of his success as a love-elegist and strikes a grand posture,

portraying himself as a *triumphator* accompanied in his chariot by the Amorini (or his personified love-elegies):

me Fama leuat terra sublimis, et a me
nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis,
et mecum in curru parui uectantur Amores,
scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas (9ff.).

Ovid, by contrast, portrays himself as the abject captive of Cupid, who drives alone in the chariot. The link between the poems is made clear by the verbal echo of Propertius' line 12 at 35f.:

Blanditiae comites tibi erunt Errorque Furorque,
assidue partes turba secuta tuas.



1-8. Ovid's normal practice is to state his theme clearly at the beginning of a poem. Here, however, he plays with our expectations. It is an easy inference from his sleeplessness that he is in love (see on 1-4 below), and that this is therefore to be a love-poem. In line 5, that inference seems momentarily to be invalidated, and it is not until lines 7-8 that we are fully informed that the poem's theme is in fact to be Ovid's subjection to Cupid. For this type of initial deception, see Cairns (1979) 166ff. The technique here has considerable affinities with that in the opening lines of 3.12; note the bewildered questions in the first two couplets, the clear statement of the theme delayed till the fourth couplet and the idiom *sic erit*, which occurs in Ovid only at 1.2.7 and 3.12.8. There does not, however, seem to be any particular thematic connection between the two elegies.

1-4. Insomnia is a classic symptom of love; cf. Plato *Phaedr.* 251E, Theocr. 10.10, 30.5ff., Plaut. *Merc.* 25, Ter. *Eun.* 219, Meleager *AP* 5.166, 7.195, 196, Catull. 68.5f., Verg. *Aen.* 4.5 with Pease's note, Crinag. *AP* 5.119, Galen 14.630ff. Kühn, Macrob. *Somn.* 1.3.6, Musaeus 232f. with Kost's note, Thomas (1979) 195ff. The conceit is particularly common in elegy; cf. e.g. Tib. 1.2.75ff., 2.4.11f., Lygd. 4.19f., Prop. 1.1.33, 1.3.39f., 1.11.5, 2.17.3f., 2.22B.47f., 2.25.47, 4.3.31f. *tum queror in toto non sidere pallia lecto, / lucis et auctores non dare carmen aues*, *Epist.* 12.171ff., *Ars* 1.735. Being inexperienced in such matters, however, Ovid does not recognise the symptoms for what they are. Although all his symptoms of love are related to his insomnia, Ovid has expanded them into a catalogue in much the

same vein as e.g. Sappho *frg.* 31.5ff., Theocr. 2.83ff., Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.1ff. The anonymous epigram *Cupido amans* (*PLM* 4 pp. 345f. Baehrens) opens with a similar series of bewildered questions; cf. also 3.2.39f.

1-2. Esse quid hoc dicam, quod ...?: for the phrasing, cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.1.6 (Arellius Fuscus, Ovid's teacher) *quid hoc esse dicam, quod me tam periculose abdicant?*, Mart. 2.12.1, 5.10.1, also Catull. 22.12, 80.1f., Cic. *Phil.* 2.1, Sen. *Epist.* 52.1, *Priap.* 43.1f.

tam mihi dura uidentur: cf. *Met.* 7.14 (of Medea falling in love) *cur iussa patris nimium mihi dura uidentur?*, Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.199f. (of Violentilla falling in love) *coepit / ... sibi dura uideri*. Since he favours a fourth-foot dactyl, Ovid here prefers *quod tam mihi* to the more natural word-order *mihi quod tam*; cf. Prop. 2.26.21f. *admirentur, quod tam mihi pulchra puella / seruia*, Pont. 4.14.15 *taliam suscensent propter mihi uerba Tomitae*, Platnauer (1951) 20ff., also 1.5.21 *quam castigato planus sub pectore uenter!* (n.), 2.4.7 *desunt uires ad me mihi iusque regendum*.

strata probably refers here to the underblankets, in contrast to *pallia*, which refers to the overblankets (cf. *Epist.* 21.172 *grauius iusto pallia pondus habent*, Prop. 4.3.31 [quoted on 1-4], Juv. 6.236 *onerosa ... pallia iactat*, TLL 10.1.136.43ff.). This seems preferable to supposing that *strata* refers by metonymy to the bed itself (see *OLD* s.v. 1b); it is more natural to wonder why a blanket, than why a bed, should seem hard. Fewer than thirty pentameters in the *Amores* (2.5%) admit a sense-pause of any kind at this position. (1.8.58, 2.2.40, 3.9.34 and 60 seem particularly noteworthy.) Here, the unusual rhythm may help to suggest Ovid's restlessness.

sedent: 'stay put'; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.8.5 *toga ipsa umeris non sedet*, *OLD* s.v. 8, also *sidere* at Prop. 4.3.31 (quoted on 1-4).

3-4. Cf. *Trist.* 4.3.25f. (Ovid to his wife, left in Rome) *nox immensa uidetur, / fessaque iactati corporis ossa dolent?*

noctem, quam longa, peregi: though not yet aware that he is in love, Ovid is experiencing the lonely lover's common misfortune that the night seems interminable; cf. 2.19.22, *Epist.* 12.60 *acta est per lacrimas nox mihi quanta fuit*, 16.317 *sola iaces uacuo tam longa nocte cubili*, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.7, Fedeli on Prop. 1.12.13. Contrast 3.7.25 (of an energetic night with Corinna) *angusta nocte*. The phrasing here perhaps has an epic color; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.193 *hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa, fouere* with Pease's note,

8.86f. *Thybris ea fluuium, quam longa est, nocte tumentem / leniit*, also *Epist.* 12.60 (quoted above). For the comparable nexus of Homeric allusions in a somewhat comparable context at Catull. 50.7ff., see Kroll's note.

lassa: *lassus* is 'nicht nur vulgär, sondern auch dichterisch' (Axelson [1945] 29), occurring frequently in Comedy but in earlier prose only at Cato *Agr.* 5.4 and *Bell. Alex.* 30.2. *fessus*, which occurs first in Cicero, Catullus, Lucretius and Varro, is rather more elevated. Other than in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, however, Ovid seems to use these metrically identical terms interchangeably (note *fessa* in the reworking of this passage at *Trist. loc. cit.*). *lassus*: Ov. 38 (*Met.* 6, *Fast.* 0); Verg. 2 (1); Hor. 8 (1); Tib. 0; Prop. 6 (2.5, 3.1); Liv. 0. *fessus*: Ov. 48 (*Met.* 28, *Fast.* 3); Verg. 40 (32); Hor. 11 (6); Tib. 5; Prop. 9 (1.2, 3.3, 4.4); Liv. 100. See Axelson (1945) 29f., Tränkle (1960) 73, Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.739 and see also on 1.1.23 *lassare*.

uersati: cf. Catull. 50.11f., Prop. 1.14.21, 2.22B.47f., Sen. *Dial.* 9.2.6 *quibus difficilis somnus est uersant se*, Juv. 13.218.

5-6. puto: a conversational aside, undercutting the tension created in the preceding lines, as at e.g. 2.15.25, 3.1.8, 3.11.34. Where prosody is determinable, the final syllable of *puto* is invariably short in Ovid; in the *Amores*, cf. 1.12.9, 2.15.25, 3.1.8, 3.7.2, 55, 3.11.34, and note also 1.10.64 (*nego*), 2.5.54 (*uolo*), 2.10.9 (*erro*, by Camps' conjecture), 3.2.26 (*tollo*), 3.11.35 (*odero*), 3.14.39 (*amo*). On this usage, which is much more common in Ovid than in any of the other Augustan poets, see Platnauer (1951) 51f.

si quo temptarer amore: I can cite no exact parallel for this phrase. For similar expressions, cf. Prop. 2.12.19 (to Cupid) *intactos isto satius temptare ueneno*, Verg. *Aen.* 1.721f. (of Cupid's effect on Dido) *uiuo temptat praeuertere amore / iam pridem resides animos desuetaque corda*, Ars 1.365 *tum quoque temptanda est, cum paelice laesa dolebit*. Such phrases as *temptare insidiis* (e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 12.25.4), *artibus* (e.g. Sall. *Iug.* 48.1), *dolore* (e.g. Lucr. 2.967f.), *morbo* (e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.31) are also relevant.

an subit et tecta callidus arte nocet?: for the insidiousness of love, cf. Prop. 2.12.11 (of Cupid) *ante ferit ... tuti quam cernimus hostem*, Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.2 *caeco carpitur igni*, Kost on Musaeus 87f. κρυφίοισι κατατρήχειν φρένα κέντροις, / ... πυριβλήτοισι δαμείς ἀδόκητον ὀιστοῖς. *tecta ... arte* seems to modify *callidus*; cf. Tib. 1.4.76 *quos male habet multa callidus arte puer*. Contrast *Met.* 13.323 *aliqua perducet callidus arte*, where *aliqua ... arte* more clearly

belongs with the verb. *tecta callidus arte* is probably to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, with both *subit* and *nocet*. For *subire* used with connotations of stealth, cf. e.g. Ars 1.362 *blanda ... subit arte Venus*, Verg. *Aen.* 11.763, Gratt. 184, Quint. *Inst.* 4.5.5 *fallendus est iudex et uariis artibus subeundus*. For *nocere* used of the baneful effects of love, cf. e.g. 46, *Epist.* 20.233f., Ars 1.236 *et spargi pectus Amore nocet*. The greater appropriateness of *callidus* as an epithet for a person than for an abstract concept, the echo of Tib. *loc. cit.* and the similarity of Ars 1.236 (quoted above) strongly suggest that *Amor* is to be extracted from *amore* (5) as the subject of *subit* and *nocet*. For this technique, cf. 1.1.30 *Musa* (n.), and the discussions of the ambiguity in Ars 1.236 (quoted above) by Kenney (1959) 244ff. and by Hollis on 231-6.

7-8. sic erit: 'that must be it'. For this idiomatic use of the future indicative, cf. 3.12.8 *sic erit: ingenio prostitit illa meo*, Plaut. *Pseud.* 677 *profecto hoc sic erit*, Ter. *Phorm.* 801, H.-Sz. 310f., K.-S. 1.142f.

haeserunt: the arrow is still stuck fast in his heart, but Ovid is thinking of the particular moment when Cupid shot him; cf. 1.1.25 *habuit* (n.).

tenues ... sagittae: probably plural for singular; cf. 1.1.22 *spicula* (n.). The phrase occurs first here and at *Pont.* 4.9.83; cf. *Am.* 3.7.30 *medium tenues in iecur egit acus*. The epithet emphasises Cupid's stealth. Since Cupid's purpose in shooting Ovid in the preceding poem was to make him a love-elegist, the word's literary connotations (see on 1.1.18 *attenuat* and 3.1.9 *tenuissima*) may also be relevant. In his note on *Ecl.* 1.2, Servius shows a clear awareness of this manner of alluding to poetic genre: *dicendo ... tenui auena, stili genus humilis latenter ostendit*. The additional sense 'clinging' is suggested by Ferguson (1978) 122 (see also on 1.13.5 *teneris*). That suggestion is supported by the juxtaposition to *haeserunt*, but there is no clear ancient testimony for an etymological link between *tenuis* and *tenax*. Ovid has just given a catalogue of symptoms of love (1-4), love was a conventional cause of thinness (see on 1.6.5 *amor ... corpus tenuauit*) and that motif occurs with specific reference to Cupid's arrows at lines 13f. of 2.9, an elegy which draws substantially on this one. Perhaps, therefore, *tenues* may have an active sense, 'emaciating'. At Ars 3.273f. *conueniunt tenues scapulis analemptrides altis, / angustum circa fascia pectus eat*, the sense may be 'constricting', since the bindings to reduce the prominence of the shoulder-blades are contrasted with the brassière which is designed to enhance the

fullness of the breasts. For adjectives which either do, or may, have such an active sense, instead of, or in addition to, their more regular passive sense, see also on 1.7.16 *praecipites*, 1.8.98 *liuida*, 1.9.13 *tumidos*, 1.12.1 *tristes*, 2.1.22 *lenia*, 3.6.39 *diues*, 94 *pigra*, 3.7.13 *gelida*, 3.9.20 *obscuras*.

possessa ... pectora uersat: cf. *Epist.* 12.213 *deus, qui nunc mea pectora uersat*, *Ars* 3.718 *incertus pectora uersat amor*. For the image in *uersat*, which picks up the more literal *uersati* in line 4, see on 2.9.28 *nescioquo miserae turbine mentis agor*. **possessa ... pectora:** cf. *Stat. Theb.* 10.676 *multo possessus numine pectus*, *Donat. Ter. Phorm.* 165.2 *quam magno amore sit possessus Phaedria*, also *Laus Pis.* 45 *possessa ... pectora temptas*. Ovid seems to be playing with legal terminology, as at 1.1.26 *uacuo pectore*; see the note *ad loc.* *possidere* (I make no distinction here between *possidēre* and *possidēre*; see Bömer on *Met.* 2.739, *TLL* 10.2.112.43ff.): *Ov.* 26 (14); *Verg.* 0 (*Ecl.* 9.3 *possessor*); *Hor.* 2 (1; *Epist.* 1.2.49 *possessor*); *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 2. The word contributes to the unusually strong legal *color* of Ovid's vocabulary, for which see Kenney (1969).

ferus ... Amor: cf. 1.1.5 *saeue puer* (n.). With *leue fit, quod bene fertur, onus* following in line 10, it is possibly relevant that *ferus* was thought to be derived from *ferri*, 'to be borne'; cf. *Serv. Aen.* 2.51 *feri quadrupedis: ab eo quod toto corpore feratur*. For a related play on *proferre, ferus, ferreus, fera* at *Tib.* 1.10.1ff., see Cairns (1979) 99 and note also *Am.* 1.7.49f. *sustinui (= tuli) ... / ferreus*.

9-10. cedimus, an ... accendimus ...?: for the indicative used in place of the deliberative subjunctive, see Mayor on *Juv.* 4.130 *quidnam igitur censes? conciditur?*, K.-S. 1.120, H.-Sz. 308. The similarity in sound suggests that Ovid is possibly influenced here by *Verg. Ecl.* 8.108 *credimus, an qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?* In his choice of the verb *cedere*, he may be reflecting the Gallan model (see *Servius* on line 46) for *Ecl.* 10.69 *omnia uincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori*. For the *adnominatio*, *cedimus ... accendimus*, cf. e.g. 1.6.19f. *uerbera ... / ... uerba*, 1.10.49f. *armillas ... / ... arma*, 2.4.14 *molli mobilis*, 2.11.10 *et gelidum ... egelidumque*, 3.1.66 *ades ... adde*, 3.6.23 *iuuenes ... iuuare*, 51 *Anien ... animosus*.

subitum ... ignem: for love as fire, cf. 11-12 (n.), 1.1.26 *uror* (n.). For *subitus* in the sense 'arising suddenly', cf. e.g. *Rem.* 81 *opprime, dum noua sunt, subiti mala semina morbi*, *Ibis* 19 *subitas ... flammis*. The echo of *an subit* (6) in *an subitum* may emphasise the insidiousness of Cupid's attack.

leue fit, quod bene fertur, onus: cf. *Met.* 8.633f. *paupertatem ... fatendo / effecere leuem nec iniqua mente ferendo*, Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.24.19f. *leuius fit patientia / quidquid corrigere est nefas*. For the idea applied in erotic contexts, cf. e.g. 17f., 2.4.6, *Eur. Hipp.* 443ff. Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητὸν ἦν πολλὴ ῥυτίς, / ἢ τὸν μὲν εἰκονθ' ἡσυχῇ μετέρχεται, / ὃν δ' ἂν περισσὸν καὶ φρονοῦνθ' εὖρη μέγα, / τοῦτον λαβοῦσα πῶς δοκεῖς καθύβρισεν, *Tib.* 1.8.7f. *deus* (sc. Cupid) *crudelius urit / quos uidet inuitos succubuisse sibi*, *Prop.* 2.5.16 *omne in amore malum, si patiare, leue fit*: other than in such closely-knit units as *sine me, pudor est*, Ovid admits a pyrrhic followed by a monosyllable at this position in the pentameter only twenty-seven times; cf. 3.2.46 *meus hic*, *Epist.* 19.180 *grauē fit*, *Platnauer* (1951) 23f. *bene fertur*: cf. *Tib.* 1.5.1 *bene discidium me ferre loquebar*, *Hor. Carm.* 3.27.74f. *bene ferre magnam / disce fortunam*, *Ars* 2.647 *quod male fers, assuesce: feres bene*, *Trist.* 3.12.3, *TLL* 2.2119.36ff.

11-16. As at e.g. 3.7.31ff. and 3.11.36, Ovid parades illustrations which have the effect of deflating the emotional intensity of his predicament.

11-12. Despite the ostensible appeal to personal experience in *uidi ego*, we know from *Sen. Contr.* 2.2.8 that Ovid is actually drawing on a declamation by Porcius Latro; see Vol. 1, 68f. For the torches of love stirred to life, cf. 1.1.8, *Prop.* 4.3.50, *Pap. Tebtunis* 1 p. 4, vv. 3f. (= Powell [1925] p. 186) ἐρῶντος ψυχὴ καὶ λαμπάδιον ὑπ' ἀνέμου / ποτὲ μὲν ἀνήφθη ποτὲ δὲ πάλι κοιμίζεται, *Publil. A* 38 *amans ita ut fax agitando ardescit magis*, *Gow* on *Theocr.* 11.51ff.

uidi ego: for *uidi* introducing an appeal to personal experience of a common phenomenon, cf. 2.2.47, 2.12.25, 3.4.13, *Fedeli* on *Prop.* 1.13.14, *van Dam* on *Stat. Silu.* 2.1.22. Although it contains an unusually heavy elision, the phrase *uidi ego* occurs eleven times in Ovid's elegiac poetry, at *Tib.* 1.2.89 and five times in *Propertius*; see *Platnauer* (1951) 74.

iactatas mota face crescere flammis: *iactatas* is made somewhat redundant by *mota face*. There is a comparable fullness of expression at *Met.* 4.508f. *face iactata per eundem saepius orbem / consequitur motis uelociter ignibus ignes*. The phrase *facem mouere* occurs elsewhere only at *Stat. Silu.* 5.3.196, in a slightly different sense; the allusion to *Latro's immota fax* seems therefore to be the more clearly signalled.

rursus is the reading at Sen. *loc. cit.*, against *uidi* in the mss. Goold (1965a) 18f. points out that Seneca alone preserves the true reading, *egelimque*, at 2.11.10 (see the note *ad loc.*), and argues that to read *uidi* twice would wrongly suggest two separate incidents. Moreover, anaphora of *uidi* would be out of place here, where Ovid is presenting a calmly rational argument, since such anaphora tends to be emotionally charged; cf. *Epist.* 3.45ff., Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.1 (Latro) *uidi ego magni exercitus ducem sine comite fugientem, uidi ab ambitiosa turba clientium limina deserta sub domino sectore uenalia*, Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 656. For illustration of this rather pleonastic, but common, use of *rursus*, Goold refers to Henry on Verg. *Aen.* 4.531 *rursus ... resurgens*, Owen on *Trist.* 2.16 *refero rursus*, Getty on Lucan 1.391 *rursus redeuntis*. Here, *rursus* means not simply 'again', but rather, pointing the antithesis between the hexameter and the pentameter, 'on the other hand' (cf. *Pont.* 3.1.139ff. *si quid aget maius, differ tua coepta ... / ... / nec rursus iubeo dum sit uacuisima quaeras*, OLD s.v. 6a), and 'at another moment' (cf. *Pont.* 2.10.41f. *modo res egisse simul, modo rursus ab illis, / quorum non pudeat, posse referre iocos*, OLD s.v. 6b). These senses may be present in πάλι at Pap. Tebtunis *loc. cit.*

nullo concutiente: ablative absolutes constructed with a present participle and *nullo* (-a, -is) (used substantivally except at *Trist.* 4.8.6 *nullo sollicitante metu*) occur 26 (12) times in Ovid; in the *Amores*, cf. 1.8.35 *nullo exercente*, 2.10.21 *nullo prohibente*, 3.7.34 *nullo ... mouente*, and note also esp. *Ars* 3.428 *nullo ... agente*, *Met.* 15.555 *nullo ... agitante*, *Fast.* 4.396 and *Trist.* 4.8.6 *nullo sollicitante*. The idiom seems to be very rare in the republican period. Livy employs it twenty-three times, but it is not found in either Horace or Tibullus, in Vergil only at *Georg.* 1.128, 2.10 and *Aen.* 12.423, in Propertius only at 2.28.30. *concutere*: Ov. 30 (22), Verg. 21 (18), Hor. 3 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 3. The word occurs sporadically in prose and verse from Ennius onwards but, apart from Ovid and Vergil, only Lucretius (20) and the younger Seneca (62 [prose: 29]) use it frequently; see *TLL* 4.118.39ff. Ovid may here have in mind Prop. 1.7.15 *te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu*, where, however, the sense is slightly different (see Fedeli's note). That line is the model for 1.1.25 (see the notes *ad loc.*, on *certas ... sagittas* and *puer ille*), which underlies the dramatic context of this elegy. See also on 1.6.50 *concussae ... fores*.

mori: of fire, torches etc., cf. [Verg.] *Aetna* 419, Plin. *Nat.* 37.104, Stat. *Theb.* 6.547, 12.252, Mart. 4.4.9. The converse, *uiuere*, is so used rather more commonly; cf. Prop. 4.3.50 *hanc Venus, ut uiuat, uentilat*

ipsa facem, OLD s.v. 3a and s.v. *uiuus* 5a.

13-16. For the taming of oxen and horses as an erotic image, cf. *Epist.* 4.21ff., *Ars* 1.471f., 3.555f., *Rem.* 235f. (quoted on 13-14), 514, Prop. 2.3B.47ff., 2.34.47ff., Tib. 1.4.16 with Murgatroyd's note, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.5.1. Ovid inverts the conceit here at *Ars* 1.19ff. *sed tamen et tauri ceruix oneratur aratro, / frenaque magnanimi dente teruntur equi: / et mihi cedit Amor* (cf. 9f. above, *cedimus ... / cedamus*). For such imagery in an *exemplum*, see also on 3.4.13f.

13-14. *iuuat*, as Burman notes, is rather an exaggeration. Oxen do not enjoy ploughing, as Ovid observes in a comparable context at 3.11.36 *nec iuga taurus amat*. Here, he seems to be straining for point.

usus aratri: '(habitual) experience of the plough'; for this sense of *usus*, see on 1.8.105 *usu mihi cognita longo*.

detractant: Ovid uses *detractare* (or *-trect-*; the forms cannot be distinguished clearly) 10 (3) times. It occurs first in Cicero (1), Caesar (1) and Sallust (2), in earlier verse only at Verg. *Georg.* 3.57 (*bos iuga detrectans*, Tib. 1.6.38 (in the context of *seruitium amoris*; cf. 17f. below) *detrecto non ego uinclu pedum* and Prop. 2.3B.47 (quoted on 17). In the imperial period, it is found predominantly in prose; Livy uses it thirty-nine times.

prensi: most of the tradition offers *pressi*. *prensi* is the reading only of *BMeφ*, and was conjectured hesitantly by Markland in his note on Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.45. It may be that *BMeφ* are themselves reporting a conjecture; see Goold (1965b) 90f. (Note, however, that φ wrongly offers *pressos* at *Rem.* 235 [see below].) *prensi* is to be preferred. '*pressi* is certainly possible, but when Ovid uses the word elsewhere in such a context he completes the sense with, for example, *iugo, temone* [at *Ars* 1.544 *sedet et pressas continet arte iugas, arte* is perhaps to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, with both *pressas* and *continet*]; and it is slightly awkward to understand the ablative here from *iuga*. *prendere*, on the other hand, is practically a *t.t.* for the rounding-up of bullocks or foals preparatory to breaking-in: besides Markland's parallels of Verg. *G.* 1.285 *pressos domitare boues*, 3.207 *prensique negabunt / uerbera lenta pati [et duris parere lupatis]*, compare Columella, *R.R.* 6.2.1 *eos autem qui de grege feri comprehenduntur, sic subigi conuenit*' (Kenney [1958] 54). The echo of Vergil's *duris ... lupatis* in Ovid's next line gives further support to *prensi*. For the corruption to *pressi*, cf. e.g. 2.9.31, *Epist.* 10.10, *Rem.* 235f. *aspicis ut pressos* (RYEKF [ut uid.] *Ma*² [corr. ex -us]: *pressos* ω) *urant iuga*

prima iuuenos / et noua uelocem cingula laedat equum?, *Trist.* 2.378.

boues: the same hyperbaton in *Amor* (18), as well as the similarity of *quam quos* (13) and *quam qui* (18), emphasises the parallelism in thought between the two couplets. For such parallelism, see on 2.10.31-34.

15-16. asper: for this term used of unbroken or skittish livestock, cf. Lucil. 112 *annicula, aspera, praecox* (sc. *equa* [?]), Colum. 6.2.4, Sil. 3.386f. *sonipes ... / asper frena pati*, Stat. *Silu.* 4.4.69, *Ach.* 1.280f. *non aspera praebet / ora lupis*. The epithet is applied to horses in a different context at Sil. 4.597 and 17.136. Here, Ovid is possibly influenced by Verg. *Georg.* 3.57 (*bos*) *iuga detrectans* (see on 14 *detractant*) *interdumque aspera cornu*. For *asper* with reference to those opposed to love, see on 2.4.15.

duris ... lupatis: for *lupata*, see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.8.6. The epithet is probably derived from Verg. *Georg.* 3.208 (see on 14 *prensi*).

contunditur ora: cf. Val. Fl. 1.424 *ora ... Thessalico ... contundere freno* and, for the phrasing, Val. Max. 3.2.23 *saxi ... pondere ora contusus*, Lucan 2.335, Claud. 15.135.

ad arma facit: for *arma* used of riding equipment, cf. Liv. 35.23.11, 43.5.8. *facere* seems to be a technical term in animal-training, 'be obedient' or 'adapt oneself'; cf. Cic. *Brut.* 192 *si auditor omnino tamquam equus non facit*, Sen. *Contr.* 3 Pref. 9 *alii ad aprum, alii ad ceruum canes faciunt. facere ad* occurs first in Ovid; cf. 3.11.42, *Epist.* 6.128, 14.56, 16.192, *Ars* 3.540, *Trist.* 1.10.44, *TLL* 6.122.42ff.

Homoeoteleuton in the two hemistichs of the pentameter, other than between a noun and its qualifying adjective, is rather uncommon; cf. 3.2.60 *pace loquar Veneris, tu dea maior eris*, 3.7.48 *oscula ferretuli; proximus esse: fui* and e.g. *Fast.* 5.284 *id ... diu licuit, poenaeque nulla fuit*, 6.88 *Iunius est iuuenum, qui fuit ante senum*. In all of these passages, the sense-pause at the caesura makes the rhyme the more noticeable.

17-18. For the thought, see on 10 *leue fit, quod bene fertur, onus*.

acrius ... multoque ferocius urget: Ovid's model is Tib. 1.8.7 *deus crudelius urit* (see on 10). He could have followed Tibullus in writing *urit*; for that phrasing, cf. 2.19.3 *acrius urit* and, for Cupid causing fiery passion, cf. 43 *ures*, 46, 1.1.26 *uror* (n.). On a second level of meaning, *urit* would follow the description of oxen- and horse-breaking just as aptly as does *urget*; for *urere* in the sense 'cause to

chafe', see on 1.8.70 *captos legibus ure tuis*. The slight change of *urit* to *urget*, however, is typical of the subtle manner in which Ovid echoes Tibullus; see on 1.6.47 *dummodo sic*, 2.9.28 *turbine*, 3.9.47 *Phaeacia*, 3.11.51 *lintea*. For Propertius echoed in such a manner, see on 2.17.34. For *urgere* used of Cupid, cf. e.g. Tib. 2.1.79 *miseri, quos hic deus urget*, *Met.* 9.624f. *plurimus urget et urit / pectora nostra*, Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.82f. For the combination *acrius ... multoque ferocius*, cf. *Met.* 11.294 *acer erat belloque ferox. multo* is to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ; cf. 1.1.13 *magna ... nimiumque potentia* (n.). For Cupid's cruelty, cf. 1.1.5 *saue puer* (n.). For Cupid, or love in general, as *acer*, cf. Prop. 2.3B.46, 2.30.9, Tib. 2.6.15, [Tib.] 3.8.6, Pichon (1966) s.v. *ferox*: Ov. 57 (38), Verg. 11 (10), Hor. 12 (11), Tib. 0, Prop. 2. (Apart from *ferociter* at Plaut. *Amph.* 213, no adverbial form of the word occurs anywhere else in classical verse.) In using *ferocius* here, Ovid is not only describing Cupid's power in a rather grand manner, but also pointedly altering the sense from 'defiant (to love)' at Prop. 2.3B.47ff. *ueluti primo taurus detractat* (see on 14 *detractant*) *aratra, / ... / sic primo iuuenes trepidant in amore feroces*. He may also have in mind Lygd. 6.13f. *ille* (sc. Cupid) *ferocem / contudit* (cf. *contunditur* in Ovid's line 15) *et dominae misit in arbitrium*.

inuitos: cf. Tib. 1.8.8 (quoted on 10), *Rem.* 267f. *omnia fecisti, ne te ferus ureret ignis: / longus et inuito pectore sedit Amor*.

seruitium: see on 1.3.5 *deseruiat*.

ferre fatentur: for the rather colloquial omission of the subject of the infinitive, see Manning (1893), Owen on *Trist.* 2.346, K.-S. 1.700ff., H.-Sz. 362. Usually, but not always (see on 1.11.13), the subject to be understood is the same as that of the main verb; cf. 1.4.70, 1.7.33f. *mihi quam profitebar amare / laesa est*, 1.8.71, 3.9.46, 3.14.5, 15, 37 *peccasse fateris*.

Amor: see on 14 *boues*.

19-20. en ego confiteor: Cupid's right to a triumph depends on Ovid's admission of defeat. Ovid is here alluding to the concept of *confessio imperii*, acknowledgment by the defeated that they have, in fact, been defeated; see Weinstock (1957) 219f., Woodman on Vell. 2.90.1 *Dalmatia, XX et CC annos rebellis, ad certam confessionem parata est imperii*, Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 513 *qui uincit non est uictor nisi uictus fatetur*. The same play occurs at *Met.* 9.543ff. (Byblis to Caunus) *pugnaui ... diu uiolenta Cupidinis arma / effugere infelix ... / ... superata fateri / cogor*. Since *confiteor* is here so emphatic, it seems preferable to construe it as an independent main verb, rather than as

an interjected parenthesis. Both constructions are common in Ovid: for the former, cf. *Epist.* 21.155, *Ars* 3.598 *en ego confiteor: non nisi laesus amo*, *Met.* 2.52, 13.270, *Pont.* 4.15.11; for the latter, cf. *Epist.* 17.95 *est quoque, confiteor, facies tibi rara*, 19.71, *Ars* 2.547, *Rem.* 314, *Met.* 9.362, *Pont.* 1.2.69. For *en ego*, cf. *Ars* 3.598 (quoted above), *Liv.* 8.4.11 *en ego ipse ... profiteor me dicturum ...*, Bömer on *Met.* 6.206.

tua sum noua praeda: for the lover as Cupid's booty, cf. 29, Meleager *AP* 12.23 ἡγρεύθην ὁ πρόσθεν ἐγὼ ποτε τοῖς δυσέρωσι / κῶμοις ἡθέων πολλάκις ἐγγελάσας / καὶ μ' ἐπὶ σοῖς, ὁ πτανὸς Ἔρως προθύροισι, Μυῖσκε, / στῆσεν, ἐπιγράψας 'σκῦλ' ἀπὸ Σωφροσύνης', Parthenius *Suppl. Hell.* 624 ἀμφοτέροις ἐπιβὰς Ἄρπυς ἐληῖσται, Kost on Musaeus 148f. παρακοίτην, / τὸν σοι Ἔρως ἡγρευσεν. See also on 1.3.1 *quae me ... praedata puella est*.

porrigimus uictas ad tua iura manus: for this sign of submission, cf. *Epist.* 21.242 *do ... libens uictas in tua uota manus*, Petron. 111.10 *porrexit ad humanitatem inuitantis uictam manum*, Otto (1890) s.v. *manus* (7), Sittl (1890) 147ff. *iura* here means 'conditions', a sense more often conveyed in such contexts by *leges*; cf. e.g. *Liv.* 6.38.7, 9.3.12, 39.23.6 *cum uicto leges imponerentur*, Curt. 4.5.7 *leges ... a uictoribus dici, accipi a uictis*, also 2.17.23 *tu quoque me, mea lux, in quaslibet accipe leges* (n.), Prop. 1.9.3 *supplex ... uenis ad iura puellae*, 3.11.2 (*femina*) *trahit addictum sub sua iura uirum*. Here, Ovid may be pointedly echoing 1.1.5 (to Cupid) *quis tibi ... dedit hoc ... iuris?*, the only earlier occurrence of *ius* with reference to a deity's jurisdiction (see the note *ad loc.*).

21-22. For the lover's war against Cupid, cf. Prop. 2.2.2 *me composita pace fefellit Amor*, 2.12.16 *assiduus ... meo sanguine bella gerit*, *Rem.* 2; against Venus, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.1.1ff.

nil opus est bello: *opus est*, a common idiom in prose, is rare in Augustan poetry other than Horace's *Satires* and Ovid. It is constructed with an ablative eight times in Horace's *Satires*, at Tib. 1.6.33, Verg. *Aen.* 6.261, 9.148f. and 32 (13) times in Ovid; with a genitive at Prop. 2.10.12; with an (accusative and) infinitive at Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.16, *Carm.* 1.15.25, Prop. 2.6.25, *Am.* 1.11.23, *Ars* 1.430 (sc. *nasci*), 3.641 (sc. *aegrotare*), *Rem.* 788, *Met.* 1.279 (sc. e.g. *agere*), 2.785 (sc. e.g. *agere*), *Trist.* 1.1.22. The phrase here is echoed at *Rem.* 675 *nunc opus est armis*; cf. also Lucan 2.318f. *post me regnare uolenti / non opus est bello*. For *nil opus est* in this line-position, cf. *Epist.* 20.187, *Ars* 1.137, 2.162, *Met.* 10.565, *Fast.* 4.813, 926, *Pont.* 1.2.92, 4.15.12 *confiteor: ... / nil opus est legum uiribus; ipse loquor*.

See also Bömer on *Met.* 10.565.

pacem ueniamque rogamus: Ovid is echoing a solemn prayer-formula; cf. Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 5 *ab Ioue Optimo Maximo ceterisque dis deabusque immortalibus ... pacem ac ueniam peto precorque ab eis ut ...*, Font. 30, *Liv.* 1.31.7, 39.10.5 *pacem ueniamque precata deorum dearumque*. The formula is used in the context of suing for peace also at *Liv.* 37.45.7 *pacem ueniamque impetrare a uictoribus*. These passages support the word-order *pacem ueniamque* (Υς) against *ueniam pacemque* (Σς), for which I can cite no parallel. For the pointed juxtaposition of *bello* and *pacem*, cf. *Fast.* 1.253 *nil mihi cum bello: pacem postesque tuebar*.

nec tibi laus armis uictus inermis ero: for similar arguments in such contexts, cf. 2.9.6 (to Cupid) *gloria pugnantis uincere maior erat*, Alcaeus of Messene *AP* 5.10.3f. τί πλέον, εἰ θεὸς (sc. Cupid) ἄνδρα καταφλέγει, ἢ τί τὸ σεμνὸν / δηώσας ἀπ' ἐμῆς ἄθλον ἔχει κεφαλῆς; Tib. 1.6.3f. *quid tibi, saeue, rei mecum est? an gloria magna est / insidias homini composuisse deum?*, Verg. *Aen.* 4.93ff., also Tib. 1.8.49, *Epist.* 2.63f., 19.143ff., 21.117ff., *Met.* 3.654f., 12.292f. See also on 1.7.38 *'io! forti uicta puella uiro est'*. For the play *armis ... inermis*, cf. e.g. 1.9.22 *armata ... inerme*, *Ars* 3.46 *armatis ... inerme*, *Ibis* 254 *armati ... inermis*.

23-48. With this description of a triumph-procession, cf. *Ars* 1.213ff., *Trist.* 4.2.19ff., *Pont.* 2.1.21ff., 3.4.21ff. For ἐκφρασις πομπῆς elsewhere in the *Amores*, note the *pompa Circensis* at 3.2.43ff., the parade in honour of Juno at Falerii at 3.13.1ff. and, in particular, the incongruous portrayal of Cupid mourning in Tibullus' funeral-cortège at 3.9.7ff. (At *Dial.* 6.3.1, *ductum erat funus triumpho simillimum* is Seneca's comment on the reception accorded to Drusus as his body was borne to Rome.)

23-24. necte comam myrto: a *triumphator* wore a laurel-crown (see on 1.7.36 *cinge comam lauro*), whereas a general celebrating an *ouatio* wore a myrtle-crown (cf. e.g. Gell. 5.6.20ff.). It would, however, be an over-interpretation to suppose that Cupid has earned only the lesser honour, his victory over Ovid having been easy and bloodless (one of the usual reasons for refusing a triumph to a successful general; cf. Gell. *loc. cit.*). Ovid refers to the procession as a triumph (25, 28, 34, 39) and, although his own victory in 2.12 is emphatically stated to be bloodless (5f.), he nevertheless claims a triumph, not an *ouatio*. Cupid wears a myrtle-crown because the myrtle was sacred to

his mother, Venus (see on 1.1.29).

maternas iunge columbas: doves also, like the myrtle, were sacred to Venus; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.192f. *maximus heros* (sc. Aeneas) / *maternas agnouit auis*, *TLL* 3.1732.44ff., *RE* 2.4.2496ff. She is frequently portrayed in a chariot drawn by doves; cf. e.g. *Met.* 14.597 *iunctis inuecta columbis*, Apul. *Met.* 6.6, Claud. 22.354, *Carm. Min.* 25.104. For the Amorini as charioteers in Hellenistic and Roman art, see Stuveras (1969) 96ff. For the expression *maternas ... columbas*, see on 1.13.23 *feminei ... labores*.

qui deceant emphasises the incongruity of Cupid's riding in a *currus triumphalis*. The phrase possibly echoes Hom. *Il.* 19.21f. (of the arms made by Hephaestus [see below] for Achilles) τὰ μὲν ὄπλα θεὸς πόρεν οἱ ἐπικεκῆς / ἔργ' ἔμμεν ἀθανάτων. *deceant currus* should be preferred to the rather less strongly attested *deceat currum*. The corruption to the singular forms is probably to be assigned to a scribe made uncomfortable by the following singular, *in ... dato curru* (25). Ovid, however, makes such a transition from plural to singular in almost as noticeable a manner at *Met.* 5.642ff. *geminos dea fertilis angues / curribus admouit frenisque coercuit ora / et medium caeli terraeque per aera uecta est / atque leuem currum Tritonida misit in urbem* and at *Met.* 8.794ff. '*accipe currus, / accipe, quos frenis alte moderere, dracones*'. / *et dedit. illa dato subuecta per aera curru ...* (As those passages illustrate, *currus* need not mean 'chariot [and team]' [a sense inappropriate here], when the plural is used for the singular.)

uitricus: it is not clear whether Ovid is referring to Vulcan or to Mars. As Venus' husband, Vulcan was Cupid's step-father, though he appears not to be so called elsewhere. The dove-chariot which Venus drives at Apul. *Met.* 6.6 is a wedding-present made by Vulcan, and it is Vulcan who makes the arms for Venus' other son, Aeneas, at Verg. *Aen.* 8.370ff. Mars, though merely Venus' lover, is described as Cupid's *uitricus* at 2.9.48 and *Rem.* 27 (the only other occurrences of the term in poetry), and also at Apul. *Met.* 5.30. As god of war, Mars has a chariot as one of his attributes. Ovid may be suggesting that he will lend it to Cupid, as he lent it to Venus at Hom. *Il.* 5.355ff. The words *dabit* (24) and *dato* (25) need not imply a gift rather than a loan; note Homer's words δός (359) and δῶκε (363), also *dedit ... dato* at *Met.* 8.796 (of Ceres lending her chariot to a nymph). Ovid describes the chariot as golden (*auratis ... rotis* [42]); golden trappings are attributed by Homer at least to Mars' horses (358). The conceit of Mars' mighty chariot being drawn by doves would enhance the fantasy here. Perhaps, however, Ovid has deliberately left the

identity of the *uitricus* ambiguous, setting a puzzle to entertain the more learned members of his circle.

25-26. dato, which picks up *dabit* (24), is rather otiose, as is *adiunctas* after *iunge* (23). Such *declinatio* was, however, to become a marked feature of Ovid's narrative style; cf. e.g. 3.6.44 *cedere iussit aquam: iussa recessit aqua*, *Met.* 8.796 (quoted on 23-24), *Fast.* 3.21 *Mars uidet hanc uisumque cupit potiturque cupita*.

populo clamante triumphum: on the origin and meaning of the ritual cry 'io triumphe!', see Versnel (1970) 1ff. and 38ff. For the indirect construction, cf. *Met.* 1.560f. *laeta triumphum / uox canet*, Liv. 21.62.2 (= Val. Max. 1.6.5) *infantem ... triumphum clamasse*, Sil. 12.742f., Mart. 7.6.7, Claud. 3.54, 21.4, K.-S. 1.254f.; for the direct construction, see on line 34.

arte: 'skilfully'. For *arte* so used without qualification, cf. e.g. *Ars* 2.434 *admissos arte retinet equos*, 506 *qui canit arte, canat: qui bibit arte, bibat*.

mouebis aues: for *mouere* used of driving chariots, cf. e.g. *Epist.* 11.48 *luciferos Luna mouebat equos*, *Ars* 1.3f. *arte citae ueloque rates remoque mouentur, / arte leues currus*, Val. Fl. 3.415.

27-28. There is a subtle variation on the idea expressed here at 2.9.15f., where Ovid is begging Cupid to seek other victims: *tot sine amore uiri, tot sunt sine amore puellae: / hinc tibi cum magna laude triumphus eat*.

capti iuuenes captaeque puellae: for expressions of this type, cf. e.g. 3.13.23 (in the description of Juno's procession at Falerii [= *Rem.* 33]) *iuuenes timidaeque puellae*, *Ars* 1.217 (of the spectators at C. Caesar's triumph) *laeti iuuenes mixtaeque puellae*, *Fast.* 3.815 *pueri teneraeque ... puellae*, *Trist.* 3.12.5 *pueri ... hilaresque puellae*, Verg. *Georg.* 4.476 (= *Aen.* 6.307; cf. 2.238) *pueri innuptaeque puellae*, and see also on 1.13.9 *ingrata uiris, ingrata puellis*. For *capere* used of erotic conquest, cf. Prop. 1.1.1 *Cynthia ... me cepit* with Fedeli's note, Pichon (1966) s.v.

magnificus ... triumphus: for the phrase, cf. 1.7.35, Vell. 2.40.3, Val. Max. 4.1.2, also Liv. 30.15.12 *neque magnificentius quicquam triumpho apud Romanos ... esse*, Vell. 2.89.1, 2.121.2. *magnificus* is largely confined to prose: Ov. 7 (2 [not in *Met.*]), Verg. 0, Hor. 0, Tib. 2, Prop. 0. Axelson's observation ([1945] 61) that adjectives in *-ficus* are for the most part highly poetic, though endorsed by H.-Sz. (754), is very questionable. Jocelyn, on Enn. *Trag.* 91, collects twice as

many adjectives of this type from Comedy as from republican Tragedy and, citing Skutsch (1909-10) 160f., he notes that 'with the exception of the tragedies of Seneca, classical poetry has very few such formations'. There are some ninety-five known adjectives in *-ficus*. Dr. Flury has examined the sixty-three which have so far been published in the *TLL*, and has very kindly informed me that hardly more than twenty of those can be considered to be poetic.

29-30. praeda recens: cf. 19 *noua praeda* (n.).

uulnus: for the wounds inflicted by Cupid, cf. 44, 2.1.7, 2.9.4ff., Prop. 2.12.12, Pichon (1966) s.vv. *saucius*, *uulnus*.

noua captiua uincula mente feram: for the chains imposed by Cupid, cf. 3.11.3 *scilicet asserui iam me fugique catenas*, Prop. 2.29.6, 3.20.23, Tib. 2.2.18, 2.4.4, Pichon (1966) s.v. *uincire*. For the mind in chains, cf. Lucil. 990 *laqueis manicis pedicis mens inretita est*, Catull. 61.33 *mentem amore reuinciens*, Cic. *Fat.* 20. *captiua ... mente*: for the phrase, cf. *Ars* 1.358 and 359 *mens ... apta capi*, also *mens capta* at *Met.* 4.62, Prop. 3.19.4 and Liv. 39.13.12. For the *mens* as the seat of the passions, see also Lyne on [Verg.] *Ciris* 162.

31-36. Apelles' painting of a victory-parade by Alexander, in which Furor was portrayed bound in chains, was set up by Augustus in his new forum; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 35.27, 93f., Serv. *auct. Aen.* 1.294. Ovid perverts that scene here, portraying Mens Bona and Pudor as bound in chains, whereas Furor celebrates. The perversion is the more ingenious and wittily conceived in that, just as the Amorini were often portrayed in the role of Dionysus (see the introduction), so Alexander liked to emphasise the affinities between his own victories in the East and those of Dionysus (see Cairns [1979] 43f.). For Ovid's frequent references to another painting by Apelles, the *Venus Anadyomene*, see on 1.14.33f., and, for his exploitation of works of art in general, see on 1.1.21-24.

It may be that, in order to make clear his perversion of the Alexander-parade, Ovid is relying on his audience's awareness of Vergil's allusion to Apelles' painting at *Aen.* 1.291ff. *aspera tum positae mitescent saecula bellis: / cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus / iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis / clauduntur Belli portae; Furor impius intus / saeua sedens super arma et centum uinctus aenis / post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento*. The chained figure was perhaps not unambiguously identifiable in the painting itself. (Pliny [93] names it, in fact, as *Bellum*, and Serv. *auct.*

refers to both *Bellum* and *Furor*.) *Furor* is first personified in Roman poetry by Vergil in that passage and by Ovid here. Such a humorously perverse allusion to those lines of the *Aeneid*, which form the culmination of Jupiter's prophecy of Rome's greatness under the Julii, would suit the outrageously nonconformist attitude to Augustan propaganda which pervades this elegy. See also Labate (1971).

31-32. Mens Bona: Cupid, whose retinue includes Error and Furor, is traditionally in conflict with rational behaviour; cf. Meleager *AP* 12.23.4 (quoted on 19), 117.3 τί δ' Ἑρωτι λογισμός; with Gow-Page's note (*HE* 4094). On freeing himself from his passion for Cynthia, Propertius dedicates himself to Mens Bona (3.24.19). On her cult, see Wissowa (1912) 313ff., Latte (1960) 239f., Bömer on *Fast.* 6.241.

manibus post terga retortis: this expression is often closely, but never exactly, paralleled until Cypr. Gall. *Gen.* 751; cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.22 *retorta tergo brachia*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.57 *manus iuuenem ... post terga reuinctum*, *Met.* 3.575 *manibus post terga ligatis*, Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.7 *post terga uinctis manibus ductus est*, Sen. *Phoen.* 577 *palmas uincta post tergum datas*, Plin. *Nat.* 35.93 (of *Bellum/Furor* in Apelles' painting) *restrictis ad terga manibus*, Prud. *c. Symm.* 2.560 *manibus ... in terga retortis* and see *TLL* 10.2.177.65ff. The harsh assonance of *t* suggests Cupid's violent handling of the goddess. It may be inspired by the sigmatism in Vergil's portrayal of Furor at *Aen.* 1.295 (quoted on 31-36). For such parallelism in sound, see on 1.1.1.

Pudor, like Mens Bona, is a natural opponent to Cupid; cf. 1.6.59f. (n.), 1.8.35f., 3.1.22, 3.10.28f. *hinc pudor, ex alia parte trahebat amor. / uictus amore pudor*, 3.14.17f., Kost on Musaeus 98 ἔρωτος δ' ἀπενόσφισεν αἰδῶ. Ovid may be reworking this passage at *Met.* 7.72f. (of Medea) *ante oculos rectum pietasque pudorque / constiterant, et uicta dabat iam terga Cupido*. Αἰδώς is a goddess already in Hesiod (*Op.* 200), but Pudor, who had no Roman cult, seems to be personified first by the Augustan poets and appears mostly in groups of similar *ad hoc* personifications; see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.24.6. (On the cult of Pudicitia, however, see *RE* 23.1942ff.)

castris ... Amoris: the image is common in Ovid; cf. 1.9.1 (n.), 44, 2.9.4, 2.18.40, *Epist.* 7.32, 19.157, *Ars* 2.236, 3.559. It is not developed so fully by the other elegists; cf. Tib. 2.3.33f. *tu ... cui tristi fronte Cupido / imperat ut nostra sint tua castra domo*, Prop. 4.1.135, 4.8.28.

quicquid ... obest: for the indefinite expression, cf. *Met.* 8.74f. *iamdudum succensa cupidine tanto / perdere gauderet quodcumque obstaret amori*. For *quicquid* = *quicquid aliud*, cf. 1.10.8, *Hor. Carm.* 2.1.25 *Iuno et deorum quisquis amicus* with Nisbet-Hubbard's note. For similar brachylogies, see Nisbet on *Cic. Pis.* 77 *qui omnes ad eum multique mortales oratum ... uenerant*. *obesse* is prosaic: *Ov.* 25 (7), *Verg.* 2 (0), *Hor.* 1 (0), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 0. *pudor* is the verb's subject at 1.8.36, *amor* at *Rem.* 714.

33-34. omnia: 'plus dixit genere neutro, quam si masculino omnes dixisset' (Marius, quoted by Burman).

te ... ad te: for hymnic anaphora of pronouns, here continued with *tibi* (35), *tu* (37), *tibi* (38) and *tu* (41), see on 1.6.15f. Such anaphora has already occurred at 1.1.15 *an, quod ubique, tuum est? tua sunt Heliconia tempe?* Those sarcastically posed questions may be pointedly echoed in *omnia te metuent*.

uulgu 'io' magna uoce 'trumphe' canet: after 25 *populo clamante triumphum*, this second reference to the ritual cry seems somewhat redundant. For the phrasing of the line, cf. *Tib.* 2.5.118 *miles 'io' magna uoce 'trumphe' canet*, *Trist.* 4.2.51f. *tempora Phoebea lauro cingetur 'io'que / miles 'io' magna uoce 'trumphe' canet*. There are further affinities between the closing passage of Tibullus' elegy and this poem: with *Tib.* 120 *plaudat curru praetereunte pater, compare mater ... / plaudet* (39f.) and *praeteriens* (44). Tibullus' poem is likely to have been written in 21 or 20 B.C. (see Syme [1978] 118); Ovid's was probably published soon after the publication of Propertius' third book, i.e. in 22 or 21 B.C. (see Vol. 1, 75f.). Either could therefore be imitating the other. Since the shared phrases are closely grouped in Tibullus, but spread over several lines in Ovid, that may suggest that Ovid is the imitator. It is, however, interesting to speculate that Tibullus may have chosen to echo this frivolous Ovidian poem in complimenting Messalla, their mutual patron (see Vol. 1, 11). One could, of course, postulate a common source, perhaps in Gallus (see the introduction).

35-36. For this retinue of personifications, cf. *Sen. Herc. F.* 96ff. (the attendants of Discordia) *Scelus / ... Impietas ... / Errorque et in se semper armatus Furor*, *Stat. Theb.* 4.661ff. (the attendants of Bacchus) *Ira Furorque / et Metus et Virtus et numquam sobrius Ardor / succiduique gradus et castra simillima regi*, *Nonn. Dion.* 25.156ff. *Φόβον καὶ Δεῖμον ἰδὼν συνάεθλον Ἑρώτων / ἴχνεσιν αἰδομένοισιν*

ἐχάζετο χάλκεος Ἄρης, / ἀσπίδα κουφίζουσιν ὀπιπεύων Ἀφροδίτην / καὶ Πόθον αἰχμαζόντα, καὶ εὐθώρηκι μαχητῇ / ἀβροχίτων ἐτέλεσεν Ἑρως καλλιτρίχα νίκην, Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.18.14, Phillips (1980).

Blanditiae: appropriate companions for *blandus Amor* (*Stat. Silu.* 1.2.19; cf. *Am.* 3.2.55 *blanda Venus, Rem.* 11 [of Cupid] *blande puer*). *Blanditiae* seem to be strongly personified only here and at *Mart.* 10.72.1ff.

comites: not simply 'companions' in the general sense, as at e.g. 1.3.11 *Phoebus comitesque nouem* (sc. the Muses), but, more specifically, 'companions in a (triumphal) procession'; cf. e.g. 1.7.37, 2.13.14 *comes in pompa ... eat*, *Vell.* 2.121.3, *Val. Max.* 5.2.6, *Lucan* 5.332 *lauriferos nullo comitetur uulnere currus, CE* 270.4f. *Gentiani ... / ... comitis ... tuis, Traiane, triumphis*, *Suet. Dom.* 2.1.

Errorque Furorque recalls such Homeric phrases as *Δεῖμόν τε Φόβον τε* (*Il.* 15.119, of the companions of Ares), and is perhaps an Ennian line-ending. Unlike *hominesque deosque* (37), however, this is not a true example of polysyndeton, the first *-que* being connective. (For polysyndeton as a stylistically elevated device, see on 1.6.57 *ferroque ignique*.) *Error*, printed in the *Rome ed. princeps* of 1471, seems somewhat preferable to the paradosis, *Terror*. (In the *apparatus*, I ignore the occurrence of *Error* in *Jh*, since that ms postdates 1471 by quite a considerable period.) *Terror* gains some support from *Sil.* 4.325 (the attendants of Hannibal) *Metus Terrorque Furorque*, but *Error*, which appears with *Furor* at *Sen. loc. cit.*, suits the amatory context rather better; see on 1.10.9 *animi ... resanuit error* (where *Y* offers *terror*; for the corruption, cf. also *Lucr.* 4.997 where, as here, dittography is responsible). For *Error* personified, cf. also *Met.* 4.502, 12.59, *Sil.* 13.586. *Furor* is personified first here and at *Verg. Aen.* 1.294ff.; see on 31-36. For later instances, see *TLL* 6.1633.6ff.

partes ... secuta tuas: 'which has sided with your faction'. For this sense, cf. *Val. Max.* 4.7.4 *Bruti et Cassii partes secutus fuerat*, *TLL* 10.1.477.23ff., *OLD* s.v. *sequor* 12a. Note the change in the meaning of *secuta* from that in the Propertian model (quoted below).

turba: of the attendants of a deity, see on 1.1.6; of the attendants of a triumphator, cf. 1.7.37, *Prop.* 3.1.12 (the model for this passage; see the introduction) *scriptorum ... meas turba secuta rotas*. The echo of Propertius is the more amusing if we may suppose that Ovid, as Propertius' *sodalis* and fellow-elegist, saw a reference to himself in the words *scriptorum ... turba*.

37-38. superas hominesque deosque: for Cupid's omnipotence, cf. e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 120ff. Ἔρος ... / λυσιμελής, πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων / δάμναται ἐν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν, Anacr. *frg.* 37.4f. Gentili ὅδε καὶ θεῶν δυνάστης, / ὅδε καὶ βροτοῦς δαμάζει, Soph. *Ant.* 781ff., Eur. *frgg.* 136 and 269 Nauck, Menander *frg.* 198 Körte. Such polarised expressions are also used to describe Jupiter's omnipotence; cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 2.669 ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει, Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.14ff. *qui res hominum ac deorum / ... / temperat*, Verg. *Aen.* 1.229f. *o qui res hominumque deumque / aeternis regis imperiis et fulmine terras*. The similarity of expression may have a particular piquancy here, given that Jupiter is explicitly stated to be among the deities led in triumph in the anonymous *Triumphus Cupidinis* referred to by Lactantius (see the introduction). For Cupid's power over Jupiter, cf. e.g. 1.10.7f., *Met.* 5.369f. *tu superos ipsumque Iouem ... / ... domas*, Menander *frg.* 209 and *Heros frg.* 1 Körte, Asclep. *AP* 5.64.5f., Meleager *AP* 12.101.6 and 107.6, [Sen.] *Octavia* 808ff. It may also be relevant that the *triumphator* seems to have been dressed to represent Jupiter; see Versnel (1970) 58ff., Weinstock (1971) 67.

haec tibi si demas commoda, nudus eris: *commoda* is an 'incommoda certe uox' (Burman). The sense seems to be '(military) advantages', as at e.g. Hirt. *Gall.* 8.21.4 *magnum ... Bellouacos eo proelio commodum esse consecutos*, Plin. *Nat.* 8.91 *non sua modo commoda, uerum et hostium aduersa*, but it is rather strange that Cupid's attendants should themselves be so described. The difficulty is reduced if, in this line, we may consider Blanditiae, Error and Furor not as soldiers, but as weapons. For such transitions from personification to non-personification, see on 1.1.30. The sense 'fringe benefits (for military service)', as at e.g. *Ars* 1.132 *haec mihi si dederis commoda, miles ero*, would give *nudus* the meaning 'destitute', but that sense of *commoda* seems even less appropriate here. In this military context, *nudus* primarily means 'unarmed', as at e.g. 2.9.35, *Ars* 3.5 *non erat armatis aequum concurrere nudas*. Ovid is, however, playing with the traditional concept of Cupid as a naked cherub, for which cf. e.g. 1.10.15 *et puer est et nudus Amor*. The ambivalence is assisted by *demas*, for the verb can mean 'remove (clothing)'; cf. 1.4.50, *TLL* 5.1.496.7ff. and see also on 3.4.3 *metu dempto*.

For the phrasing of the sentence, cf. *Epist.* 4.102 *si Venerem tollas, rustica silua tua est*, *Ars* 1.132 (quoted above), *Rem.* 139 *otia si tollas, periire Cupidinis arcus*, *Trist.* 1.2.52 *demite naufragium, mors mihi munus erit*, 2.9, 4.4.36, *Pont.* 2.9.23ff., *Priap.* 9.14 *hoc mihi si telum*

desit, inermis ero, Juv. 10.141f. *quis enim uirtutem amplectitur ipsam, / praemia si tollas?*, also Lucan 10.389ff. *quid nomina tanta / horremus uiresque ducis, quibus ille relictis / miles erit?*

39-40. laeta: *ecce proprium Veneris epitheton* (Serv. *Aen.* 1.416). Venus is so described also at Hor. *Carm.* 3.21.21, *Sil.* 6.697 (quoted below), Stat. *Theb.* 2.191, *Silu.* 1.2.143, Mart. 6.21.2, Juv. 6.570, Auson. *Mos.* 211 (quoted below); compare the Homeric φιλομειδής, used as an epithet for Aphrodite (*Il.* 3.424 etc.). The epithet is particularly appropriate here, since the triumph is a joyful occasion; cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.217, *Met.* 1.560, 13.252 (and 14.719) *laetos ... triumphos*, *Trist.* 4.2.66, *Pont.* 2.1.57f. *te quoque uictorem Tarpeias scandere in arces / laeta coronatis Roma uidebit equis*, 3.1.136, 3.3.86 *cuncta ... laetitiae plena triumphus habet*, 3.4.46, Auson. *loc. cit.* *Venus Actiacis Augusti laeta triumphis*.

de summo ... Olympo: apparently an echo of Tib. 1.6.83f. *hanc (sc. a faithless mistress) Venus ex alto flentem sublimis Olympo / spectat et infidis quam sit acerba monet*, but the allusion has no obvious point. For the grand portrayal of deities looking down on the world from their lofty splendour, cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 11.336f., Verg. *Georg.* 1.95f., *Aen.* 1.223ff., 11.725ff., *Sil.* 6.697 (quoted below). The phrase here applies sylleptically to both *plaudet* and *sparget*.

plaudet et appositas sparget in ora rosas: compare the descriptions of Tiberius riding in triumph at *Trist.* 4.2.49f. *qua ... ibis, manibus circumplaudere tuorum, / undique iactato flore tegente uias* and *Pont.* 2.1.35f. *qua ... ierit, felix adiectum plausibus omen, / saxaque roratis erubuisse rosis*. For applause at the *pompa triumphalis*, cf. also e.g. Cic. *Pis.* 60, *Phil.* 6.11, Tib. 2.5.120 (quoted on 34), Prop. 3.4.22, Verg. *Aen.* 8.717; at other *pompae*, cf. e.g. 3.2.44 (the *pompa Circensis*), 3.13.13 (Juno's *pompa* at Falerii). The scattering of flowers etc. (here specifically roses, which were closely associated with Venus; see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.138) was a common means of expressing joy; cf. Lucr. 2.626ff., Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.19ff., Suet. *Nero* 25.2, Plut. *Pomp.* 57.2, Ammian. 21.10.1, Heliod. 3.3.8, Claud. 10.297ff., *Carm. Min.* 25.116ff., Pfeiffer on Call. *frg.* 260.13, *RE* 20.1025. *appositas* 'placed beside her' seems rather flat, and there is much the same apparent feebleness at 3.1.58 and *Ars* 3.93. Possibly Ovid is alluding to a specific pictorial representation of a triumph by Cupid. In an ἔκφρασις of a wall-painting viewed by Hannibal in a temple at Liternum, Silius describes Venus' delight at the Roman victory in the battle of the Aegates Islands: *haec Eryce e summo spectabat laeta*

Dione (6.697).

41-42. pinnae gemma, gemma uariante capillos: Cupid is often portrayed with brightly coloured wings; see Westendorp-Boerma on [Verg.] *Catal.* 14.9. They seem, however, to be jewelled elsewhere in literature only at *Rem.* 39 *mouit Amor gemmatas aureus alas*. At *Stat. Silu.* 1.2.143f., Cupid sits on the jewelled yoke-beam as he drives Venus in her swan-chariot. Cupid's hairstyle is conventionally elaborate (cf. esp. *Pont.* 3.3.15f. *nec habens crinale capillo, / nec bene dispositas comptus, ut ante, comas*) and jewels contribute to the splendour of most ceremonial processions (cf. e.g. 3.13.25 *uirginei crines auro gemmaque premuntur*). It may, however, be significant that they seem distinctly out of place in the garb of a *triumphator*. In a possibly apocryphal story invented to discredit him, Pompey was said to have caused a sensation by wearing the jewelled cloak of Alexander in the triumph of 61 B.C. which celebrated his victories in the East; cf. Appian *Mithr.* 117.577 αὐτὸς ... ὁ Πομπήιος ἐπὶ ἄρματος ἦν, καὶ τὴν λιθοκόλλητον χλαμύδα ἔχων, ὥς φασιν, Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνοιο, εἴ τῳ πιστόν ἐστιν. (For a discussion of the reading in that passage, see Weinstock [1971] 38, n. 8.) Such an allusion to Alexander here is supported by that in 31-36 (see the note). For *uariare* used of decorating with jewels, cf. *Prop.* 1.15.7 *Eois pectus uariare lapillis*, *Sen. Epist.* 114.9, *Plin. Nat.* 33.1.22; of styling the hair, cf. *Medic.* 19 *odoratos positu uariare capillos*, *Met.* 2.412. For the anastrophe *gemma, gemma*, a rhetorical figure which Ovid particularly favours, cf. 1.7.48, 2.4.39, 2.5.43, 2.6.59, 2.9.14, 2.19.5, 48, 3.1.17f., 3.2.82, 3.9.1, 3.10.23.

ibis in auratis aureus ipse rotis: cf. Josephus *Bell. Iud.* 7.152 (in an account of the triumph celebrating the fall of Jerusalem) Δομετιανὸς ... παρίπνευεν αὐτὸς τε διαπρεπῶς κεκοσμημένος καὶ τὸν ἵππον παρέχων θεὰς ἄξιον. *ibis:* for the simple verb used to describe the *triumphator's* progress, cf. *Ars* 1.214 *quattuor in niueis aureus ibis equis*, *Trist.* 4.2.49 and *Pont.* 2.1.35 (both quoted on 40), *Pont.* 3.4.100 and *Epiced. Drusi* 332 (both quoted below), *TLL* 5.2.635.73ff. *in auratis ... equis:* for the *triumphator's* gilded chariot. cf. *Hor. Epod.* 9.21f., *Prop.* 1.16.3, *Liv.* 10.7.10, *Sen. Contr.* 10.1.8, also *Cic. Post Red. in Sen.* 28. For deities driving golden chariots, see Page (1955) 7, on *Sappho frag.* 1.7ff. (to Venus) πάτρος ... δόμον λίποισα / χρύσιον ἤλθε / ἄρμ' ὑπασδεύξαισα. Both *in auratis* and *inauratis* are possible; for the former, cf. e.g. *Ars loc. cit.*, *Rem.* 258 *in niueis Luna uehetur equis*, *Fast.* 6.724 *uectus es in niueis ... uictor equis*; for the

latter, cf. e.g. *Prop.* 1.16.3 *inaurati ... currus*, *Pont.* 3.4.100 *iunctis ... ibit equis*, *Epiced. Drusi* 332 *quadrigis aureus ibit equis*. Here, the balance with *aureus* strongly favours *in auratis*. For *aureus* in this context, cf. *Ars* and *Epiced. Drusi loc. cit.*, *Mart.* 8.65.10 (of a triumphal statue of Domitian) *sufficit immensis aureus ipse rotis*. The *triumphator* is termed *aureus* because of the golden decorations on the *toga picta* which he wore in the triumph-parade; cf. *Polyb.* 6.53.7, *RE* 2.7.505.10ff. The epithet is naturally appropriate to Cupid, as the son of χρυσή Ἀφροδίτη (*Hom. Il.* 3.64 etc.), and is applied to him also at 2.18.36, *Rem.* 39, *Mart.* 8.50.13; cf. *Aristaenetus* 1.1 χρυσοῦς Ἔρως. See also on 3.15.16 *aurea ... signa* (sc. of Cupid and Venus). Most adjectives formed in *-eus*, apart from those denoting 'made of', are stylistically elevated; see on 1.1.29 *litorea*. When used figuratively, *aureus* is found predominantly in poetry. A pointed antithesis, playing on the literal sense of *aureus*, may be intended here with *auratis* (cf. e.g. *Sen. Benef.* 2.12.1 *soccum auratum, immo aureum*); for compliments so formulated, cf. 3.2.32 *sequitur fortes fortior ipsa feras*, *Verg. Ecl.* 5.44 *formosi pecoris custos, formosior ipse*, *Nisbet-Hubbard* on *Hor. Carm.* 1.16.1 *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*, and note also *Heliod.* 3.3.7 (of Theagenes in the procession at Delphi) εἶπες ἄν καὶ τὸν ἵππον αὐτὸν συνιέναι τῆς ὠραιότητος τοῦ δεσπότου καὶ ὥς καλὸν κάλλιστον φέρειν τὸν ἡνίοχον αἰσθάνεσθαι.

43-46. At *Ars* 1.177ff., Ovid recommends triumph-processions as a good opportunity to meet girls. The conceit here of Cupid making spectators fall in love is reworked a few lines earlier in the *Ars*, in the context of gladiatorial shows: *illa saepe puer Veneris pugnavit harena / et, qui spectavit uulnera, uulnus habet: / dum loquitur tangitque manum poscitque libellum / et quaerit posito pignore, uincat uter, / saucius ingemuit telumque uolatile sensit / et pars spectati muneris ipse fuit* (165ff.).

43-44. tum quoque: the mss vary between *tum* and *tunc* in every passage in the *Amores* in which the following word begins with a guttural consonant; cf. 44, 1.14.21, 2.11.29, 2.16.32, 3.[5.]11, 3.13.29. Consistent with my policy of standardising orthography (see Vol. 1, 127f.), I print *tum* in all cases, regardless of mss-authority. In so doing, I am assuming that Ovid treated the two forms as synonymous and interchangeable, and did not regard *tunc* as the more emphatic. See also *Housman* (1931) xxi, n. 1.

si te bene nouimus: a variation on the colloquial *si bene te noui*; cf. 2.18.39, *Ars* 3.51, *Met.* 13.808, 14.356, *Trist.* 5.4.50, *Pont.* 1.6.4, 2.3.49, Fraenkel (1957) 316, n. 5.

ures: for this image, cf. 46, 1.1.26 *uror* (n.).

praeteriens: 'as you pass (in the triumph-procession)'. Burman suggests that Ovid is hinting at a standard motif in encomia of military prowess, the ability to gain a victory while still on the march; cf. Cic. *Manil.* 30, Sen. *Tro.* 229ff. *haec tanta clades gentium ac tantus pauor, / sparsae tot urbes turbinis uasti modo, / alterius esset gloria ac summum decus: / iter est Achillis; sic meus uenit pater / et tanta gessit bella, dum bellum parat*, Lucan 7.73f. *merito Pompeium uincere lente / gentibus indignum est a transcurrente subactis*, Sidon. *Carm.* 7.589ff., Claud. 8.458f., 21.194ff., Woodman on Vell. 2.129.3. Curio auus would not have endorsed this conceit. Referring to such a situation from a slightly different perspective, he declared: *nemo potest uno aspectu neque praeteriens in amorem incidere* (ap. Cic. *Inu.* 1.80 and Rhet. Her. 2.33).

uulnera: see on 29 *uulnus*.

45-46. non possunt, licet ipse uelis, cessare sagittae: the general idea at *Peruig. Ven.* 29ff. is much the same: *nec tamen credi potest / esse Amorem feriatum, si sagittas exuit; / ite, Nymphae, posuit arma, feriatum est Amor. / iussus est inermis ire, nudus ire iussus est, / neu quid arcu neu sagitta neu quid igne laederet. / sed tamen, Nymphae, cauete, quod Cupido pulcher est. / totus est in armis idem quando nudus est Amor*. The rather strange notion that Cupid's arrows are not entirely under his control finds a limited parallel at 2.9.37 *huc tamquam iussae ueniunt iam sponte sagittae*. Contrast *Met.* 5.381f. *qua* (sc. *sagitta*) *nec ... ulla / ... magis audiat arcum*, referring to the arrow with which Cupid shoots Dis. Note also the independent power which Propertius attributes to his writing-tablets at 3.23.5f.: *illae iam sine me norant placare puellas / et quaedam sine me uerba diserta loqui*. For *cessare* used of weapons, cf. Prop. 2.8.29f. *Achilles / cessare in tectis pertulit arma sua*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.467f. *nec saxa nec ullum / telorum interea cessat genus*, TLL 3.961.1ff., and also 2.9.12 (of Cupid) *pigra reluctanti cessat in hoste manus*.

feruida uicino flamma uapore nocet: Cupid's torch burns his victims when brought near. For *flamma* used without qualification in the sense 'torch', cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 276 (of Cupid) *impotens flammis simul et sagittis*, [Sen.] *Octauia* 808, Apul. *Met.* 4.30 (*Amor*) *flammis et sagittis armatus*, TLL 6.866.74ff. For the torch in combination with

the bow and arrows as Cupid's weapons, cf. 1.15.27, 2.9.5, 3.9.7f., Bömer on *Met.* 1.461 and 10.311. For *feruidus* used of fire, cf. Lucr. 5.1099 *flammai feruidus ardor*, TLL 6.597.38ff. *uicino*: cf. *Ars* 2.59f. *siue aetherias uicino sole per auras / ibimus*, Plin. *Nat.* 2.34 (*sidus*) *igne ardens solis uicinitate*. For *uapor* in erotic contexts, cf. e.g. Sen. *Phaedr.* 640f. *pectus insanum uapor / amorque torret*, [Sen.] *Octauia* 189ff. The alternating alliteration of *f* and *u* is elegant, and perhaps meant to be imposing, suggestive of Cupid's power. *nocet*, possibly an echo of line 6, is rather paradoxical in this context: a *triumphator* normally protects the Roman populace.

47-48. Dionysus' victorious progress from the East was considered the archetypal triumph-procession; cf. Diod. Sic. 3.65.8, 4.5.2, Plin. *Nat.* 7.191, Solin. 52.5, Macrobian. *Sat.* 1.19.4. For the Amorini portrayed as Dionysus, see the introduction.

Gangetide terra: for such periphrases devised with feminine adjectives in *-is*, cf. *Epist.* 10.100 *Cecropi terra*, 16.30 *Taenaris ... terra*, *Met.* 5.648 *Asida terram*, 8.153 *Curetida terram*, 9.448 *Aside terra*, 13.716 *terram Didonida*, *Fast.* 2.663 *Thyreatida terram*, *Trist.* 1.2.82 *Sarmatis ... tellus*, *Pont.* 2.9.54 *Bistonis ... terra*. *Gangetis* occurs only here and at Avien. *Orb. Terr.* 1353 (*Gangeticus* first at *Met.* 6.636). Many such formations are found first or only in Ovid, without concentration in any particular work or works; see Bömer on *Met.* 5.303 and 12.34. In the *Amores*, cf. 1.4.8 *Atracis*, 1.7.13 *Schoeneida*, 2.5.40 *Maeonis*, 2.18.26 and 34 *Lesbis*, 3.6.25 *Bithynide*, 41 *Asopide*.

tu grauis alitibus emphasises the paradox inherent in the portrayal of Cupid as a *triumphator*. He is conventionally regarded as *leuis* (usually in the sense 'fickle'); see on 2.9.49.

tigribus: in Hellenistic poetry and art, Dionysus' chariot is normally drawn by panthers. The Roman poets are the first to associate tigers with him, but it seems likely that they are following now lost Hellenistic models; see Bömer on *Met.* 3.668. No tiger seems actually to have been seen in Rome until the celebrations marking the dedication of the temple of Marcellus on May 4th 11 B.C.; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 8.65, also Suet. *Aug.* 43.

49-50. sacri pars ... triumph: cf. Liv. 45.39.12 *pars non minima triumphi est uictimae praecedentes*, Lucan 4.359ff. *nec enim felicibus armis / misceri damnata decet, partemque triumphi / captos ferre tui*, also TLL 10.1.466.74ff. For the epithet *sacer*, the more appropriate

here since the *triumphator* is a god, cf. *Epiced. Drusi* 25, 27.

parce tuas in me perdere uictor opes: Ovid is defeated, and it would therefore be a waste of ammunition to shoot him. A similar argument occurs in the ἀποπομπή to Cupid at 2.9.13f. *quid iuuat in nudis hamata retundere tela / ossibus? ossa mihi nuda reliquit amor*. For *parce* (-ite) constructed with an infinitive, an idiom of which Ovid is particularly fond, see Bömer on *Met.* 10.545, *TLL* 10.1.332.19ff. The usage, originally perhaps colloquial, is otherwise generally rare in the higher registers of poetry, even in spite of the poets' reluctance to use the normal prose construction, *noli* (-ite) with an infinitive (see Axelson [1945] 135). It is found in prose before Apuleius only at *Liv.* 34.32.20, in a speech remarkable for its colloquial *color*. Ovid was possibly influenced, at least subconsciously, in his choice of this expression here by the literal sense, 'spare'. *in me perdere*: cf. 3.7.55f. *non optima perdidit in me / oscula ...?* For *opes* in the sense 'military resources', see on 1.9.34.

51-52. Like the first elegy (see on 1.1.29), this poem also ends with a playful allusion to Augustan propaganda. The sentiments are unimpeachable in themselves, but are employed in a trivial context. Ovid is not, however, antagonistic to Augustus; on his indifference to politics, see Vol. 1, 26ff. For a similar exploitation of Augustan propaganda in a prayer to Cupid, cf. 2.9.17f. (n.).

aspice: introducing a paradigm, as at e.g. 1.13.43, 2.7.15, *Ars* 2.433, 3.115, *Rem.* 175, 177, 178, *Prop.* 1.2.9, 2.16.29, 2.22A.35; see also on 2.2.41 *aspicis*.

cognati ... Caesaris: on the descent of the Julii from Venus, see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.20, Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.2.33, Weinstock (1971) 15ff. and 80ff. Cupid's kinship with Aeneas is mentioned in serious Augustan political poetry at *Verg. Aen.* 1.667 and *Tib.* 2.5.39, and is exploited by Ovid at 3.9.13f. and *Epist.* 7.31f.; his kinship with Augustus himself is mentioned also at *Pont.* 3.3.61f. (addressed to Cupid) *sic regat imperium terrasque coerceat omnes / Caesar, ab Aenea qui tibi fratre tuus*. Since Cupid appears, with Venus, on a coin minted by Sex. Julius Caesar in 129 B.C. (see Crawford [1974] No. 258, also No. 320), Ovid's conceit here is perhaps not as distinctly frivolous as it may seem. Even so, Augustus cannot have welcomed this couplet. Harvey (1983) suggests that Ovid's emphasis here on Cupid's kinship with Augustus draws undesirable attention to the fact that, by this period, the triumph had come to be the prerogative of the emperor himself and his closest

circle.

felicia ... arma: following the example of Julius Caesar, Augustus, with far less justification, fostered the belief in his *felicitas* as a military leader; see Weinstock (1971) 112ff. This particular phrase occurs first here and at *Verg. Aen.* 7.745 (of Ufens); see *TLL* 6.447.12ff.

qua uicit, uictos protegit ille manu: again following the example of Julius Caesar, Augustus made much political capital from his *clementia*; see Weinstock (1971) 233ff., Woodman on *Vell.* 2.100.4. Ovid is here echoing *Prop.* 2.16.41f. *Caesaris haec uirtus et gloria Caesaris haec est: / illa, qua uicit, condidit arma manu*. It may be worth noting that Propertius is there contrasting Augustus' military achievements with the *infamis amor* (39) which drove Antony to destruction. For the *declinatio* in *uicit, uictos*, cf. *Trist.* 2.49f. *ut ... tuus gaudet miles, quod uicerit hostem, / sic, uictum cur se gaudeat, hostis habet*, *Pont.* 1.2.123 (of Augustus) *uicit semper, uictis ut parcere posset*, Bömer on *Met.* 3.95. This line is echoed at *Trist.* 4.2.46 (of Germany, in the description of Tiberius' triumph) *uincula fert illa, qua tulit arma, manu*.

1.3

[Neumann (1919) 26ff.; Curran (1966); Holleman (1970) 177ff.; Olstein (1975); Burck (1977); Davidson (1980).]



May Venus grant me success with the girl with whom I have just fallen in love (1-4). I shall be your devoted slave (5-6). Although I am of humble birth (7-8) and modest means (9-10), I am favoured by the deities of poetry (11-12) and shall be faithful to you all my life (13-18). Be the subject of my poetry, and it will be worthy of its inspirer (19-20). Just as poetry has brought fame to the women loved by Jupiter (21-24), so we shall be sung of together always throughout the world (25-26).



In the two preceding elegies, Ovid has described how Cupid forced him to be a love-elegist and has demonstrated the power which Cupid has over him; here, he completes the opening sequence by introducing the girl who is to be the subject of his love-elegies. The poem presents a nexus of familiar themes and ideas and, once again, the most substantial debt is to Propertius. Just as 1.1 and 1.2 draw respectively on Prop. 3.3 and 3.1 (see Vol. 1, 75 and the introduction to those elegies), so this elegy draws on 3.2 for the antithesis between the elegiac poet-lover's *paupertas* and his ability to immortalise his mistress through his poetry; cf. esp. 9-18, 25-26:

miremur, nobis et Baccho et Apolline dextro,
 turba puellarum si mea uerba colit?
 quod non Taenariis domus est mihi fulta columnis
 nec camera auratas inter eburna trabes,
 nec mea Phaeacas aequant pomaria siluas,
 non operosa rigat Marcius antra liquor,
 at Musae comites et carmina cara legenti
 nec defessa choris Calliopea meis.
 fortunata, meo si qua est celebrata libello!
 carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae ...
 at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aeuo
 excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus.

By recalling Propertius' boast of the power which his poetry has to attract a *turba puellarum*, as well as by comparing himself (21-24) to Jupiter, the supreme adulterer, Ovid wittily undermines his protestations of eternal devotion and, as in 1.1 and 1.2, prepares us for the light-hearted manner in which he will recount his amatory experiences.

The theme of *paupertas* (see on 7-10) is fundamental also to Tibullus' programmatic first elegy. Ovid's willingness to endure slavery to his mistress (5; see also on 12 *donat*) is anticipated at Tib. 1.1.55ff. and Prop. 1.1.9ff. His wish that the girl should mourn his death (18) is probably modelled on Tib. 1.1.59ff. The declaration that the girl will inspire his poetry (19-20) finds its closest parallel in earlier elegy in the opening lines of Prop. 2.1, and *quae me nuper praedata puella est* (1) echoes line 55 of that same poem: *una meos quoniam praedata est femina sensus* (cf. also 1.1.1 *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*).

Although it owes so much to Propertius and Tibullus, Ovid's poem nevertheless achieves a certain originality and vitality by being framed dramatically as a *suasoria*. (For *suasoriae* in the *Amores*, see Vol. 1, 69.) The programmatic statements of the older elegists about servile devotion, the power of poetry etc. have been recast as arguments designed to further Ovid's attempt to persuade the girl to accept him as her lover.

This elegy has particularly, indeed puzzlingly, close affinities with 2.17. The subject is the same, and Ovid exploits the same argument that, despite his humble status, he can reward his mistress for accepting him as her lover with the immortality which his poetry confers. There are many parallels on points of detail. Most conspicuously, the theme of *seruitium amoris*, though rare in the *Amores* (see on 5 *deseruiat*), recurs prominently in the opening lines of 2.17, and the second couplet of both poems contains a prayer to Venus, referred to in both instances as the goddess of Cythera, a designation not used elsewhere in the collection. For other notable conceptual and verbal links, cf. 1 (*praedata ... est*) and 2.17.5 and 6 (*praeda*), 5, 6 and 2.17.23 (*accipe*), 19 (*materiem felicem*) and 2.17.27 (*felicicia carmina*), 20 and 2.17.34 (the mistress as inspiration), 21 and 2.17.28 (*nomen habere*). Limited though the range of themes treated in the *Amores* may be in comparison with that displayed by Propertius and even Tibullus (see Vol. 1, 13), no other two poems in the collection are so strikingly similar in their content and presentation. In both 2.9 and 3.11, Ovid renounces his love for his mistress, only to recant.

Even those elegies are not, however, linked by such a series of close parallels in thought and language as exists between 1.3 and 2.17, and a reason can be detected for the reworking of that particular theme: the ostensibly greater bitterness of 3.11 (see Vol. 1, 95) may be taken to reflect a later, more cynical, stage in the love-affair. No such shift in tone can be detected between 1.3 and 2.17, and it is difficult to see why Ovid should have taken such pains to emphasise the links between them. It is clear, however, that the theme of this poem had a particularly strong appeal to Ovid. It is reworked, though not in such detail, also in 1.10. For that elegy's affinities with 1.3 and 2.17, see on 1.10.63f.



1-4. This opening passage sets the scene for the address to the girl, which occupies the rest of the poem; cf. 1.13.1f. (with a return to narration in the final couplet, after the lengthy address to Aurora), 2.17.1-10, 3.10.1f. The unity of the passage is emphasised by the echo of *precor* (1) in *preces* at the end of line 4. For verbal ring-composition between the beginning and end of whole elegies, see on 1.5.26 and cf. also 1.4.2, 13f., 1.9.1f., 2.2.8 (nn.).

1-2. *Iusta precor*: for the solemn expression, cf. Prop. 3.10.12 *poscentis iusta precare deos* with Fedeli's note. Ovid appends a comparable phrase to a command at *Met.* 13.466 *ite procul, si iusta peto*.

***quae me nuper praedata puella est*:** we learn first here for certain that the *Amores* are not to be homosexual. For the lover as the spoils of the girl, cf. Prop. 2.1.55 (quoted in the introduction), *Am.* 2.17.5f. *utinam dominae miti quoque praeda fuissem, / formosae quoniam praeda futurus eram*, *Ars* 2.406, 3.84, 560, and see also on 1.2.19. *praedari*, common in prose (esp. Livy [54]), occurs elsewhere in the Augustan poets only at *Ars* 3.419, Prop. *loc. cit.* and 4.2.37, Verg. *Georg.* 1.130, Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.55. The phrasing here is pointedly echoed at 2.19.19 (introducing a series of instructions to a mistress who has replaced Corinna) *tu quoque, quae nostros rapuisti nuper ocellos*. The alliteration of *p* helps to suggest Ovid's indignation at his unjust treatment.

***aut amet aut faciat cur ego semper amem*:** the alternatives proposed are somewhat paradoxical. As is noted by Lyne (1980) 242, the second alternative means effectively that the girl should at least sleep with Ovid. (*F* has the gloss *simulando se amare*.) One might rather

have expected Ovid to pray for either mutual love or freedom from love; cf. [Tib.] 4.5 (= 3.11) 13f. *nec tu sis iniusta, Venus: uel seruiat aequae / uinctus uterque tibi, uel mea uincla leua* with Smith's note, Lucilius or Polemon of Pontus *AP* 5.68 ἢ τὸ φιλεῖν περιγράφον, 'Ἐρως, ὅλον ἢ τὸ φιλεῖσθαι / πρόσθε, ἔν' ἢ λύσης τὸν πόθον ἢ κεράσης (cf. Auson. *Epigr.* 90 p. 345 Peiper *Hoc quod amare uocant solue aut misceto, Cupido: / aut neutrum flammis ure uel ure duos*), Rufinus *AP* 5.88 εἰ δυσὶν οὐκ ἴσχυσας ἴσῃν φλόγα, πυρφόρε, καῦσαι, / τὴν ἐνὶ καιομένην ἢ σβέσον ἢ μετὰθες (cf. Auson. *Epigr.* 91 p. 346 Peiper), Agathias *AP* 6.80.6. *cur ego semper amem*: 'why I should be constant in my love'. The sense is wittily changed to 'why I should constantly be in love (with different women)' at 2.4.10 *centum sunt causae cur ego semper amem*, where Ovid admits to the fickleness in love which he denies in lines 5f. and 13ff. of this poem; cf. also *Epist. Sapph.* 80 *semper causa est cur ego semper amem*. For the construction *facere cur* ..., cf. *Pont.* 3.3.81f. *quae ... cur ... reuisam / tu facis*, Liv. 42.29.11, also *Am.* 2.19.56 (to the husband of a mistress who has replaced Corinna, urging him to give him a *causa cur amet*) *nil facies, cur te iure perisse uelim?*

3-4. *a, nimium uolui*! cf. *Met.* 4.74f. *quantum erat, ut sineres toto nos corpore iungi, / aut, hoc si nimium est, uel ad oscula danda pateres?*, *Pont.* 1.8.71 *a, nimium est, quod, amice, petis: moderatius opta*. For *a, nimium*, cf. also *Epist.* 5.123, 11.45, 16.287, *Fast.* 2.45, *TLL* 1.1442. 78ff. and 3.9.4 *a, nimis ex uero*.

***tantum patiat amari*:** cf. 3.2.57 (to Venus) *da ... nouae mentem dominae, patiat amari*, *Epist. Sapph.* 96 *non ut ames oro, me sed amare sinas*, Plaut. *Cas.* 137 *sine, amabo, ted amari*, Catull. 24.6 *quam sic te sineres ab illo amari*, [Verg.] *Catal.* 4.11f. *quare illud satis est, si te permittis amari, / nam contra ut sit amor mutuus, unde mihi?* For *pati* in prayers, cf. e.g. Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 5, Imp. Aug. ap. Suet. *Tib.* 21.7 *deos obsecro ut te nobis conseruent et ualere nunc et semper patiantur*, *CIL* 6.1527.69. The liturgical nuance suggests that the girl is being considered as a goddess (see on 1.5.1-8). That conceit is more certainly present at 3.2.57 (quoted above); cf. 60 *pace loquar Veneris, tu dea maior eris*. See also below, on 16 *tu*. We are possibly to understand *se* with *amari*, as at 1.8.71 *sine credat amari*; see also on 1.2.18 *ferre fatentur*. Ovid is, however, probably Grecising; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.43f. *patiens uocari / Caesaris ultor* with Nisbet-Hubbard's note. For *tantum* in prayers and commands (= *modo*, μόνον), cf. 2.15.18, 3.6.65, 3.8.59, 3.11.49, 3.14.15, Bömer on *Met.* 9.557.

audierit: for *audire* used of deities attending to prayers, see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.27, Bömer on *Met.* 8.598. I construe *audierit* as a future perfect indicative: 'let her only allow me to love her, Venus will have heard my many prayers'. If this is correct, *patiatur* will be equivalent to *si patietur*; see on 19 *praebe*. Some translators, however, interpret it as a jussive perfect subjunctive: 'let her only allow me to love her; let Venus have heard my many prayers'. That interpretation, although it has the attraction of being more lively and urgent, seems rather less natural. When Ovid recited this elegy, his intonation presumably prevented confusion; see Vol. 1, 72f.

nostras tot ... preces: the combination of a possessive adjective with another epithet is perhaps stylistically elevated; cf. 1.2.19, *Fast.* 4.162 *tot ... tuas, diua, tuere nurus*, Fordyce on Verg. *Aen.* 8.72 *tu ... o Thybri tuo genitor cum flumine sancto*. For *tot* in such combinations, cf. also *Epist.* 17.214, *Met.* 13.499, *Fast.* 6.368, 646, *Trist.* 1.8.31f.

5-6. For the promise of lasting fidelity, restated in lines 15ff., cf. e.g. 2.17.31ff., 3.2.61f., 3.11.49ff., Tib. 1.5.61ff., Prop. 1.2.31f., 1.4 *passim*, 1.8.43ff., 1.12.15ff., 1.15.29ff., 1.19.5ff.

accipe: cf. 2.17.23 *tu quoque me, mea lux, in quaslibet accipe leges*, *Met.* 9.12 *accipe me generum*, Val. Max. 9.9.2 *accipe me fati tui comitem*, Lucan 2.346f., Val. Fl. 1.763f.

per longos ... annos: cf. 16ff., Stat. *Silu.* 3.5.106f. (to his wife) *creavit* (sc. *tellus nostra*) / *me tibi, me socium longos astrinxit in annos*. For the epithet, cf. also *Am.* 2.5.39, 2.19.23 *sic mihi durat amor longosque adolescit in annos*, Bömer on *Met.* 4.226 and see also on 1.6.25.

deseruiat: for the lover's enslavement to his beloved, see Lyne (1979), Murgatroyd (1981). The conceit seems to have been introduced to elegy by Gallus, with reference to his affair with the freedwoman Lycoris; cf. *frg.* 4.2 Büchner *domina ... mea*. It is common in Tibullus and, more especially, Propertius. Other than in his frequent use of the term *domina*, however, Ovid describes his relationship with his mistress as slavery elsewhere only at 2.17.1f.; cf. also 1.6.45ff., where he whimsically suggests that, if it ensured him success in love, he would be willing to take the place of the chained *ianitor*. At 1.2.18 and 3.11.1ff., his slavery is to Cupid rather than to his mistress. 3.11.12 *excubui clausam, seruus ut, ante domum* is modelled on Tib. 1.1.56 *sedeo duras ianitor ante fores*; by changing Tibullus' metaphor to a comparison, Ovid seems almost to be

rejecting the concept of *seruitium amoris*. For Ovid's neglect of concepts which are common in the older elegists, see Vol. 1, 17f. *deseruire* is found elsewhere in classical poetry only at Stat. *Silu.* 2.2.130. Although used by a broad range of later prose authors, it occurs earlier only in Cicero (10 times); note esp. *Cael.* 67 (of Clodia's lovers) *uigeant apud istam mulierem uenustate, dominantur sumptibus, haereant, iaceant, deseruiant*. On Ovid's use of verbs compounded with the intensifying prefix *de-*, most of which seem to be rooted in the spoken language, see Knox (1986) 40ff.

accipe, qui pura norit amare fide: for the *fides* of the elegiac lover, cf. 13, 1.10.57, 2.15.28, *Ars* 3.544 *nimum certa scimus amare fide*, Boucher (1965) 85ff., Fedeli on Prop. 1.4.16 and 1.12.8 *ut simili posset amare fide*.

7-14. Ovid's presentation of himself here accords broadly (*mutatis mutandis*) with the stereotype of the municipal gentry; compare Cicero's σύγκρισις of Quinctius and Naevius at *Quinct.* 92f.: *ea res nunc enim in discrimine uersatur, utrum possint se contra luxuriam ac licentiam rusticana illa atque inculta parsimonia defendere an deformata atque ornamentis omnibus spoliata nuda cupiditati petulantiaeque addicatur. non comparat se tecum gratia P. Quinctius, Sex. Naevi, non opibus, non facultate contendit; omnis tuas artis quibus tu magnus es tibi concedit; fatetur se non belle dicere, non ad uoluntatem loqui posse, non ab adflicta amicitia transfugere atque ad florentem aliam deuolare, non profusis sumptibus uiuere, non ornare magnifice splendideque conuiuium, non habere domum clausam pudori et sanctimoniae, patentem atque adeo expositam cupiditati et uoluptatibus; contra sibi ait officium, fidem, diligentiam, uitam omnino semper horridam atque aridam cordi fuisse*. Ovid presents similar autobiographical sketches at *Trist.* 2.109ff. and *Pont.* 4.8.17ff.; cf. also *Epist.* 20.223ff., *Pont.* 1.9.37ff., Stat. *Silu.* 5.2.15ff., 71ff. *tibi Pieriae tenero sub pectore curae / et pudor et docti legem sibi dicere mores; / tunc hilaris probitas et frons tranquilla, nitorque / luxuriae confine tenens, pietasque per omnis / dispensata modos; aequaeuo cedere fratri / mirarique patrem miseraeque ignoscere matri / admonuit fortuna domus*, Mart. 5.13. Ovid's chief elegiac model here is Prop. 3.2.9ff. (see the introduction); cf. also 2.24C.37f. *certus eras eheu, quamuis nec sanguine auito / nobilis et quamuis non ita diues eras*, 2.34.55ff. *aspice me, cui parua domi fortuna relicta est / nullus et antiquo Marte triumphus aui, / ut regnem mixtas inter conuiua puellas / hoc ego, quo tibi nunc eleuor, ingenio!*

7-10. All the great elegists were of equestrian status, which required a property qualification of 400,000 sesterces. *Paupertas*, however, was a relative term with no such definable limits. The elegists were not therefore debarred from laying claim to the conventional poverty of the poet, for which see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.10, Cairns (1979) 20f. Ovid portrays himself as a *pauper amans* most notably in 1.8, 1.10, 2.17 and 3.8; cf. also e.g. *Ars* 3.531ff., Tib. 1.1, 1.5, Prop. 1.8, 1.14, 3.2. *Paupertas* had positive moral overtones; see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.1.5. Those overtones are relevant here, and are exploited to particularly humorous effect in 3.8; there, Ovid adopts an incongruously self-righteous stance in lamenting his mistress' immoral preference for a bloody soldier who is wealthier than he is.

7-8. si me non ueterum commendant magna parentum / nomina: for *commendatio*, cf. e.g. Cic. *Catil.* 1.28 *populo Romano ... qui te, hominem per te cognitum, nulla commendatione maiorum ... extulit*, Pis. 1, *Planc.* 67, *Brut.* 96. For the negative form of expression, cf. Cic. *Quinct. loc. cit.* (on 7-14), Prop. 3.2.11ff. (quoted in the introduction), Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.1. *ueterum ... parentum*: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.39, 576, *TLL* 10.1.357.11ff.

sanguinis auctor: a rather grand phrase; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.49, *Met.* 12.558, 13.142, *Fast.* 3.98, 190, Stat. *Theb.* 1.224, 2.463, 9.842, *TLL* 2.1204.30ff. Cicero uses a comparably pompous expression at *Leg. Agr.* 2.100 *nulli me uobis auctores generis mei commendarunt*.

9-10. nec meus innumeris renouatur campus aratris: cf. Tib. 1.1.21 *tunc uitula innumeros lustrabat caesa iuuenos*, 2.3.41f. *praedator cupit immensos obsidere campos, / ut multa innumera iugera pascant oues*, Lygd. 3.5 *ut multa mei renouarent iugera tauri*, Prop. 3.5.5 *nec mihi mille iugis Campania pinguis aratur*, 4.1.129 *tua cum multi uersarent rura iuueni*, *Met.* 3.584f. *meus ... campus*: for the pronominal adjective, cf. 3.13.14 (= *Fast.* 1.84, *Pont.* 4.4.32), 3.15.16, *Rem.* 156, *Fast.* 4.462. *campus*, possibly suggested by *Campania* at Prop. 3.5.5, has connotations of extensive land-owning; i.e. the sense of the line is: 'I do not own vast acres furrowed by countless ploughs'. *innumerus*: Ov. 33 (16), Verg. 2 (2), Hor. 0, Tib. 2 (both quoted above), Prop. 0. The word occurs earlier only in *Epitaph. Plaut. ap. Gell.* 1.24.3 and at Lucr. 2.1054 and 3.779, in prose first in the elder Pliny (42 times). (Pliny's vocabulary is remarkably poetic; see also on 1.8.4 *roseis*, 111 *lacrimosa*, 2.1.23 *sanguineae* and perhaps 1.7.7 *clipei*.) The normal equivalent in prose is the metrically much less

flexible *innumerabilis*, used four times by Lucretius, once each by Cinna, Scaevola and Horace (*Carm.* 3.30.4); see *TLL* 7.1.1726.16ff. For *renouare* in the sense 'plough', cf. Lygd. 3.5 (quoted above), *Met.* 1.110, 15.125, *Fast.* 1.159, *Trist.* 4.6.13, 5.12.23, *OLD* s.v. 1d.

Note the elaborate arrangement of the line, with both epithets preceding their nouns and separated from them by the verb. For such lines, many of which appear in contexts which are, as here, in some way imposing, cf. 1.7.25, 56, 1.8.50, 1.9.16, 23, 1.10.4, 1.13.10, 1.15.15, 2.1.6, 2.4.27, 30, 2.5.34, 2.6.5, 2.7.5, 2.9.12, 21, 22, 2.14.41, 2.15.17, 2.16.36, 2.18.2, 3.3.21, 3.6.14, 52, 3.7.63, 3.9.43, 3.10.22, 3.11.10, 3.12.26, 29 and see also Wilkinson (1963) 215ff., Ross (1969) 132ff. The same arrangement occurs at Lygd. 3.5 and Prop. 4.1.129 (both quoted above). Propertius, however, rather overplays this type of line in his fourth book, which affords no less than thirty-nine examples.

temperat et sumptus parcus uterque parens: thrift was a traditional Roman virtue; cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 2.15.13ff., Lucan 3.161 *parcorum mores ... auorum*. Ovid is exploiting Comic typology; cf. 1.10.41, 1.15.17 *durus pater* (n.), Prop. 2.23.17f. *nec poscet garrula, quod te / astrictus ploret saepe dedisse pater*, Hor. *Carm.* 2.8.22 *senes parci* with Nisbet-Hubbard's note. For the emphasis here on control exerted by both parents, one may perhaps compare [Theocr.] 8.15f. and Verg. *Ecl.* 3.33f. *sumptus*: Ov. 2 (0), Verg. 0, Hor. 6 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 1 (3.2.19, i.e. in the elegy which is Ovid's chief model for this poem; see the introduction). Ovid is here again influenced by Comedy. The word occurs 44 times in Plautus, 19 in Terence; cf. esp. Ter. *Andr.* 450 *ait* (sc. the *adulescens* about his father) *nimum parce facere sumptum*, *Haut.* 207 (*parentes filiis*) *praebent exigue sumptum*. *uterque parens*: for the expression, cf. *Epist.* 6.62, *Met.* 4.387, 13.147, *Fast.* 5.181, *Ibis* 260, [Verg.] *Ciris* 240, Mart. 1.116.4, Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.66, CE 1197.2.

11-14. An assertive four-line apodosis to follow the negatively expressed four-line protasis. The passage is cleverly arranged, with the deities, Apollo, the Muses, Bacchus and Cupid, in the first couplet, balanced by four abstracts, *fides*, *mores*, *simplicitas* and *pudor*, in the second. For the combination of literary and moral qualities, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.9f. *fides et ingeni / benigna uena* (modelled on Bacchyl. *frg.* 21.3f. Snell-Maehler θυμός εὐμενής / Μοῦσα τε γλυκεῖα), also *Epist.* 1.1.57 *est animus tibi, sunt mores, est lingua fidesque*.

11-12. at introduces the apodosis; cf. *Epigr.* 3 (n.). Here, Ovid is echoing Prop. 3.2.15 (quoted in the introduction).

comites ... nouem: at Prop. 3.2.15, the Muses are the *comites* of the poet, not of Apollo. Although there are nine Muses already in Homer (*Od.* 24.60) and Hesiod (*Theog.* 60), that number was not quite canonical; see West on Hes. *loc. cit.* Nine is, however, the only number found in Augustan poetry; cf. Prop. 3.3.33, Hor. *Carm. Saec.* 62, *Epist.* 2.2.92, Ov. *Ars* 3.348, *Met.* 5.311, *Trist.* 5.12.45, *Epist. Sapph.* 108.

uitis ... repertor: for Bacchus as a god of poetry in company with Apollo and the Muses, cf. Call. *Iamb.* 1.7f., Prop. 3.2.9, 15, 4.6.75f., Lygd. 4.43f., *Ars* 3.347f., [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.59f., Stat. *Silu.* 1.5.1ff. For his association, as god of wine, with the Muses and Cupid (or Venus), cf. Solon *frag.* 26 West, Anon. *AP* 5.135.3, Antipater of Sidon *AP* 7.27.9f., Marcus Argentarius *AP* 10.18.1f. For his association with Cupid, see also on 1.6.59f. He recurs as a god of poetry in the *Amores* at 3.15.17; cf. also 3.1.23 (n.). See further Kambylis (1965) 166ff., Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Hor. *Carm.* 2.19. The periphrasis *uitis ... repertor* suggests a reference to the function of wine as a source of poetic inspiration; cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.1ff., Wimmel (1960) 225. For Bacchus' invention of wine, see Bömer on *Fast.* 2.329. The same periphrasis occurs there and at Varro *Rust.* 1.2.19; cf. *Anth.* 245.1 (*uitium*), Rut. Nam. 1.73 (*uini*), also Enn. *Trag.* 121 *uitis inuentor* with Jocelyn's note.

hac faciunt: 'are active on this side (i.e. in support of me)'. *hac* was known to Heinsius from *Mn* but, surprisingly, he ignored it. It was conjectured independently by Palmer in his note on *Epist.* 1.103 *hac faciunt custosque boum longaeuque nutrix*. As here, most mss there offer *haec*, a few *hoc*. *hac* there is Tyrrell's conjecture, based on Cic. *Att.* 7.3.5 *omnis damnatione ignominiaque dignos illac facere*, to which Palmer adds Enn. *Ann.* 232 (= Verg. *Aen.* 12.565) *Iuppiter hac stat*; cf. also Stat. *Theb.* 12.644ff. *facere* recurs in this sense at *Trist.* 4.1.53f. *sint, precor, hae* (sc. the Muses, described in line 50 as Ovid's *comites*) *saltem faciles mihi! namque deorum / cetera cum magno Caesare turba facit*. See also on 2.9.36 (to Cupid) *hic tua dextra facit*.

me qui tibi donat Amor: *donat* here means 'hand over as a slave or chattel', continuing the imagery in *deseruiat* (5); cf. Scaev. *Dig.* 45.1.135.3 *ea lege donatum sibi esse ... seruum*, Rufinus *AP* 5.22.1 σοί με λάτριν γλυκύδωρος Ἔρως παρέδωκε, Kenney (1959) 255, on *Ars* 2.387 *nec mea uos uni donat censura puellae*. Ovid echoes this passage at *Epist.* 20.227f. *sunt et opes nobis, sunt et sine crimine mores,*

amplius utque nihil, me tibi iungit Amor. For Cupid as a matchmaker, see also Kost on Musaeus 148f. (quoted on 1.2.19).

13-14. For such lists of virtues, often, as here, personified to a greater or lesser degree, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.24.6f. *Pudor et Iustitiae soror / incorrupta Fides nudaque Veritas* with Nisbet-Hubbard's note, 1.35.17ff., *Carm. Saec.* 57ff., *Met.* 1.129, *Trist.* 5.5.45ff., Sen. *Ag.* 112f. *periere mores ius decus pietas fides / et ... pudor*, [Sen.] *Octavia* 547f. *probitas fidesque coniugis, mores pudor / placeant marito*, CE 1189.7f., Claud. 3.52ff.

nulli cessura fides: for the elegiac concept of *fides*, see on line 6. A secondary sense, 'lyre', would be inapposite here. Nisbet-Hubbard rightly reject such a play in a similar context at Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.9 (quoted on 11-14). *nulli cessura:* cf. *Met.* 6.207 *nulli cessura dearum*, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 3.89f. *non cessura pruinus / membra*. The phrase is here used attributively (= e.g. *certa, firma*), balancing *sine crimine* (see below), *nuda* and *purpureus*. The extended use of the future participle as equivalent to an adjective or to a relative clause first becomes common in Ovid and Livy; see H.-Sz. 390f. In the *Amores*, note 1.12.8 *negaturis ... notis*, 1.15.20 *casurum ... nomen*, 2.15.1 *Anule ... digitum uincture*, 2.16.28 *subuenturos ... deos*, 3.1.65 *uicturum nomen*, 3.6.34 *Thebe ... futura parens*, 3.15.20 *mansurum ... opus*.

sine crimine mores: cf. *Epist.* 20.227 (quoted on 12). *sine crimine* occurs 19 (5) times in Ovid; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 4.550, Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.56, Prop. 4.11.45, Germ. *Arat.* 109, *Laus Pis.* 120. It was already, or was to become, very popular in epitaphs; cf. CE 1203.3 *bis denos perfuncta annos sine crimine morum*, Pease on Verg. *loc. cit.* For its adjectival use (= ἄμειπτοι), see on 1.7.51.

nuda ... simplicitas: for *simplicitas* as a traditional virtue, cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.113 *simplicitas rudis ante fuit; nunc aurea Roma est*, *Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.22, Vell. 2.10.2, 2.72.3, 2.125.5. For *simplicitas* as an attractive quality in a lover, cf. e.g. 1.10.13, 2.4.18, *Epist.* 2.64. The word occurs 11 (1) times in Ovid, earlier only in Lucretius (5 times, all in related expressions); Livy has it 5 times (all in Book 40). Martial and Juvenal use it 4 times each, but it otherwise remains rare in poetry, occurring only at *Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.22, Petron. 132.15 and Stat. *Silu.* 2.7.85. See also on 1.8.44 *rusticitas*. *nuda* occurs nowhere else as an epithet for *simplicitas*, but cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.24.7 *nuda ... Veritas*, Val. Fl. 5.498 *nuda Fides*. Here, the primary sense is 'candid' but, since *simplicitas* is semi-personified, the literal meaning may also be felt. There is a similar play at 1.10.15f., where Cupid is

described as *nudus* and *apertus* both literally and morally, and at *Ars* 3.747 (prefacing an account of sexual intercourse) *mihi nudis rebus eundum est*.

purpureus ... pudor: for the phrase, cf. 2.5.34, *Trist.* 4.3.70, Stat. *Theb.* 2.231, Call. *frg.* 80.10 αἰδοῖ ... ποίνικι with Pfeiffer's note. Barsby suggests that 'the triple assonance of *pu* ... could almost be taken as mocking', but perhaps it evokes rather stammering self-consciousness; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.57 *pudor prohibebat plura profari*.

15-16. non mihi mille placent: a variation on the usual profession of devotion *tu mihi sola places*, which occurs at Prop. 2.7.19, [Tib.] 3.19.3, *Ars* 1.42. For *mille* signifying an indefinite large number, cf. 2.8.1, 2.18.10, 3.14.24, *Epist.* 7.123 *mille procis placui*, *Ars* 1.63 *iuuenes tibi mille placebunt*, H.-Sz. 211, *TLL* 8.980.69ff. See also on 1.14.13 *centum*. For the erotic sense of *placere*, cf. also 1.8.23, 25, 1.10.12, 28, 2.2.5, 14, 2.4.17, 18, 20, 29, 2.10.8, 3.4.27, 32, 41, 3.6.47, 3.11.19, 3.12.11, Pichon (1966) s.v.

desultor amoris: on the *desultores*, trick-riders in the Circus, see *RE* 5.255ff. Homer compares Ajax to such a performer as he leaps from ship to ship to ward off the Trojans (*Il.* 15.679ff.). Ovid's phrase is a witty compliment to Messalla, the patron who encouraged his earliest poetry (see Vol. 1, 11). *desultor* is elsewhere used metaphorically only in Messalla's *bon mot* about the political fickleness of Q. Dellius, preserved by Seneca at *Suas.* 1.7 but probably coined in the period soon after Actium: *Dellius ... quem Messalla Coruinus desultorem bellorum ciuiliu uocat quia ab Dolabella ad Cassium transiturus salutem sibi pactus est si Dolabellam occidisset, a Cassio deinde transit ad Antonium, nouissime ab Antonio transfugit ad Caesarem*. See Barsby (1975), Gagliardi (1984) and line 17 *fila sororum* (n.). The delicately obscene implications of the image here are perhaps hinted at also in 3.2.9ff. *desultor* occurs elsewhere in poetry only at Manil. 5.85; cf. also Prop. 4.2.35f. *est etiam aurigae species Vertumnus et eius / traicit alterno qui leue pondus equo*.

tu, with *tecum*, *teque*, *te* following closely, conveys the urgency of Ovid's appeal. Such anaphora is found particularly in hymnic contexts; see on 1.6.15f. *te ... tibi ... / tu*. For the girl addressed as a goddess, see on 3 *patiatur*.

si qua fides: the phrase is used in this formulaic manner first here and at 1.8.11, *Ars* 3.791, *Met.* 9.55 and *Pont.* 3.5.53, with variations at *Am.* 2.6.51 *si qua fides dubiis*, *Epist.* 18.119, *Met.* 9.371 and *Fast.* 6.715. Since, however, it occurs at Sen. *Contr.* 1.1.18, 5 *exc.* 1, 7.6.9

(reporting Porcius Latro) and 9.6.19, it may have been current in the schools of declamation. For its use in this context, cf. Petron. 79.10 *si qua est amantibus fides*, CE 939.1 *Si qua fides hominum est, unam te semper amaui*.

cura: 'beloved'; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10.22 *tua cura*, *Lycoris*, *TLL* 4.1475.42ff. The sense 'subject for poetry' (cf. e.g. Prop. 2.1.26 *Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores* [sc. in an epic]) may also be present, anticipating the request in line 19. Comparable plays are expressed more explicitly at 3.1.41f. *sum leuis, et mecum leuis est, mea cura*, *Cupido:* / *non sum materia fortior ipsa mea* and 3.9.31f. *sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia nomen habebunt, / altera cura recens, altera primus amor*.

perennis restates *per longos ... annos* (5); cf. also 17 and see on 1.15.7.

17-18. tecum ... / uiuere contingat teque dolente mori: for the balanced expression, cf. Lygd. 3.7f. *tecum ut longae sociarem gaudia uitae / inque tuo caderet nostra senecta sinu*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.9.24 *tecum uiuere amem, tecum obeam libens*, also IG 12.2.459.5f. (in an epitaph for a pet dog) χρηστὸν ποιοῦ φίλον, ὃς σε προθύμως / καὶ ζῶντα στέργοι καὶ νεκρὸν ἀμφιέποι, *Eleg. in Maecen.* 2.155f. *uixi te, Caesar, amico / et morior*, Sen. *Contr.* 9.4.5 *ita mihi libero et uiuere contingat et mori*. The contrasting infinitives elegantly enclose the pentameter. *contingere* is first constructed with an infinitive by the Augustan poets (unless *contigit* be retained at Cic. *Arch.* 4); see K.-S. 2.240, *TLL* 4.719.16ff. Ovid echoes this passage at 2.10.35f., in parodying the normally morbid and sentimental manner in which the other elegists imagine the scene at their own death: *at mihi contingat Veneris languescere motu, / cum moriar, medium soluar et inter opus. te ... dolente:* for the beloved's grief at the death-bed, see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.1.59f. *te spectem, suprema mihi cum uenerit hora, / te (ψ; et A) teneam moriens deficiente manu*. The anaphora in Ovid's couplet may lend some support to the reading *te* in Tibullus' pentameter.

quos dederint annos: cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.13.22f. *Cinarae breues / annos fata dederunt*, *Fast.* 2.65 *dent tibi caelestes, quos tu caelestibus, annos*, Manil. 3.564, 567f.

fila sororum: the phrase occurs first here and at Hor. *Carm.* 2.3.15f. Since that ode is addressed to Dellius, the *desultor bellorum ciuiliu*, it seems certain that Ovid is echoing Horace; see Barsby (1975) 45f. and 15 *desultor amoris* (n.). *sorores*, often without further definition, is 'a sinister euphemism' (Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *loc. cit.*) for the

Parcae; see Bömer on *Met.* 15.781.

19-20. For the beloved as a source of poetic inspiration, cf. 2.17.34 *ingenio causas tu dabis una meo*, 3.12.16 *ingenium mouit sola Corinna meum*, *Trist.* 4.10.59f., *Prop.* 2.1.1ff., 2.30.40, *Tib.* 2.5.11f.

materiem: see on 1.1.2.

felicem: 'fertile'; cf. 3.1.59 (Elegy to Ovid) *prima tuae moui felicia semina mentis*, 3.12.41 *fecunda licentia uatum*; for the agricultural image, see also on 20 *prouenient* and on 3.15.19 *genialis Musa*.

in carmina: cf. *Fast.* 1.17 *da mihi te placidum, dederis in carmina uires*, *Lucan.* 1.66 *tu satis ad uires Romana in carmina dandas*, *Persius* 5.2 *linguas optare in carmina centum*. The phrase may be construed either with *praebe* (cf. *Fast.* and *Lucan.* *loc. cit.* [*dare in*]) or with *felicem* (cf. *Sen. Ag.* 706 *fecunda in ignes* with Tarrant's note), or with both. For Ovid's final use of *in*, see also on 1.1.22.

praebe: cf. *Pind.* *Nem.* 6.56ff. *Περσίδων ἀρόταις / δυνατόι παρ-έχειν πολλὸν ὕμνον ἀγερῶχων ἐργμάτων / ἔνεκεν*, *Trist.* 4.4.17 *Iuppiter ingeniis praebeat sua numina uatum*, also *Am.* 1.8.74, *Epist.* 7.34 *materiem curae praebeat ille meae*, *Fast.* 1.674. There may be an underlying sexual meaning; cf. 3.8.34, *Epist.* 4.95 *nec tamen Aurorae male se praebebat amandum*, *Ars* 2.685 *odi, quae praebeat quia sit praebere necesse*, *TLL* 10.2.387.64ff. For *dare* so used, see on 1.4.70. For the imperative in the protasis of a conditional sentence, cf. 4 *audierit* (n.), 1.8.46, 1.9.9, 1.10.64, 2.2.40, 2.4.32, 3.13.8, K.-S. 2.165.

prouenient: cf. *Trist.* 1.1.39 *carmina proueniunt animo deducta sereno*, *Pont.* 4.2.11f. *fertile pectus habes, interque Helicon colentes / uberius nulli prouenit ista seges*, *Epist.* *Sapph.* 13f. As the passage from the *Ex Ponto* makes clear, Ovid is sustaining the agricultural image in *felicem*; for *prouenire* used of plants growing, cf. also *Ars* 3.101f. *cultis bene Liber ab uuis / prouenit*, *Fast.* 4.617, *Colum.* 3.1.3 (*uitis*) *tam ... felix campis quam collibus prouenit*, *OLD* s.v. 3a.

causa carmina digna sua echoes Gallus' declaration at *frg.* 4.1f. *Büchner tandem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae / quae possem domina deicere digna mea*. In replacing the concrete term *domina* with the more abstract *causa*, Ovid shows the same lack of emotional involvement as in the opening elegy, which makes no reference to love for a mistress and discusses only metre and the subject-matter for poetry; see Hinds (1984) 48f. *causa:* cf. 2.17.34, *Prop.* 2.1.12 *inuenio causas mille poeta nouas*. The meaning is 'inspiration', not 'theme', which would make the term merely synonymous with *materiem*. For the distinction, cf. *Cic. Fin.* 1.18, *Sen. Epist.* 65.2

materia iacet iners, res ad omnia parata, cessatura si nemo moueat; causa autem ... materiam format et quocumque uult uersat, ex illa uaria opera producit. esse ergo debet unde fiat aliquid, deinde a quo fiat: hoc causa est, illud materia. For the two terms used in conjunction, cf. *Liv.* 6.31.2, 39.1.8, *Petron.* 98.9, *Juv.* 3.147 *materiam praebeat causasque iocorum*, *Tac. Agr.* 10.5. *causa ... sua* (PYC) is certainly to be preferred to *causae ... suae* (SC). There is no definite instance of *dignus* constructed with the genitive in Augustan poetry, although Vergil has *magnum haud umquam indignus auorum* at *Aen.* 12.649. The genitive construction seems to have been avoided as colloquial; see Luck on *Trist.* 4.3.57 (where, however, he surprisingly prefers *probae* to *proba*), *TLL* 5.1.1147.30ff. In his note on *at regina pyra* at *Aen.* 4.504, Servius observes: *notatus est hic uersus: uitiosa est enim elocutio quae habet exitus similes, licet sit casuum dissimilitudo*. Neither Ovid, however, nor any other Augustan poet, shows any respect for such a rule. In the *Amores*, two or more words ending in a short *a* are found in the same line as two ending in a long *a* at 1.5.9, 10, 1.8.80, 1.14.43, 1.15.36, 2.3.10, 2.4.42, 2.5.12, 2.6.6, 2.10.26, 2.13.4 *ira digna mea est, sed cadit ira metu*, 3.4.16, 3.7.13, 81, 3.9.67, 3.11.29 and 3.12.10; cf. also 2.14.6 *militia fuerat digna perire sua*.

21-24. A liaison with a god was normally considered sufficient in itself to ensure a mortal woman immortality or, at least, immortal fame; cf. e.g. 2.2.45f., *Ars* 1.556ff., *Fast.* 5.617ff., *Hor. Carm.* 3.27.73ff. Here, however, Ovid suggests that such immortal fame is assured only if the liaison is celebrated in poetry. The conceit recurs in much the same extreme form at 3.12.33f., where the fame of Jupiter's love-affairs is declared to be dependent on poetry; cf. also *Pont.* 4.8.55 *di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt*. For the power of poetry to confer immortality, cf. also 1.10.59ff., 1.15 *passim*, 2.17.27ff., 3.1.29, 65, 3.9.29ff., 3.12.21ff., 3.15 *passim*, *Ars* 3.535ff., *Tib.* 1.4.63ff. with Smith's note, *Prop.* 2.25.1ff., 3.1.21ff., 3.2.17ff., 4.1.61ff., *Gow* on *Theocr.* 16.30f., *Stroh* (1971) via *Index* 1 s.v. *Verewigungstopik*. In appealing to the precedent of Jupiter, Ovid is exploiting a theme traditional in erotic literature from *Theogn.* 1345f. onwards: *παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους / ἦρατο καὶ Κρονίδης*; see Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 2.4.2. Here, however, such an appeal is humorously incongruous, since Ovid is promising eternal fidelity, whereas Jupiter, in his liaisons with these women, is a model of infidelity. For such brief catalogues of Jupiter's love-affairs, cf. 1.10.7f., 2.19.27ff., 3.12.33f.,

Ars 3.251f., *Met.* 6.103ff., *Hom. Il.* 14.313ff., *Prop.* 2.30.28ff., [*Verg.*] *Aetna* 89f., *Anon. AP* 5.65.1f., *Bassus AP* 5.125.1f., *Palladas AP* 5.257.3f., *Sen. Phaedr.* 299ff., [*Sen.*] *Octavia* 201ff., 762ff., *Petron.* 126.18, *Apul. Met.* 6.22, *Lucian Deor. Conc.* 7, *Dial. Deor.* 4.2, 6.1, 8.1, 18.2, *Iup. Trag.* 2, *Prometh.* 17, *Athenaeus* 13.566D, *Philostr. Epist.* 30, 35, *Nonn. Dion.* 8.247ff., *Henrichs* (1974) 302f. The arrangement of the catalogue is very elegant: half a line for Io, one line for Leda, two for Europa.

21-22. carmine nomen habent: the phrase *nomen habere* is peculiarly frequent in Ovid, occurring ninety-one times, in the context of immortality through poetry also at 1.15.20, 2.17.28, 3.1.29, 3.9.31, *Ars* 3.536, *Rem.* 389, *Trist.* 3.14.22, *Pont.* 3.1.57, 4.11.2, 4.13.22, 4.16.12. Etymologising also accounts for a significant proportion of the phrase's occurrences in Ovid; see on 1.8.3 (of Dipsas) *ex re nomen habet*.

exterrita cornibus Io: cf. *Epist.* 14.91f. (of Io) *conato ... loqui mugitus edidit ore / territaque est forma, territa uoce sua*, *Met.* 1.637ff. (of Io) *conata queri mugitus edidit ore / pertimuitque sonos propriaque exterrita uoce est / ... nouaque ut conspexit in unda / cornua, pertimuit seque exsternata refugit*, *Hollis* (1970) xixff., *Lyne* on [*Verg.*] *Ciris* 48.

quam fluminea lusit adulter aue: cf. 1.10.3f., *Epist.* 8.67 *non ego fluminei referam mendacia cycni*, 17.47f. *matris in admissio falsa sub imagine lusae / error inest; pluma tectus adulter erat*. *flumineus* occurs first in Ovid (9 [6]) times, of swans also at *Epist.* 8.67 and *Met.* 2.253. Its sporadic later occurrences are almost all in poetry; see *TLL* 6.968.26ff. For adjectives so formed, see on 1.1.29 *litorea*.

23-24. simulato uecta iuuenco: cf. *Ars* 3.252 *per ... fretum falso Sidoni uecta boue*.

uirginea tenuit cornua uara manu: for this detail, see Bühler on *Moschus Europa* 126 τῇ μὲν ἔχεν ταύρου δολιχὸν κέρασ. *uirgineus*: *Ov.* 39 (32), *Verg.* 6 (5), *Hor.* 1 (1), *Tib.* 1, *Prop.* 5. The word occurs before the Augustan poets only at *Catull.* 66.14, 67.28 and *Lucr.* 1.87. Apart from *Colum.* 9.4.4 and inscriptions, it is not found in prose in the classical period. For adjectives so formed, see on 1.1.29 *litorea*. For the phrase *uirginea manus*, cf. *Epist.* 12.132, *Met.* 2.867 (of Europa), *Fast.* 3.46, *Val. Fl.* 2.544, *Stat. Theb.* 12.762, *Mart.* 11.8.6. *uarus* occurs earlier only at *Plaut. Merc.* 639, *Sitell. frg.* 1.3, *Lucil.* 542, *Cic. Part.* 126, *Varro Rust.* 2.9.4, *Hor. Sat.* 1.3.47, 2.3.56, elsewhere in Ovid at *Met.* 9.33 and 12.382 (by Heinsius' conjecture;

he is probably wrong, however, to propose *uara* instead of *parua* as the epithet for Jupiter's *cornua* in the account of the Europa-story at 2.855).

25-26. nos quoque: the train of thought is easy enough to follow, but not quite logical. The references to Io, Leda and Europa lead us to expect that Ovid will refer here to the fame of his mistress, not of them both together.

per totum ... cantabimur orbem: the concept of world-wide fame through poetry becomes frequent in Hellenistic times, after the broadening of the Greek world through the conquests of Alexander, and is a commonplace in Roman literature, after the establishment of the world-empire; see *Nisbet-Hubbard* on *Hor. Carm.* 2.20.14. It recurs in Ovid most notably at 1.15.7f., 13, 25f., 29f., *Ars* 2.740, *Rem.* 363, *Trist.* 2.118, 3.7.51f., 4.9.19f., 4.10.127f.; cf. also *Epist. Sapph.* 28. Since it is probable that a Callimachean original underlies this passage (see Vol. 1, 36), Ovid, in this introductory poem, seems to be laying subtle claim to the title of *Callimachus Romanus*.

pariter: cf. *Trist.* 5.14.5 (to his wife) *dum ... legar, mecum pariter tua fama legetur*.

iuncta ... erunt nomina nostra tuis: the girl's name is conspicuously absent from this poem. She must consent to being Ovid's mistress before he will immortalise her by name. For *iungere nomina*, cf. *Liv.* 23.22.5 *explendi senatus causa et iungendi artius Latini nominis cum populo Romano*; cf. also *Fast.* 3.511f. (Bacchus to Ariadne) *tu mihi iuncta toro mihi iuncta uocabula sumes, / nam tibi mutatae Libera nomen erit*. *nomina nostra* is plural for singular, used for metrical convenience. Since it follows the true plural *nos* so closely, the use of the device seems rather clumsy here, but Ovid combines true plurals with 'poetic' plurals for metrical convenience very freely; cf. e.g. 1.2.1ff., 19ff., 1.3.7ff., 1.6.47ff., 1.7.64f., 1.8.109f., 1.12.21. *Epist.* 5.45 is a particularly striking instance: *nostros uidisti flentis ocellos*. See also Bömer on *Met.* 6.352.

1.4

[Ford (1966).]



I shall have to endure seeing your lover enjoy your company at a banquet (1-10). Here is what you must do (11-12): arrive before your lover (13-14); converse with me through secret signals (15-28); decline wine and food offered by your lover (29-34); reject his caresses and refrain from kissing him (35-40); lest I be tortured by imagining what I cannot see, remove your cloak (41-50); if your lover falls into a drunken stupor, or when the party breaks up, try to make contact with me (51-58). This advice can help only for a short time, for we shall be kept apart all night (59-62). Do not submit willingly to his love-making (63-68) and, whatever may happen, deny it tomorrow (69-70).



Propertius boasts *aspice me... / ut regnem mixtas inter conuiuia puellas!* (2.34.55ff.), Tragedy complains to Ovid *nequitiam uinosa tuam conuiuia narrant* (*Am.* 3.1.17), it was presumably from the *conuiuium* that the elegiac lover proceeded on his drunken komos to his beloved, and Ovid devotes considerable space in the *Ars Amatoria* to advice on tactics to employ at such gatherings (1.229ff., 565ff., 3.749ff.). Whereas, however, so much Greek amatory poetry of both the archaic and the Hellenistic periods has a clear and specific sympotic setting, the *conuiuium* plays a much less prominent role in Roman erotic elegy. This poem and its companion-piece, 2.5, are, in fact, the only Augustan elegies to make substantial use of such a context. The *conuiuium* is mentioned elsewhere in the *Amores* only at 3.1.17 (quoted above), 3.4.47 and 3.11.23; cf. also *Epist.* 16.217ff. and 17.77ff., where the scenario of this poem is adapted, very successfully, to the story of Paris' visit to Menelaus and Helen in Sparta.

It may be that, in this poem, Ovid is portraying his relationship with his mistress as an adulterous one, the *uir* being her legally married husband. In Rome, unlike Greece, it was not felt to be

improper for married women to attend banquets; cf. e.g. Nepos Pref. 6 *pleraque nostris moribus sunt decora, quae apud illos* (sc. *Graecos*) *turpia putantur. quem enim Romanorum pudet uxorem ducere in conuiuium?* The banquet had, however, acquired a reputation for offering incitements to, and opportunities for, adultery; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.25ff.:

iuniores quaerit adulteros
inter mariti uina neque eligit
cui donet impermissa raptim
gaudia luminibus remotis,

Plin. *Nat.* 14.141, *CIL* 4.7698B (a *graffito* from a Pompeian dining-room) *Lasciuos uoltus et blandos aufer ocellos / coniuge ab alterius, sit tibi in ore pudor*, Suet. *Aug.* 69.1, *Cal.* 25.1, Courtney on Juv. 1.57, also *Ars* 1.229f. *dant etiam positis aditum conuiuia mensis; / est aliquid praeter uina, quod inde petas*. At 3.4.47, Ovid holds out the prospect of frequent invitations to *iuuenum conuiuia* as a reward for a husband's willingness to connive at his pretty wife's adulteries.

In 2.19 and 3.4, the mistress is certainly not Corinna and Ovid's relationship with her is certainly adulterous; see Vol. 1, 27. Since this elegy is positioned so close to the beginning of the collection, and since Corinna is the mistress who, Ovid claims, inspires his love poetry, it is probably reasonable to assume that she is the mistress addressed here. It is not certain, however, that the relationship is adulterous. Line 64 provides the only significant evidence: *quod mihi das furtim, iure coacta dabis*. That line establishes that Ovid's rival is not simply the 'lover in possession', but has rights which Ovid does not have. We cannot, however, assume that those rights are conjugal rights. When Ovid reworks this scenario in 2.5, he protests that he himself has more claim to his mistress' love than does the rival with whom she is there deceiving him: *'quid facis?' exclamo 'quo nunc mea gaudia defers? / incipiam dominas in mea iura manus!'* (29f.); few would wish to contend, however, that the girl in 2.5 is Ovid's wife. Moreover, it seems somewhat improbable that a married couple would behave, much less be envisaged in advance as likely to behave, in the manner referred to at lines 47ff. of this elegy; as Ovid himself observes at *Ars* 3.585f., husbands do not have to seize fleeting opportunities: *hoc est, uxores quod non patitur amari: / conueniunt illas, cum uoluere, uiri*. The most plausible interpretation seems to be that, as Mr. Du Quesnay has persuaded me, the mistress is a freedwoman over whom her patron, Ovid's rival in this poem, has retained certain *droits de seigneur*.

To consider Corinna a freedwoman and unmarried seems to accord best with such little information as Ovid gives elsewhere about his mistress. She may not actually be a *meretrix* (note the contrast with a *meretrix* at 1.10.21ff. and 3.14.9ff.), but her role in 1.8 is modelled on that of a Comic *meretrix*; a freedwoman fits that role more comfortably and plausibly than would a *matrona*. At *Pont.* 3.3.29ff., Ovid distinguishes the *Amores* as trivial but innocuous in contrast to the *Ars Amatoria*, the *stultum carmen* which contributed to his downfall because it allegedly encouraged adultery. At least two *Amores*-poems are overtly adulterous (2.19 and 3.4, which do not concern Corinna). The distinction would, however, retain most of its force if it were known, or assumed, that Corinna herself, the mistress involved in the majority of the elegies, was not a married woman; indeed, a liaison with a freedwoman, whether married or not, was unlikely to attract strong censure. (Note that the *lex Iulia* of 18 B.C. made adultery a criminal offence only if committed with a high-born *matrona*.) One further point is perhaps worth consideration. Corinna may be fictitious; if that is the case, it is improbable that Ovid would have endowed her with a social rank different from that of the mistresses of the other elegists. The social rank of only one elegiac mistress is known for certain: Gallus' Lycoris was a freedwoman. On the problem of Corinna's reality and status, see also Vol. 1, 19ff.

Both here and in 2.5, the humour is at Ovid's own expense. Here, he emphasises the helpless frustration with which he will have to watch his mistress in his rival's company; in 2.5, despite a change of roles which makes him his mistress' companion, the love-triangle still works against him, as his mistress, taking advantage of the advice given here at lines 51ff., flirts with and kisses a rival lover.

Ovid here adopts the role of *praeceptor amoris*. This role had been firmly established in the genre by its older exponents (cf. e.g. Tib. 1.4, 6, 8, Prop. 1.7, 9, 10, 20), as Ovid emphasises in his attempt to mitigate the offence caused by the *Ars Amatoria*: *multa ... dat (sc. Tibullus) furti talis praecepta docetque / qua nuptae possint fallere ab arte uiros / ... / inuenies eadem blandi praecepta Properti* (*Trist.* 2.461f., 465). Such *praecepta* recur in the *Amores* most notably at 1.8.23ff. (Dipsas' speech) and in 2.19 (to a new mistress and her careless husband) and 3.4 (to the husband, now too careful); cf. also 3.1.49ff., where Elegy boasts that it is through her that Corinna has learned to carry on her secret affair with Ovid. Ovid subsequently exploited the genre's erotodidactic element on a large scale when he composed the *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, the *Ars Amatoria* and the

Remedia Amoris. For the related concept, that the elegist's account of the vicissitudes of his own love-affair is able to benefit and instruct others who are suffering in love, see on 2.1.7-10. See also Wheeler (1910) and (1911), Murgatroyd's introduction to Tib. 1.4, Puelma (1982) 285ff. The *praecepta* are here presented in a particularly ingenious and lively manner, being integrated into, and used as the vehicle for, the narrative account of a future event.



1-2. nobis ... easdem: τὰς αὐτὰς ἡμῖν; cf. *Met.* 13.50 *eadem nobis iuratus in arma* with Bömer's note, *Ibis* 555, Brink on *Hor. Ars* 467. If, as suggested in the introduction, the rival has specific rights which he himself does not have, Ovid might more naturally have said 'I shall be attending the same banquet as you and your lover'. The phrasing here may therefore suggest his possessive attitude toward his mistress; cf. line 40, where he threatens to lay claim to her kisses as if they actually were his by right.

cena: the generic term for 'evening meal', whereas *epulae* signifies specifically 'banquet'. Ovid may be using the terms synonymously. *cena* is, however, very rare in the higher genres of poetry: Ov. 1, Verg. 0, Hor. 21 (2), Tib. 0, Prop. 0; see Axelson (1945) 107, also Watson (1985) 436. Ovid may have a particular reason for using it here. It was thought to be cognate with κοινός; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 726E τὸ ... δεῖπνόν φασι 'κῆραν' διὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν καλεῖσθαι, Isid. *Orig.* 20.2.14. The line may therefore mean 'may this be the last banquet which he attends (with us)', thus admitting a subtle repetition of the thought in *epulas nobis ... easdem*. *TLL* 3.779.9f. cites the phrase *ultima cena* elsewhere only at Dracontius *Romul.* 5.77 and Schol. Juv. 11.20, where it glosses *miscellanea ludi* and refers to the last meal accorded to gladiators before they fought in the arena; it would be appropriate to Ovid's disparaging comments on his rival (cf. 35f., 44 and also the attack on the *sanguine pastus eques* in 3.8) if the phrase has specific and recognisable associations with gladiators.

tuo ... uiro: Axelson (1958) 131ff. notes that the elegists tend to avoid placing pronominal adjectives at the end of the pentameter. In all three instances in the *Amores* in which a noun of iambic prosody and a pronominal adjective of iambic prosody in agreement with it are placed at the end of the two hemistichs of a pentameter, it is the pronominal adjective which precedes; cf. 2.11.38 *tuos ... sinus*, 2.13.24 *tuos ... pedes*. Here, that word-order produces an elegant chiasmus, while echoing the emphatic opening words *Vir tuus*; for similar

echoes, see on 1.3.1-4.

3-10. Cf. *Epist.* 16.217ff. (Paris to Helen) *at mihi conspiceris posita uix denique mensa / multaque quae laedant hoc quoque tempus habet. / hostibus eueniant conuiuia talia nostris, / experior posito qualia saepe mero. / paenitet hospitii, cum me spectante lacertos / imponit collo rusticus iste tuo. / rumpor et inuideo — quidni tamen omnia narrem? — / membra superiecta cum tua ueste fouet. / oscula cum uero coram non dura daretis, / ante oculos posui pocula sumpta meos. / lumina demitto cum te tenet artius ille, / crescit et inuito lentus in ore cibus.*

3-4. *ergo ego ...?*: for *ergo*, with or without *ego*, introducing a, usually indignant, rhetorical question, cf. 1.6.21, 1.7.11, 2.7.1, 3.2.8, 3.11.9ff. *ergo ego sustinui, foribus tam saepe repulsus, / ingenuum dura ponere corpus humo? / ergo ego nesciocui, quem tu complexa tenebas, / excubui clausam, seruus ut, ante domum?, TLL 5.2.769.1ff.*

dilectam ... puellam: for the phrase, cf. *Epist.* 19.205, *Rem.* 655. *diligere* sometimes entails less passion than does *amare*; cf. Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.1.1 *Clodius ... ualde me diligit uel, ut ἐμφατικώτερον dicam, ualde me amat, Ad Brut. frg. 5 me aut amabis aut, quo contentus sim, diliges, Fam. 9.14.5.* Ovid perhaps implies that distinction at *Ars* 3.517 *odimus et maestas; Tecmessam diligit Ajax* (cf. 519ff.), but not elsewhere. For the two verbs used synonymously in conjunction, cf. e.g. *Trist.* 1.6.1f. *Nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae, / nec tantum Coe Bittis amata suo est, 4.5.29f.*

tantum may serve to emphasise the antithesis between *aspiciam* and *tangi*, but the word-order suggests that it is to be construed with *conuiuia*. It may, however, influence both words; cf. e.g. Munari: 'dunque io dovrò, semplice commensale, soltanto guardare la donna diletta?'

aspiciam: for the antithesis with *tangi*, cf. e.g. *Met.* 3.478f. (Narcissus) *liceat, quod tangere non est, / aspicere, Ter. Eun. 638f. si non tangendi* (sc. *Thaida*) *copiast, / eho ne uidendi quidem erit?* There is, somewhat paradoxically, no antithesis at 3.7.39, where Ovid laments his impotence: *at qualem uidi tantum tetigique puellam!*

5-6. *alterius ... sinus ... fouebis?*: 'will you fondle another man's bosom?' Some maintain that Ovid is here envisaging rather less innocent behaviour; for masturbation at the dining-table, see on 47f. A reference to masturbation here, however, would make the reference to mere embracing in the pentameter an anticlimax and

spoil the effect of 41-50, a passage introduced by *haec tamen aspiciam*, which pointedly echoes line 4 and marks a transition to Ovid's fear of even less welcome behaviour. For the indignant question, cf. *Prop.* 2.8.5 *possum ego in alterius positam spectare lacerto?* For the prosody of *alterius*, see on 1.14.14 *nullius*.

apte subiecta: 'snuggling closely against'; cf. *Hor. Ars* 251 *syllaba longa breui subiecta uocatur iambus*. A dining-couch could accommodate two or three people; cf. e.g. *Cic. Fam.* 9.26.1f. *Accubueram ... apud Voluminium Eutrapelum, et quidem supra me Atticus, infra Verrius ... infra Eutrapelum Cytheris accubuit, Prop.* 4.8.35f.

iniciet collo ... manum?: for the literal sense of *inicare manum*, 'embrace', cf. e.g. *Catull.* 35.8ff. *quamuis ... puella / ... manus ... collo / ambas iniiciens roget morari, Prop.* 1.13.16. The figurative sense 'lay legal claim to' (see on 39f.) is also present, and it is this secondary meaning, with its reference to the rival's rights, which gives particular point to *cum uolet*; cf. *Ars* 3.586 (quoted in the introduction).

7-8. On the battle between the Lapiths and the Centaurs at the wedding of Pirithous and Hippodamia, see Bömer's introduction (pp. 75ff.) to *Met.* 12.210-535, the fullest surviving account of the myth. For that battle as a paradigm for boorish behaviour at banquets, cf. *Ars* 1.593, *Hom. Od.* 21.295ff., *Cic. Pis.* 22, *Hor. Carm.* 1.18.8 with Nisbet-Hubbard's note, *Dio Chrys.* 27.2, *Lucian Symp.* 45. This couplet is reworked at, or reworks, 2.12.19f. *femina siluestres Lapithas populumque biformem / turpiter appposito uertit in arma mero.*

desine mirari: adducing *Tib.* 2.6.41 and *Epist.* 18.203 as parallels for the scansion as a dactyl, Goold (1965a) 19f. argues in favour of Dousa's conjecture *desino* that Ovid is here stating that he himself has come to understand the Centaurs' emotions. For the phrase, he cites *Cic. De Orat.* 2.59 *illud iam mirari desino* (cf. also *Sen. Contr.* 8.4 *init.*). For this type of statement of the poet's reaction to his mistress' charms by reference to mythology, he cites *Prop.* 2.2.4 *Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tua*, noting that the wedding of Pirithous and Hippodamia is mentioned by Propertius at lines 9f. of that same poem. (One might further cite 2.3A.35f. *olim mirabar, quod tanti ad Pergama belli / Europae atque Asiae causa puella fuit. olim mirabar* is equivalent to *mirari desii*; the couplet offers the only instance of *mirari* constructed with *quod* by any Augustan poet other than Ovid [see below]; moreover, it is echoed at *Am.* 2.12.17f., immediately before the only other reference in the collection to the wedding of

Pirithous and Hippodamia, a passage closely related to the present couplet [see above].) *desine*, the paradosis, might be a trivialisation providing a more normal scansion and a more familiar expression (cf. Rhet. Her. 4.48, Cic. *Phil.* 2.67, Mart. *Epigr.* 25.1f. *Quod nocturna tibi, Leandre, pepercerit unda, / desine mirari*, 6.89.8, CE 1049.2, also Catull. 69.10 *admirari desine*, Cic. *De Orat.* 1.19 *mirari desinamus*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.29.11 *omitte mirari*). There is, however, no compelling reason to suppose that Ovid is here referring specifically to his own feelings, even though it is his own feelings which are described in the next couplet. Goold points out that 'we are given no grounds for supposing that the young lady did wonder at the Centaurs' excitability', but *desine mirari* may be no more than a *façon de parler*, 'no wonder that ...', placing no great emphasis on any particular addressee's point of view. Hunt (1979) 341 suggests that the imperative forms a sequence with *tamen cognosce* (11), 'no longer marvel ... but all the same learn'. It seems more natural, however, that *tamen* should have a more general reference to the first ten lines as a whole, '(although we shall be apart,) nevertheless ...' For *desine mirari* introducing an *exemplum*, Hunt cites Archil. *frg.* 122.6 West μηδεὶς ἔθ' ὁμέων εἰσορέων θαυμάζέτω; cf. also Claud. 18.1ff. *Semiferos partus ... / ... / et geminos soles mirari desinat orbis*.

posito ... uino: cf. 2.5.14, 2.12.20, Prop. 2.2.9f. *Ischomache ... / Centauris medio grata rapina mero*.

quod: Ovid provides almost all the examples of *mirari* constructed with *quod* in Augustan poetry; cf. Prop. 2.3A.35f. (see above), *Epist.* 16.153, *Met.* 2.858f., *Trist.* 1.1.45, also Prop. 2.26.21 and *Met.* 13.913ff. (*admirari quod*), *Met.* 12.165f. *mirabile ... / quod*, *Fast.* 3.503 *quod ... mirum facis*.

candida: a common epithet for heroines (cf. e.g. 2.18.29, *Met.* 2.349, 13.789, Prop. 2.28.51), as also for elegiac mistresses (see on 1.5.10). Note the play *candida ... / Atra-cis*.

Atracis: in most versions of the myth, Pirithous' bride is called Hippodamia; cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.742, *Epist.* 17.249f. *an fera Centauris indicere bella coegit / Atracis Haemonios Hippodamia uiros?*, Bömer on *Met.* 12.210-535 (p. 76). Atrax is the name of a Thessalian king, river and city. *Atracis*, which occurs only here and *Epist. loc. cit.*, is either a patronymic or simply denotes 'Thessalian'; see Bömer on *Met.* 12.209. For words so formed, see on 1.2.47 *Gangetide*. For the jingle *Atracis ... traxit*, cf. 2.19.27 *Danaen ... aenea*, 3.6.51 *Anien ... animosus*.

ambiguos ... uiros: cf. 3.12.28 (of the Sirens or the Sphinx) *ambiguae*

... uirginis, Met. 2.9 *Protea ... ambiguum*, 7.271 (of a werewolf) *ambigui ... lupi*, TLL 1.1843.61ff., also *Ars* 2.24 (of the Minotaur) *semibouemque uirum semiuirumque bouem*.

traxit in arma: cf. *Met.* 13.39 *Naupliades ... traxit* (sc. *Vlixem*) *ad arma*, Sil. 16.84, Tac. *Hist.* 4.56.3, 4.70.5, also Verg. *Aen.* 6.813f. *moueabit / Tullus in arma uiros*, 9.462f. *Turnus in arma uiros ... / suscitatur*, [Sen.] *Epigr.* 24.62, *Homer.* 119, *Anth.* 415.62. It may be relevant that *trahere* can mean 'abduct'; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.15.1f. *Pastor cum traheret ... / ... Helenen*, OLD s.v. 5a. The intended victim (*puella trahenda*) in a sense turns the tables on the aggressors, *Centauros in arma trahendo*; for this type of conceit, cf. *Fast.* 1.523 *uicta tamen uinces euersaque, Troia, resurges*, Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.156 *Graecia capta ferum uictorem cepit* and see also on 45f. below.

9. nec mihi silua domus: some commentators see a reference here to the Lapiths, whom Ovid describes as *siluestres* in the same context at 2.12.19. It seems more probable, however, that the whole line refers to the Centaurs, since it was they who could not keep their hands off Hippodamia. Several of the Centaurs had names associated with their woodland home; from Ovid's account of the battle in *Met.* 12, note Orneus (302), Hyles (378) and Hylonome (405). For the woods as a *domus*, cf. *Ars* 2.475 (of early men) *silua domus fuerat*, [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 203, Plin. *Nat.* 4.89, Val. Fl. 4.26, TLL 5.1.1973.7ff.; for *domus* used with reference to animals, cf. Lucr. 1.18 *frondiferas ... domos auium*, TLL 5.1.1972.17ff.

nec equo mea membra cohaerent: I can adduce no close parallel for this expression; the zodiacal sign Sagittarius is described by Manilius as *mixtus equo* (1.270) and *iunctus equo* (2.172).

11-12. quae tibi sint facienda tamen cognosce: Ovid introduces his *praecepta* in a suitably prosaic manner. Neither the gerundive nor the gerund of *facio* is frequent in Augustan poetry. Such forms occur 10 (3) times in Ovid, at Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.70 and 2.6.28, Verg. *Aen.* 8.441, but are absent from Tibullus and Propertius. The construction of *cognoscere* with an indirect question is also rare in poetry; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.27, *Aen.* 5.474f., Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.229f., *Met.* 3.96f., 12.620, *Fast.* 3.795, 4.717, Manil. 3.275f., TLL 3.1509.74ff. The prosaic tone is perhaps further emphasised by the unusual sense-pause at the fifth trochee; in the *Amores*, such a break recurs only at 1.8.35, 1.13.47, 1.14.17, 2.3.17, 2.5.33, 3.1.47, 57, 3.2.13, 3.6.43, 3.9.37, 3.11.45 (i.e. in somewhat less than 1% of the hexameters). For the significance of

tamen, see on 7 *desine mirari*; for its postponement, see on 1.5.14. For *cognosce* in didactic contexts, cf. Lucr. 1.921 *nunc age quod superest cognosce et clarius audi*, Manil. *loc. cit.* *nunc age, quot stadiis et quanto tempore surgant / sidera, quotque cadant, animo cognosce sagaci*.

nec Euris / da mea nec tepidis uerba ferenda Notis dispels the prosaic *color* of the couplet so far. Few commonplaces are as frequent in Ovid as that of the wind bearing one's words idly away; in the *Amores* alone, it recurs at 1.6.42, 1.7.15f., 1.8.106 (concluding Dipsas' *praecepta*), 2.6.43f., 2.8.19f., 2.11.33, 2.14.41, 2.16.45f.; cf. also 1.6.52. The conceit is found as early as Hom. *Od.* 8.408f. *ἔπος δ' εἴ περ τι βέβακται / δεινόν, ἄφαρ τὸ φέροιεν ἀναπράξασαι ἄελλαι*; see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.2. *tepidus* is used of winds earlier only at Catull. 64.282 *tepidi ... Fauoni* and Lygd. 4.95f. *haec deus in melius crudelia somnia uertat / et iubeat tepidos irrita ferre Notos*. It is a natural epithet for the south wind, but here, and at e.g. 2.8.20, 2.11.10 (*egelidum*) and Lygd. *loc. cit.*, one might rather have expected an epithet expressing violence, such as *rapidus*. *ferenda* = *aufferenda*; in this context, however, the simple form is usual; cf. e.g. 1.7.16, 1.8.106, 2.8.20, 2.11.33, 2.16.46, Hom. *loc. cit.*, Eur. *Tro.* 454, Theocr. 29.35, Catull. 30.10, Lygd. *loc. cit.* and 6.28, Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.3 (*portare*). For the construction of *dare* with the gerundive, cf. 1.12.22 *mollia ... ad dominam uerba ferenda dedi!*, 3.6.11f., 3.11.46, *TLL* 5.1.1692.68ff., 1699.56ff.

13-14. The repetitions in *ante ueni ... si ueneris ante, / ... ante ueni* convey Ovid's feelings of urgency and desperation. A similar effect is achieved in 67f.; cf. also e.g. 3.6.61f. *Ilia, pone metus! tibi regia nostra patebit / teque colent amnes: Ilia, pone metus!*, *Epist. Sapph.* 213f. *solue ratem! Venus orta mari mare praestat amanti. / aura dabit cursum — tu modo solue ratem!* For repetition between the beginning of the hexameter and the end of the pentameter, see on 1.9.1f. For repetition between the beginning and end of the hexameter, cf. 2.4.5 *odi, nec possum, cupiens, non esse quod odi*, 2.16.41 *ulmus amat uitem, uitis non deserit ulmum*, 3.10.19 *Cretes erunt testes; nec fingunt omnia Cretes*, 3.15.15 *culte puer puerique parens Amathusia culti*, also 1.15.5 *nec me uerbosas leges ediscere nec me* and 2.10.5 *utroque formosa est, operosae cultibus ambae*.

15-16. **cum** controls both *premet ille torum* and *ipsa ... / ibis*. There is an easier instance of the same construction in 55 *cum surges abitura domum, surgemus et omnes*. It is possibly significant that this couplet,

which marks the beginning of the banquet, is the eighth in the poem, whereas 55f., which marks the end of the banquet, is the eighth from the end of the poem. Such subtle symmetry would, however, be uncharacteristic of Ovid; see on 1.6.24.

premet ... torum: for the phrase, which, despite the context and comparison with e.g. 3.7.4 *iacui pigro crimen onusque toro*, is not intrinsically pejorative, cf. 3.14.32, *Epist.* 10.55f., 12.32, *Ars* 2.712, *Fast.* 2.795, Prop. 1.3.12, 2.29.35, *Epiced. Drusi* 316, [Sen.] *Octavia* 698, Petron. 18.1, 131.9, Sil. 7.290, 13.815, Mart. 12.96.2. See also on line 35.

uultu ... modesto: at 1.8.35ff., Dipsas likewise emphasises the advantages of a modest appearance.

comes ... / ibis: since *comes ire* is frequently used to express inseparability from one's beloved (see on 2.16.17), the phrase may be somewhat paradoxical here: the girl is to seem to be (devotedly) accompanying her other lover, when she is in fact flirting with Ovid.

accumbas: when reclining at dinner became fashionable, in stricter circles women continued to sit, but that attempt to ensure decorum had by now become obsolete; cf. Val. Max. 2.1.2, Bömer on *Fast.* 6.305.

clam mihi tange pedem: we may assume from 13f. that Ovid will have arrived already; the girl is to brush her hand against his foot as she passes the couch on which he is reclining. A different manoeuvre is envisaged at *Ars* 1.605f. *insere te turbae leuiterque admotus eunti / uelle latus digitis et pede tange pedem*. For such flirtations, cf. also Plaut. *Asin.* 775f. *neque illaec ulli pede pedem homini premat, / quom surgat*, Naev. *Com.* 77 (quoted on 17-28).

17-28. Secret signs between lovers, especially at banquets, are a favourite theme with Ovid; cf. 2.5.15ff., 2.7.5f., 3.11.23f., *Epist.* 16.258, 17.77ff., *Ars* 1.137f., 489f., 499f., 569ff., 2.543, 549, 3.514, *Met.* 3.460ff., 4.63, *Fast.* 1.418, *Trist.* 2.453f. The conceit is much rarer in the other elegists; cf. Tib. 1.2.21f., 1.6.19f., 1.8.1f., Prop. 3.8.25f. It is almost completely absent from Hellenistic epigram and Comedy, though its use in elegy is foreshadowed in such passages as Plaut. *Asin.* 784, *Mil.* 123, Ter. *Haut.* 372f. and esp. Naev. *Com.* 75ff. *quase in choro ludens datatim dat se et communem facit. / alii adnutat, alii adnictat, alium amat, alium tenet. / alibi manus est occupata, alii percellit pedem; / anulum dat alii spectandum, a labris alium inuocat, / cum alio cantat, at tamen alii suo dat digito litteras*. The difference in status of the beloved was perhaps a contributory factor in the

development of the theme: in Hellenistic epigram and Comedy, she is usually a prostitute available for hire, in elegy an affair with her often required secrecy. The theme is fairly common in later Greek literature; cf. esp. Ach. Tat. 1.10.4 and Nonn. *Dion.* 42.231ff., where the context is erotodidactic.

17-18. loquacem is perhaps to be construed with *nutus* as well as with *uultum*; cf. Tib. 1.2.21 *uiro coram nutus conferre loquaces*, Bömer on *Met.* 4.63 *nutu signisque loquuntur*, Kost on Musaeus 102 νεύμασιν ἀφθόγοισι and see also on 1.7.21f. and 1.11.18.

excipe: cf. *Ars* 2.596 *excipite* ('intercept') *arcana uerba notata manu*, 3.514 *innuet: acceptas tu quoque redde notas*. For *excipere* used of picking up secrets, cf. Cic. *Deiot.* 25 *mittebat qui rumores Africanos exciperent*, Verg. *Aen.* 4.296f. *regina dolos ... / praesensit motusque excepit prima futuros*, TLL 5.2.1255.12ff.

furtiuas ... notas: cf. 2.5.20, 3.11.24, Pichon (1966) s.v. *nota*. For the elegiac love-affair as a *furtum*, see on 64 *furtim*.

19-20. uerba ... sine uoce loquentia dicam worried Heinsius and Burman, who comments: *ego hic 'ducam' praeferrem, cum Heinsio, si ullus codex addiceret. sed quidquid prima fronte blandiantur haec, accuratius perpendenti uerba, suspectus est locus. quid enim sunt 'uerba loquentia', uel 'loquacia'? an uerba loquuntur? quis ita loquitur? si 'signa' liceret reponere salua res esset. forte tamen scripserit: 'uerba superciliis, sine uoce loquentibus, addam'. uel 'edam'.* The notion that words themselves may speak is indeed somewhat peculiar, but essentially the same as that in line 66 *blanditiae taceant* (see the note *ad loc.*). Moreover, *loquentia* should perhaps not be pressed closely; Ovid may have conceived *sine uoce loquentia* as a close-knit unit, equivalent to an α -privative adjective (see on 1.7.51 *albo et sine sanguine uultu*), such as ἄφθογγοι.

superciliis: cf. 2.5.15, *Epist.* 17.83f. *a, quotiens digitis, quotiens ego tecta notaui / signa supercilio paene loquente dari!*, *Ars* 1.500, Prop. 3.8.25.

digitis: cf. 2.5.18, *Epist. loc. cit.*, *Ars* 1.137, *Trist.* 2.453.

mero: cf. 2.5.17f., *Epist.* 17.89f., *Ars* 1.571f., *Trist.* 2.454, Tib. 1.6.19f. *digito ... liquorem / ne trahat et mensae ducat in orbe notas*.

For the ἰσοκόωλα in the pentameter, cf. 3.6.48 *ungue notata comas, ungue notata genas*. Here, a mild syllepsis is involved: 'words indicated with my fingers, words written in the wine'.

21-22. succurret: the sense 'come to mind' (see *OLD* s.v. 5) recurs in Ovid at *Epist.* 9.67, *Fast.* 5.333, *Trist.* 2.289 and *Pont.* 3.5.3, but is generally rather uncommon in poetry. In choosing this word here, could Ovid have been influenced, at least subconsciously, by Sappho *frg.* 31.9f. λέπτον / δ' αὐτίκα χρῶ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν? As Ovid will be, Sappho is suffering the pain of seeing a beloved in the company of someone else, and Ovid mentions blushing in the pentameter.

lasciua: for *lasciua* with reference to sexual intercourse, cf. 1.8.98, 2.10.27 *saepe ego lasciuie consumpsi tempora noctis*, 3.7.10, 3.14.19, 26.

purpureas ... genas: for the phrase, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 1.538, Apul. *Met.* 5.22, Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.80, Auson. 182.16 p. 44 Peiper. Here, the epithet means not simply 'bright', but 'blushing' (cf. 1.3.14 *purpureus ... pudor* [n.]), implicitly praising the girl for retaining a certain decorous modesty.

23-24. tacita ... mente: for the expression, cf. 3.7.63, *Ars* 1.602 (quoted on 27-28), *Met.* 5.427, 15.26, *Fast.* 3.634, Catull. 62.37, [Tib.] 3.12.16, Manil. 2.60, Lucan 9.564. Such phrases are mostly equivalent to adverbs, and many passed into the Romance languages with that function; see Bömer on *Met.* 8.634 *iniqua mente*. In the *Amores*, note also 2.15.3 *laeta mente*, 3.2.10 *forti mente*.

queraris: *loquaris* (PYSω) not only enjoys very strong support from the mss, but may also be considered the *lectio difficilior*. For *loqui* (*dicere*) *de aliquo* in the rare sense 'speak badly of someone', Löfstedt (1936) 69ff. cites, *inter alia*, Cic. *Cael.* 11 *de eius fama ac pudicitia ... nemo loquebatur*, Sen. *Epist.* 47.4 *sic fit ut isti de domino loquantur quibus coram domino loqui non licet*, Mart. 3.80.1 *De nullo loqueris* (v.l. *quereris*), *nulli maledicis*, 7.18.1f. *Cum tibi sit facies de qua nec femina possit / dicere*; see also TLL 7.2.1661.68ff. *queraris* (N¹Q¹Va², exc. Put. et Scal.) might be a trivialisation, as is suggested by Timpanaro (1978) 355, n. 13. Here, however, the context would not make it sufficiently clear that Ovid intends this unusual sense of *loqui de*. Moreover, whereas *queri de* is commonly constructed with a direct object (cf. e.g. *Epist.* 3.5 *pauca queri de te*, 6, 20.96, *Rem.* 644, *Met.* 10.60f., *Pont.* 2.9.7, 4.9.95f., 4.14.26), *loqui* (*dicere*) *de* in the required sense is not elsewhere so constructed. Also, since Ovid has already used the paradox of speaking without words in lines 17 *uultum ... loquacem* and 19 *uerba ... sine uoce loquentia dicam*, it is perhaps unlikely that he would use it again here so overtly as to write *tacita quod mente loquaris*. The intrusion of *loquaris* for *queraris* may

in fact be influenced by *loquacem* (17) and *loquentia* (19), just as *queraris* intrudes for *loquaris* at *Rem.* 647 in *E.*, influenced by *querenda* (644) and *queri* (645); or perhaps *queraris* was corrupted by a type of quasi-haplography to *quaris*, which was subsequently expanded to the most obvious word which would save the metre.

pendeat extrema mollis ab aure manus: for similar gestures indicating displeasure, cf. Apul. *Met.* 6.9 (of Venus on seeing Psyche) *laetissimum cachinnum extollit et qualem solent furenter irati, caputque quatiens et ascalpens aurem dexteram 'tandem' inquit 'dignata es socrum tuam salutare?'*, Heliod. 2.8.1 τὴν παρεῖαν ὑπὸ τὸ οὖς ἐπικνῶσα 'μακαρίζω μὲν' ἔφη (sc. Charicleia) 'τὴν θρηνηθεῖσαν ὑπὸ Θεαγένους ἢ καὶ φιληθεῖσαν'. Neither of the gestures noted by Pliny at *Nat.* 11.251 has any obvious relevance here: *est in aure ima memoriae locus, quem tangentes antestamur; est post aurem aequae dexteram Nemeseos, quae dea Latinum nomen ne in Capitolio quidem inuenit, quo referimus tactum ore proximum a minimo digitum, ueniam sermonis a diis ibi recondentes. mollis ... manus:* for the phrase, cf. *Epist.* 14.56, *Fast.* 4.342, *Ibis* 454, *Sen. Herc. F.* 473, *Quint. Inst.* 2.4.12.

25-26. mea lux: for this term of endearment, addressed most often by a lover to his mistress, cf. 1.8.23 (Dipsas to Ovid's mistress), 2.17.23, *Ars* 3.524 (Tecmessa to Ajax), *Trist.* 3.3.52 (Ovid to his wife), Catull. 68.132, 160, Prop. 2.14.29, 2.28.59, 2.29.1, [Tib.] 3.9.15 and 3.18.1 (both to Cerinthus); see *TLL* 7.2.1915.8ff. and see also on 2.15.21 *mea uita*.

digitis: perhaps 'on your finger', plural for singular, as at 2.15.20 (*anulus*) *astringens digitos orbe minore tuos*. Alternatively, the line may mean 'keep twisting your ring with your fingers'.

usque: 'continuously'; cf. 51, 1.8.24, 2.16.43, Bömer on *Fast.* 5.230.

27-28. Cf. *Ars* 1.601f. (tactics to adopt at a banquet) *bene dic dominae, bene, cum quo dormiat illa; / sed male sit tacita mente precare uiro*. Curses are paradoxical in the convivial setting of a banquet; cf. Liv. 39.43.4 *inter pocula atque epulas ... ubi bene precari mos esset*. Note the frequency of *m*-sounds. Alliteration is a typical feature of prayers; cf. 1.6.15f. and 1.13.11 (nn.), Appel (1909) 160ff.

tange manu mensam: it was a common practice to touch an altar while praying; see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.219. All tables were sacred (see Courtney on Juv. 2.110), and could therefore serve as a substitute for altars in prayer; cf. *Sen. Contr.* 9.2.7 *utrisque manibus*

mensam tenens 'di tibi' inquit 'immortales parem gratiam referant', and perhaps also Petron. 64.1 osculati ... mensam rogamus Nocturnas, ut suis se teneant, dum redimus a cena.

29-30. sapias: 'be sensible'; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.11.6 *sapias, uina liques* with Nisbet-Hubbard's note, Persius 5.167f. *euge, puer, sapias, dis depellentibus agnam / percutere*. Ovid is possibly echoing Horace (cf. 1.11.5 [n.]); his *praecepta* to his mistress have none of the serenity of Horace's *paraenesis* to Leuconoe!

leuiter: 'quietly'; cf. 1.6.12, *Epist.* 3.80, Fordyce on Catull. 64.273, *TLL* 7.2.1217.65ff.

posce: the *mot juste*; cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.66, Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.35, 82, Juv. 9.128f.

31-32. For the conceit, cf. *Ars* 1.575f. *fac primus rapias illius tacta labellis / pocula, quaque bibet parte puella, bibas, Epist.* 17.81f. *pocula proxima nobis / sumis, quaque bibi, tu quoque parte bibis*, Mayor on Juv. 5.128f. (addendum), Rohde (1914) 175, n. 3, Gow on Theocr. 7.70, van Dam on Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.60f. (quoted on 34 *libatos*), adding to their examples Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* 12.1, Longus 3.8, Nonn. *Dion.* 42.89ff. and the particularly silly variation by Paulus Silentiarius in *AP* 5.281.

reddideris: the final syllable of the second person singular seems originally to have been short in the future perfect indicative (as in e.g. *ueneris* at line 13 and *Rem.* 506), but long in the perfect subjunctive (as in e.g. *dederis* at 2.2.16, *Trist.* 5.5.40, 5.13.9). The poets, however, often disregard the distinction for metrical convenience; see Owen on *Trist.* 2.323, Platnauer (1951) 56. *impleueris* at *Trist. loc. cit.* is the only example in Ovid of a second person singular perfect subjunctive with a short final syllable. He lengthens the final syllable of the second person singular future perfect indicative much more frequently. Owen lists fifteen instances (and *dederis* at *Ars* 1.449, which must be discounted, being followed by *semper*); in the *Amores*, cf. 32 *biberis*, 1.8.101 *abstuleris*, 105 *praestiteris*. In every such instance in Ovid except *Fast.* 1.17 *dederis*, the word is placed immediately before the caesura, which may assist the lengthening. See also 3.8.17 *perit* (n.).

33-34. Ovid makes a different point in echoing this couplet at *Ars* 1.577f. *quemcumque cibum digitis libauerit illa, / tu pete, dumque petes, sit tibi tacta manus*.

si ... forte: the combination occurs 32 times in Lucretius, but neither Vergil nor Ovid make much use of it in their didactic poetry. It occurs only twice in the *Georgics* (*Ecl.* 1, *Aen.* 8); of the 27 (10) instances in Ovid, only one is in the *Ars Amatoria* (1.149; cf. 1.65) and one in the *Remedia Amoris* (493).

praegustauerit: the verb here means simply 'taste beforehand'; cf. Apul. *Met.* 7.11 *praegustatas a se potiones offerebat hilaris*. In this context, however, by putting us in mind of the sense 'taste beforehand (to ensure against poison)' (cf. Sen. *Contr.* 9.6.19, Courtney on Juv. 6.633 *timidus praegustet pocula papas*), it may suggest a witty paradox. Ovid is perhaps implying that, by tasting it, his rival will have poisoned the food. Martial makes a somewhat similar point in 2.15 *Quod nulli calicem tuum propinas, / humane facis, Horme, non superbe*; cf. also 3.17. The verb occurs first here, though the noun *praegustator* is used earlier, in a figurative sense, at Cic. *Dom.* 25. *prae* occurs in Ovid only at 2.4.19, 2.6.29, 2.9.38 and *Met.* 11.155, and it is even rarer elsewhere in Augustan poetry: Verg. 2 (2), Hor. 1 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 1; see Axelson (1945) 81. Nevertheless, a remarkably large number of words compounded with *prae* occur first or only in Ovid: *praeconponere* (*Fast.* 6.674), *praeconsumere* (*Met.* 7.489, *Trist.* 4.6.30), *praecontrectare* (*Met.* 6.478), *praeconcurrere* (*Met.* 9.295, 14.134), *praeacutere* (*Met.* 4.759), *praedelassare* (*Met.* 11.730), *praefocare* (*Ibis* 556), *praemedicare* (*Epist.* 12.17), *praemori* (*Am.* 3.7.65, *Epist.* 8.121), *praequeri* (*Met.* 4.251), *praeradiare* (*Epist.* 6.116), *praesonare* (*Am.* 3.13.11), *praestruere* (*Ars* 2.21, *Met.* 14.798, *Fast.* 1.563), *praesuere* (*Met.* 11.9), *praetepescere* (*Am.* 2.3.6), *praetingere* (*Met.* 7.123), *praeuerrere* (*Am.* 3.13.24), *praeuitiare* (*Met.* 14.55), *praeprigidus* (*Pont.* 4.12.35), *praegrauis* (*Epist.* 9.98), *praelustris* (*Trist.* 3.4.5, 6), *praenubilis* (*Am.* 3.13.7), *praesignis* (7 [5] times), *praemonitus* (*Met.* 15.800), *praesagium* (8 [4] times).

rēicē, as at *Ars* 1.695 and Verg. *Georg.* 3.389, but *rēicē* at *Ecl.* 3.96; see Platnauer (1951) 66ff.

libatos: cf. *Ars* 1.577 (quoted above), Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.60f. (in a comparable context) *inceptos quis ab ore dapes libataque uina / auferet ...?*

cibos: it probably does not contribute to the didactic *color* of the poem that Ovid and Lucretius are the only poets to make extensive use of this word: Ov. 56 (26), Verg. 1 (0), Hor. 5 (0), Tib. 1, Prop. 0, Catull. 1, Lucr. 36, Sen. *Trag.* 6, Lucan 2, Val. Fl. 0, Sil. 2, Stat. 6 (*Silu.* 0), Mart. 4, Juv. 15; the *Ars* and *Remedia* account for only ten of the Ovidian instances.

illius: for the prosody, see on 1.14.14 *nullius*.

35-36. nec premat indignis sinito tua colla lacertis: cf. 6, *Epist.* 16.221f. (Paris to Helen) *me spectante lacertos / imponit collo rusticus iste tuo*. *colla premere* is used most frequently of yoking animals, esp. oxen; cf. e.g. *Met.* 4.25, 7.211, *Fast.* 3.376, *Trist.* 4.6.2. For the sense 'embrace', cf. *Trist.* 3.5.15 (where there is no implication of boorishness; see on 15 *premet ille torum*) *bracchia ... accepi presso pendentia collo*. For *sinere* constructed with the subjunctive, cf. 1.8.71 *sine credat amari*, 3.14.29 *sine nescius errem*, K.-S. 2.228f., H.-Sz. 530. The archaic form of the imperative here may lend the injunction an imposing legal *color* (cf. 38 and 39f. [nn.]). *indignis ... lacertis:* the phrase recurs at *Met.* 4.138, in the sense 'arms which did not deserve to suffer' (cf. 3.9.3 [n.]); note also Prop. 1.16.6 *pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus*. *indignus* is used of an unworthy lover in a related context at *Epist.* 16.215f. (Paris to Helen) *totis indignus noctibus ille / te tenet. impositis* (PYç) is possible; for *imponere lacertos*, cf. e.g. 2.16.29, *Epist.* 16.221f. (quoted above) and note also *Fast.* 2.803 (of Lucretia) *positis urgentur pectora palmis*. It would, however, be less pointed than *indignis*. *premat impositis ... lacertis* might be intended to balance *pone* in the pentameter but, in that case, one might have expected the balance to be expressed more clearly. (For a similarly unemphatic antithesis, however, cf. 3.14.21f. *illic nec tunicam tibi sit posuisse pudori / nec femori impositum sustinuisse femur*.) *lacertus:* Ov. 80 (42), Verg. 10 (9), Hor. 6 (2), Tib. 5, Prop. 7. In dactylic poetry, the word is always placed at the end of the hexameter, except at *Epist.* 4.82 and 13.104 (*lacertus*, penultimate word in the pentameter) and Prud. *Psych.* 595 (*lacertorum*, second word in the hexameter). It is generally rare in prose, other than in the plural with the figurative sense 'strength', which is used mainly with reference to oratorical ability; see TLL 7.2.830.50ff.

mite ... caput: the phrase occurs elsewhere only at *Fast.* 3.789, where the epithet bears a somewhat different sense: *mite caput, pater* (sc. Bacchus), *huc placataque cornua uertas*. *mite* is here in antithesis to *rigido*; cf. 44 *tenerum duro*. At 3.8.9ff., Ovid makes much of the contrast between his mistress and the *sanguine pastus eques* in delicacy both physical and, as he had thought, of feelings. *mitis:* Ov. 88 (32), Verg. 5 (1), Hor. 6 (4), Tib. 5, Prop. 4.

rigido pectore: cf. 2.6.4 and *Fast.* 6.148 *rigido ... ungue*, 3.2.24 *rigido nec preme terga* (sc. [tenerae] puellae) *genu*, also *Epist.* *Sapph.* 207f. *pectus ... agreste mouetur, / an riget?*

Note the explosively indignant alliteration in *pectore pone caput*.

37-38. admittat digitos: cf. Mart. 3.17.5 *digitos ... admittere uisa est* (*scribilita*), [Quint.] *Decl.* 8.19 *ut grassaturas manus* (sc. of a vivisectionist) *totum corpus admitteret*, also Sen. *Dial.* 6.1.8 *digitos scrutantium recipiunt* (*uulnera*).

habiles: the sense is apparently 'just right for fondling' (for that encomiastic detail, cf. 1.5.20). At 2.4.35, *haec* (sc. *puella*) *habilis breuitate sua est*, the adjective seems to mean much the same. For *habilis* used in this sense of a part of the body, however, I can cite no closer parallel than Apul. *Met.* 4.15 (of a bear's skin used as a disguise) *habili corio et mollitie tractabili*. Perhaps the sense '(by being permitted to be) readily accessible' is also present; see on 1.8.40 *habiles pluribus esse uiris*. For *habilis* used of parts of the body, see also on 2.4.27 *habili percurrit pollice chordas*.

oscula ... nulla dedisse uelis: the perfect infinitive is commonly used aoristically for metrical convenience, with little or no distinction in meaning from the present infinitive; cf. e.g. 2.4.26 *oscula ... dedisse uelim*, 2.16.14 *fuisse uelim*, 2.17.30 *quid non ... dedisse uelit?*, and see Platnauer (1951) 109ff., Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 6.79. Here, however, Ovid seems to be echoing the legal formula *ne quis fecisse uelit*, in which the infinitive is a true perfect, in that it implies unpleasant consequences in the event of failure to observe the prohibition; for that formula, which had its origins in ordinances to magistrates to ensure public order and decency, see Daube (1966) 222ff., Ollfors (1967) 36ff. The more obvious legal *color* of the next couplet (see the note) makes it the more likely that Ovid is exploiting that formula in this incongruous setting. Recognition that the formula is in play here rules out *uelim* (*N¹Pc* [v.l.]), which might otherwise have had a certain attraction and was, in fact, approved by Heinsius. For *uelim* introducing erotic *praecepta*, an idiom for which neither Lucretius nor the *Georgics* provide a precedent, cf. *Rem.* 402 *ineas quamlibet ante uelim*, 791f. *hunc quoque ... / uellem desinere hostis habere loco*, also *Ars* 3.349 *quis dubitet quin scire uelim saltare puellam?* The context prevents difficulty in understanding a subject for the infinitive (*te*) which is different from the subject of the main verb; see on 1.11.13.

praecipue: Ov. 29 (11), Verg. 8 (5), Hor. 2 (0), Tib. 1, Prop. 3. Since it occurs three times in Vergil's *Georgics*, ten times in the *Ars Amatoria*, at *Rem.* 683, elsewhere in the *Amores* only at 1.8.99 (introducing one of Dipsas' *praecepta*), the word may be part of the

diction of didactic poetry. Lucretius, however, although he has *praesertim* fourteen times and *in primis* thirteen times, does not use *praecipue*.

39-40. Cf. 2.5.29f. (on seeing his mistress kiss a rival) '*quid facis?*' exclamo '*quo nunc mea gaudia defers? / iniciam dominas in mea iura manus!*', *Epist.* 12.159f. (Medea, seeing Jason's preparations for his marriage to Creusa) *uix me continui quin sic laniata capillos / clamarem 'meus est!' iniceremque manus*. Ovid threatens to assert his rights to his mistress' kisses by means of the legal process of *manus iniectio*, for which see Daube (1966) 226ff. The threat of such a *uindicatio* is, of course, an idle one, since, unlike his rival (see the introduction), Ovid has no legal claim to the girl's kisses. The emptiness of the threat is emphasised by the phrase *manifestus amator*, which recalls the legal term *fur manifestus*, 'a thief caught in the act', for which see Watson (1971) 147ff., *TLL* 8.310.10ff. For *manifestus* in the context of an illicit love-affair, cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 862 *manifesti moechi*, also *Bacch.* 918 *moechum manifestarium*. For Ovid's relationship with the girl as a *furtum*, cf. 64 *furtim* (n.).

mea: 'mine (by rights)'; cf. e.g. 2.5.29 and *Epist.* 12.160 (both quoted above), 20.147 *iste sinus meus est! mea turpiter oscula sumis!*, Prop. 1.3.37, Tib. 1.9.77f. *blanditiasne meas aliis tu uendere es ausus, / tunc aliis demens oscula ferre mea?*

41-42. aspiciam: a pointed echo of 3f. *ergo ego ... / aspiciam?*; there, Ovid was indignant about what he will have to endure to see, but now he realises that he has more reason to be anxious about what he will not be able to see.

bene ... celant: cf. 3.2.36 *quae bene sub ... ueste latent*, 3.6.40, *Epist.* 12.39, *Ars* 1.397, 2.409, 571 *bene concubitus ... celare solebant*.

pallia: the *pallium* was a cloak worn mainly by men, but sometimes also by women; cf. 3.2.25, Mart. 11.104.7 *fascia te tunicaeque obscuraque pallia celant*, *TLL* 10.1.135.56ff. Unlike such garments as the toga and the *instita*, it seems to have been worn by women of all social ranks. Since, however, the girl would perhaps not wear a cloak during the banquet, the reference may be to the draperies on the couch; for *pallium* in that sense, cf. 1.2.2 (n.) and see also on line 48 below, *ueste sub iniecta*.

caeci causa timoris: for fear of deception by the beloved, cf. 45f., 1.10.7ff., Pichon (1966) s.vv. *metuere, timere*. For *caecus* describing fear, cf. *Fast.* 2.822, Cic. *Lig.* 3, Phaedr. 2.8.3, Lucan 6.297, Val. Fl.

7.147, Tac. *Hist.* 1.82.1. The epithet is particularly apposite here, since Ovid's fear is caused by what he literally cannot see. *causa timoris*: for the phrase, cf. *Epist.* 1.16, 17.218, *Met.* 7.16, *Fast.* 5.248, *Trist.* 3.4B.70. Such expressions, usually equivalent to a predicative dative, are common in Ovid (in the *Amores*, cf. *causa doloris* [1.14.14, 2.6.10], *causa decoris* [3.1.10]), but *causa doloris* (Prop. 1.16.35 and *Epist. Sapph.* 119) is the only example elsewhere in elegy.

43-44. Professor Sandbach has tentatively suggested to me that this couplet should be placed after line 34. That ordering provides a convincing sequence: innocent foot-play (43f.), leading to a close embrace (35f.) which encourages the rival to fondle the girl's breasts (37) and, worst of all, stimulates her to kiss him (38). The phrasing of 43f., *nec ... committe ... nec ... cohaere / nec ... iunge*, matches that in 35-37, and would not deprive the injunction against kissing (38) of its distinct emphasis (see Vol. 1, 111f.). It seems more probable, however, that *quae bene pallia celant* (41) means that the girl and the rival are draped from the waist down, and that the movement of legs and feet therefore belongs with the flirtations which Ovid will not be able to see. Retaining lines 43f. in their transmitted place, we must assume that the manoeuvrings described in the couplet are less than innocent, bringing the couple into a position suitable for intimate activity of the kind referred to in lines 47f.

For the downward progression from the girl's thighs to her feet, cf. *Met.* 14.64f. *corpus quaerens femorum crurumque pedumque / Cerebereos rictus pro partibus inuenit illis* and see on 1.5.19-22. For the use of polyptoton to express close contact between lovers, cf. 3.7.10 *lascium femori supposuit ... femur*, 3.14.22, *Epist.* 2.58, *Ars* 1.140, 606, Archil. *frg.* 119.1f. West κατὰ γαστρί γαστέρα / προσβαλεῖν μηρούς τε μηροῖς, Anacr. *frg.* 94 Page, Theocr. 2.140, Lucil. 305f., Tib. 1.8.26, Marcus Argentarius *AP* 5.128.1ff.

nec ... nec ... / nec ...: this use of *nec* in anaphora connecting coordinate imperative clauses seems to occur first here; cf. 2.2.25f., *Epist.* 19.203f., *Ars* 2.595f., *Rem.* 693ff., *Met.* 2.135 with Bömer's note, K.-S. 1.204. Lines 35f. (with the transmitted ordering) are slightly different; as at e.g. Catull. 8.9f. *tu quoque impotens noli, / nec quae fugit sectare, nec miser uiue*, *Rem.* 597f. and *Met.* 15.474ff., the first *nec* connects with a preceding imperative.

femori committe femur: I can adduce no closer parallels for the use of *committere* in this context than *Epist. Sapph.* 129f. *oscula ... quae tu committere lingua / ... consueras* and *Met.* 11.73f. *suum laqueis ... /*

crus ubi commisit uolucris; contrast *supponere* (3.7.10), *impositum sustinere* (3.14.22), *conserere* (Tib. 1.8.26).

crure cohaere: although *cohaerere* is often used in the sense 'embrace' (see *TLL* 3.1536.46ff.), for this phrase also I can adduce no exact parallel.

tenerum duro cum pede iunge pedem: for the phrase, cf. *Met.* 9.44 *cum pede pes iunctus* (in describing a battle, the context in which such polyptoton is most frequent; cf. Hom. *Il.* 13.130f. φράξαντες δόρυ δουρί, σάκος σάκει προθελύμῳ / ἄσπις ἄρ' ἄσπιδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυιν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνὴρ, Bömer [1974] 506f., Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 584 *premitur pede pes*). For *tener pes* in elegy, see Lyne on [Verg.] *Ciris* 169. For the antithesis between *tenerum* and *duro*, cf. 36, Verg. *Ecl.* 10.49 (presumably an echo of Gallus; cf. Servius on line 46) *a! tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!*

45-48. Since Ovid refers to his mistress in the third person in lines 47f., that couplet is clearly spoken aside. (If it is not spoken aside, Ovid must be referring to some love-affair other than that with the girl to whom this elegy is addressed. Such a reference would hardly endear him to his present addressee. [Note, however, 2.19.9ff.] Moreover, in the opening three poems, Ovid has portrayed himself as being in the initial stages of his first love-affair; even though *saepe* [47] makes it clear that this elegy has a dramatic dating somewhat later than that of those introductory poems, it seems unlikely that, in this early position in the collection, he would suddenly and without warning refer to his frequent amatory encounters with another woman.) It is probable that lines 45f. should also be considered part of the aside; note the similarity of line 46 to the interjections at 2.18.20 *ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis!* and 2.19.34 *ei mihi, ne monitis torquear ipse meis!* For this technique, see Vol. 1, 67f.

45-46. The conceit of 'the biter bitten' is a favourite with Ovid; cf. 2.18.20 and 2.19.34 (both quoted on 45-48), 3.13.21 (n.), *Epist.* 2.48, 6.151 *Medeae Medeae forem* (a marvellous *sententia!*), *Ars* 1.645ff., 3.589f., *Rem.* 502, *Trist.* 2.450, Tib. 1.6.9f. *ipse miser docui, quo posset ludere pacto / custodes: heu heu nunc premor arte mea* with Smith's note, Otto (1890) s.vv. *ars* (4), *laqueus* (1). See also on 8 *traxit*, 1.7.6 in *sanctos uerba ferre deos* and 16 *Cressa*.

proterue: an adverbial form of the word occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at *Ars* 1.599 *quicquid facias dicasue* (sc. at a banquet) *proteruius aequo*. For the adjective in this context, cf. *Epist.*

17.79 (Helen to Paris) *cum ... me spectas oculis, lasciue, proteruis. proteruus*: Ov. 16 (6), Verg. 0, Hor. 9 (6), Tib. 0, Prop. 1. It occurs earlier only in Plautus (4), Pacuvius (1 [Trag.]), Terence (3) and Cicero (10).

exempli: cf. *Epist.* 17.215f. (Helen to Paris) *tu quoque qui poteris fore me sperare fidelem / et non exemplis anxius esse tuis?*, *Ars* 1.635f. *per Styga Iunoni falsum iurare solebat / Iuppiter: exemplo nunc fauet ipse suo*, 658 *exemplo doleat femina laesa suo*, Phaedr. 1.26.12, Auson. *Epigr.* 96.4 p. 348 Peiper.

torqueor: cf. 2.5.53 (when deceived at a banquet) *torqueor infelix, ne tam bona (sc. oscula) senserit alter*.

ipse: Heinsius conjectured *ecce*, on the basis of the nonsensical *esse*, offered by *P*, as also by *Y*. *ecce* would be suitably dramatic, and *ipse* might be influenced by such passages as 2.18.20, 2.19.34 (both quoted on 45-48) and *Pont.* 1.1.60 *facto torqueor ipse meo. esse*, however, may be a straightforward corruption derived directly from *ipse*, as apparently it is in *S* at 2.19.2. The unfamiliarity of the idiomatic *in ipse* at 1.7.26 gave rise to *in esse* (ς), perhaps with *inisse* (ς) as an intermediary. Conversely, at 2.19.14, *esse* is trivialised to *ipsa* in γω.

47-48. 'Hier wäre nun die erste der Stellen, um deren willen manche Leute die Augen verdrehen und moralische Ohnmachtsanfälle bekommen. Zugegeben muss allerdings werden, dass hier von *manustupratio mutua* die Rede ist' (Brandt). The same goings-on seem to be implied at *Epist.* 16.223f.: *rumpor et inuideo — quidni tamen omnia narrem? — / membra superiecta cum tua ueste fouet*; cf. also Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.25ff. (quoted in the introduction), Lucian *Alex.* 39 ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ ὀλεθρίου ἐκείνου ἀνδρὸς φιλήματά τε ἐγίγνετο ἐν τῷ μέσῳ καὶ περιπλοκαί. εἰ δὲ μὴ πολλαὶ ἦσαν αἱ δᾶδες, τάχ' ἂν τι καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ κόλπου ἐπράττετο, and perhaps Prop. 1.4.13f. *quae / gaudia sub tacita ducere ueste libet*.

properata: cf. *Ars* 2.717 *non est Veneris properanda uoluptas*, Caecil. *Com.* 167 *properatim in tenebris istuc confectum est opus*, Hor. *loc. cit. raptim*.

uoluptas: for *uoluptas* with reference to sexual pleasure, cf. 1.10.35, 2.10.25, 3.4.31, Adams (1982) 197f. See also on 2.3.2 *gaudia. uoluptas*: Ov. 43 (11), Verg. 6 (3), Hor. 8 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 1.

ueste sub iniecta: for the phrase, cf. *Ars* 2.618 *pars ... sub iniecta ueste pudenda latet*, 3.266, Lyne on [Verg.] *Ciris* 251. For *uestis* used of the draperies on a couch, see Fedeli on Prop. 1.4.14 (quoted

above), *OLD* s.v. 3.

opus: for *opus* with reference to sexual intercourse, cf. 2.10.36, 3.7.68, 3.14.28, *Ars* 2.480 *arte Venus nulla dulce peregit opus*, Grassmann (1966) 83, Adams (1982) 157, *TLL* 9.2.851.8ff.

49-50. puteris: puto: Ov. 284 (101), Verg. 16 (14), Hor. 34 (1), Tib. 3, Prop. 10, Catull. 21, Lucr. 73, Sen. *Trag.* 34, Lucan 37, Val. Fl. 17, Sil. 19, Stat. 41 (*Silu.* 13), Mart. 140, Juv. 37. Since Ovid uses *putare* with such remarkable freedom throughout all his works, no special significance can be attached to the mere fact of its occurrence here. The form of the verb may, however, be significant. Of the poets reviewed above, apart from Ovid (15 [8]) and Horace (3, all in the *Epistles*), only Lucretius (13) uses passive forms of *putare. puteris* may therefore have a flat and prosaically didactic *color*, suggestive of Ovid's urgently pedantic insistence on the manner in which his mistress is to behave.

conscia: for *conscius* used of inanimate objects which share lovers' secrets, often, as here, with undertones of guilt, cf. e.g. *Epist.* 17.267f. *furtivae conscia mentis / littera*, 18.105, *Ars* 1.438, 2.703 *conscius, ecce, duos accepit lectus amantes*, *Rem.* 725, *Epist. Sapph.* 138, Meleager *AP* 5.8.1f. νύξ ἱερὴ καὶ λύχνη, συνίστορας οὔτινας ἄλλους / ὄρκοις ἄλλ' ὑμέας εἰλόμεθ' ἀμφοτέρω, Philodemus *AP* 5.4.1ff., Statyllius Flaccus *AP* 5.5.1ff. See also on 1.6.70 *testis*.

51-54. For the girl's flirtations when her lover / husband has fallen, or seems to have fallen, into a drunken stupor, cf. 1.9.26 (n.), 2.5.13f., Tib. 1.6.27f. *saepe mero somnum peperit tibi, at ipse bibebam / sobria supposita pocula uictor aqua*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.25ff. (quoted in the introduction), Courtney on Juv. 1.57.

53-54. si bene compositus somno uinoque iacebit: 'if he lies well settled in a drunken sleep'. For *componere somno* in the sense 'settle in sleep', cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.525ff. *pecudes pictaeque uolucres / ... / ... somno positae*, Sil. 5.529 *longo compositum lumina somno*, *TLL* 3.2115.82ff. Since, however, *componere* can mean 'bury' or 'accord the rites due after death' (see *TLL* 3.2116.22ff.), the phrasing here recalls the much-imitated Ennian line *hostes uino domiti somnoque sepulti* (*Ann.* 288); see Skutsch's note, Verg. *Aen.* 2.265 *urbem somno uinoque sepultam* with Austin's note, 3.630ff. *expletus dapibus uinoque sepultus / ... iacuit ... per antrum / immensus*, Prop. 3.11.56 *assiduo lingua sepulta mero*, *Rem.* 806 *ut stupeant multo corda sepulta mero*,

Yardley (1980b) 265. For epic *color* in this passage, see also on lines 61 *lacrimis ... obortis* and 69 *fortuna sequetur. compositi* is used without qualification in the same context at 2.5.22. For the combination *somno uinoque*, cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 9.189 (= 236) *somno uinoque soluti*, *Epist.* 14.33 *cibo uinoque graues somnoque iacebant*, *Met.* 3.608, *Fast.* 2.333, *Liv.* 25.24.6, 29.34.11, 41.3.10, *Val. Max.* 2.5.4.

consilium nobis resque locusque dabunt: the verse is repeated almost *uerbatim* at *Trist.* 1.1.92; cf. also *Am.* 2.19.44, *Ars* 2.367f. (to Menelaus) *cogis adulterium dando tempusque locumque; / quid, nisi consilio est usa puella tuo?* In these passages, Ovid's terminology corresponds to the principles on which forensic speeches were focussed; an issue (*res*) should be considered with regard to the place (*locus*) and time (*tempus*) at which it happened; cf. *Trist.* 1.1.37ff., *Cic. Inu.* 1.38f., *Quint. Inst.* 5.10.37ff. For the phrasing here, cf. *Caes. Gall.* 5.8.1 *ut ... consilium ... pro tempore et pro re caperet*, *Ciu.* 3.43.1 *Caesar consilium capit ex loci natura*.

55-58. For the situation, cf. *Ars* 1.603ff. *cum discedet mensa conuiuia remota, / ipsa tibi accessus turba locumque dabit. / insere te turbae leuiterque admotus eunti / uelle latus digitis et pede tange pedem*.

55-56. cum surges ... surgemus et omnes: see on line 15 *cum*.

turbae ... agmen: cf. *Tib.* 1.5.63 *pauper in angusto fidus comes agmine turbae*, *Epist.* 12.157 *ire animus mediae suadebat in agmina turbae*.

memor: this absolute usage is found predominantly in poetry; see *TLL* 8.656.39ff. Here, the word emphasises the didactic tone; cf. *Lucr.* 2.581f. *illud in his obsignatum quoque rebus habere / conuenit et memori mandatum mente tenere*, *Verg. Georg.* 1.167 *omnia quae multo ante memor prouisa repones*, 2.347 (*uirgulta*) *multa memor occule terra*, *Rem.* 674 *mente memor tota, quae damus, arma tene*, also *Lucr.* 2.66, 891, 4.643, *Verg. Georg.* 1.450f., 2.259f., *Ars* 2.201, *Rem.* 217.

57-58. agmine ... in illo: enclosing the line, with a fine accommodation of word-order to sense: Ovid and his mistress are here, as is recommended in line 56, in the middle of the throng.

me: the elision of a monosyllable *in thesi* occurs most frequently at the second thesis, as here; cf. 2.1.30, 2.19.21, 3.6.80, 103 (if *quem* be considered a separate word), *Smith* on *Tib.* 1.4.56. See also on 1.8.55 *tam*. For the elision of monosyllables in general, see *Platnauer* (1951)

78, *Hellegouarc'h* (1964) 242ff., *Soubiran* (1966) 327ff.

ibi: *Ov.* 27 (23), *Verg.* 11 (8), *Hor.* 1 (1), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 1. Since the word is entirely absent from the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*, it is perhaps not significant in this didactic context that *Lucretius* uses it twenty-five times. The original iambic prosody (= *ibei*) is retained elsewhere by *Ovid* at *Epist.* 21.104 (as here, at the second arsis) and at *Met.* 4.89, 11.597 and 712 (all at the third arsis); see *TLL* 7.1.140.48ff.

59-60. In this couplet, and perhaps also the next, *Ovid* speaks aside; cf. 45-48 (n.).

me miserum!: see on 1.1.25.

monui: for *monere* and its cognates in erotodidactic contexts, cf. e.g. 1.8.21, 2.19.34, *Ars* 1.387, 459, 739, 2.427, 428, 509, 548, 3.48, 353, 494, 750, *Rem.* 124, 128, 136, 296, 439, 804, *Tib.* 1.8.69, 2.4.51, *Prop.* 1.1.35, 37, 1.15.41, 1.20.1, 51.

paucas ... in horas: cf. *Epiced. Drusi* 419 *uix etiam fueras paucas uitalis in horas*, *Suet. Iul.* 76.2 *honorem in paucas horas ... dedit*, *TLL* 6.2957.12ff. Comparable phrasing occurs elsewhere in elegy, with a different sense, only at *Prop.* 2.29.13f. *haec te non meritum totas exspectat in horas: / at tu nescio quas quaeris, inepte, fores* and *Rem.* 93 *nec te uenturas differ in horas*. *Ovid* may have that *Propertian* passage in mind: *Propertius* has left a banquet (cf. 1 *potus*) to serenade another woman, neglecting his willing mistress; in the next couplet, *Ovid* describes how he will leave the banquet and escort his inaccessible mistress as far as her door.

prosit: for *prodesse* in didactic contexts, cf. e.g. 1.8.36, *Ars* 1.161, 375, 659, *Verg. Georg.* 1.84, 3.459, 509, 4.267. Normally, the verb emphasises the advantage to be derived by the recipient from the instruction given; here, *Ovid* is thinking at least as much of his own advantage.

The alliteration of *m* and *p* in the hexameter conveys an impression of *Ovid's* agitated indignation.

separor: cf. 2.16.42 *separor a domina cur ego saepe mea?* *Ovid* uses the word 11 (4) times, it is not found in *Vergil*, *Tibullus* or *Propertius*, *Horace* uses it only at *Carm.* 2.19.18 and *Lucan*, with four examples, is the only other poet to use it more than once.

nocte iubente: cf. *Mart.* 11.82.1f. *A Sinuessanis conuiuia Philostratus undis / conductum repetens nocte iubente larem*, *Nemes. Ecl.* 3.67f. *oues ... conducere in unum / nox iubet*.

61-62. nocte uir includet: house-doors seem normally to have been

secured only at night; cf. 2.19.38 (to a complaisant husband) *incipie iam prima claudere nocte forem*, Plaut. *Most.* 444 *sed quid hoc? occlusa ianua est interdus*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.7.29 (to a woman besieged by admirers) *prima nocte domum claude. includet* has overtones of imprisonment (cf. Cic. *Dom.* 110 *cum principem orbis terrae uirum inclusum domi contineres*, TLL 7.1.950.42ff.), suggesting that the girl will be treated as a slave; that point is made more explicitly at 3.4.33f. *nec tamen ingenuam ius est seruare puellam; / hic metus externae corpora gentis agat.*

lacrimis ... obortis: for the *exclusus amator*'s tears, see on 1.6.17f. The phrase has an incongruously grand epic *color*. It occurs first at Liv. 1.58.7, four times in the *Aeneid*, elsewhere in Ovid at *Epist.* 8.109 and five times in the *Metamorphoses* (also *Epist.* *Sapph.* 97), but it may be Ennian; see Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.867, Ogilvie on Liv. *loc. cit.*

maestus is a rather more poetic term than *tristis* (for statistics, see TLL 8.46.4ff.), and contributes to the humorously inflated diction of this passage.

ad saeuas prosequar usque fores: Ovid is echoing Tib. 1.5.74 (of an *exclusus amator*) *ante ipsas exscreat usque fores. saeuas:* for such epithets applied to the door which excludes the lover, see on 1.6.2 *difficilem ... forem* and 73 *crudeles ... postes*. For *prosequi* in the sense 'escort', cf. e.g. Liv. 2.31.11 *decidentem domum cum fauore ac laudibus prosecuti sunt*, Mart. 11.24.1 *Dum te prosequor et domum reduco*. It was one of the elegiac lover's *officia* for his mistress that he should be her attendant; cf. e.g. 3.11.17f., Tib. 1.5.61ff. Here, however, it is perhaps rather more pointed to assume that Ovid's deference, however reluctant, is to his rival; cf. *Ars* 1.579ff., where he recommends that the lover should defer to his mistress' *uir* at banquets.

63-64. Cf. 2.5.59f. *nec tamen hoc unum doleo, non oscula tantum / iuncta queror, quamuis haec quoque iuncta queror*, *Ars* 1.669f. *oscula qui sumpsit, si non et cetera sumit, / haec quoque, quae data sunt, perdere dignus erit*. The point at *Met.* 1.499f. is somewhat different: *uidet oscula, quae non / est uidisse satis*.

oscula ... sumet: the phrase occurs earlier only at Prop. 1.3.16; see TLL 9.2.1113.73ff. With *non tantum oscula* following, the verb suggests *gaudia sumere*, used by Ovid of sexual intercourse at *Rem.* 401 and *Met.* 11.310.

das ... dabis: see on 70 *dedisse*.

furtim: for the elegiac love-affair as a *furtiuus amor*, cf. 18, 1.11.3, 2.2.15, 2.8.3, 8, 2.19.39, 3.4.25, Pichon (1966) s.v. *furta*, Kost on Musaeus 1 (p. 123), also TLL 6.1644.42ff., 1649.68ff.

iure coacta: on the implications of this phrase for the status of the *uir* in this elegy, see the introduction. The antithesis with *furtim* is amusingly unusual.

65-66. potes hoc may echo *si potes* (52) and *quicquid ... poteris tangere* (58); here, in imagining the worst, Ovid has become urgently assertive. The presentation of the phrase as a parenthesis is paralleled most closely at *Trist.* 4.4.29 *ingenium ... meum (potes hoc meminisse) probabat*. To have written *quod potes unum, inuita dato* would conform to Ovid's more usual idiom; cf. *Epist.* 8.5 *quod potui, renui, ne non inuita tenerer*, *Met.* 1.656f. *alto tantum suspiria ducis / pectore, quodque unum potes, ad mea uerba remugis*, *Trist.* 3.3.57 *quod potes, extenua forti mala corde ferendo*, also *Rem.* 167, *Met.* 4.684, 13.220, *Fast.* 5.472, *Trist.* 4.3.18. That formulation would, however, forfeit the urgent dramatic effect.

blanditiae taceant: for *blanditiae* in the bedroom, cf. 1.7.42, 2.19.17, 3.7.11f., 55, 3.14.25, *Ars* 2.689, 705, 723, 3.795f. *nec blandae uoces iucundaque murmura cessent / nec taceant mediis improba uerba iocis*, *Epist.* *Sapph.* 131f., Theocr. 2.141, [Theocr.] 27.67f., Juv. 6.194ff. For the phrase here, cf. *Ars* 3.796 (quoted above), Catull. 61.119f. *ne ... taceat ... / ... iocatio*, [Quint.] *Decl.* 4.8 *abite gratulationes, silete blanditiae* and see also on 19 *uerba ... loquentia*.

maligna: cf. Mart. 12.55.9 *ne sint basia muta, ne maligna*.

67-68. illum quoque ne iuuat opto: a curse on the lover to balance that in the first pentameter. The phrasing may recall line 4 *tangi quem iuuat, alter erit?* For ring-composition between the beginning and end of an elegy, see on 1.5.26 *medii ... dies*.

si minus: like *si non* (see on 3.11.35), a prosaic phrase; it occurs 10 (1) times in Ovid and at Prop. 4.4.57 (quoted below), but is not used by Vergil, Horace or Tibullus.

at certe: again, a prosaic phrase, occurring 7 (4) times in Ovid, but not used by Vergil, Horace, Tibullus or Propertius. For *at* introducing the apodosis to a conditional clause, cf. *Epigr.* 4 (n.), Prop. *loc. cit.* *si minus, at raptae ne sint impune Sabinae, / me rape*.

69-70. The idea underlying this couplet, Ovid's willingness to be credulous about his mistress' fidelity to him, is developed at length in

3.14; cf. also 2.2.55ff. At 2.5.7ff., he laments that he is unable to avoid awareness of her unfaithful conduct at a banquet.

quaecumque ... noctem fortuna sequetur: the phrasing is epic in color; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 260 *haud quaquam quemquam semper fortuna secuta est*, Verg. *Aen.* 4.109 *si modo quod memoras factum fortuna sequatur* and, for similar line-endings, cf. also *Aen.* 6.62 *fuerit fortuna secuta*, 8.15 *si fortuna sequatur*, 10.48f. *Aeneas ... / ... quacumque uiam dederit Fortuna sequatur*, 12.677 *Fortuna, sequamur*, Met. 7.518 *fortuna secuta est*.

cras: a small but significant final point: Ovid may not have his mistress tonight, but he will have her tomorrow. The introduction of this consolation here somewhat undercuts the tone of despair which has pervaded the poem so far. Compare the similar deflations in the final couplets of, in particular, 1.7, 10, 14 and 2.3. On this feature of the *Amores*, see Parker (1969) and also 1.10.11 (n.).

constanti uoce: for the phrase, cf. Cic. *Carm. frg.* 6.51 Büchner, *Har. Resp.* 18, Vitruv. 5.4.2, also Rhet. Her. 3.21, Nepos *Att.* 22.1, Tac. *Hist.* 2.13.2, Juv. 13.76f. *aspice quanta / uoce neget, quae sit ficti constantia uoltus*. Here, *constanti* perhaps has the undertone 'faithful'; cf. e.g. *Epist.* 17.201 *constans in amore manere*, Prop. 2.26.27, 2.34.11. Even though the girl may make love with his rival, her voice is to remain loyal to Ovid. For comparably sophistic distinctions, cf. 3.4.5 *ut iam seruarius bene corpus, adultera mens est*, 3.14.48 *sit modo 'non feci' dicere lingua memor* and see also on 1.8.103 *lingua iuuat mentemque tegat* and 1.10.13 *animum cum corpore*.

dedit: for *dare* in the sense 'provide sexual favours', cf. 64, 65, 3.8.34 (where, as here, the verb is used absolutely) *dare iussa dedit*, Pichon (1966) s.v. For *praebere* in that sense, see on 1.3.19.

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