

2.18

[Neumeister (1982); Heldmann (1994).]



While you, Macer, write epic (1–2), Cupid restrains my ambitions (3–4). I have often tried to give up my mistress, but she keeps me writing love-elegies (5–12). Cupid mocked my pretensions to tragedy (13–18). I may write only *artes Amoris* (19–20) or *Heroides* (21–26). Sabinus has written replies from the heroes (27–34). You also, Macer, write of love in your epic (35–38), and may turn to love-elegy (39–40).



This elegy provides several glimpses, each as fascinating as it is frustrating, into Ovid's artistic career. As a poem, however, it is perhaps not among the most successful in the collection. The framing contrast is indebted to Prop. 1.7, but is devoid of the paradoxical banter with which Propertius claims his own love-elegies to be superior to Ponticus' *Thebaid*. Indeed, Ovid admits that he would have written an epic, had not Cupid and his mistress prevented him, but he has already related setbacks of this kind, more dramatically and with greater wit, in 1.1 and 2.1, which is also much indebted to Prop. 1.7. Likewise, the brief reference to his attempt at tragedy (13ff.) is overshadowed by the brilliant ingenuity of 3.1, and the lists of his *Epistulae Heroidum* (21ff.) and Sabinus' replies (27ff.) lack the panache of other catalogues such as e.g. 2.4.11ff. (attractive women), 3.6.25ff. (rivers in love), 3.12.21ff. (poetic fictions).

Ovid had attached himself to literary society from an early age (cf. esp. *Trist.* 4.10.41ff.), but only here do we observe the *sodalitium poetarum* at work, much as the *poetae noui* appear in Catullus (cf. 22, 35, 50, 95). Only two other poems in the collection are addressed to Ovid's friends (1.9, to Atticus, 2.10, to Graecinus), and none of these friends has an integral role to play in the poem in which he is addressed; see Vol. 1, 24ff. and the introductions to 1.9 and 2.10. Nevertheless, our appreciation of this elegy would no doubt be enhanced if we knew more about Macer and Sabinus. Macer is addressed again in *Pont.* 2.10, from which we learn that he was a friend of long standing,

perhaps a relative by blood or marriage of Ovid's (third) wife (*mea ... coniunx non aliena tibi* [10]), and Ovid's guide on a Grand Tour of Sicily and Asia Minor. In saying of his poetry *tu canis aeterno quidquid restabat Homero, / ne careant summa Troica bella manu* (13f.), Ovid may be suggesting that he wrote a *Posthomeric* as well as the *Antehomeric* referred to here; see Galasso (1995) 33f. At *Pont.* 4.16.6, he is denoted simply as *Iliacus*. He cannot be identified as Aemilius Macer, whom Ovid, when young, heard reciting his didactic poetry (*Trist.* 4.10.43f.) and who, according to Jerome, died in 16 B.C. Serious doubts have been raised against the traditional identification as Pompeius Macer, son or grandson of Pompey's intimate advisor, Theophanes of Mytilene, and himself a prominent administrator under Augustus and Tiberius; see Green (1982) 26ff., White (1992) and (1993) 243f. Two considerations seem to weigh particularly against that identification: first, the improbability that Ovid would make no attempt, in *Pont.* 2.10 or elsewhere, to gain recall from Tomi through the intercession of a well-placed government official, if he were a friend of long standing and related by marriage; second, the very frequency of the *cognomen* Macer, which perhaps renders it little more than arbitrary to settle on Pompeius Macer. The Macer referred to in Tib. 2.6 is also certainly not Aemilius Macer, and there is no particular reason to identify him as Pompeius Macer. It is, however, attractive to suppose that he is the same man as Ovid's addressee here, in a poem perhaps written more than a decade after Tibullus' death. Even if this is not so, Ovid is at least exploiting the fact that they have the same name. Tibullus' Macer has deserted Cupid's standards and joined the army: *Castra Macer sequitur: tenero quid fiet Amori? / ... ure, puer, quaeso, tua qui ferus otia liquit, / atque iterum erronem sub tua signa uoca* (1, 5f.); Ovid concludes that Macer will come over from martial epic to *militia amoris*: *si bene te noui, non bella libentius istis / dicis, et a uestris in mea castra uenis* (39f.). It may be worth noting that the phrase *tener Amor* seems to occur before Ovid's lines 4 and 19 only at Tib. 1.3.57 and 2.6.1. This contrast will be the sharper if we may suppose that Tibullus' Macer is not actually taking up military service, but rather forsaking love-elegy for epic; see O'Neil (1967), Bright (1978) 217ff. and the note to line 40. That interpretation is, however, very speculative; see Murgatroyd (1994) 239f.

Even less is known about Sabinus. Syme ([1978] 75, n. 3) notes three *rhetores* with this name, but our only other certain testimony to him is in the catalogue of poets of the late Augustan/ early Tiberian period in *Pont.* 4.16:

et qui Penelopae rescribere iussit Vlixem,
 errantem saeuo per duo lustra mari,
 quique suam †trismem† imperfectumque dierum
 deseruit celeri morte Sabinus opus (13ff.).

(The textual corruption is generally supposed, without clear justification, to obscure a reference to an epic.) Of the twenty-nine other poets included in the catalogue, only four can claim even one couplet to themselves. (Macer has to share a couplet with three other epic poets [5f.].) It is not clear why Ovid gives such prominence to Sabinus; his works being entirely lost, we cannot assess them. (The extant replies from Ulysses to Penelope, from Demophoon to Phyllis and from Paris to Oenone, attributed to one A. Sabinus, were written by an Italian humanist; see Martini [1933] 21f.) It may not be uncharitable to suppose that Ovid, in a poem asserting his own significance as a poet in his lonely old age, looked with particular favour on a friend who had once been inspired by his *Epistles* and, perhaps, more recently by his *Fasti*. Ovid may indeed owe to Sabinus the idea of writing the double-*Epistles*.

Ovid's abortive *Gigantomachia*, though referred to in such detail, seems to be a mere fiction; see on 2.1.11–16. We may be even more sceptical about the lofty project (cf. 4 *ausuros grandia*) in this poem, so vaguely outlined that it is not certain till line 11, *sumptis ... ab armis*, that it actually is a martial epic. Ovid is just as unspecific about his attempt at tragedy (13–18), but this claim probably has more substance. To invent a further work as a foil to Macer's *Antehomerica* and to his own amatory poetry would lack purpose, and he did write at least one tragedy. The *Medea*, his only known tragedy, of which only two small fragments survive (cited at Sen. *Suas.* 3.7 *in tragoedia eius* [where the play is not actually named] and Quint. *Inst.* 8.5.6), is praised by Quintilian along with the *Thyestes* of Varius, which *cuilibet Graecarum* (sc. *tragoediarum*) *comparari potest* (*Inst.* 10.1.98). In Quintilian's view, *Medea uidetur ostendere quantum ille uir praestare potuerit, si ingenio suo imperare quam indulgere maluisset* (*Inst. loc. cit.*; cf. Tac. *Dial.* 12.6). If the *Medea* had won such acclaim in his own time — and Ovid declares himself well-suited to the genre; cf. 14 *huic operi quamlibet aptus eram* — it is puzzling that we hear of no other plays, and ironic that his abandonment of tragedy has no other explanation than the opposition of Cupid and his mistress.

Whether or not lines 13–18 refer to a setback in the composition of the *Medea*, they seem inconsistent with a chronological reading of the

Amores, for there is no hint in 3.1 that Ovid had ever before attempted tragedy. It is therefore probable that 2.18, or at least this passage, will have appeared for the first time in the second edition. If this is so, there is no chronological problem in supposing that lines 19–20 *quod licet, aut artes teneri profitemur Amoris/ (ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis!)* allude to the *Ars Amatoria* rather than to the *Amores*. (On the chronology of Ovid's early poetry, see Vol. 1, 74ff., esp. 86ff., Heinze [1997] 21ff.) Scholarly opinion is divided, but favours the *Ars*; for discussion, with much further bibliography, see Jacobson (1974) 300ff., Spoth (1992) 35, n. 3. This may well be correct. Such meagre information as we have would allow us to suppose that this poem reflects Ovid's career in about 10–7 B.C., with the second edition of the *Amores* and the single *Heroides* (see below) recently completed, the *Medea* nearing completion, and work just recently begun on the *Ars Amatoria* (hence perhaps the brevity of the allusion to that undertaking). In favour of the *Amores*, however, one might argue that this elegy itself is being written for that collection; that, if we may give full weight to the exclusive phrasing of *quod licet, aut .../ .../ aut ...* (19ff.), Ovid is referring to the *Amores*, as he already has in 12 *res ... domi gestas et mea bella cano*; that he is echoing Propertius' reference to his own love-elegies at 1.7.5 *nos, ut consuimus, nostros agitamus amores*; that the girl, although charitable enough in any case to allow Ovid to compose the *Heroides*, is more likely to be requiring elegies in praise of her beauty (as in 2.1) than a handbook for lovers; that the pained exclamation in line 20, if an allusion to the *Ars*, would seem an appropriate reaction only to the advice given to women in the third book (cf. 1f., 577f., 589f. *ponite iam gladios hebetes, pugnetur acutis;/ nec dubito, telis quin petar ipse meis*, 667f., 672), which was published after the second edition of the *Amores*, if we may accept *deue* (or *-que*) *tribus libris titulo quos scripsit Amorum* at *Ars* 3.343 (see Rosati [1996b] 207, n. 4). The terms *artes*, *profitemur* and *praeceptis* readily suit the *Ars*, but love-elegy in general could be represented as fundamentally didactic. Emphasising the similarities between the *Ars* and the elegies of his predecessors, Ovid notes Tibullus' complaint that he suffered through the instructions which he gave to his mistress: *fallere custodes idem docuisse fatetur;/ seque sua miserum nunc ait arte premi* (*Trist.* 2.449f., drawing on Tib. 1.6.9f.), and he characterises Propertius' elegies as *blandi praecepta Properti* (465); see also the introduction to 1.4. At *Pont.* 2.10.15f., addressing Macer again, Ovid says: *Naso parum prudens, artem dum tradit amandi,/ doctrinae pretium triste magister habet*. There, he is clearly referring to the *Ars*.

The allusion to the opening words of the *Ars*, *Si quis in hoc artem populo non nouit amandi*, is more precise than here. It does not necessarily follow, however, that he is here also referring to the backfiring of the amatory instruction which he gives in that poem: certainly, the pentameter in that couplet is modelled on *Am.* 2.5.62 *nescioquis pretium grande magister habet*, where Ovid is lamenting the superiority of a rival's teaching. Moreover, the pentameter here has a particularly close parallel in the *Amores* at 2.19.34 *ei mihi, ne monitis torquear ipse meis! teneri ... Amoris* in 19 (cf. 4) affords no clue to the reference, since the same combination occurs in a programmatic context not only (in the plural) at 3.1.69 and 3.15.1, but also at *Ars* 1.7.

In lines 21–26, Ovid lists nine (or ten; see on 23 *male gratus Iason*) of the single *Heroides*: 1 (Penelope), 2 (Phyllis), 5 (Oenone), 11 (Canace), 6 (Hypsipyle [and perhaps 12 (Medea)]), 10 (Ariadne), 4 (Phaedra), 7 (Dido), 15 (Sappho). This catalogue refers to the work in a remarkably full manner; contrast the brevity of *artes teneri profitemur Amoris*, if Ovid is there advertising the *Ars Amatoria*. Scholarly attention has been focused, however, on its omissions. The authenticity of almost all the single *Heroides* not mentioned here has been suspected to a greater or lesser degree, and their absence from this poem has contributed substantially to these suspicions. Even granted, however, that this catalogue may not be among Ovid's best (see above), it would be an injustice to him to suppose that he aimed doggedly for a full tally; see Hinds (1993) 30ff., Heinze (1997) 51ff. This passage gives no compelling evidence against the view that the single *Epistles* had very recently been published, with the same letters in the same order as we have them. Penelope comes first (and Phyllis second) as in the mss-tradition of the *Heroides*. (Ulysses' reply is also listed first in line 29, and represents Sabinus' whole collection at *Pont.* 4.16.13f., as opening poems and lines conventionally do; see on 1.1.1 *Arma*.) Less can be inferred from the final position of Sappho's letter, since the *Epistula Sapphus* owes its position in the *Heroides* largely to the evidence of this poem; see Vol. 1, 86, n. 32. Artistic considerations will have led Ovid to rearrange the letters for this catalogue: Booth, for example, suggests that Penelope is rewarded for her patience, Phyllis not (21f.); the recipients of the letters in 23f. have their culpability in common; Dido and Sappho are both potential suicides (25f.). It is possible that Ovid omits some *Epistles* from his catalogue because they were not answered by Sabinus. He may have composed individual *Heroides* over a period of years, reciting them to his *sodales*, but their publication as a collection would give particular point to lines 27f.,

where he congratulates Sabinus on the speed with which he has brought replies from all over the world.



1–4. Ovid's model is Prop. 1.7.1ff. *Dum tibi Cadmeae dicuntur, Pontice, Thebae/ armaque fraternae tristia militiae,/ atque, ita sim felix, primo contendis Homero/ (sint modo fata tuis mollia carminibus),/ nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores/ atque aliquid duram quaerimus in dominam*. Just as this poem may be addressed to the same Macer as appears in Tib. 2.6 (see above), so Ovid claims to have been a close friend of Ponticus also; cf. *Trist.* 4.10.47f. *Ponticus heroo, Bassus quoque clarus iambis/ dulcia conuictus membra fuere mei*.

1–2. Whether the pentameter refers to the gathering of the Greek contingents or to the first engagements at Troy, Ovid presents Macer's *Antehomerica* ὅστερον πρότερον, Ὀμηρικῶς (Cic. *Att.* 1.16.1).

Carmen ... perducis: the phrase implies at least a certain degree of completion (cf. Cic. *Inu.* 2.178 *una pars ad exitum hoc et superiore libro perducta est*, TLL 10.1.1288.44ff.), and thereby foreshadows Ovid's acknowledgement of his own short-lived career as an epic-poet and as a tragedian. That *perducere* is regularly used of military commanders may anticipate the pentameter, in which Macer is said to do what he describes being done; cf. Prop. 2.1.18 (quoted below).

ad iratum ... Achillem: as at 2.1.29 *cantatus Achilles*, an allusion to the opening words of the *Iliad*, Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος. Similarly, *arma uiris* in the pentameter seems to allude to those of the *Aeneid*. The sense is: 'as far as the "Wrath of Achilles"'; for the so-called *ab urbe condita* construction, see K.-S. 1.766ff., H.-S. 393f., also Dewar on Claud. 28.429.

dum tu .../ .../ nos ...: for the antithesis, cf. Prop. 1.7.1ff. (quoted on 1–4) with Fedeli's note on line 5, *Pont.* 2.10.13ff. (to Macer) *tu canis aeterno quidquid restabat Homero,/ ne careant summa Troica bella manu./ Naso parum prudens, artem dum tradit amandi,/ doctrinae pretium triste magister habet, Anacreont.* 26 σὺ μὲν λέγεις τὰ Θήβης,/ ὁ δ' αὖ Φρυγῶν αὐτάς,/ ἐγὼ δ' ἐμὰς ἀλώσεις./ οὐχ ἵππος ὠλεσέν με./ οὐ πεζός, οὐχὶ νῆες./ στρατός δὲ καινὸς ἄλλος/ ἀπ' ὀμμάτων με βάλλων, also Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.36f. (quoted below) and, contrasting mere poetic activity with the actual achievements of a military commander, Verg. *Georg.* 4.559ff. *haec super aruorum cultu pecorumque canebam/ et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum/ fulminat Euphraten*

bello uictorque uolentis/ per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.

primaque iuratis induis arma uiris: for the poet as doing what he describes being done, a recurrent figure of speech in this elegy, cf. 1 *perducis*, 4 *ausuros grandia*, 11 *ingenium ... reuocatur*, 13 *sceptra ... sumpsi*, 27–34, 35 *tutum*, 1.9.34, 2.1.15 *in manibus*, 3.12.23ff. (nn.), *Trist.* 2.317f. *cur non Argolicis potius quae concidit armis/ uexata est iterum carmine Troia meo?*, 439 (of Varro ‘of Atax’) *Phasiacas Argo qui duxit in undas*, 533f. *et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor/ contulit in Tyrios arma uirumque toros*, *Pont.* 4.16.18, 34 *apta ... uenanti Grattius arma daret*, *Prop.* 2.1.17f. *quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent,/ ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus*, 35 *te mea Musa illis semper contexeret armis*, *Hor. Sat.* 1.10.36f. *turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque/ diffingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo*, 2.5.41, van Dam on *Stat. Silu.* 2.7.57, 77f. *et qui per freta duxit Argonautas/ et qui corpora prima transfigurat*, Coleman on *Juv.* 4.2.2 *qui magnum Aenean Laurentibus intulit aruis*, Courtney on *Juv.* 1.162f. *securus licet Aenean Rutulumque ferocem/ committas*, *Plut. Mor.* 458D (a rare instance of the figure in Greek) τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ὁ Σοφοκλῆς καὶ τὸν Εὐρύπυλον ὀπλίσας, Lieberg (1982), esp. 99ff. The idiom might convey a compliment; cf. *Serv. Ecl.* 6.62f. *tum Phaethontidas musco circumdat amarae/ corticis atque solo proceras erigit alnos: mira ... est canentis laus, ut quasi non factam rem cantare, sed ipse eam cantando facere uideatur*. Contrast *Trist.* 2.439 and *Stat. Silu.* 2.7.77 (both quoted above) with Quintilian’s rather dismissive assessment of Varro (*Inst.* 10.1.87) as being merely an *interpres operis alieni* (sc. Apollonius of Rhodes). The imposing word-order of the line (see on 1.3.9) emphasises the grandeur of Macer’s epic. **prima:** Marg-Harder suggest that Ovid intends a contrast with Homer’s account of Achilles’ rearming with the weapons made for him by Vulcan. **iuratis:** Helen’s suitors swore that they would fight to ensure the preservation of her marriage, and Agamemnon’s troops swore not to return home till Troy had been sacked; see Bömer on *Met.* 12.6f. Ovid may here be referring to either oath, or to both. For the active sense of the participle, cf. 3.3.1 *fidem iurata fefellit*, Bömer on *Fast.* 5.527, H.-Sz. 290f., *TLL* 7.2.677.25ff. **induis arma uiris:** cf. *Epist.* 8.50, *Ars* 1.197 *induit arma tibi genitor patriaeque tuusque*, *TLL* 7.1.1265.9ff. **arma uiris** seems to allude to the opening words of the *Aeneid*; see above, on *iratum ... Achillem*, also 35 *arma canenti*, 1.1.1 *Arma* (nn.).

3–4. Macer: on his identity, see the introduction. Dr. Casali and Professor Nisbet suggest that Ovid may be hinting at a paradox that a poet with grand designs should be so named. One would rather expect a lover to be *macer*; cf. *Met.* 11.793 *fecit amor maciem*, *TLL* 8.5.31ff., and see also on 1.6.5f.

ignaua Veneris ... in umbra: the idiom in line 2, presenting Macer as a military commander as well as a writer of martial epic poetry (see the note) establishes an antithesis with Ovid as both lover and love-poet. For the *uita umbratilis* of the lover in contrast to military activity, see on 1.9.41f. *ipse ego segnis eram discinctaque in otia natus;/ mollierant animos lectus et umbra meos*; of the (love-)poet, see on 1.15.1f. *Quid mihi, Liur edax, ignauos obicis annos/ ingentique uocas carmen inertis opus?*

cessamus sustains the contrast with Macer’s martial preoccupations; for the sense ‘be free from military service’, see on 2.14.1. That sense is hinted at also by Tragedy in a similar context at 3.1.24f. *cessatum satis est .../ ... cane facta uirorum*. In the equivalent passage in Propertius’ first Ponticus-elegy, *nos ... nostros agitamus amores* (1.7.5), the verb may suggest *militia amoris*; see on 1.9.45 *agilem*. In the poem immediately preceding, however, in another such comparison of lifestyles, Propertius had said to Tullus: *tua non aetas umquam cessauit amori;/ semper at armatae cura fuit patriae* (1.6.21f.).

tener ... Amor: the phrase seems to occur earlier only at *Tib.* 1.3.57 and 2.6.1 *Castra Macer sequitur: tenero quid fiet Amori?* (See the introduction [p. 383].) The epithet is appropriate to the god of love-poetry; see on 2.1.4 *teneris ... modis*. Its juxtaposition to *ausuros grandia*, however, and the conflicting combination with the violent verb *frangit* emphasise the paradoxical contrast between Cupid’s puny appearance and his great power; see on 1.1.13 *sunt tibi magna, puer, nimiumque potentia regna*.

ausuros grandia: for *audere* with reference to ambitious literary projects, often with connotations of failure, as here, see on 2.1.11 *ausus eram ... caelestia dicere bella*. For *grandis* in such contexts, cf. 3.1.70 (in contrast to the *teneri ... Amores*) *a tergo grandius urget opus*, *TLL* 6.2.185.52ff. Just as he describes Macer as arming the Greeks (see on 2), so Ovid seems here to be applying the same manner of expression to himself: ‘der Ausdruck *ausuros grandia* [ist] so allgemein gefasst, dass er auch etwa einen tapferen Kämpfer meinen kann, der grosse Taten zu wagen bereit ist, d. h. aber den Helden eines Epos’ (Lieberg [1982] 102).

frangit: cf. Prop. 1.14.17 *illa* (sc. *Venus*) *potest magnus heroum infringere uires*, 2.34.34 and 3.21.33 *fractus amore*, *Fast.* 1.301 *non Venus et uinum sublimia pectora fregit*, also *Trist.* 3.14.33 *ingenium fregere meum mala*. Might the antithesis with Macer's poetry be accentuated by Ovid's choice of this verb? It is Cupid who breaks him, not Achilles, to whom alone Homer applies the epithet ῥήξηνος (*Il.* 7.228 etc.). For allusions to that epithet, see on 1.9.34 *Argeas frangite*, *Troes*, *opes* and 2.14.13 *quis Priami fregisset opes ...?*, and note also *Trist.* 2.411f. *nec nocet auctori* (probably Sophocles; see Luck's note), *mollem qui fecit Achillem*,/ *infregisse suis fortia facta modis*.

5–6. The asyndetic balance both here and in the following couplet (*saepe meae dixi .../ ... sedit ... illa meo*,/ *saepe 'pudet' dixi ... illa .../ ... dixit '... pudet?'*) seems to suggest the ease with which the girl prevailed. Similarly, *meae ... puellae*, being normally an expression of endearment (see on 2.6.19), perhaps foreshadows Ovid's admission of defeat.

meae is emphatic, in that it is separated so widely from *puellae* and echoed in *meo* at the end of the pentameter.

tandem conveys exasperation and impatience; cf. Cic. *Catil.* 1.1 *Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?*, Sall. *Catil.* 20.9, *OLD* s.v. 1.

discede: Ovid may not have wished to end the affair, but merely that the girl should allow him an opportunity to pursue his grand poetic designs. Compare 2.1, in which his mistress closes the door against him when he tries to write a *Gigantomachia* rather than elegies in praise of her. *discedere* is often used, however, of the wife in a divorce; see *TLL* 5.1.1277.12ff.

in gremio sedit ... meo: a seductive ploy (cf. 2.2.62 *in gremio iudicis illa sedet* [n.]), just as effective as the door-slamming in 2.1.

7–8. pudet: just as Tragedy appeals to his sense of *pudor* in 3.1 (cf. esp. 21f. *fabula, nec sentis, tota iactaris in Vrbe*,/ *dum tua praeterito facta pudore refers*), so Ovid here apparently means that he is embarrassed to be writing in such a trivial genre as love-elegy. By contrast, Propertius' teasing of Ponticus had depended heavily on his paradoxical assertion that his love-poetry gave him a status unattainable through mere epic; cf. esp. 1.7.9ff., 21ff. Ovid's mistress, however, chooses to suppose that he is ashamed of their love-affair. This establishes a nice antithesis with the preceding elegy, in which Ovid attempts to persuade Corinna that he is worthy of her love.

lacrimis uix ... retentis: tears can be effective; see on 1.8.83f. Propertius is impervious to such entreaties when he renounces his love for Cynthia at 3.24.25f. (= 25.5f.) *nil moueor lacrimis: ista sum captus ab arte;/ semper ab insidiis, Cynthia, flere soles*.

me miseram! iam te ... amare pudet?: if indeed we may assume that the unnamed mistress in this elegy is Corinna, these six words are her only direct utterance in the whole collection; see Vol. 1, 22. Her lack of prominence is similarly illustrated by the fact that 'Corinna, uale', her dying parrot's farewell at 2.6.48, is the only address to her by name; see the note. *me miseram!*: most editors print these words as an independent exclamation; cf. 1.1.25 (n.), *Trist.* 4.3.52 *me miserum, si te iam pudet esse meam!* *me* is perhaps to be construed, however, as the object of *amare*; cf. e.g. Prop. 1.1.1, 1.3.39f. *noctes;/ me miseram quales semper habere iubet*. It seems to suit the elegiac mistress' self-centred *persona* slightly better that she should be asking Ovid whether he is ashamed of loving her rather than whether, *amare* being construed absolutely, he is ashamed of conducting a love-affair. It may be best to extract *me* as the object of *amare* from the exclamation *me miseram!* As Booth observes, this problem would present less difficulty to a contemporary audience or readership, untrammelled by the conventions of modern punctuation. (See also on 2.9.47 *est*.) If there is an echo here of Prop. 2.24B.15f. *me/ fallaci dominae iam pudet esse iocum*, it seems too tenuous to influence the interpretation. For the striking assonance in *miseram iam*, see on 2.2.52.

9–10. Just as Ovid's mistress prevented him from joining Macer in writing epic, so Catullus had feared that his poet-friend Caecilius would be detained by his mistress: *si sapiet, uiam uorabit;/ quamuis candida milies puella/ euntem reuocet, manusque collo/ ambas iniciens roget morari* (35.7ff.).

implicuit: only this form of the perfect stem is admissible in dactylic poetry, and it is in general use in prose also; cf. *Epist.* 2.142, 9.94, *Ars* 1.561, 2.580, *Met.* 1.762, 3.343, *Fast.* 5.220, Smith on Tib. 1.4.56, *TLL* 7.1.640.11ff. See also on 2.7.2 *dimicuisse*.

suos circum mea colla lacertos: the word-order suggests the embrace; cf. e.g. 1.4.35 *nec premat indignis sinu tua colla lacertis*, *Epist.* 8.93, *Met.* 1.555, 10.407, 11.240, *Pont.* 1.4.51 *amplectique meis corpus non pingue lacertis*, and see also on 2.11.3 *temeraria*.

perdunt: see on 2.10.29 *felix, quem Veneris certamina mutua perdunt!*

oscula mille: 'countless kisses', as at Petron. 127.10, Stat. *Ach.* 1.576, *CE* 1176.3, Claud. *Carm. Min.* 25.131. For *mille* signifying an indefinite large number, see on 1.3.15 *non mihi mille placent*. Catullus' *da mi basia mille, deinde centum* etc. at 5.7ff. is, paradoxically, to be taken literally, as he makes a careful tally of the kisses for which he hopes.

11–12. In 2.12, Ovid had boasted of his achievement in winning his mistress rather than mere military glory; here, he chafes that he cannot write a martial epic, and that he is confined to recording his own *militia amoris*. Following von Albrecht (1976) 61f., Booth considers the verbs in this couplet, *uincor*, *reuocatur* and *cano*, to be historic present tense, and concludes that Ovid is here referring to the *Amores* as a past occupation, in contrast to the *Ars Amatoria*. Might they perhaps suggest that the *Amores* have very recently been completed? In line 22, *scribimus* refers to *Heroides*-poems which must have been finished, since Sabinus is able to compose replies.

uincor unobtrusively introduces the military imagery which is developed more strongly in the rest of the couplet; cf. also 17 *deduxit*, 18 *triumphat*.

ingenium ... reuocatur: the beloved is more typically declared to be an inspiration than an impediment; see on 2.17.34 *ingenio causas tu dabis una meo*. For the expression, cf. Val. Max. 7.5.2, Tac. *Agr.* 3.1, also *OLD* s.v. *reuoco* 8a. Ovid is playing on the phrase *militēs (uel sim.) reuocare* (see *OLD* s.v. 1b), thus hinting at the convention whereby the poet is said to be personally involved in things which he describes being done (see on line 2).

sumptis ... ab armis: since *ausuros grandia* (4) lacks precision, it is first here that we learn that the ambitious project which Ovid was forced to abandon was, as in 1.1 and 2.1, a martial epic.

res ... domi gestas et mea bella cano: cf. Prop. 2.1.13f. *seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu, / tum uero longas condimus Iliadas*. The formulation of the line suggests a disjunction between home affairs and foreign wars; cf. e.g. *Met.* 15.747f. *bella ... finita triumphis / resque domi gestae* and such phrases as *domi bellicae* and *domi militiaeque* (see Bömer on *Met.* 12.185, *TLL* 5.1.1974.67ff.). In fact, of course, Ovid's *militia amoris* is a domestic preoccupation; for his *nocturna ... bella*, see on 1.9.45. For the paradox, cf. e.g. Tib. 2.3.33f. *tu ... cui tristi fronte Cupido / imperat ut nostra sint tua castra domo*, Sopater in *Rhet. Gr.* 8.94 Walz (in an erotic context) τὸν πόλεμον ... οἴκοι νικήσομεν. Ovid may be echoing Propertius' declaration to Maecenas

that, if he were capable of writing an epic, *bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris* (2.1.25).

13–14. sceptrā tamen sumpsī: since Ovid has already told us that he had been forced to give up a grand project in favour of love-elegy, it is wittily unconventional and unexpected that he should now report the frustrating of a second attempt at a higher genre. The echo here of *ingenium sumptis reuocatur ab armis* (11) seems to emphasise his obstinate but doomed determination. Ovid took up the sceptre and (15) donned the cloak and buskins, tokens of his status as a tragedian; cf. 3.1.63 *altera* (sc. Tragedy, who is herself so portrayed at 12ff. [see the note]) *me sceptro decoras altoque cothurno*. We may perhaps think of him also as adopting the role of one of his characters; cf. Sen. *Epist.* 76.31, where the same symbols denote tragic performers. For the convention whereby the poet represents himself as being personally involved in things which he describes being done, see on line 2. Such accoutrements assisted composition; cf. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 412ff. (Euripides in rags when writing of his mendicant heroes), *Thesm.* 148ff. (Agathon) ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν ἐσθῆθ' ἅμα <τῇ> γνώμῃ φορῶ. / χρὴ γὰρ ποιητὴν ἄνδρα πρὸς τὰ δράματα / ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν, πρὸς ταῦτα τοὺς τροποὺς ἔχειν, Sen. *Contr.* 9.3.13 *cum Latine declamauerant, toga posita sumpto pallio quasi persona mutata rediebant et Graece declamabant*, Mart. 12.94.3f. *transtulit ad tragicos se nostra Thalia cothurnos: / aptasti longum tu quoque syrma tibi*. For similar motives, Pompey was said to have paraded in Alexander's cloak (see on 1.2.41), Caligula wore his breast-plate (cf. Suet. *Cal.* 52), and Marcus Aurelius *duodecimum annum ingressus habitum philosophi* (presumably a simple cloak) *sumpsit* (*Hist. Aug. Aur.* 2.6). Lucian derides Dionysius I's attempt to compose successful tragedies by writing on Aeschylus' tablet (*Adv. Ind.* 15; see Hunter on Eubulus *frag.* 25a). Ovid asserts firmly his ability as a tragedian (14), and Cupid's mockery (15f.) is directed not so much against his pretensions to the high genre of tragedy as against his presumption that he is free to write what he likes. Nevertheless, Ovid derives witty capital, at his own expense, from the contrast between his splendid apparel and the unceremonious manner in which Cupid and his mistress force him to give it up.

cura: the πόνος, ἀγροπνία of good poetry; cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.206 (of the *Medicamina paruius, sed cura grande, libellus, opus*, *Pont.* 1.5.59ff. *quod uenit ex facili, satis est componere nobis, / et nimis intenti causa laboris abest. / cur ego sollicita poliam mea carmina cura?*

Tragoedia .../ creuit: as the following parenthesis establishes, Ovid is here declaring his success as a tragedian. The precise sense of this phrase is not, however, entirely clear. Hollis (1977) 150f., regarding *Tragoedia* as a personification, observes that “‘creuit’ would then bear a multiplicity of meanings in true Ovidian style: (a) “was increased” (the corpus of tragedy had one play added to it), (b) “gained in esteem”, (c) “swelled with pride”, (d) “grew larger” — perhaps one should think of deities who suddenly expand (e.g. Demeter in Callimachus, *hymn* 6 or Fama in *Aeneid* iv), also of figures like Horace, *Odes* i. 1. 35–6 “quodsi me lyricis uatibus inseres / sublimi feriam sidera uertice””. This last sense seems to offer particular wit: even without Ovid’s help, Tragedy had her buskins to boost her size, and, moreover, far from following convention in eschewing such a genre because of its ὕψος, Ovid boasts that he has increased its grandeur. Attractive as these suggestions may be, however, it is not inevitable that one should adopt Hollis’ view that Ovid is here responding to 3.1.29 (quoted below). For arguments that he ‘is pointing to a single, substantially-advanced, but still incomplete, play’, see Booth’s note.

huic operi quamlibet aptus eram: that Ovid should make such a boast perhaps suggests that his tragedy, if not yet published, was complete enough to have been recited to, and to have earned the approbation of, his *sodales*. For the *Medea*’s favourable reception, see the introduction (p. 384). Tragedy herself has high hopes for Ovid’s success in her genre: *nunc habeam per te Romana Tragoedia nomen! implebit leges spiritus iste meas* (3.1.29f.). Ovid ignores the convention of coy modesty; see on 2.1.12 (of his *Gigantomachia*) *satis oris erat* (a much more ingenious boast), and contrast Propertius’ excuse for not attempting epic at 3.9.4 *non sunt apta meae grandia uela rati* with Ovid’s reworking of that line both at 2.1.36 (to the heroes of epic) *non apta est gratia uestra mihi*, where he claims that the rewards for writing epic are not great enough (see the note), and at *Trist.* 2.548 *saepe dedi nostrae grandia uela rati*, where he boasts of having composed the *Fasti*, a tragedy or tragedies, and the *Metamorphoses*. For *opus* in the sense ‘genre’, cf. e.g. 3.1.6 (n.), 3.9.5 (to Elegy) *ille tui uates operis, tua fama*, Tibullus, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.67 *inlustrauerunt hoc opus Sophocles atque Euripides*, 69. The basic meaning, ‘work’, points to a contrast with line 3 *ignaua Veneris cessamus in umbra*; cf. 3.1.24 (Tragedy to Ovid) *cessatum satis est: incipe maius opus*, 69f. *quamlibet*: see on 1.7.66.

15–16. risit Amor: compare 1.1.3f., where Cupid mockingly disables Ovid’s epic, and 3.1.33, Elegy’s sly smile at Tragedy’s pretensions.

pallamque meam pictosque cothurnos/ sceptraque: for these attributes, see on 3.1.12–14. *pictos* emphasises the gorgeous splendour of Ovid’s apparel. Tragedy’s buskins are so described at 3.1.31, and Dionysus himself, the god of tragedy, is portrayed ἐρευθιόωντι κοθόρνῳ at Nonn. *Dion.* 18.200; see also *RE* 11.1524.41ff. The triple-*-que* is appropriately grand; see on 2.1.36.

priuata ... manu: for all that Ovid boasts of his aptitude for tragedy, nevertheless he was violating the conventions of the genre; cf. Hor. *Ars* 90f. *indignatur item priuatis ac prope socco/ dignis carminibus narrari cena Thyestae*. *priuata* implies a contrast with *regali*; cf. e.g. Liv. 2.2.3, Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.142, *Carm.* 1.37.31, *Fast.* 6.597, Sen. *Thy.* 218, *Ag.* 264, and see *TLL* 10.2.1390.50ff., 1396.52ff. For the royal sceptre of Tragedy, see on 3.1.13.

cito may, as Booth suggests, bear primarily the sense ‘readily’, rather than ‘early [sc. in Ovid’s poetic career]’; see *OLD* s.v. 4. (For speculation that this elegy, or at least this passage, may have appeared for the first time in the second edition, see the introduction [p. 385].) The temporal sense would not, however, be inappropriate, conveying a boastful assertion of Ovid’s precociousness as a tragedian. By contrast, the main argument of Tragedy’s speech in 3.1 is that he is too slow in turning to her genre; cf. 15f. *ecquis erit ... tibi finis amandi/ o argumenti lente poeta tui?* For the convention that different times of life are suited to composition in different genres, see on 3.1.27f. *quod tenerae cantent lusit tua Musa puellae/ primaque per numeros acta iuuenta suos*.

17–18. Cupid and his mistress together bring Ovid under their control (cf. Prop. 1.1.1ff., Tib. 2.4.1ff.), thereby, as in 2.1, determining the type of poetry which he should write.

hinc quoque refers primarily to the frustrating of Ovid’s epic (3ff.), but possibly alludes also to the opening of 2.1, in which he announces the poetry which Cupid and his mistress allow him to write: *hoc quoque composui .../ .../ hoc quoque iussit Amor*.

dominae numen: for the beloved as a goddess, see on 1.5.1–8. For *numen* in this context, cf. 3.3.12, 3.11.47, *Epist.* 13.157.

deduxit here means primarily ‘turned away’; cf. Prop. 2.25.9 *me ab amore tuo deducet nulla senectus*, *TLL* 5.1.276.80ff. Foreshadowing the pentameter, the sense ‘led in triumph’ is also present; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.31f. *deduci superbo/ ... triumpho*, *TLL* 274.51ff. The con-

trast between elegy and the grander genres of epic and tragedy may also remind us of the use of *deductus* as a metaphor applied to literature, in the sense 'fine-spun'; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.5 *deductum dicere carmen*, TLL 283.3ff.

iniquae: whereas the elegiac mistress might conventionally be described as cruel (cf. e.g. 2.17.5ff.), the girl has actually deflected Ovid from higher projects by more subtle tactics, tears, embraces and kisses. Perhaps we are to think particularly of Prop. 1.7.6 *aliquid durum quaerimus in dominam*, where Propertius explains his, self-imposed, confinement to love-elegy. Dr. Kraus suggests to me that Ovid may be hinting at the form of the elegiac couplet, the medium through which girls expected to be praised; cf. 3.1.8 (of Elegy) *pes illi longior alter erat*, Pont. 4.5.3 *longa uia est, nec uos* (sc. *leues elegi*) *pedibus procredit is aquis*.

deque cothurnato uate triumphat Amor: for Cupid in triumph over Ovid, see the introduction to 1.2. For *triumphare de* ..., cf. Prop. 2.8.40 *mirum, si de me iure triumphat Amor?*, OLD s.v. *triumpho* 1b, 4. *cothurnatus* occurs first here, at *Fast.* 5.348, *Ibis* 529 (*Lycophrona*), 593 (*uatem* [sc. Euripides]); see TLL 4.1086.35ff. For such noun-based adjectives occurring first or only in Ovid, see on 1.7.17 *uittatis*. *uate:* the dignity of the term emphasises the indignity of Ovid's subjection; see on 1.1.6.

19–20. On the work referred to in this couplet, see the introduction (pp. 385f.).

quod licet: a very particular application of the concept of *licentia uatum*, for which see on 3.12.41. Normally the emphasis is on freedom, here it is on restriction. Ovid's perspective is different again at 3.1.69f. *teneri properentur Amores, dum uacat*; whereas he here chafes at his restriction to love in the lower genres, there he has bargained to be allowed to continue with love for a little longer. This line is related to that passage not only in sense but also in the similarity in sound and structure of *profitemur* and *properentur*; see on 2.17.34.

artes teneri profitemur Amoris: for *artes* (-em) *profiteri* used of expounding doctrines, cf. Cic. *Brut.* 48, *Tusc.* 2.12 *labitur* (sc. *philosophus*) *artemque uitae professus delinquit in uita*, TLL 2.668.82ff., OLD s.v. *profiteor* 5b. At *Ars* 2.639 *nos etiam ueros parce profitemur amores* and *Fast.* 6.573 *dum dea furtiuos timide profitetur amores*, the verb seems to mean rather 'avow'. Némethy suggests that Ovid may here have in mind Tib. 1.4.77ff. *me, qui spernentur, amantes/ consultant: cunctis ianua nostra patet/ tempus erit, cum me Veneris prae-*

cepta ferentem/ deducat inuenum sedula turba senem. As professor, Ovid is able to salvage some slight dignity, but even that is lost in the exclamation in the pentameter.

ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis! for such interjections, see on 1.4.45f. *ei mihi*: see on 1.6.52.

21–22. aut quod Penelopes uerbis reddatur Vlixi: the names of Penelope and Ulysses occupy the same line-positions at line 29 below, *Epist.* 1.1 and *Pont.* 4.16.13 (both quoted on 29–30). Ovid varies the construction, with only the nominative *Penelope* occurring twice. For such parallelism, see also on 26. *quod .../ .../ quod ... et quod .../ .../ quodque ...*: cf. 32 *quodque legat Phyllis*, Auson. *Epigr.* 103.12ff. (referring to the *Heroides*) *quod sibi suaserunt Phaedra et Elissa dabunt/ quod Canace Phyllisque et fastidita Phaoni*. *Penelopes uerbis*: not simply 'on behalf of Penelope' (cf. *Epist.* 16.71, *Met.* 4.154, *Trist.* 1.1.15 *uade, liber, uerbisque meis loca grata saluta*, OLD s.v. *uerbum* 14); the epistle purports to be written in Penelope's own words. *reddatur* is here used primarily in the sense 'deliver', *qua* letter, but the sense 'set forth (in writing)' is also present; see OLD s.v. 12, 13.

scribimus: the verb suits both letter-writing and poetic composition. For the present tense, see on 11f.

lacrimas: the lamentations of Phyllis (and Hypsipyle, alluded to in the next line) were proverbial; see Kissel on Persius 1.34f. *Phyllidas, Hypsipylas, uatum et plorabile siquid/ eliquat*. In *Epist.* 2, Phyllis' complaints against Demophoon are more prominent than her tears. The first hemistich of *Epist. Sapph.* 97 is closely comparable: *scribimus et lacrimis oculi rorantur abortis*.

Phylli relictas: the pathos of Phyllis' situation is emphasised by the apostrophe, a device used only here in these catalogues of epistles. For the Greek vocative, see on 2.8.2 *Cypassi*.

23–24. male gratus Iason: Ovid is probably referring not only, as line 33 indicates, to *Epist.* 6, from Hypsipyle, but also to *Epist.* 12, from Medea, who taxes Jason particularly for his ingratitude; cf. 23ff., 126, 208, the only passages in the *Heroides* where *ingratus* is found. The authenticity of Medea's letter has been questioned more strongly than that of any other of the epistles not specifically included in this catalogue, but these suspicions seem unwarranted; see Heinze (1991–3) and (1997) 51ff., Hinds (1993). *male gratus* occurs also at *Epist.* 7.27 (Dido to Aeneas), with erotic connotations, as here; see on 1.10.43. For this rather colloquial use of *male*, see on 3.7.77 *male sane*. For the spelling *Iason* as at 2.14.33 see Gould (1965) 13f.

Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque: for the mannered phrasing, of a type eschewed by Propertius at 2.24C.43f. *paruo dilexit spatio Minoida Theseus,/ Phyllida Demophoon* (sc. *filius Thesei*), *hospes uterque malus*, see on 2.11.36 *Nereidesque deae Nereidumque pater*.

25–26. tenens strictum ... ensem: cf. *Epist.* 7.185ff. *adspicias utinam quae sit scribentis imago;/ scribimus et gremio Troicus ensis adest;/ perque genus lacrimae strictum labuntur in ensem,/ qui iam pro lacrimis sanguine tinctus erit*, Verg. *Aen.* 4.645ff. *altos/ conscendit* (sc. Dido) *furibunda rogos ensemque recludit/ Dardanium, non hos quaesitum munus in usus*. As again in the same context at *Epist.* 7.197 (= *Fast.* 3.549) and *Ars* 3.39, Ovid prefers the stylistically elevated *ensis* to the normal prose term, *gladius*; see Oakley on Liv. 7.10.9.

Dido miserabilis: cf. *Fast.* 3.545 *arserat Aeneae Dido miserabilis igne*. As at 31 below and *Epist.* 7.9, Vergil's Dido is *miser(rim)a*; cf. *Aen.* 1.344, 719, 4.117, 315, 420, 429. Both epithets connote not only her tragic doom but also her sufferings in love.

dicat: Dido's letter is presented as a speech, with few epistolary conventions; see Knox on *Epist.* 7.4 (6) *alloquor*.

Aoniam Lesbis amica lyram (sc. *tenens*): it seems reasonable to assume that, just as there are verbal correspondences between lines 21 and 29 (see on 21), at the beginning of the respective catalogues, so Ovid marked their conclusion in the same manner here and in line 34. Confusion in the tradition, however, perhaps arising from scribal enhancement of this parallelism, and problems of interpretation leave the text of both lines uncertain; see Dörrie (1975) 187ff., Tarrant (1981) 148ff., Primmer (1982) 253f., Heldmann (1994) 211ff., Rosati (1996b) 209f. Despite the textual difficulties, however, there seems to be no good case (*pace* Tarrant) for doubting that Ovid is referring to Sappho in both lines. The authenticity of the extant *Epistula Sapphus* has, however, been much debated, ever since the poem first became known again in the 15th century; see Tarrant (1981), Murgia (1985), Knox (1995) 12ff., Rosati (1996b). I accept the arguments of those who, on textual, stylistic, linguistic and metrical grounds, deny Ovidian authorship, even though this puts an agonising strain on credibility, requiring an assumption that the genuine *Epistula Sapphus* was quickly lost without trace and supplanted by a not unaccomplished substitute. *Aoniam Lesbis amica lyram* is Goold's modification ([1965] 42f.) of Bornecque's *Aoniam Lesbis amata lyram*. With this reading, Goold detects a reference to the legend of Sappho's leap from the Leucadian Rock, lyre in hand, just as Dido writes while holding Aeneas' sword.

Booth, however, may be right to object that *amica* 'does not provide a satisfying contrast with *amata* in v. 34: something indicating Sappho's rejection or frustration is required', but her hesitantly proposed *omissa* carries little conviction. *Aoniam ... lyram*: cf. 1.1.12, Prop. 1.2.28. *Lesbis*: for this form, cf. 34, *Epist.* 3.36, *Fast.* 2.82, *Epist. Sapph.* 100, 199, 200, 201, and see also on 22 *Phylli* and 1.2.47 *Gangetide*.

27–34. On Sabinus, see the introduction. The notion that he has arrived as a messenger from all corners of the world varies the conceit of the poet doing what he describes being done; see on line 2. (At *Pont.* 4.16.13 [quoted on 29f.], Sabinus is promoted from messenger to instigator of Ulysses' letter.) Here, Ovid is complimenting him on his ingenuity in devising replies to the *Epistulae Heroidum*. The similarity, however, of *quam cito* (27) to *tam cito* in line 16, where Ovid reports his abortive attempt at tragedy, may suggest a degree of criticism of the speed of Sabinus' composition. We may fairly wonder what some of Sabinus' heroes might have found to say in their replies. Unlike Ovid's own double *Epistles*, especially those between Paris and Helen and between Acontius and Cydippe, in which the hero's letter invites a reply from the heroine, there can be little verisimilitude in, for example, a reply from Aeneas to Dido, or from Demophoon to Phyllis, since the letters of both those heroines announce their imminent death. *si modo uiuit* (sc. *Phyllis*) in line 32 seems to draw attention to this difficulty. It is not known how many *Epistulae Heroum* Sabinus wrote. From the context here, one might suppose just a few, as a *jeu d'esprit*, but *Pont.* 4.16.13f. (see the introduction [p. 386]) seems to suggest a substantial collection.

27. meus ... Sabinus: 'my dear friend Sabinus'; see on 3.9.62 *cum Caluo, docte Catulle, tuo*, and on 30 below, *Hippolyto ... suo*.

29–30. Ulysses' reply to Penelope represents Sabinus' collection at *Pont.* 4.16.13f. *et qui Penelopae rescribere iussit Vlixem,/ errantem saeue per duo lustra mari*. It is reasonable to infer from its prominence here and its citation there that it appeared first in Sabinus' *Epistulae Heroum*, matching the prominence of Penelope's letter in Ovid's collection.

candida is often used to denote a radiant complexion; see on 1.5.10. At the end of her letter to Ulysses, Penelope expresses her anxiety that she has lost her youthful beauty: *certe ego, quae fueram te discedente puella,/ protinus ut uenias, facta uidebor anus* (*Epist.* 1.115f.). Here, however, the epithet probably refers to her proverbial chastity; cf.

[Tib.] 3.10.17f. *at nunc tota tua est, te solum candida secum/ cogitat* with Tränkle's note, *TLL* 3.244.43ff. Pace Franciscus and Burman, there is no need to emend to *callida*, suggesting an allusion to the weaving of Laertes' shroud.

signum cognouit Vlixis: Penelope has recognised Ulysses' seal on the letter; cf. e.g. Plaut. *Curc. Argum.* 4, *Pseud.* 987f. *cedo mi epistulam./ — accipe et cognosce signum*, 1002. Ovid is, however, alluding to Hom. *Od.* 19.250 σήματ' ἀναγνώσῃ τὰ οἱ ἔμπεδα πέφραδ' Ὀδυσσεύς, where Penelope hears a report about her husband from Odysseus in the guise of Aethon the Cretan (= a messenger like Sabinus). The same line occurs at 23.206, where Odysseus proves his identity to Penelope. We may perhaps think also, more readily but less appositely, of the nurse Eurycleia's recognition of Odysseus by the scar above his knee (19.390ff.); for *signum* referring to a scar, cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 1073 (in a recognition-scene) *signum esse oportet in manu laeva tibi*, *OLD* s.v. 3c. *Vlixis:* Ovid favours this form of the genitive; see Goold (1967) 121, Bömer on *Met.* 14.159. Here, he may have wished particularly to avoid matching the dative *Vlixī* of line 21; for variation between these lines, see the note *ad loc.*

ab Hippolyto ... suo: the combination of name and personal pronoun is appropriate to the epistolary context; cf. *Epist.* 1.1 *Hanc tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Vlixē*, *OLD* s.v. *suus* 7. Here, the pronoun has erotic connotations; see on 1.15.30 *sua ... Lycoris*. Along with *nouerca*, however, it also emphasises the incestuous nature of the liaison, such pronouns often denoting familial ties; see on 1.8.42 *at Venus Aeneae regnat in urbe sui*. At *Epist.* 4.164 *seruiat Hippolyto regia tota meo*, the sense is both 'my darling Hippolytus' and also 'Hippolytus, if only he would agree to be mine'.

31–32. iam pius Aeneas ... rescipsit: for Aeneas' *pietas*, his most distinctive attribute in the *Aeneid*, see Pease on 4.393ff., where his devotion to higher obligations forces him to leave Dido: *at pius Aeneas, quamquam lenire dolentem/ solando cupit et dictis auertere curas,/ multa gemens magnoque animum labefactus amore/ iussa tamen diuum exsequitur classemque reuisit.* *iam* is doubtless to be construed with the verb, as at *Fast.* 1.527f. and 3.601f., the two other passages in which Ovid uses the hemistich *i. p. A.* Here, however, the juxtaposition to *pius* may suggest a fleeting hope for Dido, that Aeneas now regards his duty as requiring him to return to her. Simply to receive a reply did not, in any case, ensure happiness; cf. 33 *tristis ... littera*.

miserac ... Elissae: see on 25 *Dido miserabilis*. For *Elissa* as a metrically convenient alternative to *Dido*, especially in the oblique cases, see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.335.

si modo uiuit: this qualification, as applicable to Dido as to Phyllis, occurs in an epistolary context also at *Epist.* 10.75 and *Trist.* 4.3.20.

33–34. tristis ... littera: Sabinus' Jason presumably informed Hypsipyle of his new liaison with Medea, whose charms she dreads so much in *Epist.* 6. For *tristis* in the active sense 'bringing sorrow', see on 1.12.1 *tristes ... tabellae*. He may also have informed her of Medea's murder of the children, a realisation of Hypsipyle's curse at *Epist.* 6.151ff. For *littera* meaning 'epistle', see on 1.12.2.

dat uotam Phoebō Lesbīs amata lyram: if the text is correct (see on 26), it seems that Sabinus' Sappho dedicates her lyre to Apollo, whether as god of poetry or as god of the Leucadian region, in thanks for Phaon's reciprocation of her love. The purpose of leaping from the Leucadian Rock, however, was normally considered to be to obtain relief from the sufferings of love either through death or through the removal of one's own passion; see Rosati (1996b) 210. In the extant *Epistula Sapphus*, Sappho's leap is imminent when she announces the dedication of her lyre to Apollo (181ff.).

35–40. Propertius had exploited the standard antithesis between epic and love-elegy in the Ponticus-poems of his *Monobiblos*, teasing his friend that he would have to give up his *Thebaid* when he fell in love; see the introduction. Now, perhaps more than fifteen years later, the *Aeneid* had been published. Vergil's Dido-episode was influenced strongly by Apollonius' portrayal of Medea's passion for Jason and drew heavily on the language and conventions of contemporary love-elegy. The distinctions between the genres were no longer as clear-cut as they had been. Just as Ovid himself and Sabinus recount the amatory adventures of epic heroes and heroines in their *Epistulae Hero(id)um*, so Macer, being of an amatory disposition (that is the implication of *si bene te noui* [39]), is able to emphasise the erotic aspects of his Trojan epic without transgressing generic proprieties (see on 35 *tutum*). At *Pont.* 2.10.17f., Ovid again suggests a literary rapport between himself and Macer, but in a rather more serious vein: *sunt tamen inter se communia sacra poetis,/ diuersum quamuis quisque sequamur iter.*

35–36. nec tibi .../ ... Amor: these words, positioned at the beginning and end of their sentence and line, perhaps, as is noted by Neumeister (1984) 101f., signal a further allusion to the Propertian model. Macer

may write on amatory themes even while continuing his epic, whereas Propertius had warned Ponticus that, once he has fallen in love, his epic will be useless and Cupid will give him no inspiration for love-poetry: *longe castra tibi, longe miser agmina septem/ flebis in aeterno surda iacere situ;/ et frustra cupies mollem componere uersum/ nec tibi subiciet carmina serus Amor* (1.7.17ff.).

tutum: for the 'preservation' of generic or stylistic proprieties, cf. e.g. Hor. *Ars* 27f. (*uates*) *professus grandia turget;/ serpit humi tutus nimium timidusque procellae*, 266, [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 19, 41, 78, 85 ἐντοι δὲ καὶ ἀσφαλίζονται τὰς μεταφορὰς ἐπιθέτοις ἐπιφερομένοις, ὅταν αὐτοῖς κινδυνώδεις δοκῶσιν. In the opening couplet, Macer had been represented as being personally involved in the Trojan War (see on line 2). If that same conceit is felt here, *tutum* is nicely paradoxical, for it is warfare, not love, which is perilous; contrast e.g. Prop. 3.3.23f. *alter remus aquas, alter tibi (sc. carmina amatoria scribenti) radat harenas;/ tutus eris: medio maxima turba mari est*.

uati: there is a certain degree of irony in Ovid's use here, where he is advocating the development of love-themes, of a term particularly appropriate to composition in the elevated genres; see on 1.1.6.

arma canenti, like *induis arma uiris* in line 2, may allude to the opening words of the *Aeneid*. The shared allusion will emphasise Ovid's return to direct comment on Macer's own poetry. For such ring-composition, see on 38 *uiro* and 2.8.28 *modis*.

aureus: for Cupid so termed, see on 1.2.42. Here, we are possibly to recall that Homer designates Aphrodite as χρυσοῖ at *Il.* 5.427, when he has Zeus warn her not to meddle in warfare.

in medio Marte: Cupid is a peaceful god; see on 1.10.19 *nec Venus apta feris Veneris nec filius armis* and 3.2.50 *media pace repertus amor*. For the phrasing, with alliteration here adding emphasis, see 1.6.30 *in media pace* and 2.17.24 *medio ... foro* (nn.), *TLL* 8.586.56ff.

tacetur: might Ovid be adapting and perverting Cicero's famous *silent ... leges inter arma* (*Mil.* 11)? Passive forms of *tacere*, although generally rare (Plaut. *Pers.* 246, Ter. *Eun.* 108, Cicero 5 times), occur in Ovid also at *Epist.* 9.90, 17.55, *Ars* 2.607, *Met.* 10.502, *Fast.* 3.721, *Trist.* 5.3.38, 5.14.33 (praising his wife's chastity along with that of, *inter alias*, Laodamia [cf. 38]), but he uses a passive form of the prosodically equivalent *silere* only at *Fast.* 1.47.

37–38. A fine contrast: whereas adulterous passion led Helen to accompany Paris to Troy, thus causing the Trojan War, marital fidelity led Laodamia to accompany her husband in death, when Protesilaus

was the first Greek to be killed at Troy. As Ovid was to point out in his defence of his own amatory poetry, the adulterous relationship between Helen and Paris is fundamental to the *Iliad*: *Ilias ipsa quid est aliud nisi adultera, de qua inter amatores pugna uirumque fuit?* (*Trist.* 2.371f.) Homer refers to Protesilaus' ἀμφιδρυφῆς ἄλοχος (*Il.* 2.700), but the legend, best known to us from Catull. 68.73ff. and Ovid's *Epist.* 13, seems to have developed at a later period; see Fedeli on Prop. 1.19.7–10. Euripides' *Protesilaus* was probably very influential; the catalogue of tragedies with amatory content at *Trist.* 2.381ff., including this legend at 403f., seems to draw particularly on Euripides. Laodamia's letter is not mentioned in this poem (but see below, on *adultera* and the pentameter). Nevertheless, it is not improbable that the whole collection of single *Epistles* had already been written; see the introduction (p. 386). A reference to two of the *Epistles* here (Oenone's letter being dominated by her anxieties about Helen) would emphasise the unexpected similarities between Ovid and Macer in their literary pursuits in different genres.

illic: 'in that story (*uel sim.*)'; cf. *Fast.* 1.9 (dedicating the *Fasti* to Germanicus) *inuenies illic et festa domestica uobis*, *Pont.* 3.4.44, Varro *Ling.* 9.7, Sen. *Epist.* 95.2, *TLL* 7.1.371.82ff.

adultera: Ovid uses the term much more frequently than do the other major Augustan poets. *adulter* (subst.): Ov. 23 (5), Verg. 2 (*Aen.* 10.92, of Paris, 11.268, of Aegisthus), Hor. 9 (7), Tib. 0, Prop. 0; *adultera* (subst.): Ov. 13 (3), Verg. 0, Hor. 1 (*Carm.* 3.3.25, of Helen), Tib. 0, Prop. 1 (4.7.57 [*lect. dub.*]); *adulter* (adj.): Ov. 4 (0), Verg. 0, Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 1 (2.34.7, of Paris); *adulterium*: Ov. 15 (7), Verg. 1 (1), Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 1. Horace has the Greek subst. *moechus* 5 (1) times, *moecha* at *Sat.* 1.4.113, *moechor* at *Sat.* 1.2.49; Propertius has *moecha* at 4.5.44, in a reference to Greek comedy. *adultera* is used of Helen in the *Heroides* by Oenone (5.125), Laodamia (13.131) and Helen herself (17.219), as also in the synopsis of the *Iliad* at *Trist.* 2.371 (quoted above). She had been termed *abducta ... moecha* at Catull. 68.103, in a passage echoed in the pentameter.

nobile crimen may be construed with both *Paris* and *adultera*, thereby denoting their behaviour as a notorious scandal. It seems preferable, however, to regard the phrase as appositional to *adultera* alone; for this personal use of *crimen*, see on 2.17.25 *non tibi crimen ero*. Ovid (23) has written a letter from Oenone to Paris (and there may have been a response by Sabinus); if *nobile crimen* refers to Helen alone, it may reflect Oenone's anxieties about her rival's regal status. At *Epist.* 16.296, Paris beseeches Helen: *tua sim quaeso crimina solus ego*. The

strongest support for construing *crimen* personally here, however, comes from the similarly phrased *Epist.* 9.53 *una* (sc. *Iole*), *recens crimen, referetur adultera nobis*, where the personal usage seems assured by the parallelism with the preceding hexameter: *non tibi crimen erunt, Teuthrantia turba, sorores. nobile*: Helen's adultery was not only 'infamous' (cf. *Trist.* 2.384 *nobilis est Canace fratris amore sui*, Tarrant on *Sen. Ag.* 566 *scelere Lemnon nobilem*) but also a fit subject for epic (see van Dam on *Stat. Silu.* 2.7.114 *te* [sc. *Lucan*] *nobile carmen insonantem*). The latter implication, however, runs somewhat counter to Ovid's attempt to emphasise the affinities between Macer's epic and his own amatory poetry; for *nobilis* used of epic in contrast to love-elegy, cf. *Rem.* 395f. *tantum se nobis elegi debere fatentur, quantum Vergilio nobile debet epos* (Muretus; *opus codd.*).

et comes extincto Laodamia uiro = *Trist.* 1.6.20 (with *aut* replacing *et*). As probably also at *Epist.* 13.1f. *Mittit et optat amans, quo mittitur, ire salutem/ Haemonis Haemonio Laodamia uiro*, Ovid's model is Catull. 68.80 *docta est amisso Laodamia uiro. comes*: cf. *Epist.* 13.161f. (Laodamia's oath to Protesilaus) *me tibi uenturam comitem, quocumque uocaris, siue ... quod heu! timeo — siue superstes eris, Ars* 3.17f. *respice Phylaciden, et quae comes isse marito/ fertur et ante annos occubuisse suos, Pont.* 3.1.109f. *si comes extincti manes sequerere mariti/ esset dux facti Laodamia tui*, also *Met.* 4.151f. (Thisbe to Pyramus) *persequar extinctum letique miserrima dicar/ causa comesque tui*, 11.705 (Alcyone to Ceyx) *tibi nunc saltem ueniam comes*, and see further on 3.9.65 *his comes umbra tua est*. For the spelling *Laodamia*, see Goold (1958) 113. *uiro*, signifying *Protesilaus*, may allude to *prima ... uiris* in line 2; for such verbal ring-composition, see on 35 *arma canenti* and 2.8.28 *modis*.

39–40. si bene te noui: Ovid testifies to his close friendship with Macer in *Pont.* 2.10; see the introduction. For the rather colloquial idiom, see on 1.2.43 *si te bene nouimus*. At *Ars* 3.51f., urging him to complement the first two books by composing an *Ars Amatoria* for women also, Venus says to Ovid: *si bene te noui (cultas ne laede puellas)/ gratia, dum uiues, ista petenda tibi est*. At *Epist.* 79.7, Seneca writes to Lucilius: *aut ego te non noui aut Aetna tibi saluam mouet; iam cupis grande aliquid et par prioribus scribere*. At 3.68.11f., Martial comments on the newly aroused literary interests of a *matrona*: *si bene te noui, longum iam lassa libellum/ ponebas, totum nunc studiosa leges*.

istis: the pronoun often strikes a colloquial and disparaging note; see on 1.8.35 and 57. Here, Ovid seems to be stating a preference for love over war as a theme for poetry, while acknowledging the higher status of the latter.

dicis: the verb suits composition in the highest genres; cf. *Prop.* 1.7.1 (quoted on 1^o–4), and see on 2.1.11 *caelestia dicere bella*.

a uestris in mea castra uenis: cf. *Prop.* 4.1.135 (Horos to Propertius) *at tu finge elegos, fallax opus (haec tua castra!)*, *Fast.* 3.173f. *nunc primum studiis pacis deus utilis armis* (sc. *Mars*) *aduocor, et gressus in noua castra fero*, *Cic. Fam.* 9.20.1, *Hor. Carm.* 3.16.22ff., *Sen. Epist.* 2.5 *hodiernum hoc est quod apud Epicurum nactus sum (soleo enim et in aliena castra transire, non tamquam transfuga, sed tamquam explorator)*, *Dial.* 12.5.2. For the *castra Amoris*, see on 1.2.32. Ovid is here cleverly inverting the military metaphor of deserting Love (see on 2.9.3 [to Cupid] *miles numquam tua signa reliqui*), suggesting that Macer will desert to love-poetry. The image will be particularly apposite if Ovid's addressee is to be identified with the Macer of *Tib.* 2.6; see the introduction (p. 383). *uestris* refers to epic poets in general, and is not, *pace* Lenz, equivalent to *tuis* (see on 2.5.14). *mea*: this poem may well have been written when Ovid was the sole survivor of the quartet of great love-elegists (cf. *Trist.* 2.445ff., 4.10.51ff.), and could regard the genre as his own domain. Heinsius, assuming the Macer of *Tib.* 2.6 to be the same man as Ovid's addressee and to have deserted love-elegy in favour of martial epic, advocates *redis* (ς) rather than *uenis* (PYSς); see the introduction (p. 383).

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

(A) Editions and Commentaries

The following editions of and commentaries on the *Amores* are generally referred to by author's name alone. I have included only those works which I have found most useful. More detailed information about the older editions is provided by Munari (cited below) *xli* f.

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Heinsius | <i>Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis editio nova.</i> Nic. Heinsius Dan. f. recensuit ac notas addidit. Amsterdam, 1661 (<i>Amores</i> Vol. 1, 119ff., notes 193ff.) |
| Burman | <i>P. Ovidii Nasonis opera omnia cum integris</i> Micylli, Ciofani et Dan. Heinsii notis et Nic. Heinsii curis secundis, cura et studio Petri Burmanni. Amsterdam, 1727 (<i>Amores</i> Vol. 1, 321ff.) |
| Riese | <i>P. Ovidius Naso</i> , ed. A. Riese. Leipzig, 1871–4 (<i>Amores</i> Vol. 1 [1871]) |
| Ehwald | <i>P. Ovidius Naso</i> ex R. Merkelii recognitione ed. R. Ehwald, (<i>Amores</i> Vol. 1, 1ff.) Leipzig, 1888 |
| Edwards | <i>P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores</i> , ed. G.M. Edwards in <i>Corpus poetarum Latinorum</i> ed. J.P. Postgate, Vol. 1, 354ff. London, 1894 |
| Martinon | <i>P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores, Les Amours d'Ovide.</i> Traduction littérale en vers français avec un texte revu, un commentaire explicatif et archéologique par Ph. Martinon. Paris, 1897 |
| Némethy | <i>P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores</i> edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit Geyza Némethy. Budapest, 1907 |
| Brandt | <i>P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres</i> erklärt von Paul Brandt. Leipzig, 1911 |
| Showerman | <i>Ovid, Herioides and Amores</i> with an English translation by Grant Showerman. London–Cambridge, Mass., 1914 (2nd ed., revised by G.P. Goold, 1977) |
| Bornecque | <i>Ovide: les Amours.</i> Texte établi et traduit par Henri Bornecque. Paris, 1930 |
| Munari | <i>P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores:</i> testo, introduzione, traduzione e note di Franco Munari. Florence, 1951 (I refer to the 5th ed., 1970) |

- Marg-Harder *P. Ovidius Naso, Liebesgedichte. Amores* lateinisch und deutsch von Walter Marg und Richard Harder. Munich, 1956 (7th ed., 1992)
- Kenney *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris* edidit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit E.J. Kenney. Oxford, 1961 (I generally refer to the 2nd ed., 1994 [corrected 1995])
- Lenz *Ovid, Die Liebeslegien* lateinisch und deutsch von Friedrich Walter Lenz. Berlin, 1965 (3rd ed., 1976)
- Lee *Ovid's Amores*. English translation by Guy Lee with Latin text. London, 1968
- Goold See Showerman
- Bertini *P. Ovidio Nasone Amori* a cura di Ferruccio Bertini. Milan, 1983
- Booth *Ovid: the Second Book of Amores*. Edited with translation and commentary by Joan Booth. Warminster, 1991
- Ramírez de Verger-Socas *Publio Ovidio Nasó: Obra Amatoria I: Amores*. Latin text by A. Ramírez de Verger, translated by F. Socas. Madrid, 1991

(B) Other Works Cited

This is not a bibliography. It is intended simply to give fuller details of works generally cited in this volume either by author's name and date of publication or, in the case of commentaries, by author's name and a reference to the text. Abbreviations for periodicals are either those of *L'Année philologique* or more explicit.

- Adams, J.N. (1973). 'Two Latin words for "kill"', *Glotta* 51.280–92
- , (1982). *The Latin sexual vocabulary*. London
- , (1990). 'The uses of *neco* I', *Glotta* 68.230–55
- , (1991). 'The uses of *neco* II', *Glotta* 69.94–123
- Ahern, C.F., Jr. (1987). 'Ovid, *Amores* 2.7.27f.', *CJ* 82.208–9
- Alfonsi, L. (1959). 'Ovidio, *Amores*, II, 16, 11–12', *Latomus* 18.800–1
- Allen, A. (1975). 'The moon's horses', *CQ* n.s. 25.153–5
- Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P.J. and Nisbet, R.G.M. (1979). 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrīm', *JRS* 69.125–55 (= Nisbet [1995] 101–31)
- Antony, H. (1976). *Humor in der augusteischen Dichtung. Lachen und Lächeln bei Horaz, Propertius, Tibullus und Vergil*. Hildesheim
- Arens, J.C. (1950). '-fer and -ger. Their extraordinary preponderance among compounds in Roman poetry', *Mnemosyne* 3.241–62
- Arnott, W.G. (1996). *Alexis. The fragments*. Cambridge (CCTC 31)
- Audollent, A. (1904). *Defixionum tabellae*. Paris

- Austin, R.G. (1955). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*. Oxford
- , (1964). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*. Oxford
- , (1968). 'Ille ego qui quondam ...', *CQ* n.s. 18.107–15
- , (1971). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*. Oxford
- Axelsson, B. (1945). *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund
- Bachrens, A. (1893). *Catulli Veronensis liber*, 2nd ed. Leipzig
- Bailey, C. (1947). *Titus Lucretius Carus De rerum natura libri sex*. Oxford
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. (1979). *Romans and aliens*. London
- Barchiesi, A. (1984). 'Centum ora' in *Enciclopedia Vergiliana*, I 737f. Rome
- , (1992). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum I–3*. Florence
- , (1994). Review of Booth's commentary (1991), *Gnomon* 66.588–92
- Barr, W. et al. (1976). 'Topics in Horace, Odes 1.29', *LCM* 1.78–84
- Barrett, W.S. (1964). *Euripides: Hippolytos*. Oxford
- Barsby, J.A. (1996). 'Ovid's *Amores* and Roman Comedy', *PLLS* 9.135–57 (*ARCA* 34)
- Baumeister, A. (1885–8). *Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums*. Munich–Leipzig
- Beck, M. (1996). *Die Epistulae Heroidum XI'III und XIX des Corpus Ovidianum*. Paderborn (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* 1, 11)
- Bednara, E. (1906). 'De sermone dactylicorum Romanorum quaestiones', *ALL* 14.317–60, 532–604
- Bentley, R. (1728). *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, 3rd ed. Amsterdam
- Berger, A. (1953). *An encyclopaedic dictionary of Roman law*. *TAPhS* n.s. 43, Part 2
- Berres, T. (1992). *Vergil und die Helenaszene*. Heidelberg
- Bertini, F. (1984). 'Ovidio, o dell' ambiguità', *Vichiana* n.s. 13.3–4
- Bigwood, J.M. (1993). 'Ctesias' parrot', *CQ* n.s. 43.321–7
- Birt, T. (1876). *Ad historiam hexametris Latini symbola*. Diss. Bonn
- Blänsdorf, J. (1995). *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum*. Stuttgart–Leipzig
- Blockley, R.C. (1983). *The fragmentary classicising historians of the later Roman empire II: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*. Liverpool (*ARCA* 10)
- Blok, J.H. (1995). *The early Amazons*. Leiden (*Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* 120)
- Blümner, H. (1911). *Die römischen Privataltertümer*. Munich
- Bobrowski, A. (1991). 'The propemptikon in the Augustan poetry (Hor. Od. III 27; Prop. I 8; Ovid. Am. II 11: a comparative study)', *Eos* 79.203–15
- Bömer, F. (1957–8). *P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten*. Heidelberg
- , (1969–86). *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. Heidelberg

- , (1974). 'Der Kampf der Stiere', *Gymnasium* 81.503–13
- Bond, G.W. (1963). *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Oxford
- Bonneau, D. (1964). *La crue du Nil, divinité égyptienne, à travers mille ans d'histoire (332 av. – 641 ap. J.-C.)*. Paris (*Études et commentaires* 52)
- Bonner, S.F. (1949). *Roman declamation in the late Republic and early Empire*. Liverpool
- Booth, J. (1981). 'Aspects of Ovid's language', *ANRW* II 31.4.2686–700
- , (1982). 'Two notes on the text of Ovid's *Amores*', *CQ* n.s. 32.156–8
- , (1983). 'Double-entendres in Ovid, *Amores* 2.3', *LCM* 8.101–2
- , (1992). 'Ovid *Amores* 2.13.17–18: *quae Oedipum requirant interpretem*', *CPh* 87.241–6
- Booth, J. and Verity, A.C.F. (1978). 'Critical appreciations IV: Ovid, *Amores* 2.10', *G&R* 25.125–40
- Bormmann, F. (1968). *Callimachi hymnus in Dianam*. Florence
- Boucher, J.-P. (1965). *Études sur Properce. Problèmes d'inspiration et d'art*. Paris
- Boyd, B.W. (1987). 'The death of Corinna's parrot reconsidered: poetry and Ovid's *Amores*', *CJ* 82.199–207
- Brandt, P. (1902). *P. Ovidi Nasonis De arte amatoria libri tres*. Leipzig
- Bréguet, E. (1960). 'In una parce duobus. Theme et clichés' in *Hommages à L. Hermann*, Brussels, 205–14 (*Coll. Latomus* 44)
- Bright, D.F. (1978). *Haec mihi fingebam. Tibullus in his world*. Leiden (*Cincinnati classical studies* n.s. 3)
- Brink, C.O. (1971). *Horace on poetry 2. The ars poetica*. Cambridge
- , (1982). *Horace on poetry 3. Epistles Book 2: the letters to Augustus and Florus*. Cambridge
- Brown, R.D. (1987). *Lucretius on love and sex: a commentary on De rerum natura IV, 1030–1287*. Leiden
- Brunt, P.A. (1971). *Italian manpower 225 B.C.–A.D. 14*. Oxford
- Buchheit, V. (1962). *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum*. Munich (*Zetemata* 28)
- , (1966). 'Mythos und Geschichte in Ovids *Metamorphosen* 1', *Hermes* 94.80–108
- , (1972). *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgika*. Darmstadt (*Impulse der Forschung* 8)
- , (1988). 'Priapeum 3 und Ovid', *RhM* 131.157–61
- Büchner, K. (1965). 'Die Elegien des Lygdamus', *Hermes* 93.65–112, 503–8 (= *Studien zur römischen Literatur* VIII, Wiesbaden [1970], 116–77)
- Buckland, W.W. (1921). *A text-book of Roman law from Augustus to Justinian*. Cambridge (3rd ed., revised by P. Stein, 1963)
- Bühler, W. (1960). *Die Europa des Moschos*. Wiesbaden (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 13)
- Burnyeat, M.F. (1997). 'Postscript on silent reading', *CQ* n.s. 47.74–6

- Cahoon, L. (1984). 'The parrot and the poet: the function of Ovid's funeral elegies', *CJ* 80.27–35
- , (1985). 'A program for betrayal. Ovidian *nequitia* in *Amores* 1.1, 2.1, and 3.1', *Helios* 12.29–39
- , (1988). 'The bed as battlefield: erotic conquest and military metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*', *TAPhA* 118.293–307
- , (1991). '*Psittacus redux*: Boyd's bird and mine (or, some thoughts on aims and methods in literary studies)', *CJ* 86.368–76
- Cairns, F. (1969). 'Propertius i. 18 and Callimachus, *Acontius and Cydippe*', *CR* n.s. 20.131–4
- , (1972). *Generic composition in Greek and Roman poetry*. Edinburgh
- , (1976). 'The distaff of Theogenis – Theocritus *Idyll* 28', *PLS* 1.293–305 (*ARCA* 2)
- , (1979a). *Tibullus: a Hellenistic poet at Rome*. Cambridge
- , (1979b). 'Self-imitation within a generic framework: Ovid, *Amores* 2.9 and 3.11 and the *renuntiatio amoris*' in *Creative imitation and Latin literature*, edd. A.J. Woodman and D. A. West, Cambridge, 121–41
- Califf, D.J. (1997). '*Amores* 2.1.7–8: a programmatic allusion by anagram', *CQ* n.s. 47 (forthcoming)
- Cameron, A. (1995). *Callimachus and his critics*. Princeton
- Campbell, M. (1994). *A commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica III 1–471*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 141)
- Camps, W.A. (1954). 'Critical notes on some passages in Ovid', *CR* n.s. 4.203–7
- Casali, S. (1995). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula IX: Deianira Herculi*. Florence
- Ceașescu, G. (1991). 'Un topos de la littérature antique: l'éternelle guerre entre l'Europe et l'Asie', *Latomus* 50.327–41
- Citroni, M. (1975). *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber primus*. Florence
- Clark, S.B. (1908). 'The authorship and the date of the double letters in Ovid's *Heroides*', *HSPH* 19.121–55
- Clausen, W.V. (1955). '*Silva coniecturarum*', *AJPh* 76.47–62
- , (1994). *A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford
- Cleasby, H.L. (1907). *De Seneca tragico Ovidii imitatore*, Diss. Harvard
- Coleman, K.M. (1988). *Statius. Silvae IV*. Oxford
- Colton, R.E. (1967). '“Parrot poems” in Ovid and Statius', *CB* 43.71–8
- Conte, G.B. (1986). *The rhetoric of imitation. Genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets*. Ithaca–New York (*Cornell studies in classical philology* 44)
- Coppola, G. (1931). 'Gli epigrammi sepolcrali incisi sulle pareti della grotta della vipera presso Cagliari', *Rend. Acc. Lincei* 7.388–437
- Corbett, P.E. (1930). *The Roman law of marriage*. Oxford

- Costa, C.D.N. (1973). *Seneca: Medea*. Oxford
- Courtney, E. (1965). 'Ovidian and non-Ovidian *Heroides*', *BICS* 12.63–6
- , (1980). *A commentary on the satires of Juvenal*. London
- , (1988). 'Some literary jokes in Ovid's *Amores*' in *Vir bonus discendi peritus: Studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday*, ed. N. Horsfall, London, 18–23 (*BICS* Suppl. 51)
- , (1990). *P. Papini Stati Silvae*. Oxford
- , (1993). *The fragmentary Latin poets*. Oxford
- Crawford, M.H. (1996). *Roman statutes*. London (*BICS* Suppl. 64)
- Cunningham, M.P. (1949). 'Some poetic uses of the singular and plural of substantives in Latin', *CPh* 44.1–14
- Curley, D. (1997). 'Ovid, *Met.* 6.640: a dialogue between mother and son', *CQ* n.s. 47.320–2
- Currie, H. MacL. (1973). 'Propertius IV. 8: a reading', *Latomus* 32.616–22
- Dahlmann, H. (1975). *Cornelius Severus*. Wiesbaden (*Mainzer Abhandlungen* 6)
- Damon, C. (1990). 'Poem division, paired poems, and *Amores* 2.9 and 3.11', *TAPhA* 120.269–90
- Daremberg, C. and Saglio, E. (1877–1919). *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*. Paris
- Davis, J.T. (1977). *Dramatic pairings in the elegies of Propertius and Ovid*. Bern–Stuttgart (*Noctes Romanae* 15)
- , (1981). 'Risit Amor: aspects of literary burlesque in Ovid's "*Amores*"', *ANRW* II 31.4.2460–2506
- Della Corte, F. (1971). 'La Gigantomachia di Ovidio' in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio De Falco*, Naples, 437–45 (= *Opuscula* 4.1–9 [1973], Genoa)
- , (1972). 'L'annuncio delle *Heroides*', *GIF* 24.314–22 (= *Opuscula* 11.101–9 [1988])
- , (1985). 'L'elegia della lontananza' in *Hommage à Jean Granarolo*, ed. R. Braun, 367–71 (*AFLNice* 50) (= *Opuscula* 10.151–5 [1987])
- Denniston, J.D. (1939). *Euripides: Electra*. Oxford
- , (1954). *The Greek particles*, 2nd ed. Oxford
- Deroux, C. (ed.) (1979). *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history*. Brussels (*Coll. Latomus* 164)
- Dewar, M. (1996). *Claudian. Panegyricus de sexto consulatu Honorii Augusti*. Oxford
- Dickie, M.W. (1996). 'An ethnic slur in a new epigram of Poscidippus', *PLLS* 9.327–36 (*ARCA* 34)
- Diggle, J. (1969). 'Marginalia Euripidea', *PCPhS* n.s. 15.30–59 (= [1994] 5–33)
- , (1970). *Euripides: Phaethon*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 12)
- , (1972). 'Ovidiana', *PCPhS* n.s. 18.31–41
- , (1980). 'Notes on Ovid's *Tristia*, Books I–II', *CQ* n.s. 30.401–19
- , (1981). *Studies on the text of Euripides*. Oxford
- , (1983). 'Corinna's bed (*Amores* 2.11.7)', *PCPhS* n.s. 29.21–2
- , (1984). 'The manuscripts and text of *Medea*: II. The text', *CQ* n.s. 34.50–65 (= [1994] 273–97)
- , (1994). *Euripidea. Collected essays*. Oxford
- Dimundo, R. (1991). 'L'ingenuo rivale e il silenzio richiesto (Ovid., *Am.* 1.4; 2.5)' in *Ovidio, poeta della memoria. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Sulmona, 19–21 ottobre 1989*, ed. G. Papponetti, Sulmona, 275–91
- Dodds, E.R. (1960). *Euripides: Bacchae*, 2nd ed. Oxford
- Dombart, B. (1886). 'Historia', *ALL* 3.230–4
- Dörrie, H. (1971). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum*. Berlin (*Texte und Kommentare* 6)
- , (1975). *Der Brief der Sappho an Phaon*. Munich (*Zetemata* 58)
- Dover, K.J. (1978). *Greek homosexuality*. London (2nd ed., Cambridge, Mass. 1989)
- Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. (1976–7). 'Virgil's fifth *Eclogue*', *PVS* 16.18–41
- , (1981). 'Virgil's first *Eclogue*', *PLLS* 3.29–182 (*ARCA* 7)
- , (1984). 'Horace and Maecenas: the propaganda value of *Sermones* I' in *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus*, edd. A.J. Woodman and D.A. West, Cambridge, 19–58
- Duc, O.S. (1980). 'Amores und Abtreibung: Ov. *AM.* II 13 & 14', *C&M* 32.133–50
- , (1981). 'Ovid's *Amores* and abortion', *Mosaic* 12.37–53 (Differences between these articles are slight.)
- Dunbar, N. (1995). *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford
- Edwards, C. (1993). *The politics of immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge
- Eingartner, J. (1991). *Isis und ihre Dienerinnen in der Kunst der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 115)
- Enk, P.J. (1932). *Plauti Mercator*. Leiden
- , (1946). *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos)*. Leiden
- , (1962). *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber secundus*. Leiden
- Ernout, A. (1958). 'Les enclitiques -que et -ue', *RPh* 32.189–97
- Eschenburg, F.B. (1876). *Metrische Untersuchungen über die Aechtheit der Heroides des Ovid*. Berlin
- Esteve Forriol, J. (1962). *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz*. Diss. Munich
- Evans, S. (1971). 'Odyssean echoes in Propertius IV. 8', *G&R* n.s. 18.51–3
- Fantham, E. (1982). *Seneca's Troades*. Princeton
- , (1992). *Lucan. De bello civili Book II*. Cambridge

- Fedeli, P. (1980). *Sesto Propertio: il primo libro delle elegie*. Florence
- , (1984). *Sexti Properti elegiarum libri IV*. Stuttgart
- , (1985). *Propertio: il libro terzo delle elegie*. Bari
- Feeney, D.C. (1986). 'Epic hero and epic fable', *Comparative Literature* 38.137–58
- Flidner, H. (1974). *Amor und Cupido: Untersuchungen über den römischen Liebesgott*. Meisenheim (*Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 53)
- , (1975). 'Ohne Liebe ein Gott: Überlegungen zu Ovid *am.* 2,9,25f.' in *Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien zur augusteischen Zeit. Kieler Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Lefèvre. Amsterdam, 432–5
- Flury, P. (1988). 'Osculum und osculari. Beobachtungen zum Vokabular des Kusses im Lateinischen' in *Scire litteras. Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, edd. S. Krämer and M. Bernhard, Munich. 149–57
- Fordyce, C.J. (1961). *Catullus: a commentary*. Oxford
- , (1977). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri VII–VIII*. Oxford (Glasgow University publications)
- Fraenkel, E. (1950). *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Oxford
- , (1951). Review of Munari's 1st edition (1951), *Athenaeum* 29.349–52
- , (1957). *Horace*. Oxford
- Fränkel, H. (1945). *Ovid: a poet between two worlds*. Berkeley–Los Angeles (*Sather classical lectures* 18)
- , (1962). *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, 2nd ed. Munich (= *Early Greek poetry and philosophy* [1975] Oxford)
- Frank, M. (1995). *Seneca's Phoenissae*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 138)
- Fraser, P.M. (1972). *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford
- Frécaut, J.-M. (1972). *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide*. Grenoble
- Friedrich, W.-H. (1956). 'Episches Unwetter' in *Festschrift Br. Snell*, Munich, 77–87
- Führer, R. (1972). 'Ov. *Am.* II 10, 9', *Hermes* 100.408–12
- Galasso, L. (1995). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber II*. Florence
- Galinsky, G.K. (1969). *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome*. Princeton (*Princeton monographs in art and archaeology* 40)
- Gamel, M.-K. (1989). 'Non sine caede: abortion, politics and poetics in Ovid's *Amores*', *Helios* 16.183–206
- Gauly, B.M. (1990). *Liebeserfahrungen. Zur Rolle des elegischen Ich in Ovids Amores*. Frankfurt am Main
- Gavrilov, A.K. (1997). 'Techniques of reading in classical antiquity', *CQ* n.s. 47.56–73
- Gelzer, T. (1975). *Musaeus: Hero and Leander*. Cambridge, Mass. (*Loeb classical library* 421)

- Giangrande, G. (1974). 'Los tópicos helenísticos en la elegía latina', *Emerita* 42.1–36 (= *Scripta minora Alexandrina* 2, Amsterdam [1981], 463–98)
- , (1981). 'Hellenistic topoi in Ovid's *Amores*', *MPhil.* 4.25–51 (= *Scripta minora Alexandrina* 4, Amsterdam [1985], 515–41)
- Gibson, R.K. (1995). 'How to win girlfriends and influence them: *amicitia* in Roman love elegy', *PCPhS* 41.62–82
- Goetz, G. (1899). *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum*. Leipzig
- Goldberg, C. (1992). *Carmina Priapea*. Heidelberg
- Goodyear, F.R.D. (1965). *Incerti auctoris Aetna*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 2)
- , (1966). *Ciris*, in *Appendix Vergiliana*, edd. W.V. Clausen et al. Oxford
- Goold, G.P. (1958). 'A new text of Catullus', *Phoenix* 12.93–116
- , (1965). 'Amatoria critica', *HSPH* 69.1–107
- , (1966). 'Noctes Propertianae', *HSPH* 71.59–106
- , (1967). Review of *P. Ovidi Nasonis Remedia Amoris, Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, ed. F.W. Lenz, Turin (1965), *AJPh* 88.120–2
- , (1970). 'Servius and the Helen-episode', *HSPH* 74.101–68 (= *Oxford readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, ed. S.J. Harrison, Oxford [1990], 60–126)
- , (1985). *M. Manilii Astronomica*. Leipzig
- Görler, W. (1965). 'Ovids *propemptikon* (*Amores*, 2.11)', *Hermes* 93.338–47
- Gow, A.S.F. (1952). *Theocritus*, 2nd ed. Cambridge
- , (1955). 'Two epigrams by Diotimus', *CR* n.s. 5.238–41
- , (1965). *Machon*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 1)
- Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L. (1965). *The Greek anthology: Hellenistic epigrams*. Cambridge
- Grassmann, V. (1966). *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz. Literarischer Hintergrund und sprachliche Tradition*. Munich (*Zetemata* 39)
- Green, P. (1982). *Ovid: the erotic poems*. London
- Green, R.P.H. (1991). *The works of Ausonius*. Oxford
- Griffin, J. (1985). *Latin poets and Roman life*. Oxford
- Guzzo, P.G. (1971). 'La collezione di antichità Antinelli a Ronciglione', *ArchClass* 23.241–51
- Hall, J.B. (1975). 'Varia critica', *PACA* 13.11–4
- , (1983). 'Ovid *Amores* II. ix. 23–24', *PACA* 17.63
- , (1995). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia*. Stuttgart–Leipzig
- Handford, S.A. (1947). *The Latin subjunctive. Its usage from Plautus to Tacitus*. London
- Hardie, A. (1983). *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, patrons and epideixis in the Graeco-Roman world*. Liverpool (*ARCA* 9)
- Hardie, P.R. (1986). *Virgil's Aeneid: cosmos and imperium*. Oxford
- Hardy, W.G. (1923). 'On Ovid *Am.* ii. 19 and iii. 4', *CPh* 18.263–4
- Harris, W.V. (1989). *Ancient literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.

- Haupt, M. and Ehwald, R. (1966). *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen*, with corrections and bibliographical additions by M. von Albrecht. Zurich-Dublin
- Häussler, R. (1976). *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike. I. Teil: von Homer zu Vergil*. Heidelberg
- Headlam, W. and Knox, A.D. (1922). *Herodas: the mimes and fragments*. Cambridge
- Heinemann, M. (1910). *Epistulae amatoriae quomodo cohaereant cum elegiis Alexandrinis*. Diss. Strassburg
- Heinze, T. (1991-3). 'The authenticity of Ovid *Heroides* 12 reconsidered', *BICS* 38.94-7
- , (1997). *P. Ovidius Naso. Der XII. Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 170)
- Heldmann, K. (1982). 'Ovid über den Pfau — zum Lobe der Schönheit', *Hermes* 110.375-80
- , (1994). 'Ovids Sabinus-Gedicht (am. 2,18) und die "Epistulae Heroidum"', *Hermes* 122.188-219
- Henderson, A.A.R. (1979). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Remedia amoris*. Edinburgh
- Henderson, J. (1987). *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*. Oxford
- Henderson, J.G.W. (1991). 'Wrapping up the case: reading Ovid, *Amores*, 2, 7 (+ 8) I', *MD* 27.39-88
- , (1992). 'Wrapping up the case: reading Ovid, *Amores*, 2, 7 (+ 8) II', *MD* 28.27-83
- Henry, J. (1873-92). *Aeneidea*. London-Edinburgh-Dublin
- Herescu, N.I. (ed.) (1958). *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide*. Paris
- Herrlinger, G. (1930). *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung*. Stuttgart (*Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 8)
- Heubeck, A. and Hockstra, A. (1989). *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey IX-XVI*. Oxford
- Heubner, H. (1963-82). *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Die Historien*. Heidelberg
- Heydenreich, T. (1970). *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt*. Heidelberg
- Heyob, S.K. (1975). *The cult of Isis among women in the Graeco-Roman world*. Leiden (*Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* 51)
- Heyworth, S.J. (1995). 'Propertius: division, transmission, and the editor's task', *PLLS* 8.165-85 (*ARCA* 33)
- Hill, D.E. (1973). 'The Thessalian trick', *RhM* 116.221-38
- Hill, W.C.O. (1954). 'Longevity in psittacine birds', *The Avicultural Magazine* 60.165
- Hiltbrunner, O. (1970). 'Ovids Gedicht vom Siegelring und ein anonymes Epigramm aus Pompei', *Gymnasium* 77.283-99
- , (1981). 'Die neue Lesung des pompeianischen Epigramms vom Siegelring', *Gymnasium* 88.45-53
- Hinds, S.E. (1987). 'Generalising about Ovid', *Ramus* 16.4-31
- , (1993). 'Medea in Ovid: scenes from the life of an intertextual heroine', *MD* 30.9-47
- Hintermeier, C.M. (1993). *Die Briefpaare in Ovids Heroides*. Stuttgart (*Palingenesia* 41)
- Hofmann, J.B. (1951). *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, 3rd ed. Heidelberg
- Hollis, A.S. (1970). *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book VIII*. Oxford
- , (1977). *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book I*. Oxford
- , (1990). *Callimachus: Hecale*. Oxford
- Holzenthals, E. (1967). *Das Krankheitsmotiv in der römischen Elegie*. Diss. Cologne
- Hopkinson, N. (1982). 'Juxtaposed prosodic variants in Greek and Latin poetry', *Glotta* 60.162-77
- , (1984). *Callimachus: hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 27)
- Horsfall, N. (1971). 'Incedere and incessus', *Glotta* 49.145-7
- , (1990). 'Virgil and the illusory footnote', *PLLS* 6.49-63 (*ARCA* 29)
- , (1991). *Virgilio: l'epopea in akambicco*. Naples (*Forme, materiali e ideologie del mondo antico* 31)
- Housman, A.E. (1890). 'Notes on Latin poets II', *CR* 4.340-2 (= [1972] 132-5)
- , (1894). 'The manuscripts of Propertius III', *JPh* 22.84-128 (= [1972] 314-47)
- , (1896). 'Cicero *Pro Milone* c. 33.90', *CR* 10.192-3 (= [1972] 378-9)
- , (1900). 'Elucidations of Latin poets II', *CR* 14.257-9 (= [1972] 519-22)
- , (1903-30). *M. Manilii Astronomicon libri*. Cambridge
- , (1909). 'VENER = TVTS', *CQ* 3.244-8 (= [1972] 790-4)
- , (1910). 'Greek nouns in Latin poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal', *JPh* 31.236-66 (= [1972] 817-39)
- , (1923). 'Notes on Seneca's tragedies', *CQ* 17.163-72 (= [1972] 1073-84)
- , (1926). *M. Annaei Lucani belli civilis libri decem*. Oxford
- , (1930). 'The Latin for "ass"', *CQ* 24.11-3 (= [1972] 1163-5)
- , (1933). 'Notes on the *Thebais* of Statius I', *CQ* 27.1-16 (= [1972] 1197-1222)
- , (1972). *The classical papers of A.E. Housman*, edd. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear. Cambridge
- Hunter, R.L. (1983). *Eubulus: the fragments*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 24)
- Hutchinson, G.O. (1988). *Hellenistic poetry*. Oxford
- Innes, D.C. (1979). 'Gigantomachy and natural philosophy', *CQ* n.s. 29.165-71
- Jacobson, H. (1974). *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton

- Jäger, F. (1913). *Das antike Propemptikon und das 17. Gedicht des Paulinus von Nola*. Diss. Munich
- Jäger, K. (1967). *Zweigliedrige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare bei Propertius und in Ovids Amores*. Diss. Tübingen
- Jäkel, S. (1964). *Menandri sententiae*. Leipzig
- Jakobi, R. (1988). *Der Einfluss Ovids auf den Tragiker Seneca*. Berlin (*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 28)
- Jax, K. (1938). *Der Frauentypus der römischen Dichtung*. Innsbruck–Leipzig
- Jocelyn, H.D. (1967). *The Tragedies of Ennius*. Cambridge (CCTC 10)
- , (1980). 'On some unnecessarily indecent interpretations of Catullus 2 and 3', *AJPh* 101.421–41
- Kambitsis, J. (1972). *L'Antiope d'Euripide*. Athens
- Kassel, R. (1958). *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*. Munich (*Zetemata* 18)
- Kassel, R. and Austin, C.F.L. (1983–). *Poetae comici Graeci*. Berlin–New York
- Kaster, R.A. (1995). *Suetonius: de grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Oxford
- Kay, N.M. (1985). *Martial Book XI*. London
- Keller, A. (1988). *Die Abortiva in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Stuttgart (*Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Pharmazie* 46)
- Keller, O. (1909–13). *Die antike Tierwelt*. Leipzig
- Kenney, E.J. (1955). 'The tradition of Ovid's *Amores*', *CR* n.s. 5.13–4
- , (1957). 'Palinode', *CR* n.s. 7.16
- , (1958). 'Notes on Ovid', *CQ* n.s. 8.54–66
- , (1959). 'Notes on Ovid: II', *CQ* n.s. 9.240–60
- , (1962). 'The manuscript tradition of Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars amatoria*, and *Remedia amoris*', *CQ* n.s. 12.1–31
- , (1964). 'Two footnotes', *CR* n.s. 14.13
- , (1966). Review of Lilja (1965), *CR* n.s. 16.411–2
- , (1969). 'Ovid and the law', *YClS* 21.243–63
- , (1971). *Lucretius: De rerum natura Book III*. Cambridge
- , (1972). Review of Bömer (1969–86), Vol. I, *CR* n.s. 22.38–42
- , (1990a). *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche*. Cambridge
- , (1990b). Introduction and notes to Melville (1990).
- , (1996). *Ovid: Heroides XVI–XXI*. Cambridge
- Keppie, L. (1983). *Colonisation and Veteran settlement in Italy, 47–14 B.C.* London
- Ker, A. (1958). 'Notes on some passages in the amatory poems' in Herescu (ed.), 224–8
- Keul, M. (1989). *Liebe im Widerstreit: Interpretationen zu Ovids Amores und ihrem literarischen Hintergrund*. Frankfurt am Main

- Kienast, D. (1965). 'Rom und die Venus vom Eryx', *Hermes* 93.478–89
- Kiessling, A. and Heinze, R. (1968). *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden*. 13th ed. Dublin–Zürich
- Kim, M.I. (1992). 'A parrot and piety: Alcuin's nightingale and Ovid's *Amores* 2.6', *Latomus* 51.881–91
- Kindstrand, J.K. (1981). *Anacharsis. The legend and the Apophthegmata*. Uppsala
- Kissel, W. (1990). *Aulus Persius Flaccus: Satiren*. Heidelberg
- Kleingünther, A. (1933). Ἡρώτος εὑρητής. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*. *Philologus* Suppl. 26.1
- Knoche, U. (1932). Review of Bornecque's edition of the *Amores*, *Gnomon* 8.518–29
- Knox, P.E. (1986). *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the traditions of Augustan poetry*. Cambridge (PCPhS Suppl. 11)
- , (1991). Review of this edition, Vols. 1 and 2, *CPh* 86.239–48
- , (1995). *Ovid, Heroides. Select epistles*. Cambridge
- Kölblinger, G. (1971). *Einige Topoi bei den lateinischen Liebesdichtern*. Vienna (*Dissertationen der Universität Graz* 15)
- Korzeniewski, D. (1964). 'Ovids elegisches Proömium', *Hermes* 92.182–213
- , (1971). *Hirtengedichte aus neronischer Zeit*. Darmstadt (*Texte zur Forschung* 1)
- , (1976). 'Dulce malum. Ein unbeachtetes Sprichwort und das Lucilius-Fragment 1097 M', *Gymnasium* 83.289–94
- Kost, K. (1971). *Musaios: Hero und Leander*. Bonn (*Abhandlungen zur Kunst-, Musik- und Literaturwissenschaft* 88)
- Krahe, H. (1949–50). 'Der Ortsname Sulmo und seine Verwandten', *Beiträge zur Namensforschung* 1.180–7
- Kraus, C.S. (1994). *Livy: Ab urbe condita Book 17*. Cambridge
- Kraus, W. (1958). 'Forschungsbericht: Ovid', *AHIG* 11.130–46
- Krenkel, W. (1971). 'Erotica I: Der Abortus in der Antike', *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock* 20.443–52
- Kühn, W. (1970). 'Die Meerfahrt der Corinna. Ovid, *am.* 2, 11' in *Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Karl Büchner*, ed. W. Wimmel, Wiesbaden, II 151–7
- Labate, M. (1977). 'Tradizione elegiaca e società galante negli *Amores*', *SCO* 27.283–339
- , (1984). *L'arte di farsi amare: modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana*. Pisa
- Lachmann, K. (1853). *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex*, 2nd ed. Berlin
- Laguna Mariscal, G. (1989). 'El texto de Ovidio, *Amores* II 10, 9 y el tópico del *navigium amoris*', *Emerita* 57.309–15
- Landgraf, G. (1898). 'Der Accusativ der Beziehung (*determinationis*)', *ALL* 10.209–24

- Langen, P. (1896). *C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo*. Berlin
- La Penna, A. (1951). 'Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina', *Maia* 4.187-209
- Lateiner, D. (1978). 'Ovid's homage to Callimachus and Alexandrian poetic theory (*Am.* 2.19)', *Hermes* 106.188-96
- , (1990). 'Mimetic syntax: metaphor from word order, especially in Ovid', *AJPh* 111.204-37
- Lattimore, R. (1942). *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*. Urbana (Illinois studies in language and literature 28)
- Laughton, E. (1948). 'Flavus pudor', *CR* 62.109-11
- , (1950). 'Flavus again', *CR* 64.88-9
- Lausberg, M. (1973). 'Iuppiter in manibus (*Ov. am.* 2, 1, 15)', *MH* 30.122-5
- Lease, E.B. (1900). 'Zur Konstruktion von licet', *ALL* 11.9-26
- Lebek, W.D. (1976). 'Ein lateinisches Epigramm aus Pompei und Ovids Gedicht vom Siegelring (*Am.* 2.15)', *ZPE* 23.21-40
- Le Boeuffe, A. (1977). *Les noms latins d'astres et de constellations*. Paris
- Lee, A.G. (1962). 'Tenerorum lusor Amorum' in *Critical Essays on Roman literature: Elegy and Lyric*, ed. J.P. Sullivan, London, 149-79
- Lefèvre, E. (1989). *Das Bild-Programm des Apollo-Tempels auf dem Palatin*. Konstanz (*Xenia* 24)
- Lejay, P. (1911). *Horace: Satires*. Paris
- Lenz, F.W. (1938). 'Parerga Ovidiana', *RAL* ser. 6 13.320-410
- , (1939). 'Ovid: Bericht über das Schrifttum der Jahre 1928-1937', *Jahresbericht für Altertumswissenschaft* 264.1
- , (1959). 'Io ed il paese di Sulmona (*Amores* II, 16)' in *Atti del convegno internazionale ovidiano, Sulmona 1958* II 59-68. Rome (= [1972] 241-50)
- , (1962). 'Noch einmal Io ed il paese di Sulmona (*Ovid Amores* II, 16)', *RCCM* 4.150-3 (= [1972] 334-7)
- , (1965). 'Ovidio, *Amores* 2.2 e 3, una sola poesia?', *Maia* 17.119-24 (= [1972] 449-54)
- , (1972). *Opuscula selecta*. Amsterdam
- Leo, F. (1878). *De Senecae tragoediis observationes criticae*. Berlin
- , (1912). *Plautinische Forschungen. Zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. Berlin
- Lewis May, J. (1925). *The art of love. Ovid*. London
- Lewy, H. (1929). 'Philologisches aus dem Talmut', *Philologus* 84.377-98
- Lieberg, G. (1982). *Poeta creator: Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung*. Amsterdam
- Lilja, S. (1965). *The Roman elegists' attitude to women*. Helsinki
- Lindsay, W.M. (1903). *Nonii Marcelli de compendiosa doctrina libri XX*. Leipzig

- , (1913). *Sexti Pompei Festi de uerborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig
- Livrea, E. (1973). *Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon liber quartus*. Florence
- Lobel, E. and Page, D.L. (1955). *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*. Oxford
- Löfstedt, E. (1956). *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, 2 Vols. (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.) Lund
- Lörscher, G. (1975). *Der Aufbau der drei Bücher von Ovids Amores*. Amsterdam (*Neuremata* 3)
- Low, R. (1986). *Parrots. Their care and breeding*, 2nd ed. Poole, Dorset
- Luck, G. (1961). *Die römische Liebeselegie*. Heidelberg
- , (1962). 'Beiträge zum Text der römischen Elegiker', *RhM* 105.337-51
- , (1963). Review of Kenney's 1st edition of the *Amores* etc., *Gnomon* 35.256-62
- , (1964). *Über einige Interjektionen der lateinischen Umgangssprache. Kritische Beiträge zu Plautus und Terenz*. Heidelberg
- , (1967-77). *P. Ovidius Naso: Tristia*. Heidelberg
- , (1969). *The Latin love elegy*, 2nd ed. London
- , (1970). 'Der Dichter zwischen Elegie und Epos' in *Antike Lyrik*, ed. W. Eisenhut, Darmstadt, 462-79
- Lucke, C. (1982). *P. Ovidius Naso. Remedia Amoris: Kommentar zu Vers 397-814*. Diss. Bonn
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1978). *Ciris: a poem attributed to Vergil*. Cambridge (CCTC 20)
- , (1980). *The Latin love poets from Catullus to Horace*. Oxford
- Macleod, C.W. (1976). 'Propertius 2.26', *SO* 51.131-6 (= *Collected essays*, ed. O. Taplin, Oxford [1983], 196-201)
- , (1977). 'The poet, the critic, and the moralist: Horace, *Epistles* 1.19', *CQ* n.s. 27.359-76 (= [1983] 262-79)
- Madvig, J.N. (1873). *Adversaria critica*, Vol. 2. Copenhagen
- , (1876). *Cicero: De finibus bonorum et malorum*, 3rd ed. Copenhagen
- Magnus, H. (1923). Review of Némethy (1922) etc., *Phil. Woch.* 43.485-91
- Maltby, R. (1991). *A lexicon of ancient Latin etymologies*. Leeds (ARCA 25)
- Mangoni, C. (1993). *Filodemo. Il quinto libro della poetica (PHerc. 1425 e 1538)*. Naples (*La Scuola di Epicuro* 14)
- Mankin, D. (1995). *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge
- Manning, R.C. (1893). 'On the omission of the subject-accusative of the infinitive in Ovid', *HSPH* 4.117-41
- Marchionni, R. (1996). 'morem gerere', *MD* 36.197-210
- Markland, J. (1728). *P. Papinii Statii libri quinque Silvarum*. London (*Editio auctor indicibusque instructa* Dresden-London 1827)
- Marshall, F.H. (1907). *Catalogue of the finger rings, Greek, Etruscan and Roman, in the departments of antiquities, British Museum*. London

- Martini, E. (1933). *Einleitung zu Ovid*. Prague
- Martyn, J.R.C. (1981). 'Naso — *Desultor amoris* (*Amores* I–III)', *ANRW* 31.4.2436–59
- Marx, F. (1904–5). *C. Lucilii carminum reliquiae*. Leipzig
- Mayor, J.E.B. (1886–9). *Thirteen satires of Juvenal*, 4th ed. London
- McKewen, J.C. (1979). 'Augustan elegy and mime', *PCPhS* n.s. 25.71–84
- McKie, D.S. (1984). 'The horrible and ultimate Britons: Catullus 11.11', *PCPhS* n.s. 30.74–8
- Meiggs, R. (1982). *Trees and timber in the ancient Mediterranean world*. Oxford
- Melville, A.D. (1990). *Ovid. The love poems* (with an introduction and notes by E.J. Kenney). Oxford
- Merkelbach, R. and West, M.L. (1967). *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford
- Mette-Dittmann, A. (1991). *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus*. Stuttgart (*Historia Einzelschr.* 67)
- Miller, J.F. (1993). 'Ovidian allusion and the vocabulary of memory', *MD* 30.153–64
- Mills, S. (1978). 'Ovid's donkey act', *CJ* 73.303–6
- Mineur, W.H. (1984). *Callimachus: hymn to Delos*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 73)
- Mora, F. (1990). *Prosopografia Isiaca*. Leiden (*Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* 113, 1–2)
- Morford, M.P.O. (1967). *The poet Lucan: studies in rhetorical epic*. Oxford
- Morgan, K. (1977). *Ovid's art of imitation: Propertius in the Amores*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 47)
- , (1991). 'Ovid, *Amores* 2.13.18: a solution', *CW* 85.95–100
- Morgan, M.G. (1975). 'Three non-Roman blood sports', *CQ* n.s. 25.117–22
- Most, G.W. (1979). 'Three textual notes on Ovid's *Amores*' in Deroux (ed.), 356–72
- Müller, L. (1856). 'De Ovidi Amorum libris', *Philologus* 11.60–91, 192
- , (1863). 'Zur Kritik des ersten Theils der ovidischen Dichtungen', *Philologus* 18.71–90
- Munari, F. (1949). 'Codici heinsiani degli "*Amores*"', *SlF-C* 24.161–5
- Murgatroyd, P. (1980). *Tibullus I*. Pietermaritzburg
- , (1984). 'Genre and themes in Ovid *Amores* 2.15', *EMC* 28.51–5
- , (1994). *Tibullus: Elegies II*. Oxford
- , (1995). 'The sea of love', *CQ* n.s. 45.9–25
- Murgia, C.E. (1985). 'Imitation and authenticity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1.477 and *Heroides* 15', *AJPh* 106.456–74
- Myers, K.S. (1990). 'Ovid's *tecta ars: Amores* 2.6, "programmatics and the parrot"', *EMC* 34.367–74
- Mynors, R.A.B. (1990). *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford

- Nardi, E. (1971). *Procurato aborto nel mondo greco-romano*. Milan
- Navarro Antolin, F. (1996). *Lygdamus. Corpus Tibullianum III.1 6. Lygdami Elegiarum liber*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 154)
- Némethy, G. (1922). *Supplementum commentariorum ad Ovidii Amores, Tristia et Epistulas ex Ponto*. Budapest
- Neue, F. and Wagener, C. (1892–1905). *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, 3rd ed. Berlin
- Neumann, R. (1919). *Qua ratione Ovidius in Amoribus scribendis Propertii elegiis usus sit*. Diss. Göttingen
- Neumeister, C. (1982). 'Mimesis und imitatio in Ovids Elegie Am. 2, 18', *A&A* 28.94–102
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (1961). *Cicero. in L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*. Oxford
- , (1987). 'The oak and the axe: symbolism in Seneca *Hercules Oetaeus* 1618 ff.' in *Homo viator, Classical essays for John Bramble*, edd. Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie and Mary Whitby, Bristol, 243–51 (= [1995] 202–12)
- , (1990). 'Cola and Clausulae in Cicero's speeches', in *Owls to Athens, Essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. E.M. Craik, Oxford, 349–59 (= [1995] 312–24)
- , (1995). *Collected papers on Latin literature*, ed. S.J. Harrison. Oxford
- Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1970). *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*. Oxford
- , (1978). *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*. Oxford
- Norden, E. (1913). *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig–Berlin
- , (1927). *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI*, 3rd ed. Berlin
- Oakley, S.P. (1997–). *A commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*. Oxford
- O'Hara, J.J. (1996). *True names. Virgil and the Alexandrian tradition of etymological wordplay*. Michigan
- Oliver, R.P. (1958). 'Ovid in his ring (*Amores* 2. 15. 9–26)', *CPh* 53.103–6
- , (1969). 'The text of Ovid's *Amores*' in *Classical studies presented to Ben Edwin Perry*, Urbana, 138–64 (*Illinois studies in language and literature* 58)
- O'Neil, E.N. (1967). 'Tibullus 2.6: a new interpretation', *CPh* 62.163–8
- Opelt, I. (1965). *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen. Eine Typologie*. Heidelberg
- Otto, A. (1890). *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig, with Nachträge ed. R. Häussler (1968), Darmstadt
- Owen, S.G. (1915). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis. Ex Ponto libri quattuor, Halieutica, fragmenta*. Oxford
- , (1916). 'Emendations of Latin poets', *CQ* 10.222–4
- , (1924). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium liber secundus*. Oxford
- Page, D.L. (1938). *Euripides: Medea*. Oxford

- , (1981). *Further Greek epigrams*. Cambridge
- Palmer, A. (1896). *Catulli Veronensis liber*. Oxford
- , (1898). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides*. Oxford
- Parker, D. (1969). 'The Ovidian coda', *Arion* 8.80–97
- Paul, G.M. (1984). *A historical commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum*. Liverpool (ARCA 13)
- Pease, A.S. (1935). *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*. Cambridge, Mass.
- , (1955). *M. Tulli Ciceronis De natura deorum*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Peck, W. (1960). *Griechische Grabgedichte*, Berlin (*Schriften und Quellen der antiken Welt* 7)
- Pelling, C.B.R. (1988). *Plutarch: Life of Antony*. Cambridge
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949–53). *Callimachus*. Oxford
- Pfister, F. (1915). 'Hat Ovid eine Gigantomachie geschrieben?', *RhM* 70.472–4
- Pichon, R. (1966). *Index verborum amatoriorum*. Hildesheim (= *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores*. Diss. Paris [1902] 75–303)
- Pinotti, P. (1988). *Publio Ovidio Nasone: Remedia amoris*. Bologna
- Platnauer, M. (1948). 'Elision of *atque* in Roman poetry', *CQ* 42.91–3
- , (1951). *Latin elegiac verse. A study of the metrical usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid*. Cambridge
- Platner, S.B. and Ashby, T. (1929). *A topographical dictionary of ancient Rome*. Oxford
- Pöschl, V. (1959). 'Ovid und Horaz', *RCCM* 1.15–25 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. W.-L. Liebermann, Heidelberg [1979], 1257–67)
- Postgate, J.P. (1899). 'Operatus and operari', *JPh* 26.314–20
- Powell, J.G.F. (1988). *Cicero: Cato maior de senectute*. Cambridge (CCTC 28)
- Powell, J.U. (1925). *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford
- Prato, C. (1964). *Gli epigrammi attribuiti a L. Anneo Seneca*. Rome
- Preisendanz, K. (1974). *Papyri Graecae magicae*, 2nd ed. Stuttgart
- Primmer, A. (1982). 'Datierungs- und Entwicklungsfragen bei Vergil und Ovid', *WS* n.s. 16.245–59
- Quinn, K. (1963). 'Persistence of a theme: the *propempticon*' in id., *Latin Explorations*, London, 239–73
- Ramírez de Verger, A. (1988). 'The text of Ovid, *Amores* 2.13.17–18', *AJPh* 91.86–91
- Rappold, J. (1881). 'Textkritisches zu Ovid's Schriften', *Zeitschr. öst. Gymn.* 32.801–17
- Rawson, E. (1987). 'Discrimina ordinum: the *lex Julia theatralis*', *PBSR* 55.83–114 (= *Roman culture and society. Collected papers*, Oxford 1991, 508–45)
- Reed, J.D. (1997). *Bion of Smyrna: the fragments and the Adonis*. Cambridge (CCTC 33)

- Reeve, M.D. (1973). 'Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*', *CQ* n.s. 23.324–38
- , (1974). 'Three notes on Ovid', *CQ* n.s. 24.116–8
- Reitzenstein, E. (1935). 'Das neue Kunstwollen in den *Amores* Ovids', *RhM* 84.62–88 (= von Albrecht Zinn [edd.] [1968] 206–32)
- Richardson, L., Jr. (1992). *A new topographical dictionary of ancient Rome*. Baltimore
- Richmond, J.A. (1965). 'A note on the elision of final *ē* in certain particles used by Latin poets', *Glotta* 43.78–103
- , (1990). *P. Ovidi Nasonis La Ponto libri quattuor*. Leipzig
- Richter, W. (1977). 'Lunae labores', *WS* n.s. 11.96–105
- Riddle, J.M. (1992). *Contraception and abortion from the ancient world to the Renaissance*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Roby, H.J. (1889). *A grammar of the Latin language from Plautus to Suetonius*, II. London
- Rohde, E. (1914). *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 3rd ed. Leipzig
- Rosa, L. (1954). 'Sulle varianti della tradizione manoscritta degli *Amores* di Ovidio', *AFLN* 4.41–60
- Rosati, G. (1996a). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae XVIII–XIX: Leander Heroni, Hero Leandro*. Florence
- , (1996b). 'Sabinus, the *Heroides* and the poet-nightingale. Some observations on the authenticity of the *Epistula Sapphus*', *CQ* n.s. 46.207–16
- Ross, D.O., Jr. (1969). *Style and tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, Mass.
- , (1975). *Backgrounds to Augustan poetry. Gallus, elegy and Rome*. Cambridge
- Rothstein, M. (1920–4). *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*, 2nd ed. Berlin
- Rudd, N. (1976). *Lines of enquiry: studies in Latin poetry*. Cambridge
- Russell, D.A. and Wilson, N.G. (1981). *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford
- Sabot, A.-F. (1976). *Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse*. Paris
- Saller, R.P. (1982). *Personal patronage under the early empire*. Cambridge
- Salmon, E.T. (1958). 'S.M.P.E.' in Herescu (ed.), 3–20
- Sandbach, F.H. (1972). *Menandri reliquiae selectae*. Oxford
- Schilling, R. (1954). *La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste*. Paris (2nd ed. 1982)
- Schmidt, V. (1985). 'Corinnas *psittacus* im Elysium: Ovid *Amores* 2, 6', *Lampas* 18.214–28
- Schmitzer, U. (1997). 'Gallus im Elysium. Ein Versuch über Ovids Trauerlegie auf den toten Papagei Corinnas (*am.* 2.6)', *Gymnasium* 104.245–70
- Schnurr, C. (1992). 'The *lex Julia theatralis* of Augustus: some remarks on seating problems in theatre, amphitheatre and circus', *ICM* 17.147–60

- Schoonhoven, H. (1980). *Elegiae in Maecenatem*. Groningen
- Schrader, J. (1761). *Obseruationum liber*. Francker
- , (1776). *Liber emendationum*. Leeuwarden
- Schulte, W. (1909). *De Ovidiano synaloepharum usu*. Diss. Münster
- Schulz-Vanheyden, E. (1969). *Properz und das griechische Epigramm*. Diss. Münster
- Schulze, W. (1894). *Orthographica*. Marburg (Repr. 1958, Rome [*Sussidi eruditi* 14])
- Scourfield, J.H.D. (1993). *Consoling Heliodorus. A commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*. Oxford
- Seager, R.J. (1976). 'Horace, Odes 1.29 as a propempticon', *LCM* 1.65–70
- Sedlmayer, H.S. (1880). 'Die Aufeinanderfolge gleicher oder ähnlicher Versschlüsse bei Ovid', *WS* 2.293–5
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1949). 'Propertiana', *CQ* 43.22–9
- , (1953). 'Num in direct questions: a rule restated', *CQ* n.s. 3.120–5
- , (1956). *Propertiana*. Cambridge
- , (1994). *Homoeoteleuton in Latin dactylic verse*. Stuttgart–Leipzig (*Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 31)
- Sicherl, M. (1983). 'Ovid, Amores 2.1, 15' in *Festschrift für R. Muth zum 65. Geburtstag*, edd. P. Händel and W. Meid, Innsbruck, 463–8
- Siedschlag, E. (1977). *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen*. Berlin
- Sigerist, H.E. (1951–61). *A history of medicine*. New York–Oxford
- Sittl, C. (1890). *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*. Leipzig
- Skutsch, O. (1985). *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford
- Smith, K.F. (1913). *The elegies of Albius Tibullus*. New York
- Smolenaars, J.J.L. (1994). *Statius Thebaid VII*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 134)
- Solin, H. (1975). 'Die Wandinschriften im sog. Haus des M. Fabius Rufus' in *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji*, edd. B. Andreae and H. Kyrieleis, Recklinghausen, 243–72
- Solodow, J.B. (1986). 'Raucae, tua cura, palumbes: study of a poetic word order', *HSPH* 90.129–53
- Soubiran, J. (1966). *L'élision dans la poésie latine*. Paris (*Études et commentaires* 63)
- Spengel, L. (1853–6). *Rhetores Graeci*. Leipzig
- Spoth, F. (1992). *Ovids Heroides als Elegien*. Munich
- Steinby, E.M. (ed.) (1993). *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*. Vol. I, A–C. Rome
- Stephens, L. (1985). 'The lexical diffusion of vowel shortening in classical Latin: iambic verbs', *Helios* 12.39–50
- Stevens, P.T. (1971). *Euripides: Andromache*. Oxford

- Stirrup, B.E. (1976). 'Structure and separation: a comparative analysis of Ovid, Amores II.11 and II.16', *Eranos* 74.32–52
- Stroh, W. (1971). *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*. Amsterdam
- Syme, R. (1978). *History in Ovid*. Oxford
- Syndikus, H.P. (1972–3). *Die Lyrik des Horaz: eine Interpretation der Oden*. Darmstadt (*Impulse der Forschung* 6, 7)
- , (1984–90). *Catull: eine Interpretation*. Darmstadt (*Impulse der Forschung* 46, 48, 55)
- Takács, S.A. (1995). *Isis and Sarapis in the Roman world*. Leiden (*Religions in the Graeco-Roman world* 124)
- Tarrant, R.J. (1976). *Seneca: Agamemnon*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 18)
- , (1981). 'The authenticity of the letter of Sappho to Phaon (*Heroides* XV)', *HSPH* 85.133–53
- Thill, A. (1979). *Alter ab illo: recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle à l'époque augustéenne*. Paris
- Thomas, E. (1965). 'A comparative analysis of Ovid, Amores II. 6 and III. 9', *Latomus* 24.599–609
- Thomas, P.L. (1979). 'Red and white: a Roman color symbol', *RhM* 122.310–6
- Thomas, R.F. (1982). 'Catullus and the polemics of poetic reference (poem 64.1–18)', *AJPh* 103.144–64
- , (1986). 'Virgil's Georgics and the art of reference', *HSPH* 90.171–98
- , (1988). *Virgil. Georgics*. Cambridge
- Thompson, D.W. (1936). *A glossary of Greek birds*, 2nd ed. Oxford
- Thompson, L.A. (1989). *Romans and blacks*. Oklahoma
- Thraede, K. (1962). 'Das Lob des Erfinders. Bemerkungen zur Analyse der Heuremata-Kataloge', *RhM* 105.158–86
- Timpanaro, S. (1953). 'Delle congetture', *A&R* 3.95–9 (= *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina*, Rome [1978] 673–81)
- Töchterle, K. (1994). *Lucius Annaeus Seneca: Oedipus*. Heidelberg
- Tracy, V.A. (1976). 'The leno-maritus', *CJ* 72.62–4
- Tränkle, H. (1960). *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Wiesbaden (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 15)
- , (1963). 'Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen', *Hermes* 91.459–76
- , (1990). *Appendix Tibulliana*. Berlin
- Travlos, J.N. (1971). *A pictorial dictionary of ancient Athens*. London
- Treggiari, S. (1991). *Roman marriage: iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*. Oxford
- Tremoli, P. (1955). *Influssi retorici e ispirazione poetica negli 'Amores' di Ovidio*. Trieste (*Fac. di Lett., Ist. di Filol. Class.* 1)
- Tupet, A.-M. (1976). *La magie dans la poésie latine I: des origines à la fin du règne d'Auguste*. Paris

- Ussher, R.G. (1973). *Aristophanes. Ecclesiazusae*. Oxford
- van Dam, H.-J. (1984). *P. Papinius Statius: Silvae Book II*. Leiden
- van den Broek, R. (1972). *The myth of the phoenix according to classical and early Christian traditions*. Leiden (*Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* 24)
- van Wageningen, J. (1917). 'Fulmen', *Mnemosyne* 45.135–9
- van Wonterghem, F. (1984). *Forma Italiae. Regio IV, Vol. I: Superaequum, Corfinium, Sulmo*. Florence
- Verdière, R. (1989). 'Ovide, *Am.*, 2, 13, 1–4', *Latomus* 48.190–3
- Versnel, H.S. (1970). *Triumphus. An inquiry into the origin, development and meaning of the Roman triumph*. Leiden
- Vidman, L. (1969). *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*. Berlin (*RVV* 28)
- Ville, G. (1981). *La gladiature en occident des origines à la mort de Domitien*. Rome
- Vollmer, F. (1898). *P. Papinius Statius: Silvarum libri*. Leipzig
- von Albrecht, M. (1961). 'Zum Metamorphosenproem Ovids', *RhM* 104.269–78
- , (1964). *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*. Hildesheim (*Spudasmata* 7)
- , (1972). 'Forschungsbericht: Ovid, II', *AAHG* 25.55–76, 267–90
- , (1976). 'Qua arte narrandi Ovidius in Amoribus scribendis usus sit' in *Acta conventus omnium gentium Ovidianis studiis fovendis. Tomis 25–31 Augusti 1972*, Bucharest, 57–63
- von Albrecht, M. and Zinn, E. (edd.) (1968). *Ovid*. Darmstadt (*Wege der Forschung* 92)
- von Bothmer, D. (1957). *Amazons in Greek art*. Oxford
- Walter, H. (1986). 'Zur Gedichtgrenze zwischen Ovid *Am.* 2, 13 und 14', *RhM* 129.306–21
- Watson, P. (1983a). 'Ovid, *Amores* 2.7 and 8. The disingenuous defence', *WS* n.s. 17.91–103
- , (1983b). 'Puella and virgo', *Glotta* 61.119–43
- , (1985). 'Axelson revisited: the selection of vocabulary in Latin poetry', *CQ* n.s. 35.430–48
- Watt, W.S. (1985). 'Ovidiana', *MH* 42.56–60
- , (1995). 'Ovidiana', *MH* 52.90–107
- Watts, W.J. (1973). 'Ovid, the law and Roman society on abortion', *AClass* 16.89–101
- Weinstock, S. (1971). *Divus Julius*. Oxford
- West, M.L. (1966). *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford
- , (1969). 'Near eastern material in Hellenistic and Roman literature', *IISPh* 73.113–34

- , (1978). *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford
- Weyman, C. (1904). 'Zu den Sprichwörtern und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer II', *ALL* 13.379–406
- , (1926–7). 'Similia zu Vergils Hirtengedichten', *WS* 45.122–6, 248–51
- Whitaker, R. (1983). *Myth and personal experience in Roman love-elegy. A study in poetic technique*. Göttingen (*Ilypommemata* 76)
- White, P. (1992). 'Pompeius Macer' and Ovid', *CQ* n.s. 42.210–8
- , (1993). *Promised verse Poets in the society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Wijsman, H.J.W. (1996). *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica. Book V: a commentary*. Leiden (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 158)
- Wilhelm, F. (1916). 'Zur Elegie', *RhM* 71.136–42
- Wilkins, A.S. (1901). *M. Tulli Ciceronis De oratore libri tres*. Oxford
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1955). *Ovid recalled*. Cambridge
- , (1963). *Golden Latin artistry*. Cambridge
- Williams, G.D. (1994). *Banished voices: readings in Ovid's exile poetry*. Cambridge
- Williams, G.W. (1958). 'Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals', *JRS* 48.16–29
- , (1968). *Tradition and originality in Roman poetry*. Oxford
- , (1969). Review of Lee's translation (1968), *CR* n.s. 19.378–9
- Williams, R.D. (1960). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus*. Oxford
- , (1962). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber tertius*. Oxford
- Willink, C.W. (1986). *Euripides: Orestes*. Oxford
- Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford
- Wimmel, W. (1960). *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*. Wiesbaden (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 16)
- Witt, R.E. (1971). *Isis in the Graeco-Roman world*. London
- Wölfflin, E. (1884). 'Pandus, span. pando', *ALL* 1.329–43
- , (1898). 'Sponte sua', *ALL* 10.138
- Woodcock, E.C. (1959). *A new Latin syntax*. London
- Woodman, A.J. (1977). *Velleius Paterculus: the Tiberian narrative (2.94–131)*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 19)
- , (1983). *Velleius Paterculus: the Caesarian and Augustan narrative (2.41–93)*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 25)
- Woodman, A.J. and Martin, R.H. (1996). *The Annals of Tacitus. Book 3*. Cambridge (*CCTC* 32)
- Wunderer, W. (1889). *Ovids Werke in ihrem Verhältnis zur antiken Kunst*. Diss. Erlangen
- Yardley, J.C. (1973). 'Sick-visiting in Roman elegy', *Phoenix* 27.283–8
- , (1974). 'Propertius' Lycimna', *TAPhA* 104.429–34

- , (1977). 'The Roman elegists, sick girls, and the *soteria*', *CQ* n.s. 27.394–401
- , (1979). 'Ovid's other *propempticon*', *Hermes* 107.183–8
- , (1981). 'Ponticus' inspiration: Propertius 1.9.15', *AJPh* 102.322–5
- , (1990). 'Cerinthus' *pia cura* ([Tibullus] 3.17.1–2)', *CQ* n.s. 40.568–70
- , (1991). 'The symposium in Roman elegy' in *Dining in a classical context*, ed. W.J. Slater, Ann Arbor, 149–55
- Young, D. (1971). *Theognis*. Leipzig
- Zablocki, S. (1966). 'De antiquorum epicediis', *Eos* 56.292–310
- Zagagi, N. (1980). *Tradition and originality in Plautus. Studies of the amatory motifs in Plautine comedy*. Göttingen (*Hypomnemata* 62)
- Zanker, P. (1983). 'Der Apollontempel auf dem Palatin. Ausstattung und politische Sinnbezüge nach der Schlacht von Actium' in *Città e architettura nella Roma imperiale*, 21–40 (*Analecta Romana instituti Danici* Suppl. 10)
- Zazoff, P. (1983). *Die antiken Gemmen*. Munich
- Zwierlein, O. (1986). *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas*. Wiesbaden

The following abbreviations should also be noted.

ALL	<i>Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik</i> , Leipzig, 1884–1908
CCTC	<i>Cambridge classical texts and commentaries</i> , Cambridge, 1965–
CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berlin, 1862–
CoO	R.J. Deferrari, M.I. Barry and M.R.P. McGuire, <i>A concordance of Ovid</i> , Washington, 1939
H.-Sz.	J.B. Hofmann, <i>Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik</i> , revised by A. Szantyr, Munich, 1965
K.-S.	R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre</i> , 5th ed., revised by A. Thierfelder, Darmstadt, 1976
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> , Zurich–Munich, 1981–
LSJ	<i>A Greek-English lexicon</i> , edd. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart-Jones, R. McKenzie, 9th ed. with supplement, Oxford, 1968
OLD	<i>The Oxford Latin dictionary</i> , Oxford, 1968–82
RE	<i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , Stuttgart, 1893–1978
RLAC	<i>Reallexion für Antike und Christentum</i> , Stuttgart, 1950–
RLM	<i>Rhetores Latini minores</i> , ed. C. Halm, Leipzig, 1863

- Suppl. Hell.* *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, edd. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, Berlin New York, 1983
- TLL* *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* Leipzig Stuttgart, 1900

Abbreviations used in citing Latin texts are generally those of *TLL*, in citing Greek texts, those of *LSJ*. My occasional departures from those systems are intended to achieve greater clarity. References to the *Heroides* adopt the poem- and line-numbering of Dörrie (1971), to the *Ibis*, that of Owen (1915), to the *Ex Ponto*, that of Richmond (1990). Except where otherwise specified, Sappho and Alcaeus are cited from Lobel–Page (1955), Callimachus from Pfeiffer (1949–53) – for the epigrams, the Palatine Anthology's numeration is frequently given and the text is quoted from Gow–Page (1965) – , Ennius' tragedies from Jocelyn (1965), the *Annales* from Skutsch (1985), Lucilius from Marx (1904–5), the epigrams attributed to the younger Seneca from Prato (1964), Nonius from Lindsay (1903), Paulus/Festus from Lindsay (1913), Ausonius from Green (1991).

Information about the occurrence of a word or phrase is often presented in abbreviated form. In order to take account of at least the most significant differences in stylistic level between their various works, I generally give two figures for Ovid, Vergil and Horace. The first denotes the total number of occurrences in the author, the second the number of occurrences in, respectively, the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (combined), the *Aeneid* and the *Odes* (including the *carmen saeculare*). For example, thirty of the forty-six occurrences of *niueus* in Ovid are in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, eight of the seventeen in Vergil are in the *Aeneid*, and Horace has the word once in the *Satires* and three times in the *Odes*; in the note to 2.1.24, this information appears as: Ov. 46 (30), Verg. 17 (8), Hor. 4 (3). (Statistics given in this way ignore or treat separately works which are or may be spurious. Of the works cited in *CoO*, I reject as unOvidian the *Somnium* [*Am.* 3.5], the *Epistula Sapphus*, the *Halientica* and the *Nix*; figures for Vergil refer only to the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, those for Tibullus only to the first two books in the *Corpus Tibullianum* and those for Seneca's tragedies exclude the *Hercules Oetaeus* and the *Octavia*.)

ARCA

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

36

OVID: AMORES
TEXT, PROLEGOMENA AND
COMMENTARY
in four volumes

J C McKEOWN

VOLUME III
A COMMENTARY ON
BOOK TWO

1998

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

ISSN 0309-5541

X FRANCIS CAIRNS