

**A COMMENTARY ON OVID *ARS AMATORIA* 2, 1-294**

A thesis submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Faculty of Humanities

**2014**

**SARAH L. BROOKS**

**SCHOOL OF ARTS, LANGUAGES AND CULTURES**

## Contents

Abstract	3
Declaration and Copyright Statement	4
Acknowledgement	5
Preface	6
General Introduction	
1 Content and Structure	
a. Unity	8
b. Narrative Progress	11
2 Genre	
a. Generic Ascent and the Didactic Position	16
b. <i>Amores</i> and <i>Ars</i>	19
3 Mythological Figures of the Lover	
a. Myth in the <i>Ars</i>	24
b. Paris	27
c. Daedalus and Icarus	30
d. Ulysses and Calypso	32
e. Milanion	34
f. Hercules and Echoes of Aeneas	36
4 Other Figures of the Lover	
a. The <i>kolax</i>	40
b. The Electoral Campaigner	41
5 Method of the Commentary	43
Commentary on <i>Ars Amatoria</i> 2, lines 1-294	45
Bibliography	198

Word Count: 80, 000

## Abstract

This thesis ('A commentary on Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 2, 1-294') is submitted to The University of Manchester for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It examines the methods through which Ovid presents internal unity and structure to the poem: through the use of the progress metaphor, and a sense of narrative progression. It also examines the generic positioning of the *Ars* within Ovid's wider oeuvre, with special reference to the *Amores* and *Heroides*. It treats the poet's use of mythological *exempla*, and how these are used as models (whether positive or negative) for the lover. This provides rich intertextuality with Ovid's elegiac predecessors. As well as mythological figures, Ovid uses the models of the *kolax* ('Flatterer') and of the canvassing electioneer as a means of reconciling the lover's traditional role as 'slave of love' with that of a free Roman male. These themes are exposed and analysed through a systematic, line-by-line commentary on the first 294 lines of *Ars* 2.

## Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

## Copyright Statement

- i.** The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given the The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.
- ii.** Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made **only** in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii.** The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trade marks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.
- iv.** Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=487>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations>) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Theses.

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Professor Roy Gibson for his tireless support, and for reading and correcting numerous drafts of this thesis. I would also like to thank Professor Alison Sharrock and Dr Andrew Morrison for their valuable advice and contributions throughout my time at the University of Manchester. This thesis was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. It is dedicated to the memory of my father, Stephen Brooks.

## Preface

The commentary covers the first 294 lines of *Ars Amatoria* 2. Due to the restrictions of an 80,000 word thesis, it is not possible to cover the entire poem and do justice to it. 294 seemed an obvious place to stop as the tone of the poem begins to change after this point.

First, *obsequium* can be seen as a unifying feature of the major section 145-294, where Ovid gives advice on *indulgentia*, *obsequium*, *militia amoris*, and gift-giving. Labate (1984) 175-226 draws a strong connection between the obsequious behaviour of the Ovidian lover in the *Ars* and the behaviour of the *kolax* or ‘Flatterer’. Labate’s theory can be demonstrated with special reference to 145-294, since the acts Ovid recommends force the lover into the role of *kolax*, thus justifying my decision to stop at this point. 295-336 goes on to address the use of flattery and sick-visiting, which can be seen as slightly different perspectives of the *kolax* theme.<sup>1</sup> For a thorough treatment of the role of the *kolax* as figure of the lover, see section 4a, pp37-8.

Second, Ovid himself marks a break at line 295, with a new beginning:

*sed te, cuicumque est retinendae cura puellae,  
attonitum forma fac putet esse sua.*

(Ars 2.295-6)

The echo of the opening of the Book, where the aim of ‘holding’ a girl is set out (12 *arte tenenda est*), the emphatic direct address *sed te*, and the intensely didactic feel of the following lines (295-314), all point the reader towards a new start. Lines 295-314 represent further development of the idea of flattery.

This Introduction is designed to cover the whole of *Ars* 2 in order to demonstrate how those issues which dominate the section 1-294 also relate to the Book as a whole. However, certain features of the Introduction relate to issues that solely dominate 1-294,

---

<sup>1</sup> The *kolax*-type behaviour advocated when a relationship is still fairly new is less relevant for a more grounded relationship, as presented after 337; cf. 337-8 *sed non, cui dederas a litore carbasa, uento / utendum, medio cum potiere freto.*

specifically key themes which recur throughout the main commentary. For more general introductions to the *Ars*, see especially Watson's article in *Brill's Companion to Ovid* (2002), Sharrock's in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (2002), and Gibson's in the Blackwell *A Companion to Ovid* (2009).

The text of the *Ars Amatoria* which I use is based on the second revised edition of the Oxford Classical Text of E.J. Kenney (1995). Variants and conjectures are reported selectively for discussion in the commentary. I also use Kenney's OCT for the *Amores*; for the *Metamorphoses* I use the Teubner of W.S. Anderson (1985); for Propertius I use the Loeb edition by G.P. Goold (1990); for Tibullus I use the Cairns edition of G. Lee (1975).

## General Introduction

### 1 Content and Structure

#### a. Unity

*Ars Amatoria* 1 ends with a couplet pointing towards the following book:

*pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta, laboris;  
hic teneat nostras ancora iacta rates.*

(*Ars* 1.771-2)

The division of the Books was signposted (misleadingly) at the start of *Ars* 1:

*principio, quod amare uelis, reperire labora,  
qui noua nunc primum miles in arma uenis;  
proximus huic labor est placitam exorare puellam;  
tertius, ut longo tempore duret amor.*

(*Ars* 1.35-8)

The first-time reader of the *Ars* might assume that this seemingly clear setting-out of the poet's agenda reflects the contents of the three Books; i.e. that *Ars* 1 deals with finding a suitable girl, *Ars* 2 with winning her over, and *Ars* 3 with ensuring the love is long-lasting. However, this is not the case: the first two stages, those of finding and of seducing the girl, are given in Book 1. This leaves Book 2 with the task of educating the reader in how to ensure he can *keep* the girl for as long as he wants. It seems Ovid is deliberately misleading his reader from the very start about what to expect. When the reader comes to the end of Book 2, the three stages set out at the start have been completed. This makes the address of Book 3 to women a complete surprise.

*Ars* 2 begins and ends with direct reference to the previous and following books:

*dicite 'io Paeon' et 'io' bis dicite 'Paeon':  
decidit in casses praeda petita meos.  
laetus amans donat uiridi mea carmina palma  
praelata Ascraeo Maeonioque seni.*

(*Ars* 2.1-4)

The opening of the second book presents the figure of the *Praeceptor Amoris* ('Teacher of Love') - the persona which Ovid adopts throughout the *Ars*<sup>2</sup> - as thrilled with the success of the first book. There is much cause for celebration; after all, the hunting metaphor of the first couplet seems to imply that the girl has been caught,<sup>3</sup> yet also suggests on a poetic level that the first book has been a success with the general reader. The *laetus amans* then demonstrates his gratitude to the poet by setting him above even Hesiod and Homer. However, Ovid goes on to explain that there is much more work to be done by the lover in order to secure his victory. For more on the complexities of this opening, see the commentary (below).

Just as the close of Book 1 points towards the existence of a second book, so the close of Book 2 points towards the existence of a third book, addressed to women:

*ecce, rogant tenerae sibi dem praecepta puellae:  
uos eritis chartae proxima cura meae.*

(*Ars* 2.745-6)

The address to women was not part of the "table of contents" set out at the start of Book 1.<sup>4</sup> This 'surprise' ending of Book 2 tantalises the reader with promise of a further book

---

<sup>2</sup> Durling (1958) 157-167. Ovid calls himself *praeceptor Amoris* at 1.17; *praeceptor amandi* at 2.161; and is addressed by Apollo as *lasciui ... praeceptor Amoris* at 2.497. Note also his statement at *Trist.* 1.1.67 *non sum praeceptor amoris*, marking the change of direction in his exile poetry.

<sup>3</sup> Volk (2002) 179: 'the perfects *decidit* (2) and *uenisse* (11) present the capture of the *puellae* as a fact, and we are invited to think that it took place, as it were, simultaneously to the teacher's voicing his instructions on how to bring it about'. For more on Volk's theory of 'poetic simultaneity' in the *Ars*, see section 2a.

<sup>4</sup> Watson (2002) 143 cites the fact that the third book is not mentioned at 1.35-40 to support her view that the final couplet of *Ars* 2 'spoils the closure and was clearly added later after the composition of Book 3'. However, such structural games may allow Ovid to provide feigned spontaneity (Sharrock (1994a) 18-20). It

focused on a female readership. These introductions and conclusions, false starts and surprising endings, all serve to link the three books of the *Ars* together into a unified whole.

Another way internal unity is achieved is through the progress metaphor of the ship and chariot which can be traced throughout the *Ars* and into the *Remedia Amoris*. Ship and chariot imagery is used to represent, firstly, the progress of the poet, and, secondly, the progressive success of the lover.<sup>5</sup> At the start of Book 1 (5-8), the poet compares himself to Automedon, the charioteer of Achilles, and to Tiphys, the helmsman of Jason, concluding that he serves the same function as these mythological characters in terms of his relationship with *Amor*. This sets in motion for the rest of the *Ars* the metaphor of the comparison between steering a ship or driving a chariot, and directing the course of the poetry. The metaphor in the *Ars* hinges around the need to control nature;<sup>6</sup> if the ship and chariot can be controlled, then so can *Amor*. Such imagery continues through Book 1<sup>7</sup> and is taken up again at the start of Book 2.

At 2.5-8, the ship and chariot imagery refers to the *laetus amans* (3), and the ship metaphor of 9-10 seems to refer to the progress of the lover, for it is *tua pinus* (i.e. the *iuuenis*' ship) that is sailing in mid-sea. Yet the next verb is first person, *peto*. It may be the reader's ship, but it seems it is the poet who is steering this vessel.<sup>8</sup>

The ship metaphor is used far more consistently through Book 2 than in Book 1. Later in the book, the lover is warned to use appropriate 'wind' for the situation of his ship (337-8). The chariot and ship metaphors appear once more in conjunction with one another around the mid-point of the book (426-34). This time, the metaphors are applied more specifically to the poetic progress. The poet refers to his work as 'my chariot'. The ship imagery is then used to explain the poet's apparent inconsistencies: the passage preceding this urged the lover to avoid being caught out in his infidelities, while the following passage suggests that

---

is not uncharacteristic of Ovid to play such games; e.g. the playful (or disingenuous) opening to the *Amores* (with Barchiesi (1988) 101-3).

<sup>5</sup> However, the differentiation between the two becomes increasingly difficult to discern as the imagery starts to run together. Myerowitz (1985) 96 'in the first two books... the progress of the love affair and the progress of the poem run a parallel course'.

<sup>6</sup> Myerowitz (1985) 78-80.

<sup>7</sup> The chariot metaphor recurs at 1. 39-41 *hic modus, haec nostro signabitur area curru, / haec erit admissa meta premenda rota*. The ship metaphor concludes the Book (1.771-2, quoted above).

<sup>8</sup> A point noted by Myerowitz (1985) 83.

with some women success can be achieved by inciting jealousy in her. The ship metaphor thus marks a strong change of direction in the poet's tactics.

Towards the close of the book, the ship and chariot imagery are used to express the methods the lover should employ during sex (725-32). It is appropriate that these metaphors, which have played such a key role throughout the *Ars*, should occur at this point, which is arguably the ultimate aim of the poem: effective sexual technique is a good way of keeping the girl. Furthermore, all these images are potentially erotic.

Books 1-2 are also established as a pairing through the return of Automedon as an example of the poet: the poet is *amator* in just the same way as Automedon is charioteer (2.738). This echoes the start of Book 1 (5-8). Thus the ring composition of the chariot metaphor can be seen as linking Books 1 and 2 together, and emphasising the (false?) closural nature of Book 2.<sup>9</sup>

These metaphors continue throughout Book 3 and the *Remedia Amoris*. Indeed, the metaphors are even more consistent in Book 3.<sup>10</sup> One possible reason for the predominance of the metaphor in *Ars* 3 could be that it becomes increasingly necessary to provide formal structure to a book which contains less of a 'story' than *Ars* 1-2.<sup>11</sup> It is through these self-aware passages that Ovid is able to force the authorial voice into the foreground, and provide some sense of structure and progress to the narrative.

#### b. Narrative Progress

A further way in which structure can be discerned through the *Ars* is by a sense of narrative progression in terms of the affair imagined between the lover and his *puella*. As Alison Sharrock has shown, it is possible to provide a deliberate "over-reading" of the

---

<sup>9</sup> The strong closural feel to the end of *Ars* 2 makes *Ars* 3 all the more of a surprise.

<sup>10</sup> Ship metaphor at 3.26-7, 99-100, 499-500, 583-4, 747-8 and at *Rem.* 70, 577-8, 811-12. Chariot metaphor at 3.467-8, 594-7 and at *Rem.* 397-8, 413-4 (for sex, echoing 2.725-32).

<sup>11</sup> For *Ars* 3 as containing less narrative, see Sharrock (2006) 37-9.

text,<sup>12</sup> so that the ‘story’ of the affair between the lover and his *puella* is brought to the foreground. Although Ovid engages with epic conventions, the *Ars* does not share epic’s teleological or linear narrative drive. However, it can be shown that there is a narrative progression in terms of the imagined affair. The rest of this section will demonstrate how to tell the ‘story’ of *Ars* 2.

The opening of *Ars* 2 makes clear the success of *Ars* 1, highlighting the progression within the previous book, where the lover has moved from having no *puella* at all, to discovering one that he likes, and even considering force against her (the Achilles model of 1.689-704). However, the work is not over yet for the lover: the girl may have been seduced, but now she must be kept (2.9-12). The lover is told the mythological example of Daedalus and Icarus,<sup>13</sup> apparently to demonstrate just how difficult a task it is to control the wings of love (97-8).<sup>14</sup>

The lover then, apparently anxious about how to keep hold of his *puella*, takes a rather misguided detour into magic, from which the *praeceptor* warns him away with the aid of the examples of Medea and Circe (99-106). Instead, the lover needs only to be ‘loveable’ in order to be loved (107-8). To do this, he must have some indefinable extra quality beyond his physical attractiveness. Perhaps eloquence is a good place to start. The ability to speak well is a key attribute of Ulysses (and of Aeneas, as I argue below). This leads to the use of Ulysses seducing Calypso as a model (123-144). However, as we see Ulysses working his charms on Calypso, ultimately it is Calypso’s manipulations that prove the success story. Is this a subtle warning to the lover to beware the tricks of women?

The lover then takes another wrong turn, as he makes the mistake of arguing with his *puella*. Ovid warns him that he should leave arguments to married couples (155-6). To help, the *praeceptor* offers an example of a time when he too made the same mistake and violently attacked his girlfriend’s hair. The lover is comforted: even Ovid himself has made such errors! Instead of violence, the lover should use gentleness (177-8). Using the example of Milanion, the poet advises the lover to serve his *puella*. But he should not

---

<sup>12</sup> Sharrock (2006) 35-7 seeks the ‘implied narrative’ both of the mythological ‘digressions’ and of the ‘love-story’ hidden behind the instructional passages and demonstrates how the narrative force of Book 2 is stronger than that of the other books of the *Ars*.

<sup>13</sup> Sharrock (2006) 26-9 suggests a way of rendering the ‘digressions’ as narratological: the *praeceptor* uses the stories to teach some facet of his *ars* to the student.

<sup>14</sup> More detail on the complexities of this myth and its metapoetic potential is given at section 3c.

worry too much: the kind of love Ovid recommends does not expect the dangerous service Milanion enters into for Atalanta.

Obsequious behaviour in the mould of Milanion has proved so successful that the lover now has a place within the girl's own house. They play a non-competitive game together, and the lover is able to perform extremely personal acts of service for his girl. The lover has a pang of anxiety at this point: does this behaviour not make him look too much like a slave? Ovid comforts him yet again with the model of Hercules, whose masculinity was not harmed by playing the slave for his girlfriend (217-22).

The girl then has a trip to the countryside, and calls for her lover to visit her there. He rushes to be with her. Now he is starting to look more like a soldier, enduring the frosty *uia*, than a mere slave. It seems the lover's situation is improving. Again, as with the Hercules example, the lover should not be ashamed of behaving in much the same way as Apollo behaved during his servitude to Admetus (239-40). Things get a little more challenging at this point, as the lover even climbs through a window to gain access to his *puella* and to prove his love for her. In this way, he is following the example of Leander.

Now that the lover has shown some familiarity with the girl's household, he establishes himself there more strongly by ingratiating himself with her slaves (251-4). He even gives them small gifts. This reminds him: he also gives gifts to his *puella*, even attempting some lines of poetry in her honour (273-86).

As well as making himself integral to her household, at the same time he makes her think that she is central to his, by attributing to her any acts of kindness towards his slaves which he was planning to do anyway (287-94).

The lover then changes tactic and pours out compliment after compliment to his *puella*. There is even a reference to the kind of words of admiration he uses during *concubitus*, making it plain that he has succeeded in establishing some kind of sexual relationship with her (307-8). Any girl is won over by flattery, even the terrifying Medusa. The lover risks everything by giggling during these compliments, but manages to save the day by concealing his insincerity at the last minute.

Now comes the most serious test of the lover's abilities - a crisis: the girl is sick. The lover takes the opportunity to demonstrate his total devotion to her. There is a touching moment as he weeps over her, allowing her even to drink his tears with her parched lips. He prays for her recovery, reports positive omens to her (utilising her superstitious nature) and even manages to get one over on his rival, who stubbornly administers unpleasant drugs to her, gaining her disfavour (335-6).

The girl recovers, and the lover continues his manipulation of her by making himself invaluable to her, and then, suddenly, abandoning her. This is all a tactic to make her miss his attentions, just as Phyllis missed her Demophoon, Penelope her Ulysses, and Laodamia her Protesilaus. But the lover must beware: too much absence will lead his girl to find another lover, just as Menelaus' absence pushed Helen into the arms of Paris (367-72).

A further danger lies in infidelity. Some bad luck: news of his faithlessness has reached the *puella's* ears, despite his attempts to keep it secret. These tactics include showing caution about sending gifts, meeting his mistress in out-of-the-way spots, and ensuring he checks over writing-tablets before he sends messages, in case words written to another are unintentionally revealed (391-396). Luckily, the lover manages to convince her of his loyalty by bold denials. He also uses sex to convince her of his love (413-4) although he almost takes another false turn by relying upon aphrodisiacs.

This infidelity has had such a good outcome, that the lover now invents mistresses in order to incite jealousy in his *puella*. Yet, he does not leave her too long in doubt, and once more uses sex to comfort her. Peace is restored.

Now further problems emerge for the lover to face: his *puella* decides to let him endure a night excluded from her bedroom (521-26). Is this punishment for his previous infidelity? However, the lover makes the best of the situation by playing the part of the *exclusus amator*, yet ensuring he does not overwhelm her with his unwanted attentions.

The problems increase: now she has another lover! The lover hates his rival, and is in danger of exacerbating the situation by losing his temper, just as Vulcan pushed Venus further into the arms of Mars through his exposure of their affair (561-92). The lover manages to control himself, and allows her to have other lovers. The lover next gets into

trouble for boasting about his own affairs (601-40). This is an unattractive trait: sex should be a private thing.

The next problem: the lover has noticed a physical flaw in his *puella*, but he gallantly overcomes his distaste (641-662). Perhaps the girl is actually a little old. This too he turns into a positive attribute: she has experience on her side. After all, who would prefer Hermione to her mother Helen (699-700)?

The lover now reaches the bedroom (703-32). As Sharrock (2006) 36 points out, this climactic end makes sense on a structural level, but perhaps not on a narrative level. As the occurrence of *concupitus* at certain key moments throughout the book has made clear, the relationship between the lover and his *puella* has long been a sexual one anyway. However, structurally, it does seem appropriate to end the book on a note of sexual success. During sex, the lover takes care to ensure her pleasure, as well as his own – but only when there is enough time: otherwise, he does not bother.

This is where the book ends. The lover may have faced hardship along the way, but it seems that the constant return to sexual intimacy between himself and his *puella* has strengthened their relationship, and has enabled him to ‘keep’ her through all their ups and downs. On the other hand, this constant return to sex poses the question: how long does the lover actually intend to ‘keep’ the girl? Perhaps this game of infidelity on his side - ‘make-up-sex’ - infidelity on her side - ‘make-up-sex’ - physical aversion, which only increases as she gets older - ‘make-up-sex’ – can continue indefinitely. This allows Ovid to avoid providing any definitive telos, something which the non-narrative status of elegy permits (see section 2a).

Right at the end of the book comes a shock: the *praeceptor* has proved so successful in his teaching of the lover that girls want his help too. The lover is outraged by this betrayal. Surely his teacher is arming the opposite sex against him! The *praeceptor* comforts the lover in the prologue to *Ars* 3: by educating women, the teacher is merely making them a better match for the lover who is (now, thanks to *Ars* 2) an expert in seduction.

## 2 Genre

### a. Generic Ascent and the Didactic Position

As has been shown, the ‘plot’ of the *Ars* is a love-affair between the lover and his *puella*. This subject-matter would seem to place the *Ars* within the generic boundaries of elegy. In addition, it is written in elegiac couplets, and engages closely with themes prevalent in Propertius and Tibullus, Ovid’s elegiac predecessors. Yet the *Ars* has been blamed for the death of elegy.<sup>15</sup> A form of elegy remains after the *Ars* (i.e. the *Fasti* and *Tristia*) but Ovid’s treatment of elegiac material in the *Ars* makes it impossible for any successor to attempt it in any seriousness.<sup>16</sup>

A main difference separating the *Ars* from the *Amores*, Ovid’s earlier elegiac work, is tone. The *Ars* is framed as instructional, advising the reader on seduction. The *Ars* may be written in elegiac couplets, but its generic categorisation, at least for a modern reader, is that of an elegiac-didactic poem.<sup>17</sup> The influence of the didactic poems of Lucretius and Virgil becomes significant. Kenney in his classic 1958 article outlines the echoes within Ovid of the *Georgics* and *De Rerum Natura*.<sup>18</sup> As Kenney concludes, to use Virgil’s patriotic agricultural handbook as a model for the *Ars* is ‘to run the risk of being accused of impudence if not actual impiety’.<sup>19</sup>

It became the ideal career trajectory for an ancient poet to begin with lighter material, and gradually increase in seriousness. The archetype for this was Virgil,<sup>20</sup> who began with the

---

<sup>15</sup> Volk (2002) 187: ‘What deals the deathblow to the genre of love elegy is not so much that there is such a thing as an *ars amandi* (after all, people have tried to rationalize love before and failed), but that it is so successful’.

<sup>16</sup> Durling (1958) 158 ‘(May this be the real reason why Ovid killed Roman elegy, that after him the conventions could not be used without the taint of pretence?)’.

<sup>17</sup> Watson (2002) 144 emphasises the innovation of using the elegiac couplet for a didactic work.

<sup>18</sup> Kenney pays close attention to the use of those stock phrases and metaphors, particularly the progress metaphor, which link the *Ars* to the more serious didactic poems. His aim is to explode the idea that Ovid is merely using them to give an air of ‘burlesque’, or to mock Virgil or Lucretius themselves. For Kenney, Ovid’s target is actually Augustan values, particularly those concerning adultery.

<sup>19</sup> Kenney (1958) 208-9: ‘the Devil quoting Scripture’.

<sup>20</sup> See Farrell (2002) 37 on the significance of Ennius as a model for basing the poetic career path on that of the *cursus honorum*. His argument is that the tradition of the poetic career did not in fact begin with Virgil, that it can be traced back, via Ennius, to Greek and Hellenistic origins, and that Ovid is reacting both to Virgil and to a much lengthier tradition.

lighter pastoral poems of the *Eclogues*, followed by the didactic *Georgics*, culminating in the weightier epic the *Aeneid*. Ovid can be shown to follow a similar path. If the elegiac *Amores* represent the lightest stylistic register, making them equivalent to the pastoral *Eclogues*; then the *Ars Amatoria* fits nicely in the mid-point of the poet's career, the didactic, *Georgics*-style poem. This Virgilian career model is bolstered by the *Metamorphoses*, which are not only written in dactylic hexameter like the *Aeneid*, but also engage closely with the themes and concerns of the *Aeneid*, even including a 'mini-Aeneid' in its pages.<sup>21</sup>

This neat career path is confused by the abundance of work which does not quite fit the pattern,<sup>22</sup> a confusion exacerbated by the difficulties of dating the poetry.<sup>23</sup> For example, the *Heroides* are thought to be written between the *Amores* and the *Ars*. This makes sense: elegiac in style, these letters from heroines to their absent lovers look towards weightier genres for their inspiration, notably epic and tragedy. They mark an ambitious gesture towards a higher register, while still retaining the pull of the lower register through their metrical delineation and the subject-matter dominated by the pain of love and enforced separation. Yet the double *Heroides*, where a dialogue is set up between the male lover and the heroine,<sup>24</sup> are arguably dated slightly later, after the *Ars Amatoria*. This is a position I argue in section 3b, based on the presentation of Paris (the first male voice we hear in the *Heroides*) as an engaged reader of the *Ars*.

The *Ars* is therefore positioned between the *Amores* and the *Metamorphoses* through its designation as 'didactic elegy'. The fusion of didactic and elegiac elements should not seem so strange: didactic poetry was an 'unsatisfactory hybrid',<sup>25</sup> and, in fact, didactic features can already be seen in elegy.<sup>26</sup> Farrell argues that there was no ancient critical category of didactic poetry, and that most poems which we would term 'didactic' would in

---

<sup>21</sup> *Met.* 13.623-14.607.

<sup>22</sup> Barchiesi and Hardie (2010) 60 note how in Ovid there are 'moments of a rise through the genres in conscious emulation of the Virgilian career pattern, moments of unchanging continuity, as well as moments of regression'. Consider also the question of how Ovid's *Medea* may fit into this pattern.

<sup>23</sup> See Barchiesi and Hardie (2010) 61 n. 5.

<sup>24</sup> The ordering is significant: the male voice is heard first. Although the single *Heroides* (letters written by mythological women to their absent lovers) seem to provide a female voice in the overwhelmingly masculine world of elegy, Harrison (2002) 83 notes how the double epistles mark a 'reversion in some sense to traditional love-elegy' through the 'reinsertion of the male'.

<sup>25</sup> Volk (2002) 1-2: 'didactic poetry ... is a contradiction in terms. Poetry is not meant to be instructional, and teaching is certainly not expected to be poetic'.

<sup>26</sup> cf. Prop. 4.5 (the *lena* Acanthis), Tib. 1.4 (the god Priapus teaches the art of seducing boys), Ov. *Am.* 1.8 (the *lena* Dipsas teaches the *puella* how to manipulate a lover).

fact have been termed ‘epic’ due to their use of the epic hexameter.<sup>27</sup> So how far is the *Ars* truly didactic?

Volk suggests four defining characteristics of didactic poetry: (i) explicit didactic intent; (ii) a teacher-student constellation; (iii) poetic self-consciousness; and (iv) poetic simultaneity.<sup>28</sup> When these categories are applied to the *Ars*, as one would expect, the poem is deemed to fulfil each criterion, and therefore fit within the didactic genre: Ovid sets out his didactic intent clearly at the very start of the poem; he emphasises his position as teacher to the *iuuenis* repeatedly (see note to 9); he presents himself as self-aware poet; and he presents his advice simultaneous to its enactment by the lover.

This final, and most interesting, of her categorisations (i.e. that the poet should give a sense that the teaching is a progress that is unfolding before our eyes)<sup>29</sup> is presented by Ovid in a number of ways: the progress metaphor of the ship and chariot is part of this sense of narrative motion,<sup>30</sup> but it is also provided through the *praeceptor*’s tone of dictating his instruction in due order. When Ovid makes a sudden change of direction, seeming to contradict his previous advice, he is actually (extremely self-consciously) drawing attention to the need to adapt to different situations. Sharrock, in her review of Volk, refers to this as the difference between ‘Level 2’ and ‘Level 3’ skill sets. No woman is the same,<sup>31</sup> and so different methods may be required for different girls. Some girls actually require the impetus of a rival in order to stoke their ardour. The lover must be flexible, and use the *Ars* appropriately. So, although the advice at times seems contradictory, it is actually both a symptom of the didactic convention, and a pedagogic tool.

One specific element of the *Ars* that can be noted as a marker of the didactic style is the inconsistency of the *praeceptor*.<sup>32</sup> The teacher of the *Ars* frequently seems to contradict

---

<sup>27</sup> Farrell (2003) esp. 385. However, note that an Augustan reader would doubtless have perceived a difference between didactic and epic, as the modern reader does: the *Georgics* are clearly different in many ways from the *Aeneid*, as the *Ars* is different from the *Metamorphoses*.

<sup>28</sup> Set out at Volk (2002) 40, and applied to the case of the *Ars Amatoria* at 157-195.

<sup>29</sup> Sharrock (2003) in her review of Volk takes this point further, calling it ‘plot’.

<sup>30</sup> Volk (2002) 20-22.

<sup>31</sup> The physical differences between women is one played out at *Ars* 3.135ff with advice on wearing hairstyles appropriate to one’s face. This is a theme to which the poet returns at the end of the Book, 3.771ff, on selecting sexual positions appropriate to one’s bodily attributes.

<sup>32</sup> Durling (1958) 163-4 notes how the ‘posture of lack of control – whether over the process of writing or over the course of a love affair – is thus one of the important subsidiary devices by which the absolute technical control of the poem is suggested’.

himself. For instance, in *Ars 2* a change of direction is marked at 425-66. The *praeceptor* has spent 50 lines detailing the dangers of female jealousy, and advising the lover on ways to avoid it completely or, if it is not possible to avert it, to end it quickly (through *concupitus*). Then comes a sudden change: the lover is now to reveal his infidelities to the girl! Yet we can see this as part of the pose of ‘poetic simultaneity’: the teacher is adapting his teachings as the need arises.

The didactic pose of the teacher educating a student, making mistakes and changing his mind, enables Ovid to position the *Ars* as a didactic text (whatever that may have meant for him), in the model of the *Georgics* and *de Rerum Natura*.

b. *Amores* and *Ars 2*

Such misdirection as that mentioned in the previous section promotes the impression of the *praeceptor* as teacher fully qualified to teach through his experience of love. The implication is that the teacher has himself experienced many of the pitfalls awaiting the lover, and so is able to educate another from the privileged position of someone who has learnt from their own mistakes.

The promotion of the authorial voice through the use of explicit ‘personal’ examples, which present occasions when the *praeceptor* himself has made mistakes, serves two functions. First, it demonstrates the difficulty of what he is demanding from the lover; and, second, on a poetic level, it enables Ovid to engage the reader with echoes of the *Amores*, for it is within the earlier elegiac poetry that the examples used can be traced. Ovid is thereby able to produce an intratextual dialogue between his own poetic works.<sup>33</sup> This forges fairly clear engagement with the *Amores*, signposted by terms such as *memini*, presented as personal recollections of the poet’s own amatory experiences. This continues the overall impression that *Vsus opus mouet hoc* (1.29).<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Barchiesi and Hardie (2010) 59: ‘in a number of cases, his texts ‘talk to each other’, with the result that each work is positioned within a career’.

<sup>34</sup> Watson (2002) 149 describes the *praeceptor* as ‘a continuation of Ovid’s *Amores* persona grown older’.

When warning against arguing with the *puella*, the *praeceptor* gives an example of a time when he himself failed to follow his own advice (165-74). There, the contrast between the *diues* and the *pauper amator* leads to an example of why poor lovers cannot afford to lose control: the loss of control ends up costing the lover dearly. This is a good example of what could be described as both implicit and explicit use of the *Amores*. The comments on the *pauper amator* in 165-8 give a general autobiographical feeling and may recall such poems as *Amores* 1.10 where the girl has fallen from grace because she keeps asking for gifts.<sup>35</sup> However, for the careful reader, 169-72 refer to a specific moment from *Amores* 1.7, where the lover has attacked his girlfriend. Overwhelmed by guilt, the lover regrets his violence, which, it turns out, was directed only against her hair:

*aut tunicam a summa diducere turpiter ora  
ad mediam (mediae zona tulisset opem)?  
at nunc sustinui raptis a fronte capillis  
ferreus ingenuas ungue notare genas.*

(*Amores* 1.7.47-50)

The *me memini* of *Ars* 2.169 acts as a startling signpost directing our attention to this earlier incident of violence against hair. However, this is not merely a repetition of the earlier poem. Awareness of the intertext adds an extra dimension to the interpretation of the *Ars* passage. For when he says that he does not remember tearing her tunic (for which she made him pay to replace), the careful reader may recall that at *Amores* 1.7.47-8, he in fact wishes that he *had* torn her tunic, rather than the weightier crime of attacking her person. This exposes the truth: that he did *not* damage her clothing at all, and warns of the dangers of the greedy meretrix, who will use any excuse to wheedle money out of her lover. This makes the following couplet, *Ars* 2.173-4 even funnier: the lover should avoid making the same mistake in order to avoid ‘losses’ caused, not by the *culpa* of the violence itself, but by allowing an opportunity for her to claim payment.<sup>36</sup> For a full analysis, see commentary (below).

---

<sup>35</sup> cf. *Am.* 1.10.11 *cur sim mutatus quaeris? quia munera poscis.*

<sup>36</sup> Sharrock (2002) 157-9 focuses on this passage as an example of ‘realism’, while Gibson (2009) examines Ovid’s use of personal experience as a ‘largely “literary” experience’, forcing the reader to look back at the *Amores* to unpack the tricks he is playing with the genre. Volk (2002) 164-5 uses this passage to demonstrate

Later, while recommending that the lover accept a rival calmly, the poet again recalls a time when he himself made a mistake:

*oscula uir dederat, memini, suus; oscula questus  
sum data: barbaria noster abundat amor.*

(*Ars* 2.551-2)

The couplet is a pointed echo of an incident in the *Amores* in which the poet describes attending a banquet at which his *puella* is present with her *uir*. The whole poem details his feelings of jealousy, but it is in begging her not to allow his rival to kiss her that we really see the lover's jealous rage:

*oscula praecipue nulla dedisse uelis.  
oscula si dederis, fiam manifestus amator  
et dicam 'mea sunt' iniciamque manum.*

(*Amores* 1.4.38-40)

The use of the pluperfect *dederat* in the *Ars Amatoria* echoes the future perfect *dederis* of the similar incident in the *Amores*, implying that the open condition of *Amores* 1.4.39 actually came about. Thus, the *Ars* does not simply 'repeat' the action of the *Amores*, but actually serves to finish the story. It would seem that the rival *did* kiss the *puella* at the feast, and our poet was provoked to some rash action. Did he declare himself her lover? Whatever he did, he now regrets it as a barbarous act (*barbaria noster abundat amor*, *Ars* 2.552). Yet how far is this really an error? Perhaps Ovid relishes displaying himself as a *barbarus amator*.

These flashbacks to the earlier *Amores* not only gives an (albeit comedic) impression of realism, they also enable Ovid to position his poetic works in an orderly way. As though the reader were not already well aware that the *Ars* marks a progression on from the *Amores*, both thematically and generically, the poet hammers home his point: the *Amores* was written by a younger self, a self more prone to errors of judgement, which the *Ars*

---

how the *praeceptor* advertises his previous failings in order to '[put] himself on the same level with his students'.

hopes to rectify by showing new lovers how to avoid such mistakes. Not only that: by utilising the reader's own memory of the *Amores* (and here is where *memini* is so funny: it is really suggesting to the reader 'surely *you* remember...') the *Ars* also imbues those memories of the *Amores* with extra meaning which was absent in the original poem, whether it be a tunic torn (or not torn) in a fit of rage, or a jealous outburst against a kiss bestowed on a rival.

Another way Ovid uses the *Amores* is by presenting himself as a very different type of speaker from an important rival to his precepts: Dipsas, the *lena* of *Am.* 1.8, whose didactic instruction for the *puella* is overheard by the outraged lover. Dipsas is an important model for much of the *Ars*, and Ovid can be shown to frame his instruction as a counter-attack against the *lena*'s manipulation of her female student. The relationship between the *praeceptor* and *lena* becomes much more pronounced in Book 3.<sup>37</sup> However, Dipsas appears as a shadow model behind much of the *Ars* which will be examined in this commentary: in the discourse on magic (99-106), the reader may recall that other 'teacher of love' who *did* rely upon witchcraft, so that Ovid's rejection of magic becomes also a rejection of the teachings of Dipsas; and in the passages on gift-giving (251-86) Ovid's advice on how to *avoid* giving corresponds to Dipsas' equal and opposite advice on how to *get more*.

In addition to such specific engagement, the *Ars* utilises a number of the themes of elegy. The difference, however, is in tone. Ovid's aim, as exemplified by the Daedalus and Icarus episode (more on this below, section 3c), is to lay some control on the concept of *Amor*, which is notoriously difficult to pin down.<sup>38</sup> In this way he hopes to emulate the skills of Tiphys as helmsman and Automedon as charioteer (see above, p. 9). This means that the more painful aspects of love - the metaphors of disease, sickness, and death<sup>39</sup> - which dominate earlier elegy, are omitted, in favour of the demonstration of control. Where the lover does look like the traditional suffering lover, pale and thin, it is because he is told to

---

<sup>37</sup> On which, see Gibson (2003) 19-21.

<sup>38</sup> cf. *Ars* 2.19-20.

<sup>39</sup> Such themes demonstrate the elegists' stance of alienation.

do so.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the traditional elegiac themes in Ovid's hands look very different from either Propertius or Tibullus.

Certain elegiac themes are introduced, only to be instantly rejected. Magic formed a significant feature of elegy,<sup>41</sup> yet, immediately following the Daedalus and Icarus episode, the *praeceptor* criticises its efficacy (99-100). This forms a peculiarly abrupt detour after the extensive *exemplum* which has dominated the opening of the Book. Yet, it allows Ovid to engage closely with some of the more general expectations of the reader, familiar as they would be with the conventions of elegy. The well-read lover may be tempted to employ the tactics of the elegists and resort to magic, but this, the *praeceptor* says, would be a dead-end.

When Ovid does suggest utilising magic, it is part of a series of tricks designed to play upon the *girl's* superstitions, not the lover's. When the girl falls sick (315-36), the lover should ensure that he does all he can to *appear* to be helping her. Rather than doing anything actually useful, like providing unpleasant medicines,<sup>42</sup> the lover should employ an old woman (who looks very like a witch) to purify the sickroom, and, in perhaps one of the more cynical statements of the *Ars* (and there are many), he should *somnia laeta uide* (2.328). Ovid has already prepared the reader for the misuse of magic through his dismissal of its serious use at 99ff. Yet this treatment of magic has something broader to say about Ovid's treatment of elegiac material in general: the *Ars* is a highly cynical treatment of previous elegy, exposing the mechanisms behind the scenes.

---

<sup>40</sup> For instance, cf. 1.729-30 *palleat omnis amans: hic est color aptus amanti; / hoc decet, hoc †multi non ualuisse putant.* † The use of the jussive subjunctive *palleat* emphasises the absurdly cynical instruction.

<sup>41</sup> A notable example of the lover employing magic in elegy is the programmatic first elegy of Propertius Book 1, cf. 1.1.19-24 *at uos, deductae quibus est pellacia lunae / et labor in magicis sacra piare focus, / en agedum dominae mentem conuertite nostrae, / et facite illa meo palleat ore magis! / tunc ego crediderim Manes et sidera uobis / posse Cytinaeis ducere carminibus*, also Prop. 4.5, Tib. 1.5, 2.4.55-60. For a full treatment of this elegiac *topos*, see introductory note to lines 99-106.

<sup>42</sup> This the rival can do, in order to incur her displeasure (336).

### 3 Mythological Figures of the Lover

#### a. Myth in the *Ars*

One of the many ways Ovid treats his predecessors irreverently is through his use of myth.<sup>43</sup> Myth provides abundant resources for engagement with epic poets like Homer and Virgil, but also with previous elegy, which utilises the world of myth for its own purposes. In lines 1-294 of *Ars* 2, Ovid uses a number of different mythological figures to represent the lover. As noted in section 1b, the mythological passages can be interpreted as pedagogic tools: they exemplify some piece of advice for the lover. For example, the extended myth of Pasiphae in *Ars* 1 demonstrates the idea that all girls can be caught<sup>44</sup> because female lust is excessive.

In the first half of *Ars* 2, when Ovid is delivering ‘Level 2’ instruction, the myths (of which I shall focus on five main figures, selected either for their position in the text or length of passage) provide a hero (or heroine) as stand-in for the lover. These figures teach him either the positive outcomes of following Ovid’s advice, or the negative fallout of failing to do so. However, quite whom the lover is intended to identify with is part of the complex game Ovid is playing with myth and, thereby, with his predecessors who have utilised the same mythological characters for different purposes.

Ovid uses mythological *exempla* throughout the *Ars* to provide his reader with models to emulate (or not). Propertius and Ovid’s *Amores* have already shown myth to be a central motif of elegy<sup>45</sup> - another way the *Ars* engages with elegy / *Amores*. In the past, the lengthy passages (such as Daedalus and Icarus, and Ulysses and Calypso in *Ars* 2) were seen as ‘digressions’ from the main thrust of the *Ars*. However, more recent scholarship has attributed greater meaning to these ‘digressions’ than mere decoration or distraction

---

<sup>43</sup> See Watson (1983a) for a detailed analysis of the role of the mythological *exempla* as models for the reader.

<sup>44</sup> cf. *Ars* 1.269-70.

<sup>45</sup> Whitaker (1983) 140-2 divides Ovid’s use of *exempla* into four discrete categories: (i) ‘illustrative exempla’; (ii) ‘witty exempla’; (iii) ‘mixed exempla’; and (iv) ‘“Propertian” exempla’. A main difference he notes between Propertian / Tibullan and Ovidian use of elegy is in Ovid’s insistence upon an introductory *sententia* to his *exempla* (164). Watson (2002) 151 focuses on how the use of myth fuses elegy and didactic elements, citing the lengthy Aristaeus *exemplum* of Virgil’s *Georgics* 4. Myth is used much less consistently in Tibullus.

from the main story. I plan to examine the significance of the mythological heroes whom the poet presents as possible mirrors for the lover.

Ovid's use of myth proves extremely problematic in many ways. Frequently, it proves difficult to discern with whom the poet intends his reader to identify. The layers of readership<sup>46</sup> add to the sense of confusion, as the poet may simultaneously imply a relationship between, for instance, the figures of Icarus and the lover, and also between himself as poet and the reader, in which both become complicit in mocking the foolish lover.

In most cases (as I explore below), each individual *exemplum* can be shown to fail in terms of its initially stated agenda. Paris does not truly exemplify joy, Daedalus and Icarus do not demonstrate the difficulties of restraining *amor*, Ulysses roundly fails to show the lover the utility of eloquence, and Milanion is hardly a useful figure to use to encourage the lover to persist. So why does Ovid use such seemingly inappropriate *exempla*?

These *exempla* are far from straightforward, and challenge the reader to understand them. They invite a plurality of interpretation, and force the reader to make a judgement as to their respective worth as *exempla*. For example, if one accepts the Paris *exemplum* at the very start of the book as a straight-forward expression of the lover's happiness, the meaning is clear, and the reader may move on. However, if one pauses to question the suitability of such a figure as model for the lover, then things become more challenging for the reader. Has Ovid simply failed to notice the problematic nature of such a model?<sup>47</sup> I would argue that he is deliberately setting out to wrong-foot the reader at the very opening of the new book, and by doing so he forces the reader to stop and start as he attempts to evaluate and interpret the *exemplum*.

This richness invites comparison with Ovid's important literary models, and encourages the reader to look again at both other uses of the myths and, significantly, at Ovid's own uses, both in the *Ars* and in his other poetic works. For example, when Ovid re-writes the

---

<sup>46</sup> By which I mean the differences between ostensible readership (i.e. the *iuvenis*) and the actual wider readership of Roman men, Roman women, and, indeed, the modern reader.

<sup>47</sup> See introductory note to lines 1-8.

story of Ulysses and Calypso, he engages in an intertextual dialogue with the Homeric model. When he writes of Ulysses *referre aliter saepe solebat idem* (128), he is referring to his own propensity of telling the same stories in different ways himself.<sup>48</sup> Yet the relationship is complicated through cross-intertextuality with Virgil's Dido, and with Ovid's own presentation of Penelope in *Heroides* 1. These echoes and counter-echoes reverberate throughout the *Ars* so that when, at 287-294, Ovid recommends manipulating the *puella* so that she considers herself indebted to the lover, memories of Calypso manipulating Ulysses enrich the interpretation.

Myth performs a slightly different role in 295-746, as there are only three main, extended mythological narratives, all of which focus upon the problems that arise when there are three people in a relationship. This fits well with the idea that the second half of *Ars* 2 delivers 'Level 3' instruction on how to cope when the basic relationship is complicated by the addition of another person, whether a second mistress for the lover, or another male for the *puella*, i.e. a rival for the lover.

At 2.359-72, the love-triangle of Helen-Menelaus-Paris is used to demonstrate the dangers of leaving the *puella* for too long. The next love-triangle involves Agamemnon-Clytemnestra-Cassandra, at 2.399-408. This demonstrates the dangers of the lover allowing the *puella* to learn of his infidelities. In both these love triangles, Ovid is striving to enact a controversial apology for figures (Helen and Clytemnestra) usually reviled for the crime of adultery.

The adultery theme comes to a vivid conclusion in the final love triangle: that of Mars-Venus-Vulcan at 561-92. This is designed to demonstrate the dangers of exposing the *puella*'s affairs; exposure runs the risk of her throwing in her lot with the man who shares her guilt.

The adultery theme throughout the second half of *Ars* 2 is too powerful to ignore. Ovid may remove *matronae* from his target,<sup>49</sup> but the models he uses for the *puella* in these three significant *exempla* involve married queens and the goddess of love, all of whom are guilty of adultery. By omitting the negative outcomes of *these* adulteries (he ignores the

---

<sup>48</sup> See introductory note to lines 123-44, and 127-8n.

<sup>49</sup> cf. *Ars* 1. 31-2.

Trojan War entirely in the case of Paris and Helen, and Clytemnestra's great sin is in taking Aegisthus as lover, rather than in plotting the death of her husband), and providing excuses for the women's adulteries, he is playing fast and loose with the demands of the Augustan marriage laws.

In the discussion of individual passages which follow, I deliberately focus on the question of the identity of the lover. The reader should not necessarily be defined as the imagined lover, and when Ovid challenges the status of that lover, he can arguably be discerned as mocking the lover for the reader's entertainment. This both distances the reader from identifying entirely with the lover, yet subtly draws him closer to the poet, since both are complicit in the joke at the expense of the lover. See the introductory notes to each section in the main part of the commentary for full treatments of the other key issues.

b. Paris

Firstly, the lover is as *laetus* as was Paris on his way back to Troy (5-6); or like Pelops when he had successfully gained Hippodamia (7-8). Paris kidnapping Helen is clear engagement with Homer,<sup>50</sup> but also with Ovid himself: for Paris was the author of the first of the epistles written by a man (*Heroides* 16). The story of Pelops is one told by Pindar<sup>51</sup> and, again significantly, one to which Ovid will himself return at *Metamorphoses* 6. To a certain extent, these are fairly clear examples, where the mythological heroes (villains?) are evidently stand-ins for the lover.

The sense is that the lover is *laetus* because he has seduced his *puella*, just as Paris was *laetus* once he had kidnapped Helen, and Pelops was *laetus* at bearing off Hippodamia after he won the chariot race. The choice of description of the two myths is interesting,

---

<sup>50</sup> And also, incidentally, with the opening of Herodotus Book 1: the kidnapping of a girl is a good place to start a book.

<sup>51</sup> Pind. *Ol.* 1. See note on 2.7-8.

since they respond to the ship / chariot metaphor which dominates the *Ars*, and in fact is picked up in the following lines (9-10).

Yet Paris is also a provocative choice as the first *exemplum* since he is unarguably an *adulter*. Ovid plays with this subversive idea through his ambiguous reference to Helen as *coniunx* (6n.): at this moment, she is both Menelaus' and Paris' 'wife'. Although it is normal in elegy to compare the elegiac *puella* to famous women from myth, this particular famous woman is famed for her adultery:<sup>52</sup> how does this mesh with Ovid's claims that he does not write for *matronae* at 1.31-34? Furthermore, Paris as representative of the lover is both flattering (after all, he is a prince renowned for his successful seduction of Helen) and insulting (consider his rustic upbringing, his limited skill in battle, and his role as 'torch', setting light to Troy through his flawed morality).

Paris is significant, not only as he is the first mythological figure of the lover in the book, but also because Ovid has already given him a voice, or perhaps will do,<sup>53</sup> at *Heroides* 16. The depiction of Paris in *Heroides* 16 as an engaged reader of the *Ars* is a powerful one, as he writes a letter to Helen to persuade her of his passion for her, and to convince her to come away with him. The tricks that Paris employs show him to be the ideal reader of the *Ars*, but, significantly, particularly of *Ars* 1. Similar techniques are present: the very act of writing a letter dominates *Ars* 1.437-86, and Paris' persistence and flattery of Helen seems to follow the advice in the *Ars*. He flatters her beauty (*Her.* 16.133ff), makes wild promises he knows he need not keep, approaches her maids,<sup>54</sup> and much of his persuasion centres around the differences between himself and Menelaus (*Her.* 16.203ff).

Notably, when Paris describes his feelings at watching Menelaus with Helen at the feasts, he resembles the jealous persona of *Amores* 1.4, and the lover at *Ars* 1.565ff. He even feigns drunkenness in order to excuse his behaviour (*Her.* 16.247-8) and nods secret signs (16.258). Helen's letter provides even more detail, demonstrating Paris' similarity to the lover of *Ars* 1: he makes signs with fingers (17.81-2) and draws messages of love on the table for her to see (17.87-8). Thus, a warning: Paris may exemplify the ideal reader of *Ars*

---

<sup>52</sup> Though, note Ovid's 'apology' for Helen at 2.359-372, esp. 371 *Helenen ego crimine soluo*.

<sup>53</sup> See section 1a on the difficulty of dating the *Heroides* (with Anderson (1973) 68-70, Barchiesi and Hardie (2010) 63).

<sup>54</sup> At the end of her letter, Helen suggests that they continue their communications *per socias* (17.367). This echoes Ovid's advice at 3.469-70 that girls should use their slaves as go-betweens.

1, but the actual reader should not make the same mistake as him and assume that all his work is now over.

Helen's reply proves how successful the advice of *Ars* 1 can be. There, the lover was advised that the girl might send back an angry reply at first,<sup>55</sup> but that she will eventually be convinced. Helen's reply begins by reprimanding him, reminding him of his place in the house as a guest, and feigning outrage at his boldness. At *Her.* 17.35, however, we learn that her modesty has been feigned and she is actually pleased at receiving Paris' letter. In this way, Helen in the *Heroides* appears as a match for Paris as she fits the mould of elegiac *puella*,<sup>56</sup> just as he performs the role of elegiac lover. She has learnt the advice of *Ars* 3 – that girls should titillate their lovers through vacillation.

The figure of Paris reappears later in *Ars* 2, at 359-72. There, he is not named, merely referred to as *hospes* (360, 362 and 369) and *adulter* (365). Although the figure that represents the lover there is actually Menelaus (as a negative *exemplum*),<sup>57</sup> the careful reader will recall the significance of Paris as the first stand-in for the lover at the opening of the Book. There, the figure of Paris has been subsumed into the role of the rival,<sup>58</sup> rather than the lover as he was at the start. Although this marks a change in status, the key point is that he is still successful as rival, just as he was as lover. At the start, he was denoted as a careful reader of *Ars* 1. Now, he has proved Ovid's point about the need to adapt to different situations. He too has learnt from the lessons of *Ars* 2. By ignoring certain aspects of these myths, i.e. the negative outcomes and the role of the gods in aiding both Paris and Pelops to seduce their respective girls, Ovid is able to present these characters as ideal Ovidian lovers.

---

<sup>55</sup> cf. also 1.665 *improbe dicet*.

<sup>56</sup> She even denotes herself as *puella* at *Her.* 17.39.

<sup>57</sup> Notably, the blaming of Menelaus for going away is present in Paris' letter to Helen at *Her.* 16.158, a mark of his 'disordered conscience' (Isbell's translation).

<sup>58</sup> As the focalisation will be on the spurned rival (Vulcan) during the Mars and Venus *exemplum* at 561-92.

c. Daedalus and Icarus

Things start to look a little more complicated with the next *exemplum*. Ovid pitches headlong into the story of Daedalus and Icarus, 21-98. The reader quickly becomes engrossed in this wonderful piece of storytelling, notably lengthy at 76 lines. It permits particular engagement with Virgil's great epic, the *Aeneid*, and is a theme to which Ovid will return at *Metamorphoses* 8. Yet what is the meaning of this story, and why is it here? It seems to have nothing to do with the theme of sexual love. Is it mere decoration? Its positioning towards the start of the middle book and sheer length suggest that perhaps it tells the reader some greater truth about Ovidian poetics, or about the relationship between the poet, the teacher, and his student. Quite whom the lover is supposed to identify with is difficult to discern. However, the scene in which Daedalus 'teaches' his son how to fly is too compellingly similar to the teacher-student relationship between Ovid and his reader to deny the fact that the lover is supposed to identify with the rash Icarus. And so the story forms a *negative* example: the lover should *not* emulate this particular model. However, the reader has had to work very hard to unpick this meaning.<sup>59</sup>

The story of Daedalus and Icarus' attempted escape from Minos occupies *Ars* 2.21-96, and is the longest *exemplum* of the *Ars*. The story is retold at *Met.* 8.183-235, and the repetition of ideas from the *Ars* in the *Metamorphoses* has led to the *Ars* being described as a 'practice run' for the weightier epic.<sup>60</sup> However, as Sharrock has shown, there is much more at work in the Daedalus and Icarus myth than simply 'decoration'.<sup>61</sup> It is within the need to maintain a 'middle path' that the reader can perceive a metapoetic significance to the passage. When Ovid speaks of an artist, it is difficult not to read into this some representation of Ovid the poet as creator. Thus, Ovid becomes a Daedalus-figure. Like Daedalus, steering between the sea and the sun, Ovid within the *Ars* must steer a difficult

---

<sup>59</sup> Note, however, Whitaker's useful analysis of *exempla* as 'although assigned a definite *explicit* function to perform, may also perform an *implicit* one – which may turn out to be as, or more, important than its explicit function' (Whitaker (1983) 15).

<sup>60</sup> For a discussion of the stylistic relationship between the Daedalus stories in *Ars* 2 and *Met.* 8, see main commentary.

<sup>61</sup> Sharrock (1994a) 87-195.

course between the low genre of elegy and the high genre of epic. Continuing the metaphor, Icarus must represent the lover / student / reader of the *Ars*.

An additional mythological figure is important to a full understanding of the Daedalus and Icarus passage: Phaethon. At *Trist.* 3.4.21-30 Ovid uses the examples of Icarus and Phaethon as models of young men who flew too high, using them as mirrors of his own over-ambitious poetry:

*nec natum in flamma uidisset, in arbore natus,  
cepisset genitor si Phaethonta Merops.  
tu quoque formida nimium sublimia semper,  
propositique, precor, contrahe uela tui.*

*(Trist.* 3.4.29-32)

By comparing his own fate with that of Icarus and Phaethon, Ovid draws attention to the metapoetic potential of both myths. There are many cosmetic similarities between the stories:<sup>62</sup> both fall from the sky due to a hubristic attempt to fly; both sons can never live up to their powerful/talented fathers; and, for Ovid, both open the second book of a poem: the *Ars* and the *Metamorphoses* respectively.

Ovid emphasises the connection between the two myths through verbal echoes of Icarus in his telling of the fall of Phaethon at *Met.* 2.1-400. The Sun's promise to grant his son's wish is proved *temeraria*, *Met.* 2.50, and he describes Phaethon as *tam puerilibus annis* at *Met.* 2.55; these lines echo *Ars* 2.83 *puer incautis nimium temerarius annis*. Phaethon, like Icarus, is 'ignorant' (cf. *Met.* 2.100 *ignare*; 148 *inscius*; 191 *ignarus*; *Ars* 2.50 *nescius*). Both are *pueri* (*Met.* 2.198; *Ars* 2.29; 49). In relation to the route of the chariot, the Sun states *in axe* (*Met.* 2.59), echoing *Ars* 2.94 *sub axe*. The father also refers to constellations as tools of navigation at *Met.* 2.80-3, just as Daedalus does at *Ars.* 2.55-6.<sup>63</sup> The Sun warns his son with *nate, caue* at *Met.* 2.89, echoing Daedalus' caution of *nate, timeto* at *Ars.* 2.63. The divine father swears on the *Stygias ... undas* at *Met.* 2.101, recalling Daedalus' more literal use of the Styx at *Ars.* 2.41 *per Styga detur iter, Stygias tranabimus undas*. Like

---

<sup>62</sup> See Wise (1977) 44-59.

<sup>63</sup> Note also special reference to Bootes at *Met.* 2.176.

Icarus' dead faint at *Ars.* 2.88,<sup>64</sup> Phaethon pales in fear when he realises his predicament (*Met.* 2.169 *ipse pauet*). Phaethon is *infelix* at *Met.* 2.179, while Daedalus is the *pater infelix* at *Ars.* 2.93. Like Icarus, Phaethon looks down in horror at the moment of the fall (*Met.* 2.178; *Ars.* 2.87 *despexit*). Their fear is described in similar language: Phaethon is *trepidus* at *Met.* 2.194 while Icarus *trepidat* at *Ars.* 2.90. When the boys finally fall, the same verb is used (*Met.* 2.322; *Ars.* 2.91 *cadens*).

Most significantly, similar metapoetic language is used to describe the flights of the boys. The route is a *uia* (*Met.* 2.63 *ardua prima uia est*; *Ars.* 2.22 *audacem ... uiam*). The 'journey' language creates a link with the progress metaphor which continues throughout the *Ars*, forming a connection between the path of Daedalus and Icarus, and the dual paths of the poetic progress and the progress of the love affair. The instruction the father gives to his son before his flight in the *Met.* story mirrors the instruction Daedalus gives to Icarus. The Sun god emphasises the need for moderation at *Met.* 2.67 *moderamine* and 2.137 *medio tutissimus ibis*. He even uses the phrase, special to Ovid, *inter utrumque* at *Met.* 2.140, echoing *Ars* 2.63 *inter utrumque uola*.<sup>65</sup>

When Daedalus/the Sun instruct their sons on how to fly, and to adopt caution, the lover sees an image of his own instructions in love from the *praeceptor*. Icarus/Phaethon fail to heed their fathers' warnings, and so they die. The message here is clear (or is it?) – the lover must follow Ovid's advice or else fail utterly. Both stories represent the poet struggling to find his path in a fresh genre.

#### d. Ulysses and Calypso

The relationship between the next mythological *exemplum* and the lover starts by appearing straightforward at 123-42: the lover should be eloquent, like Ulysses. Ovid then tells the story (a new aspect of an old story) of Ulysses with Calypso. Ulysses wants to leave Ogygia, the nymph's island, but the cunning Calypso manipulates the hero,

---

<sup>64</sup> *Ars* 2.88 *nox oculis pauido uenit oborta metu*: finds resonance also at *Met.* 2.181 when Phaethon too falls into a dead faint: *suntque oculis tenebrae per tantum lumen obortae*.

<sup>65</sup> See 63-4n. on the full metapoetic potential of this phrase.

renowned for his love of storytelling, into staying longer, by playing upon his qualities as narrator of his own adventures at Troy. The scene proves a striking deviation from *Odyssey* 5, as the goddess is depicted grieving at Ulysses' imminent departure, and employing delaying tactics. She plays upon his love of story-telling by asking him to tell stories of Troy over again. In this way, she looks rather more like Virgil's Dido, being told stories of Troy by Aeneas in *Aeneid* 2-3.<sup>66</sup>

Ovid not only fits the Homeric hero into the elegiac mould, he also, as with Daedalus and Icarus, gradually reveals that it is in fact the subordinate character with whom the lover is to identify, and a female one at that. However, like Icarus, the reader is aware that she is doomed to fail: Ulysses will eventually leave her and return to Ithaca.

Ulysses too, in Ovid's hands, becomes a failed hero: that eloquence of which he is so proud roundly fails to be expressed. In the *Metamorphoses*, Ulysses gives a speech during the Judgement of Arms, demonstrating the key attributes of a great rhetorician:

*finierat Telamone satus, uulgique secutum  
ultima murmur erat, donec Laertius heros  
adstitit atque oculos paulum tellure moratos  
sustulit ad proceres expectatoque resoluit  
ora sono, neque abest facundis gratia dictis.*

(*Metamorphoses* 13.123-7)

The final line of the passage quoted above has clear significance for the opening of Ovid's treatment of Ulysses in the *Ars*: he describes the hero as *facundus* (123). Yet the presentation of Ulysses in the later epic is very different from the eroto-didactic version. Ulysses in the *Metamorphoses* demonstrates striking rhetorical ability to manipulate his audience: he makes them wait (*donec*, 13.124 and *expectatoque ... sono*, 13.126-7), he rises (*adstitit*, 13.125), delays further still through some dramatic pretence at raising his eyes (*oculos ... moratos*, 13.125), and only then loosens his lips. All this is designed to force his audience to hang upon his words. Yet in the *Ars* version, the great rhetorician demonstrates none of these methods: he may be described as *facundus* (123), but there is

---

<sup>66</sup> Or like Circe; cf. *Od.* 9.31-2. I return to the significance of Aeneas as background figure for the lover at section 3f.

scanty evidence of this ‘eloquence’. He is repetitious (*ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem*, 128); boastful (note the lack of reference to Diomedes); fails to suit his subject-matter to his audience (a story of military tactics may be of interest to the Greek troops, but probably not to Calypso);<sup>67</sup> and, most importantly, his words are not enough: this great speaker resorts to pictures on the sand to explain his stories! As becomes evident towards the end of the passage, it is actually Calypso who appears *facunda*: she manipulates Ulysses into telling and re-telling these stories; she understands her audience well (a key trait of rhetorical skill); she is able to react to the situation swiftly and to her advantage; and she has the final word (141-2).

This may not be Homer’s Calypso, but it certainly looks like a humorous use of Homer’s Ulysses. As with Paris (and many other Homeric characters), Ovid takes an epic hero and successfully recasts him as an elegiac lover. Meanwhile, it is Calypso’s character that comes to the foreground as manipulative and cunning: the attributes of an Ovidian lover.

We see once more that the framework for Ovid’s mythological *exempla* are not always quite what they seem at first reading, and interpretation is enhanced by knowledge of the Homeric intertext.<sup>68</sup> The Calypso scene resonates throughout the first half of *Ars* 2: most noticeably in the Atalanta passage (who is manipulating whom?), 177-196; and in the lover’s manipulation of the girl regarding his own slaves, where he allows her the *appearance* of being in control, 287-294.

e. Milanion

The next *exemplum* is that of Atalanta and Milanion, 185-96. The main intertext with which Ovid engages here is the programmatic first poem of Propertius.<sup>69</sup> It is a playful engagement, exposing the complexities and problems of the earlier passage. The character

---

<sup>67</sup> Is Ulysses therefore breaking Ovid’s own rule not to declaim to *puellae*; cf. *Ars*. 1.465?

<sup>68</sup> Sharrock (1987) 406-12.

<sup>69</sup> Though note the occurrence of reference to the myth at Theognis 1287-94, *Ov. Am.* 1.7.13-14, 3.2.29-32, *Ars*. 3.775. Whitaker (1983) 156 n. 44 notes the high likelihood that the Ovidian references to Atalanta are based on erotic paintings (see introductory note to 177-196).

with whom the lover should identify is Milanion; however, an added dimension is added to the story by subtly equating Atalanta, the truculent girl, with the *praeceptor*. For surely it is the girl herself who commands the besotted youth to carry her nets: as compiled by Apollodorus 3.9, it is Atalanta herself who kills the centaur Hylaeus. Yet Ovid is a kinder master: unlike Atalanta, he will not order the lover to carry nets or endure wounds, whether literal or the metaphorical wounds of love.<sup>70</sup>

Milanion may seem to a modern reader a fairly obscure figure to employ for the lover. However, the passage detailing Milanion's devoted service to Atalanta in his attempts to seduce her are largely influenced by Propertius:

*Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores  
saeuitiam durae contudit Iasidos.  
nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,  
ibat et hirsutas saepe uidere feras;  
ille etiam Hylaei percussus uulnere rami  
saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit.  
ergo uelocem potuit domuisse puellam:  
tantum in amore fides et benefacta ualent.*

(Prop. 1.1.9-16)

The name of the suitor is the same (Milanion (188); and the situation of the generalised hunt (rather than specifically the hunt of the Calydonian boar) is the same. Both passages open with a statement regarding Milanion's success (186). In both, Milanion is presented as the passive sufferer, emblematic of suffering (187-8; compare *percussus*, 1.1.13, and *saucius*, 1.1.14). However, apart from the adjective *Hylaeus* (191), Ovid generally avoids the archaisms of his predecessor:<sup>71</sup> Atalanta is named simply (185) rather than by Propertius' patronymic epithet *durae ... Iasidos*.

---

<sup>70</sup> See esp. note on line 2.192 *sed tamen hoc arcu notior alter erat*.

<sup>71</sup> On which, see Ross (1975) 61.

There are two significant aspects to the story of Atalanta: one where she appears as a hunter, and one where she appears as a runner.<sup>72</sup> One key similarity between the Propertian and Ovidian versions is the sense of conflation of these aspects: for Propertius, Atalanta dwells in an Arcadian world of hunting, yet is also described as *uelox*, hinting at the story of Atalanta as runner. Ovid's version is similar in its conflating of the two ideas, perhaps designed to expose the confusion of the Propertian version. Atalanta eventually succumbs to a man, so that the reader may expect the more erotically-charged athlete story, but then the location described is that of the hunt, and Milanion is depicted carrying her nets for her.<sup>73</sup> The language of the hunt also recalls the very opening of the Book (2n).

Perhaps Ovid also intends to expose the problems behind the Propertian model: does the lover really *want* to resemble this weeping, suffering man? This engagement with earlier elegy, notably the programmatic opening of Propertius, is intended to strike the careful reader as significant. The passage reflects back on earlier elegy, yet also paves the way for the extended descriptions of the myths in the *Metamorphoses*. Once more, the *Ars* seems caught between the two extremes of elegy and epic.

f. Hercules and Echoes of Aeneas

The final use of myth I examine in 1-294 is that of Hercules and Omphale, 217-22. Once more, the figure representing the lover is deceptive. Ovid has been advising the lover on how to perform personal services for his *puella*. In this way, the lover may be concerned that he is starting to look a little too much like a slave.<sup>74</sup> The poet uses the example of Hercules, a hyper-masculine hero, who emasculated himself through love of Omphale. The use of Hercules here, together with the reference to Hylas at 110,<sup>75</sup> allows Ovid to engage with Apollonius' *Argonautica*.

---

<sup>72</sup> Outlined in the introductory note to 177-196.

<sup>73</sup> The carrying of nets also forges an engagement with Tib. 1.4.50 where Priapus recommends the carrying of nets to please the lover. Ovid inverts this by stating that *his* lover need not perform such tasks (*nec iubeo collo retia ferre tuo*, *Ars* 2.194). For more of the Tibullan intertext, see introductory note to 177-196.

<sup>74</sup> See section 4a on the constant slippage between slave, free, and *kolax* as model for the lover.

<sup>75</sup> Sharrock (1994a) 36 on 109-10: 'Hercules clearly features in the pentameter'

The reader may note a connection between Omphale emasculating Hercules and Atalanta emasculating the weeping Milanion.<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, as with the Ulysses *exemplum*, Ovid takes a hero and turns him into the prototype elegiac lover. In this way, the myths Ovid chooses to use to exemplify each particular tenet of his *ars* feed into one another.

Although this *exemplum* is extremely brief (at only 6 lines, it is the shortest on which I am focusing), it is arguably promoted in importance through a second important figure which lurks beneath this *exemplum*: Aeneas.<sup>77</sup> At section 3d the figure of Aeneas the seductive storyteller lay behind the figure of Ulysses. Here, he features due to the connections drawn between him and Hercules by Virgil. It is through such shadowy allusions that the reader may discern a critique of the Augustan regime: by mocking Hercules, is Ovid thereby poking fun at Augustus' pretensions of divinity?

Hercules has extra resonance for the Roman reader due to his significance to the Augustan regime as exemplar for Augustus. Arguably, Augustus' decision to enact his triple triumph of 29BC to coincide with the festival of Hercules in Rome was more than a coincidence: he thereby aimed to align himself with the heroic figure. Horace returns a number of times to a comparison of the two figures,<sup>78</sup> and, in the *Aeneid*, Virgil consolidates this identification by using the story of Hercules and Cacus in Book 8 as a model for Aeneas, explicitly identified in turn as ancestor of Augustus. Ovid's reader, therefore, may contrast Virgil's treatment of Hercules' heroic tasks in *Aeneid* 8 as defeater of Cacus and model for Aeneas, with Ovid's subversive depiction. This would not be the first time that central Augustan figures are treated fairly irreverently by Ovid, most notably Venus and Romulus.<sup>79</sup>

Aeneas is almost entirely absent from the *Ars Amatoria*, yet arguably central to its themes. He is first referenced at *Ars* 1.60, as the son of Venus.<sup>80</sup> This is repeated at *Ars* 3.86,<sup>81</sup> and

---

<sup>76</sup> On which, see introductory note to 217-232.

<sup>77</sup> Sharrock (2006) 29 notes the significance of Dido in the *Remedia Amoris*, but does not elaborate too much: 'the story which the *Remedia* refuses to tell is precisely that [of Dido]. Dido, although she is rarely mentioned, is central to the *Remedia Amoris*. Her near-absence makes a very telling gaping hole'.

<sup>78</sup> cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.9-12; 3.14.1-4; and 4.5.29-36.

<sup>79</sup> In *Ars* 1.101-34, Ovid chooses to tell the story of the Sabine rape, hardly an episode that paints Romulus in too positive a light.

<sup>80</sup> Aeneas, as son of Venus, is aligned with the Julian house (see Dimundo *ad loc.*)

<sup>81</sup> For Rome as 'Venus' city', with reference to Aeneas, cf. *Am.* 1.8.42, 1.15.25, 2.14.17.

Virgil's *Aeneid* is cited as appropriate reading for girls at *Ars* 3.337. The key use of Aeneas for my argument, however, is in terms of his relationship with Dido.<sup>82</sup>

*et famam pietatis habet, tamen hospes et ensem  
praebuit et causam mortis, Elissa, tuae.*

(Ars 3.39-40)

Ovid exposes Aeneas' dual role as pious hero and faithless lover. This is treading a dangerous line. An Augustan poet may not want to over-emphasise the twofold nature of his ancestor Aeneas, exposing the hypocrisy of the hero presented by Virgil as both *pius* and a transgressive guest.

Firstly, Aeneas' family makes him the ideal lover. His mother is the goddess of love, and his brother is Cupid.<sup>83</sup> When Ovid invokes Venus and Cupid at the start of Book 2 (15-20), is the reader to remember the importance of Venus to the Julian family tree, and therefore the importance of Aeneas as founder?

I argue that Aeneas is an absent model for the Daedalus/Icarus *exemplum*. It has been shown that Aeneas is significant for a reading of the *Metamorphoses* version of the myth.<sup>84</sup> Like Daedalus, Aeneas is both *pater/Pater* and *pious*; when Daedalus gives his son navigational instruction, he resembles the *praeceptor* Aeneas, educating Pallas in navigation at sea; and when Icarus dons his wings, he is described in terms reminiscent of Aeneas' raising of his shield at the end of *Aen.* 8, albeit a travesty of the epic hero. Daedalus deliberately identifies himself with Aeneas in his speech to Minos begging to be granted permission to return to Athens: he defines himself as an exile, 'driven by hostile fates'; and when he addresses Jupiter, the reader may perceive a reference to Augustus. Ovid's engagement with Virgil *Aeneid* 6 and the doors of Daedalus forces the reader to examine this passage in the context of a katabasis: Daedalus' claim that he would resort to the Styx to gain his freedom (41) places him in the position of an Aeneas-like figure.

---

<sup>82</sup> Consider also *Her.* 7.64, with *Am.* 2.18.25, 32.

<sup>83</sup> Note Cupid's grief at his brother Aeneas' death at *Am.* 3.9.13.

<sup>84</sup> Sharrock (1994a) 187 points out the allusion to Aeneas at *Met.* 8.214.

I also see Ovid's Ulysses and Calypso *exemplum* as heavily influenced by the Aeneas and Dido relationship at *Aeneid* 1-4. The story that Ulysses tells Calypso of Rhesus in the *Ars* has its counterpart in the *Aeneid*, during the ekphrasis of the doors of the temple of Juno (*Aen.* 1.469-71). Both scenes include reference to the *tentoria* (*Aen.* 1.469 and *Ars* 2.137), the use of the adjective *cruentus* (*Aen.* 1.471 and *Ars* 2.130), and the description of the *caedis* (*Aen.* 1.471 and *Ars* 2.135). The use of the stick in our passage helps to set the descriptions of Troy which Ulysses gives as pictorial, and therefore a form of ekphrasis. Yet an important difference between the passages is aspect: Aeneas is described as *lacrimans* (*Aen.* 1.470) and, slightly earlier, *gemens* (*Aen.* 1.465) as he gazes on these images of his own people's destruction. For Ulysses, these same stories are evidence of success (one reason why he perhaps elides any reference to Diomedes is that he thereby takes all the glory for himself).

Another way in which Ulysses resembles Aeneas, is that they both attempt to usurp the role of poet. In *Aeneid* 2-3, Aeneas takes on the role of narrator, and tells his own version of events at Troy (Book 2) and then of his wanderings (Book 3). Here, Ulysses tells his own version of the events of *Iliad* 10, and so becomes conflated not only with the voice of poet, but the greatest of epic poets: Homer (see 4n for Ovid's own Homeric pretensions). Like Daedalus in the previous extended *exemplum*, Ulysses therefore becomes another representative of the poet.

In sum, Ulysses looks like a more confident, if less likeable, Aeneas, while Calypso comes to look like a more successful Dido (note that the former succeeds in keeping Ulysses with her for seven years). Ovid invites comparison between these two female figures, both keen to keep hold of their men, archetypal delayers to both the heroic and poetic missions (and so appropriate mythological figures to appear at the programmatic opening of a book concerned with 'holding' lovers; cf. 12). However, Ovid's Calypso trumps Virgil's Dido in terms of success: Calypso's manipulation plays on Ulysses' vanity, and is therefore better than any of Dido's methods of persuasion. If she had Ovid's teachings to arm her, even *moriens Dido* may have succeeded in holding on to her lover.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> cf. *Rem.* 57-8, where Dido appears as one of a number of women who would have benefited from Ovid's advice.

#### 4 Other Figures of the Lover

##### a. The *kolax*

One of the more significant breakthroughs in scholarship on the *Ars* in the last 30 years has been Labate (1984), who sees in Ovid's presentation of the lover some evidence of his support for the Augustan regime. Labate argues for the poet reconciling through his work the character of the elegiac lover with the expectations of the Roman citizen. In the hands of Propertius and Tibullus, the lover was presented as alienated from society.<sup>86</sup> However, Ovid's rejection of certain elegiac themes such as sickness, pain, and death prepares the way for his similar rejection of the alienation of the lover. Although I do not agree that Ovid is pro-Augustan (the question of whether he is advocating adultery is too compelling to ignore), he is certainly presenting the lover in a very different way from his poetic predecessors in elegy. Yet by depicting the lover as an integrated member of society, Ovid is doing something even more shocking than his predecessors: he is exposing how the rules of society can easily be manipulated to suit the cynical requirements of the lover.

At points where Ovid does sail particularly close to advocating anti-Augustan behaviour, he is careful to add a proviso, limiting such behaviour to the amatory sphere.<sup>87</sup> For instance, when discussing the type of gifts to bestow on the *puella*, the *praeceptor* adds a couplet condemning those who use such methods in order to work their way into a will - the legacy-hunter, or *captator* (see 271-2n.). Yet by adding this couplet, Ovid is drawing a huge amount of attention to the fact that he *is* saying something that does not mesh with the demands of the civic rules which underpin his own society. By saying that he does *not* advocate such behaviour, he is overtly drawing it to the reader's attention: there is a very thin line between the behaviour he *does* advocate and that which he (nominally) rejects. The instances where he does deviate from Augustan ideals limit any argument that he does not intend to undermine Augustus.

---

<sup>86</sup> One thinks perhaps of Tibullus' preoccupation with the countryside over the city; and Propertius' rejection of travel at, e.g. 1.6.

<sup>87</sup> See Labate (1984) 97-120, esp. 111-12 for full analysis of 2.271-2.

I apply Labate's theory to the first half of *Ars* 2, especially the instructional passages on *obsequium* (177-294). The passage mentioned above is central to this section, for the figure of the legacy-hunter shares many features with that of the *kolax* or 'flatterer'.<sup>88</sup>

The ambiguity of where slavery ends and flattery starts is important: Ovid is careful to present the lover as *not* a victim of *seruitium amoris*, yet he asks him to act *pro seruo* (228). The Hercules *exemplum* of 217-22 is necessary to offset the impression of *seruitium* at 197-216, where the servile behaviour of the lover may be deemed *turpe*.

Yet the lover is not doing all these things for nothing, he is no slave to the *domina* and in fact gains rewards for adopting the attitude of a slave: he gets to touch her, be near to her, seduce her.<sup>89</sup> He feels no alienation: in this way, Labate is right that the model is reconcilable to Roman society. Ovid may be playing with the concept of *seruitium*, but the lover's servitude is carefully controlled. Being a flatterer, for him, means acting like a slave *with an ulterior motive*.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, the language Ovid uses frequently places the lover in the position of an actor playing a role.<sup>91</sup> The lover has an aim and, by manipulating the conventions of love, the lover can play the role of the traditional elegiac lover, imitating sincerity, and thereby profiting more. This is one way of reconciling the apparent servitude of the lover with his enhanced social status: yet Ovid still questions how close he is to persuading the lover to act like a slave.

#### b. The electoral campaigner

Labate uses the model of the electoral campaigner, as with the model of *kolax*, as a way of reconciling the lover to the questionable behaviour advocated by the *praeceptor*.<sup>92</sup> When the lover is advised to become friendly with his *puella*'s slaves (251-60), he looks very like

---

<sup>88</sup> See Damon (1997) 118: 'There is an *ars* to the inheritance-hunting business, as there is to that of the parasite'.

<sup>89</sup> cf. esp. 227-8n, where the lover's attendance on a tipsy *puella* may give him an opportunity to take advantage of her.

<sup>90</sup> Myerowitz (1985) 208 n.22: 'The notion of love as slavery occurs frequently in the *Ars*, not as a metaphor for the enthrallment of passion but in the limited sense of a conventional behavior pattern to be knowingly applied'.

<sup>91</sup> cf. esp. the use of the theatrical phrase *partes ago* to describe the lover's 'act' at 198 (see commentary).

<sup>92</sup> Labate (1984) 223-4.

a politician canvassing for votes. He is advised to shake hands, making sure to approach the slave-girls according to their rank, and ‘make them his own’, cf. *demeruisse* and *fac plebem ... tuam*. When he is advised to place his *puella* under obligation to him (287-294), he is indulging in the tactics of the politician garnering supporters.

A text of conceptual importance is the *Commentariolum Petitionis*. The dubious authorship and likely much later dating of the text makes its use as a straightforward intertext difficult; however, both the *Comm. Pet.* and Ovid’s presentation of the lover in terms of the treatment of his mistress’ slaves inhabit the same conceptual area. At *Comm. Pet.* 5, the ambitious candidate is advised to win support through precisely the kind of tactic Ovid’s lover employs with the slaves:

*deinde, ut quisque est intimus ac maxime domesticus, ut is amet et quam amplissimum esse te cupiat, ualde elaborandum est, [tum] ut tribules, ut uicini, ut clientes, ut denique liberti, postremo etiam serui tui; nam fere omnis sermo ad forensem famam a domesticis emanat auctoribus. denique sunt instituendi cuiusque generis amici.*

(*Comm. Pet.* 5.17-18)

While the *Comm. Pet.* recommends greeting slaves last (*postremo*), for the Ovidian lover, slaves are a much higher priority. They provide a good opportunity for him to inveigle himself into the household of the *puella*.

Labate argues that what makes the *Comm. Pet.* model work in our context is that both texts advise what could be construed as unethical, or even degrading, behaviour in ‘normal’ life. However, ‘love is a special arena where the normal rules of society do not apply’.<sup>93</sup> The *Comm. Pet.* makes repeated remarks concerning the suitability of the behaviour he advocates within the narrow confines of political campaigning: such behaviour would be deemed immoral in any other sphere.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Gibson (2009) 97.

<sup>94</sup> *Comm. Pet.* 7.2, 11.7, 11.15.

The presentation of lover as canvasser in the *Ars* is complicated by the opposing presentation of him as *cliens amoris*,<sup>95</sup> whereby it is the girl who comes to resemble the *patronus*, who must be attended everywhere, and promptly (see introductory note to 217-232). The lover's apparent devotion as *cliens* in fact benefits him too: surely attending her, spending time with her, is his total aim.<sup>96</sup>

## 5 Method of the Commentary

The commentary is modelled upon the *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics* series of commentaries, and aims to be productively selective about use of parallels: these will be limited to ones of significant interpretative value. However, unlike the *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics* series, only very occasional comment is made on the constitution of the text; where I do make such comment, the sigla I use are those of Kenney's Oxford Classical Text. These comments will be limited to those key moments where the manuscript tradition is either particularly tangled or analysis of it is deemed significant for the interpretation of the poetry. One reason for this limitation is the focus of the commentary on the narrative line of the poem: too much concern with textual criticism would detract from this focus.

The 294 lines consist of 16 sections. Each section has its own introductory note, which, firstly, gives a summary of the passage, and, secondly, outlines the main issues raised by the passage. In turn, these issues are linked to the themes introduced in the General Introduction. There follows a full commentary on each lemma. Where individual words or phrases require specific and extended comment, I separate them into lemmata; however, elsewhere I leave lines or indeed in rare cases entire couplets intact for comment. This method avoids the commentary becoming too unwieldy. I have provided my own translations of certain entire lines or couplets in order to aid the reader's navigation

---

<sup>95</sup> A familiar role for the elegiac lover to adopt; see Gibson (1995) 63-72 on *amicitia* in elegy: the lover's use of the terms of *amicitia* in the *Ars* enables him to bind the girl closer to him through the expectations of reciprocity. The *kolax* is one way to reconcile the multiple roles of *patronus*, *cliens*, and *seruus*. See also Labate (1984) 200-219.

<sup>96</sup> See James (2003b) 148-9.

through the commentary, and support a student's reading of the text. In cases where the syntax or meaning of a line is unclear, or where I go on to unpack any grammatical issues, I have felt the addition of a translation useful in order to speed up the reader's progress through the thesis.

The two previous commentaries on *Ars Amatoria* 1-3 are P. Brandt (1902) and E. Pianezzola, G. Baldo and L. Cristante (1991). On *Ars Amatoria* 2, the most recent commentary has been M. Janka (1997). A.S. Hollis' commentary on *Ars Amatoria* 1 (1977) has also proved extremely useful. In terms of detail, this commentary hopes to position itself somewhere between Brandt and Janka's commentaries. Brandt's is an excellent, though old-fashioned style, commentary, concentrating on the relevant intertexts, while Janka's has the benefit of engagement with much appropriate recent scholarship. Janka's introduction, at only 7 pages, is rather thin, although the structure of the commentary is engaging and easy to follow, with, similarly to mine, sections under separate headings, with full introductions followed by lengthy lemmata comments.

One of the ways in which this commentary differs from Janka's is in terms of my engagement with the extensive scholarship on *Ars* 2. Janka fails to engage with either Labate (1984) *L'Arte di Farsi Amare* or Myerowitz (1985) *Ovid's Games of Love*; although both these monographs have made significant advances in Ovidian scholarship. I am particularly interested in establishing an overall narrative line for the poem, and unpacking how this narrative line is sustained or interrupted by Ovid's use of *exempla*. In order to establish this narrative line, understanding of the thematic as well as of the linguistic connections is vital. Labate's notion of certain behaviour-types limited to appropriate spheres of life has proved one of these vital thematic links which bind the poem together. For example, at 251-60, I apply Labate's theory regarding the model of the political electioneer to the situation of the lover ingratiating himself with the slaves of the *puella*. Yet the theory can be applied more widely to the section on *obsequium* more generally (177-294), since the performance aspect of *obsequium* is central to the concept.<sup>97</sup>

Meanwhile, Myerowitz's analysis of the progress metaphor as a means of signposting this narrative progression is one of the vital linguistic means by which the poem is bound. Most

---

<sup>97</sup> cf. esp. 202 *imponat leges uultibus illa tuis*, 294n.

notably, the language of the progress metaphor is echoed during the Daedalus and Icarus *exemplum*, so forging a linguistic link between the model and the progress of the lover, as well as the progress of the reader.<sup>98</sup> Both Labate and Myerowitz have therefore proved invaluable in terms of my own understanding of the poem, and development of this narrative line.

Another flaw is that Janka consistently targets Sharrock (1994a) *Seduction and Repetition* for his criticism. Some of these attacks are exaggerated, and to a certain extent he does set her up as a straw (wo)man. I intend to engage more supportively with some of Sharrock's arguments, along with Labate and Myerowitz's fascinating readings of the *Ars*, and adding my own interpretations to these, specifically those regarding the complexities of mapping the *exempla* onto the narrative line of the instructional passages.<sup>99</sup>

### Commentary on *Ars Amatoria* 2, lines 1-294

**1-8:** the *praeceptor* expresses his joy at the success of *Ars* 1

The opening lines of *Ars* 2 express joy that 'sought booty' has fallen into the *praeceptor*'s 'nets'. The hunting metaphor is a common euphemism for erotic pursuit; see Gibson on *Ars*. 3.427-8, Murgatroyd (1984), Green (1996). The metaphor is already familiar to the reader of Book 1; cf. 1.45-50, 89, 253, 263, 270, 391-2, 766. The instinctive reaction of the reader is to interpret these lines as referring to the lover as hunter, who has successfully caught his *puella* due to the instruction of Book 1; yet the nets are *meos*, i.e. those of the *praeceptor*. The poet successfully merges the act of poetic creation with the behaviour of the lover, strengthening the sense of the 'teacher-student constellation' (Volk (2002) 37-8 and esp. 180).

---

<sup>98</sup> cf. 9-10n, 37-8n, 51-2n, 63-4n, and 83-4n.

<sup>99</sup> See section 3 for an analysis of Ovid's complex use of myth, most notably at lines 5-6 (Paris), 21-98 (Daedalus and Icarus), Ulysses and Calypso (123-44), and Atalanta and Milanion (185-94).

This ambiguity also suggests an alternative reading: that the *praeceptor* is celebrating his own victory in the seduction of his reader; see Sharrock (1994a) 21-2: ‘The *lover* has fallen into Ovid’s trap... He is a victim of seduction by the poet/teacher ... At the moment of transition between Books 1 and 2, the trap snaps shut. The prey – whoever it may be – is caught’. The following couplet seems to corroborate the initial reading: the lover is *laetus*; yet it is the poet who receives the *uiridi ... palma* for his successful teachings, and is even rated above Hesiod and Homer. This merging of identities forges a stronger link between the parallel ambitions of teacher and student.

The following two couplets provide the first use of myth to represent the lover: he is like both Paris, after successfully abducting Helen, and Pelops, after winning the chariot race which facilitated his marriage to Hippodamia. See Introduction, pp25-7, for a full discussion of these opening myths. A warning lurks beneath the surface for the lover: things did not turn out well for either of these mythological heroes (and they both resorted to cheating in order to win). The relationship between Paris and Helen results in the Trojan War and the ultimate death of Paris himself; the behaviour of Pelops during the chariot race leads to the curse against the house of Pelops, and ultimately the suicide of Hippodamia; see Myerowitz (1985) 83: ‘two celebrated mythological precedents for “joyrides” which ended in tragedy for the lovers’ - and so the lover should not rest now: there is still more work to be done to safely secure his girl.

**1-4** These lines present the poet *and* the lover as triumphant victors. Ovid represents victory through engagement with ancient Greek metaphors for success, whether poetic or erotic. Line 1 engages with Greek paeanic, but also Apolline, terminology; line 2 presents a traditional hunting metaphor, although the question of just who is being caught remains ambiguous; in line 3, a prize is awarded to the poet in the specific style of the Roman triumph; and in line 4, Ovid uses the models of Hesiod and Homer as the greatest poets. By positioning himself within the traditions of Hesiod and Homer, as well as tapping into the metaphor of hunting for love, Ovid makes the first four lines of *Ars* 2 intensely programmatic.

**1-2 dicite ‘io Paeon’ et ‘io’ bis dicite ‘Paeon’** The repetition of the key words *dicite*, *io*, and *Paeon* give a ritualistic sound to the opening line of *Ars* 2. The plural imperative *dicite* implies that the speaker is the poet, directing his readers to recite the words of

approval. The use of the imperative as the first word of the book, which is then strikingly repeated within the same line, serves to establish Book 2 in the same didactic style as Book 1, cf. 1.2 *legat et ...amet; Medic. 1 discite*.

The hymnal effect of the repetition is appropriate, since the *paeon* is often a hymn of victory most commonly addressed to Apollo, cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.473, 5.401, 22.391; *Aesch. Pers.* 391; *Call. Hymn 2.* 103 ἦ ἦ παιῶν; *Verg. Aen.* 6.657; *Ov. Met.* 14.720, Sharrock (1994a) 258-9, Rutherford (2001) 23, 45-7. Apollo will feature prominently at the midpoint of Book 2, 493-510, where he appears to the poet with all the accoutrements of the god of music, plucking his lyre and crowned with laurel, in a scene echoing the *Aetia* prologue. References to the god of poetry at the beginning and middle of *Ars 2* are significant in poetic terms: Ovid from the very start of the book is claiming Apolline approval for his poetic venture. This is problematic when one recalls the opening of Book 1, where the poet rejected divine inspiration, cf. 1.25 *non ego, Phoebae, datas a te mihi mentiar artes*. The contradiction is unsettling, as the poet indicates the god to whom he owes a debt (Apollo) without directly naming him. The *paeon* is a specific celebration of victory; cf. *Prop.* 3.15.41-2 *uictorque canebat / paeana*. It can have a closural force, here marking the end of Book 1, yet also heralding the start of a new venture: ‘rarely, an appeal to Paian comes first, as in Plato, *Crit.* 108 C; Ovid *AA 2*, which begins with a triumphant παιάν-cry’, (Rutherford (2001) 72 n. 12).

‘*io triumphae*’ was traditionally chanted at Roman triumphs; cf. *Tib.* 2.5.118, *Hor. Epod.* 9.21, *Ov. Trist.* 4.2.51-2, Beard (2007) 50. The use of *io* here in conjunction with the Apolline *Paeon* serves to embed the Roman triumphal tradition into the poetic tradition, thus allowing the poet to usurp the position of triumphing general, a position which, at the time Ovid was writing, was the sole right of Augustus and his family; see Beard (2007) 69-71. The triumphal theme is continued at 3 (see below). The Triumph was already used disrespectfully at 1.223-8, where the occasion of a Triumph becomes for the lover a mere opportunity to show off his geographical knowledge to the girl; see Galinsky (1969) 96-101. *io* is an exclamation from someone divinely inspired; cf. *TLL* 7.2.281.49ff.

**decidit in casses praeda petita meos** Kenney (1970) 386-8 notes the innovative use of hunting nets as the nets of love in *Lucr.* 4. 1146-8. The connection between the prayer to Apollo in the previous line and the hunting imagery in this line has led Murgatroyd (1984) 366 to identify this couplet as an example of Apollo appearing as the god of hunting.

*decido* is used in the special sense of falling into traps; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.517, Ov. *Rem.* 502, TLL. 5.1.162.57ff. As Volk (2002) 179 points out, the perfect tense provides a sense of ‘poetic simultaneity’ (see Introduction, pp17-18) since the poet depicts the act of ‘falling’ as having already taken place very recently: in fact, at the liminal edges between Books 1 and 2.

*casses* are the figurative nets of love, designed to entrap lovers; cf. Tib. 1.6.5, Ov. *Ars.* 3.554. Within the *Ars*, Ovid favours the more common word *retia* for ‘nets’; cf. 1.45, 263, 764, 2.189, 194, *Rem.* 202, 516. Ovid advised his readers on where to spread nets (*retia*) at 1.263-6, an act that must be carefully performed in order not to capture the *wrong* girl by accident; see Green (1996) 246.

*praeda* refers to the target of amorous designs; cf. 1.89 and 2.406, where Agamemnon becomes the *praeda* of his *praeda*, Cassandra. In the latter example, the double meaning, both the literal one of *praeda* as prize of war, and the metaphorical one of prize of love, is cleverly utilised.

**3-4 laetus amans donat uiridi mea carmina palma** The triumphal language from line 1 is resumed: the *palma* is a motif of the Roman Triumph; see Beard (2007) 26. The lover rejoices in the success he has achieved by reading and following the advice of Book 1, and now the lover is presented as granting Ovid the ‘palm’ to demonstrate his gratitude. This image is repeated at the very end of the book (ring composition), 733, where the poet calls to be awarded the *palma* again by the *grata iuuentus* (echoing the *laetus amans* here). It is notable that the palm is ‘green’, a mark of youthful vigour and vitality. The palm is awarded to lovers at Hor. *Carm.* 3.20.12, Prop. 2.9.40, 4.1.40; note also Tib. 1.9.82, where the palm is awarded to a god for help in amatory affairs.

**praelata Ascraeo Maeonioque seni** ‘preferred (i.e. *mea carmina*) to the Ascraean and the Maeonian old man’: the Ascraean here means Hesiod; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.70, *Georg.* 2.176 *Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen* (Virgil acknowledging Hesiod as model), Prop. 2.10.25, 2.13.4, 2.34.77, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.11, *Fast.* 6.14, 6.96; while the Maeonian old man is an allusion to Homer; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.6.2, Prop. 2.28.29, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.9-10 with McKeown *ad loc.*, 2.5.40, 3.9.25, *Her.* 9.65, *Rem.* 373, Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.26 *Maeonium Ascraeumque senem*. Ovid selects Hesiod and Homer as models for didactic and epic poetry, respectively, but in such a way as to distance himself from them. The noun *seni* here denotes venerability and antiquity rather than merely old age, cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.34 (of Lucilius), OLD s.v. 1c.

However, a careful reader may recall Ovid's rejection of Hesiodic experience as model at the opening of Book 1, an intratext which adds an extra layer to the opening of Book 2; cf. 1.27-8 *nec mihi sunt uisae Clio Clisusque sorores / seruanti pecudes uallibus, Ascra, tuis*. The verbal echo here of *Ascra* is designed to emphasise the connection. The occurrence at the start of Book 1 is part of the general rejection of divine inspiration claimed by previous poets, including Hesiod at *Theog.* 22-34. At the start of Book 2, Ovid goes one step further, by claiming that his readers even *prefer* his poetry to the divinely inspired Hesiod; see Solodow (1977) 109-10. Furthermore, Homer too will return at 109; see note below. Thus, the references here to Hesiod and Homer look forward as well as back to the start of Book 1.

**5-6 talis ... Priameius hospes** Paris featured fairly frequently in *Ars* 1; in terms of his role as abductor of Helen, cf. 1.54 *raptaque sit Phrygio Graia puella uiro, 685-6 iam nurus ad Priamum diuerso uenerat orbe, / Graiaque in Iliacis moenibus uxor erat*, and in relation to his task as arbiter at the Judgement of the Goddesses, cf. 1.247-8, cf. esp. 248 *cum dixit Veneri 'uincis utramque, Venus'*, the moment which results in the eventual abduction, also 625-6 and 683-4.

Paris is frequently described ironically as *hospes*, cf. 360, 362, and 369. For the significance of the recurrence of Paris later in *Ars* 2, denoting his role as ideal Ovidian lover, see Introduction, pp25-7. The repetition of this key word to describe the 'bad guest' forces the reader to connect these two moments.

**ab armiferis ... Amyclis** The description of Amyclae (a town near Sparta, here synecdoche for Sparta itself) as 'arms-bearing' foreshadows the consequence of the abduction: Sparta will indeed arm itself in preparation for advancing upon Troy. It also contrasts with the juxtaposed *Priameius*, since the latter epithet refers to Paris, a famously un-warlike character. Although *armiger* was a common term, *armifer* is a neologism of Ovid's, and he uses it frequently of Minerva; cf. *Am.* 2.6.25, *Met.* 14.475, *Fast.* 3.681, 6.421, *Trist.* 4.10.13, Arens (1950) 254-5. It is also present elsewhere in Ovid to describe places; cf. *Ov. Her.* 2.84, TLL. 2.613.40ff.

**candida cum rapta coniuge uela dedit** This line depicts Paris in the very moment of sailing from Sparta towards Troy, with Helen on board.

The whiteness of the sails is emphasised, to draw attention to the good fortune of Paris in successfully seducing the wife of his host, Menelaus. Whiteness can be representative of good fortune; cf. e.g. Catull. 68.148, 107.6, Hor. *Carm.* 1.36.10, Ov.

*Trist.* 3.4.34. In this way, Paris looks very much like the *laetus amans* of 3. However, a subtle warning is present in the wording of this line, as white sails provide a sense of foreboding due to the motif of the white sails in the myth of Theseus; cf. Catull. 64.222, Plut. *Thes.* 17.

Like *hospes* to describe Paris in the previous line, *coniunx* to describe Helen here is also ironic, as it allows for a certain degree of ambiguity: whose wife is she at this moment? At Sparta, Helen is wife of Menelaus. Once she reaches Troy, she becomes bride of Paris; cf. 1.685-6 (quoted above), esp. 685 *nurus*. On the transitional voyage between the two, she maintains an ambiguous marital status. This ambiguity highlights just how provocative the choice of Paris is as the very first *exemplum* in the poem in the context of the Augustan marriage laws; see Introduction, pp25-7. For the *puella* compared with Helen at this precise moment of marital ambiguity, cf. *Am.* 1.10.1-2, esp. 2 *coniugibus belli causa duobus*.

### **7-8 talis erat qui te curru uictore ferebat, / uecta peregrinis Hippodamia rotis**

The repetition of *talis* links this with the *exemplum* of the previous couplet. Pelops may be unnamed, but the reference to Hippodamia towards the end of the pentameter line makes the identity of the second *exemplum* clear. Oenomaus, king of Pisa, challenges his daughter's suitors to a chariot race. Pelops manages to defeat the king by corrupting his charioteer, Myrtilos, and persuading him to sabotage the king's chariot; cf. Soph. *El.* 504ff, Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.752-8, Diod. Sic. 4.73. An alternative version attributes Pelops' success to the divine intervention of Neptune; cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1.89.

The myth of Pelops has a tragic outcome: the charioteer Myrtilos as he dies curses the house of Pelops, which results in a tragic cycle of events, including the fratricide of Atreus and Thyestes (Pelops' sons), the death of Agamemnon (Pelops' grandson), and the matricide thereafter committed by Orestes (Pelops' great-grandson). Thyestes was referenced at 1.327, and tragedy in general was a fertile source for *exempla* in the previous book, cf. e.g. Medea at 1.335-6, Hippolytus at 1.338 and 511, and Phaedra at 1.744.

Pelops' chariot is *peregrinus* because he is a foreigner: he was Phrygian, cf. Prop. 1.2.19-20 *nec Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum / auecta externis Hippodamia rotis*. The almost identical pentameter indicates Ovid's close engagement with the Propertian intertext: there used to demonstrate the benefits of unadorned beauty. There is a problem here though: Hippodamia may have been naturally beautiful, but along with taking her as wife, Pelops also takes the throne from her father whose death he causes during the chariot

race. Thus, Pelops' happiness is not purely erotic: it also has a vast impact upon his social status. It may be of significance to note the structural connection between the Ovidian and Propertian use of the myth: both occur towards the start of the second poem; see Introduction, pp28-30, for Ovid's use of second poems in his echo of *Ars 2* at the start of *Met. 2*.

**9-14:** the task of *Ars 2* is to keep hold of the girl

These lines form a strong break from the jubilant opening, and justify the need for a second book of instruction from the *praeceptor*. A return to the progress metaphor allows the voice of the *praeceptor* to interrupt the lover's joy with a warning: the ship (both poetic and erotic) is in mid-sea, and more work is required to reach the 'harbour'. However, the reader is prepared for the theme of the second book by 1.38 *tertius, ut longo tempore duret amor*; see Introduction, p7. The question of how lengthy *longus* may be is ignored, in favour of a more general statement regarding the importance of the skill of *keeping* love, which apparently requires greater *ars* than *finding* the girl (which was the theme of Book 1).

The reader is presented with a cluster of inconsistencies within these opening lines. The poet simultaneously refutes his connection with Homer (4) and subtly indicates his aspirations for imitating just such epic style (see note to 9-10). He is particularly inconsistent in terms of his treatment of divine inspiration: he at once rejects Hesiod (4), an echo of the rejection of divine inspiration at the start of *Ars 1*, and marks himself as a divinely inspired poet (*uates* at 11, see below). These inconsistencies continue throughout the opening; see introductory note to 15-20, where the connection with the opening of *Ars 1* is made more explicit.

**9-10 quid properas, iuuenis?** The reader is specifically addressed as *iuuenis* (or similar) at 1.382 *nec iuuenum quisquam me duce captus erit*, 459 *Romana iuuentus*, 2.557 *o iuuenes*, 667 *o iuuenes*, 3.811 *ut quondam iuuenes, ita nunc, mea turba, puellae, Rem. 41 decepti iuuenes*. By naming the reader thus at this early stage of the book, and in the form of a rhetorical question, Ovid draws attention to the act of writing, engaging in what Volk

(2002) 40 terms ‘poetic simultaneity’, since we see the reader in the act of ‘hastening’, called back by the admonishing poet; see Introduction, pp17-18.

**mediis tua pinus in undis / nauigat, et longe quem peto portus abest** On the significance of this return to the ship metaphor for the progress of the poem as well as the progress of the lover’s relationship, see Introduction, pp9-10. A ship faltering in mid-sea is extremely dangerous; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.339 (of Palinurus’ death) *exciderat puppi mediis effusus in undis*. Mid-sea also has generic and stylistic implications, as the Augustan poets used the metaphor for denoting greater epic force; cf. *Ars.* 3.100, with Gibson *ad loc.* Ovid implies not only that there is much work for the lover still to do, but also that there is a need now for greater poetic skill.

As Myerowitz (1985) 83 notes, there is a conflict between the lover’s *pinus* (ownership denoted by *tua*) and the role of poet as guide (the first person *peto*; cf. also *me uate* in the following line, which echoes *me duce* of 1.382, see below).

The *portus* performs the role of figurative refuge or haven; cf. e.g. Prop. 3.24.15-16 with Heyworth and Morwood *ad loc.*, Ov. *Pont.* 2.8.68, TLL. 10.2.62.52ff. It also, in the context of poetics, marks the projected end of the poem; cf. 3.100, 748. For the harbour as sexual metaphor, see Gibson on 3.748. The sexual undercurrent here binds the poetic and sexual aims of the book tightly together.

**11-12 non satis est uenisse tibi me uate puellam** ‘it is not enough for a girl to have come to you with me as bard’: the reader may recall the warning towards the start of Book 1 that *haec tibi non tenues ueniet delapsa per auras* (1.43). There, the lover was advised that he would have to *seek* for the *apta puella* (1.44). This echo of the start of Book 1, and the perfect infinitive *uenisse*, emphasise the fact that the desired girl *has* been found: the *praeda petita* of line 2. However, this is not enough.

Here Ovid is no common *poeta*, but a *uates*, as at 1.29, 525, 2.165, 739. In Book 3, he may use *poeta* to mean poets in general, but he never uses it to refer to himself. *uates*, the old Latin word for poet, has extra religious connotations regarding divine inspiration, and so continues the hymnic nature of the language in the opening generally; cf. e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 9.33ff, Hor. *Carm.* 1.31.1-2 with Nisbet and Hubbard *ad loc.*, *Epod.* 17.44, *Epist.* 2.1.119-20, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.6 with McKeown *ad loc.*, OLD s.v. 2. The religious aspect is particularly ironic considering Ovid’s rejection of divine inspiration at the start of Book 1; cf. 1.25-30, Ahern (1990) 45, Volk (2002) 161. The use of *uates* here foreshadows the invocation of Venus, Cupid, and Erato at 15-16 (see below). For *uates* denoting poetic

ambition, cf. Prop. 2.10.19, Mart. 8.73.5 *Cynthia te uatem fecit, lasciue Properti*, Ov. *Met.* 11.2 (of Orpheus) *Threicius uates*.

**arte mea capta est, arte tenenda mea est** This line outlines the main difference between Books 1 and 2: Book 1 was concerned with finding and seducing the girl, Book 2 is concerned with keeping hold of her.

Solodow (1977) 122-4 outlines the three meanings of *ars* in Ovid's hands, all of which are relevant to the interpretation of this line. Firstly, 'skill', i.e. it was Ovid's advice that enabled the lover to seduce the girl, and it will be his continued instruction that will teach the lover how to keep her. Secondly, 'text-book', i.e. the *Ars Amatoria* itself: so a straight-forward statement of poetic structure. Thirdly, 'artifice', i.e. the implication is that the *praeceptor* has taught the lover the tricks of the trade, emphasising the deceptive nature of seduction, and promising that such amusing deceptions will continue in this book. This final meaning is strengthened by the use of *capio*, which can also mean 'to take in' or 'delude'; cf. OLD. s.v. 20.

Sharrock (1994a) 23 notes how the rapacious language (*capio* and *teneo*) echoes the hunting metaphor of 2, drawing attention to the ambiguity of just who is the target of the 'capturing' and 'holding': the girl or the lover himself (as reader). Clearly, the feminine *capta* and *tenenda* refer to the *puella* of the previous line. However, the language of pursuit forces the reader to recall the difficulty of identifying the *praeda* of line 2: the girl or Ovid's reader.

**13-14 nec minor est uirtus, quam quaerere, parta tueri** 'nor is it a lesser virtue to protect what you have got, than to search for it': i.e. the *puella*. The concept, both literal and metapoetic, is that the theme of Book 2 should not be denigrated. *minor* is echoed at 17 *magna paro*, implying that Book 2 will consist of a higher level of instruction. However, it also helps to present poetry in mid-creation, i.e. 'poetic simultaneity' (Volk (2002) 13-24, esp. 15 on Verg. *Ecl.* 4.1 *Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus*).

**casus inest illic, hoc erit artis opus** Ovid is trying to downplay the significance of Book 1; yet by doing so, he is clearly demonstrating its worth: the lover would not be in the position he now is without the benefit of the instruction of Book 1 on finding the *puella*. However, chance certainly played a part in Book 1: the Roman way of life was shown to provide many opportunities for seducing girls, whether it be while taking a stroll (1.67-88), at the theatre (1.89-134), the games (1.135-228), a dinner party (1.229-52). After all, Rome is full of girls; cf. 1.55-6 *tot tibi tamque dabit formosas Roma puellas, / haec*

*habet' ut dicas 'quicquid in orbe fuit'*. Book 2 will prove more difficult for the lover as it is targeted towards a specific girl, and the potential pitfalls that await. The repetition of *ars* from 12, as there, draws attention to the poet's technique (see note above).

### **15-20:** invocation to Venus and Cupid

The poet invokes Cupid and Venus, and then the Muse Erato, to support his poetic undertaking. These lines form a deliberate echo of the prologue to *Ars* 1. These resonances have been present throughout the opening of *Ars* 2 (see introductory note to 9-14). In *Ars* 1, the poet rejected divine inspiration in the form of Apollo (cf. 1.25-6) and the Muses (cf. 1.27-8) as a direct allusion to Callimachus and Hesiod, respectively, see Hollis *ad loc.* However, this rejection of Callimachean and Hesiodic ideals is immediately challenged at 30 with *coeptis, mater Amoris, ades*, an invocation to Venus; see Miller (1986) 157-9. Here now, the poet not only invokes Venus once more, but he adds her son, the *puer* Cupid, and then Erato, in what seems an ultimate contradiction of his rejection of *Clio Cliusque sorores* (1.27). The abundance of targets for his divine invocation serves to 'trump' the corresponding passage from *Ars* 1. One may also recall the Apolline language with which the Book opened (1n). The poet appears to be reneging on the claims of the prologue to Book 1.

The invocation of Erato allows Ovid to emphasise the central position of this passage, whether one considers the poet at this point to be thinking of the *Ars Amatoria* in terms of two books or three. Virgil and Apollonius both invoke Erato at central points: Virgil towards the start of *Aen.* 7 (37-45, cf. esp. 37 *nunc age ... Erato*); and Apollonius at the very start of *Argon.* 3. Yet Virgil's invocation of the Muse whose name is love (cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1-5, esp. 3.5 τῷ καὶ τοι ἐπήρατον οὖνομ' ἀνήπται) is problematic as an introduction to the Iliadic second half of the *Aeneid*. The presence of Erato in Apollonius to introduce the story of Medea and Jason is much more appropriate. Virgil is clearly echoing Ap. Rhod. 3.1 εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν, Ἐρατώ, with his *nunc age*, an echo Ovid attempts to reinforce with his repetition of *nunc*. It is the etymological connection between Erato and *eros* that enables Ovid to claim that she 'has the name of Love' (16). Ovid repeats this connection at *Fast.* 4.195-6 *sic Erato (mensis Cythereius illi / cessit, quod teneri nomen amoris habet)*.

Ovid then provides a description of the attributes of *Amor*, emphasising its flighty nature. This is designed, firstly, to demonstrate the difficulty of the task to follow, to restrain the winged deity in one place (note *magna paro*, 17). Secondly, it provides a connection with the Daedalus and Icarus myth which follows, focusing as it does upon the use of wings.

**15-16** The repetition of *nunc* at emphatic positions at the beginning of each line of this couplet, as well as forging a connection with Virgil and Apollonius (see introductory note), reinforces the tone of divine invocation; cf. e.g. Tib. 1.3.27 *nunc, dea, nunc*.

**nunc mihi, si quando, puer et Cytherea, fauete** The *puer* is Cupid. He is invoked first, possibly a hint towards the important role he will play in the following lines as model for Icarus in the next lengthy *exemplum*. *puer* also foreshadows the eroticisation of Icarus as *puer* in the Daedalus *exemplum* (29-30n).

Cythera is an island in the Aegean, sacred to Venus because on her birth from the sea she was believed to have stepped ashore on her way to Cyprus; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 192-3.

**nunc Erato, nam tu nomen Amoris habes** Erato will be invoked again at the mid-point of this book, at 425, as *docta Erato*, once more consolidating her special connection with the central moment of poetic production. *nomen habere* is used especially in etymological contexts; see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.3.

**17-18 magna paro, quas possit Amor remanere per artes, / dicere** ‘I prepare to speak great things, through which arts *Amor* might be able to remain’: *Amor* represents both the love between the lover and his *puella*, and the personification of Love, i.e. the god Cupid. The following lines, which detail the god’s attributes, show Ovid utilising the conventional appearance of the god to demonstrate the difficulties the lover will face, but also which he as teacher will face. A contrast between minor and major is a structuring element also in *Ars* 3; see Gibson on 3.499-500.

When Ovid writes that the aim of his *artes* is to make Love ‘remain’, he also implies that it should be enduring. Yet the precise amount of time he means is left open to interpretation. This is the third reference to *ars* in as many couplets. The repetition exposes the crucial aspect of the problem: love is not something that can be easily controlled by ‘skill’.

**tam uasto peruagus orbe puer** ‘a boy liable to wander the so vast world’: the first example of *Amor*’s attributes focuses upon his wandering nature. The repetition of

*puer* from 15 makes clear the identity of this god as the son of Venus. *peruagus* is a *hapax legomenon*, but *uagus* is elsewhere used of fickle lovers; cf. Prop. 1.5.7, Ov. *Am.* 2.9.53, Mart. 6.21.6, 12.96.8.

**19-20 et leuis est et habet geminas, quibus auolet, alas** The careful reader may note a similarity between these wings and the manufactured wings of Icarus (below). These lines prepare the reader for the myth which is to follow.

The assonance at the start of the line is remarkable, echoing the jingle of *uasto peruagus ... puer* of the previous line, and continuing the hymnal quality of these lines. Cupid is *leuis*, both ‘light’ in terms of his insubstantial size, but also ‘fickle’; cf. Tib. 1.1.73 (of Venus), Ov. *Am.* 3.1.41 *sum leuis, et mecum leuis est, mea cura, Cupido*.

However, *leuis* is also used of lighter modes of poetry, such as elegy. Together with the reference to *geminas ... alas*, a metapoetic reference is made: ‘the “twin wings” of Love are probably the two elements of the elegiac couplet’ (Sharrock (1994a) 192).

The idea of a god ‘flying about’ is common; cf. e.g. Catull. 66.55, Verg. *Aen.* 11.712; specifically of Cupid, cf. Prop. 2.12.15 *euolat*, Tib. 2.2.17 *aduolet*, 2.5.39 *uolitantis ... Amoris*. Here, the image of the god flying *away* is key: not only is he prone to flit about, he is also likely to disappear once he has settled somewhere. This connects too with the Daedalus myth to follow, for it is on wings (both *double* in form, note the need for ‘balance’, see 68n, and used by *two* people, father and son) that they will attempt to ‘fly away’ from Crete and Minos.

**difficile est illis imposuisse modum** ‘it is difficult to impose a limit to them (i.e. the wings)’: however, see Sharrock (1994a) 192: ‘*modus ...* is also metrical order, so the phrase also means “constrain love in verse” – write erotic didactic poetry’. As in the previous line, the depiction of Love is imbued with metapoetic imagery. In addition, the need to impose moderation upon the reader of the *Ars* is paramount, as the myth to follow will demonstrate (see below). Platnauer (1951) 109-10 outlines the examples of the perfect infinitive used as present infinitive after certain verbs, such as also at 98 *paro*, 121-2 *cura est*, 215-6 *turpe est*, and 252 *pudor est*.

**21-98:** Daedalus and Icarus: the difficulty of the task of keeping hold of Love / a warning regarding youthful temerity

Early in the second book of the *Ars*, Ovid inserts the story of Daedalus and Icarus attempting to escape from Crete. Minos has prevented the inventor of the Labyrinth from leaving, in effect keeping him prisoner on the island. Victimized by the king, Daedalus resorts to a desperate measure; he invents a novel method of escape for himself and for his son: flight. This *exemplum* is presented, through its framing couplets (19-20 and 97-8), as a way of demonstrating the difficulty of restraining wings: Minos failed to restrain a winged man (Daedalus), while the *praeceptor* hopes to restrain the wings of the highly volatile god, *Amor*.

However, the explanation of the *exemplum* is deliberately and provocatively unsatisfactory. The sheer length of the passage marks it as something significant: at 76 lines, it is the longest of the mythological digressions in the *Ars*. The length of the passage means that by the time the reader reaches the end, the reference to *Amor* at the start has become a distant memory. Moreover, the myth described is one of the few within the Cretan cycle (and, indeed, the only one of the extended myths in the *Ars*) that lacks any erotic focus, making it a surprising choice. The opening lines make learned references to Pasiphae enclosed in the heifer-disguise, and to the Minotaur, product of Pasiphae's affair with the bull, enclosed in his Labyrinth: thus we have a number of possible subjects that could represent an analogy to Love restrained. Yet, Ovid selects the one Cretan myth that does not concern *Amor* at all, at least not of the erotic kind. The episode seems on an initial reading to fail in its task to exemplify some facet of the education of the lover, the task of the didactic *exemplum*.

#### Scholarly Debate

Much has been written on the Daedalus and Icarus episode at the start of *Ars* 2 in an attempt to explain the strange (apparent) failure of the passage. Myerowitz (1985) 150-67 examines the passage in terms of its presentation of *ars*, linking it closely with the Ulysses and Calypso passage at 123-44 (see below). Her argument is that Daedalus is the archetypal *artifex*, a role in which he is highly successful. Yet it is in his roles as *praeceptor* and as father to Icarus that he fails; see esp. Myerowitz (1985) 167.

Ahern (1989) 273-96 provides valuable insight into the potential social and poetic statements inherent within the passage. He attempts an extremely useful analysis of the

‘puzzling’ episode. He begins by acknowledging that the story does not work in terms of its stated context. For instance, if the poet’s attempts to retain love resemble the failed attempts of Minos to hold on to Daedalus, are we to identify the poet with Minos? Surely not: the figure of Daedalus as *artifex* looks much more like the poet. Ahern therefore aligns Daedalus with Ovid, Icarus with the lover, and Minos with ‘social custom’. To take this idea a little further: Minos comes to represent the more restrictive side to creativity (after all, it is under his rule that Daedalus creates his most famous invention, the Labyrinth); Daedalus represents the moderate element (as exemplified by his moderating advice to Icarus, 59-64); while Icarus expresses the excessive side to creativity (see esp. 83-4n). When Daedalus instructs his son on how to fly (51-64), we are to see here an allusion to the *praeceptor* instructing his student on how to proceed in the art of seduction. Like Icarus, the student must either obey the instructions of the father-like teacher or fail. Ahern (1989) 293-5 goes on to introduce the concept of the passage as representing Ovid’s concern with poetics, which he uses as a means of escaping the constraints of Augustan society (which is how Minos resembles Roman ‘social custom’, restraining the poet).

Sharrock (1994a) 87-195 emphasises the actual similarities between the reader and *Icarus*, rather than aligning him with the more privileged positions of Daedalus and the poet. Sharrock takes Ahern’s suggestion concerning poetics much further, and applies a metapoetic reading to the entire Daedalus passage. She demonstrates how the episode can be read as a representation of the *Ars* itself, both sustaining and complicating Ahern’s theory. Generally, flight stands as a metaphor for poetic composition; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.20, 4.2. Flying high indicates the ambitious poetry of epic, while flying low denotes lower genres of poetry such as elegy. Daedalus’ advice to fly a middle course mirrors Ovid’s attempts to sustain a middle course between didactic and elegy in this hybrid of didactic elegy. If we take Daedalus and Icarus as representing different types of poet, the success of one and the failure of the other represent the dangers for Ovid in attempting to overreach himself and transgress upon the higher stylistic level from the narrower confines of Callimacheanism.

Ovid provides his own later metapoetic reading of the story of Icarus, at *Trist.* 1.1.87-90, where style of writing is directly compared with Icarus’ flight, as Ovid warns his book not to stretch too far, or it will gain a fate similar to that of Icarus:

*dum petit infirmis nimium sublimia pennis*

*Icarus, aequoreas nomine fecit aquas.*

(*Trist.* 1.1.89-90)

The feathers of Icarus are *infirmas* (compare the *infirmas ... aues* of the simile at 66), he is excessive (*nimum*, 83), and he gives his name to a sea (*aequora nomen habent*, 96). Yet this last emphasis is important: Icarus does not merely die, he gains eternal fame through his death (96n).

Janka's commentary, written in 1997, although influenced by Sharrock's work, proves rather more cautious in its approach, and questions many of Sharrock's more thought-provoking suggestions. For instance, he considers much of her poetologically-charged analyses as 'Hyperinterpretation' (see Janka on 2.35-6) or even as misinterpretation (see Janka on 2.37-8, 45-6, 59-62). Although I disagree in most of these instances, there is an element of truth when he dismisses some of her interpretations as 'zu weit hergeholt' (see Janka on 2.81-2) or even 'besonders abwegig' (see Janka on 2.93-4). I would certainly not go as far as Janka in the outright dismissal of some of the more challenging readings. Although I perhaps do not subscribe to them all myself (and I will discuss these in the commentary below), I certainly recognise the value of a highly charged poetological approach. My strategy of interpretation aims to form a critical 'middle path' between these two approaches.

### The Cretan Cycle

Although surprising at this crucial point in the text to have an *exemplum* entirely devoid of erotic focus, the use of an episode from the Cretan cycle is less of a surprise: there were a number of references to the Cretan cycle in *Ars* 1: Ovid used the myth of Pasiphae as an example of the excessive nature of female passion (cf. 1.289-326); and that of Ariadne to demonstrate the power of Bacchus, or wine (cf. 1.525-68). The Cretan cycle was a popular source for the exploration of the nature of transgression and paradox; see Armstrong (2006) 1-16. The Daedalus and Icarus passage provides a rich opportunity for Ovid to expose these paradoxes: Minos is at once cruel despot (21, 32, 52), powerful king (35), and fair judge (25); Crete is both place of refuge for the exiled Daedalus and his prison; Daedalus is innocent victim of Minos' cruelty (21), murderer (27), and pimp (23); see

Armstrong (2006) 124-9. Armstrong emphasises the Roman fascination with Crete for just this reason: it allows them to engage with the contradictions inherent within their own society, between the repressive Augustan marriage laws on the one hand and the actual behaviour of its citizens on the other.

The Daedalus myth, although presumably familiar to the ancient reader from lost Greek sources, finds its most enduring treatment in Ovid. However, Ovid is explicitly engaging with a very significant earlier source: the opening passage of Verg. *Aen.* 6, in which Daedalus depicts the image of the flight from Crete on the doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae. The ekphrasis of the Daedalan doors at the start of the highly significant Book 6 can be interpreted as metapoetic, where the images depicted represent the demands of epic poetry; Sharrock (1994a) 104-11. The echoes of Virgil at the start of *Ars* 2 invite the reader to understand the Ovidian version as metapoetic, especially considering the central position of both passages within their respective poems (as Sharrock (1994a) 106-11 indicates). In the Virgilian version, when it comes to presenting the death of his son, Daedalus' hands fail: a failure which can be interpreted as another instance of the 'autobiographer inclined to paper over the cracks of his own dubious behaviour' (Armstrong (2006) 128); this is an omission which Ovid rectifies, by telling precisely that aspect of the myth which Virgil's Daedalus is unable to represent.

In addition to the Virgilian intertext, Horace in *Carm.* 1.3, 2.20, and 4.2 employs the Daedalus and Icarus story as an analogy for poetic aspiration; see 21-2n. It is these poems, in addition to the Ovidian versions, which make the myth a hackneyed theme by the time Juvenal writes his satirical treatment; cf. 1.54. The fame of the myth of Icarus is such that when Trimalchio gets it wrong at Petron. *Sat.* 52.2.2, his ignorance is absurd.

#### The Ovidian Afterlife of the Myth

The present elegiac treatment of the myth finds its epic counterpart at *Met.* 8.183-235. The epic version adds a coda to the story: the murder of Perdix told in the form of flashback (8.236-259). There are a number of notable differences between the two versions, many of which can be attributed to the differing demands of the genre in which they are written. Heinze (1919) produced a thorough, though outmoded, genre-based comparison of versions of the Proserpina myth in the *Met.* and *Fasti*, seeing the differences as due to the

differing demands of the specific genres in which they were written. However, Little (1970) 64-105 confronts Heinze's assumptions, specifically those regarding treating the *Met.* purely as 'epic'. Hinds (1987) 99-134 sees much that is useful in Heinze's genre-based approach, while emphasising the need for care in the case of Ovid, on the grounds that he constantly challenges the generic boundaries of his poetry.

The same problems emerge when attempting to compare the treatments of the same myth in the *Ars* and the *Met.*: the didactic aspect of the *Ars* version makes any attempt to attribute differences to the elegiac tradition more complicated. However, there are undoubted differences in the telling of the Daedalus story in the two poems and there are complex generic games at work. Some differences can indeed be marked as due to generic differences, but others have more to do with the very different contexts in which the versions appear (e.g. the necessity of presenting Daedalus as *praeceptor* in the *Ars*). The *Ars* version has a very different agenda from the *Met.*: the aim of the *praeceptor* is to warn the rash lover about the dangers of veering away from the teacher's instruction. Although the *Metamorphoses* may be 'a rather elegiac kind of epic' (Hinds (1992) 82), it is still more tightly bound with the epic tradition, and so the poet is permitted to dwell upon some of the more narrative or descriptive aspects of the story; e.g. the extended description of the creation of the wings (*Met.* 8.188-200 compared with the much briefer *Ars.* 2. 45-8); the point-of-view of those witnessing the flight from the grounds (*Met.* 8.217-220 details a fisherman, shepherd and ploughman rather than the focus on the sole fisherman at *Ars.* 2.77-8). In addition to the emotive tears of Daedalus in the *Ars* version (70) Ovid adds a Virgilian touch to the *Met.* version (8.211 *et patriae tremuere manus*) deliberately designed to echo Daedalus' failing hands at Verg. *Aen.* 6.33 *bis patriae cecidere manus*. Also, as Viarre (1988) 447-8 points out, the *Metamorphoses* must necessarily emphasise the metamorphic aspect of the story: Daedalus and Icarus 'becoming' birds.

**21-2** The opening couplet swiftly introduces the *exemplum*: within two lines the poet centres the myth around Minos, denoting it as Cretan. The naming of Daedalus is delayed to an emphatic position in the following couplet, but the reference to a *hospes* (21) and the contrastive *ille* (22) invite the reader to supply the name and identify the specific moment within the Cretan cycle. The connection with the previous sections is hard to discern: the only real clue is the reference to *pinnis* (22), which resemble the *alae* of *Amor* from 19: a

link which is brought to the foreground with the repetition of *pinnas* and *Minos* at the end of the episode (97).

**hospitis effugio praestruxerat omnia Minos** Note how the *hospes* and *Minos* frame the line, drawing up the opposition between the two even before *Daedalus* has been named.

*hospes* is often used ironically of heroes who transgress the guest-friendship relationship, as with Paris at 5 (above). This marks a connection between this *exemplum* and the opening one of Paris, forcing the reader to see an element of the myth which Ovid conceals: *Daedalus*' role as 'bad guest' (see introductory note). The reference to *Daedalus* as 'guest' may also recall *peregrinus* from 8, referring to *Pelops*: another example of *hospitium* gone wrong. *hospes* is used of other faithless guests, e.g. *Aeneas* (Verg. *Aen.* 4.10, Ov. *Ars.* 3.39), *Demophoon* (Prop. 2.24.44, Ov. *Her.* 2.147, *Ars.* 3.38), *Jason* (Prop. 2.24.44, Ov. *Met.* 7.21), *Ulysses* (Ov. *Rem.* 265); TLL. 6.3.3027.42ff.

*effugium* is a rare word in poetry, previously used specifically of escape from death; cf. *Lucr.* 5.994, *Verg. Aen.* 2.140, TLL. 5.2.210.76ff. For *Daedalus*, remaining at *Crete* means death, both literally and metaphorically. He has proved himself a faithless guest towards *Minos* through his aiding of *Pasiphae*'s affair (23-4) and of *Ariadne*'s flight with *Theseus*: how will *Minos* punish him for this final betrayal? However, escape allows *Daedalus* to achieve immortal fame through the dedication of his wings at *Cumae* (Verg. *Aen.* 6.14-33).

The *exemplum* opens with an oxymoron: a guest is no guest who is not allowed to leave (Sharrock (1994a) 183-4). Note *Menelaus*' comments on the duties of a good host at *Od.* 15.68-74, esp. 72-3 ἴσόν τοι κακόν ἐσθ', ὅς τ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα νέεσθαι / ξεῖνον ἐποτρύνει καὶ ὅς ἐσσύμενον κατερύκει.

The central verb *praestruxerat* expresses the extent of *Minos*' control, a theme re-established at 35-6 (see below). Sharrock takes this further and sees here a possible reference to a version of the story in which *Minos* shuts *Daedalus* and *Icarus* inside the *Labyrinth* as punishment; Sharrock (1994a) 189-90. *Janka ad loc.* dismisses this suggestion as 'ziemlich implausibel'. Yet Sharrock's questioning of the chronological sequence of the myth is provocative: Ovid challenges the reader to fill in the blanks. The verb here also demonstrates a key aspect of Ovidian style: his originality in using words compounded with *prae* (McKeown on *Am.* 1.4.33-4).

**audacem pinnis repperit ille uiam** The 'daring way' (the innovative aerial flight of *Daedalus*) frames the line, emphasising its significance in terms both of the

narrative and of the interpretation of the passage. For *audax uia* also has a metapoetic meaning, referring to poetic daring; cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.40 *da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis*, 4.565, Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.10. Seneca makes a clear reference to Ovid at Sen. *Oed.* 892-910, esp. 908 *audacis uiae*, a connection made clear by the use of the unusual word *libro* at 100 (see 68n, below). The chorus in Seneca are using the myth, as does Ovid here, to demonstrate the value of *moderantia*.

*pinnis* is synecdoche, common in Ovid, referring to the wings of gods, heroes, and monsters: especially used of *Amor*; cf. Prop. 2.12.14, 3.10.28; Ov. *Her.* 15.179, *Rem.* 198, *Met.* 1.466; and of the false wings of Daedalus or Icarus; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.15, Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.35, Ov. *Met.* 8.212, *Trist.* 1.1.89 (quoted in introductory note).

The central verb *repperit* depicts Daedalus as an inventor; Sharrock (1994a) 139-41, OLD s.v. 6.

**23-4** This couplet clarifies the target of the *exemplum* (Daedalus) and distinguishes him through learned reference to his most famous creation, the Labyrinth. However, the allusiveness of the high style reference is underpinned by Ovid's previous telling of the myth of Pasiphae and the bull in some detail at *Ars.* 1.289-326. The reference in this line to the 'crime of the mother' invites the reader to recall this intratext. The verb *clausit*, although here referring to the inventor concealing the product of the union within the Labyrinth, also implies the other part of the Pasiphae story in which Daedalus played a part: the enclosure of the woman inside the wooden heifer (cf. *Ars.* 1.325-6, where Daedalus' part in the creation of the *uacca ... acerna* is omitted). Thus Ovid is able to both elide and hint towards Daedalus' complicity in the mother's adulterous affair. This consistent attempt to downplay Daedalus' more questionable actions strengthens the identification of the poet with his character.

**Daedalus, ut clausit conceptum crimine matris** The harsh alliteration of this line builds up to a dramatic climax, which ends bathetically in the following line.

*ut* provides a hint towards the timing of this act: the Minotaur is already shut away. The relationship between Daedalus and Minos has not entirely broken down at this point, since the *hospes* can approach the king to seek his release: either Daedalus has not provided Ariadne with the ball of thread (cf. Catull. 64.113) or Minos has not yet learnt of this final betrayal. Lines 31-2 imply the passage of time between the initial request and the resolve to fly. Perhaps this gap gives time for the death of the Minotaur, which would naturally make Daedalus' escape more pressing. This is all supposition since, without

reference to Ariadne or Theseus throughout this passage, locating the timing of this story within the mythological cycle is difficult. This may be to Ovid's advantage, since it means that he does not have to tell the story of Daedalus betraying the secret of the Labyrinth.

**semibouemque uirum semiuirumque bouem** 'the half-bull man and the half-man bull': an astonishing line, an example of both halves of the pentameter being metrically interchangeable, thus forming 'a kind of jingle' (Platnauer (1951) 14-15). According to Sen. *Contr.* 2.2.12, this was one of three lines which Ovid's friends wanted him to remove, but of which Ovid himself was particularly proud. Ovid is fond of such wordplay when describing half-men; cf. *Her.* 9.141 (Nessus), *Met.* 12.536 (Lapiths and Centaurs), *Fast.* 5.380 (Chiron), *Trist.* 4.7.18 *centimanumque Gyan semibouemque uirum*. Virgil describes Cacus as *semihomo* (*Aen.* 8.194) and as *semifer* (8.267); yet Ovid's use of such terms lack all restraint, ironic in a passage all about generic moderation.

Sharrock uses this couplet as an example of the poet expressing the very nature of the didactic elegiac genre through the use of the elegiac couplet: not only does the hybrid nature of the Minotaur mirror the hybrid nature of the *Ars* (as does the hybrid nature of the mortal granted wings), but the hexameter builds up an epic expectation which the pentameter pulls down. The alliterative hexameter and the allusive reference to the product of Pasiphae's affair with the bull 'build up an effect of mystery and monstrosity – to be dispelled suddenly in the delightfully ridiculous pentameter' (Sharrock (1994a) 129-30).

**25-30** The first of three speeches by Daedalus, these lines are addressed to Minos, his captor, begging for release; the second speech (33-42) is a soliloquy, designed to encourage himself to attempt to fly; and the third speech (51-64) is addressed to his son Icarus, explaining the need for flight and including the key warning about *how* to fly (57-64). Daedalus speaks once more within the episode, when searching for his son (94-5) and the episode ends with the implication that the father will go on calling *Icare* (see 95n).

This is a formal speech, representing how a suppliant should address his host. Daedalus, as an aging man, is beginning to think more of his own death, and wants to return to Athens to die. Any good host should not only allow his guest to leave, but should even provide conveyance (see 21n). Once more, Ovid glosses over the more problematic undertones here: Daedalus was exiled from Athens for murdering his nephew Perdix (cf. Diod. Sic. 4.76, Ov. *Met.* 8.236-59). How is Daedalus to return to this city, the site of this terrible crime, even should permission be granted by Minos? Daedalus own reference to

his exile as caused by *fatis ... iniquis* (27) demonstrates the character's blindness to his own flaws.

A further problem emerges at the end of this speech, as Daedalus begs that Minos release the son, if he refuses to release the father, or *vice versa* (29-30) As with 23-4, Ovid utilises the structure of the elegiac couplet to great effect: the hexameter line builds up a picture of Daedalus as selfless father, concerned primarily for his son; the pentameter lines pulls this down as we seem to see the parent quite prepared to leave his son behind if necessary. If the reader is to see in the relationship between Daedalus and Icarus an analogy for the *praeceptor* and lover, what does this hint towards Daedalus as irresponsible parent mean for the lover? This undertone of Daedalus' culpability colours the entire passage.

**25-6 'sit modus exilio,' dixit** Daedalus' opening plea to Minos begins with words reminiscent of 20, there concerned with the poet's task of limiting the wings of *Amor*. By casting Minos as someone with no concept of moderation, and Daedalus as someone with a keen sense of moderation, Ovid strengthens the identification of Daedalus with the role of the poet: for moderation is an important theme of the *Ars*; see Gibson (2007) 12, 105-9.

**iustissime Minos** The repetition of the naming of the king at emphatic positions at line endings (see 21, above) heightens the sense of importance, especially in conjunction here with the superlative vocative form of address. Daedalus employs this flattering form of address as a means of persuasion, demonstrating that he will attempt language before he resorts to the transgressive flight. However, the epithet 'just' is ironic when one considers the hint at 21 that Minos is not behaving as a proper host should in refusing to allow Daedalus to leave. Furthermore, a guest should not have to supplicate his host at all in order to gain permission to leave. The epithet refers to Minos' role as judge in the Underworld; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.432, Prop. 4.11.21. Yet, like Daedalus, Minos is a complex figure: cuckolded husband, cruel despot, bad host, victim of Daedalus' revenge, fair judge; see Armstrong (2006) 2.

**accipiat cineres terra paterna meos** A second jussive subjunctive builds up the tone of supplication. Daedalus is trying to manipulate Minos by inciting his pity: he emphasises his own old age (he refers to himself twice as *senex*, 29-30) and his nearness to death. The hero's desire to be buried in his country was a frequent concern, and those about to die often beg their killer to return their bodies to their people, e.g. Hector in the *Iliad*, Turnus in the *Aeneid*.

**27-8 et, quoniam in patria fatis agitatus iniquis / uiuere non potui, da mihi posse mori** ‘and, since driven by unfair fates I was not able to live in my country, allow me to die (there)’: Daedalus continues to present himself as an innocent victim of the fates.

*in patria* echoes *terra paterna* in the previous line, emphasising the desire of Daedalus to return to Athens on pious grounds.

The disingenuous statement *fatibus agitatus iniquis* allows Daedalus to avoid any discussion of the true reason for his exile (i.e. the murder of Perdix). The language recalls Verg. *Aen.* 1.2 *fato profugus*, where the reader is encouraged to sympathise with Aeneas as innocent exile, and the phrasing is frequent in Virgil; cf. *Aen.* 2.257, 3.17, 8.292, 10.380. In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas really is ‘driven by hostile fates’, i.e. the wrath of Juno, which motivates much of the action. Daedalus is presenting himself very much as an Aeneas-like figure, concerned with returning home; see Introduction, pp35-6. The similarities with Aeneas continue in the following couplet, with the father’s (limited) concern for his son.

Ovid draws an effective contrast between life and death in the pentameter, with the strong antithesis of *uiuere* and *mori* framing the line, and the repetition of *potui ... posse*.

**29-30 da reditum puero, senis est si gratia uilis; / si non uis puero parcere, parce seni** ‘Grant a return to the boy, if your sense of obligation to the old man is of little value to you; if you do not want to spare the boy, spare the old man’: the hexameter builds up a sense of rhetoric with the repetition of *da* from the previous line and the juxtaposition of *puero senis*; the pentameter continues this tone with the strong repetition of *puer* and *senex* and the anaphora of *parcere parce*, yet undercuts it through the ‘rather unfatherly proposal’ (Myerowitz (1985) 164).

Daedalus exaggerates his son’s youth and his own agedness to increase the rhetorical pathos. This technique also prepares the reader for the instruction from father to son in Daedalus’ final speech (51-64). Such language strengthens the theory that the reader is to align the figure of Daedalus with the poet. One recalls the description at 4 of Hesiod and Homer as *Ascraeo Maeonioque seni*: thus we are already familiar with the idea of the great poet as *senex*.

The language of obligation is designed to draw Minos’ attention to his impious actions in keeping Daedalus against his will: ‘*gratia* was often provoked by a *beneficium* or *officium* for which it constituted a kind of repayment’ (Saller (1982) 21-2). Daedalus is owed some kind of reciprocity, firstly due to his status as *hospes*; secondly, for his role as

‘Minos’ man’ (Armstrong (2006) 124). Yet the reader knows that Daedalus has also performed actions at Crete for which the king would *not* feel thankful, such as the aiding of Pasiphae and of Ariadne in their affairs. The juxtaposition of *gratia uilis* emphasises Minos’ inappropriate behaviour towards a social inferior to whom he is indebted.

**31-2** This couplet separates Daedalus’ speech to Minos from his soliloquy which is to follow (33-42). The threefold repetition of *dico* in 31-3 (*dixerat ... diceret ... dixit*), all at emphatic positions at the start or end of lines, foreshadows the tricolon of *clamo* with which the episode ends, see 93-6n.

**haec, sed et haec et** The assonance here gives a sense of repeated pleas: this sense of repetition is strengthened by the change from pluperfect to imperfect subjunctive in the form of *dico*.

**diceret, egressus non dabat ille uiro** *egressus*, ‘departure’ mirrors Daedalus’ plea for *reditum* at 29, above. The brief report of Minos’ refusal reflects his dead-stopped response: *non dabat* echoes Daedalus’ repetition of the imperative *da* in 28 and 29. The reader’s focalization is on the suppliant, while the king is presented as a despotic ruler, whose word is final. Minos’ silence contrasted with Daedalus’ speeches (covering a huge 30 lines out of the 76 line passage) makes the latter far more human and sympathetic.

Although none of the manuscripts give the reading *diceret*, Kenney justifies Ker’s emendation and adds the supporting detail that it ‘abolishes the unexampled scansion *rēgressus*’ in place of the following word *egressus* (Kenney (1959) 254). Ker’s solution means that Platnaeur’s comment (1951) 63 on *rēgressus* only appearing here in elegy and used elsewhere by Virgil as *rēgressus* (Verg. *Aen.* 11.413) becomes nullified.

**33-42** Daedalus’ second speech, addressed to himself. Minos has refused him permission to leave Crete, and so Daedalus resolves upon a novel method of escape: flight. He realises that all his powers of rhetoric have failed to move Minos and so he must resort to action. He decides to fall back upon his one great resource: his power as an inventor. He realises that Minos dominates both land and sea (35-6): only the sky remains as an option. Realising that Jupiter may perceive a man’s attempt to fly as transgressive, he includes a prayer to Jupiter (39-40) that he will not encroach upon the heavens. This denotes Daedalus as a pious man, yet also makes it clear that he is aware of the risks associated with this act: Icarus’ death is actually a punishment for the father for trying to fly in the first place. Icarus’ own hubris in flying too high becomes an inevitable consequence of this

dangerous and transgressive act. The soliloquy ends with a strong statement by the man exposing his desperation: he would even face death to escape his current situation. Ironically, he will face death, but it will be the loss of his son, rather than his own life: hardly an encouraging situation for the pupil of the *Ars* (Volk (2002) 191 n. 54).

The passage gains further levels of complexity when one considers the role of Daedalus as poet (see Introduction, pp27-30). This soliloquy is marked out as one of the more metapoetic features of the passage: Daedalus sounds very like a poet selecting the type of poetry he will write; Sharrock (1994a) 134-9. He speaks of *materia* and how to become *ingeniosus* (34). The act of attempting the sky sounds very like a poet considering a gigantomachy, especially when placed against his apology to Jupiter (37-40). The *iter* (37 and 41), *coepto ... meo* (38), and the *uia* (40) all provide stand-ins for the poet's 'journey', i.e. poetic composition (see notes below for specific unpacking of these terms).

**33-4 quod simul ut sensit** 'which as soon as he realised it': i.e. Daedalus tries all other methods of persuasion before resorting to this daring plan. *sentio* can mean 'to recognise' or 'become aware of'; cf. OLD s.v. 2.

**'nunc, nunc, o Daedale,' dixit** The repetition with which Daedalus begins his speech to himself is striking, and reminiscent of the repeated *iam iam* at Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.9, with Nisbet and Hubbard *ad loc*: 'things are going to happen "any minute now"'. It gives a sense of urgency; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.189 *hortatur Mnestheus*: "*nunc, nunc insurgite remis...*", 8.579, 12.526, Ov. *Fast.* 2.745 *nunc, nunc properate, puellae*.

Daedalus' self address, with *o* and the vocative, aligns him once more with the role of the poet: self-address is a common device used by poets, especially Catullus; cf. 8.1 *miser Catulle*, 8.19 *at tu, Catulle*, 46.4, 51.13, 52.1, 52.4, 76.5, 79.2. Self-address is also used by Ovid of himself at *Am.* 1.11.27, 2.1.2, 2.13.25, *Ars.* 2.744 *Naso magister erat*, 3.812, *Rem.* 71, 72, 558.

See 31-2n for the significance of *dixit*, picking up on the emphatic repetition of *dixerat ... diceret*.

**materiam, qua sis ingeniosus, habes** 'you have the material, with which you can be ingenious': a problematic line. The surface-level meaning is that Daedalus has the resources and natural ability to overcome this obstacle. However, the language he uses is 'redolent of poetics' (Sharrock (1994a) 33-42), which acts to align Daedalus again with the position of the poet. *materia* can mean 'material', but also 'subject-matter', a polysemy frequently utilised by Ovid; cf. *Am.* 1.1.19, 1.3.19 *te mihi materiem felicem in carmina*

*praebe*, *Ars.* 1.49 *tu quoque, materiam longo qui quaeris amori*, with Hollis *ad loc.* Meanwhile, *ingenium* is a quality necessary in the lover; see 112n, with Myerowitz (1985) 157. Janka considers this a weak argument, indicating the complexity of the terms, which are not limited to the purely poetic elsewhere, citing particularly *Am.* 2.19.44 and *Ars.* 1.49 (quoted above). However, the metapoetic significance in the latter instance seems clear: the girl is *materia* for the lover, but also surely for the elegiac poet.

**35-6** This couplet expands upon *praestruxerat omnia* (21), demonstrating just why Minos can keep them prisoner so successfully – he holds sway over all the surrounding land and sea.

**possidet et terras et possidet aequora Minos** The repetition of *possidet* emphasises the king’s omnipotence: he was known for having great naval success; cf. Herod. 1.171, Thuc. 1.4.1.8, Phaedra’s (Minos’ daughter’s) letter to Hippolytus at *Ov. Her.* 4.157 *quod mihi sit genitor, qui possidet aequora, Minos*. Clearly escape by land is out of the question given that Crete is an island, and Minos rules it in its entirety. The repetition of *possideo* is imitated at *Met.* 8.187 (quoted below).

Minos is named for the third time in emphatic position at the line end. However, Daedalus now drops the flattering epithet *iustissime* (25). There is no need any more for rhetorical persuasion, since Minos is no longer the addressee.

**nec tellus nostrae nec patet unda fugae** Repetition of the sense of the previous line, with variety provided by the use of the synonyms, *tellus* for *terras* and *unda* for *aequora*. Note the far more concise expression of this situation at *Met.* 8.185-7 *‘terras licet’ inquit ‘et undas / obstruat, at caelum certe patet; ibimus illac! / omnia possideat, non possidet aëra Minos’*.

The use of the plural *nostrae* here is the first indication that Daedalus will be taking his son, the *puer* of 29-30, with him.

**37-8** At the mid-point of his soliloquy, Daedalus comes up with the idea of the sky as the only option left open to him.

**restat iter caeli: caelo temptabimus ire** There is no other method of escape. The line has a roundness to it, with the polyptoton of *caeli caelo* and the echo of *iter* in *ire*. The placing of the polyptoton at the centre of the middle of the middle speech is significant in a passage all about the middle route (see esp. 63n).

Considering the metapoetic language throughout this speech (see 33-42n, above), the *iter* recalls the progress metaphor of the ‘journey’ which Ovid utilises throughout the *Ars*, see Introduction, pp9-10.

The verb *tempto* can be used in a literary sense, of generic daring; cf. Verg. *Georg.* 3.8 *temptanda uia est* (with *iter* in our passage echoing Virgil’s *uia*), Prop. 2.3.19, Ov. *Trist.* 4.10.21 *saepe pater dixit ‘studium quid inutile temptas?’*. The sense is that something new will be attempted which is risky, and does not guarantee success. It is also used of military strategies in Virgil; cf. *Aen.* 2.38 *temptare latebras* (of the wooden horse), 5.499 *iuuenum temptare laborem*.

**da ueniam coepto, Iuppiter alte, meo** The reason for this prayer is explained in the following couplet. Jupiter as king of the gods may interpret Daedalus’ attempt upon the sky as a hubristic attempt upon the heavens; *caelum* means ‘heaven’ as well as ‘sky’; cf. OLD s.v. 3. This engages with the poetic theme of the gigantomachy, a common element of the *recusatio*; cf. esp. Ovid’s innovative version of a *recusatio* at *Am.* 2.1.11-20. Daedalus’ prayer is both a literal apology for flying, and a metapoetic *recusatio*: on a stylistic level, Ovid (in the guise of Daedalus) will not be attempting the high epic style of the gigantomachy.

The metapoetic language continues in this line, supporting the impression of the gigantomachy. *da ueniam* appears in the sense of granting pardon for literary daring at *Trist.* 5.1.65, *Pont.* 3.9.55 *da ueniam scriptis*; ‘Ovid directs us towards a metaphoric, poetic reading of his earlier work’ (Sharrock (1994a) 136, with 136 n. 77 for a full list of intertexts). Moreover, *coepta* (both ‘undertakings’ and, crucially, ‘beginnings’) is used elsewhere by Ovid to refer programmatically to his own poetic undertakings; cf. *Ars.* 1.30 *coeptis, mater Amoris, ades, 771 coepti ... laboris*, 3.671, *Rem.* 704, *Met.* 1.2-3 *di, coeptis ... / adspirate meis* (after Verg. *Georg.* 1.40 *audacibus adnue coeptis*): in this way, Daedalus comes to look more and more like a figure of the poet.

The epithet *alte* is both a pious address to the god, emphasising his exalted status, and also signifies his practical location, i.e. in the sky (clarified in the following line). Furthermore, Sharrock suggests that ‘the address to Jupiter may hint at a facetious reference to Augustus’ (Sharrock (1994a) 137); a theory which Janka dismisses as ‘reine Spekulation’. See Introduction, pp34-7, for my theories regarding subliminal references to Augustus through the shadowy allusions to Aeneas.

**39-40 non ego sidereas affecto tangere sedes** ‘I do not aspire to touch the starry seats’: the prayer formula continues as Daedalus provides the reason for Jupiter potentially considering his flight as transgressive.

A number of aspects in this line foreshadow the death of Icarus: firstly, *non ego* can be understood as deliberately distancing Icarus from inclusion in the promise; secondly, *sidereus* can refer specifically to the sun (cf. OLD s.v. 1b), indicating the source of Icarus’ death and, like *alte* in the previous line, emphasising the theme of height which continues throughout the passage and culminates in Icarus’ fatal plunge.

The metapoetic overtones continue, as Ovid uses *affecto* elsewhere of ambitious poetic undertakings (cf. *Am.* 1.1.14 *cur opus affectas ambitiose nouum?*) and specifically of the gigantomachy (cf. *Met.* 1.152 *adfectasse ferunt regnum caeleste Gigantas*, *Fast.* 3.439 *fulmina post ausos caelum adfectare Gigantes*, *Pont.* 4.8.59 *sic adfectantes caelestia regna Gigantes*, TLL. 1.1181.47ff). It is also used specifically of Phaethon’s flight at *Met.* 2.58 *nescius adfectas* (see Introduction, pp28-30, on the intertextual relationship between Phaethon in the *Metamorphoses* and Daedalus in the *Ars*).

**dominum** i.e. Minos. The selection of this term has extra resonance in the context of elegy, since the elegiac *puella* is frequently described as *domina*, reflecting the power struggle at work between the girl and the lover, see 111n *ut dominam teneas*. Ovid therefore presents the relationship between Minos and Daedalus as similarly one of struggle: Daedalus will wrest power from his king and host through his daring act.

**nulla nisi ista uia est** The *uia* echoes the *iter* of 37. The assonance conveys a sense of Daedalus’ haste and desperation.

**41-2** ‘Let a way be granted through the Styx, we will swim across the Styx; the laws of my nature must be renewed by me’: the soliloquy ends with a strong statement from Daedalus that he would even face death to achieve his aim. This aligns him with two important models: Aeneas and Orpheus. The former resonates due to the significance throughout this passage of *Aen.* 6, in which, after admiring Daedalus’ depiction of the Cretan cycle on the doors of the temple of Apollo, Aeneas then enacts his own katabasis. The latter resonates with the reader due to his significance as powerful poet, capable of moving rocks, rivers, and trees with his song (cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.23-34) who did in fact cross and re-cross the Styx (cf. Verg. *Georg.* 4.453-527 and Ovid’s own treatment of the myth at *Met.* 10.3-85). Virgil’s telling of the Orpheus myth will be echoed in Daedalus’ commands to Icarus to follow him closely (57-8) and, ultimately, in Daedalus’ triple

repetition of *Icare* (93-5), an allusion to Orpheus' threefold calling of *Eurydicen* at Verg. *Georg.* 4.525-7. Ovid, through his mouthpiece Daedalus, tackles the high epic subject-matter of the gigantomachy (39) and katabasis: although a literal enactment of these topoi would not be appropriate in this elegiac poem.

The meaning of the pentameter is more convoluted: an alternative translation, taking *naturae ... meae* as dative rather than genitive, is 'laws must be renewed for my nature'. The difference is important, and the ambiguity allows Ovid to play with the two options: 'is Daedalus trying to change himself or to change the world?' (Myerowitz (1985) 157).

**per Styga detur iter, Stygias tranabimus undas** The echoes in this line from earlier in the speech serve to round it off: *iter* from 37; and *unda* from 36. The echoes also highlight the fact that Minos was able to prevent his 'guests' from escaping by water, but he is powerless to prevent them from swimming Stygian waves, i.e. dying.

**sunt mihi naturae iura nouanda meae** Is this a good thing or not? After the prayer to Jupiter assuring him that he will not make an hubristic attempt upon the heavens, for Daedalus to change *natura*, whether internal or external (see above on the ambiguity), has an arrogant ring. The following line will pick up on this problem (see below on *mala*, 43), just as this line picks up on the theme of over-stretching, which is present in *temptabimus* (37); cf. *Met.* 8.189 with Anderson *ad loc.*

**43-4** This couplet separates Daedalus' soliloquy from the description of the creation of the wings (45-8). It engages with the theme, already established by Horace's use of the myth, of Daedalean flight as somehow unnatural and transgressive; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.34-5 *expertus uacuum Daedalus aera / pennis non homini datis*, 4.2.1-4.

**ingenium mala saepe mouent** 'Bad things often incite talent': the *mala* are the evil circumstances created by Minos through his behaviour as bad host, but also imply something more sinister, given the hints at transgression present in the rest of the couplet (Myerowitz (1985) 161). Ovid provides an ironic re-reading of the idea at *Trist.* 3.14.33, as he aligns himself as exile with the exiled Daedalus, although for him: *ingenium fregere meum mala*.

*ingenium* can refer to specifically literary or poetic talent, and Ovid elsewhere contrasts it with *ars* as defining qualities of a fine poetic work; cf. *Am.* 1.15.14 *quamuis ingenio non ualet, arte ualet* (of Callimachus), 1.15.19 *Ennius arte carens* (with McKeown *ad loc.*), *Trist.* 2.424 *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis*. So both Callimachus and Ennius are talented, but for different reasons: Callimachus has *ars* but not *ingenium*, while Ennius

has *ingenium* but lacks *ars*. In contrast, Daedalus is defined as the ideal creator, for he has both (note the reference to his wings as *ars* at 48). This connection between Daedalus' *ingenium* and *ars* will be made even more explicit at *Met.* 8.159 *Daedalus ingenio fabrae celeberrimus artis*.

**quis crederet umquam / aérias hominem carpere posse uias?** This statement voices disbelief of the marvellous achievement, foreshadowing the fisherman's astonishment at 77-8 (below), and is further mirrored in the fisherman, shepherd, and ploughman's astonishment at *Met.* 8.217-20; cf. esp. 219 *quique aethera carpere possent*. Yet our phrase also hints at the unnaturalness of the attempt, as at esp. Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.34-5 (quoted above): man was not granted wings. The emphasis here on Daedalus as *homo* (possible etymology from *humus*; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.34 *etiamne hominem appellari, quia sit humo natus*, TLL. 6.3.2871.50ff), juxtaposed with *aerius*, presents the grounded mortal trespassing hubristically in realms forbidden him, a fear already voiced by Daedalus himself at 38-9.

The desire to grasp the 'aerial ways' echoes the astronomer Archytas' mental grasping after an understanding of the stars at Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.5 *aérias temptasse domos*. The difference, of course, is that Daedalus' desire becomes a literal event. The Horatian intertext adds an interesting dimension, since the poem is all about death, specifically the drowning of the poet's *persona*, and so may foreshadow the drowning of Icarus.

The ambition *carpere uias* corresponds to the lover at 230, who is instructed *carpe uiam*, i.e. to waste no time in attending the *puella* whenever she summons him. Thus Ovid subtly aligns Daedalean ambition with the lover's task of retaining the girl.

**45-8** The description of the manufacture of the wings corresponds to the more extensive treatment at *Met.* 8.189-200. There are a number of similarities; e.g. *disponit in ordine pinnas* (45) becomes *ponit in ordine pennas* at *Met.* 8.189; he binds the wings with *linum* (46 and *Met.* 8.193), and, crucially, with *cera* at the deepest part (47 and *Met.* 8.193). However, one of the key differences between the epic and elegiac versions of this scene is the inclusion of a simile in the *Met.* version: the wings are there compared to *rustica ... / fistula*; cf. 8.191-2. A simile is more appropriate in an epic poem (though note that Ovid does include a rare simile in his *Ars* version, 66, below), but the comparison to panpipes is significant, as it draws out the poetological associations already present in the myth. The manufacture of any work of art is liable to be interpreted as deeply poetological: the famous examples of the shields of Achilles and Aeneas can be shown to represent the

wider themes of the *Iliad* and *Aeneid* respectively, and the invention of the panpipes, a source of music, was detailed during the highly charged opening Book of the *Met.*; cf. 1.689-712. In fact, Hesiod's detailing of the manufacture of a plough at *Op.* 414-440 may be seen as an important didactic intertext here, particularly since Ovid directly compares himself with his didactic predecessor at 4 (above): describing the making of useful items is part of the didactic tradition, and an aspect which Ovid here successfully transposes to a very different type of didactic poem. Another important difference between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Ars* versions is Ovid's inclusion in the *Ars* version of the phrase *leue opus* (46). At *Met.* 8.200 the wings are an *opus*, but Ovid's addition of *leue* in the elegiac version allows him to engage with the elegiac resonances of the phrase (see below).

**45-6 remigium uolucrum** '(lit.) the oarage of birds': this refers to the *pinnae* at the end of the line. The naval imagery, which is re-used at *Met.* 8.228, picks up on the ship metaphor with which the Book began (see 5-6n and 9-10n) and, in turn, is drawn out by Daedalus' next speech to his son, which he opens by denoting the wings as *carinae* (see 50n). With the very opening words of the description of the manufacture of the wings, the reader is invited to notice the connections between the mythological craftsman at work and the self-referential composition of the poem. The metaphor of wings as oars was an old one; cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 52, Lucr. 6.743 *remigi ... pennarum*, Verg. *Aen.* 1.301 *remigio alarum*. Yet Ovid's use of the phrase must be a deliberate echo of Verg. *Aen.* 6.19 *remigium alarum*, describing the dedication of Daedalus' wings at Cumae: it thus draws the reader's awareness to the literary afterlife of the wings, as well as denoting the phrase as high (epic) style.

**leue per lini uincula nectit opus** The description of the creation of the wings is framed by the phrase *leue opus*, an important generic signifier for elegiac poetry. 'Lightness' was key for the neoteric poets, influenced by Callimachus' 'slender Muse' of *Aet. frag.* 1.24 Μοῦσαν ... λεπταλέην, and Ovid refers to his *Amores* as *leue opus* at *Trist.* 2.339 and had previously used *opus* to denote the *Ars* at 14 (see note above). Ovid uses *leuis* as a 'literary critical term' (McKeown on *Am.* 1.1.19-20) at *Am.* 2.1.21, 3.1.41, and *Trist.* 2.331-2. Virgil uses similar binding language at *Ecl.* 10.70-1 to compare the song of the poet with the act of weaving slender grasses into a basket (Sharrock (1994a) 143).

The use of linen to bind the wings continues the ship imagery, as linen was used in sail ropes; cf. *Fast.* 3.587.

**47-8 imaque pars ceris astringitur igne solutis** The bottom parts of the feathers are linked together with melted wax. This is an important aspect of the construction of the wings, since it is this wax which will melt and cause Icarus' plunge into the sea, a danger which Daedalus foresees at 59-60 (below). Wax is also used in the construction of panpipes, strengthening the connection made more explicit with the simile of *Met.* 8.191-2; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 3.25-6 *fistula cera / iuncta*, Mart. 14.64.1 *compactam ceris et harundine*.

**finitusque nouae iam labor artis erat** At the moment of completion, the constructed wings are described again in terms of poetic composition: *labor artis*. Like *opus*, *labor* too can denote poetry; cf. 1.453 *hoc opus, hic labor est* (itself a parody of Verg. *Aen.* 6.129, and so already highly charged in poetic terms); 1.771 *pars est exhausta laboris* (i.e. Book 1); 3.404 *hoc uotum nostri summa laboris habet* (of poets). Meanwhile, the reference to Daedalus' *ars* (in conjunction with his *ingenium* at 43 marking him as the ideal craftsman, see note above) draws the reader's attention to Ovid's own *Ars*; 'Daedalus' *ars* is Ovid's *Ars*' (Sharrock (1994a) 111).

The repetition of the theme of newness (see 42n) continues the note of daring.

**49-50** This couplet, describing Icarus' joy in playing with the wings without knowing what they are intended for, is replayed at *Met.* 8.195-200. In both versions, he is described as *puer* (49 and *Met.* 8.195); he is ignorant (*nescius*, 50, and *ignarus*, *Met.* 8.196); *renidens* (49) is repeated with reference to his *ore renidenti* (*Met.* 8.197); and the same verb is used to describe the action of manipulating the wings (*tracto*, 49 and *Met.* 8.196). Yet the *Met.* version is extended, to add pathos to the scene: Icarus playfully catches at the feathers (*Met.* 8.198) and softens the wax with his thumb (*Met.* 8.198-9), interrupting his father's work with his game (*Met.* 8.199-200). These descriptions of the son at play in the epic version emphasise his youth, and foreshadow the tragedy to come (note the references to *periculum* at *Met.* 8.196 and to the *cera* at *Met.* 8.198), giving a touching impression of the father-son relationship: for 'every father has had that experience, whether his miraculous work is bashing a typewriter or papering the kitchen wall' (Rudd (1988) 23).

**tractabat** 'he was handling' or 'manipulating': cf. OLD. s.v. 2c.

**ceramque ... pinnasque** By describing the wings as mere 'wax and feathers', Ovid emphasises their potential vulnerability in the wrong hands.

**puer ... renidens** Icarus will not be named directly until we see him in flight at 76. Until then, he is referred to only as *puer* (29, 65, and 83) or *natus* (63, 69, and 73), emphasising the familial connection between himself and Daedalus to increase the pathos.

The reader may also recall that other winged *puer*, Cupid from 18. Cupid is identified with Icarus, since Ovid will attempt to control Cupid in much the same way as Daedalus will attempt to instruct Icarus (and as the *praeceptor* attempts to instruct the lover). However, *puer* also has more problematic connotations in terms of the *Ars*: it is not used at all in addressing the reader, and it often refers to slaves or objects of sexual desire; cf. e.g. 264 (see below), 684 *hoc est, cur pueri tangar amore minus*. Thus the noun is already a loaded term.

*renidens*, ‘shining’ or ‘smiling’, demonstrates Icarus’ playful glee and youthfulness. His ignorant fascination with the instrument of his own death is touching: an ignorance which is emphasised in the following line.

**nescius haec umeris arma parata suis** ‘not knowing that these arms were prepared for his own shoulders’: Icarus’ ignorance is reminiscent of Aeneas’ ignorance in donning his arms at Verg. *Aen.* 8.729-31 *talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis, / miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet / attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum*. This intertext ‘gives Icarus pretensions to being an epic hero’ (Sharrock (1994a) 163), and so allows Ovid to parody his own epic pretensions. On echoes of Aeneas in the Daedalus episode, see Introduction, pp35-6.

However, Icarus’ ignorance contrasts strongly with Daedalus’ genius: the son will never be as great as his father, and so is not clever enough for the task to come, whether because of his age or lack of natural ability. He also contrasts with the bright Perdix, described at *Met.* 8 as only twelve years old, yet *animi ad praecepta capax* (243). Icarus is incapable of following his father’s *praecepta* of 51-64.

**51-64** Daedalus’ third and final extended speech is addressed to his son, and concerned with instructing him on how to manipulate the wings and how to behave once in the air. The passage corresponds to the more concise *Met.* 8.203-8. There may be some truth in the argument that Ovid merely felt it more appropriate to streamline the scene for the *Met.* version (Anderson *ad loc.*); however, the emphasis on the craftsman speaking as teacher in the *Ars* version aligns Daedalus strongly with the role of the Ovidian *praeceptor*, a need which is less pressing for the *Met.* version. The timing within the two versions is slightly different too, since in the *Met.* passage, Daedalus gives his instructions right at the moment of enacting the flight (*pariter praecepta, Met.* 8.208): this intensifies the scene, appropriate for the more dramatic epic version. Also, Daedalus’ act of pre-warning Icarus before the

flight in the *Ars* emphasises the boy's culpability in his own death, and thus provides more of an admonitory *exemplum* for the reader.

The passage is packed full of didactic imperatival expression: gerundives *adeunda* (51), *effugiendus* (52), and *aspiciendus* (56); imperatives *rumpe* (54), *sectare* (57), *uola* (63), *timeto* (63), and *dato* (64); and didactic formulae *sit tua cura* (58) and *me duce* (58). These increase the impression of Daedalus as *praeceptor*.

**51-2 cui** i.e. to Icarus.

**pater** Daedalus is previously referred to as *hospes* (21), and *senex* (29-30), both of which encourage the reader to empathise with his situation. Now, however, it is his paternal relationship towards Icarus which is emphasised, and which continues to dominate the rest of the passage; cf. 66 (Daedalus as *mater* within the bird simile, see below), 70 *patriae ... genae*, 84 *deseruitque patrem*, 91 *pater o pater*, 93 *at pater infelix, nec iam pater*.

**his ... carinis** The ship metaphor, which has run throughout the passage so far (see esp. on 45 *remigium uolucrum*), and which subtly engages with the progress metaphor from the start of the poem (see 9-10n) is now made explicit, with the wings described as the 'keels' with which Daedalus and Icarus plan to return to Athens. The synecdochic noun is of high style and continues the epic engagement. Yet this metaphor may also allude quite literally to a less fantastical version of the myth: that in fact Daedalus was the inventor of ship sails (Sharrock (1994a) 191); cf. Paus. 9.11.4-5 (in this version, Icarus is drowned because he is a poor helmsman and overturns his own ship).

**patria est adeunda** Daedalus aims to return to Athens. This echoes the desire from 26-8 that he be permitted to return to his *terra paterna* (26) from which he was 'driven', *agitatus* (27).

**hac nobis Minos effugiendus ope** Note that the king's name is repeated in the following line. As at 35, any attempt at a flattering epithet has been dropped (compare *iustissime Minos* at 25, part of Daedalus' address to the Cretan king).

**53-4** 'Minos was not able (to enclose) the air, he enclosed everything else: burst the air, which is permitted, with my inventions': a tricky couplet, with convoluted syntax. *claudere* must be understood (rather awkwardly) in the first clause, while the antecedent for *quem* is the Greek accusative *aira*, repeated within the couplet.

Daedalus summarises for Icarus lines 35-7, inverting the sequence. There, Daedalus began by detailing the areas which Minos governed, and then dramatically resolved that the one way left for escape was through the sky. Here, Daedalus begins with the emphatic *aera*, repeated for emphasis in the following line.

**alia omnia clausit** The verb is repeated from 23, where it refers to the shutting of the Minotaur in the Labyrinth by Daedalus. Thus, the tables have been turned on Daedalus as it is now he who is trapped.

**inuentis aera rumpe meis** Ovid uses the term *inuentum* to refer to his instruction at 164 (below). This then once more serves to align Daedalus with the role of the *praeceptor*. The verb *rumpe* gives an impression of violent force and upward thrust; cf. *Met.* 4.124 *aera rumpit* (of Pyramus' blood spurt).

**55-6** Daedalus gives more specific directions concerning the precise route which Icarus should take, based on the constellations. This continues the ship metaphor, since constellations were used by sailors for navigation at sea; cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.744-6. These lines also bear some similarity to Aeneas' directions to Pallas at Verg. *Aen.* 10.161-2, as the latter *quaerit sidera, opacae / noctis iter*. See Introduction, pp35-6, on the significance of the Aeneas/Pallas relationship for Ovid's presentation of the Daedalus/Icarus relationship. The focus on constellations also allows Ovid to engage with one of his didactic models, Aratus' *Phaenomena* (cf. esp. 323-5 and 728-31 on Orion and 581-4 on Bootes), which in turn bolsters the didactic force of Daedalus' speech to his son.

The same constellations are used in the *Met.* version: there, Daedalus advises his son that he does not need to keep an eye on the constellations Bootes, Helice (the Greek name for the she-bear, equating to *uirgo Tegeaea*, Callisto, here), or Orion as he will lead the way (*Met.* 8.206-8). He may be echoing *Od.* 5.272-4, where the three are used by Odysseus in steering his course from Calypso's island. In addition, Bootes, Callisto, and Orion were all mythological characters punished (or rewarded) for transgression by being made into constellations. In fact, these constellations are not located near to one another, so Ovid must be using them for a specific purpose: the myths become *exempla* for the characters within our *exemplum* and are used by Ovid as part of a subtle warning for Icarus regarding the dangers of transgression. However, Icarus ignores these warnings and will become a sea (the Icarian); see 96n on how far this is a reward or a punishment for his hubris.

**sed tibi non ... / ... aspiciendus erit** This equates to *Met.* 8.206 *nec te spectare*. Icarus does not need to concern himself with navigation as he merely needs to follow his

father's lead. This contrasts with Aeneas' more thorough explanation of navigation to Pallas at *Aen.* 10. Does Daedalus' failure to provide full parental teaching increase the impression we have of Daedalus as limited father and so culpable for Icarus' death?

**uirgo Tegeaea** 'the Tegean virgin': i.e. Callisto, whose story is told at *Met.* 2.401-530 and *Fast.* 2.153-192. Callisto, a nymph of Diana, is raped by Jupiter, subsequently rejected by Diana, and then transformed into a bear by Juno. Ovid's reference to the raped Callisto as *uirgo* may be ironic, especially since the child she bore as a consequence of the rape (and the reason for her rejection by Diana) is referred to in the following clause. Tegea is a town in Arcadia, and so represents here synecdoche for Arcadia: Callisto was the daughter of Lycaon, king of Arcadia (whose story is also told at *Met.* 1.163-252 and *Fast.* 2.167), and she is called 'Tegean' also at *Fast.* 2.167. Callisto is used elsewhere as an example of constellations by which to navigate; cf. Catull. 66.66, Prop. 2.28.23-4 *Callisto Arcadios errauerat ursa per agros: / haec nocturna suo sidere uela regit.*

**comesque Bootae, / ensiger Orion** The story of Arcas, Callisto's son, transformed into the constellation Bootes (or Arctophylax), is told at *Met.* 2.496-507. Arcas, now a young man, is out hunting when he comes across the she-bear. As he is about to throw a spear at his own mother, Jupiter finally takes pity on them and transforms them both into neighbouring constellations, thus freezing them forever transfixed upon one another. Bootes is commonly used in navigation; cf. Catull. 66.67, Prop. 3.5.35, Verg. *Georg.* 1.229, Ov. *Fast.* 3.405 *siue est Arctophylax, siue est piger ille Bootes, 5.733.*

Orion is the 'companion of Bootes' due to proximity of location. However, it is interesting that it is the connection between Bootes and Callisto that Ovid will emphasise in his telling of the myth at *Met.* 8.

One version of the myth of Orion was that he attempted to rape Diana; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.71-2 *temptator Orion Dianae / uirginea domitus sagitta.* However, Ovid's presentation of the myth at *Fast.* 5.493-544 attributes his removal to the heavens to an hubristic boast about his skills as hunter; cf. esp. 5.539-40 *uerba mouent iram non circumspecta deorum: / 'quam nequeam' dixit 'uincere, nulla fera est'.* The constellation Orion is used by Virgil in terms of hostile weather at sea as well as navigation; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.535 *nimbosus Orion, 4.52, 7.719.* Orion is also 'sword-bearing' at Ov. *Fast.* 4.388, Luc. 1.665, TLL. 5.2.13ff.

**57-8** 'Follow me with the given wings; I will go ahead: let it be your care to follow, with me as leader you will be safe': a highly repetitive couplet, with the duty of the son to

follow indicated in the first half of each line, and the task of the father to lead indicated in the second half of each line. Note particularly the repetition of the personal pronoun, *me ... ego ... tua ... me*. The need for the pupil to follow the teacher continues to strengthen the connection between Daedalus and the *praeceptor*.

**ego praeuius ibo** The scene of Daedalus leading the way for his son ominously recalls Orpheus leading Eurydice out of the underworld; cf. *Met.* 11.65 *nunc praecedentem sequitur, nunc praeuius anteit*, TLL. 10.2.1116.37ff. The Orpheus resonances began with the reference to crossing the Styx (see 41n) and will be resumed with the repetition of *Icare* at 93-5 (see note below).

**sit tua cura** A common didactic formula, and one favoured by Ovid in the *Ars*; cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.51-2, 3.305, 383, 4.113, Ov. *Ars.* 1.354, 2.122, 242, 295, 3.380, 484, *Rem.* 681. Daedalus is sounding more and more like Ovid himself.

**me duce tutus eris** The *praeceptor* refers to himself as ‘leader’ and makes a similar promise about safety at 1.382 *nec iuuenum quisquam me duce captus erit*. This again consolidates the identification between Daedalus as teacher and Ovid as *praeceptor amoris*. Armstrong (2005) 39-40 argues that the echo of *Am.* 3.12.11 *me duce*, where Ovid laments that he has inadvertently prostituted his *puella* through his poetry, hints at a negative force here too, foreshadowing the disaster to come. An additional important intertext consolidates the metapoetic dimension, one that is arguably already there through the Orpheus resonances already discussed (see above): Prop. 3.3 presents a Callimachean *recusatio*. Apollo appears to the poet about to embark upon *regum facta* (3.3.3) and commands him to strive for lower themes with *paruis ... rotis* (3.3.18). Packed full of Callimachean imagery, he also begs him not to overburden his *cumba* (3.3.22). As part of this ship imagery, he proceeds to direct as follows: 3.3.23-4 *alter remus aquas alter tibi radat harenas, / tutus eris: medio maxima turba marist*. The naval metaphor is a clear metapoetic statement: the poet should stay close to land (i.e. stick to familiar, elegiac material) rather than risking dangers in the middle of the sea (i.e. the more difficult demands of epic poetry). So when Daedalus echoes Propertius’ *tutus eris* (3.3.24), he exposes the metapoetic potential of the Icarian situation: by attempting too much, Icarus will fail. Yet how does this fit with Ovid’s earlier statement, warning the reader that he is in *mediis ... undis* (see 9-10n, above)? Perhaps Ovid is also in danger of attempting too much in his own telling of the myth.

**59-62** The crux of the myth: if the pair fly too high, the heat of the sun will melt the wax which holds the feathers of the wings together; if they fly too low, the spray will moisten the wings and weigh them down. Sharrock (1994a) 132-3 notes how the two couplets represent in miniature the contrast between epic and elegiac styles: ‘the first couplet is *high*, the second is *low*’, literally (i.e. the first concerns flying high, and the second with flying low), poetically (note the high stylistic register of the first couplet) and metapoetically (i.e. flying high has connotations of epic attempt, while lowness denotes baser genres like elegy). The construction *siue ... siue* allows Ovid to set up effectively the contrast between the two, equally disastrous, consequences of mismanaging the wings. Janka rejects this theory as ‘unzutreffend’, on the grounds that the contrast between high and low is designed purely to emphasise the dangerousness of such an undertaking, and he suggests that Sharrock has over-interpreted in this case in order to support her own metapoetic theory; however, I consider this a rather restrictive interpretation (see introductory note on my position between the two scholars).

**siue aetherias uicino sole per auras / ibimus** The first consequence is the one that actually occurs, see 85n (below). As Icarus flies too high, the wax melts and the wings disintegrate.

*aetherias ... auras* echoes the *aerias ... uias* of 44, so emphasise the high daring of this act, and its transgressive nature, for which the pair will be punished. Yet the phrase is also of high register, allowing Ovid to mock his own epic pretensions; cf. Lucr. 3.405, 835, 5.657, Verg. *Georg.* 2.292, *Aen.* 1.547, 4.446, 6.762, 7.557, 768. Ovid uses the phrase for a similarly bathetic function at *Am.* 2.14.41 *ista sed aetherias uanescent dicta per auras*.

**impatiens cera calor erit** ‘the wax will be unable to tolerate the heat’: for this meaning of *impatiens* as ‘that does not endure’ or ‘tolerate’ as well as ‘impatient of’, cf. OLD s.v. 1.

**siue humiles propiore freto iactabimus alas** The ablative absolute *propiore freto* mirrors the ablative absolute *uicino sole* in the previous line, drawing a strong contrast between the two possible causes of disaster. This possibility of the wings weighed down by sea-spray seems to be original to Ovid, and allows him to explore the metapoetic potential of low vs high. *humilis* is used specifically of poetry and poets; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.2 *non omnis arbusta iuuant humilesque myricae* (as the poet sets out his grand poetic scheme), Prop. 1.7.21 *tum me non humilem mirabere saepe poetam*, 2.10.11 *surge, anime, ex humili; iam, carmina, sumite uires*, 3.17.1, 39. Ovid’s reference here to ‘humble wings’

has deep poetological significance too, especially when considered in conjunction with the statement about flying high in the previous couplet.

The phrase *iacto alas* is to be understood as referring to the spreading of wings, and is used commonly in Ovid; cf. *Met.* 4.699, *Trist.* 3.10.45; TLL. 7.1.52.27ff.

The reference to ‘wings’ as *alae* recalls the description of Cupid’s wings in this way at 19. This echo strengthens the impression that Ovid is here intending the reader to see an allusion to the poetry of love, of which Cupid, as god of love, is emblematic.

**mobilis aequoreis pinna madescet aquis** ‘the movable wing will become moist with sea-water’: as with *alae* in the previous line, the reference to the feather as *mobilis* here recalls the fickle nature of Cupid’s wings as *leuis* at 19 (see above), there too redolent of poetics (specifically elegy).

The phrase *aequoreis ... aquis* here echoes the high style *aetherias ... auras* (59), drawing out the contrast between high and low, sea and sky. The hyperbolic phrase is a favourite with Ovid, attested elsewhere 18 times. This fondness is perhaps unsurprising considering his propensity for stretching language to its very limits.

The image of moistened wings resembles Perseus at *Met.* 4.729 *maduere graues adspergine pennae*. The difference is that Perseus’ wings are divine, and therefore more resilient than Icarus’. It brings us back to the problem of 43-4: mortal man, without divine aid, should not attempt such an hubristic act.

**63-4** Daedalus concludes his speech by advising Icarus to adopt a moderate approach to the flight: he should fly *between* sea and sun, in order to avoid the dangers of both. The middle way has resonance both in terms of moderate behaviour (which Icarus fails to adhere to, see 83n *incautis nimium temerarius annis*) and also, and significantly, in generic terms (consider for example the statement of the moderate gait at 3.299-306 with Gibson *ad loc.*). Icarus becomes a warning for both lover and poet: the lover should adopt moderate behaviour in his pursuit of the *puella*; and the poet should adopt a moderate line in terms of poetics, neither overreaching himself nor going too close to the lowly genre of elegy. ‘Icarus’ mistake ... was that he did not fly between the two, but flew up to the heights of pure hexameter’ (Sharrock (1994a) 133).

**inter utrumque uola** ‘fly between each of the two’: i.e. between sea and sun, and, metapoetically, between elegy and epic. This is the demanding task of the didactic elegy: Ovid must take care not to veer too far in either generic direction. The phrase *inter utrumque* is rare outside Ovid; cf. *Rem.* 810, *Met.* 2.140 *inter utrumque tene* (the Sun to his

son, Phaethon, see Introduction, pp28-30), 8.206 (Daedalus to Icarus), *Fast.* 2.244 (of constellations), TLL. 7.1.2136.29ff.

**uentos quoque ... timeto** Daedalus' instruction here to 'fear the winds' is directly contravened at 75 where Icarus flies *posito ... timore*. Fear is a key aspect of the *praeceptor*'s teaching in Book 2, as he advises the lover to adopt a fearful attitude; cf. e.g. 167 *timeat maledicere pauper*, 174 *culpae damna timete meae*, 302 *sed timida, caueat frigora, uoce roga*, 386 *crimina sunt cautis ista timenda uiris*. This emphasis on the need for caution once more links the lover to the presentation of Icarus in the *exemplum*, see Introduction, pp27-30.

**nate** The familial relationship between father and son is emphasised at this key moment, the end of Daedalus' speech to his son, see 51n (*pater*). Note also how this final speech is framed by references to the *pater* and *natus*.

**quaque ferent aerae, uela secunda dato** The emphasis on sails and winds (note also *uentos* in the previous line) forms another link with the progress metaphor of 9-10. Strong winds have metapoetic force, since 'the "extreme" of strong winds needs to be avoided on the sea of love' (Gibson (2007) 36). In fact, it is Icarus' carefree indulgence of his flying style that leads to the disaster: Daedalus' instructions foreshadow the problems that emerge during the flight. The phrase *uela secunda* is used by Ovid elsewhere of his poetic style; cf. *Fast.* 3.790 *des ingenio uela secunda meo*.

**65-70** Preparation for the flight: Daedalus fits the wings to Icarus and shows him how to manipulate them; he dons them and poises himself; he then touchingly kisses his son, demonstrating paternal concern, in an act which foreshadows the tragedy to come.

**65-6 dum monet** The act of fitting the wings to Icarus' shoulders is described as occurring contemporaneously with Daedalus' warnings. This may be another example of the faulty *praeceptor*, since we have already learnt that Icarus is enchanted by the wings (*puer ... renidens*, 49) and so possibly liable to be distracted when in close proximity to the wings. Rather than listening to his father's important final words of advice, the child is more interested in playing with the wings.

The verb *moneo* and its cognates are frequently used in the *Ars* to describe the *praeceptor*'s teaching, another important clue that the reader is to see a connection between the *praeceptor* and Daedalus as teacher; cf. e.g. 1.387, 459, 739, 2.608, 3.193, 353, *Rem.* 439.

**aptat opus puero monstratque moueri** The three verbs in this line (*moneo*, *apto*, and *monstro*) all give a strong impression of action in this line: this is what the speeches have been leading up to. However, is there too much going on for Icarus to fully absorb all that he needs to know prior to the flight? Referring to him as *puer* also promotes this impression of his youth and inexperience: he is not up to this challenge (see 49n).

The phrase *apto opus* has strong metapoetic resonance, since the verb is used elsewhere by Ovid of ensuring that he matches subject-matter to the metre; cf. *Am.* 1.1.19 *nec mihi materia est numeris leuioribus apta*, 2.1.4, 2.17.21-2. This strengthens the literal and metapoetic meanings present throughout the passage. For the metapoetic potential of *opus*, see 46n (above): ‘the *opus*, his *ars*, which Daedalus fits to Icarus parallels the *opus*, his *Ars*, which Ovid fits to the love-god’ (Sharrock (1994a) 147-8).

The infinitive after *monstro* is attested previously at *Lucr.* 5.1105-6 *uitamque priorem / commutare nouis monstrabant rebus*, *Verg. Aen.* 4.497-8 *abolere nefandi / cuncta uiri monimenta iuuat monstratque sacerdos*, TLL. 8.1442.81ff.

**erudit infirmas ut sua mater aues** ‘as their own mother teaches her weak chicks’: a rare simile in the *Ars*, this emphasises how close Ovid is to encroaching upon epic style. Like Icarus, he is veering higher than appropriate. The *Met.* version of the Daedalus myth includes the same simile, yet more emphasis is placed upon Daedalus’ concern; cf. *Met.* 8.213-4 *comitique timet, uelut ales, ab alto / quae teneram prolem produxit in aera nido*. It is striking that Ovid supplies a simile in the middle of an extended *exemplum*, which can be viewed as a type of simile itself; see Ahern (1989) 276.

**67-8 inde sibi factas umeris accommodat alas** Daedalus dons the wings having secured the other pair to his son’s shoulders. Similar language is used of fitting the wings to Icarus at *Met.* 8.209 *ignotas umeris accommodat alas*.

**perque nouum timide corpora librat iter** ‘and he timidly poises the bodies for the new journey’: the ‘new journey’ frames the line, recalling the *audaciam ... uiam* from 22. *per* followed by the accusative *iter* recalls Virgil’s description of Daedalus’ flight at *Aen.* 6.16 *insuetum per iter*, TLL. 10.1.1135.76ff.

Note that although Daedalus behaves ‘timidly’ here, and advocates Icarus’ timidity at 63, it is Icarus’ lack of fear that will prove problematic; see 75n (below).

*libro* gives a sense of balance, a key aspect for a passage heavily concerned with the need for moderation between the two extremes of high and low/epic and elegy. The verb is used specifically to describe the act of balancing during flight; cf. *Verg. Georg.* 4.196 *sese*

*per inania nubila librant* (Virgil's metapoetic bees), *Ov. Am.* 2.6.11, *Met.* 8.201, *Sen. Oed.* 100 *Daedalus librans iter*, *TLL.* 7.2.1351.53ff.

**69-70** The scene of Daedalus kissing his son and weeping recalls elegiac death scenes, so presaging the death of Icarus; cf. *Prop.* 4.11.77 *oscula cum dederis tua flentibus*, *Tib.* 1.1.62 *lacrimis oscula mixta dabis*. The *Met.* version emphasises this element of foreshadowing (cf. 8.211-2 *dedit oscula nato / non iterum repetenda*) and draws out the Virgilian echo (cf. 8.211 *patriae tremuere manus* recalls *Verg. Aen.* 6.33 *bis patriae cecidere manus*). The connection between tears, kisses, and death is utilised at 325-6, when the *puella* is sick and the lover is instructed to demonstrate strong emotion.

**iamque uolaturus** The future participle gives a sense of excitement, as the reader is drawing closer to the actual flight.

**paruo dedit oscula nato** The adjective *paruus* emphasises Icarus' youth, increasing the pathos of this touching scene, which recalls Hector's kissing of Astyanax at *Il.* 6.474: while the Homeric scene foreshadows the father's death, it should also be remembered that the son too is fated to die when Troy eventually falls. The alignment of the failed parent Daedalus with the great hero Hector is heavily ironic, especially considering that in this case, the father will be taking the son directly into a dangerous situation.

**nec patriae lacrimas continuere genae** Once more, the focus on Daedalus as *pater* and Icarus as *natus* (in the previous line) increases the pathos of the scene. This builds up to 93 *at pater infelix, nec iam pater*. Such emotion does not bode well for the scenes to follow.

The verb *contineo* used in this way refers to an attempt to control emotion: i.e. Daedalus is unable to hold back the tears *from* his cheeks; cf. *Am.* 1.14.51 *lacrimas male continet*, 3.9.46, *Her.* 15.174, *Ars.* 2.582 *uix lacrimas Venerem continuisse putant*.

**71-2** The moment of the flight: Ovid delays the moment of take-off with a description of the location from which they launch themselves. The couplet is redolent of the poetics which have dominated the passage: the location is 'smaller than a mountain' but 'higher than the level plains', a description of moderation which resembles the flight path *inter utrumque*. Meanwhile, the pair are described in terms of their *corpora bina*, literally meaning both 'two bodies' as in the pair of them, father and son, ultimately separated (as likewise of Romulus and Remus at *Fast.* 2.418), but also 'twofold bodies', hinting at their

double nature as both man and bird at that moment: ‘the generic mix-up of the poem is signified metaphorically by the hybrid nature of the protagonists in the exemplum’ (Sharrock (1994a) 128). Lucretius has previously emphasised the impossibility of just such doubling at *Lucr.* 5.878-924, esp. 879 *duplici natura et corpore bino*. Thus, Daedalus and Icarus in their incarnation as birdmen are both impossible and unnatural.

**monte minor collis, campis erat altior aequis** ‘There was a hill smaller than a mountain, higher than the level plains’: the alliterative grouping into pairs in this line (m/m, c/c, and a/a) emphasises the issue of duality.

**hinc data sunt miserae corpora bina fugae** The passive verb gives a sense of inevitability to the scene, and presents the pair as helpless. The *misera ... fuga* which frames their bodies foreshadows the tragedy. Interestingly, Ovid refers to his own exile as such at *Pont.* 4.13.42, thus drawing closer connection between Daedalus and the poet.

**73-6** The two are finally in flight. The first couplet focuses upon Daedalus as he steers his course cautiously, nervously glancing back to check on his son’s progress; while the second couplet contrasts Icarus’ more carefree attitude towards the flight. The contrast is emphasised through the positioning of the names of the characters in the same, emphatic positions at the start of the pentameter line of these successive couplets.

**et mouet ipse suas et nati respicit alas** This line is identical to *Met.* 8.216. The verb *moueo* was used of the manipulation of the wings at 65, where it was part of the demonstration to Icarus on how to move the wings. The juxtaposition of *ipse suas* emphasises the focus on Daedalus, yet also shows how the shared journey (note *corpora bina* in the previous line) has already become separate.

Even during the flight, Daedalus’ concern is primarily for his son; *nati* echoes the touching emphasis on the father/son relationship at 69-70. His concern manifests itself through constantly glancing back at his son. The verb *respicio* means both ‘to look away from what one is doing’ (OLD s.v. 1) and ‘to show concern for another’ (OLD s.v. 8), so Daedalus is evidently more concerned for Icarus than for himself. This recalls Aeneas’ fatherly concern for Ascanius; cf. *Verg. Aen.* 4.274-5 *Ascanium surgentem ... / respice*.

**Daedalus** The name is held off until this emphatic moment at the start of the pentameter. This is mirrored in the naming of Icarus (below).

**et cursus sustinet usque suos** ‘and he sustains his courses continuously’: despite the distraction of checking on his son’s progress, Daedalus is having no trouble in sustaining his own course. Note the polysyndeton in this couplet (*et ... et ... / ... et ...*): this

gives a sense of a build up of actions. Daedalus is doing all the careful actions while Icarus is merely enjoying himself.

**iamque nouum delectat iter** The *nouum iter*, which was a source of anxiety for Daedalus at 68, is now a source of pleasure for Icarus. *delectat*, sandwiched between the *nouum ... iter*, shows how Icarus is already disregarding Daedalus' advice, specifically on fear; 63n. The hint of *deliciae* behind the verb also provides an erotic subtext to the line: the intrusion of the erotic shows how out of place is Icarus, the elegiac *puer*, in this dangerous position. *delecto* is used elsewhere in the *Ars* of erotic pleasure; cf. 1.623 *delectant etiam castas praeconia formae, Rem. 103 quia delectat Veneris decerpere fructum*. In this way, the *exemplum* warns the lover about over-reaching himself beyond the bounds of the erotic (and the poet about poetic over-reaching beyond the bounds of elegy).

**positoque timore** This makes Icarus' disregard for Daedalus' instruction on fear evident; cf. 63 *timeto*.

**Icarus** The name is delayed for emphasis. Myerowitz notes how 'the scene is dramatized by being presented consecutively from several different, almost cinematographic, perspectives' (Myerowitz (1985) 165). These changes of perspective are bewildering for the reader, who firstly sees Daedalus in action (73-4); then Icarus (75-6); then the point-of-view shifts to that of the fisherman who witnesses the event (77-8). The delay in naming Daedalus and Icarus, and the ambiguous *aliquis* of line 77, increase the sense of confusion.

**audaci fortius arte uolat** Daedalus previously ordered Icarus *inter utrumque uola*, and the use of the same verb reinforces this echo, and emphasises how Icarus is gradually veering away from his father's advice: flying too strongly will make him soar higher, when he should be keeping a level trajectory *between* sea and sun. The *Met.* version utilises similar language; cf. 8.223 *cum puer audaci coepit gaudere uolatu* (*gaudere* mirrors *delectat* from the previous line).

**77-82** Scene-setting serves to delay the consequences of Icarus' lack of fear. The first couplet switches perspective to that of a fisherman who observes the pair in flight; the following two couplets detail the islands which they pass. The precision of the described route is questionable: Naxos, Paros, and Delos are appropriate places for the pair to pass on their way from Crete to Athens; however Samos to the left and Calymne to the right form a 'geographical puzzle' (Rudd (1988) 24). Sharrock (1994a) 158 suggests an interesting

solution to this problem, that the route described is actually that of Icarus, not Daedalus, and that he has veered off in order to make for Ionia, Homer's birthplace. Thus, Icarus' route takes on metapoetic resonance, reinforcing his adherence to epic, his ineptitude for which is demonstrated by his ultimate failure.

**77-8** 'Someone, while he captures fish with trembling rod, saw them, and his right hand abandoned the work begun': the scene has its epic counterpart at *Met.* 8.217-20, where the fisherman image is extended to include also a *pastor* and an *arator*, and a more fantastic touch is added, whereby the reader is permitted a description of their impressions and thoughts at 8.220 *credidit esse deos*. A similar image occurs at Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.316-22, where shepherds abandon their flocks in terror at the strange sight of ships sailing on the sea. This intertext may imply knowledge of the alternative version of the myth, that Daedalus in fact invented sails for ships, and it is through sailing that he escaped from Crete. For a fisherman who had never seen ships before, this would cause quite as much astonishment as men flying through the sky.

**hos aliquis, tremula dum captat arundine pisces, / uidit, et inceptum dextra reliquit opus** Sharrock (1994a) 194 provocatively suggests that the ambiguous *aliquis* (referring to the fisherman) can, however, also suggest an alternative identification: Ovid himself. She cites the metapoetic potential of much of the language of the couplet as supporting evidence for this theory, including the fact that *arundo* can mean 'pen' as well as 'fishing-rod'. However, the only extant examples of this other meaning come well after Ovid; cf. Pers. 3.11, Mart. 1.3.10, TLL. 6.3.2543.62ff.

Despite this weakness, the rest of her argument is sound: what is Ovid doing referring to the fisherman's task as an *opus*, notably an *inceptum opus*? Works that have been *undertaken* have extra resonance in terms of Ovidian poetics; cf. *Met.* 1.2-3 *coeptis ... / ... meis*, mirrored at 38 *coepto ... meo* (above). Also, the wings themselves were described as Daedalus' *opus* at 46 and 65, where the poetic connection was evident: that Daedalus, who looks very like Ovid, should create something that looks very like poetry is striking. However, now the fisherman resembles Ovid: is Ovid playing with his reader, challenging him to clarify the multiple identifications at work, which are deliberately obscured. One solution could be the nearness of fishing to elegiac hunting: fishing was a metaphor utilised by the elegists for catching the *puella*; cf. Prop. 4.1.141-2, *Ars.* 1.47-8, 393, 763-4, 3.426, *Rem.* 448, Murgatroyd (1984) 364-7.

**79-80** The first places that Daedalus and Icarus pass as they leave Crete are Naxos, Paros, and Delos, which constitute the Cyclades, and then Samos (far to the east of the Cyclades) is situated to the left: the pair are heading in the opposite direction from Athens; Sonderegger (1986) 530-2 discusses the comparable situation in the *Metamorphoses*. In fact, they seem to be following the route of the Trojans in reverse; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.121-7.

**Samos a laeua** Samos, an island associated with Juno (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.16), lies midway between Crete and Athens. Note that Icarus falls midway towards his destination, reinforcing the emphasis throughout the passage on the middle way.

**(fuerant ... relictæ / ...)** Sharrock (1994a) 157-8 shows how the places that Icarus 'leaves behind' denote over-worked poetic locations, while the places named in the following couplet are more learned, obscure, and represent higher epic style.

**Naxosque** Naxos is an island famous for Ariadne's abandonment by Theseus, and her subsequent seduction by Bacchus, to whom the island is sacred; cf. Catull. 64.121, Prop. 27-8.

**Paros** An island close to Naxos, famous for its marble and the home of the iambic poet Archilochus; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.126 *niueamque Parum*, Ov. *Met.* 7.465 *marmoreamque Paron*.

**Clario Delos amata deo** 'Delos loved by the Clarian god': Delos is sacred to Apollo because it is his birthplace; cf. Callim. *Hymn* 4, esp. 4.2 Δῆλον, Ἀπόλλωνος κουροτρόφον, Verg. *Georg.* 3.6, Tib. 2.3.27, Hor. *Carm.* 1.21.10 *natalemque ... Delon Apollinis*, Ov. *Met.* 6.191, 333. Claros is a town in Ionia sacred to Apollo; cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.515-6 *mihi Delphica tellus / et Claros et Tenedos*, 11.413, *Fast.* 1.20. The emphasis at this point on Apollo both recalls the god's prominence at the start of the Book (see 1-2n), and also foreshadows his significance later in the Book, esp. 493-510.

**81-2** On the right lie Lebinthos, Calymne, and Astypalaea. These places are more obscure than those listed in the previous couplet, and the description of the last place dominates the entire pentameter line, in a high epic style, which, shows how 'Icarus builds up his elevated poetic powers' (Sharrock (1994a) 158-9). The *Met.* version includes the first two locations, but not Astypalaea; cf. *Met.* 8.222 *dextra Lebinthos erat fecundaque melle Calymne*.

**dextra Lebinthos erat** An island of the Sporades which lies between Cos and Paros.

**siluisque umbrosa Calymne** ‘and Calymne shaded by woods’: Ovid promotes the metapoetic potential of this island in the *Met.* version, where it is described as ‘abundant with honey’ (quoted above). Here, its obscurity is drawn out: not only is it shady, but the name itself may be etymologically connected with κάλυμμα, meaning ‘a covering’ or ‘veil’ (Sharrock (1994a) 158).

**cinctaque piscosis Astypalaea uadis** ‘and Astypalaea surrounded by shallows teeming with fish’: another island in the south Aegean, between Crete and Athens, its long and narrow shape justifies the description here. Ovid uses Astypalaea in connection with the Cretan cycle elsewhere; cf. *Met.* 7.461, where the Astypalaeian kingdom offers to join forces with Aegeus against Minos. The adjective *piscosus* is found in more elevated poetic genres, and so demonstrates Ovid here striving for a higher style; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.254-5 *circum / piscosos scopulos*, 11.457, Ov. *Met.* 10.531, 12.10, *Fast.* 3.581.

**83-92** After three couplets of delaying scene-setting, the action turns to focus dramatically on Icarus. Once more he is characterised by the over-confidence which marked him at 75-6, and which now leads to separation from his father (83-4). This deviation, which Daedalus repeatedly warned against at 57-8, results in tragedy: the wax melts and the wings disintegrate (85-6); Icarus panics (87-8); he begins to flail (89-90); and, finally, he falls, calling out to his father, and drowns in the sea (91-2).

**83-4 puer** Describing Icarus at this crucial point as *puer* increases the pathos of the scene, emphasising as it does his youth and vulnerability. Yet the term also eroticises him, since the reader may recall the *puer* Cupid from 18, who is so important for the interpretation of this *exemplum*; see 49n *puer ... renidens*. Lines 107-122 serve to eroticise the lover, effectively making him the *puer delicatus* of the *praeceptor* in much the same way as Icarus is eroticised here (Sharrock (1994a) 27-30), so forging another link between the lover and Icarus, and between the *praeceptor* and Daedalus.

**incautis nimium temerarius annis** ‘too reckless with incautious years’: Icarus’ lack of caution is what leads to his downfall. This recklessness has already been signposted by Ovid; e.g. the child’s ignorant pleasure in the wings (49-50) and the delight he feels during the flight, banishing fear (75-6). Icarus at this point very much resembles the lover, advised at 9-10 *quid properas, iuuenis? mediis tua pinus in undis / nauigat, et longe quem peto portus abest*. Icarus’ ‘ship’ may be the wings, but the naval metaphor for the flight is sustained throughout the *exemplum*; cf. *remigium* (45), *carinis* (51), the constellations

commonly used for navigation by sailors (55-6), *uela secunda* (64), the story of the shepherds stunned at the sight of men sailing at Ap. Rhod. 4.316-22 (echoed at 77-8). This supports the interpretation that the lover is intended to realise that he is in danger of being identified with Icarus.

The line contains a tricolon of words denoting excess. *temerarius* is used frequently by Ovid, especially in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* (20 times out of a total of 34 Ovidian usages); however, the word is not used at all by Virgil or Horace, and only once by Propertius; cf. Prop. 2.8.13 *multos nimium temerarius annos*. In the Propertian intertext, the lover considers himself ‘too reckless for many years’ because he has wasted much money supporting his *puella*: this is not a mistake the Ovidian lover will make (see Ovid’s advice on *paupertas* at 161-6, and on gift-giving at 261-86). Once more, Icarus seems to represent the failed elegiac lover, and therefore stands as a warning for the reader.

**altius egit iter** Icarus makes his first mistake as he begins to veer too high. The phrase is exactly repeated at *Met.* 8.225, although the epic version adds the detail: *caelique cupidine tractus* (224).

**deseruitque patrem** The epic version reads *deseruitque ducem* (*Met.* 8.224), which makes the father’s role as leader, and Icarus’ duty to follow, clear. Here, by calling Daedalus *pater* again, Ovid foreshadows the moment, which is approaching, when he will no longer be a father (see 93n, below).

*desero* can mean both ‘to part company with’ (OLD s.v. 1) and ‘to fall short of (a standard)’ (OLD s.v. 3b): i.e. the son *failed* his father by disregarding the latter’s repeated advice at 57-8. In the *Ars*, ‘leaving behind’ your lover is a problem in the context of sex, cf. 725-6 *sed neque tu dominam uelis maioribus usus / desere, nec cursus anteat illa tuos* (note the motif of the progress metaphor).

**85-6 uincla labant** ‘the bonds waver’: the reference to *uincla* echoes the description of the manufacture of the wings at 46, recalling the flimsy nature of the linen bonds. The work of art that was there put together, now disintegrates.

**cera deo propiore liquescit** The god is, of course, the sun. By naming the sun *deus* (reminiscent of Phaethon’s father; see Introduction, pp28-30), Ovid hints at a sacrilegious undertone to the venture, one predicted by Daedalus himself at 37-40, cf. esp. 39 *non ego sidereas affecto tangere sedes*. This echo obfuscates the object of the punishment: is it that Icarus is paying the price for his father’s ambitious and hubristic undertaking?

The description of the wax melting is the climax to the story, but, as with the description of the bonds wavering at the start of the line, the image echoes the manufacture of the wings at 47, i.e. the melting of the wax prior to forming the wings. Thus, Ovid is emphasising the disintegration of Daedalus' great work.

The phrase *deo propiore* forms an amalgamation of *uicino sole* (59) and *propiore freto* (61), thus merging the two situations which Daedalus warned against.

**nec tenues uentos bracchia mota tenent** The image of Icarus vainly flailing in mid-air is both pathetic and humorous. At *Rem.* 754, *bracchia mota* is used to present the motion of the arms during dance. So the image of Icarus' 'moving arms' is potentially humorous since the reader imagines the boy dancing in mid-air.

The description of the winds as *tenues* emphasises their insubstantiality, but also contains a hint of the Callimachean 'slender Muse': this suggests that the elegiac *topoi* are pulling Icarus back from his epic ambitions.

The verb *teneo* recalls the aim of the Book: to show the lover how to *hold* the girl, cf. 12 *arte mea capta est, arte tenenda mea est*. Icarus' lack of ability to 'hold' once more depicts him as the failed lover: not only does he fail to follow Daedalus' advice, he fails to follow the *praeceptor's* advice too.

**87-8** From a description of the disintegrating wings in the previous couplet, this couplet now focuses on Icarus' panic. The following couplet describes the wings completely falling apart, leaving Icarus' arms nude, while this couplet presents a snapshot of the brief moment of realisation, as Icarus is frozen prior to his plummet.

**terrītus** The boy who was so carefree moments earlier (75-6 and 83-4) now has too much of that fear which the father urged upon him (63 *uentos quoque, nate, timeto*).

**a summo despexit in aequora caelo** Brandt *ad loc.* notes the similarity between this line and *Met.* 2.178 *ut uero summo despexit ab aethere terras*, another point of connection between Icarus and Phaethon (see Introduction, pp28-30). Both sons are out of their element, too high in the sky (*summus*), and their gaze downwards presages their fatal plunge.

The image of poet as an eagle in flight over the middle of the sea is an old one; cf. Pind. *Nem.* 5.20-1 ἔχω γονάτων ἐλαφρόν ὄρμάν / καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί.

The juxtaposition of sea and sky at the end of the line reflects the generic significance of the line: Icarus is currently too high (epic) but will soon drown *beneath* the elegiac waters.

**nox oculis pauido uenit oborta metu** ‘night came rising to his eyes with panic-struck fear’: an echo of the heroic death of the first Trojan warrior at *Il.* 4.461-2 τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψεν, / ἤριπε δ’ ὡς ὅτε πύργος ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ. This aligns Icarus with the failed epic hero: he has veered well beyond his poetic abilities.

The repetition of words conveying fear (*pauidus* and *metus* echo *territus* from the previous line) highlights how Icarus has entirely given way to excessive fear, resulting in this dead faint. In the *Ars*, fear should be used with caution: the female addressee of *Ars* 3 is advised to incite a certain amount of fear in her lover, but not too much; cf. *Ars.* 3.601-10, esp. 604-6 *ut sis liberior Thaide, finge metus. / cum melius foribus possis, admitte fenestra / inque tuo uultu signa timentis habe*. The girl is also warned to mix joy with fear, or her lover may lose interest; cf. *Ars.* 3.609-10 *admiscenda tamen Venus est securam timori, / ne tanti noctes non putet esse tuas*. Here, Icarus has too much fear, and represents the failed Ovidian lover.

**89-90 tabuerant cerae** ‘the wax had melted away’: the pluperfect shows that the wax has already entirely vanished, and Icarus is now helpless, completing the action of *cera ... liquescit* (85).

**nudos quatit ille lacertos** ‘he shakes naked arms’: the switch to the present tense adds an immediacy to the drama of the couplet. The entire line is repeated exactly at *Met.* 8.227. This phrase completes the action of 86: the *brachia mota* are now entirely nude. The verb *quatit* is used of shaking wings at Verg. *Aen.* 3.226 *magnis quatunt clangoribus alas*, Ov. *Met.* 4.677 *paene suas quaterere est oblitus in aere pennas* (Perseus’ wings).

**et trepidat** The verb *trepido* seems to be an elevated term, used overwhelmingly by Lucretius and Virgil in his epic: *Lucr.*: 11; *Prop.*: 2; *Tib.*: 1; Verg. *Georg.*: 3; Verg. *Aen.*: 36. Ovid favours the word in the *Met.*, although it features very occasionally in his other work: *Am.*: 2; *Her.*: 3; *Ars.*: 4; *Met.*: 38; *Fast.*: 2; *Trist.*: 6; *Pont.*: 5. These statistics demonstrate how the poet is still veering into epic territory.

**nec quo sustineatur habet** ‘nor does he have that by which he might be held up’: the verb *sustineo* recalls the description of Daedalus keeping to his course at 74 *cursus sustinet usque suos*. This draws a contrast between Daedalus’ success and Icarus’ failure. The change from active to passive places Icarus in the position of vulnerable and helpless victim, compared with Daedalus’ calm control.

**91-2** After much delay, the moment of the fall is described, opening with two abrupt words of falling. After so much build-up, the crucial moment is over relatively quickly. The pathos of the waters closing over Icarus' mouth as he is still speaking is immense, but the image also reinforces the idea of Sharrock (1994a) 161-3 that Icarus represents the world of epic: he is still striving to communicate even at the moment of death.

**decidit atque cadens** The first verb of falling, *decido*, may recall the *puella* falling into traps at 2. *cado*, the second verb of falling, has additional connotations of death, especially in battle (OLD s.v. 9): in this way Icarus is still trying to look like an epic hero. The verb is also used of Phaethon's fall at *Met.* 2.322 *etsi non cecidit, potuit cecidisse uideri* (see Introduction, pp28-30, for the similarities between the stories of Icarus and Phaethon). It is a particularly appropriate verb to use of Icarus and Phaethon, who both fall from the sky, since it can also refer to heavenly bodies, meaning 'to sink' or 'set' (OLD s.v. 6).

**'pater o pater, auferor' inquit** The first and only words that Icarus speaks are extremely brief, especially when compared to Daedalus' extensive 33 lines (or partial lines) of direct speech. This mirrors the procedure of the *Ars* in general, where the *praeceptor* (naturally enough, as main speaker) does almost all the talking, and the voice of the lover only intrudes very rarely, and as the *praeceptor* allows. For example, the student is often directed to say (or not say) certain things by the *praeceptor*, who thereby retains control; cf. e.g. 1.42 *elige cui dicas 'tu mihi sola places'*, 56 *'haec habet' ut dicas 'quicquid in orbe fuit'*, 2.301 *'moues incendia' clama*, 628 *cuilibet ut dicas 'haec quoque nostra fuit'?* The most striking example of the student being permitted to speak occurs at the end of Books 2 and 3, where the addressee is instructed to inscribe spoils *NASO MAGISTER ERAT* (2.744, 3.812): in these cases, the male/female addressee is encouraged not only to speak, but to *write*; however, the words they are to write are dictated by the *praeceptor*, who still retains control. A similar game is at play at the very start of Book 2 (*dicite 'io Paeon' et 'io' bis dicite 'Paeon'*, 1), where the lover is instructed to praise the poet: how can praise be genuine which the lover is forced to express? The only instance of the lover providing a contradictory voice to the *praeceptor* occurs at the start of Book 3, where the male addressee of Books 1-2 is imagined objecting to the theme of Book 3: *'quid uirus in angues / adicis et rabidae tradis ouile lupae?'* (3.7-8).

It is of note that the *Met.* version alters this scene, and denies Icarus a voice entirely; his mouth is merely described as *patrium clamantia nomen* (8.229). The emotive force of *o*

sandwiched between the repeated *pater* is also lost in the epic version; a repetition which here foreshadows the repetition of *pater* and the vocative form *Icare* in the following lines.

**clauserrunt uirides ora loquentis aquae** ‘the green waters closed over his lips as he spoke’: the chiasmic form of this line presents the ‘green waters’ surrounding the ‘speaking lips’. Icarus continues calling upon his father as he drowns: this is both touching and metapoetic (see above).

**93-6** From Icarus, the perspective now switches back to Daedalus, who is still searching for his son, unaware that he has already drowned. Daedalus’ rising panic mirrors the panic of Icarus at 87-8. The image of the father seeking for his child recalls Daedalus’ concern for his son’s progress at 73, where he constantly looked back to check he was still following him. The search also recalls another parent searching for a child: Ceres seeking her lost daughter, Proserpina, at *Fast.* 4.455-584, esp. 456 *nec mora, ‘me miseram! filia,’ dixit ‘ubi es?’*, and 483-4 *perque uices modo ‘Persephone!’ modo ‘filia!’ clamat, / clamat et ...*. Ovid there utilises the same motif of repeated shouting of name, and the repeated use of the verb *clamo*. In both cases, the parent asks the same, impossible question: *ubi es*; in both cases, the lost child is ‘dead’, whether figuratively (in the case of Proserpina) or literally (in the case of Icarus).

**at pater infelix, nec iam pater** Identical to *Met.* 8.231.

**‘Icare’ clamat, / ‘Icare,’ clamat ‘... / Icare’ clamabat** Note that here Ovid uses *clamo*, whereas at *Met.* 8.231-2 he uses *dico*. Anderson *ad loc.* describes the former as ‘more passionate’. The change in tense from present to imperfect gives a sense of eternal shouting, as does the triple repetition of the vocative case of the son’s name: ‘Daedalus, the lines suggest, will call to Icarus for the rest of his life’ (Myerowitz (1985) 167). This repetition of a deceased beloved’s name recalls Orpheus’ repetition of Eurydice’s name as he dies (in water); cf. Verg. *Georg.* 4.525-7 *Eurydicen uox ipsa et frigida lingua, / a miseram Eurydicen! anima fugiente uocabat: / Eurydicen toto referebant flumine ripae*. In both texts, the repetition of the deceased beloved’s name represents a traditional funeral *conclamatio*; see Toynbee (1971) 44. For the significance of Orpheus to the reader’s interpretation of the *exemplum*, see 41-2n, 57-8n.

**ubi es, quoque sub axe uolas?** The pathos is increased by the father’s pathetic assumption that his son is still flying somewhere above the sea, even though he is well aware of the dangers of the flight (a fear expressed at 59-62). The verb *uolo* echoes

Daedalus' instruction at 63 *inter utrumque uola*: the father still clings to the hope that Icarus is merely in a separate part of the sky.

**pinnae aspexit in undis** The same as at *Met.* 8.233, the feathers provide tragic proof of Icarus' death.

**ossa tegit tellus, aequora nomen habent** The elliptical narrative brings a swift ending to the story. Ovid does not detail further the father's grief or the gathering of the son's bones.

The reference to *tellus* may come as a surprise after the emphasis on drowning, although it does make possible the interesting juxtaposition of *tellus aequora*, which echoes the significance of land and sea throughout the passage; cf. 35-6. However, it is possible that Ovid here refers to a version of the myth whereby Icarus' body was washed up on the shore of the island Doliche and buried by Hercules, who thereafter renamed the island Icaria; cf. Apollod. 2.6.3, Paus. 9.11.5. Ovid himself, however, when he returns to tell the story at *Met.* 8, attributes the burial to Daedalus himself, cf. 8.234-5 *deuouitque suas artes corpusque sepulcro / condidit, et tellus a nomine dicta sepulti*. Thus, the *Met.* version focuses on the naming of the land rather than the sea (the Icarian strait).

The naming of the sea (and/or land) emphasises Icarus' death, but also his life, since his fame will live on in this way, cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.15, 4.2.3-4, Ov. *Fast.* 4.283-4. By ending the story with the aetiological naming of the sea after Icarus, Ovid engages with Callimachus' *Aetia*, thus concluding a highly metapoetic passage with a firm statement of affiliation to the Callimachean aesthetic.

**97-8** This couplet rounds off the *exemplum*, but in a provocatively unsatisfactory way. Ovid expects the reader to accept the explanation that the passage was designed to demonstrate the similarity between Minos' attempts to restrain Daedalus and Ovid's own attempts to restrain *Amor*. However, this is misleading: not only does Ovid actually look far more like Daedalus in the passage (see Introduction, pp27-30), but also the figure of Minos fades well into the background after the first line of the *exemplum*. There, he was the subject (*praestruxerat ... Minos*, 21), but in the following line, Daedalus emerges as subject (*ille*, 22), and Minos does not return to the foreground. In addition, Daedalus is given all the direct speech and even Minos' negative reply to Daedalus' plea to be allowed to leave is not reported (*egressus non dabat ille uiro*, 32). So this sudden return to focus on Minos is deliberately unsettling.

**non potuit Minos hominis compescere pinnas** ‘Minos was not able to confine the wings of a man’: the words of confinement in this couplet (*compesco* here and *detineo* in the following line) recall the aim of this Book, to make love *stay* (cf. 12 *arte tenenda mea est*), but the repetition of stopping words provide a suitable closural tone.

**ipse deum uolucrum detinuisse paro** ‘I myself prepare to detain the winged god’: i.e. *Amor*, the winged god who was described in some detail at 17-20. There, the difficulty of pinning such a volatile, fickle god was emphasised. Ovid cleverly returns to the theme with which the passage began, thus framing the *exemplum*. Sharrock (1994a) 194 points out the ‘heavy authorial self-reference’ of *ipse ... paro*, framing the line. The fact that the *exemplum* does not demonstrate the framing statements is the main problem, one which forces the reader to take another look. This is a problem that will recur in the Ulysses and Calypso episode, 123-44 (see below).

The perfect infinitive *detinuisse* here acts as a present infinitive after *paro*; see Platnauer (1951) 109-10.

### **99-106:** magic is no good in matters of seduction

In a seemingly abrupt transition, Ovid embarks on a discussion of the efficacy of erotic magic. However, there are points of contact between this passage and that which preceded it: magic is presented as an alternative to the teachings of the *praeceptor* and, in terms of its failure, resembles the voice of failed teacher which Daedalus signified; notably, the lover who mistakenly tries magic looks rather like the erring Icarus and so strengthens the theory that Icarus provides a warning for the lover regarding taking a wrong turn. Like Icarus, who does not listen to instructions, the lover is already moving towards the wrong thing. This passage too includes challenging mythological *exempla* (Medea and Circe) which conceal more than they reveal, as with the Daedalus and Icarus story; specifically, the *exemplum* of Circe can be shown to have Daedalan resonances (see below).

### Magic as Threat to the *Praeceptor*

Ovid is concerned in the *Ars* with making it clear to the reader that his type of amatory advice on seduction is the most effective. In so doing, he suggests alternatives which the lover could attempt: magic (here), and wealth (161-6). Wealth is one way of bypassing the

need for *ars*: the rich rival *inuentis plus placet ille meis* (164). In the case of magic, however, Ovid is adamant that, contrary to money, it simply does not work; cf. *fallitur* (99), *non facient ut uiuat amor* (101). In fact, it can even be harmful since it risks poisoning the intended target (105-6n). Thus, magic and wealth are presented as rivals for the *praeceptor*, since both circumvent the need for *ars*, and therefore for Ovid's *Ars*.

The posture of magic as rival for the *praeceptor* picks up on a theme already present in elegy: here, the model of Dipsas is significant (see Introduction, p21). Dipsas (like the *lena* Acanthis of Prop. 4.5) is deliberately defined as a witch-like character in terms used in our passage to define the conventions of witchcraft: she is an *anus*, 1.8.2 (note the use of an *anus* in the mystical rites at 329-30); she is familiar with magical arts, 1.8.5-18, including spells (*carmina*, 5) herbs (*gramen*, 7), and hippomanes (*uirus amantis equae*, 8). However, in her reported speech to the *puella* which follows, she does not recommend witchcraft at all. In fact, the lover has defined her as a witch simply because he is threatened by the influence she has over his *puella*. Magic, like the female voice, is viewed in elegy as something threatening to the lover's agenda.

### Magic in Elegy

Magic as a theme is also present in previous elegy. Like Ovid, Propertius rejects magic as an option for the desperate lover at Prop. 1.1.19-24: in fact, he returns to the theme at 3.24 to demonstrate that magic has indeed been of no use to him:

*quod mihi non patrii poterant auertere amici,  
eludere aut uasto Thessala saga mari,  
hoc ego non ferro, non igne coactus, at ipsa  
naufragus Aegaea (uera fatebor) aqua.*

(Propertius 3.24.9-12)

The references to *ferrum* and *ignis* in 11 make the link with the programmatic first poem of Book 1 evident. There, the discourse on witchcraft was followed by the lover's other option: medically cutting out the infection; cf. 1.1.27 *fortiter et ferrum saeuos patiemur et ignes*. Thus, the sequence Prop. 1-3 is book-ended by references to witchcraft and medicine, and both are deemed useless. The *exempla* of Medea and Circe are also used by

Propertius at 2.1.53-4 *seu mihi Circaeο pereundumst gramine, siue / Colchis Iolciacis urat aena focis*. There, the witchcraft is wholly negative and harmful, defined as burning the lover.

Tibullus uses magic in a rather different way, accepting the dangers of magic if only his *puella* will look favourably upon him. At 1.2.41-58 it is clear that he has bought the services of a *saga* to help Delia to evade her husband: the witch has various powers which he claims to have witnessed, including a knowledge of *malas Medeae ... herbas* (53), and she has provided him with a *cantus* (55) to allow his *puella* to successfully deceive her husband. Tibullus returns to the theme of magic in Book 2:

*quicquid habet Circe, quicquid Medea ueneni,  
quicquid et herbarum Thessala terra gerit,  
et quod, ubi indomitis gregibus Venus afflat amores,  
hippomanes cupidae stillat ab inguine equae,  
si modo me placido uideat Nemesis mea uultu,  
mille alias herbas misceat illa, bibam.*

(Tibullus 2.4.55-60)

The same features are present in our passage: the two witches Medea and Circe as models; the concept that potions can be harmful (*uenena*); and the reference to hippomanes. The lines immediately preceding this indicate that Tibullus would even sacrifice his ancestral home for Nemesis (2.4.53-4): the lover is entirely subjugated. This type of subjugation is a problem for Ovid, who advises his lovers throughout the *Ars* to retain a sense of self-control: external forces such as magic potentially threaten this self-control. It is of further significance that these external forces are specifically denoted as female.

### Medea and Circe

The female monopoly on witchcraft is implied by the elegists through the use of female *exempla*: Medea and Circe. These two mythological characters are connected through a family relationship, as well as through their magical abilities: Circe is Medea's aunt. The two even meet when Jason and Medea are fleeing Colchis; cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.659-752. In a discussion on witchcraft, it is conventional that these two famous figures should

feature as representatives of witches. Circe features as witch in Homer (*Od.* 10), Virgil (*Aen.* 7), and in the *Metamorphoses* (Books 13-14). Medea, figure of tragedy (cf. Eur. *Medea* and the lost play of Ovid), is also a prominent figure in Hellenistic poetry (Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3), and both are referenced as famous witches at Theoc. *Id.* 2.15-16 φάρμακα ταῦτ' ἔρδοισα χερεῖονα μήτέ τι Κίρκης / μήτέ τι Μηδείας.

Ovid's use of the witches is problematic: for him, they exemplify the limitations of magic, since both Medea and Circe failed to keep hold of their lovers. He even uses the verb *teneo* to make the connection between their attempts to hold on to Jason and Ulysses and the lover's attempts to hold on to his *puella* (cf. 12 *tenenda ... est*). Yet both did succeed to a certain extent: Medea bore children to Jason, and Ulysses remained with Circe for one year (perhaps not as long as the seven he stayed with Calypso, but still a significant period of time). The Circe *exemplum* is further complicated by the fact that in the *Odyssey*, it is precisely the *failure* of magic that results in Circe and Ulysses becoming lovers; cf. *Od.* 10. 310-47.

Furthermore, both Jason and Ulysses benefitted from their partners' magic, so implying that magic was entirely useless in their case is misleading. In Medea's speech to Jason at Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1026-62, she instructs him on how to use magic to defeat the earth-born men sowed from the teeth of the dragon: he is to engage in a mystical rite, invoking Hecate (1035) and, most significantly for our passage, she gives him a drug to strengthen him (1042-1051, esp. 1042 ἦρι δὲ μυθήνας τόδε φάρμακον). In addition to the *exemplum* of Medea as failed lover (103-4), Ovid also refers to 'Medea's drugs' (101) as not efficacious in inciting love, and goes on to refer to the harmful nature of potions (105-6). However, Medea's knowledge of magic directly affected Jason's success, and so made their relationship possible. In the *Odyssey*, Circe's magic, although ineffective directly upon Odysseus' person due to his immunity, does prove useful for the hero: her knowledge of the Underworld means that she provides invaluable information to facilitate Odysseus' katabasis; cf. *Od.* 10.487-540: 'once won ... Homer's goddess exhibits a degree of helpfulness which is rare indeed in the monster-filled fairyland of Odysseus' wanderings' (Segal (1968) 421).

At *Od.* 10.314-5, Circe seats Odysseus ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροῦ / καλοῦ δαιδαλέου. The adjective δαιδαλέος is then picked up by Virgil in his description of Circe at *Aen.* 7.282 as

*daedala Circe*. Circe as *exemplum* here is appropriate, not only due to her traditional role as witch, but also because of her Virgilian epithet, which connects her with the Daedalus passage which preceded. Like Daedalus, she as representative of magic provides a rival for the voice of the *praeceptor*.

**99-100 fallitur** The discussion of magic begins with the strong *fallitur*, which immediately demarcates what follows as false. Ovid's stance is reminiscent of the Lucretian style, especially the latter's attack on superstition, therefore aligning Ovid with his didactic predecessor; cf. Lucr. 1.62-79.

**Haemonias si quis decurrit ad artes** 'if anyone resorts to Haemonian arts': these arts are those of Thessaly, associated with witchcraft; cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 1043, Hor. *Carm.* 1.27.21-2 *Thessalis / ... uenenis*, Prop. 1.13.21, Tib. 2.4.56 (*Thessala terra*, quoted in introductory note), Ov. *Am.* 1.14.40 *anus Haemonia*, *Met.* 7.222 *Thessala Tempe*.

*si quis* recalls the first words of Book 1 (*si quis in hoc artem populo non nouit amandi*), marking this section out as a new beginning. It also draws the competitive contrast between Ovid's *Ars* and magical *ars*, since the lover who follows Ovid's advice risks veering wildly off course if he resorts to magic. The phrase is used at a number of key points in the *Ars* to draw attention to the role of the reader, and reoccurs specifically in the context of magic at *Rem.* 249 *uiderit, Haemoniae siquis mala pabula terrae*.

The verb *decurro* is also used of resorting to magic to attain love at *Rem.* 287 *ardet et assuetas Circe decurrit ad artes*. The *Remedia* passage is important for our reading here, since Circe, as representative magical practitioner, is presented in terms that mirror the depiction of Calypso at 123-44, and her magical powers are useless in her attempts to *cure* her love, rather than, as here, to promote it. The verb also has the sense of 'running away' in conceptual space, and so recalls the literal deviation of Icarus in the previous passage.

**datque quod a teneri fronte reuellit equi** This refers to a type of aphrodisiac magic called hippomanes (literally *hippo-mania*, 'horse-madness') in which, as expressed here, the small black membrane on the brow of a new-born foal is used in potions; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.515-6 *quaeritur et nascentis equi de fronte reuulsus / et matri praereptus amor*, Plin. *NH.* 8.165.3 *et sane equis amoris innasci ueneficium, hippomanes appellatum, in fronte, caricae magnitudine, colore nigro, quod statim edito partu deuorat feta aut partum ad ubera non admittit*. However, there is evidence of two other forms of hippomanes: as a plant (cf. Theoc. *Id.* 2.48); and as a slimy discharge secreted by the mare in heat. This latter, more sexually explicit definition is found widely in Latin poetry; cf.

Verg. *Georg.* 3.280-1 *hippomanes uero quod nomine dicunt / pastores, lentum destillat ab inguine uirus*, Prop. 4.5.18 *hippomanes fetae semina legit equae*, Tib. 2.4.58 (quoted in introductory note). Ovid himself elsewhere uses the discharge version; cf. *Am.* 1.8.8 *uirus amantis equae*, *Medic.* 38 *nec temptate nocens uirus amantis equae*. Yet it is clear from the context that Ovid has selected the less erotic type. Perhaps his aim is to remove any sexual overtones in order to diminish the seductive effect of the reference, and make it less appealing an option for the lover. Furthermore, even Virgil is not consistent in his use of the term (note the difference between his use in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*). Perhaps it is relevant that Ovid imitates the *Aeneid* version, in which the aphrodisiac is all part of Dido's misdirection: she never intends it to work. This forms in turn a rejection of the *Georgics* passage, both challenging his didactic predecessor generally, and questioning the Virgilian passage specifically, where the sexual appetite of animals is used as part of his argument against love.

**101-2** Other types of magic are now brought into the discussion: potions and incantations. Ovid's use of obscure vocabulary and repeated sounds imitate the language of magic. So, although magic is rejected as a method of seduction, the rejection is 'couched in incantatory language which subverts the simple message of condemnation of incantation' (Sharrock (1994a) 68).

**non facient ut uiuat amor** This makes clear for what purpose people are likely to resort to magic: to incite love in another (literally: 'to make love live').

**Medeides herbae** 'Medean herbs': Medea's drugs actually did not incite love in Jason; rather he had already fallen in love with her and the drugs were applied to protect him (see introductory note for a discussion of Medea's use of drugs in helping Jason). Sharrock (1994a) 68 notes how the use of the hapax legomenon *Medeides* here promotes a sense of incantatory language. The adjective also prepares for the re-emergence of Medea as a model at 103 (below). Ovid tells his own version of the story of Medea in full at *Met.* 7.1-403, and he claims to have written a tragedy (which has been lost).

*herba* is a neutral term which Ovid uses of both harmful and useful aphrodisiacs at 415 (*herbas ... nocentes*) and 422 (*herba salax*); cf. TLL. 6.3.2618.30ff. He also uses the term to describe Circe's drugs at *Rem.* 263 *quid tibi profuerunt, Circe, Perseides herbae*, as Tibullus uses it to describe Medea's at Tib. 1.2.53 (quoted in introductory note). This is in common with Virgil's use of the term to describe Dido and Circe's drugs; cf. *Aen.* 4.514 *pubentes herbae nigri cum lacte ueneni* with Pease *ad loc.*, 7.19 *potentibus herbis*.

**mixtaque cum magicis nenia Marsa sonis** ‘and Marsian incantation mixed with magic sounds’: Sharrock (1994a) 68 demonstrates how this line, with its alliteration of *m* and *n*, the sibilance in the second half of the line, and its chiasmic word order ‘mixed in like a magic brew’, reflects the style of a magic spell. While Ovid rejects magic, he also engages in its conventions.

*mixta* here recalls Verg. *Georg.* 3.283 *miscueruntque herbas*, which follows on directly from the description of hippomanes. Throughout these lines, Ovid demonstrates verbal connections with this significant didactic intertext.

Spells are commonly described as *magicus*; cf. Prop. 4.4.51 *o utinam magicae nossem cantamina Musae*, Tib. 1.5.12 *carmine cum magico*, Ov. *Met.* 7.330 *cantus magicaeque potentia linguae* (of Medea’s spells), TLL. 8.51.39ff.

The phrase *nenia Marsa* occurs at Hor. *Epod.* 17.29, where the spells are oppressive (*caputque Marsa dissilire nenia*) and at Ov. *Fast.* 6.142 of the transformative power of such spells. In these instances, the word *nenia* is clearly used to mean a chanted incantation. However, the term was originally used of the funeral dirge, particularly associated with a female singer, and so contains morbid connotation; yet it eventually came to mean something akin to *nugae* (‘trifles’) and so has comic connotations too; see Heller (1943) 262-3. Horace himself uses the word in a very different context to describe a jingle at *Epist.* 1.1.63. Heller suggests that from a very early time there was something derogatory in the character of the word, so lending a parodic tone to both Ovid’s and Horace’s usages.

The adjective *Marsa* seems more straightforward, since it is ‘part of the expected vocabulary of magic’ (Sharrock (1994a) 69-70). The Marsians were an Italian people, famed as magicians and charmers; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.758 *Marsis quaesitae montibus herbae*, Hor. *Epod.* 5.76 *Marsis ... uocibus* (of spells, as here). However, Dench (1995) 154-74 questions the sinister mysticism attributed to the Marsians, and suggests that this was due in large part to the perceived threat of the Social or Marsic War, something which Ovid mentions in the final poem of the *Amores*; cf. esp. 3.15.10 *cum timuit socias anxia Romana manus*. The wars were evidently a concern to the poet, and, although no longer a military threat at the time Ovid was writing, the Marsians remained figures of fun, who sold their mystic trade for money. Furthermore, the Marsians claimed descent from a child born to Circe by Ulysses, and worshipped a goddess, Angitia, a sister of Medea, thus linking them with the mythological *exempla* in the following line; cf. Gnaeus Gellius F9 *HRR*, *apud*

Solinus 2.27-30. Elsewhere, she is identified with Medea herself; cf. Serv. ad. Verg. *Aen.* 7.759.

A textual variant reads *Marsa uenena* (A $\omega$ ) in place of *nenia Marsa* (RYA<sub>b</sub>): *uenena* would make clear the negative connotations of magic as dangerous. Virgil uses *Marsa* at *Aen.* 7.758 (quoted above) in the context of gathered herbs, so *uenena* would imply a poisonous potion: this theme is picked up at 105-6. However, I follow Kenney's rendering of the text, since *Marsa uenena* is unattested elsewhere, whereas Horace provides an important precedent for *nenia Marsa* (see above).

**103-4** 'The Phasian girl would have held the son of Aeson, Circe would have held Ulysses, if only love could be preserved by song': the opening of the couplet is highly allusive, continuing the obscure style of incantation from the previous line. The *exempla* are problematic in the context of supporting Ovid's argument that magic does not benefit lovers, since both figures had certain levels of success; see introductory note.

**Phasias Aesoniden** The 'Phasian girl' is Medea, named from the region Phasis, an epithet particularly favoured by Ovid; cf. *Her.* 6.103 *non haec Aesonides, sed Phasias Aetine*, 16.347, *Ars.* 2.382 *barbara ... Phasias*, 3.33, *Rem.* 261, *Met.* 7.298, *Fast.* 2.42, *Pont.* 3.3.80 *Phasias ... puella*. The 'son of Aeson' is Jason: the patronymic is used by Apollonius and in Latin is favoured by Ovid; cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.33 Αἰσονίδης *et al.*, Prop. 1.15.17, *Ars.* 3.34, *Met.* 7.60 *et al.*, TLL. 1.1084.58ff.

**Circe tenuisset Vlixem** The reference to Circe foreshadows the extended *exemplum* of Calypso at 123-44. There, Calypso will play a similar role as Circe at *Rem.* 263-90, where she strives to persuade Ulysses to remain with her. Ovid's Calypso is far more successful in this rhetoric than his Circe (see 123-44n).

The verb *teneo* echoes the aim of the Book: to *keep hold* of the girl (12), thus drawing the connection between the *exempla* and the lover. The use of these *exempla* raises the question: how *long* does the lover want his relationship to last? For both Circe and Medea did 'hold' their lovers for a certain period of time: indeed, according to literary tradition, both bore children as products of these relationships. The children born to Medea and Jason, and their deaths at the hands of their mother, feature prominently in Euripides' *Medea* and, according to Hesiod, Circe bore Ulysses two sons, Agrios and Latinos; cf. *Theog.* 1011-3.

**si modo seruari carmine posset amor** The sentiment here recalls *non facient ut uiuat amor* (101), but the use of the verb *seruo* suggests a subtle difference: Medea and

Circe were unable to *sustain* their relationships, although they were able to instil love initially (*ut uiuat amor*).

The use of *carmen* emphasises the slippage here between the dual meaning ‘spell’ and ‘poetry’, a common motif which emphasises the enchanting nature of song; cf. e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 8.68, *Aen.* 4.487 with Pease *ad loc.*, Prop. 2.28.35, Tib. 1.2.54, Ov. *Am.* 2.1.23-8, *Fast.* 2.426. This strengthens the sense that Ovid is setting up magic as a competitor for his poetic voice (see introductory note). Janka rejects the notion of ambiguity here; however, an analysis of the occurrences of *carmen* in the *Ars* and *Remedia* (24) reveals that the overwhelming majority is in reference to poetry (22), of which 7 are concerned with Ovid’s own poetry; while only a small proportion is concerned with magic (3).

**105-6** Ovid concludes the discussion of magic with a comment on more sinister aspects of the craft: love potions can harm the girl in whom the lover hopes to incite or sustain love. The harmful nature of aphrodisiacs is discussed again at 415-16.

**nec data profuerint pallentia philtrea puellis** Either ‘nor will pallor-inducing philtres given to girls have been of any use (to you)’ or ‘neither will given pallor-inducing philtres have been of use to girls’: the precise meaning is ambiguous due to the dative *puellis*, which could form the object of either *data* or *profuerint*. On one hand, should the lover use potions against girls, they will fail to work to the lover’s advantage; while, on the other hand, girls who are given love-potions will not feel their benefit, but rather be harmed. The latter interpretation foreshadows the pentameter, with its emphasis on the harmful nature of these drugs on the girls who are given them, thus suggesting the second reading. The violent alliteration of *p* in this line continues the incantatory style of the passage and also reflects Ovid’s attitude towards such potions as dangerous.

*pallentia* must refer to the effect the drugs have on girls; cf. Tib. 1.8.17 *pallentibus herbis* with Murgatroyd *ad loc.* However, the term can simply mean ‘pale’, i.e. describing the colouring of the potions; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.47 *pallentis uiolas*, *Georg.* 4.124, Ov. *Medic.* 69, TLL. 10.1.125.47ff. *pallentia* can be a mark of sickness, thus emphasising the harmful nature of drugs; cf. Tib. 3.10.5, Cels. 4.7.1 *et al.*, TLL. 10.1.123.79ff. Irony lies in the fact that a lover may well want to incite pallor in his *puella*, since this is a common mark of love, cf. Prop. 1.1.22 *et facite illa meo palleat ore magis*, Ov. *Ars.* 1.729 *palleat omnis amans: hic est color aptus amanti* with Hollis *ad loc.*, TLL. 10.1.123.69ff. The Propertian intertext (quoted above) is significant since there the poet specifically desires a witch to

make his girl pale, and he makes clear the connection between a lover's pallor and that of a victim of a love-potion.

*philtrum* (lit. 'love-potion') is a Grecism (φίλτρον) which is very rare in Latin before Ovid, cf. Theocr. *Id.* 2.1 πᾶ δὲ τὰ φίλτρα with Gow *ad loc.* The Greek sound continues the use of obscure and mystical terms. The word is used by Hyginus of the potion given to Deianira by the Centaur Nessus, indicating its truly harmful aspect; cf. *Fab.* 34.2.4.

**philtrum nocent animis** The repetition of *philtrum* from the previous line continues the sense of mystical chanting which pervades this passage.

The initial reading of *nocent* here, if taken to refer to the harm caused by the lover to girls, indicates plainly enough that potions can harm them. However, if we consider that Roman men could well be the victim of female witches, then the subliminal meaning of *noceo* as 'cause impotence' adds a humorous dimension; cf. Tib. 1.5.47 *haec nocuere mihi*, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.27-8. Girls who ply men with magic potions risk the exact opposite result than they would wish: a complete lack of desire; see Sharrock (1994a) 75-8.

**uimque furoris habent** The implication is that such potions are bad because they can harm the recipient and even incite madness (*furor*; cf. TLL. 6.1.1629.49ff), perhaps an echo of the reference to 'horse-mania' at 100 (see above). We have seen the danger of crazed women earlier in the *Ars*; cf. 1.342 *acrior est nostra plusque furoris habet*. Madness as the fierce passion of love is a common motif, particularly of elegiac love, and is connected to the theme of medicine; cf. Catull. 50.11 *indomitus furore*, Verg. *Ecl.* 10.60, *Aen.* 4.91, 101, 433, Prop. 1.1.7 *iam toto furor hic non deficit anno*, 1.13.20 *et al.*, Ov. *Met.* 10.397 *seu furor est, habeo, quae carmine sanet et herbis*, Pichon (1991) 157-8. As with the double meaning of *pallentia* in the previous line, the ambiguity of this phrasing in the context of earlier elegy suggests that philtres may indeed work, but the risk is that they work too well, inciting too much love. Furthermore, such *furor* is in conflict with the more rationalistic approach of the *Ars*: 'la follia rappresenta la condizione antitetica ad un'ars razionale, insegnabile e controllabile' (Baldo *ad loc.*).

**107-122:** beauty is short-lived: more enduring qualities are required to keep the girl

Like magic (and wealth at 161-76), personal beauty forms another way of circumventing the need for *Ars*. For example, in Book 3, Ovid makes it clear that he is specifically teaching girls who need him because they are *not* great beauties:

*turba docenda uenit pulchrae turpesque puellae,  
pluraque sunt semper deteriora bonis.  
formosae non artis opem praeceptaque quaerunt;  
est illis sua dos, forma sine arte potens.*

(Ars 3.255-8)

Beautiful girls have no need for *ars* or for *Ars*: Ovid's aim in Book 3 is to show less naturally beautiful girls how to use his *ars/Ars* to make the most of their appearance. However, his tactic with regard to his male addressee is somewhat different: for women, the skill lies in seducing without beauty; for men, it is in seducing (and in keeping the girl interested) without payment. Therefore the male lover needs to be reminded he has no need to cultivate his own appearance: rather, he should focus on his mind. This advice is in keeping with Ovid's attitude towards the lover throughout *Ars* 1-2, where he recommends self-control and intellectual cunning.

In contrast to his attitude towards his female addressee, Ovid is not so openly dismissive of the lover's appearance: he never says that the lover lacks the *forma* which he claims is unnecessary in a man, and indeed, quite the opposite, he consistently flatters the lover throughout this passage. Ovid implies that the lover possesses a *corpus ... bonum* (112) and he addresses him as *formose* (117). Although Ulysses, the focus of the *exemplum* which follows (123-44), is expressly defined as *non formosus* (123), Ovid seems determined not to raise suspicions in the mind of the lover that he is being insulted regarding his appearance. However, is there another, even subtler, way in which Ovid *is* insulting the lover? In Book 3 Ovid specifically warns his female addressees to avoid men who take too much trouble over their appearance; cf. 3.433 *sed uitate uiros cultum formamque professos* (the quality of *forma* is more appropriate for a woman, see 107-8n). The *exempla* used in this passage of Nireus and Hylas are denoted as passive and effeminate (see 109-10n) and the rhetoric of the wilting flower is more commonly used of women and *pueri delicati* (see 115-6n). Sharrock (1994a) 30-2 uses this effeminising undercurrent to support her argument on the 'pederastic pedagogue': that while the *praeceptor* is teaching the lover how to win over girls, he is also subtly seducing the lover for himself.

Yet the passage is problematic in another way: the rhetoric of 107-120 seems to be building up to something more profound than we have at 121-2. The pseudo-religious tone of *sit procul omne nefas*, the sententious feel to *ut ameris, amabilis esto* (107), the references to Homeric and Hellenistic epic heroes (109-10), the flower metaphor (115-16), the conventional comment on hair and wrinkles (117-18), and the final morbid statement on the funeral pyre (120), are all bathetically undercut by the urge at the very end to cultivate the *ingenuas artes* and to learn *linguas duas*. Ovid is fond of this type of bathetic coda, where his previous high toned arguments come crashing down at the very end; see Parker (1969) 80-97 on *Am.* 1.7 *et al.*

Parallel arguments towards a woman are aimed at persuading her to give in to her lovers: life is short and beauty is fleeting so the *puella* should make the most of whatever beauty she has while she can (cf. 3.57-100). Yet the male lover does not need such urging: rather, he should become educated. The implication is that cleverness will prove a more valuable commodity than beauty for him. In poetic terms, it allows the lover to imitate his learned teacher, although he could never quite come up to the mark (see 284n *dulci qualiacumque sono*); but it also means that he should be able to comprehend the teacher's literary eloquence. Specifically, the following *exemplum*, that of Ulysses and Calypso, requires a knowledge of Greek as well as of Latin in order to fully understand all its implications; see Sharrock (1987) 412. In this way, the passage under discussion resembles the coda to *Am.* 2.6:

*COLLIGOR EX IPSO DOMINAE PLACVISSE SEPVL CRO.*

*ORA FVERE MIHI PLVS AVE DOCTA LOQUI.*

*(Amores 2.6.61-2)*

The bird whose death is lamented throughout the poem (in emulation of Catull. 2 and 3) is a parrot. Ovid changes Catullus' sparrow to a parrot in order to utilise the oral potential of the latter: parrots, like poets, are good at imitating others. The coda to our passage forms a similar function: the emphasis on speech joins the task of the lover to the task of the poet.

**107-8** **sit procul omne nefas!** 'be far off all wickedness': a hyperbolic exclamation which feigns religious condemnation of magic. Ovid uses such phraseology elsewhere in the *Ars* to mock his own pretensions; cf. 1.31 *este procul, uittae tenues, insigne pudoris*

(with Dimundo *ad loc.* on the phrasing as an imitation of the opening of religious ceremonies), 2.151. The religious language is used to distance anything which threatens the teaching of the *praeceptor*. The dismissal of those deemed sacrilegious is common at the start of religious ceremonies; cf. Callim. *Hymn* 2.2 ἐκάς, ἐκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρος, Verg. *Aen.* 6.258 *procul o, procul este, profani*.

**ut ameris, amabilis esto** ‘in order that you might be loved, be loveable’: a sententia simplified by later writers; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 9.4 *si uis amari, ama*, Mart. 6.11.10 *ut ameris, ama*. Ovid’s use is deeply self-centred: reciprocal love is not presented as a viable option; instead, the lover should make himself ‘loveable’. Furthermore, the word *amabilis* is ambiguous: considering that Ovid will proceed to dismiss mere beauty, the unusual term can be used specifically of physical attractiveness; cf. e.g. Plaut. *Asin.* 674 *nimis bella es atque amabilis*. It is also attested as a slave-name; cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.148 with Brink *ad loc.*, TLL. 1.1807.50ff. Perhaps it thereby demotes the lover to a slave, a *puer*, just as the following lines will present him subtly as an *eromenos*. There may also be a hint of the *topos* of *seruitium amoris* which is prevalent in elegy, although not something that Ovid openly advocates in the *Ars* as it compromises the dignity of the lover. Ovid’s lover gives the impression of being enslaved to his *domina* while really being the one in control; see Introduction, p38.

**quod tibi non facies solaue forma dabit** The lover needs more than simply physical beauty. Ovid will expand upon this at 121-2, where he bathetically suggests how the lover can improve his intellect (see below). The implication is that the lover *does* possess these physical attributes: it is thus part of the flattery of the lover (see 117n *formose*). However, as Sharrock (1994a) 33-4 suggests, the attributes which Ovid specifies, *facies* and *forma*, are inappropriate in an adult male. Both terms are frequent in the *Ars*, and are commonly used of women: *facies* of female prettiness occurs at *Ars* 1 (two times), 3 (10 times), and the *Remedia* (1 time); *forma* of female attractiveness occurs at *Ars* 1 (5 times), 2 (2 times), 3 (9 times), and the *Remedia* (4 times). The concentration of the occurrences in Book 3, addressed to women, supports the argument that they are specifically used of female beauty. Notably, the occasions where they are used of men, it is part of the rhetoric distancing the lover from such attributes; cf. 1.509 *forma uiros neglecta decet*, 3.433 (quoted above): in the context of the *Ars*, *forma* in men is a problem, so to suggest here that it is something possessed by the lover is insulting. The abundance of occurrences of *forma* within 5 lines emphasises this problem. Moreover, *facies* is a term closely bound up with superficiality and *simulatio*; cf. TLL. 6.1.48.54ff.

**109-10** To demonstrate the limitations of beauty, Ovid uses two mythological *exempla* which can be mapped onto Ovid's pupils. Nireus and Hylas are heroes known for their beauty, which nevertheless failed to save them. However, the *exempla* also contain underlying sexual connotations: both were younger men loved by older. Nireus, Ovid suggests, was loved *too much* by his poetic creator; while Hylas was famously loved, not only by the river nymphs who stole him, but by his older male lover, Hercules (see Introduction, pp34-5, on the significance of the characterisation of Hercules in the *Ars*). Sharrock (1994a) 37 shows how the passive syntax *adamatus* and *raptus* place both mythological figures into the passive sexual role. Significantly, *raptus* is only used elsewhere in the *Ars* of kidnapped or raped women; cf. 1.54 (of Helen), 102 (of the Sabine women), 680 (of Phoebe and Hilaira), 3.190 (of Briseis).

**antiquo Nireus adamatus Homero** 'Nireus excessively loved by ancient Homer': Nireus is the most beautiful hero at Troy after Achilles; cf. *Il.* 2.673-4 Νιρεὺς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε / τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα, Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 204-5 ἄμα δὲ Νι- / ρέα, κάλλιστον Ἀχαιῶν, Ov. *Pont.* 4.13.16 *quam pulchra Nireus conspiciendus erat*. Defining him as loved by Homer comments on Homer's positive description of him, but also suggests that the love felt by Homer was akin to that of an *erastes* for his *eromenos*; cf. TLL. 1.567.51ff. This has strong ramifications for the relationship between the *praeceptor* and his student, since the former has already compared himself favourably with Homer (see 4n).

There may be a critical comment on Homer as 'antiquated' (OLD s.v. 9c): a particularly compelling possibility considering Ovid's implied criticism of Homer at 4, where he suggested that Homer was less relevant for the Ovidian reader, and therefore outdated. Furthermore, Homer is both 'ancient' because he writes six centuries before Ovid, and perhaps 'old', i.e. played the role of the older lover, the *erastes* to Nireus' *eromenos*; see Sharrock (1994a) 35. The chiasmus here, whereby *antiquo ... Homero* frames *Nireus adamatus* reflects the erotic connotations: the poet syntactically embraces his character.

Nireus is explicitly connected with the term *facies* at Prop. 3.18.27 *Nirea non facies, non uis exemit Achillem* and with the term *forma* at Hor. *Epod.* 15.22 *formaque uincas Nirea*. Notably, Horace closely connects Nireus with Ganymede, the famous *puer* of Jupiter, cf. *Carm.* 3.20.15-16 *qualis aut Nireus fuit aut aquosa / raptus ab Ida*. The reference to Ganymede as *raptus* and the location of his capture as *aquosus* has echoes in the following line, where Hylas is *raptus* by *water-nymphs*.

**Naiadumue tener crimine raptus Hylas** The story of the beautiful Hylas seized by water-nymphs, who then drag him into their river to drown, is told at Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.1220-39, cf. esp. 1229-30 τὸν δὲ σχεδὸν εἰσενοησεν, / κάλλει καὶ γλυκερῆσιν ἐρευθόμενον χαρίτεσσιν. In his case, it is precisely his beauty that leads to his death.

The story of Hylas was a popular one in poetry, and Propertius devotes an entire poem (1.20) to its telling, notably the only extended myth in the first two books of Propertius. After Apollonius, the relationship between Hylas and Hercules becomes explicitly eroticised; cf. also Theocr. *Idyll* 13.5-7, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.43-4. It is probable that the story was treated by Callimachus (see Thomas on Verg. *Georg.* 3.6) and Gallus (see Ross (1975) 80-1). It was so common that it seems to have become a rather hackneyed theme; cf. Verg. *Georg.* 3.6 *cui non dictus Hylas?*, Juv. 1.164. Ovid's use of *tener* to describe Hylas indicates both his youth (see 100n, above), but also defines him as popular material for elegy, since *tener* is a defining quality of Love and love poetry; cf. *Am.* 1.6.11 *tenera cum matre Cupido*, 2.1.4 *teneris ... modis*, 2.18.4 *tener ... Amor*, 19, 3.1.69, 3.15.1, 3.8.2 *tenerum ... carmen*.

By calling the Nymphs' abduction of Hylas 'a crime', Ovid recalls another crime perpetrated by a woman: Pasiphae's *crimen* at 23. There, too, the crime represented the excessive nature of female passion, a topic discussed at length at *Ars.* 1.269-350, cf. esp. 342 *acrior est nostra plusque furoris habet*. This *furor* of female sexual depravity forms a connection with the warning of the risks of madness-inducing magic at 106 (*uimque furoris habent*, see note above).

**111-12 ut dominam teneas** Referring to the girl as *domina*, the conventional term for the mistress of slaves, places her in a position of power: see 261n where the treatment of the *domina* is contrasted with that of her *serui* and *ancillae*. The juxtaposition of *domina* and *teneo* emphasises the difficulty of controlling her; with Sharrock (1994a) 26. *teneo* deliberately recalls the aim of Book 2, as set out at 12 (*tenenda ... est*) and so directs the reader's attention back to the start.

The positioning of *domina* in this line mirrors the positioning of *Naiadumue* in the previous line, thus drawing a subliminal link between the domineering 'mistress' and the rapacious nymphs. *teneas* in turn mirrors the position of *tener* in the previous line, so drawing a link between the effeminate Hylas and the struggling lover.

**nec te mirere relictum** 'nor wonder that you have been left behind': the image of the abandoned lover continues the emasculating tendencies of these lines, since he is

placed in a similar position to the women of the *Heroides*, where the term is used 31 times to describe the plight of the abandoned women. *relinquo* is commonly used of the severance of relationships, cf. e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.30 *postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit*, Ov. *Rem.* 583 *dominaeque relictas*, OLD s.v. 1b.

**ingenii dotes corporis adde bonis** ‘add qualities of character to the advantages of your body’: as at 108, Ovid subtly hints that the lover does possess physical advantages, thus flattering his reader. Yet referring to the attributes which he should add as *dotes* (lit. ‘dowries’) once more places the lover in the position of the female, passive partner in the relationship. In Book 3, the term is specifically used to convey how unnecessary *ars* is for girls who are beautiful already, since they have their own dowry; cf. 3.258 (quoted in introductory note), TLL. 5.1.2046.56ff. Ovid favours the word far more than previous poets: Verg.: 1, Hor.: 5, Prop.: 3, Tib.: 0, Ov.: 36. One reason for this may be the joke behind referring to *dos* in the context of relationships which are specifically marked as *unmarried*, cf. *Am.* 2.4.17 with McKeown *ad loc.*

Despite this underlying insult, there is hope for the lover yet: the reference to *ingenium* recalls Daedalus, who was described as *ingeniosus* at 34. It is these qualities which the *Ars* can teach, more effectively (one hopes) than Daedalus taught his own son.

**113-14** ‘Beauty is a fragile quality, and the more it is added to years, the less it becomes and is itself consumed by its own span’: a difficult couplet, which attempts to make the sense appear paradoxical, although the sentiment is fairly basic: time diminishes beauty. The warning about the ravages of time on appearance is a common method of persuasion, addressed to the beloved, most frequently a young male, whose ‘passive erotic career has a more definite end’ (Sharrock (1994a) 39-40); cf. Thgn. 1305-10, Theoc. *Id.* 29.26, Prop. 2.28.57-8 *nec forma aeternum aut cuiquamst fortuna perennis: / longius aut propius mors sua quemque manet* (transposed by Goold to 3.18), Tib. 1.9.13-14 *iam mihi persoluet poenas, pulvisque decorem / detrahet et uentis horrida facta coma* (seduction of Marathus). This continues the propensity of the passage to place the lover in the position of *puer delicatus*. The general argument about fading beauty is, however, used in the *Ars* as part of the persuasion of the *puella*; cf. 3.59-82, esp. 67-8 (flower metaphor, see 115-16n), and 73-6 (wrinkles and grey hairs, see 117-18n). In the context of the *Ars*, the lover is here placed in the position of the *puella*, whose fear about approaching age is utilised to persuade her to give in to the lover’s advances.

**forma bonum fragile est** *forma*, repeated from 108, and *bonum*, repeated from 112, emphasises the transitory nature of such physical attributes. Elsewhere, *bona* are used by Ovid specifically of physical attractions; cf. 3.79 *nostra sine auxilio fugiunt bona*, with Gibson *ad loc.*

The reference to beauty's fragility sets up the contrast with the stronger attributes which Ovid will recommend at 119-22. The phrasing has a proverbial ring, echoing the Sallustian *sententia* at *Cat.* 1.4 *formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, uirtus clara aeternaque habetur* (Sen. *Phaedr.* 773 *res est forma fugax*). In the *Tristia*, Ovid uses *fragilis* to denote the passage of time; cf. *Trist.* 4.8.3 *iam subeunt anni fragiles*.

**accedit ad annos** A difficult phrase, expressing gradual advancement of years; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.84-5 *ubique / accedent anni*, Prop. 4.11.95 *uestros accedat ad annos* (Cornelia's more altruistic wishes for her children), TLL 1.266.18ff.

**spatio carpitur ipsa suo** Within the *Ars*, *spatium* is frequently used of the passage of time; cf. 2.455 *si spatium quaeras, breue sit*, 651, 3.724, *Rem.* 277 *spatium pro munere posco*.

*carpo*, here meaning 'to eat away' or 'consume' (cf. OLD s.v. 7), foreshadows the flower metaphors in the following couplet; cf. 3.79 *carpite florem* (part of the rhetoric of persuasion, see above). The verb is frequently used of making the most of life (esp. things that are transitory; cf. OLD s.v. 2), and so strengthens the engagement in these lines with the *topos* of erotic persuasion, cf. Catull. 62.43, 68.35, Hor. *Carm.* 1.11.8 *carpe diem* with Nisbet and Hubbard, Prop. 2.34.73-4.

The juxtaposition of *ipsa suo* vividly expresses the sense of *forma* consumed by itself.

**115-16** 'Neither violets nor open lilies flower always, and, when the rose is lost, the thorn that is left behind hardens': the flower metaphor marks the end of youth, the appropriate time for love. The three flowers that are mentioned (violet, lily, and rose) are those of Theoc. *Id.* 23.28-30 *καὶ τὸ ρόδον καλὸν ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ χρόνος αὐτὸ μαραίνει / καὶ τὸ ἴον καλὸν ἐστὶν ἐν εἴαρι, καὶ ταχὺ γηρᾶ / λευκὸν τὸ κρίνον ἐστὶ, μαραίνεται ἀνίκα πιπτη*. These lines are spoken as part of a paraclausithyron declaimed by an older male lover to his younger male beloved, and Ovid's echo here places the lover in the role of the *eromenos*, and the *praeceptor* in the role of older *erastes*. The lily and violet of the first line of the couplet are also used as metaphor for the dying youth Hyacinthus at *Met.* 10.190-1, another *eromenos* loved by Apollo.

**nec uiolae semper nec hiantia lilia florent** The emphasis on *semper* just before the caesura forces the point: these qualities do not endure forever, a theme taken up again at 120. Theoc. *Id.* 23.29 (quoted above) expands on this to limit violets to springtime (ἐν εἴαρι).

*hio* is a sensual verb to use of a flower: it gives an impression of the flower at its most open and gaping, like a mouth (cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.91, Prop. 4.2.45 *nec flos ullus hiat pratis*, OLD s.v. 1b).

**et riget amissa spina relictā rosa** The ablative *amissa ... rosa* could be absolute, as I have translated above, but could also be the ablative of instrument, i.e. ‘the thorn left behind by the lost rose’. Note how *relictā* here recalls the message of 111 *nec te mirere relictum*. Either way, the sense is that the rose has faded away, died, and left behind a thorn. This is a metaphor for the effect of time upon beauty, but also has emasculating connotations for the lover: the thorn represents the growth of facial hair and so denotes the lover as a *puer delicatus* whose erotic career has come to an end and is no longer an appropriate target for an older male *erastes*; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.10.3-5, see Sharrock (1994a) 42. A similar image occurs at Verg. *Ecl.* 5.38-9 *pro molli uiola ... / ... spinis surgit paliurus acutis*. There, the thorns that grow where violets once grew stand as a metaphor for the loss of Daphnis. Similarly, the metaphor is used by Flora at *Fast.* 5.353-4 *et monet aetatis specie, dum floreat, uti; / contemni spinam, cum cecidere rosae*. It is at her festival that rich opportunity is provided for lovers, and it is she who advocates the use of youth and beauty.

Notably, Acanthis, the *lena* of Prop. 4.5, also uses the rose as a metaphor to encourage her female pupil to seek more than poetry from her lovers. She too refers to *rugae* (see below), strengthening the connection between the two passages. It is appropriate that Ovid as poet should fixate particularly on Prop. 4.5.52-62, since it is here that the *lena* recommends the girl prioritise wealthy lovers over poet-lovers who have nothing to give except poetry.

**117-18** The floral metaphor for aging is followed in this couplet by a more explicit warning about the ravages of time of the human form: grey hair and wrinkles. Yet, despite this, the lover is addressed as *formose*, emphasising his current youth and good-looks as opposed to future ugliness, which also consolidates the impression Ovid is creating of the lover as feminised target. Although the flower metaphor of the previous couplet was demonstrated (above) as defining the lover as *puer delicatus*, the warning about grey hair

and wrinkles here is more appropriate for a woman since the erotic career of the *puer* would end far earlier than the onset of grey hair and wrinkles (Sharrock (1994a) 44).

**et tibi iam uenient cani, formose, capilli** The framing of *formose* by the *cani capilli* emphasise this contrast between the lover's present state and his future one. A stark colour contrast is provided by the transition from the flowers in the previous couplet.

The warning about grey hair is used in Book 3 to persuade the girl; cf. 3.75-6 *quasque fuisse tibi canas a uirgine iures / sparguntur subito per caput omne comae*. The focus may be different, but the lover here is identified as dominated by feminine fears about ageing. Yet the argument may be a distressing one for a male lover, due to the humiliating depiction of old lovers in Roman Comedy (cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 5.1.15, *Merc.* 305 *tun capite cano amas, senex nequissime?*) and of the *senex amator* in elegy (cf. Prop. 2.18.5-6 *quid mea si canis aetas candesceret annis, / et faceret scissas languida ruga genas?*, Tib. 1.1.71-2 *iam subrepet iners aetas, neque amare decebit, / dicere nec cano blanditias capite*, 1.2.90-2, 1.8.29 *munera nec poscas; det munera canus amator*, Ov. *Am.* 1.9.4 *turpe senilis amor*, with Griffin (1985) 130-33, Bertman (1989) 157-71, Strohm (1991) 264-76).

In contrast to the feminising effect of the references to grey hair and wrinkles, the term *formosus* recalls the *puer delicatus* of the previous lines; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.1 *formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin, 17 o formosum puer*, 45, Prop. 1.20.52 *formosum .. Hylan* (defined by Propertius as similar to Gallus' *puer*), Tib. 1.4.3 (Priapus' targets are *formosos*). *formosus* was first used widely in Latin by Virgil (*Ecl.*: 16, *Georg.*: 1, *Aen.*: 0), but was adopted as a favourite of the elegists (Prop.: 35, Tib.: 6, Ov. *Am.*: 21, *Met.*: 23). Virgil clearly deemed the word too low for epic, yet Ovid employs it in his epic specifically 'in contexts in which [he] is consciously playing against the background of elegiac and neoteric poetry' (Knox (1986) 100). Here, the use defines the lover as deeply elegiac as well as eroticised.

**iam uenient rugae, quae tibi corpus arent** 'now wrinkles will come to you, to plough your body': the agricultural metaphor for the wrinkling effect of age on the body engages with the many agricultural metaphors used in the *Ars*, usually regarding the timing of seduction. The repetition of *iam*, *uenient*, and *tibi* emphasise both the immediacy of ageing (as at 3.76 *subito*) and its personal nature as it affects the lover. The contrast between *iam* and the future tense provides an oxymoronic juxtaposition, placing this feared moment at some point in the future while also hinting that it is happening already.

The fear of wrinkling seems to be one specific to women; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.13.11 (where Lyce, who wants to appear *formosa*, fails due to her wrinkles), *Met.* 15.232 *ut in speculo rugas adspexit aniles* (Helen's plight).

*aro* is used elsewhere of wrinkling, and gives a vivid impression of the furrowing and puckering effect; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.417 *frontem obscenam rugis arat*, Hor. *Epod.* 8.3-4, Ov. *Medic.* 46, *Pont.* 1.4.2. It is noteworthy, however, that all these other examples concern the wrinkling of the face or, specifically, the brow. The emphasis here on the body may be 'in pointierter Opposition zu *animus*' in the following line (Janka *ad loc.*) However, it also foreshadows another instance in the *Ars* in which the body is wrinkled: such an argument about a wrinkled body is used at the end of Book 3, in the catalogue of sexual positions, advising women whose bellies have been scarred by parturition which position would best suit them; cf. 3.785 *tu quoque, cui rugis uterum Lucina notauit*. This preoccupation with wrinkles is denoted as a particularly female anxiety, and so once more places the lover in the position of *puella*; cf. Prop. 4.5.59 *dum rugis integer annus* (part of the *lena Acanthis*' persuasive rhetoric).

**119-22** Ovid concludes this passage by suggesting precisely what the lover needs in order to become *amabilis* (106): not *forma* alone, but *animus*. 'The mind-body opposition reflects the two books of the *Ars*' (Sharrock (1994a) 48): Book 1 focused on seducing the body of the *puella*, while Book 2, with its promise of teaching the lover how to keep *hold* of her, focuses upon seducing her mind. The advice to value self-improvement over physical appearance has its mirror in the advice to women at 3.555-76 where the *praeceptor* contrasts the behaviour of young lovers with that of older ones, to the advantage of the latter. The girl is advised to value experience over beauty in the male: here, too, the lover is advised to improve his *animus* rather than depend solely upon his *forma*. However, the advice which the *praeceptor* actually gives proves to be amusingly superficial (see introductory note).

**iam molire animum, qui duret** 'now build up your soul, so that it might endure': the third *iam* in as many lines (see 117-18n) forces a sense of the build up of the rhetorical style which Ovid over-uses in these lines, preparing for the bathetic climax at 122.

Endurance comes to hold a key thematic position in *Ars* 2, see 177-250n, esp. 178 *perfer et obdura*: it also echoes the general stated aim of the Book; cf. 1.38 *ut longo tempore duret amor*. The use of the verb *duro* recalls *riget* (116), which was used to describe the rose-thorns left behind once the flower had died.

**et astrue formae** ‘and add to your beauty’: the two imperatives in this line (*molire* and *astrue*), with similar meanings denoting improvement, impress the reader with the didactic urgency of the lines. Once more, it is assumed that the lover does possess *forma* (see 108n), thus flattering him. The textual variant which reads *formam* (Aω) must be incorrect since *astruo* is usually followed by the dative to mean ‘to make an addition (to)’ (OLD s.v. 3).

**solus ad extremos permanet ille rogos** ‘that alone persists to the final pyres’: i.e. the *animus*. The image is used by Propertius, cf. 1.19.2 *nec moror extremo debita fata rogo* (marking the end of the human body, with Fedeli *ad loc.*), 2.11.4, 2.20.17, also Mart. 10.63.4 *et nihil extremos perdidit ante rogos*, TLL.5.2.2003.5ff. The image is a fairly common one in Ovid’s elegiac predecessor, and certainly feels rather hackneyed: this again makes the bathos of the following line a surprise.

The verb *permaneo* echoes *duro* from the previous line: the distance between them helps to obscure the fact that the pentameter is a tautology. The duality of these lines (*molior/astruo*; *duro/permaneo*; *animus/forma*) foreshadows the punchline: *linguae duae* (122).

**nec leuis ... / cura sit** Janka *ad loc.* suggests that this call to the lover to take his advice seriously forges a connection with the *temerarius* Icarus (83) who does not take his task seriously enough.

The phrase echoes Verg. *Georg.* 1.52 *cura sit*, at the same metrical position, thus reinforcing the didactic pretensions (Baldo *ad loc.*).

**ingenuas pectus coluisse per artes** ‘to cultivate your breast in the free arts’: the perfect infinitive after *cura est* should be translated as a present infinitive (Platnauer (1951) 109).

The *ingenuae artes* are studies which are appropriate for a free-born man (cf. 1.459 *disce bonas artes, moneo, Romana iuuentus* with Hollis *ad loc.*, OLD s.v. 3). Just as Ovid assumes beauty in the lover, so he also assumes a certain distinction of class (see 216 where flattery is designed to make the lover feel better about adopting a servile attitude, 530 *dedecet ingenuos taedia ferre sui*). Sharrock (1994a) 49 cites *Pont.* 2.7.47-8 to suggest that these *artes* stand for the *Ars* itself. The use at *Am.* 3.8.1, where it is treated in the same bracket as love poetry (i.e. both are despised as gifts by girls) also supports this metapoetic reading. The very use of the term *ars* within the *Ars* is always liable to be interpreted as metapoetically charged; the self-reference here is further supported by the explicit reference to language in the following pentameter line. The intertext with the *Amores* also

hints at a problem: there, neither poetry nor *ingenuae artes* were valued. At 273-86 Ovid will examine the theme of poetry as gifts, and reluctantly admit that *non multum carmen honoris habet* (274). Yet, here, he is recommending the ‘free arts’ which lacked any esteem at *Am.* 3.8.

The verb *colo* engages with the theme of the *cultus amator* which prevades the *Ars* (Janka *ad loc.* after Myerowitz (1985) 199 n. 2).

**et linguas edidicisse duas** ‘and to thoroughly learn the two languages’: i.e. Greek and Latin. This advice on knowing languages suggests an ability to read such a poem as the *Ars*, which draws on an intense mix of Greek and Latin literary traditions. Specifically, it prepares the reader for the following *exemplum* of Ulysses and Calypso, where he will need a good knowledge of both languages (and the literary traditions of both) to fully appreciate its nuances (Sharrock (1987) 412). Perhaps the reader might expect something more from his teacher after such a lengthy build up, but the importance of poetry to Ovid can not be overestimated: for example, in Book 3 Ovid recommends that girls read poetry, and he concludes his reading list with his own works; cf. 3.329-46.

The verb *edisco*, meaning ‘to learn by heart’ or ‘commit to memory’ is especially favoured by Ovid (Verg.: 1, Hor.: 2, Prop.: 1, Tib.: 1, Ov.: 8). *disco* is used extremely frequently in the *Ars* as part of Ovid’s didactic language, after Verg. *Georg.* 1.51, 2.35, 249, 3.414. See Gibson on 3.298 for a full discussion of the term and its use in didactic works after Ovid.

**123-144:** Ulysses and Calypso: the seductive power of intelligence and manipulation for retaining one’s hold on the beloved

The second extended mythological *exemplum* in *Ars* 2, this passage relates a story involving Ulysses and Calypso as a means of demonstrating the need *ingenuas pectus coluisse per artes* (121). Ulysses is a character renowned more for his rhetoric (*facundus*) than for his beauty (*non formosus*, 123), immediately distancing him from the *pueri delicati* signified by Nireus and Hylas (109-10); but he was eminently successful as a lover, inciting the desire of two goddesses (Circe and Calypso). After the naming of Circe and Ulysses at 103, the reader might expect Ovid to tell their story here: this expectation makes the delayed naming of Calypso at the end of 125 rather a surprise (Sharrock (1987) 412 n. 18). The scene as it unfolds is evidently set on Ogygia in the days leading up to

Ulysses' departure. The hero has grown tired of Calypso, yet he appears very different from his depiction at *Od.* 5, where the first glimpse of him in the poem presents him sitting weeping and gazing out to sea, longing for Ithaca; cf. *Od.* 5. 151-8, esp. 153 ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι ἦνδανε νόμῳ. In Ovid's version of the scene, Ulysses is eagerly telling Calypso about his adventures, even marking out maps of Troy on the sand: in this way, he looks very much like the lover keen to impress his mistress. If one were to ignore the role of Calypso in the passage, Ovid's Ulysses serves as an ideal example of a man utilising his eloquence to seduce the *puella*.

### Calypso

However, Calypso is not an average *puella*. In the passage, she plays an extremely active role: one that the introduction to the myth has not led the reader to expect; see Sharrock (1994a) 78-83. First, she is the agency behind Ulysses' story-telling: it is she who urges him again and again (*iterumque iterumque*, 127) to tell her about the fall of Troy. Ovid suggests that she does this because Ulysses refuses to heed her warnings about the unsuitable waves (126). Secondly, when a wave sweeps over Ulysses' sandcastle model of Troy, rather than seeing this as an end to the story and an excuse to enable Ulysses' departure, she cunningly turns the tables on him and uses it as an example of the power of the sea, and the dangers to which he will expose himself should he leave: Ulysses, the famed rhetorician, is himself outdone; see Introduction, pp30-2. Ultimately, the reader knows that this is all in vain: Ulysses will not be deterred from leaving, and Calypso's fears are well founded, considering the storm which capsizes the raft at *Od.* 5. 291-463. However, this scene could theoretically be replayed over and over again, delaying his departure indefinitely (if we did not know from the *Odyssey* that there is a time limit). The prominence of Calypso's role, emphasising the ability of a girl to keep a man, seems to contradict the wider aim of *Ars* 2, which was to teach a man (the lover) how to keep a girl (12).

### Ovidian Intertexts

In *Her.* 1, Penelope articulates envy for those whose husbands have returned to tell stories of their adventures at Troy (1.27-39). Although she has not heard the stories from Ulysses himself, she has apparently heard something of his experiences from her son, who learnt

them from Nestor (*Her.* 1.37-8). Ulysses will eventually tell stories to her himself, at *Od.* 23.310-41. However, the stories he tells her then are not of Troy, but of his wanderings, i.e. the plot of *Odyssey*, Books 9-12. There are a number of points of contact between the passages in the *Heroides* and the *Ars*: the imagined husband and Ulysses both ‘draw’ maps of Troy (*pingit* at *Her.* 1.32 and *Ars* 2.132), while naming the places (note esp. the Simois at *Her.* 1.33 and *Ars* 2.134). When Penelope goes on to demonstrate her knowledge of the action at Troy, the stories she has already heard from Telemachus are the deaths of Rhesus and Dolon (*Her.* 1.39, echoed at *Ars* 135-8). She, however, has heard that another was involved, a detail which Ulysses leaves out of his narrative; cf. *Her.* 1.43 *adiutus ab uno*, i.e. Diomedes. After all, she has had a more objective account.

### Virgilian Intertexts

As argued at Introduction pp36-7, behind the story of Calypso and Ulysses lurks the shadow of Dido and Aeneas. After Aeneas has told the story of the fall of Troy and of his wanderings (*Aen.* 2-3), Dido begs to hear the same stories again (*Aen.* 4.77-9). Dido, like the *coniunx* of *Her.* 1.30, ‘hangs’ upon Aeneas’ words (*pendet ... ab ore*, *Aen.* 4.79). Just as Calypso begs to hear about the fall of Troy (*rogabat*, *Ars* 2.127), Dido demands the same thing (*exposcit*, *Aen.* 4.79). The repetition of *iterum* at *Aen.* 4.78-9 is echoed in *iterumque iterumque* at *Ars* 2.127. Yet Dido is *demens* (*Aen.* 4.78), unlike the rational, cunning, and manipulative Calypso.

### Scholarship

There have been a number of attempts to interpret this complex passage. Frécaut (1983) 287-95, in addition to drawing attention to the comparisons touched upon above between this passage and *Heroides* 1, usefully compares Ulysses’ pathetic attempts to depict the great river of Troy with the attempts of the Trojan refugees to create their own Xanthus at Buthrotum, at Verg. *Aen.* 3.349-51. Myerowitz (1985) 167-74 draws comparisons between the Ulysses and Calypso passage and that of Daedalus and Icarus, concluding that both are concerned with demonstrating the limitations of *ars*. Sharrock (1987) 406-12 focuses on establishing the timing of the scene, demonstrating that the moment Ovid presents is during the raft-building scene in *Od.* 5.237-61: she uses the concluding couplet of the previous passage (121-2, esp. *linguas edidicisse duas*) to show how Ovid demands

knowledge of the Greek intertext for a full reading of this passage. Salvadori (1993) 197-202 unpacks the importance of Ovid's telling of Homeric stories. Sharrock (1994a) 78-83 unpacks the multi layers of identification and questions who Calypso represents: the *puella*, Ovid, or both?

**123-4 non formosus erat** The echo of *formose*, referring to the lover (117), means this passage immediately opens with a clue regarding whom the lover should identify with: *not* Ulysses. It also serves to mark Ulysses as very different from the *pueri delicati*, Nireus and Hylas (109-10). See 117n for the elegiac significance of this word.

In addition to the Circean undertones to this passage (see note to following couplet), there may be hints too of Nausicaa. The reader may recall Homer's description of Ulysses' terrifying appearance when he first appears to Nausicaa; cf. *Od.* 6.137 *σμερδαλέος δ' αὐτῆσι φάνη κεκακωμένος ἄλμη*.

**sed erat facundus** 'but he was eloquent': Ovid is fond of this epithet for Ulysses, and employs it at *Her.* 3.129, *Met.* 13.92, TLL. 6.1.160.49ff (note that he uses it to describe Ulysses' words at *Met.* 13.127, quoted in Introduction, p31). In attributing such an epithet to the hero, he is engaging with the Homeric epithets for Ulysses.

**Vlixes** The naming of the hero at an emphatic position at the end of the line echoes 103, where he appeared in conjunction with Circe. Yet, as is established in the following couplet, it is not the story of Ulysses and Circe which Ovid is about to tell, but that of Ulysses and Calypso.

**et tamen aequoreas torsit amore deas** 'and yet he tormented sea goddesses with love': this sets Ulysses up as the model of the *exemplum*, as a mythological figure who used his eloquence rather than his beauty to seduce. The 'sea goddesses' alluded to must be Calypso and Circe, yet there may be a nod towards the Sirens, who, like the Naiads of 110, prove dangerous for sailors at *Od.* 12.165-200; and also towards Leucothoe, whose aid at the end of Book 5 saved Ulysses from the shipwreck; cf. *Od.* 5.333-53. Their 'watery' aspect may also foreshadow the significance the sea will have to the story; cf. 126, 139, and 142.

The vivid verb *torqueo* with the ablative *amore* emphasises the painful racking sensation of love ('to torture mentally' OLD s.v. 5); cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.37 *invidia uel amore uigil torquebere*, Tib. 1.4.81 *eheu, quam Marathus lento me torquet amore* (a line also echoed by Ovid at *Ars* 1.176 *eheu, quam multos aduena torsit amor*). The Tibullan speaker goes on to admit the failure of his arts (*deficiunt artes*, 1.4.82) and of his teachings

(*uana magisteria*, 1.4.84). This hints at another theme of our passage: the deficiency of *ars* in the context of love; see Myerowitz (1985) 167-74.

**125-6 a quotiens** The emotive *a* echoes the depiction of love as something painful in the previous line (*torsit amore*), while *quotiens* gives an impression of repetition: how many times has Calypso successfully utilised such a ploy to delay her lover?

**illum doluit properare** ‘she grieved that he was hastening’: in the *Odyssey*, Calypso demonstrates none of this grief at the departure of Ulysses; quite the contrary, although she is upset at the message from Hermes at the start of Book 5, once she accepts the inevitability of her lover’s departure, she actually aids him in it; cf. *Od.* 5.228-68.

The verb *propero* is used to describe men (or women) fleeing their lovers at Verg. *Aen.* 4.309-10 *quin etiam hiberno moliris sidere classem / et mediis properas Aquilonibus ire per altum* (part of Dido’s argument to persuade Aeneas to stay at Carthage), Prop. 2.23.19 *timeo, propera iam surgere* (a woman urges her lover to leave as her husband has arrived home unexpectedly), Ov. *Ars* 1.701 *saepe ‘mane’ dixit, cum iam properaret Achilles*, *Met.* 1.510 *qua properas* (Apollo to Daphne), 5.599-600. The echoes here of Aeneas abandoning Dido (see Introduction, pp35-7) and of Achilles abandoning Deidamia hint at the role Calypso is in danger of playing: that of abandoned female.

*doleo* with an accusative and infinitive construction is fairly common, esp. in Ovid; cf. e.g. Tib. 2.3.23, Ov. *Met.* 2.352, 3.260 *et al.*, *Fast.* 5.232 *et al.*, TLL. 5.1.1826.45ff.

**Calypso** The name ‘hidden’ at the end of the line comes as rather a surprise, considering the reference to Ulysses and Circe at 103. Also, the scene which Ovid presents of Calypso lamenting Ulysses’ imminent departure is very different from that presented by Homer; see introductory note. However, there is precedent for elegists using the myth of Calypso in this way; cf. Prop. 1.15.9-16 where Calypso is depicted sitting on the beach weeping (esp. 1.15.10 *fleuerat*, 1.15.11 *maesta*, 1.15.13 *dolebat*), in a passage designed to recall Ulysses’ position at the start of *Od.* 5. Also, cf. Prop. 2.21.13 *elusa Calypso*.

Ovid similarly emphasises the elegiac potential of the abandonment of Circe, at *Rem.* 263-290, where the goddesses’ lengthy speech is nothing but *irrita ... uerba* (286). In contrast, Calypso’s concise speech (141-2) is granted authority by the concluding lines (143-4n). Hence, Calypso appears far more calculating and successful than Circe (Myerowitz (1985) 170-2).

**remigioque aptas esse negauit aquas!** Calypso’s doubts about the waters will return at 141-2, when she is given two lines of direct speech. This ring composition binds

the passage together, and emphasises the importance of her character to its interpretation: 127-38, it emerges, are merely a set-up contrived by Calypso to prove her point. Ulysses himself should by now be well aware of the hostility of the waters, since he has been shipwrecked on Ogygia, and has lost what remained of his crew to the sea (*Od.* 12.403-50).

The echoes of Dido in the previous line are reinforced by the connection between this line and the sentiment of Verg. *Aen.* 4.309-10 (quoted above): Dido uses the time of year (winter) and the poor weather as an argument to persuade Aeneas to stay. If, as Sharrock (1987) 408 suggests, Ovid intends the reader to make the assumption that Ulysses left Ogygia in winter (based primarily upon *Od.* 5.174-6), the connection between the two heroines is strengthened. For Dido, this argument proves entirely useless, and so this forms another example of Calypso proving a more successful manipulator (see Introduction, pp30-2).

**127-8** Calypso's initial ploy has failed and she now manipulates Ulysses into telling and re-telling stories of Troy by playing upon his love of story-telling.

**haec ... / ille** The pronouns at the start of successive lines in this couplet give a sense of the rhetorical battle between the two.

**Troiae casus** Calypso asks to hear, quite specifically, about the 'fall of Troy', i.e. the story that Dido is told in *Aeneid* 2. However, what she gets is a scene from *Iliad* 10, which is already deemed problematic by scholars, who question its authenticity.

**iterumque iterumque rogabat** 'again and again' gives a sense of endless repetition, echoing *quotiens* from 125: Calypso uses these tactics repeatedly, to draw out Ulysses' departure, suggesting that it is working. See introductory note on the connection between this line and Verg. *Aen.* 4.77-9, forging a link between Calypso and Dido.

**referre aliter saepe solebat idem** 'he was accustomed often to tell the same thing in a different way': a further striking deviation from Homer, since Ulysses refuses to repeat himself; cf. *Od.* 12.452-3 ἐχθρὸν δέ μοί ἐστιν / αὐτίς ἀρίζηλως εἰρημένα μυθολογεύειν. Perhaps the joke for Ovid is that Ulysses has *failed* to tell his story ἀρίζηλως. Furthermore, Ovid himself is guilty of this trait in his own story-telling: for instance, the Daedalus and Icarus myth is retold in *Met.* 8, Ulysses' own story of Rhesus and Dolon is retold in *Met.* 13, and the *Ars* itself covers much of the subject-matter of the *Amores* (and elegy in general): 'Ovid's comment on Ulysses' rhetorical skills could almost be a programmatic statement of his own' (Sharrock (1994a) 2). This analogy between Ulysses and poet makes interpretation of this passage even more complex.

**129-30 litore constiterant; illic quoque** The emphasis here on the location of the scene is significant, since not only does it explain Ulysses' mapping of Troy on the sand and the wave which then washes it away (131-40), but it also provides a strong allusion to *Od.* 5, where the action between Ulysses and Calypso takes place almost entirely on the beach (esp. the first sight of Ulysses, weeping on the shore at *Od.* 5. 151-8). On a metapoetic level, the liminal positioning of the pair denotes a touching elegiac scene, akin to a propempticon, before the huge epic storm which the Homeric reader knows will follow once Ulysses sets sail.

**pulchra Calypso** The repetition of the goddesses' name, in the same emphatic position as at 125, reinforces her significance to the passage. Her epithet *pulchra* contrasts with Ulysses, who is *non formosus* (123): in the context of the previous passage, beauty in a woman should be enough to keep her man, but, like the male lover, she too requires something more to guarantee success. The term may also recall Ulysses' flattering rhetoric at *Od.* 5. 216-8, where he compares Calypso's immortal beauty to that of his mortal wife, thus reminding the reader of Ulysses' eloquence.

**exigit Odrysii fata cruenta ducis** 'she makes demands for the gory death of the Odrysian leader': Calypso asks Ulysses to tell her the story of the death of Rhesus, King of Thrace and Trojan ally, in language rather more forceful than the *rogo* of 127. 'Odrysian' is a poetic term for Thrace; cf. *Rem.* 459, *Met.* 6.490. The death of Rhesus is told at *Il.* 10.432-502: Dolon, a Trojan scout, is captured by Ulysses and Diomedes while trying to spy on them and he informs them that Rhesus is encamped nearby and possesses some splendid horses. Ulysses and Diomedes then conduct a night-raid to murder the king and plunder his horses. The scene is a particularly bloody one, as Diomedes first beheads the supplicating Dolon (10.454-7), and then slaughters twelve of Rhesus' men (10.482-8), before finally murdering the king (494-7). Although Ulysses attends him, his primary function is to clean up after Diomedes, to make a path for the horses they steal (10.488-93). This scene is a peculiar one for a *puella* to be asking to hear.

**131-2** Before Ulysses even begins to speak, he uses a stick (which he just happens to be holding) to depict his story on the sand. This turns the story into a form of ekphrasis, echoing the ekphrasis of the temple doors at *Aen.* 1 (see Introduction, pp36-7). Perhaps, after all, Ulysses is becoming tired of telling the same story: in the lines to follow he

merely gives an outline rather than the full story, and here he employs a visual aid for *uariatio*.

**leui uirga** Lightness has metapoetic potential here, as at 46 in describing Daedalus' work (*et leue per lini uincula nectit opus*); see note above. The reference to the images as Ulysses' *opus* in the next line (see below) reinforces the connection between Daedalus and Ulysses, so that the reader is obliged to perceive the latter as yet another figure of the poet. Rather like Daedalus in *Aen.* 6.14-33, Ulysses is attempting to depict his own story, and, also like Virgil's Daedalus, he ultimately fails: he is dishonest (see below on the omission of the role of Diomedes) and his work of art is only a temporary one (139-40).

**(uirgam nam forte tenebat)** The polyptoton of *uirga* emphasises the significance of the object with which Ulysses draws his pictures. The reason why Ulysses would be holding a *uirga* is apparent to the careful reader of Homer: he is in the middle of building his raft (Sharrock (1987) 409). See Albrecht (1964) 59-60 for the frequency of *nam* introducing parentheses in the *Metamorphoses*.

The use of the verb *teneo* may recall the aim of the book, as set out at 12, to 'hold onto' the girl. Once more, the reader may ask himself exactly who is holding whom in this scene.

**quod rogat** This answers the question of 127 (*rogabat*).

**in spisso litore pingit opus** 'he paints his work on the dense sand': the term for a poetic work, *opus*, marks this line out as deeply metapoetic (see 14n). In addition, the heavy sand (*spissus*: '(of substances) dense, solid, compact' OLD s.v. 2) contrasts with the light stick (*leuis*), signifying the liminal place Ulysses (at least as Ovid presents him) holds between elegy and epic. The subject-matter is epic, yet the reason for telling the story is elegiac (to impress a *puella*), and the manner in which he tells it has the concise feel of a Hellenistic epyllion.

The verb *pingo* engages with the *aliquis* of *Her.* 1.31-2; see introductory note.

**133-8** Over these three couplets, Ulysses gives an extremely compressed account of the deaths of Dolon and Rhesus, which dominates the entire second half of *Iliad* 10; cf. 10.314-579. In the *Iliad* version of the story, Homer attributes all the deaths to Diomedes; cf. *Il.* 10.559-60 τὸν δὲ σφιν ἄνακτ' ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης / ἔκτανε, πὰρ δ' ἐτάρους δυοκαίδεκα πάντας ἀρίστους. In Ovid, Diomedes slips out of the picture altogether: it seems that Ulysses is telling the Homeric story in a different way (see 128n *ille refert aliter saepe*

*solebat idem*) in order to place himself in the best possible light (Sharrock (1987) 410). In addition to this biased account, Ulysses' narration lacks any emotional depth (contrast Aeneas' story-telling, see Introduction pp36-7): it is disjointed, abrupt, without any of the epic colouring of the Homeric version. Moreover, Ovid exacerbates the impression of failed speaker through the intrusive effect of the parentheses at 133 and 135: these interruptions of the narrative draw even more attention to Ulysses' extreme lack of eloquence, and therefore contradict the opening statement (123 *sed erat facundus Vlixes*).

**133-4 'haec' inquit 'Troia est'** Ulysses' abrupt opening lacks any of the rhetorical skill of his speech in *Met.* 13 (see Introduction, p31, for a detailed comparison).

**(muros in litore fecit)** The first intruding voice of the narrator describes Ulysses building sandcastles to represent the walls of Troy. The fragility of this Troy made from sand (see also on 139-40) recalls the ease with which the gods knock it all down at Verg. *Aen.* 2. 610-18.

**'hic tibi sit Simois; haec mea castra puta ...'** The emphasis on the need for Calypso to exercise her imagination (*tibi, puta*) undercuts the power of Ulysses' rhetoric. Yet it also places Ulysses in the role of teacher: not only is he adopting the poetic voice by telling his own story, but he also forms another analogue for the *praeceptor*; cf. e.g. 298 *Coa decere puta*. The river Simois is an important landmark at Troy and occurs frequently in geographical descriptions of the area; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.100, 6.88, Prop. 2.9.12, Ov. *Met.* 13.324. This clichéd demarcation adds an impression of arbitrary marking-out of the region and landmarks: this is surely all too military and detached for the female listener to appreciate.

**135-6 ... campus erat'** The fourth location he depicts is dwelt upon a little longer (the entire couplet), since this is the site of the murder of Dolon.

**(campumque facit)** The polyptoton echoes the intrusion of the narrator's voice at 131. See Albrecht (1964) 56-8 for the frequency of *-que* introducing parentheses in the *Metamorphoses*.

**'quem caede Dolonis / sparsimus ...'** The murder of the scout is described graphically at *Il.* 10.454-7. The plural *sparsimus* suggests an accomplice, although Diomedes goes unnamed and this could simply be an example of a plural for singular (Sharrock (1987) 410 n. 15). *spargo* is used of the splattering of blood; cf. Lucr. 2.195,

5.1202, Prop. 2.8.34 *sparsas caede ... comas* (another Homeric instance, as Patroclus' hair is described as spattered with his own gore).

‘... **Haemonios dum uigil optat equos / ...**’ ‘while wakeful he desires the Thracian horses’: Dolon's motivation for spying upon the Greeks was his desire to be awarded the beautiful Thracian horses that belonged to Achilles as prize; cf. *Il.* 10.391-2. The irony lies in the fact that the ones who gain Thracian horses will be Ulysses and Diomedes (the horses of Rhesus). For *Haemonius* as ‘Thessalian’, see 99n.

Ovid may be drawing attention to Ulysses' tendency to omit elements of the story which depict him unfavourably: the story of the murder of Dolon and Rhesus is particularly violent. There is something underhand in Ulysses and Diomedes' actions during the night-raid: the term *uigil* emphasises the fact that these murderous acts took place at night. In the Homeric version, Diomedes cuts Dolon down mid-supplication; here, the use of *dum* forces the reader to recall precisely what Dolon was doing at the moment of his death: attempting to supplicate his killer (*Il.* 10.454-7).

**137-8 illic Sithonii fuerant tentoria Rhesi** The fifth site which Ulysses depicts is Rhesus' camp. The demonstrative pronoun *illic* in emphatic position draws attention to the illustrative dependence of Ulysses' story-telling.

Sithonian, like Odrysian, is poetic for Thracian; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10.66, Ov. *Met.* 13.571, *Fast.* 3.719. The specific reference to the ‘tents’ recalls Verg. *Aen.* 1.469 (see Introduction, p36).

**hac ego sum captis nocte reuectus equis** Note that Ulysses omits the murders of Rhesus and his men entirely, including the colourful simile of *Il.* 10.485-8 describing Diomedes as a lion attacking sheep. This allows Ulysses to omit the role of Diomedes without quite lying, but also humorously draws the reader's attention to Ulysses' primary role throughout the episode: it is he who steals the horses, clearing the bodies of the slain men away so that the horses can be moved back past them (*Il.* 10.488-93, 498-502).

Ulysses even draws himself in his picture (*ego sum*): this is an allusion to *Aeneid* 1, when Aeneas recognises himself depicted on the temple doors; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1. 488 *se quoque principibus permixtum agnouit Achiuis* (see Introduction, p36, for a full analysis of the significance of the *Aeneid* passage here).

**139-40 pluraque pingebat** The repetition of *pingo* from 132, the start of Ulysses' speech, gives a sense of ring composition, enclosing the hero's *opus*.

**subitus cum Pergama fluctus / abstulit et Rhesi cum duce castra suo** ‘when a sudden wave bore away Pergamum and the camp of Rhesus with its leader’: i.e. the wave washes away the citadel Troy (described in 133) and the camp of Rhesus (described in 137), leader and all.

The action of the sea interrupts the story-telling, much as the appearance of Dido interrupts the ekphrasis at *Aeneid* 1 (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.494-7) and as the appearance of Achates interrupts the ekphrasis at *Aeneid* 6 (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.33-6). *subitus* in a similar line position as the parentheses at 131, 133, and 135, continues the disjointed feel of Ulysses’ entire speech. It is this that prompts Calypso’s final argument about the dangers of entrusting oneself to such a powerful thing as the sea (141-2).

In the following couplet, Calypso refers to the ‘great names’ which the sea can obliterate so easily, i.e. Pergamum and Rhesus. Pergamum is the name of the Trojan citadel, and is frequently used as synecdoche for Troy itself; cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 1.651 *et al.*, Ov. *Met.* 12.445 *et al.* Rhesus was named at 137 (see above).

**141-2 tum dea** Now it is Calypso’s turn to speak, and she does so uninterrupted. *dea* is an echo of the Homeric epithet for Calypso, δῖα θεάων (cf. *Od.* 5.78 *et al.*).

‘**quas’ inquit ‘fidas tibi credis ituro, / perdidierint undae nomina quanta, uides’** ‘she says ‘these waves which you believe to be faithful to you as you are about to go, see what great names they have destroyed’’: a rather convoluted couplet, *fidas* must refer to *undae*.

It is notable that Calypso, unlike Ulysses, is permitted to speak uninterrupted. Her two lines of unbroken speech demonstrate much of the rhetorical flair which Ulysses is famed for: the convoluted, yet elegant, syntax shows her mastery of the language. She fits her speech to her audience, showing a keen awareness of the kind of man he is; and she also uses a physical phenomenon to prove her point (*uides*). Her repetition of words of faith (*fidas* and *credis*) emphasises her point about the danger of the sea. Most strikingly, in a passage on eloquence, it is *she* who has the last word.

On a metapoetic level, the *undae* represent epic endeavour and the dangers of poetic failure: the threat of obliteration of identity is one which pursues Ulysses throughout his wanderings in the *Odyssey*.

*uides* in emphatic position echoes the Lucretian tendency to use a visual metaphor to demonstrate a scientific truth; cf. Lucr. 1.907, 2.263 *nonne uides*, 2.883 *iamne uides*

*igitur, et al.* This engagement with the didactic style continues at the start of the following line, with *ergo age* (see below).

**143-4 ergo age** This phrase allows Ovid to move from the *exemplum* back to the framing narrative, and gives the impression that he has indeed proved his point (cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.63). Yet how far has this *exemplum* actually done so? He started by describing Ulysses as *facundus*, a fact which the rest of the passage fails to prove (indeed, even disproves), until Calypso comes to appear the real model of eloquence.

**fallaci timide confide figurae** ‘trust timidly to a deceitful figure’: the surface meaning, establishing ring composition with the opening of the passage, means that the lover should beware of depending on his attractive appearance (*figura* meaning ‘outward appearance (of a person)’ OLD s.v. 3). However, this seems a *non sequitur* to the immediately preceding couplet. In addition, *figura* can have the meaning ‘a figure of speech’ (OLD s.v. 11), suggesting the duplicity of Calypso’s words, and of the entire *exemplum* generally (Sharrock (1994a) 83). Furthermore, the *figura* could refer to the drawing in the sand (‘an image, likeness (esp. of artistic representations or sim.)’ OLD s.v. 8), thus emphasising the fragility of *ars*: ‘*Ars* is more durable than *natura*, the frame argument suggests. Within the mythological example, however, questions are raised as to the ultimate durability of *ars* itself’ (Myerowitz (1985) 174).

Timidity and fear is central to the *Ars*, as demonstrated in the Daedalus and Icarus episode (see 75-6n).

**quisquis es** More ring composition marks this as the conclusion of the wider section which began with magic (cf. 99 *si quis*). As at the start of the passage, the echo of the opening of *Ars* 1 (1 *si quis*...) inevitably raises questions of readership.

**aut aliquid corpore pluris habe** ‘or have something more than body’: the lover should either be cautious about his beauty, or reinforce it with something stronger and more enduring (see 119-20n).

**145-176:** indulgence is better than harsh behaviour: save the latter for married love!

In another seemingly abrupt transition, Ovid addresses a new theme: the subtle manipulations of *indulgentia* make it a highly successful technique when employed by lovers. This draws attention to the mechanism at work in the previous passage: it is Calypso’s cunning strategy to delay her lover, the *facundus Vlixes* (123), that truly

demonstrates this *facunditas*, for it is she who uses all her tools of seduction to persuade Ulysses to stay longer. The theme also looks ahead towards the following passage: *obsequium* as exemplified by the seduction of Atalanta (177-96).

The passage opens (145-50) by contrasting *indulgentia* (as exemplified by the swallow and dove) with *asperitas* (as exemplified by the hawk and wolf): the aim is to show mankind's preference for indulgent behaviour. However, this protocol will be inverted at 435-6, where a greater complexity introduced to the issue is used to denote a more advanced level of instruction (*sunt quibus ingrata timida indulgentia seruit / et, si nulla subest aemula, languet amor*). The repetition of *indulgentia* (the only two instances of the word in the *Ars*) heightens the impression of advanced instruction - Level 3; see Introduction p17. At *Am.* 2.19, the poet acknowledges his susceptibility to manipulation, and confesses that jealousy helps to revive his passion, while indulgence is actually a turn-off (cf. 2.19.35 *nocet indulgentia nobis*). This helps to define the difference between this passage and the change of direction signposted at 435-6: *indulgentia* is appropriate at the earlier stages of a relationship, but later, stronger tactics may be necessary to keep the lover's (or the *puella*'s) interest from waning.

At 151-2, in language reminiscent of *sit procul* (107, where Ovid deliberately distanced himself from the *nefas* of witchcraft) he now distances himself from marriage. The argument urges that lovers should avoid quarrels because arguments are for married couples (153-6). After all, the lover is not bound by the rules of marriage, or to only one sexual partner (157-8): therefore, there should only be flatteries and pleasant sounds (159-60).

This negative depiction of married love risks appearing to offend Augustus, due to the implications such references to marriage have in terms of the Augustan marriage laws, specifically the *lex Iulia* of 18 BC. This passage is significant in terms of Ovid's general treatment of marriage in the *Ars*; cf. 1.31-2 (quoted below, see 151-2n), 2.599-600, 3.57-8, 483-4, 613-6, *Rem.* 385-6. These disclaimers about the type of women who represent the *puella* of *Ars* 1-2 or who are the appropriate reader of *Ars* 3 emphasise Ovid's controversial attitude to the status of marriage.

Although the precise nature of the *lex Iulia* is difficult to reconstruct (Treggiari (1991) 60-1, Edwards (1993) 37) and the terminology ambiguous (Treggiari (1991) 262-4), it is certain that it not only made adultery (and other sexual offences) illegal, but also attempted to illegalise extra-marital sex with any woman not a *meretrix*: is Ovid in his carefully worded disclaimers raising the issue of the difficulty of distinguishing a *meretrix* from a matron through dress alone? For there was a loophole, not closed until 19 AD, by which women could deliberately define themselves as belonging to a lower class in order to evade the law (Treggiari (1991) 297, McGinn (1998) 194-202). When read in light of the laws, this passage, which depicts marriage in such a negative way as full of bitterness and arguments, can be seen as a subtle attack on the institution itself. According to Ulpian, the law specified that a man who discovered that his wife had committed adultery, and failed to divorce her, could himself face prosecution; cf. Ulp. *Dig.* 48.5.2.2, 48.5.2.6, see Edwards (1993) 38-9. Thus, ‘by introducing such a structure of charge and countercharge, Augustus can hardly be thought to have raised the tone of conjugal life’ (Treggiari (1991) 294): it is this ‘structure of charge and countercharge’, a legislation which promotes a litigious way of life, which Ovid here targets.

At 161, Ovid moves the subject on to a discourse on wealth. Just as he makes it clear in Book 3 that he does not write for beautiful girls (quoted in introductory note to 107-122), so he here claims not to write for the rich: wealthy lovers have no need for the *Ars* because they can buy sex. This not only circumvents the need for *Ars*, it also demonstrates no *ars*, and so is condemned later in the poem as a barbaric cheat (see 273-86n). There follows (165-72) an example from the *praeceptor*’s own experience of a time when he loved as a poor man: he gave poetry instead of gifts (a theme reintroduced at 273-86), and he even recalls a specific time when his temper caused him problems (echoing *Am.* 1.7, see Introduction, pp19-21).

The passage on wealth is closely modelled on a similar passage in Tibullus:

*pauper erit praesto semper tibi; pauper adibit  
primus et in tenero fixus erit latere.  
pauper in angusto fidus comes agmine turbae  
subicietque manus efficietque uiam.  
pauper ad occultos furtim deducet amicos  
uinclaque de niueo detrahet ipse pede.*

(Tibullus 1.5.61-66)

The anaphora of *pauper* is echoed in the Ovidian repetition of *pauper* in 165-8. By recalling this passage, Ovid hints towards all the examples of *indulgentia* which a poor man is prepared to enact for his *puella*: in this way (Tibullus argues) a poor man can actually provide more than a wealthy man. This echo foreshadows the acts of *obsequium* which the *praeceptor* recommends in the following passage (177-232). Note particularly 210, where the lover is told to make way for her in a crowd (echoing Tib. 1.5.63-4); 211-12, where the lover removes her shoes for her and makes her comfortable (echoing Tib. 1.5.65-66); and 223-4 where the lover is advised to attend the girl whenever she calls him, and not to leave until late (echoing Tib. 1.5.61-2).

The passage concludes (173-6) by drawing together both halves of this complex section: the lover should avoid his teacher's mistakes (i.e. the violence detailed at 169-72) and ensure only pleasant interaction with the *amica* (in contrast with the arguments of married life discussed at 153-6). The passage has a programmatic intention: by advocating an avoidance of violence, Ovid is correcting the mistakes of previous elegists, including himself in the *Amores*. In *Ars* 1-2, violence is recommended as a strategy, and only where the male lover can still retain self-control, whether playing the role of attacker or victim; cf. e.g. the use of force at 1.665-706, the girl's violent manifestation of her jealousy at 2.451-2 *ille ego sim, cuius laniet furiosa capillos; / ille ego sim, teneras cui petat ungue genas*.

**145-6**     **dextera praecipue capit indulgentia mentes**     'especially does dexterous gentleness seize minds': *praecipue* forces a certain connection (perhaps somewhat awkwardly) between this line and what has gone before, as also when marking transitions

at 1.89, 591, 2.607, 641, 665, 3.237, 309, 681. Perhaps *indulgentia* is to be interpreted as one of those qualities which the lover is urged to adopt in addition to physical beauty (143-44).

The gentleness of *indulgentia* contrasts with the implicit violence of *capit*, which nevertheless reinforces the connection between this section and the aim of the *Ars* (see 12n *arte mea capta est*). This contrast suggests another important deviation from previous elegy: there, subjugation was a consequence of love (cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.2.30 *captiua ... mente*, TLL. 8.0735.50ff.); the *Ars* teaches how to turn the tables and control the girl through *indulgentia*.

**asperitas odium saeuaque bella mouet** *asperitas* has various shades of meaning: it can mean a ‘general lack of refinement’ (OLD s.v. 6), or ‘cruelty’ (OLD s.v. 7), as Atalanta at 185, who is used to exemplify the power of *indulgentia* over *asperitas* (see below); with Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.129.

*odium* is precisely the opposite emotion that the lover wishes to arouse in his *puella*; cf. 333 *nec tamen officiis odium quaeratur ab aegra*.

*bella mouere* meaning ‘to inspire wars’ occurs frequently, predominantly in poetry; see McKeown on *Am.* 2.12.21, TLL. 2.1838.40ff.

**147-8** The first examples from nature, the hawk and wolves, exemplify those animals that have harsh or violent attributes, and so are disliked by mankind.

**odimus accipitrem** The first person plural *odimus* refers generally to mankind, but serves also to link the *praeceptor* with his addressee, as also at 3.511 *odimus immodicos*, 517 *odimus et maestas*. The verb is also used in the *Ars* to express more specifically the *praeceptor*’s personal preferences, as at 2.683 *odi concubitus, qui non utrumque resoluunt*, 3.239-40 *odi, quae sauciat ora / unguibus et rapta brachia figit acu*.

The following couplet will provide the dove as another example of *indulgentia*: the *accipiter* specifically preys upon doves in literature; cf. *Il.* 22.139 (a simile to describe Achilles’ pursuit of Hector), Varr. *Rust.* 3.7.6, Verg. *Aen.* 11.721-4, Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.17-18 *accipiter uelut / mollis columbas*, Ov. *Ars.* 2.363 *accipitri timidas credis, furiose, columbas*, *Met.* 5.605-6. Not only is the hawk vicious, it also specifically targets the creature known for its gentleness.

**quia uiuit semper in armis** ‘because it always lives in arms’: like the Getans, synonymous with uncivilised wildness; of *Pont.* 1.8.5 *uiuimus assiduis ... in armis*.

**et pauidum solitos in pecus ire lupos** ‘and (we hate) wolves who are accustomed to attack the fearful flock’: this example deploys a common motif in poetry in which the male aggressor is depicted as a wolf and the female victim as a sheep; cf. e.g. *Il.* 16.352-5, Theoc. *Id.* 11.24 φεύγεις δ' ὡσπερ ὄϊς πολλὸν λύκον ἀθρήσασα, Verg. *Aen.* 9.58-63, 565-6, Ov. *Ars* 1.117-8 *ut fugiunt aquilas, timidissima turba, columbae / utque fugit uisos agna nouella lupos* (the Sabines’ reaction to the Roman attack). The intratext with the rape of the Sabines reinforces the idea that such behaviour may have been appropriate in Romulus’ time, but is unnecessary in a more civilised era.

**149-50** The second examples from nature, the swallow and doves, exemplify those animals that have gentle attributes, and so are loved by mankind.

**at caret insidiis hominum, quia mitis, hirundo** ‘but the swallow is free from the snares of men, because it is gentle’: the hunting imagery recalls the metaphor with which the book opened, see 2n (above). The *quia* clause repeats the rhetorical structure of 147, emphasising the contrast between the two couplets. However, note the omission of the verb in the clause: a common technique in Ovid; see McKeown on *Am.* 1.13.37.

The theme of mildness will recur later in the book in a modified form, notably at 178 *postmodo mitis erit*, 462 *mitis erit*. The lover’s aim is to make the girl *mitis*, and thereby more susceptible to his seductions.

The *hirundo* will reappear later in the book in a more aggressive role; cf. 383 *altera dira parens haec est, quam cernis, hirundo*. The contrast between Ovid’s use of the swallow in Book 2 makes the later reference to Procne more shocking.

**quasque colat turres Chaonis ales habet** ‘and the Chaonian bird has turrets to inhabit’: i.e. doves are so loved that, not only are they exempt from being hunted, men even build dovecots specially for them; cf. *Pont.* 1.6.51 *nam prius incipient turris uitare columbae*.

The description of doves as ‘Chaonian’ adds an extra dimension to the special treatment they receive from mankind: Chaonia was a district in the north-west part of Epirus, home of the ancient town of Dodona. The Dodonan doves were considered prophetic; cf. Hdt. 2.57 (rationalisation of the myth), Verg. *Ecl.* 9.13 *Chaonias dicunt aquila ueniente columbas*, Prop. 1.9.5. Furthermore, in the language of augury, *alites* are birds that give omens by their flight. Thus the term *ales* too highlights their role as birds of prophecy: this reinforces the importance of such creatures for mankind’s relationship with

the gods. Finally, the dove, as a bird of Venus, was closely aligned with erotics: later in the book, *columbae* are used to exemplify the power of sex; cf. 465-6.

**151-60** After the examples from nature, Ovid returns to a Rome-centric focus, using legal language to draw a contrast between acrimonious married relationships and milder ones unrestricted by legal marriage (see introductory note).

**151-2** **este procul** The echo of 1.31 *este procul, uittae tenues, insigne pudoris, / quaeque tegis medios instita longa pedes* - there designed to exclude Roman matrons from Ovid's readership - links this passage on marriage with those opening restrictions. The language presents the *praeceptor* in the pose of priest, excluding certain persons or elements from a ritual; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.258 *procul o, procul este, profani*, Ov. *Am.* 2.1.3 with McKeown *ad loc.* on Ovid's perversion of the sacred language; see also Solodow (1977) 116.

**lites et amarae proelia linguae** 'quarrels and battles of bitter tongue': such arguments are an example of *asperitas* within relationships: the *proelia* in particular links back to the *saeua bella* of *asperitas* at 146. The word also serves to round this passage off at 175 *proelia cum Parthis* (see below). The following couplet makes clear that such bitterness should be restricted to marital relationships: *lites* foreshadows the emphasis on legal disputes there, since it can mean 'quarrels' but also 'lawsuits'; cf. TLL. 7.2.1499.69ff.

**dulcibus est uerbis mollis alendus amor** 'soft love must be nourished by sweet words': an example of *indulgentia* within erotic relationships, where seductive language is specifically aimed at sexual persuasion (James (2003b) 20). The reference to *dulcia uerba* foreshadows the sexual climax of the book; cf. 724 *et dulces gemitus aptaque uerba ioco*. This connection hints at the reward of such indulgent behaviour: sex; cf. also 3.798 *dulcia ... gaudia* (orgasm), with Pichon (1991) 136.

The gerundive *alendus est* recalls the aim of Book 2: to *keep* the girl; cf. 12. The verb is used rather more cynically at *Rem.* 746 *diuitiis alitur luxuriosus amor*: this issue of wealth is raised at 161-72 (see below).

*amor* or those connected with it are often defined as *mollis* within the *Ars*; cf. 1.10 *sed puer est, aetas mollis et apta regi*, 2.236 *mollibus his castris*, 565 *neque enim dea mollior ulla est* (of Venus), *Rem.* 24 *mollia regna* (of Cupid). This engages with the *topos*

in elegy of depicting love as gentle, and, especially, of defining body parts of the beloved as *mollis*; see Pichon (1991) 204-6.

**153-4** **lite fugent nuptaeque uiros nuptasque mariti** ‘with a lawsuit let brides put their husbands to flight and husbands their brides’: Ovid now emphasises, through the emphatic repetition of *lite*, the litigious element which was only very subtly present in 151. The polyptoton *nuptae ... nuptas* and the repetition of different words for husband emphasise the effect of *lites* in pulling such couples apart, and the inherent power struggle that is a consequence of such acrimony. Furthermore, the sound-echo of 24 *semibouemque uirum semiuirumque bouem* draws attention to the unnatural monstrosity of such a situation, where wives are turned against husbands.

Although the term *uir* is used in elegy to denote both husband and rival (the precise marital status of the *puella* being impossible to discern), the use of *nupta* and *maritus* make the reference to marriage clear. Ovid uses *uxor* in the following couplet (155, see below), but the polyptoton here of *nupta* expresses that even those who are newly married are susceptible to such problems; cf. e.g. 2.388 *di melius! uix hoc nupta tenere potest* (another example of Ovid’s negative attitude towards marriage: even a bride cannot expect fidelity from her new husband).

The verb *fugo* demonstrates how far this situation is opposite to the aims of the *Ars*; cf. esp. the nightmarish situation of 2.531 *effugere hunc non est*.

**inque uicem** ‘and in turn’: the phrase gives a sense of retaliation and combativeness.

**credant res sibi semper agi** ‘and let them think they must always resort to law’: the legal terminology emphasises the destruction that the law inflicts upon relationships. *res agere* meaning ‘to conduct a case’ is, like *causam agere*, a legal phrase; cf. Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.24 *aut maiorem aut minorem agi rem*, 2.61 *ita res agantur et in iudicium ueniant*, TLL. 1.1394.72ff.

**155-6** This couplet continues the theme of marriage by contrasting what is appropriate for a wife (lawsuits / quarrels) with what is appropriate for a girlfriend (pleasant words).

**hoc decet uxores** The language of appropriateness conflicts with the outrageous message which is designed to lambast the entire institute of marriage. See Gibson (2007) 117-22 for the excessive frequency of words of *decorum* in the *Ars*, including *decet* (especially frequent in *Ars* 3).

*uxor* situates this statement concretely in contemporary Rome, and connects it with the legal status of wife (Treggiari (1991) 6-7). *coniunx* is the higher style word for wife (see Watson (1985) 431-2) and is used in the *Ars* largely of mythological wives; cf. 1.334 (Clytemnestra), 2.6 (Helen), 574 (Venus), 3.19 (Alcestis), 111 (Andromache), 391 (Livia: a contemporary Roman wife, but the more elevated term is more appropriate for her as wife of Augustus), 699 (Procris). Although note 3.303, where a humorous effect is made by inappropriate use of the term *coniunx* to describe the waddling peasant.

**dos est uxoriam lites** ‘the dowry of a wife is lawsuits’: although manuscript *R* reads *dos* here (also *Aω*), the second hand of *R* (also *DE<sub>a</sub>*) has *res*. However, this anomaly can be explained through the transposition of *res* in the line above (there, *res* must be correct due to the legal phrase *res agi*, see note above). For similar, ironic use of *dos*, cf. Prop. 4.4.92 *haec, uirgo, officiis dos erat apta tuis*, Ov. *Met.* 5.15, TLL. 5.1.2044.5ff.

The adjective *uxorius* is rare in poetry, and occurs nowhere else in elegy: Ovid is deliberately employing deeply un-erotic vocabulary here. A significant intertext is Verg. *Aen.* 4.266 where Mercury reproaches Aeneas for being *uxorius*, i.e. controlled by his ‘wife’: this uxoriousness famously results in catastrophe. A similarly negative depiction of uxoriousness (or at least one that also leads to disaster) occurs at Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.20, where Tiber is described as *uxorius amnis*, avenging his wife Ilia.

**audiat optatos semper amica sonos** These ‘desired sounds’ are the *dulcia uerba* of 152 (see note above). The repetition of *semper* from 154 emphasises the contrast intended between marriage, which inevitably (Ovid argues) ends in divorce, and illegitimate love, which is only agreeable. The following couplet will expand on the freedom afforded to those who are unmarried, focusing on the element of choice and lack of restriction.

The choice of *amica* here rather than *meretrix* or *puella* emphasises the ‘friendliness’ of such a relationship, contrasting with *nupta* and *uxor* from the previous lines; see Adams (1982) 348-50 on the deterioration of the term from a favourable meaning where eventual marriage took place to a meaning closer to *meretrix* (late Republic).

**157-8** The legal terminology resumes in this couplet: the concept of men being ‘commanded’ to marry engages with the Augustan marriage laws, which induced men to marry, as well as restricting them. These inducements even resulted in men becoming engaged to very young girls to enable an extended enjoyment of privileges prior to legal

marriage (initially, the laws bracketed engagements with marriage, until this was revised in 9 AD); see Treggiari (1991) 65, McGinn (1998) 70-1.

**non legis iussu** ‘not by the command of law’: i.e. this relationship is not a legal marriage.

**lectum uenistis in unum** The emphasis here on fidelity conflicts with the statement at 388 (quoted above). The point, however, is that the lover has chosen his partner based on sexual desire rather than any other factors taking consideration of the wealth or social status of the girl.

**fungitur in uobis munere legis Amor** ‘Love performs the duty of law in your case’: the repetition of *legis* emphasises the contrast between actual law of marriage (157) with the self-imposed law of lovers (here). For *fungor* with the ablative *munere*, meaning ‘to perform the function of’, cf. *Rem.* 795, TLL. 6.1.1587.37ff.

**159-60 blanditias molles auremque iuuantia uerba / affer** ‘bring soft flatteries and words that delight the ear’: i.e. the *dulcia uerba* of 152 and the *optati soni* of 156. This reference to *blanditiae* foreshadows the significance of ‘flattery’, particularly at 295-314 (see Introduction, pp37-8, on the model of the *kolax* for the lover).

**ut aduentu laeta sit illa tuo** This is the repeated aim of the Book, that she be glad to see him rather than tired of him; cf. 531 (quoted above). Compare also the lover’s manipulation of the girl through absence at 349-56. Note the rather elegant juxtaposition of *illa tuo* at the line end, reinforcing the proximity of the lovers.

**161-8** These lines return to the issue of readership: Ovid is not writing as *praeceptor* for the *diues amator*, because such a man does not require instruction. Rather, his reader is the *pauper amator* because, Ovid argues, he himself loved as a poor man, and gave poetry instead of gifts (more on poetry as a less desirable gift at 273-86, below). This seems rather a sharp transition from the argument of the preceding lines; however, the connection will be made apparent at 167-8: poor men need to be especially careful not to offend their *puellae*. The gap between rich and poor is a common *topos* of elegy, where the voice of the poet is presented as *pauper*, struggling to retain the *puella* despite competition from the *diues amator*; cf. e.g. Prop. 1.8.37-40 (esp. 39-40, quoted at 166n), Tib. 1.5, 2.4 (with Murgatroyd *ad loc.*), Ov. *Am.* 1.8.31-2, 1.10 with McKeown *ad loc.* on the link between this theme and Comedy, ‘with its impecunious *adulescens* in love with a *meretrix* controlled by a *leno auarus*’, 3.8.

**161-2 non ego diuitibus uenio** The declamatory tone of this line opening (with Janka *ad loc.*) marks this as a change of direction. By distancing himself from wealthy men, Ovid foreshadows the statement at 276 *dummodo sit diues, barbarus ipse placet*. He rejects the wealthy from his audience, as they already have an advantage over other lovers: the skill of the *Ars* lies in seducing without payment.

**praeceptor amandi** ‘the teacher of loving’: Ovid tends to recall the title of the poem at key moments; cf. e.g. 1.1 *artem ... amandi*, 17 *ego sum praeceptor Amoris*, 2.497. By reminding the reader of the programmatic opening, Ovid marks this passage as a new beginning, especially considering that he is addressing the very nature of his readership. His role as ‘teacher’ (but also as poet) comes to the foreground in 169-74, as he recalls a personal experience which forms a warning for the lover. There is a joke in calling Hesiod at *Fast.* 6.13 *praeceptor arandi*: the close verbal proximity of *arandi* and *amandi* connects these two figures, already linked at 4 (see above).

**nil opus est illi, qui dabit, arte mea** ‘He who will give has no need of my art’: i.e. the rich lover, who can give *presents* has no need for the tricks Ovid as *praeceptor* can teach, or for the *Ars* more generally.

**163-4 secum habet ingenium qui, cum libet, ‘accipe’ dicit** ‘he has his own talent who, when he pleases, says ‘take this’: an insult concealed by its flattering tone. The implication is that men who are wealthy do not take proper care of their true *ingenium*, the cultivation of which was shown to be so vital at 111-12. Considering the presence of *ars* at the end of the preceding line, there is also a hint at poetics, which foreshadows the *pauper amator*’s reliance on poetry as gift at 166. At *Am.* 1.15.14, Ovid specifically says of Callimachus, *ingenio non ualet, arte ualet*. Like a good poet, a good lover also requires both *ingenium* and *ars*: the cultivation of one’s *ingenium* was emphasised in the earlier passage (107-22), and the *ars* may be supplied by the *Ars* itself. Unlike the lover who has access to the *Ars Amatoria*, the wealthy lover, excluded from the poem by its author, fails in both these respects.

**cedimus** The *praeceptor* gives up, yielding to the wealthy man (the plural verb implying that the lover too must yield). However, as he teaches at 197, *cedendo uictor abibis* (with Sharrock (1994a) 152 n. 112): so perhaps there is some sense in surrender after all; cf. Tib. 1.4.40 *cedas: obsequio plurima uincet amor*.

**inuentis plus placet ille meis** ‘he pleases more than my inventions’: there is a doubtful textual variant (ς) which reads *ualet* in place of *placet*, which, if correct, would make the connection with the statement on Callimachean poetics at *Am.* 1.15.14 stronger. Yet *placet*, provided by most manuscripts (*RAς*), foreshadows the power of barbarians to please (*placet*), as long as they bear gifts (276).

By terming his poetry *inuenta*, Ovid recalls Daedalus’ wings, which the creator termed *inuentis ... meis* in similar line positions at 54. This sustains the link between *praeceptor* and Daedalus as both teacher and poet (see Introduction, pp27-30). Note also how the juxtaposition of *ille meis* at emphatic position heightens the contrast between the ‘other’ (wealthy rival) and the *pauper poeta*.

**165-6** The examples from personal experience begin and are expanded upon in 169-72. Ovid is fond of these nods to the *Amores* (see Introduction, pp18-21) and emphasises that he speaks from experience; cf. 1.29 *Vsus opus mouet hoc*, see Myerowitz (1985) 218 n. 35. He gained his credentials as both poet and lover during the composition of the *Amores*; cf. esp. *Am.* 1.3 where the poet lover is poor but can offer lifelong fidelity and the immortalisation promised by poetry. The repetition of *pauper* in this and the following couplet (165 and 167) recalls the anaphora of the same word at Tib. 1.5.61-66 (quoted in introductory note), and so hints at the type of acts a poor man, eager to please, will provide for his girl. Ovid returns to the theme of gift-giving at 3.531-8, where he recommends that girls have multiple lovers, who can give her gifts (the *diues amator*) but who can also provide certain services: this list culminates in poets, who offer immortality of the *puella*. Even (or perhaps especially) in the Book addressed to girls, Ovid is still promoting his own cause.

**pauperibus uates ego sum** An echo of 1.17 (quoted above). Ovid frequently terms himself *uates* rather than *poeta*, emphasising his authority; see 11n (above).

**quia pauper amaui** ‘because I loved as a poor man’: the perfect tense of *amo*, situating this instance in the past, forges a connection with the *Amores*, where the poet did present himself as a *pauper amator* (see Introduction, pp18-22).

**cum dare non possem munera, uerba dabam** The joke here lies in the double meaning of *uerba dare*, both (literally) to ‘give words’, but also ‘to deceive’; cf. Prop. 2.24.8, Ov. *Am.* 2.2.58, *Ars.* 1.721, 2.558, 3.618, TLL. 5.1.1675.11ff. The surface reading is that he wrote girls poetry in lieu of a gift, a common habit for the writer of the *Amores*, in an engagement with earlier elegy; cf. e.g. Prop. 1.8.39-40 *hanc ego non auro, non Indis*

*flectere conchis, / sed potui blandi carminis obsequio.* However, the deceptive undercurrent foreshadows the use of insincerity later in the poem; cf. esp. 311-12 *tantum, ne pateas uerbis simulator in illis, / effice, nec uultu destrue dicta tuo.* True *ars* lies in the lover seducing using his intelligence rather than tricks like wealth (and magic) that circumvent the need for *ars*: ‘the game is essentially amaterialistic insofar as it sets up a system in which wit subsumes the role of wealth in courtship’ (Myerowitz (1985) 181).

The *praeceptor* will recommend the cheaper kinds of gifts which a poor lover can give at 261-72, including, at 273-86, suggesting that they attempt poetry themselves! It should be noted that the role of the *pauper amator* is just that: Ovid does not truly believe that either himself or his reader are anything less than ordinary Roman citizens. Poverty is a useful pose to enable them to avoid paying.

**167-8 pauper amet caute** ‘the poor man should love cautiously’: an echo of *pauper amaui*, drawing a contrast between the poet’s own experiences and the potential pitfalls awaiting the careless lover. Janka notes the pointed juxtaposition of *amet caute*, which draws attention to the artifice of attempting to control an irrational emotion.

The lover was warned against lack of caution in the *exemplum* of Icarus; cf. esp. 75-6, 83 *incautis nimium temerarius annis.* With *timeat* in the following clause, this line heavily articulates the need for caution in the lover.

**timeat maledicere pauper** ‘the poor man should be afraid to speak ill’: the repetition of *pauper* draws the connection between this and Tib. 1.5.61-66 (see introductory note). The verb *maledico* also draws a connection with Tib. 2.5.101, where a drunk young man abuses his *puella*, and then afterwards (*postmodo*, 2.5.102) regrets his words; cf. TLL. 8.165.26ff. The emphasis here on language recalls the *lites* of 151-6, although the example from personal experience which dominates the following two couplets focuses on physical aggression. The poor lover cannot afford to retaliate in any way, either verbally or physically.

**multaque diuitibus non patienda ferat** ‘and he should bear many things which wealthy men would not endure’: this picks up on the theme of Tib. 1.5.61-6, which concerns the benefits accruing to a girl who takes a poor man as lover. Here, the same situation is painted in a negative light for the poor man who has to endure such things in order to please his girl.

The line is extremely close in structure to 3.566 *multaque tironi non patienda feret*: the older man makes a better lover than a younger one. The argument there, as here, has the same aim: to promote Ovid's own cause.

**169-72** The example from personal experience, both erotic and literary; see Introduction, p19, for a full analysis of these lines and their wider significance. Ovid takes the 'quarrels' of 151 to a higher level: physical violence.

**me memini iratum dominae turbasse capillos** The opening words introduce a personal experience recalled, as also at Verg. *Georg.* 4.125, Tib. 1.6.25, Ov. *Ars.* 2.551 (quoted at Introduction, p20), 3.659. By referring to the girl here as *domina*, Ovid deliberately emphasises the loss of power which is the consequence of the loss of self-control (see 111n): the control gained by the girl due to this incident is emphasised in the following couplet, where the disgraced lover is forced to pay financial restitution for his outburst.

The crime of messing up a girl's hair is a serious one in the context of the *Ars*, especially Book 3 where much time is spent advising women on their hair; cf. 3.133-68. Violence, particularly against hair, is a common motif of elegy; cf. Prop. 2.5.23, 4.5.31-2 *si tibi forte comas uexauerit, utilis ira: / post modo mercata pace premendus erit* (the girl in our passage follows Acanthis' advice in order to receive the greatest profit from her repentant lover), Tib. 1.10.53, 62. For Ovid's use of violence against hair at *Am.* 1.7, see Introduction, p19.

**haec mihi quam multos abstulit ira dies!** 'how many days did this anger steal from me!': the girl first punishes him by refusing to see him, thus demoting him to the status of *exclusus amator* (though note the more financially-motivated punishment in the following couplet).

**nec puto nec sensi tunicam laniasse** The torn tunic is a detail missing from *Am.* 1.7: Ovid may add it to emphasise the financial consequences of indulging in jealous rage: she makes him pay compensation to replace the damaged item (which was not really damaged). *nec puto nec sensi* enables Ovid to avoid stating outright that the *puella* was lying: furthermore, the angry lover was hardly in a state to claim clarity of memory. Whether the tunic was torn or not, the outcome is the same: in order to see her again, he must pay.

Torn clothes, like violence against hair, is a further *topos* of elegy; cf. Prop. 2.5.21, 2.15.18, Tib. 1.10.61 *e membris tenuem rescindere uestem*. Additionally, at 3.569, Ovid promotes the cause of older lovers by stating that they are less likely to tear tunics.

**sed ipsa / dixerat** This girl has learnt the lesson of Acanthis in Prop. 4.5.31-2 (quoted above). *dico* contrasts with *puto* and *sentio* in the previous line: the lover's mental and physical knowledge of his innocence is powerless against her verbal claims.

**et pretio est illa redempta meo** 'and it was replaced at my cost': the lover must both 'atone' (*redimo* OLD s.v. 3b) and 'buy back' or 'replace' the tunic (OLD s.v. 1). The use of *pretium* to define the transaction depicts the relationship as a commercial one, a situation which the *praeceptor* wants to help the lover to avoid; cf. 3.551 with Gibson *ad loc.*

**173-6** This wide-ranging passage concludes by returning to the theme with which it started: *indulgentia* is preferable to *asperitas* because it avoids the necessity of financial compensation, which the *praeceptor*'s own personal experience exemplified as a warning.

**at uos, si sapitis, uestri peccata magistri / effugite** The startling opening of the line refocuses the reader with a sudden direct address. The reference to wisdom forms a challenge to the reader to improve on the defective teacher. However, as with *amet caute* (167), the emphasis on 'wisdom' in amatory matters would appear an oxymoron outside the province of the *Ars*, where such control of the uncontrollable is standard.

**et culpae damna timete meae** 'and fear the losses of my guilt': both loss of time (170) and money (172). The echo of *me memini* in *meae* at the end of the line serves to enclose the lines which deal with the personal experience of the *praeceptor*, with Janka *ad loc.* Similarly, the need to 'fear' echoes *timeat* of 167, emphasising that this is the kind of loss which would be much more difficult for a *pauper* to cope with.

**proelia cum Parthis** The 'battles' should only be for Roman enemies (or between husbands and wives, see 151n). The language sounds rather like a political slogan (with Baldo *ad loc.*) but the following lines undermine the focus on Augustan foreign policy (which featured at 1.177-212).

**cum culta pax sit amica** 'with the cultured girlfriend let there be peace': the end of the section recalls the pleasantries which should exist between unmarried lovers at 156-60. The repetition of *amica* from 156 (and of *proelia* from 151) reinforces this sense of closure. The girl is *culta* because she is well-read, and may have learnt from Acanthis the best ways of fleecing a lover: the lover should beware this. The adjective is common in the

*Ars* to describe the girl, particularly in Book 3, where much time is spent on physical cultivation.

**et iocus et causas quicquid amoris habet** ‘and jokes and whatever has the causes of love’: *iocus* is used of sexual encounters in the *Ars, de lusu amoris*; cf. 1.354, 2.600, 724, 3.580, 796, TLL. 7.2.289.37ff.

Similar phraseology is used at Tib. 1.4.10 *nam causam iusti semper amoris habent*, where Priapus warns against the seductive qualities of boys.

**177-196:** Atalanta and Milanion: obsequious behaviour is the best strategy to strengthen her love

Although Ovid has just demonstrated the need for *indulgentia*, this passage implies that he accepts the difficulty of sustaining such an attitude in the face of rejection. He begins this section by introducing the theme of *obsequium*: the lover should employ obsequiousness until the *puella* softens towards him. Yet the term *obsequium* is slightly more complicated than this translation implies, for it ‘encompasses ideas of indulgence, obedience and even, to a degree, self-abasement’ (Armstrong (2005) 89). As well as ‘compliance’ (OLD s.v. 1, as I have translated it throughout), the term has additional connotations of ‘servility’ (OLD s.v. 2b) or even ‘sexual compliance’ (OLD s.v. 2c). It therefore follows on closely from the previous passage on *indulgentia*, but also foreshadows the more self-abasing actions of the *kolax* which are recommended in the following passages (197-232).

In order to exemplify the success of this obsequious approach, Ovid uses three examples from nature that stress the need for perseverance: bending a bough without breaking it; swimming with the current rather than against it; and taming wild animals by degrees. These examples from nature allow Ovid to engage with his great didactic predecessor: Virgil’s *Georgics* (with Leach (1964) 142-54). However, it can be shown (below) that he engages with the *Georgics* in a more subtle way, notably the reference to *mollia iussa* at the very end of the passage (196n).

The examples from nature culminate in the myth of Atalanta (186-92). She is renowned for being ‘harsh’ (*asperius*, 185, and *trux*, 186), yet Milanion was able to tame her (186). He may have lamented the way she treated him (187-8) but he continued to serve her by

carrying her nets while hunting and even sustaining wounds while trying to protect her (189-91): all this he suffered for love (192). The conclusion of the passage modifies the force of the mythological *exemplum* as Ovid attempts to console the lover who may be feeling daunted by the model of Milanion: Ovid's precepts will be *mollia*, i.e. he will not be expected to carry nets or brave literal wounds, or, if one interprets line 195 cynically (see below), Ovid's lover will even be immune to the metaphorical wounds of love.

The myth of Atalanta has a tangled literary tradition, with two central myths concerning her. First, she appears as hunter; and, second, as athlete. She plays a key role in the Calydonian boar hunt; but is also a swift-footed princess whose father will grant her hand only to a man who can defeat her in a foot-race. Which story does Ovid refer to here?

### Atalanta

According to Homer, Atalanta was present at the Calydonian boar hunt, and even struck the first blow (*Il.* 9.529-99, Apollod. 1.8.2, Ov. *Met.* 8.299-317, Hyg. *Fab.* 173). As a consequence of Atalanta's role in the hunt, and due to his personal feelings for her, Meleager, the leader of the hunt (sometimes named Milanion, as on the François Vase depicting the hunt; LIMC s.v. Atalanta), granted her the prize of the boar's head, for which he was attacked by his uncles. His defeat of them led to his own death through the agency of his mother (his uncles' sister). There is also a lost play by Euripides named *Meleager*, to which the relationship of Atalanta and Meleager may have been central.

The story of the foot-race first appears in a few fragments of Hesiod (72-76), also Theocr. *Id.* 3.40-2, Apollod. 3.9.2, Ov. *Met.* 10.560-680, Hyg. *Fab.* 185: all of these sources name the suitor as Hippomenes, although Apollodorus also suggests the alternative of Milanion. The story generally runs that Hippomenes, with the divine aid of Aphrodite, is able to defeat Atalanta by cheating (rather like Pelops, cf. 7-8). The goddess of love gives him three golden apples, which he throws into Atalanta's path during the race. Distracted by the apples, Atalanta is overtaken by the hero, who wins and therefore gains her as wife. However, since Hippomenes fails to perform the vows he made to Aphrodite, she punishes the couple by instilling them with passion while in a sanctuary of Cybele (or, variously, of Zeus): as punishment for defiling this sacred place, they are transformed into lions.

Both versions present Atalanta as an Amazon-like woman engaging in traditionally male activities, who has rejected marriage in favour of a life devoted to the virgin huntress Artemis. She can be seen as ‘the embodiment of ambiguity and liminality, combining aspects of male and female, insider and outsider’ (Barringer (1996) 49). Yet both stories also depict her as the object of desire, to, variously, Hippomenes, Milanion, and Meleager. Furthermore, it is through this desire for Atalanta that these men meet their disastrous fates. Atalanta is specifically refused membership in the voyage for the golden fleece due to anxiety over including a woman in the male sphere, and the erotic complications; cf. Ap. Rhod. 1.769-73. So perhaps this is not the most inspiring model for the lover: resulting in the need for the consolatory coda at the end (193-6). The erotic potential of the myths surrounding Atalanta seems to have inspired much ancient art; cf. Grant (1975) 153, Clarke (1998) 173, CIL 6.37965.22f. It is this erotic tradition which is engaged with during Ovid’s catalogue of sexual positions at the end of *Ars* 3; cf. 3.775-6 *Milanion umeris Atalantes crura ferebat: / si bona sunt, hoc sunt aspicienda modo*.

Atalanta recalls the very opening of *Ars* 2: the hunting imagery recalls the metaphor of 1-2 while the reader’s knowledge of the athlete story echoes the reference to Pelops and Hippodamia at 7-8 (another marriage won by athletic competition). There is no mention of the Calydonian boar (but there may be an echo of this theme in *toruos ... apros*, 190). If one compares Ovid’s treatment with a very similar treatment in Propertius, the game of conflation of stories seems to become a little clearer.

#### Latin Versions of the Myth

Ovid’s version of the myth is largely influenced by Prop. 1.1.9-16 (quoted and analysed at Introduction, p33). The differences between the passages can be interpreted both as a move towards modernisation in Ovid (note particularly the naming of Atalanta) but also as a nod towards another important intertext: Gallus.

Although lost, the work of Gallus is thought to have included a version of the myth of Atalanta and Milanion. Based on the prominence granted the myth in Propertius (the first myth in the first poem of the first book), it has been argued that Gallus too employed the myth programmatically in some way (Ross (1975) 90-1, Cairns (2006) 110-12). Furthermore, Virgil seems to be engaging with this same lost Gallan text at *Ecl.* 10.50-63

(with Ross (1975) 86-96). When Ovid changes Propertius' description of Milanion 'going to see wild beasts' to actually 'piercing' terrifying boars (190), he is engaging with Virgil's presentation of Gallus; cf. esp. *Ecl.* 10.55-6 *interea mixtis lustrabo Maenala Nymphis / aut acris uenabor apros*. Not only does Virgil situate the action on Maenalus (as does Ovid), he also refers to the boars which are not specifically identified in Propertius: this Ross interprets as indicating proof that all three poets are looking back towards a significant, programmatic moment in Gallus. The reference to boars, however, also recalls the Homeric instance of Atalanta as participant in the Calydonian boar hunt: thus, like Propertius' *uelox puella*, hinting at the other famous story of the girl.

Propertius, although setting Milanion up as a positive *exemplum*, will actually reveal (1.1.17-18), through the use of repeated negatives, that this is a negative *exemplum*: his situation is quite different and more complicated than that of the poet (Ross (1975) 64-5). Ovid does a similar thing: he does not dismiss the relevance in the way that Propertius does yet he does modify it through the strong triple negative of 193-5. Although it is impossible to postulate on the nature of Gallus' use of the myth, it is possible that Ovid is positioning himself somewhere between these two important predecessors, neither fully identifying with Milanion, yet also not fully dismissing him.

**177-8** Although the previous passage ends with a picture of *pax* (175-6), this one opens with a problem: what if the *culta amica* is not so amenable? The lover should not give up, but persevere, and shortly she will come around. This couplet sets up the situation which will dominate the rest of the passage: the usefulness of *obsequium* in persuading a girl to soften.

**si nec blanda satis nec erit tibi comis amanti** The description of the girl as *blanda* here hints at an important intertext for the opening lines of this passage: Prop. 1.8.39-40 (quoted at 166n). Furthermore, Ovid describes Propertius as a *blanda poeta* at *Trist.* 2.465 *blandi praecepta Properti* and 5.1.17 *aptior huic Gallus blandique Propertius oris*. This terminology foreshadows the significance of Propertius (and Gallus) in the Atalanta *exemplum* at 185-92.

**perfer et obdura** 'persist and endure': a reference to Catull. 8.11-12 *sed obstinata mente perfer, obdura. / uale, puella. iam Catullus obdurat*. However, Ovid inverts the Catullan sense (as does Horace at *Sat.* 2.5.39 *persta atque obdura*) to mean that the lover should not give up in pursuing the girl. Note, however, how Ovid reverts to the Catullan form of resistance to love at *Rem.* 642.

**postmodo mitis erit** cf. Tib. 1.4.53 *tunc mihi mitis erit*. The addition of the adverb here gives a casual sense of patience eventually rewarded, as at 322 *tum sere, quod plena postmodo falce metas*. The masculine assumption is that all women can be won over; cf. 1.269-70. The *hirundo* was loved precisely for its softness (149), and so was a model of *indulgentia*.

**179-84** These three couplets provide three examples from nature to exemplify the effectiveness of gentle manipulation rather than a violent struggling against. The girl should be gradually persuaded, just as a bough is gently bent; as a swimmer must follow the current of a river; and as animals can be tamed only through gentle compliance. The lines recall the similar examples of the benefits of patience at 1.471-6, which also culminated in a well-worn mythological example: Penelope, with Hollis *ad loc*. The anaphora of *obsequium* towards the start of each couplet emphasises the connections.

**179-80** The image of the bough is taken from Verg. *Georg.* 1.169-70 *continuo in siluis magna ui flexa domatur / in burim et curui formam accipit ulmus aratri*: the Hesiodic creation of the plough. The plough-building represents a key motif of didactic poetry: the description of a practical article (and one which was important for the creation of Daedalus' wings; 45-8).

**flectitur obsequio curvatus ab arbore ramus** Ovid is playing with the double meaning of *flecto* as 'bend' (physically; OLD s.v. 1) and as 'bend' (someone's will or opinion, to cause to relent or soften; OLD s.v. 9).

**frangis** Elsewhere in the *Ars*, the verb is used only of the act of breaking down doors to gain access to the *puella*, which Ovid presents as a bad thing; cf. 3.71, 567, *Rem.* 31. *frango* continues the double meaning of the sentiment, since, like *flecto*, it can also be used to refer to the subduing of another person; cf. TLL 6.1.897.52. This foreshadows how Atalanta 'succumbs' to Milanion (186).

**si uires experiare tuas** 'if you test your strength': demonstrations of hyper-masculinity generally tend to be recommended against in the *Ars*; cf. esp. 1.463 *sed lateant uires* (of speech).

**181-2** The second example from nature is of how to cross rivers without swimming against the current; cf. *Rem.* 121-2 *stultus, ab obliquo qui cum descendere possit, / pugnat in aduersas ire natator aquas*. Virgil uses the image to express the lengths that mares will

go to in order to mate; cf. *Georg.* 3.270 *superant montis et flumina tranant*. For Virgil, such behaviour is excessive; however, later in the Book Ovid recommends the lover engage in almost (but not quite) such behaviour in order to impress the girl with a sense of his devotion (see 250n, below, *tranabas, animum nosset ut illa tuum*).

**obsequio tranantur aquae** ‘by compliance waters are swum across’: the emphatic position of the repeated ablative form of *obsequium* mirrors the previous couplet. The verb *trano* helps to connect this passage with its Virgilian model; cf. *Georg.* 3.270 (quoted above).

**nec uincere possis / flumina** The language of conquering seems inappropriate for the act of crossing a river, yet mirrors the military language of ‘conquering’ the girl, picked up again at 197 (below); cf. 511-12 *quisquis sapienter amabit / uincet*, 742 *uincite muneribus, uicit ut ille, datis*. The enjambment here holds off the object of *uincere*, so that the reader may supply the other possible object: *puellam*.

**si contra quam rapit unda nates** ‘if you swim otherwise than the wave carries you along’: *contra* here is adverbial, and, with *quam*, means ‘otherwise than’ or ‘contrary to’ (OLD s.v. 10c). For *rapio* of ‘carry along’ of physical forces, cf. OLD s.v. 9a. The construction is used again metaphorically at *Pont.* 3.7.8 *contra, quam rapit amnis*; cf. TLL. 4.742.82ff.

**183-4** The final example from nature: even wild animals can be tamed through compliance (tigers, lions, and bulls). The irony of this is that the bull is a tool of man, and yet the man must behave compliantly towards the animal: this hints at the sense of manipulation which dominates the *Ars*. Like a bull, the girl must *believe* that she is in control, although ultimately it is the farmer/lover who guides the plough/affair. As with each of the examples from nature, Virgil’s *Georgics* provide a significant intertext; cf. *Georg.* 4.510 *mulcentem tigris et agentem carmine quercus*. There, Orpheus softens tigers and moves oak trees with his song: Ovid likens the behaviour of the lover with the seductive power of the poet. This engagement foreshadows the depiction of Milanion as Orpheus-like poet of his own laments (187-8n).

**obsequium tigresque domat Numidasque leones** The ferocity of the animals in this line emphasises the power of *obsequium* in calming an aggressive woman (like Atalanta in the following lines). The epithet *Numidus* to describe lions is unique: the Numidians were a nomadic people of Northern Africa, near Carthage, hence the reference to them at Verg. *Aen.* 4.41 as a potential threat to the security of Dido’s position.

**rustica paulatim taurus aratra subit** The reference here to ploughs strengthens the allusion above to Virgil's description of the creation of the plough (179n). The *Georgics* can be seen to dominate the imagery of these lines. *paulatim* echoes Tib. 1.4; cf. 1.4.16 *paulatim sub iuga colla dabit*. The bull has strong resonances within the *Ars* as a metaphor for attempts to control the *puella*; cf. 1.19 *tauri ceruix oneratur aratro*, 471 *tempore difficiles ueniunt ad aratra iuuenci*.

**185-6** The myth of Atalanta opens with a challenge to the reader in the form of a rhetorical question: 'what was harsher than Atalanta of Nonacris?' The mythological Atalanta represents the girl of 177 who is unkind to her would-be lover. Although Atalanta is directly named in the hexameter, it is in the pentameter that the reader identifies the hero with whom he is intended (at this point) to identify: the *uir* (186) refers to Milanion, unnamed until 188. Note that it is not until after the relation of the myth that Ovid reveals the limitations of the story as an *exemplum* for the lover (193-6), where Milanion 'turns out to be an example of primordial excess, ridiculously inappropriate to the cultivated milieu of Ovid's student lover' (Myerowitz (1985) 146).

**quid fuit asperius Nonacrina Atalanta?** Atalanta is the archetypal *dura puella*, echoing *asperitas* (146). Difficult women (particularly in matters of love) are frequently denoted as *asper*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.279 *aspera Juno*, 11.664 *aspera uirgo* (of Camilla), Ov. *Met.* 13.803 *asperior tribulis* (of Galatea).

The direct naming of Atalanta contrasts with the more learned epithet at Prop. 1.1.10 *durae ... Iasidos*. The epithet here, *Nonacrina*, means 'of Nonacris', a city in Arcadia, and so locates the myth in its Arcadian setting.

The final vowel of *Nonacrina* and the first of *Atalanta* are not elided, a type of hiatus only used at this point in the line by Ovid where the second word is a proper name and the first an adjective agreeing with it; see Platnauer (1951) 58-9. A hiatus unique to Ovid (9 occurrences), he often employs this in the case of Atalanta; cf. *Her.* 4.99 *Maenalia Atalanta*, *Fast.* 5.83 *caelifero Atlante*.

**succubuit meritis trux tamen illa uiri** 'yet she, although truculent, succumbed to the merits of a man': by defining Atalanta here as *trux*, Ovid recalls the Propertian epithet *dura* (see note above). The verb also contrasts with the Propertian *contudit*, a much more aggressive word to describe Atalanta giving way at last: there she is 'worn down'. This tallies with Ovid's general avoidance of purposeless violence in the *Ars* (see esp. 169-72n).

The verb also recalls Prop. 2.34.47 *gravi taurus succumbit aratro*, forging a further connection with the final example from nature in the previous couplet (184).

The reference to Milanion's *merita* also echoes Prop. 1.1.16 *fides et benefacta*, since *meritum*, *beneficium* (and *officium*) belong to the same area of vocabulary - that of patronage - and are difficult to distinguish from one another (Saller (1982) 8, 20-1).

**187-8 saepe suos casus nec mitia facta puellae / flesse sub arboribus Milaniona ferunt** 'they say that Milanion often wept beneath the trees over his misfortunes and the harsh deeds of the girl': the Alexandrian footnote marked out by *ferunt* in this couplet is a signpost directing the reader to look back at previous instances of this myth: i.e. Propertius (and, arguably, Gallus); see introductory note. Ovid follows Propertius' version in focusing less on the hunt than on the lover's suffering. Furthermore, if, as Cairns (2006) 110 suggests, Gallus himself played the role of Milanion in his use of the myth, then this points the reader back to the poet who did relate Milanion's laments from a first-person point of view. The emphatic position of *saepe* at the start of the first line of this couplet, repeated at 189 and 190, gives an impression of repeated laments and promotes the sense that 189-90 form reports of the type of laments Milanion might make.

*suos casus* refers both to physical sufferings (detailed at 189-91) and emotional sufferings (mentioned at 192, i.e. the pain of love); cf. Prop. 1.13.1 *nostro ... casu*, Tib. 1.9.82 *casus ... meos*, Ov. *Am.* 2.1.10 *composuit casus iste poeta meos*. Most occurrences of *casus* in elegy are specifically used of singing one's own erotic misfortunes, and so here Milanion is presented as an elegiac poet himself (strengthening the likelihood of Gallus employing him as a prototype elegiac poet). Furthermore, *flere* with a direct object is mostly found in poetry; see McKeown on *Am.* 1.12.1, TLL. 6.900.69ff.

By calling Atalanta *puella*, Ovid marks her out as an elegiac girl, with *nec mitia facta* recalling the aim of 177-8. At the same time, however, the concluding lines of the passage (193-6) will make it clear that she is an excessive type and so the lover should not worry about his girl being quite so difficult to win over. Note the satisfying sense of *uiri* and *puellae* at consecutive line-endings, with Janka *ad loc.*

Milanion's tears strengthen the impression of elegiac lover: tears are part of the arsenal of a manipulative lover; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.12.1 *flete meos casus*, *Ars.* 2.201 (below).

**189-92** These lines relate the activities which Milanion might be likely to complain about: carrying nets, fighting boar, and enduring wounds from the Centaurs who attempted to rape Atalanta.

**saepe tulit iusso fallacia retia collo** ‘often he bore deceitful nets on his commanded shoulder’: this engages with Priapus’ advice at Tib. 1.4.50 (*dum placeas, umeri retia ferre negent*). By importing this detail from Tibullus, Ovid is able to give Milanion an active role, contrasting with Propertius’ emphasis on the passivity of Milanion. However, Priapus’ advice was relevant for a Roman man courting a boy, who might be more likely to go hunting, but not for a Roman man courting a fashionable girl (*culta ... amica*, 175): this discrepancy is emphasised and rectified at 194 (below). Note that the lover also carries his male beloved’s nets at Verg. *Ecl.* 3.75, Ov. *Met.* 10.171.

The description of the nets as *fallacia* is surprising: it must mean that they both deceive the beasts whom they trick into falling into them (with Brandt *ad loc.*) but also help to deceive the girl (who is herself hunted, 2n). The lover’s show of *obsequium* is his means of trapping the girl: deceit is an important part of seduction; cf. e.g. 1.645 *fallite fallentes*.

Milanion is acting under compulsion, as emphasised by the description of his neck as *iussus*: this contrasts with Ovid’s milder orders for the lover (193-6n).

**saepe fera toruos cuspide fixit apros** Milanion here seems much more active than his Propertian counterpart. Compare Prop. 1.1.12 (quoted above): Ovid’s Milanion takes a less passive role in the hunt, while Propertius’ merely ‘goes to look at’ the beasts. This encapsulates a key difference between the *Ars* and earlier elegy: Ovid does not recommend real suffering for his lover. Yet the specific naming of boars (rather than, as at Prop. 1.1.12, *feras*) serves as a pointer to one of the main versions of the myth of Atalanta: the Calydonian boar hunt (see introductory note).

*toruus* is a common adjective for wild animals; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.63 *torua leaena*, *Georg.* 3.50-1 *toruae / ... bouis*, *Aen.* 6.571-2 *toruosque ... / ... angues*, Prop. 2.3.6 *toruus aper*, Ov. *Met.* 6.115 *toruo ... iuuenco*, 10.237.

**sensit et Hylaei contentum saucius arcum** ‘wounded he also felt the taut bow of Hylaeus’: the Centaurs Hylaeus and Rhaecus attempted to rape Atalanta; cf. Apollod. 3.106, Verg. *Aen.* 8.294. They are prevented by her (or by Hercules in Virgil’s rendition) and killed. Here, Ovid adds a detail that Milanion was himself injured during the encounter.

This line corresponds to Prop. 1.1.13-14, where once more the passivity of Milanion is emphasised by the double passive participles *percussus* and (as here) *saucius*. A notable difference, however, is that Hylaeus' *ramus* has been changed into an *arcus*, facilitating the pun of the following line (see below). Milanion's wound here also recalls the spectator at the games who is himself wounded by Cupid (1.169 *saucius ingemuit telumque uolatile sensit*): Ovid will reuse this metaphor in the following line.

**sed tamen hoc arcu notior alter erat** 'but yet another was better known than this bow': i.e. the bow of Cupid. In addition, since *arcus* was a sexual metaphor (Adams (1982) 21-2; cf. *Am.* 1.8.47-8, *Met.* 2.16), the line perhaps indicates how Milanion's own sexual impulses have greater control over him than any natural fears about facing such dangers as Hylaeus.

**193-6** The conclusion to the passage, with its preponderance of negatives, undercuts the power of the *exemplum*: the *praeceptor* does not really expect a show of devotion from the lover as Atalanta expected from Milanion. An important intertext for these lines is Verg. *Georg.* 3.40-1 *interea Dryadum siluas saltusque sequamur / intactos, tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa*. There, the 'not soft commands' refers to the composition of the *Georgics*. Ovid's rejection of this, through the negativization of the statement, both draws out Propertius' doubts as to the relevance of the Milanion *exemplum*, and challenges Virgil as didactic model, particularly in terms of his reliance on his patron Maecenas (see Baldo *ad loc.*).

**non te Maenalias armatum scandere siluas / nec iubeo collo retia ferre tuo** 'I do not order you, armed, to ascend Maenalian woods, nor to carry nets on your shoulder': the return to direct address of the lover and the repetition (here and at 195, below) of the first-person *iubeo* makes the *praeceptor*'s voice intrude to moderate the meaning of the *exemplum*.

Maenalus, an Arcadian mountain range, synecdoche for Arcadia, defines the girl, as *Nonacrina* did at 185. She is specifically described as Maenalian at Ap. Rhod. 1.769-70 Ἀταλάντη / Μαινάλῳ, Ov. *Her.* 4.99 (quoted at 185n).

The repeated words of 194, familiar from 189, present a rejection of the Tibullan advice on carrying nets as irrelevant for the modern and heterosexual lover (see above).

**pectora nec missis iubeo praebere sagittis** 'nor do I order you to offer your breast to sent arrows': the negatives continue as this line negates the act of 191, where Milanion braved Hylaeus' bow, but also, and more problematically, that of 192, where he

suffered from Cupid's bow. If Ovid's pupil is immune to Cupid's bow (i.e. genuine love), then it implies that the kind of emotion Ovid recommends in the *Ars* is entirely manufactured.

**artis erunt caetae mollia iussa meae** 'the commands of my cautious art will be soft': the final line of the passage forms the only positive statement of the last two couplets, and propounds Ovid's own style as *praeceptor*, in stark contrast both to Atalanta (189) and Virgil (see note above).

Heinsius' amendment of *caetae* to *cauto*, would mean that Ovid's precepts are gentle 'for the cautious man'. Either way, caution is a key attribute for both the lover and the *praeceptor* (see 83n and 167n). Ovid's moderate demands throughout the *Ars* recall the middle route advocated by Daedalus at 59-62 (with Myerowitz (1985) 163).

**197-216:** instruction on general obsequiousness: agree with her in everything, let her win when you play games

Ovid assured the lover at the end of the previous passage that his *iussa* would be *mollia*: this passage exemplifies the type of *mollia iussa* he will give. Although the commands certainly are more relevant for a contemporary man, and do not involve the same level of physical endurance, perhaps they can be seen as difficult in a different way: in light of the model of the *kolax* (see Introduction, pp37-8), the servile behaviour which Ovid recommends here may prove problematic for a free-born Roman citizen to enact.

Ovid begins the passage by stating that, paradoxically, the lover will win through yielding (*cedendo uictor abibis*, 197): the key is to do as *she* commands. This forges a link with the previous *exemplum*, where Milanion succeeded by doing what Atalanta ordered (*iusso ... collo*, 189) but also with the commands of the *praeceptor* (*iubeo*, 194 and 195). This language raises the theme of control: the lover should let his *puella* believe she is in control, when really he is (or is it the *praeceptor* who really holds all the cards?).

The rest of the passage details the various ways in which a contemporary lover can demonstrate *obsequium* to the modern-day girl. The Arcadian hunt is exchanged for modern, urban pursuits, which all betray marks of *luxuria*: conversation (199-202); game-playing (203-8); strolls (209-10); resting (211-14); and beautifying (215-16). On all these

occasions, the lover should allow the girl to get the upper hand: he must agree with her in everything; allow her to win at games; attend her on her walks and while she rests; and even help her during her beauty regime. The use of repetition and polyptoton in these lines reflects the kind of mirroring technique the lover should employ. The reference to *speculum* (216) completes the image: the lover is encouraged to hold a mirror up to the girl, while his own speech, expressions, and actions are carefully choreographed to present their own kind of mirror.

Another problem, on a stylistic level, is that this passage is highly instructional - unusually for *Ars 2*; see Sharrock (1994a) 263. There is an abundance of imperatives and imperatival phrasing throughout the passage: *cede*, 197; *fac modo ... agas*, 198; *arguito ... probato*, 199; *dicas ... neges*, 200; *arride ... flere memento*, 201; *tu male iactato, tu male iacta dato*, 204; *facito stent*, 206; *fac pereat*, 208; *ipse tene*, 209; *ipse fac*, 210; *nec dubita*, 211; *deme uel adde*, 212; *est calfacienda*, 214; *nec ... turpe puta*, 215. So many things for the lover to do give an impression of a distinct increase in effort required, belying Ovid's opening promise.

**197-8 cede repugnanti** 'yield to her who fights back': Ovid is playing with the paradox between resistance and submission. The *praeceptor* proves an inconsistent teacher, since elsewhere (notably 1.673-706) he does suggest that the lover use force. However, the postscript to that advice was not to become too annoying; cf. 1.715-19.

**cedendo uictor abibis** 'by yielding you will come away the victor': the paradox continues to be drawn out, here between victory and submission. The polyptoton of *cede ... cedendo* emphasises this paradox. The phraseology apes high style; cf. esp. Verg. *Aen.* 10.859 *uictor abibat* (of Mezentius).

**fac modo, quas partes illa iubebit, agas** 'only make sure that you perform those roles which she will order': the following lines will detail the sort of tasks Ovid means. Note that nowhere is it made explicit that the girl directly 'orders' her lover to perform these functions: the lover should simply perform them spontaneously. Once more, the use of *iubeo* echoes the 'commands' of Atalanta (189) and of the *praeceptor* (194-6). The sense of doing just what the girl asks of you foreshadows the presence of moderation at 324 *quae sinet ipsa*.

The language (*partes ago*) is theatrical (*ago* OLD s.v. 25), and presents the lover as an actor playing a role, engaging with the theme of illusion and misrepresentation

throughout the *Ars* (on which, see Introduction, pp37-8); cf. 1.278 *femina iam partes uicta rogantis aget*, 611 *est tibi agendus amans*, 2.294 *perde nihil, partes illa potentis aget* (see below), *Rem.* 524 *etiam partes conciliantis ago*; with Solodow (1977) 119. The theatricality of the line may pre-empt the engagement with Terence in the following lines (see below), with Baldo *ad loc.* Furthermore, Janka *ad loc.* notes how the imperative form of *facere* elsewhere signposts this kind of strategy of *simulatio*; cf. 206, 208, 296.

**199-202 arguet: arguito; quicquid probat illa, probato; / quod dicet, dicas; quod negat illa, neges** The advice in these lines is closely modelled on the figure of the parasite at Ter. *Eun.* 249-53, himself a stock character; see Sharrock (2009) 220. The parasite Gnatho's speech regarding flattery is an important parallel for Ovid's presentation of the lover as *kolax*; with Labate (1984) 206. There, Gnatho describes himself as a flatterer imitating the mood swings and opinions of his target; cf. esp. 251-2 *quicquid dicunt laudo: id rursum si negant, laudo id quoque. / negat quis? nego: ait? aio.* The echo of the scene from Terence emphasises the theatricality of this entire passage, exposing the *simulatio* at play. The same theme of flatterer is taken to an extreme at Juv. 3.103 *si dixeris 'aestuo', sudat.*

The mirroring effect is emphasised through the repeated polyptoton: each half line is balanced with the other, effectively juxtaposing opposites: condemnation/approval; agreement/disagreement; laughter/tears. Ovid is fond of this mirroring effect throughout the *Ars* as an effective tool of seduction; cf. 1.503 *cum surgit, surges; donec sedet illa, sedebis*, 2.300 *gausapa si sumpsit, gausapa sumpta proba*, 3.513 *spectantem specta; ridenti mollia ride.*

**riserit: arride** Laughter proves a useful tool in the *Ars*. In Book 3, Ovid advises his female addressee on how to laugh in an attractive way, while avoiding too vigorous laughter; cf. 3.280-90. The same polyptoton is used at *Met.* 3.459 *cum risi, adrides.*

**si flebit, flere memento** Like laughter, tears too are an important weapon in the lover's arsenal. They are used to convince the *puella* of his devotion (1.659-62, 2.325, see below), or to manipulate her as she weeps (2.459, *Rem.* 215). Girls too prove expert at using fake tears strategically; cf. 3.291-2, *Rem.* 639, 690. It may be significant that Milanion's tears (188) were apparently genuine: another indicator that the *exemplum* should be viewed by the lover as a negative one (though note the doubt cast even upon Milanion's tears by the presence of *ferunt*).

**imponat leges uultibus illa tuis** ‘let her impose laws on your expression’: a continuation of the concept of 197-8, that she should be (or at least believe herself to be) in control of the lover; with Baldo *ad loc.* At 311-14, the lover is warned against betraying real feelings during such moments of *simulatio*; cf. esp. 312 *nec uultu destrue dicta tuo*. The joke is that the girl (like Gnatho’s master) will interpret the lover’s actions as indicating his affection; however, the way Ovid expresses the imitation runs extremely close to mockery of her, especially here where he tells the lover to copy her facial expressions.

The juxtaposition of *illa tuis* at the line end emphasises the mirroring effect which pervades these lines. Although the plural form of *uultus* may hint at the duality of the lover’s expression (Henderson on *Rem.* 352), the form is far too common for this theory to be entirely convincing. However, the focus on the face continues the impression of acting a role (198n).

**203-8** These three couplets, all linked together through the anaphora of *seu ... seu ... siue* as the first word of each couplet, detail how the lover should behave during game-playing: he should always allow her to win (as the lover is advised to do at Tib. 1.4.51-2 during fencing). This continues the military metaphor of the relationship as a psychological battle between the lovers.

Ovid treats as a waste of time handbooks concerned with teaching how to play games at *Trist.* 2.471-84, and he there specifies the same games as here: dice-rolling, both *tesserae* and *tali*; and *ludus latruncularum*; see Volk (2002) 157. Here he utilises the same techniques as would be expected in such a handbook, but with the opposite aim: to deliberately lose rather than win. One imagines that this deliberate losing would go against everything a free-born Roman would be taught to consider appropriate. Ovid’s point is that a lover must endure certain degrees of shame in order to succeed; i.e. *cedendo uictor abibis* (197).

**203-4** **seu ludet numerosque manu iactabit eburnos** ‘whether she will play and throw the ivory numbers with her hand’: it is difficult to assimilate ancient games to modern ones (Ingleheart on *Trist.* 2.465-6) but it seems likely that this refers to a simple dice-throwing game called *tesserae*, in which bets were taken on the throw of a dice, rather like the modern game craps. *numeri* are metonymy for the dice themselves (as also at 3.355 *iactet numeros*, OLD s.v. 2e), which would have resembled a modern six-sided dice;

cf. *Trist.* 2.475-6 *tessera quos habeat numeros, distante uocato / mittere quo deceat, quo dare missa modo* with Ingleheart *ad loc.*

The verb *ludo*, with its sexual connotations of erotic games (as at 1.91, 2.389, 599-600, 3.62, *Rem.* 23-4), means that the subtext of the game of love remains. This raises the theme of game-playing as a part of seduction. Literal game-playing recurs in Book 3 as an important way of girls seducing men; cf. 3.357 (quoted on 207n), 367-8 *turpe est nescire puellam / ludere: ludendo saepe paratur amor.*

Gambling over dice is a mark of extravagance, emphasised by the description of the dice as *eburnus*; cf. Prop. 2.24.13 *et cupit interdum talos me poscere eburnos* (transposed by Goold to 2.23).

**tu male iactato, tu male iacta dato** ‘You should throw amiss and make bad moves to the throws’: the repetitiveness of this line is recalled in the repetitiveness of *Trist.* 2.476 (quoted above). This couplet, with its tricolon of *iacto*, is highly excessive, reflecting the excessiveness of the scene (see introductory note).

**205-6 seu iacies talos** The second game described is *tali*, similar to the dice-game *tesserae*, except knuckle-bones were used instead of dice, and the score was made based on which side of the bone it landed on. Four bones would be thrown, and the highest score (Venus) occurred when each landed on a different side; the lowest score (Dogs) was awarded when each landed on the same, lowest scored, side; cf. Prop. 4.8.45-6 *me quoque per talos Venerem quaerente secundam / semper damnosi subsiluire canes*, *Trist.* 2.473-82 with Ingleheart *ad loc.* There is an erotic context for gambling with knuckle-bones; cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.117-18 ἀμφ’ ἀστραγάλοισι δὲ τῶγε / χρυσείοις, ἃ τε κοῦροι ὀμήθεες, ἐψιόωντο (Ganymede and Eros).

**uictam ne poena sequatur** ‘so that punishment does not follow her in defeat’: this game, based primarily on chance, must be a difficult one to fix, even in the opponent’s favour. The girl as *uicta* echoes the lover as *uictor* (197), continuing the theme of power struggle. Elsewhere in the *Ars*, the term is used of post-coital surrender, so hints at the eventual sexual reward for the lover of such behaviour; cf. 691 *uictos ... ocellos*, 728 *pariter uicti femina uirque iacent.*

**damnosi facito stent tibi saepe canes** ‘make sure that the dogs often stand injurious to you’: the ‘dogs’ are injurious because it means a losing score (‘the lowest throw at dice’ OLD s.v. 4), but also financially ruinous because it leads to loss; cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.21, Juv. 14.4, Mart. 14.19.1. However, it is ironic here considering that, for the

lover, loss will lead to victory. The presence of *saepe* hints at the difficulty of deliberately losing at a game which is predominantly based on chance; in contrast, to lose at a more strategic game (207-8) should be somewhat easier.

**207-8** **siue latrocinii sub imagine calculus ibit** ‘or if the playing-piece goes beneath the image of robbery’: the game referred to here, described in an extremely convoluted way, is the *ludus latroncolorum*; cf. 3.357-8 *cautaque non stulte latronum proelia ludat, / unus cum gemino calculus hoste perit*. Although often compared to chess, it was not exactly the same; cf. *Trist.* 2.477-80 with Ingleheart *ad loc.* As the military language suggests, it seems to have been a game resembling a battle, in which the aim was to trap the opponent’s piece between two of your own (at least, this seems to be the implication of the scene in Book 3, where the game is described in a little more depth).

**fac pereat uitreo miles ab hoste tuus** ‘make sure your soldier is destroyed by the glass enemy’: the military language presents the battle of wits between the two contestants in light of the elegiac *topos* of *militia amoris* (foreshadowing the significance of the theme at 233-8); cf. 3.358 (quoted above), 359 *bellatorque ... bellat*. The lover is assimilated to his playing-piece, the *miles*, and the *puella* is his *hostis*; yet the lover’s real aim is to be defeated. At *Trist.* 2.477, the counter used for this game is described as a *discolor ... miles*, perhaps referring to the shimmering appearance of the glass piece.

**209-10** The action now moves outdoors, as the lover’s tasks become more public: he grapples with a parasol to shade the *puella*; and makes way for her in a crowd. These are tasks which would normally be performed by a slave, and so represent the slippage between the roles of lover, *kolax*, and slave; see Introduction, pp37-8. The emphatic repetition of *ipse* followed by an imperative as the opening words of each line of this couplet emphasises the need for personal attentions in these actions: the lover must perform these tasks *himself*.

An important intertext for this and the following couplets is Tib. 1.5.63-6 (quoted in introductory note to 145-176), where the *pauper amator*, who must endure much which the *diues amator* does not have to submit to, should make way for his *puella* in a crowd, and attend to her comfort. The poor man must be especially eager to please, so that his services are provided in lieu of a gift.

**ipse tene distenta suis umbracula uirgis** ‘You yourself hold the parasol distended by its spokes’: the possession of a parasol is another mark of luxury, see

introductory note. At *Fast.* 2.311-12, Hercules holds up a parasol for his *puella*, Omphale: this intertext of the hyper-masculine mythological hero demeaning himself for the sake of his beloved foreshadows the Hercules *exemplum* of 217-22.

**ipse fac in turba, qua uenit illa, locum** ‘you yourself make room in the crowd, wherever she comes’: this marks a progression from Book 1, where the lover made use of the crowd to get close to the *puella*; cf. 1.604-5 *ipsa tibi accessus turba locumque dabit. / insere te turbae*). Now, the lover is acting as her attendant, signifying a greater level of intimacy. The addition of the phrase *qua uenit illa* continues the impression of the *puella* dictating the situation: the lover must grant her apparent independence of action.

**211-12** The action now returns to the indoor environment, as the lover should perform more tasks which would normally be performed by a slave, all of which are designed for her comfort: fetching a footstool, taking care of her feet. These commands may be *mollia*, but they are also *turpia* (215), no matter if Ovid attempts to conceal this. The subjugation is emphasised through the acts, which physically place the lover prostrate at the girl’s feet (an elegiac ideal; see Introduction, pp37-8).

**nec dubita tereti scannum producere lecto** ‘nor hesitate to draw out a stool to the smooth couch’: the couplet opens by urging the lover not to hesitate, implying that the advice to follow would be something he would naturally be hesitant about, as also at 1.584 *nec dubites*, with Hollis *ad loc.* Similar wording is used when challenging the lover to hesitate about behaving like Hercules (222).

At 1.162, the lover was advised to be ready with a handy stool, since *parua leues capiunt animos* (1.159): i.e. girls are easily impressed by small services. This corroborates the concept of this advice being *mollia*. Yet does this intratext also imply that the lover is taking a step backwards, to the very start of his lesson?

The *teres lectus* here probably refers to a dining couch. As above, this signifies progression from Book 1, where the lover was merely another guest at the feast (cf. 1.565-78); now he is an attendant. The jingle between *tereti* and *tenero* in the following line hints at the eroticism of the adjective, which is specially used to define the feminine; cf. 1.622 *teretes digitos*, Stat. *Ach.* 1.849 *teretes thrysos*.

**et tenero soleam deme uel adde pedi** ‘and remove the sandal from or add it to the soft foot’: the action continues to be situated at a feast, since shoes would be removed prior to a meal, and donned again afterwards; cf. Plaut. *Truc.* 367 *deme soleas*, Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.77 *soleas poscit*. Yet the presence of perambulations at 209-10 suggests that this action

may occur before or after a walk. The description of the girl's foot as *tener* once more hints at the reward of such slavishness: the lover is permitted to touch her.

**213-4** The physical contact which was implicit at 212 is now emphasised: the lover is advised to warm the *puella*'s hands, denoting increased closeness. Although Ovid implies that this act is unpleasant through the phrase *quamuis horrebis et ipse*, the closeness is imbued with sensuality. At 1.496, the lover was searching for excuses to touch her: so how far has the lover really come in terms of his physical relationship with the girl if he still needs to find such excuses.

**saepe etiam dominae, quamuis horrebis et ipse, / argenti manus est calfacienda sinu** 'often the hand of your mistress must even be warmed by your chilly lap, although you yourself also shiver': the lover should warm her hands in his lap (although *sinus* could also refer to the curve of his garment around his chest). *sinus* has strong erotic colouring in the context of elegy, and is especially frequent in the *Ars*; cf. Catull. 37.11 *meo sinu*, Prop. 1.5.30, 1.8.38, Tib. 1.1.46 *tenero ... sinu*, 1.2.96, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.5, 2.12.2 *in nostro est ecce Corinna sinu*, 3.2.76, *Ars.* 1.128 *cupido ... sinu*, 561, 2.360 *tepidus ... sinu* (of Paris), 548, 3.34, 698, 743-4. Similarly, the verb *calfacio* means both 'to warm' (OLD s.v. 1) and 'to rouse' or 'excite' (OLD s.v. 4b).

This act of warming means the lover's own hand would remain loose and susceptible to cold. However, another meaning of *horreo* as shuddering with disgust (cf. TLL 6.3.2979.33) foreshadows the parenthesis of the following couplet: a free-born Roman may feel such behaviour is beneath him.

The description of the girl as *domina* exposes the power struggle at work in this entire passage; see 111n. Furthermore, by marking her as 'mistress', Ovid is able to situate this scene within her own household, emphasising how intimate the lover has become with her *and* her house (as also with her slaves, at 251-60).

Note the repetition of *quamuis* in the same position in consecutive couplets: these are shameful acts for a free-born man to perform, so excuses are required to explain why such behaviour is necessary in a lover. These excuses are intended to be humorously bathetic, especially in contrast to the physical endurance of Milanion.

**215-16** This final couplet shows the lover even more deeply embedded within the house of the girl, as he holds up a mirror for her. Although Ovid suggests that this is a demeaning task, it is clearly an effective one, guaranteeing intimacy - the reward for all his demeaning

behaviour. However, this couplet should be read in the light of 3.209-10 *non tamen expositas mensa deprendat amator / pyxidas: ars faciem dissimulata iuuat*. It should not be thought that the girl would allow her lover to witness her make-up regime. Instead, she may use this opportunity to allow her lover to see her attractively combing her hair; cf. 3.235-6 *at non pectendos coram praebere capillos, / ut iaceant fusi per tua terga, ueto*. Therefore, while the lover manipulates the girl, she too manipulates him: as the Calypso episode had warned us.

**nec tibi turpe puta (quamuis sit turpe, placebit) / ingenua speculum sustinuisse manu** ‘nor think it foul (although it be foul, it will please) to hold up a mirror in your freeborn hand’: mirrors are exclusively used by women in the *Ars*; cf. 1.305, 307, 3.136, 507, 681. It would have been a female slave’s task to hold up a mirror for her mistress in this way; cf. Prop. 4.7.76 *ne speculum dominae porrigat illa nouae*.

The perfect infinitive after *turpe* should be translated as a present infinitive, as at 1.733-4 *nec turpe putaris / ... imposuisse*. The repetition of *turpe* within the same line undermines the force of the parenthesis.

The description of the lover’s hand as *ingenua* (recalling 121) defines the lover as a freeborn Roman male, in contrast to the slavish acts he is advised to perform. Ovid is deliberately attempting to soften the impact of the recommendation of such demeaning tasks by flattering his reader.

The use of the verb *placeo* recalls the aim of Book 2: to keep hold of a girl, through pleasing her.

**217-232:** Hercules: enduring shame to seduce a woman: play the part of a slave to win her over

Ovid uses the hero Hercules to exemplify the previous lines (209-16) where the lover is advised to lower himself to perform shameful acts for his mistress. The hyper-masculine figure Hercules is best known for his heroic acts: these include killing the snakes which his stepmother, Juno, sent against him in his crib (217); and taking on Atlas’ role by supporting the world on his shoulders (218). However, another story emphasises a more shameful task he performed: as punishment for killing Iphitos (or, in alternate versions, for stealing Apollo’s tripod from Delphi), he was commanded by the Delphic oracle to play the part of a slave for the Ionian queen Omphale (219-20).

The myth of Hercules is framed by two scenes very much set in Rome - a fashionable lady at her toilette (215-16) and the social demands of the forum (223-4) - so the detour to the world of myth is rather surprising. 223-232 demonstrate how the lover may emulate the hero in everyday life: rather than literally becoming a female slave, there are a number of things he can do that do not go quite so far. This list builds up to the *militia amoris* passage, which includes the *exemplum* of Apollo to demonstrate the benefits of *labores* (Weber (1983) 80). However, the specific acts recommended make the lover a little more like an eager *cliens* to a demanding *patronus* than a slave to a mistress. The girl receiving visitors and being attended at the forum puts her in the position of electioneer, as at *Comm. Pet.* 34-6 (see Introduction, pp39-40). Once more, categories seem to be sliding into one another.

The polyptoton of *iubeo* forms a link between Atalanta (189), Omphale (221), and the *puella* (223). Atalanta's commands are harsh and involve physical endurance; Omphale's commands involve complete emasculation; the *puella*'s commands involve playing the role of *cliens*. This is how a Roman male can put the models of Milanion and Hercules into practice. The reference to the forum (223) places the scene firmly back in Rome, as with the *domus*-situated activities of 203-16; now, however, it is the external life that is the focus, as the lover travels to and fro, generally dancing attendance wherever the *puella* goes (forum, a feast, a trip to the country). As with the previous passage, Ovid demonstrates how easy it is for *kolakeia* to tip over into slavery, and vice versa; cf. esp. 227-8n, where the lover acts *pro seruo*.

#### Ancient Treatment of the Myth

Some versions of the myth present the hero actually dressing up as a woman in order to perform the role of female slave to Omphale: from the fragments of Ion's *Omphale* (esp. fr. 21 N.) it is clear that part of the play concerned Hercules being dressed up as a woman; it was also the subject of vase-paintings (see Loraux (1990) 35). Other versions repress this cross-dressing element, although they emphasise the shameful nature of Hercules' *seruitium*; cf. Soph. *Trach.* 248-53, Diod. Sic. *Bib.* 4.31.5-8, Apollod. 2.6.3, Hyg. *Fab.* 32.

Propertius uses the episode twice in his poetry, both times emphasising the costuming of Hercules as a girl; cf. 3.11.17-20, 4.9.47-50. Like Ovid's treatment here, Propertius too focuses on the scene of Hercules spinning wool, drawing out the humorous contrast between Hercules' rough hands and the soft wool (soft both literally, and because it is a task more appropriate for a *mollis* girl). However, it is in Ovid that the cross-dressing aspect of the myth finds its most thorough treatment.

Ovid frequently presents the gods and heroes of the *Metamorphoses* cross-dressing; cf. *Met.* 2.425 *induitur faciem cultumque Dianae* (Jupiter disguises himself as Diana in order to rape Callisto), 4.218-24 (Sol disguises himself as the mother of Leucothoe), 14.676-77 (Vertumnus disguises himself as an *anus* in order to seduce Pomona). In each of these cases, the male disguises himself as a female in order to rape or seduce a vulnerable girl. However, Ovid presents the cross-dressing Hercules somewhat differently in his poetry: while his servitude allows Hercules to demonstrate his devotion to Omphale, she is complicit in the arrangement. At *Heroides* 9, Deianira reproaches the absent Hercules for debasing himself among the Ionians; cf. *Her.* 9.73-4 *inter Ioniacas calathum tenuisse puellas / diceris et dominae pertimuisse minas*. It is Omphale, as *domina*, who rules Hercules with her *minae*.

In the later treatment of the myth at *Fast.* 2.303-58, Ovid revels in the comic potential of Hercules dressed as a woman. There, the hero accompanies Omphale (holding an *umbraculum* for her at *Fast.* 2.311-12, see 209n, above) and the two end up swapping clothes. They fall asleep, and Faunus enters: he passes by Omphale, drawing back in fear at the feel of the shaggy lion-skin; yet he pounces upon Hercules, lured in by the feel of the soft garment he wears. The hero leaps up, and pushes off his would-be attacker. The story is amusing, yet performs an important role in terms of the treatment of the myth: Hercules' virility is, if anything, reinforced by the donning of feminine clothes (and the violent emergence of the masculine from within them); see Cyrino (1998) 213-226.

Although Hercules emerges from the story of his servitude to Omphale with his heroic status intact (after all, he goes on to father a child by Omphale, and ultimately becomes a god), it may be argued that the treatment of the figure in Propertius and Ovid, and the delight that both poets take in representing this side of the story, can be read as subversive. For Ovid to emphasise the ridiculous aspects of the hero potentially undermines this key

figure in Augustan propaganda (see Cyrino (1998) 220). On the subversive shadow of Aeneas in this *exemplum*, see Introduction, pp34-7.

**217-18** The opening couplet presents Hercules as hyper-masculine hero, to contrast with the descriptions of him as slave (219-20). The depiction of him as hero here is mirrored in the heroic epithet at 222 (see below); while the descriptions of Hercules as lover at 219-20 are mirrored in the impression of *seruitium amoris* given at 221 (see Weber (1983) 84 on the structural chiasmus at work in these lines). This *exemplum* both looks back at the Hylas *exemplum* of 110, and forward to the Apollo and Leander *exempla* of 239-42 and 249-50 respectively (see Weber (1983) 79-88 on the significance of the triple *exempla* Hercules, Apollo, and Leander in close proximity).

**ille** Hercules is not named until 221, and then through an epithet (see below). However, the opening couplet provides the reader with clues as to the identity of *ille*: this man was persecuted by a stepmother and raised the sky. The identification of the hero through the persecutions of Juno is notable due to the possible etymology of the name *Hera-kles* (Hera-glory); with Loraux (1990) 43.

**fatigata praebendo monstra nouerca** ‘with his stepmother wearied by offering monsters’: i.e. Juno keeps on providing monsters for Hercules to fight. The *monstra* probably refer to any number of creatures which Juno sent to kill Hercules: the snakes in his cradle (cf. Theocr. 24.12-13); and the Hydra (cf. Apollod. 2.5.2). However, the echo of Virgil’s treatment of the myth of the snakes attacking the baby Hercules implies strongly that it is this story which Ovid is thinking of here; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.288-9 *ut prima nouercae / monstra manu geminosque premens eliserit anguis*. Furthermore, Ovid refers to this story at 1.187-8 *paruus erat manibusque duos Tiryntius angues / pressit et in cunis iam Ioue dignus erat*. There, the story is used to exemplify the strength of the young Gaius, and so utilises the myth in the ‘correct’, pro-Augustan way (with Dimundo *ad loc.*).

The ablative *fatigata ... nouerca* is a conjecture of Madvig, while the codices read *fatigatae ... nouercae*, which would make the line mean ‘with him holding out against the monsters of his wearied stepmother’. However, this stretches the meaning of *praebeo*: the reasonable alternatives offered by different manuscripts include *uincendo* (A $\omega$ ) and *premando* (W).

The description of Juno as *fatigata* is ironic, since it is she who is wearying herself: the passivity of Juno contrasts with her active role in the *Aeneid*; cf. esp. Verg. *Aen.* 1.279-

80 *aspera Juno, / quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat*. For *fatigo* followed by the gerund, cf. TLL 6.1.346.51ff.

**qui meruit caelum quod prior ipse tulit** ‘who earned the sky which he himself previously supported’: this line refers to two important moments in the life of Hercules: his apotheosis (cf. Apollod. 2.160, Ov. *Met.* 9.262-72, TLL 8.804.6ff) and his act of holding up the world on his shoulders (cf. Apollod. 2.120, Ov. *Her.* 9.19, *Met.* 9.198). The reference to becoming a god undercuts the hint of 219-20 that his servitude was *turpe*: chronologically, he achieved divinity *after* subjugating himself for a woman. Ovid employs a similar pun in his retelling of Hercules’ killing of Cacus at *Fast.* 1.565 *nititur hic umeris (caelum quoque sederat illis)*.

**219-20** The second couplet bathetically undercuts the traditional heroic acts by focusing upon the story of Hercules among the Ionians. By embarking directly, without giving any context as to how he has ended up in this situation, Ovid presents Hercules as an elegiac lover, enslaved to his mistress.

**inter Ioniadas calathum tenuisse puellas / creditur** ‘he is believed to have held a basket among Ionian girls’: the use of a Greek loan word (κάλαθος) emphasises the sense of exoticism and femininity which is out of place for this rough character (*rudes*, below). The *calathus* is specifically a female item, used for gathering fruit or flowers (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.46, Ov. *Fast.* 4.435), as well as for holding wool (cf. *Il.* 6.491, *Od.* 1.357, 21.351, Verg. *Aen.* 7.805, Ov. *Met.* 12.475). It is frequently used in erotic contexts (as at 264, where one contains the rural gifts for the *puella*, see below), and is used to upbraid Achilles for his cross-dressing at 1.693 *quid tibi cum calathis?* There too, Ovid uses the story of a great warrior dressed as a woman.

The construction *calathum tenuisse* recalls *speculum sustinuisse* from 216 (noted by Weber (1983) 82). This serves to draw the *exemplum* and the lover’s situation closely together. In addition, Janka notes how Hercules ‘holding’ baskets here recalls him ‘holding’ the sky in the previous line. This language of ‘holding’ also recalls the aim of Book 2 (as set out at 12): to ‘hold’ the girl.

The Alexandrian footnote denoted by *creditur* forces the reader, as with the Milanion myth at 188 *ferunt*, to consider Ovid’s sources for this myth (on which, see introductory note).

**et lanas excoluisse rudes** ‘and to have spun out the rough wool’: although *rudes* refers to the wool, the reader must inevitably consider the roughness of the hands which

are plying it, especially considering Propertius' treatment at Prop. 3.11.20, signposted by Ovid's use of the Alexandrian footnote *creditur* (above). Myerowitz (1985) 199 n. 2 remarks on the civilizing effect of the uncommon verb *excolo*: although referring to the cultivation of wool, it is amusing that such a *rudis* figure as Hercules should be depicted in the act of refinement.

**221-22 paruit imperio dominae Tirynthius heros** The emphasis on commands (note the emphatic juxtaposition of *paruit imperio* at the start of the line) connects this scene with both Atalanta and the *puella* of 223-32; see introductory note.

The heroic epithet *Tirynthius* is juxtaposed with the description of Omphale as *domina*, to emphasise the hero's enslavement. The same epithet is used in the *Fasti* version of Hercules cross-dressing, as he knocks Faunus down (*Fast.* 2.349), and serves the same function as here: to remind the reader of the true hero lying beneath the disguise (see Raval (2002) 152).

**i nunc et dubita ferre quod ille tulit** 'go now and hesitate to bear what he bore': the aim of the *exemplum* is to demonstrate that if such behaviour is appropriate for the hyper-masculine Hercules, then it cannot be shameful for the lover to emulate. However, the *praeceptor* has so far failed to prove himself as entirely trustworthy, so this advice may also be misleading.

The argument is repeated at the similar Apollo *exemplum*, which is closely connected with this *exemplum*; cf. 241 *quod Phoebum decuit, quem non decet?* However, rather than raising the lover to the status of Hercules, the hero is himself demoted to the status of elegiac lover: Ovid fails to give the causes for Hercules' servitude to Omphale, which might have gone some way towards excusing his behaviour.

McKeown on *Am.* 1.7.35 notes the sarcastic tone of the phrase *i nunc*, one particularly common in Ovid; cf. e.g. *Her.* 9.105 (Deianira), *Ars.* 2.635. It challenges the reader in an aggressive way.

*dubita* is repeated from 211, drawing the *exemplum* and its context together. The double imperative in this line pre-empts the resumption of the didactic tone in the rest of the passage.

The repetition of *tulit* in the same emphatic end-line position from 218, the first referring to holding the sky, the second to enduring servitude, is humorous: although the lover may not even hope to imitate Hercules in all things, in this one labour he certainly can, and should; Weber (1983) 83.

**223-24** The Hercules *exemplum* is now embedded back into the main narrative through a resumption of the type of behaviour the lover should submit to in order to please the girl: he should attend her at the forum. This places the action firmly back in Rome, specifically in the public arena. Note that he does not accompany her there (as at 209-10) but rather should make sure that he is present there at any point when she might arrive. This means arriving early and staying until late. This is a slightly odd concept: the lover is playing the role of *kolax* who does not quite belong to the domestic unit, but is hoping to inveigle his way in; see Introduction, pp37-8. As well as taking place indoors (203-16), the gallant behaviour of the lover should also be integrated into the everyday life of the Roman citizen (see Labate (1984) 208-9).

The abundance of words of coming and going (*adesse, uenias, abi*) give an impression of (apparently) purposeless action.

**iussus adesse foro** ‘ordered to be present at the forum’: the lover has been transformed into a *cliens amoris*. In Book 1, the forum was a good place for lovers to meet (cf. 1.79-80), yet here Ovid depicts the relationship between a client and patron rather than that between lovers: attending one’s patron at the forum was an important function for a *cliens*; cf. TLL 2.919.15ff.

**iussa maturius hora / fac semper uenias** ‘always make sure that you come earlier than the appointed hour’: the eager lover should always arrive early; cf. Tib. 1.5.61-2 (quoted in introductory note to 145-176: also, as here, engaging with the concept of the *salutatio*, with Murgatroyd *ad loc.*).

The polyptoton of *iubeo* recalls the many words of command in the Atalanta story (see introductory note).

**nec nisi serus abi** ‘nor go away otherwise than when (it is) late’: not only does the girl make her lover wait for her to appear, sometimes she fails to appear entirely, thus deliberately wasting his time. This conflicts with the advice of *Comm. Pet.* 36, where the canvasser is advised *quod eius fieri poterit, certis temporibus descendito*: the girl makes a more demanding *patronus* than the lover (see introductory note to 251-60).

**225-26** The second piece of advice is to make sure the lover meets the girl wherever and whenever she demands his presence. This broadens the focus of the previous couplet, from the forum to *anywhere*. The circle will be further extended at 229-32, when she summons him to the country.

**occurras aliquo tibi dixerit** ‘she will have said to you that you should run to meet her somewhere’: the girl’s words form a command, recalling 223. The forum has been exchanged for *aliquo*: one benefit may be that she is more likely to turn up, yet the lover may have to go a long way out of his path to meet her.

**omnia differ** In addition to having to travel out of his way, the lover may have other duties to take care of: these should all come second to the *puella*.

**curre** The repetition of words of running in emphatic position at the start of both lines of this couplet makes clear the haste expected of the lover. The presentation of the lover running around to attend to his mistress recalls the *cliens* of Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.30-1; see Labate (1984) 219. Yet it also recalls the *seruus currens* of Comedy: another example of the slippage between the roles of *cliens*, *kolax*, and *seruus*; see Introduction, pp37-40.

**nec inceptum turba moretur iter** ‘nor let the crowd delay the begun journey’: earlier, the crowd provided a useful excuse to get close to the girl (210); now it is a hindrance.

**227-28** The scene now changes to attending the *puella* home after a feast. This echoes the scene of 211-12 within the house after a feast: now, the lover should make his servile position more public by acting the role of slave (*pro seruo*) on the streets. The streets of Rome were notoriously dangerous (see McKeown on *Am.* 1.6.9-14) and so masters were escorted home by slaves; cf. Prop. 1.3.10, 2.29.2. The lover now performs this risky duty for the *puella*.

**nocte** The darkness of night-time provides a good opportunity for the lover; cf. 619-20. Janka notes the contrast between the lateness here and the early hour of *maturius* (223).

**domum repetens** This situates the scene on the streets as the girl returns home. At 1.245, the lover was warned about the dangers of judgement impaired by night and drinking: perhaps here, inversely, the lover is in a position to take advantage of *her* impaired judgement.

**epulis perfuncta redibit** ‘she will return finished with the feast’: the feast provided a rich opportunity for the lover at 1.603-7, as also at *Am.* 1.4.55-8. Perhaps the journey home will provide as much opportunity.

**tum quoque pro seruo, si uocat illa, ueni** ‘then also come as slave, if she calls you’: the lover should only attend when she has specifically asked for him: this foreshadows the danger of becoming tedious to her; cf. 531-2 ‘*effugere hunc non est*’

*quare tibi possit amica / dicere?* Yet when he does attend her, he should do so *pro seruo*: this makes clear the lack of balance in the relationship, completing the connection with the Hercules *exemplum* (see introductory note). The lover has been promised that he will not be debasing himself too much; but now he is directly compared to a slave! Once more, categories are colliding into one another: the lover is simultaneously slave, kolax, and *cliens*.

**229-32** The final advice for the lover is to attend the *puella* if she summons him from the countryside: this draws the net of her influence even wider. Significantly, it recalls Prop. 3.16, where the girl writes for Propertius to come to her at Tibur, with all haste. The lover's endurance of various hindrances (a broken down vehicle; bad weather; searing heat; or snow-drifts) recalls Hercules' endurance of labours (217-18).

**rure erit** Is she at her own country-estate, or that of a rival? For *rus* as 'country-estate', cf. OLD s.v. 2.

**dicet uenias** 'she says you should come': the girl continues to direct the lover's movements, as at 225 and 228.

**Amor odit inertes** The juxtaposition of love and hate is striking, recalling Catull. 85.1 *odi et amo. inertes* foreshadows the dismissal of lazy men from Love's army at 233 (below). The endurance of these lines leads up to the discourse on *militia amoris* in the following passage. Gibson on 3.60 remarks on the term *iners* as both 'idle' (OLD s.v. 2) and 'lacking in *ars*' (OLD s.v. 1), hence opposed not only to Love, but also to Ovid's scheme and the *Ars* itself.

**si rota defuerit, tu pede carpe uiam** 'if your wheel fails you, you should take the way by foot': here we have the opposite sentiment of Catull. 35.7 *uiam uorabit*, where the poet begs his friend Caecilius to come to him, despite the pleas of his mistress to remain. Furthermore, the emphatic *carpe uiam* forms a sound-echo of *carpe diem* (Hor. *Carm.* 1.11.8): the lover's endurance will result in a rich reward. The phrase is used in a military context at Verg. *Georg.* 3.347 *uiam cum carpit* and *Aen.* 6.629, and so foreshadows the following passage on *militia amoris*.

**nec graue te tempus sitiensque Canicula tardet** 'nor let the heavy weather and the scorching Dogstar delay you': the lover situated outdoors, enduring bad weather, recalls the motif of the *exclusus amator* (as also at 237-8, below). The *graue tempus* may refer to stormy weather, but the reference to the 'thirsty Dogstar' in the second half of the

line indicates that *graue* implies oppressive heat, as also at Hor. *Carm.* 3.23.8; cf. TLL 6.2.2296.9ff.

The Dogstar (Sirius), which rises in July, brings the ‘dog-days’, i.e. the hottest time of the year in the Mediterranean area; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.17, 3.13.9, *Sat.* 2.5.39. At Tib. 1.4.42, the time is specifically denoted as a poor one for travelling. The epithet *sitiens* refers to the thirst-inducing heat; yet the term could also refer to the lover’s insatiable love; cf. *Rem.* 230, 247, 406, 533, 632, OLD s.v. 1c.

The verb *tardo* echoes the use of *moror* (226), emphasising the need for haste rather than delay.

**nec uia per iactas candida facta niues** ‘nor the way made white by fallen snow’: the cold weather contrasts with the heat of the previous couplet. The whiteness of the path is not the hindrance, so much as the piles of snow which make progression a challenge. The description of snow as *iacta* occurs also at *Trist.* 3.10.3; cf. TLL 7.1.37.39ff.

### **233-250:** the lover is like a soldier: the *exempla* of Apollo and Leander

This passage follows on easily from 223-32, where the lover was advised to attend the girl everywhere she goes. 231-2 emphasises the hardships which the eager lover must endure: heat and snow. Such hardships are a good prelude to the elegiac motif of *militia amoris* (on which see Murgatroyd (1975) 59-79) and, when this passage opens with the phrase *militiae species amor est*, Ovid is tapping into this motif, although subtly inverting it. In previous elegy, the life of a soldier was contrasted with that of a lover (cf. e.g. Tib. 1.1.53-6, 2.6.1-5); in Ovid, the two lifestyles are equated, so that the lover actually *is* a soldier; cf. *Am.* 1.9 (esp. 1.9.1 *militat omnis amans*), with McKeown *ad loc.* At 233-8, Ovid presents the lover with various scenarios in which he can resemble a soldier: both endure harsh elements, physical pain, and *labor* (235-6); and rain and cold as they are forced to sleep on the ground. This last additionally refers to the elegiac motif of the *paraclausithyron*, in which the *exclusus amator* bewails his situation before his girlfriend’s closed door.

The mythological *exemplum* which Ovid chooses to represent his argument (239-42) is deeply problematic. Apollo is presented as a figure who endured *labor* (pasturing cattle and sleeping in a tiny house) for his love of Admetus. This must be an engagement with Tibullus 2.3, not least because it is a rare instance of the use of a mythological *exemplum*

in that poet. Yet the Apollo myth is surely an example of *seruitium amoris*, much closer in sense to the Hercules *exemplum* of 217-22, than to *militia amoris*. Apollo is no soldier, even of Love, and his endurance is very different from the physical kind mentioned at 235-8.

Tibullus proves an extremely important intertext for this entire passage: certain Tibullan motifs appear (e.g. the *signa* of Love, the *longa uia*) and these allusions climax in the *exemplum* of Apollo. For Tibullus, Apollo is an example of the rewards of the rustic life: perhaps Ovid's use of the myth is designed to recall the Tibullan intertext, where the physical demands of farming are emphasised:

*nec quererer quod sol graciles exureret artus,  
laederet et teneras pussula rupta manus.  
pauit et Admeti tauros formosus Apollo,  
...  
nempe Amor in parua te iubet esse casa.*

(Tibullus 2.3.9-11, 32)

Ovid uses very similar language: the same verb (*pauesco*); the same position of the genitive form of Admetus with the accusative form of his cattle (*Admeti uaccas*, 239); and the reference to the *parua casa* (240). However, Tibullus goes on to present his 'farming Apollo' in an idyllic way, as the god weaves baskets (2.3.15-16), carries calves (17-18), and sings to his cattle (19-20): hardly the hard way of life emphasised at the start of the poem. Apollo's change of lifestyle leaves him open to the accusation that he has abandoned his former duties. Perhaps Ovid's inappropriate use of the myth is designed to provoke a reassessment of Tibullus' treatment, which similarly failed to present the story as a demonstration of physical endurance, rather than a shameful *seruitium*.

Ovid goes on to recommend that the *exclusus amator* brave dangers in order to gain access to his *puella*'s bedroom (243-6): these include scaling walls to find entry via a window. This seems a very risky strategy on the part of the lover, and does not correspond with Ovid's promise of *mollia iussa* (196). Furthermore, there is more than a whiff of adultery here. The clandestine approach suggests an illegitimate relationship, possibly with a married woman (or at least, with someone who 'belongs' to another). This is all very

titillating for the lover (compare, for example, the advice to women to induce fear by admitting their lover by the window and then inventing the husband's return at 3.605-8).

Yet the strategy, he claims, is an effective one: for it will demonstrate the lover's sincere devotion (247-8). There follows yet another troubling *exemplum* (249-50): that of Leander, who swam the Hellespont to reach Hero. The *exemplum* is problematic in two ways: first, Leander dies in the process of swimming the Hellespont, so is hardly a comforting model for the lover; second, his lack of passion strongly undermines the rationale behind the risk. However, if Leander truly lacks passion, then he may make a good model for the lover, who is meant to be successful at getting sex *without* being in love.

The myth of Leander and Hero is told from the lovers' perspective at *Her.* 18 and 19, where the double letter format means that Leander's letter receives its reply. In Ovid's hands, the tragic story is transformed into a dialogue on seduction and impatience: Leander refuses to wait for a storm to end to swim across, and so he dies in the attempt. However, in *Her.* 19, Hero appears even more impatient; cf. esp. 19.5-6 *urimur igne pari, sed sum tibi uiribus impar: / fortius ingenium suspicor esse uiris*. She clearly doubts his devotion (cf. 19.24 *posse quidem, sed te nolle uenire, queror*) and upbraids him as *lente morator* (19.70). She interprets his failure to appear as evidence that his feelings for her have changed: is it this accusation that finally persuades him to venture across despite the weather? The use of the *exemplum* in the *Ars* would suggest so: Leander ventures across in order to prove himself and dispel her paranoid fears.

**233-4 militiae species amor est** 'love is a kind of warfare': the passage opens with a phrase reminiscent of the opening of *Am* 1.9 (quoted above), and so positions what follows closely in the sphere of *militia amoris*. Yet it is only the following three couplets that can genuinely be described as *militia*: this is in keeping with Ovid's tendency in the *Ars* to use elegiac themes in a far more dense and compact way than he does in the *Amores*, where an entire poem is devoted to the theme.

For *species* meaning 'kind' or 'subdivision', cf. OLD s.v. 10.

**discedite, segnes** 'Withdraw, idle men': this recalls 229 (*Amor odit inertes*). At *Am.* 1.9.41, the poet admits *ipse ego segnis eram*; however, love for his *puella* drove him to action (1.9.43). The lover must be hard-working in his approach. This contrasts with

Tibullus' rejection of warfare and contentment with being called idle as long as he is with Delia; cf. Tib. 1.1.58 *segnis inersque uocer*.

**non sunt haec timidis signa tuenda uiris** 'these are not standards to be guarded by timid men': Ovid commonly refers to the 'standards' of Love as part of the language of *militia amoris*; cf. *Am.* 1.11.12 *in me militiae signa tuere tuae*, 2.3.10 (*signa ferenda*), 2.9.3 *tua signa*, 2.12.27-8 *Cupido / iussit militiae signa mouere suae*, 3.15.16 *aurea de campo uellite signa meo*, *Rem.* 4. In this, he follows the model of Tibullus, who was the first to assign Cupid his own standards (Murgatroyd on *Tib.* 2.6.6). Tibullus is significant throughout these lines, preparing the reader for the strong parallel at 239-40 (see below).

A textual variant (A $\omega$ ) reads *ferendo*, as at *Am.* 2.3.10 (quoted above). However, there is no similar dispute about 3.528 *illi signa tuenda dedit*, and Ovid uses the phrase at *Am.* 1.11.12 (quoted above), again with no dispute.

This comment on the inappropriateness of timidity in the realm of love seems to contradict the importance of fear elsewhere; see 75n, where Icarus' lack of fear leads to disaster. Furthermore, Ovid has already identified with the *pauper amator*, who is characterised by his fear of causing offence at 167. However, a distinction should be drawn between 'timidity', which may result in the lover holding back from the daring acts Ovid goes on to describe in these lines, and 'caution', which is consistently a good thing throughout the *Ars*.

With *uir*, Ovid hints at the ambiguity of the term as meaning 'man' (OLD s.v. 1), 'lover' (OLD s.v. 2), and 'soldier' (OLD s.v. 5).

**235-6** This couplet begins the list of attributes which both the lover and the soldier have in common. Note the tricolon of 'and' words in the hexameter, building up a sense of an overwhelming number of tasks which must be endured.

**nox et hiems** The lover is described as wakeful at 1.735-6 *attenuant iuuenum uigilatae corpora noctes / curaque et in magno qui fit amore dolor*. However, considering the hint at the *paraclausithyron* in the following couplet (see below), night-time is specifically the time for the *puella*'s doors to be besieged by her lover's entreaties.

**longaeque uiae** This phrase continues the Tibullan engagement, which culminates in the Apollo/Admetus *exemplum* (see introductory note). At *Am.* 2.16.15-20, the poet complains about being so far from his *puella*, and claims that any journey would be made easier with his girl by his side (note particularly the repetition of the phrase *longa uia* to refer to the journey at 2.16.16 and 18). Perhaps the *uia* only seems *longa* to the lover

because he is away from his *puella* (note the similar transferred epithet at *Am.* 2.19.22 (quoted at 238n), with McKeown *ad loc.*

**saeuique dolores** The lover is expected to feel pain; cf. 1.735-6 (quoted above).

**mollibus his castris et labor omnis inest** ‘and every kind of labour is in these soft camps’: the softness of Love’s ‘camp’ is in sharp contrast with the physical endurance which the lover must suffer. At *Am.* 1.9.1 (paradigmatic for this passage) *habet sua castra Cupido*. The camp of Love also appears at 3.559 *rudis et castris nunc primum notus Amoris*, and is generally frequent in Ovid; see McKeown on *Am.* 1.2.32.

Milanion’s *labor* was important at Prop. 1.1.9 (quoted in Introduction, p33) but was downplayed in Ovid’s treatment of the myth (185-96). The reference here implies an increased level of instruction: Ovid’s instructions now seem much less *mollia* than he claimed they would be.

**237-8** This couplet continues the list, but now the things the lover must endure are those connected with the paraclausithyron, a theme which Ovid returns to more fully at 523 *clausa tibi fuerit promissa ianua nocte*. Like a soldier, the lover (specifically one who has been deprived access to the *puella* and so must sleep on her doorstep) endures rain and cold and nights spent on the bare ground. The same connection between a lover and a soldier is made at *Am.* 1.9.15-16 *quis nisi uel miles uel amans et frigora noctis / et denso mixtas perferet imbre niues?* Tibullus notes the connection between the *exclusus amator* and the soldier at 1.1.73-5 *dum frangere postes / non pudet ... / hic ego dux milesque bonus*, although Ovid tends to avoid the violence which Tibullus advocates; cf. 3.565-70, esp. 567 *nec franget postes*.

**saepe ferens imbrem caelesti nube solutum** ‘often you will bear rain loosened from a heavenly cloud’: elegiac lovers are immune to rain and cold; cf. Tib. 1.2.31-2 *non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis, / non mihi cum multa decidit imber aqua*.

**frigidus et nuda saepe iacebis humo** ‘and cold you will often lie on the bare ground’: the repetition of *saepe* and the use of the future tense emphasise the recurrence of these uncomfortable experiences, as well as their inevitability for the lover. The *exclusus amator* sleeps before his mistress’ door, and the elegists frequently emphasise the coldness to increase the impression of the lover’s endurance; cf. Prop. 1.16.22 *turpis et in tepido limine somnus erit*, Ov. *Am.* 2.19.21-22 *et sine me ante tuos proiectum in limine postes / longa pruinosa frigora nocte pati*, 3.11.9-10. When Ovid returns to this theme for a fuller

treatment later in the Book, he again emphasises this aspect; cf. 524 *perfer et immunda ponere corpus humo*.

As in English, *frigidus* also has a metaphorical meaning of sexually frigid or lacking in passion (OLD s.v. 8d); cf. *Am.* 2.1.5 *non frigida uirgo*, *Rem.* 492 *frigidior glacie fac uideare tuae*. The lover is both physically ‘cold’ (OLD s.v. 6) and sexually frustrated due to his rejection by the *puella*. The same pun occurs at 3.70 *frigida deserta nocte iacebis anus*: the girl in her old age will lie cold and, more importantly, alone.

**239-40** The transition to the myth of Apollo is somewhat abrupt, and does not satisfactorily illustrate the preceding passage on *militia amoris*. However, a line opening *Cynthi-* will always have a place in love elegy; cf. Prop. 1.1.1 *Cynthia prima*. Tibullus has been in the background throughout the previous lines (see notes above) and now comes to the foreground through Ovid’s retelling of a myth which is central to Tib. 2.3, and in fact represents Tibullus’ most extensive use of myth (see introductory note).

Like Hercules, Apollo is forced into the service of a mortal as punishment for murder (see 217-22n). Euripides’ *Alcestis* opens with Apollo explaining his presence at the palace of Admetus, the king of Pherae in Thessaly: he has been punished by Jupiter for killing the Cyclopes. However, as with the Hercules story, there is an erotic twist, as the god has fallen in love with the king; cf. Callim. *Hymn* 2.48-9 ζευγίτιδας ἔτρεφεν ἵππους / ἠϊθέου ὑπ’ ἔρωτι κεκαυμένος Ἀδμήτιοι.

**Cynthius Admeti uaccas pauisse Pheraei / fertur** ‘Apollo is said to have pastured the cows of Admetus of Pherae’: the language closely recalls Tib. 2.3 (see introductory note for a full comparison). The Alexandrian footnote, *fertur*, recalls Tib. 2.3.22 *dicitur*, which implies that the shame felt by his sister was well-known. It also provides a link with the Hercules *exemplum*; cf. 220 *creditur*. In both cases, it suggests an act contrary to the high status of the character (as also with Pasiphae at 1.300 *fertur*, with Hollis *ad loc.*).

Apollo is the ‘Cynthian’ god because he has a cult centre at Delos, where the mountain Cynthus is situated. The myth of Apollo, and his cult title, foreshadows the appearance of the god himself at 493.

**et in parua delituisse casa** ‘and to have hidden away in a small house’: does the *parua casa* refer to Admetus’ palace (in which case the adjective is ironic, although even this would seem small to a god) or to a herder’s cottage? In either case, this represents another point of departure from the previous lines: the lover is forced to sleep on the *nuda*

*humo* (238); at least Apollo has a roof over his head in this *exemplum*. This points towards the inappropriate use of the myth in Tibullus too, where the god's rustic acts do not represent the real heavy endurance of farmers (see introductory note).

**241-2** The *exemplum* concludes with lines reminiscent of 221-22, closely linking the *exempla* of Hercules and Apollo, and hinting that they both actually represent the same elegiac topos: *seruitium amoris*.

**quod Phoebum decuit, quem non decet?** 'What became Apollo, whom does it not become?': Ovid is fond of the vocabulary of appropriateness; see 155n. The change from perfect to present tense concisely matches the mythological situation with the contemporary.

**exue fastus** 'put off disdain': the lover is advised not to be too arrogant to adopt such behaviour as Apollo considered fitting. This prepares the lover for the more challenging advice of the following lines (243-50).

Each book of the *Ars* makes consistent reference to *fastus* as an enemy of love; cf. 1.715-16 *si tamen a precibus tumidos accedere fastus / senseris*, 2.323, 3.511 *odimus immodicos (experto credite) fastus*, *Rem.* 305 *diligit ipsa alios, a me fastidit amari*, 511 *iam ponet fastus*. The concept appears limitedly in Propertius (cf. 1.1.3, 1.18.5), but Ovid takes a more considered and systematic approach in his rejection of *fastus*.

**curam mansuri quisquis amoris habes** 'you whoever have care for an enduring love': this recalls the aim of the Book (11) and will be repeated at 295 *sed te, cuicumque est retinendae cura puellae*. Ovid reminds the reader of his overall aim, and the reason for his endurance, before recommending particularly difficult activities.

**243-6** These lines form a distinct shift in the advice given to the lover: the *iussa* are no longer *mollia*, as Ovid recommends risky strategies to overcome exclusion. If the lover finds his way barred (243-4), he should try climbing the building and gaining access through the *compluuium* (the central opening in the middle of the *atrium*) or through a window (245-6). These images are humorous, yet dangerous, and the necessity of such acts hints at adultery (see introductory note), a hint strengthened by the use of the adjective *furtiuus* to describe such a route (see below).

**si tibi per tutum planumque negabitur ire / atque erit opposita ianua fulta sera** 'if it be denied you to go by a safe and level way and the door is locked by a bar set in place against you': the locked door is a common problem for the elegiac lover (see

introductory note), and, usually, violence follows; cf. Tib. 1.2.6 *dura ianua firma sera*, Ov. *Am.* 1.6.28 *ianua fulta*. This sets up a false expectation of violence, which the following lines will correct.

**at tu per praeceps tecto delabere aperto** ‘but you slip down headlong from an opening in the roof’: usually, the *exclusus amator* either attacks the door (cf. 3.567-8) or sings a lament (cf. Prop. 1.16, Ov. *Am.* 1.6). Here, Ovid suggests a new alternative: to gain entry in a different way. This allows Ovid to avoid the violence of earlier elegy (an avoidance he recommends at 3.567-8), yet also to refuse to admit the lover’s capacity for song (see 284n *commendet dulci qualiacumque sono*).

*per praeceps* is a variation on *in praeceps* (OLD s.v. 2a) and mirrors *per tutum* from the previous couplet. At 1.381, the *praeceptor* assured the lover that no such drastic manoeuvres would be necessary (*non ego per praeceps*). Furthermore, such clambering is potentially fatal, as evidenced by Tib. 2.6.39 *qualis ab excelsa praeceps delapsa fenestra*.

At 1.43, Ovid claimed that the sought girl would not appear to the lover *delapsa per auras*. Here, however, in a humorous inversion, it seems possible for the lover to appear in this way in front of the girl.

**det quoque furtiuas alta fenestra uias** ‘also let a high window give furtive ways’: this other way in which the lover could gain access hints at adultery: the adjective *furtiuus* is used of clandestine and adulterous affairs; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.171 *furtium ... amorem*, Tib. 1.5.7 *furtiui ... lecti*, 1.9.55, Ov. *Am.* 1.11.3 *furtiuae ... noctis*, 2.2.15 with McKeown *ad loc*, *Ars* 1.275 *furtiua Venus*, 2.730, 3.640 *furtiuos ... iocos*, Adams (1982) 167f, TLL. 6.1.1644.42ff.

**247-8** The reward for such daring behaviour will be that she will be relieved and know that she was the reason the lover undertook such dangerous action: the lover will therefore prove his love to her (although the genuineness of this *certus amor* is brought into doubt by the cynical treatment of the Leander myth in the following couplet). Note that at *Her.* 18.199-200, Leander fantasizes about Hero’s reaction to the discovery of his corpse: *flebis enim tactuque meum dignabere corpus / et ‘mortis’ dices ‘huic ego causa fui!’*

**laeta erit et causam tibi se sciet esse periculi** ‘she will be glad and know that she is the cause of danger to you’: *laeta* corresponds to the *laetus amans* with which the book opened (3): now Ovid is placing the girl in the position of vaunting lover who has secured their *praeda*.

**hoc dominae certi pignus amoris erit** ‘this will be for your mistress a pledge of your certain love’: by denoting the girl here as *domina*, Ovid exposes the games of control and manipulation at work in these lines. The love is not *certus* (as the *exemplum* to follow demonstrates), but it is the gesture which is the important thing; with Myerowitz (1985) 27.

**249-50** The Leander *exemplum* does not fail in the way that the Apollo *exemplum* fails: it *does* exemplify the preceding lines. Leander’s risk-taking demonstrates his love for Hero. However, it is problematic in a different way: notably, the model of doomed lover is not a comforting one for the lover who has just been advised to scale buildings and climb in through windows. Furthermore, the story is used at Verg. *Georg.* 3.258-63 very allusively (Leander and Hero are not named, and the situation is kept deliberately obscure) to demonstrate the trouble that love can cause.

**saepe tua poteras, Leandre, carere puella** ‘often you had been able, Leander, to be apart from your girl’: this suggests that he is not as keen on visiting Hero as she is to be visited (a suggestion present also in the double *Heroides*, see introductory note). Despite this, he understands the rules of the game and that appearances are what matter, making him an ideal model for the lover.

*careo* here means ‘to be separated from’ (OLD s.v. 2b). The apostrophic naming of the hero contrasts with Virgil’s highly allusive version (see above).

**tranabas** ‘you were swimming across’: i.e. across the Hellespont, which separated them.

**animum nosset ut illa tuum** ‘so that she might know your mind’: this corresponds to 248, i.e. the act of swimming across, especially his final swim during the storm, acts as a pledge of his love. This is deeply ironic in the context of the previous line, which reveals his *animus* as less passionate.

**251-260:** instruction on how to treat *her* slaves to bind her closer to you

The instruction moves on to a new area: that of bringing the *puella*’s servants over to the lover’s cause. Ovid suggests that the lover win over her maids and slaves by such acts as greeting them by name and shaking hands (251-4). He should also win them over with a gift on appropriate days (255-8). He should generally make her household his own, especially focusing on the doorkeeper (259-60). This last is significant as he is in a special

position to be able to provide practical help for the lover to access the girl's bedroom, therefore making the risky acrobatics of 245-6 (one hopes) unnecessary.

At 223-6, Ovid presents the lover as playing the role of *cliens* to the *puella* as canvassing *patronus*. Now, it seems that the lover has been promoted to political electioneer himself, as this passage on winning over slaves places him in the position of a Roman man canvassing for votes; with Labate (1984) 223-4. At *Comm. Pet.* 5.17 (quoted in Introduction, p39), the political candidate is advised to secure friends of every class, even slaves. For the lover, winning over slaves (especially female ones) is a priority, because they are so close to the *puella*.

The corruption of the girl's maids recalls the advice at 1.351-74 on winning over the maid as she can prove a useful ally. There, Ovid goes on to address the question of whether the lover should also seduce the maid (1.375-98): his advice is not to do so until the mistress has been secured. A maid's help proves invaluable at *Am.* 1.11, as Nape acts as a go-between for the lovers. However, at *Am.* 2.7 and 8, it becomes clear that Ovid has seduced Corinna's hairdresser, Cypassis, and the mistress has discovered the truth. Is this another example of the lover avoiding the mistakes of his teacher (173-4n)?

A further problem emerges when this passage is read in the light of the treatment of gift-giving in the *Amores*. At *Am.* 1.8.87-92, the speaker, Dipsas, can be seen as a foil for the *praeceptor*: the advice he gives his male reader is designed to overcome the *puella* who is under the influence of such a *lena*. She regards the lover as *praeda petita*, just as the *praeceptor* considers the *puella* the same (2n). She advises the girl to use her entire household (family members as well as slaves) to fleece the lover. The *Amores* intertext suggests that the slaves may be working as agents of their mistress. However, Ovid presents a way around this: the lover should only give gifts on special days, when gift-giving to slaves may be expected. This allows a certain limitation to the amount the slaves will get from him: as with the seduction of the girl, there is greater glory in seducing them through behaviour rather than financial rewards.

**251-2      nec pudor ancillas, ut quaeque erit ordine prima, / nec tibi sit seruos demeruisse pudor**      'Let it neither be a shame for you to have won the favour of slave-girls, according as each one will have been first in rank, nor of slaves': the repetition of

*pudor* at the start and end of this couplet ostensibly downplays the shameful nature of such an act. However, it merely serves to highlight how shameful it really is in the normal sphere of Roman life: ‘to court the slaves of a courtesan might cause any would-be lover’s gorge to rise’ (James (2003b) 202). In love, such behaviour is more acceptable (as also in electioneering, see Introduction, pp39-40).

The verb *demereo* in this context means ‘to oblige’ or ‘win the favour of’ (OLD s.v. 2) rather than the more common meaning ‘to earn’ (OLD s.v. 1). It raises the theme of obligation, by which the lover will bind the slaves to his cause: i.e. the acts of attention (253-4) and of bribery (255-8).

At the end of the passage, the emphasis on winning over the *ianitor* feeds into the theme of the *exclusus amator*, which is present throughout the previous passage. The *ancilla* who has specifically *not* been won over to the lover’s cause appears at 525 *forsitan et uultu mendax ancilla superbo*. This is in the context of the *exclusus amator*, begging for admittance on the promised night. In the context of the *Ars*, therefore, the *ancilla* also plays a key role in the physical admittance of the lover to her mistress’ bedroom.

The advice to win over the slave-girls according to their rank seems a strange concept, although perhaps a rationalistic one in terms of the running of a household. The lover should prioritise winning over those *ancillae* who are closest to their mistress first; perhaps those like Cypassis the hairdresser at *Am.* 2.7 and 8 (see introductory note). At 1.367, the maid who has been persuaded to the lover’s cause is imagined combing her mistress’ hair (*matutinos pectens ancilla capillos*) while dropping hints about the lover’s passion for her. The more access the maid has to her mistress, the more opportunity she has to urge the lover’s cause.

**253-4 nomine quemque suo (nulla est iactura) saluta** ‘greet each by their name (there is no loss)’: this refers to the knack of the political candidate for remembering the names of their supporters, and addressing them correctly: *nomenclatio*; cf. *Comm. Pet.* 11.3 *primum id quod facis, ut homines noris, significa ut appareat, et auge ut cottidie melius fiat*.

The parenthesis emphasises the sense of shame which the lover may feel at behaving in such a way towards slaves: this repetition of the shameful aspect of such behaviour is continued from the previous couplet (repetition of *pudor*, above). Intended to be reassuring, it merely draws attention to the problem.

**iunge tuis humiles ambitiose manus** ‘join humble hands to your own, ambitious man’: the second line of the couplet presents another tactic of the political candidate: shaking hands with their supporters.

By addressing the lover as *ambitiosus*, Ovid makes clear the debt he owes in this passage to the art of political canvassing (cf. e.g. 3.541 *nec nos ambitio nec amor nos tangit habendi*, OLD s.v. 4): only someone ambitious for advancement would stoop to such tricks. The juxtaposition with *humiles* draws a sharp contrast between the social status of the lover and those he is trying to win over.

**255-6 sed tamen et seruo (leuis est impensa) roganti** ‘But yet also to the slave who asks (the expense is trivial)...’: the heavily apologetic tone of *sed tamen et* is necessary, since this is in conflict with the statement of 1.453 *hoc opus, hic labor est, primo sine munere iungi*. The suggestion of the parenthesis is that such gifts are cheap, whereas perhaps the *puella* will expect something more expensive (although see following passage on how Ovid negotiates that problem too). The slave asking for presents (for himself, but really for his mistress) recalls *Am.* 1.8 89 (see introductory note).

**porrige Fortunae munera parua die** The ‘day of Fortune’, 24<sup>th</sup> June, is a festival day dedicated to those of lower class, in celebration of Servius Tullus; cf. *Fast.* 6.771-84. This statement conflicts with the advice of 1.413-18, where the lover is advised to avoid specific days when gift-giving may be expected by the *puella*, such as her birthday. However, Ovid emphasises the limitations of giving: only when asked (see above), on specific days (here and below, 258), and only small gifts (*munera parua*). This prepares the reader for the small gifts which the lover will be recommended to give to the *puella* at 262 (below).

**257-8 porrige et ancillae** *munera* is understood from the previous line. The repetition of *porrige* here from the previous line (both in emphatic position at the start of the line) reinforces the similarity between the two groups, and emphasises the chiasmic arrangement: *ancilla/seruus/seruus/ancilla*.

**qua poenas luce pependit / lusa maritali Gallica ueste manus** ‘on the day when the Gallic band, deceived by the marital garment, paid the penalty’: this refers to the festival of 7<sup>th</sup> July, enacted by slaves, particularly female ones, in celebration of the role slave-girls played in defeating Gallic invaders. The slave-girls, disguised as Roman *matronae* (hence the misleading nature of the *maritalis uestis*), seduced the Gauls, which

enabled their defeat. However, this is problematic in the context of the Augustan marriage laws: of all days, Ovid has selected the one in which the boundaries between slave and free were blurred, specifically through dress.

**259-60 fac plebem, mihi crede, tuam** ‘make the people yours, trust me’: throughout this passage, Ovid has felt it necessary to reassure the lover with such asides, all of which merely emphasise how unusual is such treatment of slaves. However, the primary meaning of *plebs* refers to the plebeian class of citizens in Rome (OLD s.v. 1) rather than those who work within the household, and so continues the sense of political canvassing.

**sit semper in illa / ianitor** ‘let the doorkeeper always be among them’: the *ianitor* seems to be the man who guards the door to the entire house (cf. TLL. 7.1.132.4ff).

**et thalami qui iacet ante fores** ‘and he who lies before the doors of her bedroom’: this makes the reason for the special treatment of the doorkeeper clear: he has special access to the girl’s door, and the power to release the bolt, which was such a hindrance at 244. The reader may recall Ovid’s own failure with a doorkeeper at *Am.* 1.6: once more, the lover should avoid the mistakes of his teacher (173-4).

The lover is again imagined in the position of the electoral canvasser, who should examine carefully the benefits which various types of people could provide his campaign, before winning them to his cause; cf. *Comm. Pet.* 6.5. The irony lies in the wide differentiation between the lowly slave who lies, like a dog, before his mistress’ door, and the political supporter who has the power to advance the politician’s cause.

**261-272:** instruction on the kind of gifts you should give

From the girl’s slaves, Ovid now turns to examine the sorts of gifts which the lover could give the *puella*. By prioritising her slaves, Ovid refuses to pander to the greedy meretrix. Furthermore, the gifts which Ovid recommends are not the expensive ones which a greedy meretrix might demand (cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.10.11 *cur sim mutatus quaeris? quia munera poscis*); instead, they should be small and cheap, yet specially selected (*callidus*, 262). Fruit makes a good gift at appropriate times of the year, when it is easy to obtain (263-4): especially if the lover can pass them off as coming from his own property, although picked up cheaply in Rome (265-6). This gives a sense of a personal touch and also hints that he is

a wealthy man who owns his own estate (*rure suburbano*, 265; with Armstrong (2005) 131-2).

### Amaryllis

When Ovid suggests the lover give grapes and chestnuts ‘which Amaryllis used to love’ (267-8), the use of the imperfect tense *amabat* draws a connection with the Amaryllis who featured in Theocritus’ *Idylls* 3 and 4 and Virgil’s *Eclogues* 1 and 2. In Theocritus, Amaryllis is the recipient of love-gifts. Virgil’s Amaryllis is named in the programmatic opening lines of *Ecl.* 1 (*formonsam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas*, 1.5), and in *Ecl.* 2 she is mentioned as the former recipient of love-gifts, specifically chestnuts (2.52 *castaneasque nuces, mea quas Amaryllis amabat*). Virgil’s use of the imperfect both signifies the context – that Amaryllis has been supplanted by Alexis in Corydon’s affections – and points the reader back to Theocritus. Ovid’s use of the imperfect, in addition to his almost verbatim repetition of Verg. *Ecl.* 2.52, points the reader back to Virgil, and thereby towards Theocritus.

Yet Ovid’s presentation of the figure of Amaryllis is very different: she *no longer* loves this simple fare (*non amat illa*, 268): the present tense *amat*, contrasting with the imperfect form of the same verb in the previous line, makes clear the change in situation. Amaryllis, model of rusticity, has now changed: a shocking symbol of the times. Amaryllis appears again in the *Ars* as a model for the female addressee in Book 3: when discussing the multitude of colours available for girls to dye their clothing, Ovid suggests chestnut-colour; cf. 3.183 *nec glandes, Amarylli, tuae nec amygdala desunt*. The self-involved *praeceptor* wants his readers to look like city girls but simultaneously bewails the loss of a simpler, more rustic, time, when things were easier for the would-be lover. This is symptomatic of a general paradox of the *Ars* and of wider Roman attitudes: nostalgia for a Golden Age exists alongside a sense of the importance of contemporary Rome.

### The Figure of the Legacy-Hunter

Worryingly, however, the passage ends with a couplet which both connects the lover’s behaviour with that of legacy-hunters, and condemns such behaviour. In Horace’s *Satires*, the prophet Tiresias advises Ulysses on how he can make some money, by giving presents

to an elderly patron. When Ulysses objects that such behaviour is below his honour as a hero of Troy, Tiresias replies ‘*ergo / pauper eris*’ (Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.19-20). Like the legacy-hunter, ingratiating himself with a *senex* by giving him presents of birds (*turdus*, 2.5.10) and apples (*dulcia poma*, 2.5.12), the lover should ingratiate himself with the *puella* by giving similar *rustica dona* (264); see Labate (1984) 223. In 271-2, Ovid expressly distances himself from the use of such tactics for legacy-hunting. Once more, the kind of behaviour which Ovid advocates is expressly limited to the special sphere of love: if it were to leak into any other arena of life, it would be morally unsound (as with the behaviour of the political candidate, see Introduction, pp39-40). Nevertheless, Ovid’s protestation here merely draws attention to how easy it is for these lines to blur.

**261-2    *nec dominam iubeo pretioso munere dones***    ‘nor do I order you to present your mistress with a valuable gift’: in an echo of the opening of the previous passage (*nec pudor ancillas*, 251), Ovid opens this passage by turning to the mistress. The use of the term *domina* draws a connection with the previous passage, where she played the ‘mistress’ to her own slaves, but also engages with the power struggle between the lover and his *puella* throughout the *Ars*; 111n. Janka notes the ring composition with *dominam* in 270, which draws the passage tightly together.

The verb *iubeo* may recall another instance where Ovid has recently referred to his own commands: *mollia iussa*, 196. There, the reassurance turned out (eventually) to be false. Is this a signal that the same sort of thing is about to happen again? Indeed, it seems the lover’s mistrust is justified, as expensive gifts turn out to be far more appreciated by girls at 275 *munera magna petuntur*.

***parua, sed e paruis callidus apta dato***    ‘the cunning man should give small, but suitable, gifts’: the polyptoton of *parua* to describe the gifts places the emphasis on their smallness, in order to detract from the inconsistency the lover may have spotted in his teacher’s advice: surely he should not have to give anything at all; cf. 1.453.

After a passage on slaves, it is pointed that the lover is referred to as *callidus*, a common term for the manipulative slave of Comedy; cf. e.g. Plaut. *Amph.* 268, *Pseud.* 385, Ter. *Eun.* 1011. The ambiguous status of lover as both master and slave continues.

**263-4**    The *parua dona* which Ovid recommends are those that are extremely easy to get hold of: rustic foodstuff in the appropriate season, when such produce is easy to procure and therefore cheaper.

**dum bene diues ager** ‘while the field is very rich’: i.e. fertile, in reference to the countryside (cf. TLL 5.1.1590.54ff), but this phrase also foreshadows the entrance of the *diues amator* in the following passage (276n).

**cum rami pondere nutant** ‘when the branches sway with weight’: i.e. with the weight of fruit; cf. Catull. 62.51, Ov. *Met.* 14.660, TLL 10.1.2618.49f.

The verb *nuto* is used of tree-tops to describe a downward action with a swaying movement; cf. OLD s.v. 3.

**afferat in calatho rustica dona puer** ‘let the boy bring rustic gifts in a basket’: here, the *calathus* is a fruit-basket, used at 219 for Hercules’ wool. However, the lover is not the one holding the basket: unlike Hercules, he is in the dominant position as master of the *puer* (a slave-boy). The *calathus* also features in those bucolic passages concerned with rustic gift-giving; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.45-6 *tibi lilia plenis / ecce ferunt Nymphae calathis*. Here, however, the Nymphs are replaced by the more realistic *puer*.

*rustica dona* pose no threat to the position of the elegiac lover, since it allows the lover to give presents without the risk of transforming into the loathed *diues amator*; see Labate (1984) 221-2.

**265-6 (rure suburbano poteris tibi dicere missa, / illa uel in Sacra sint licet empta Via)** ‘(you can say that they have been sent from your suburban estate, although they may have been bought even in the Via Sacra)’: the lover can act the part of the *diues amator* as far as the girl is concerned, while saving his own pocket.

*rus* can mean a country estate (OLD s.v. 2); see 229n where the *puella* is imagined summoning the lover to *her* country estate. The adjective *suburbanus* means that this estate would be situated close to the city (OLD s.v. 1); cf. Catull. 44.6-7 *suburbana / uilla*, Prop. 4.1.33 (specifically of Rome).

The joke here is that the Via Sacra provides a much more convenient way for the lover (or his *puer*) to obtain fresh produce. The *lena* Dipsas recommends that the *puella* send gifts to herself from the Via Sacra in order to give the impression that her lover has a rival; cf. *Am.* 1.8.100 *si dederit nemo, Sacra roganda Via est*. This passage is therefore another counter to the advice of Dipsas (see 251-60n, above). Propertius’ reference to the Via Sacra as the place to pick up *uilia dona* (Prop. 2.24.14) seems to corroborate the impression that this is a cheap market.

**267-8 afferat aut uuas** The repetition of *afferat* from the same emphatic start of the line at 264 gives the impression of a list: these are the type of *rustica dona* the *puer* should bring.

**aut quas Amaryllis amabat, / at nunc castaneas non amat illa nuces** ‘or the chestnuts which Amaryllis used to love, but now she does not love them’: the cynical use of the bucolic figure Amaryllis (see introductory note) prepares the reader for the ironic treatment of the *aurea saecula* in the following passage (277).

The emphatic *at nunc* engages with Propertius’ attack on the current climate that values gold over goodness; cf. Prop. 3.13.47-8 *at nunc desertis cessant sacraria lucis: / aurum omnes uicta iam pietate colunt*. In the following passage, Ovid will turn to address the theme of ‘gold’, and admit its power.

**269-70** The final items in the list of *parua* yet *apta* gifts are birds and flowers, again produce which is easily procured at little expense, yet are common as love-gifts in poetry.

**turdoque licet missaque corona / te memorem dominae testificare tuae** ‘you may demonstrate that you are mindful of your mistress because a thrush or garland has been sent’: birds, whether living (as pets) or dead (as delicacies), make good gifts; cf. Catull. 2 and 3 (the *passer* as pet), Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.10 (see introductory note).

Garlands too make good presents (cf. Theocr. 3.21, Hor. *Carm.* 4.11.3) and the *exclusus amator* often hangs garlands of flowers on doorposts as a sign of love (cf. *Rem.* 32). There is a textual variant that reads *columba* ( $P_bQ^2$ ): doves make good gifts too; cf. Theocr. 5.96, Verg. *Ecl.* 3.68-9. However, *corona* is better attested ( $RYA\omega$ ). Kenney suggests that *turdoque ... missaque corona* might be hendiadys for *missa corona turdorum*; i.e. a brace of thrushes, as at Mart. 3.47.10, 13.51.2. He suggests that ‘this is a gift much more likely to appeal to the *orba senectus* mentioned in 271’ (Kenney (1959) 254). This would also clear up the doubt about whether these birds are designed as pets or for eating.

The pentameter echoes 248, where the dangerous exploits of the lover were designed to impress the *puella* with the extent of his love for her. However, the fact that the lover is advised to lie about the provenance of these gifts undermines his motivation. Furthermore, why is Ovid persisting in his advice to send *rustica dona* when he has just admitted that not even Amaryllis would be impressed by them anymore?

**271-2** The final couplet voices a moral outburst against those who use the tactics of a flatterer in any other arena of life apart from love. Ovid is ostentatiously reminding the

reader that such behaviour is permissible only within the confines of the erotic situation. However, Ovid's reassurances that the recommended behaviour should not leak over into society merely highlight the danger (see Introduction, pp37-40).

**turpiter his emitur spes mortis et orba senectus** 'by these things are the hope of death and a childless old age foully bought': i.e. those who try to inveigle themselves into the wills of childless old men by such techniques; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.10-14 (see introductory note). Gifts, especially of foodstuffs, 'were of more symbolic than real value, expressions of clients' loyalty' (Saller (1982) 123-4).

**a, pereant, per quos munera crimen habent!** 'ah, may they perish, those through whom gifts are open to a charge!': the expression *crimen habent* occurs earlier at Prop. 2.32.2, Tib. 1.6.41, but is favoured by Ovid; cf. *Am.* 2.5.6 with McKeown *ad loc.*

### **273-286:** advice on giving poetry as a gift

In the previous passage, Ovid complained that city girls are more rapacious than Amaryllis, yet continued to recommend the sorts of *rustica dona* which impressed that character. Now, he addresses the concept of giving poetry as a gift: unfortunately, like apples and grapes, poetry too makes a poor gift (273-4). Girls prefer *munera magna*, and this is where the *diues amator* has the advantage (275-6). Ovid then muses on the decline of values, where gold is valued above all else (277-8), and even Homer would be rejected if all he offered was his poetry (279-80). James (2003b) 14 refers to this as the 'elegiac impasse – the girl demands goods and the love-poet offers her poetry instead'. However, there are some girls (perhaps Ovid has in mind his own Corinna) who do appreciate poetry; and there are others who aspire to be considered *doctae* (281-2): it is these types of girls whom poetry might be likely to have some effect on (283-4) and who might consider poetry a gift, albeit a very small one (285-6).

The shadow of Dipsas is present throughout the wider section of gift-giving (251-286). She, like the *puella*, fails to acknowledge the respect due to poetry as a gift (see Gibson (1995) 69), and therefore antagonises the poet-lover still further; cf. *Am.* 1.8.57-8 *ecce, quid iste tuus praeter noua carmina uates / donat?* Since she represents the *praeceptor's* competitor (she teaches the girl how to fleece her lover, while the *praeceptor* offers equivalent advice to the lover on how to avoid such fleecing), the poet of the *Ars* is

concerned with undermining her advice, particularly on this point, which can prove so harmful to the *pauper amator* and his finances.

Propertius' *lena* Acanthis in 4.5, like Dipsas, urges her tutee to select her lover according to his ability to give presents. Ovid's reference to the *barbarus amator* (276) and the lack of honour awarded to poetry by girls (274) offers a strong connection with the Propertian passage; cf. esp. 4.5.51 *barbara colla*, 54 *uersibus auditis quid nisi uerba feres?* Although attempting to undermine the advice of the *lenae* Dipsas and Acanthis, the *praeceptor* cannot help but resignedly concede to them on this point. This is what makes his own skill as poet-lover in the *Amores* so great: he is able to seduce through poetry (see below).

Just as the lover's *puella* is no Amaryllis, so she is also no Corinna. For in the *Amores*, Ovid presents himself as a poet-lover whose poetry is so impressive that women vie to be its subject, i.e. Corinna; cf. *Am.* 2.17.29 *noui aliquam, quae se circumferat esse Corinnam*. So when, in the *Ars*, he voices regret that girls no longer value poetry, but rather expensive gifts like gold, he makes it clear that the lover's *puella* is not to be compared with his own. Inevitably, the two *are* compared, and the lover's *puella* is found wanting, part of the *altera non doctae turba* (282).

Similarly, the lover too is presented subtly as falling short of his teacher's standard. His poetry is deemed *qualiacumque* (284), and there is a question raised over the provenance of any poetry which the lover might be in a position to give (see 283n *lector*). The reference to Homer as failed lover at 279-80 highlights the contrast between the great epic poet and the lover's poor attempts at love poetry: a mere *exiguum munus* (286). Ovid is a realist, and though his own poetry seems to be sufficient for the greedy *meretrix*, that of the lover is not. Ovid has the poetic talent to overcome such obstacles; the lover must not expect so much of his own resources.

**273-4      quid tibi praecipiam teneros quoque mittere uersus?**      'why should I recommend that you also send tender verses?': *praecipio* is used frequently in instructional prose, but not in Lucretius or Virgil, yet occurs a number of times in the *Ars* to describe the teaching of the *praeceptor*; cf. 1.263-4, 3.28 (with Gibson *ad loc.*), 3.197, *Rem.* 803. Here, the reminder of the didactic form marks out a change in direction from the previous passage.

The description of the poetry here as *tener* defines it as erotic, i.e. elegy (cf. OLD s.v. 6b). The adjective is a common epithet for love (cf. 1.7 *tenero ... Amori*) and so of the love object (cf. 1.403 *teneras ... puellas*, 1.465 *tenerae ... amicae*, 2.745, 3.31), and ultimately of love poets and their poetry (cf. 3.333 *teneri ... Properti*, *Rem.* 757 *teneros ... poetas*).

**ei mihi** Of course the poet would voice his dismay at the lack of regard for poetry among girls: he has a vested interest and so is ultimately self-serving. However, it also forges a connection with Tib. 1.4.57, where the exclamatory *heu* introduces a passage bemoaning the current *saecula* which provoke the *puer* into demanding gifts rather than accepting poetry, as here (277n).

**non multum carmen honoris habet** This is a direct contradiction of Propertius' claim for the power of poetry over the appeal of wealth; cf. 1.8.39-40 (quoted at 166n). Poetry is similarly disregarded as a gift at 3.411 *nunc hederae sine honore iacent*, although Ovid proceeds to recommend poets as lovers as they can promote the fame of their *puellae*. He continues, even in his address to women, to champion the cause of the *pauper poeta*.

**275-6 carmina laudantur** Janka notes how the verb *laudo* here contrasts with the lack of *honor* in the previous line. The idea is also inverted at 283 (below), where poetry is used to praise certain types of girls.

**sed munera magna petuntur** These 'great gifts' contrast with the *parua* ones recommended at 262. Once more, the lover seems to be failing on both counts: he is neither getting away with giving nothing, nor giving enough to satisfy the greedy girl.

**dummodo sit diues, barbarus ipse placet** 'as long as he be wealthy, a very barbarian pleases': Ovid here echoes *Am.* 3.8, where the poet criticises the *puella* for preferring a nouveau riche soldier (3.8.9 *recens diues*) - with hands still stained with blood - over himself. Unfortunately, the realist Ovid must acknowledge that the *pauper amator* will always be usurped by the *diues amator* (as at 161-8, above).

The *praeceptor* seems resigned to the greed of girls, as expressed by the *lena Acanthis*; see introductory note. Generally in the *Ars*, barbarism is antithetical to the project; cf. esp. 2.552 *barbaria noster abundat amor*, see Myerowitz (1985) 61.

Given the context of poetry-writing throughout this passage, the term *barbarus* may also refer to bad Latin, i.e. *barbarismus*; see Gibson on 3.482. Thus, as long as a low-skilled poet lover also has riches (in the context of elegy, a contradiction in terms), then he will succeed.

**277-8 aurea sunt uere nunc saecula** ‘truly now are the ages golden’: this is an ironic reference to the Golden Age, idealised as a time of peace. For Ovid, the current time is *literally* golden because girls only want gold. This is a problematic statement in a political context, since it was part of Augustan ideology to present the emperor as effecting a return to the Golden Age (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.792-3 *Augustus Caesar, diui genus, aurea condet / saecula*); this is something Ovid alludes to again at 3.113 *nunc aurea Roma est*, before going on to expose the plain wood concealed by flashy gold leaf (3.231). The cynical treatment of the Golden Age corresponds with the similar treatment of the bucolic time of Amaryllis (267-8n).

**plurimus auro / uenit honos** ‘the greatest honour comes to gold’: this echoes the lack of honour attributed to *carmen* (274n).

**auro conciliatur amor** ‘love is procured with gold’: the anaphora of *aurum/aureus* in this couplet (note especially the framing of the previous line with *aureus* and *aurum* at the start and end) emphasises Ovid’s point regarding the pervasiveness of gold in Rome. This imitates the repetition at Prop. 3.13.48-50, where *aurum* occurs four times.

*concilio* is used for sexual procurement; cf. Lucr. 5.961, Ov. *Am.* 1.13.42 *num me nupsisti conciliante seni*, *Ars* 2.553-4 *doctior ille, / quo ueniunt alii conciliante uiri*, TLL 1.1971.46f. The emphasis here on the purchasable nature of love echoes the previous passage, where the love of an Amaryllis failed to be bought with chestnuts. Love has always been purchasable, but now inflation means more is expected. However, Ovid makes his feelings about *buying* love clear at 161-8 (see above): wealth circumvents the need for *ars/Ars*.

**279-80** Here, Ovid draws the figure of Homer down to the position of elegiac lover, much as he did with Ulysses (123-44). There was a tradition that Homer gave away the authorship of his poetry as gifts: first, as a dowry for his daughter (*Ael. VH* 9.15); second, as a hospitality-gift (*Strabo* 14.1.18). He was consistently represented in antiquity as poor, hence his reliance on his poetry in these stories in place of tangible gifts; see Graziosi (2002) 186-93. Ovid’s cynical point is that such gifts would not work with a modern girl.

**ipse licet uenias Musis comitatus** ‘You yourself may come accompanied by the Muses’: this is an allusion to the prominence of the role of the Muses in the opening invocations of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; cf. *Il.* 1.1 ἄειδε θεᾶ, *Od.* 1.1 ἔννεπε μοῦσα. There may also be a reference to ancient art, where Homer is depicted flanked by Muses. It

is notable that the Muses are referenced at the very start (1.27-8) and at the very end of book 2 (704), where they usher in the distinctly un-epic section on sex.

**Homere** The vocative address, repeated in the following line, varies the tone and recalls the similar treatment of Homer at *Am.* 3.8.28 *nox tibi, si belles, possit, Homere, dari*, i.e. even Homer would have to become a soldier in order to succeed with a girl. The repeated naming is striking, especially since the previous reference to Homer was highly allusive (4n). This may serve to increase the sense of a lowering of style.

**si nihil attuleris** i.e. if he brings no tangible gift other than his poetry (signified by the Muses in the previous line). *affero* echoes 264 and 267, where the verb occurs in the same emphatic position to refer to the items conveyed by the *puer*. This links the figure of Homer closely with that of the elegiac lover or, more disparagingly, his slave-boy.

**ibis, Homere, foras** ‘you will go outdoors, Homer’: i.e. he will be thrown out to become the *exclusus amator*. This may foreshadow the role of *exclusus amator* which will be the subject of 521-34.

**281-2 sunt tamen et doctae, rarissima turba, puellae** ‘there are however also learned girls, a very rare crowd’: the *docta puella* (like the named *puella* of the elegists: Cynthia, Delia, and Corinna), is ‘very rare’, i.e. the lover should not expect his girl to be as learned and appreciative of poetry as these idealised few. This parallels 3.255-6 *turba docenda uenit pulchrae turpesque puellae, / pluraque sunt semper deteriora bonis*. Beautiful girls have no need for Ovid’s *ars* (just as wealthy men have no need, 163-4n). However, the majority of girls are *turpes*, and, here, fail to live up to the standard of the *docta puella*.

Solodow (1986) 133 points out the effectiveness of the appositional phrasing of this line: it heightens the sense of juxtaposition between the plural *puellae* and the singular *rarissima turba*, further emphasised by the inherent paradox of having a *rara turba*.

**altera non doctae turba, sed esse uolunt** ‘(there are) not learned (girls), another crowd, but they want to be (learned)’: awkward phrasing, the plural *uolunt* must refer back to the *non doctae puellae*. The joke seems to be aimed at the pretentious, self-deluding *puella*; see Armstrong (2005) 85-6.

Note the striking chiasmic pattern in this couplet: *doctae ... turba ... / ... doctae turba*, which gives an intensely hyperbolic effect.

**283-4** **utraque laudetur per carmina** ‘let each be praised through poems’: having carefully noted a distinction between the two types of girls who may appreciate (or feign an appreciation for) poetry, Ovid now tosses it away as an irrelevance, and clumps the two together. The instruction to ‘praise’, here in poetry, is resumed at 297, there in the form of conversational flattery.

**carmina lector / commendet dulci qualiacumque sono** ‘the reader should render agreeable the poems, such as they are, with sweet sound’: i.e. the substance and quality of the poetry is less important in this respect than the manner in which it is recited. This diminishes both lover and *puella*: the latter is incapable of discernment; the former is incapable of producing poetry of a high standard. The description of the lover as *lector* enables Ovid to deny him the name of *poeta* or *uates* (11n): he is merely the reader, and probably has not even written the poor quality poetry himself.

This off-hand contempt for the reader is reinforced by the description of the poetry as *qualiacumque*. The term is used programmatically at Catull. 1.8-9 of his own poetry (*quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli / qualecumque*). However, for Catullus, this represents a statement of generic level: when Ovid uses the term to describe the poetry of *another*, he is being deeply insulting. Note that elsewhere he only uses it of his own poetry; cf. *Trist.* 1.11.17-18 *tamen ipse trementi / carmina ducebam qualiacumque manu*, 5.11.24 *carmina nostra ... qualiacumque*.

However, the framing *dulci ... sono* softens this criticism, and suggests some redeeming ability in the lover. ‘Sweet sounds’ are an important tool in the *Ars*; cf. 2.152, 156 (above), 480 *arte Venus nulla dulce peregit opus*, 3.798 *dulcia mendaci gaudia finge sono*, *Rem.* 332 *blandis ... sonis*.

**285-6** The final couplet of the passage concludes the many problems which the previous lines have set up: how to impress with poetry a girl who is more inclined towards expensive presents. He suggests that a *carmen* may be effective, and considered in lieu of a more tangible gift, but only *exiguum*. The abundance of limiting words in the pentameter undermines any hope the lover may have that his poetic output will be much appreciated: the *lena*e of Prop. 4.5 and of *Am.* 1.8 really have won out (see introductory note).

**his ergo aut illis** ‘therefore for either the latter or the former’: this refers back to the different types of *turba* detailed in 281-2; cf. *ille* OLD s.v. 6. This is the first limiting statement of the couplet: poetry will not work on most girls, only on those (very rare) girls who are learned, or those (more common) girls who wish to be considered as learned.

**uigilatum carmen in ipsas / forsitan exigui muneris instar erit** ‘a carefully composed poem in their honour will perhaps be like a small gift’: *uigilatum* means the lover has stayed awake in his anguish, carefully crafting poems for his beloved; cf. 1.735 *attenuant iuuenum uigilatae corpora noctes*, OLD s.v. 3. This is an indication of Callimachean aesthetics, although, in the case of the lover, it has little effect on the quality of his poetry, as the previous couplet implies; see Armstrong (2005) 86.

The limiting words (*forsitan* and *instar*), in addition to the adjective *exiguus*, illustrate the disappointment felt by the *puella* in receiving poetry rather than expensive gifts.

**287-294**: instruction on how to treat *your* slaves to appear indebted to *her*

In his OCT text, Kenney regards these lines slightly differently: he views the wider passage 287-314 as a single entity. However, I have divided it into two discrete parts: this passage (287-294) follows on closely both from 251-60 (due to the focus on the treatment of slaves), and from 261-286 (due to the continuing theme of gift-giving); while the next passage (295-314) is concerned more with the effectiveness of compliments. The openings of each of the passages as I divide them (*at quod*, 287, and *sed te*, 295) mark off these new beginnings.

This passage works as a contrast to 251-60 since now Ovid examines the treatment of the lover’s own slaves, rather than those of his *puella*. This forms a stark contrast to the immediately previous passage (273-86) which emphasised his poverty (also 161-8): now we see the lover as master of his own household (foreshadowed by his access to a *puer* at 264). Throughout the *Ars*, Ovid presents the status of the lover as deliberately fluctuating (Sharrock (1994a) 17). Furthermore, 251-60 demonstrated the lover making his presence felt within the girl’s household; now the girl is a fixture within the *lover’s* household, to such an extent that his own slaves are approaching her to intervene with their master (Fitzgerald (2000) 55-6). This marks an important development in the relationship: an increased level of intimacy between the lover and the *puella*.

The passage also works as a contrast to 261-286 since these lines provide a way for the lover to give easy ‘gifts’: she asks for favours, which the lover grants. This is similar to the previous passages, except that the lover is cleverly arranging for her to ask for what he *can*

give. She is still asking (288 *roget*, 290 *petat*, 292 *debeat*, 293 *donetur*), but now the lover is manipulating her and succeeding. The layers of deception recall the Calypso episode: the lover allows the girl the impression of being in control, when really he is in charge himself. While the girl begs the lover to spare his slaves, she may consider herself the *domina* (290), when actually she is merely an *amica* (288 and 293). Such behaviour creates an atmosphere of mutual obligation, binding lover and girl closer together.

The structure of this brief passage is uncomplicated: the opening couplet introduces the concept; then come two examples; and the final couplet summarises. The two examples concern enticing the girl to beg for a slave's freedom (289-90); and for a pardon for one being punished (291-2). Using slaves in this way may be morally unsound, and potentially dangerous for the master, at risk from a disgruntled slave; however, the risk for the master who promises freedom and then withdraws it may actually have been low, considering the harsh legal ramifications for slaves who murdered their masters (Treggiari (1969) 11-19). Meanwhile, the opening and concluding couplets emphasise the lack of trouble for the lover in this new strategy: he will only be doing what he meant to do anyway.

**287-8 at quod eris per te facturus** 'but what you are about to do by your own efforts': *facturus* is repeated at 292, closing the passage. The repetition emphasises the self-serving motivation for the lover, reassuring him that he still retains control of his own household, although giving the girl the impression that she is dominating him.

**et utile credis** 'and (what) you believe (to be) useful': the vocabulary of utility pervades the *Ars*; cf. 1.159 *fuit utile multis*, 1.580 *utilior uobis factus amicus erit*, 2.667 *utilis, o iuuenes, aut haec, aut serior aetas*, 2.732, 3.417 *utilis est uobis*. Here, however, the word is placed back in its common sphere of economic action rather than the sexual metaphorical sphere. Ovid binds the passage through the ring composition with *utilitas* (293). The emphasis on 'usefulness' in this passage underscores the sense of reassurance for the lover: he will lose nothing (he means to do everything the girl asks anyway), and, in addition, will enable the lover to gain twice: gratitude from the slave and from the *puella*.

**id tua te facito semper amica roget** 'make sure that your girlfriend always asks it from you': the repetition of *amica* at the start and end of the passage (293) draws attention to the fact that she is really an *amica*, and not a *domina* (290) as she believes.

**289-90 libertas alicui fuerit promissa tuorum** ‘(if) freedom shall have been promised to one of your slaves’: i.e. manumission. The lover looks particularly good in the eyes of the *puella* for adhering to her request, because he is able to demonstrate how he values her opinion, but also because it allows him to demonstrate his own good nature and *liberalitas* - ‘supposedly part of the character of the Roman gentleman’ (Treggiari (1969) 14).

**hanc tamen a domina fac petat ille tua** ‘yet bring it about that he seeks it from your mistress’: *domina* with the possessive adjective *tua* conveys the intention of this action: to make *her* believe herself in charge of the lover’s actions, when really (as *per te*, 287, made clear) he is acting under his own impulse.

**291-2 si poenam seruo, si uincula saeua remittis** ‘if you are relaxing punishment and savage bonds from a slave’: the repetition of *si* and the striking zeugma of *poena* and *uincula* - where the punishment is metaphorically ‘relaxed’ (OLD s.v. 6) while the chains literally are (OLD s.v.8) - together emphasise that this is something that is only to be done when the lover wishes to do so of his own accord. This advice is paralleled during Petronius’ *cena Trimalchionis*, where the guests speak up on behalf of a slave who supplicates them to save him from being whipped; cf. Petron. *Sat.* 30.10.1 *ut seruo remitteret poenam*.

The adjective *saeua* to describe the chains forces the reader to focalise with either the girl, who pities the slave, or with the slave himself. Yet, if the focaliser is to remain the lover, then this adjective implies sympathy for the slave from the master himself.

**quod facturus eras** ‘what you are about to do’: repeated from 287, and so heavily underlining the point that the lover loses nothing.

**debeat illa tibi** ‘let her owe it to you’: this tactic engages with that of the political candidate, who strives to place others under obligation to him, while also giving the impression that he is under an obligation to them; cf. *Comm. Pet.* 6.2-3.

**293-4 utilitas tua sit** ‘let the utility be yours’: i.e. the act which the lover intends (the freeing of a slave or the remitting of a punishment) is conveniently brought about, with the further useful effect that the *puella* considers herself in some way indebted to the lover.

**titulus donetur amicae** ‘(but) let the title be given to the girlfriend’: perhaps the title of *domina*, which the final word of the line (*amica*) denies her? There may be a further joke in the special use of the word *titulus*, used both of a ‘claim to distinction’ (OLD s.v. 7)

as here, but also the ‘title of a poetry book’ (OLD s.v. 3), perhaps often that of the *puella*: note *Cynthia*, the first word of Propertius and therefore a possible title for the Book. Note that Ovid uses the term to describe his own poetic work at the programmatic openings of his exile poetry; cf. *Trist.* 1.1.7, *Pont.* 1.1.17. Since the previous passage was concerned with poetry and poetry-composition, these resonances may still be in the reader’s mind.

**perde nihil** Reminiscent of the parenthetical *nulla est iactura* (253): the lover should make use of any activity he intends to bind the girl closer to him.

**partes illa potentis agat** ‘let her play the role of the powerful one’: a return to the theme of theatricality which pervades the *Ars* (see 197n *partes ... agas*). The subjunctive humorously undercuts any sense of power retained by the girl: she is merely being *permitted* to play a part.

## Bibliography

- Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S.A. (2002) 'Rereading Callimachus' *Aetia* Fragment 1', *Classical Philology* 97: 238-255
- Adams, J.N. (1972) 'Latin words for 'woman' and 'wife'', *Glotta* 50: 234-255.
- (1982) *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London.
- Ahern, C.F. (1989) 'Daedalus and Icarus in the *Ars Amatoria*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 273-96.
- (1990) 'Ovid as *vates* in the proem to the *Ars Amatoria*', *CPh* 85: 44-8.
- Albrecht, M. (1964) *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*, Hildesheim.
- Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P. J. and Nisbet, R.G.M. (1979) 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 69: 125-155.
- Anderson, W.S. (1972) *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6-10*, Norman.
- (1973) 'Heroides', in J.W.Binns (ed.) *Ovid*, London.
- Arens, J.C. (1950) '-fer and -ger: Their Extraordinary Preponderance among Compounds in Roman Poetry', *Mnemosyne* 3: 241-262.
- Armstrong, R. (2004) 'Retiring Apollo: Ovid on the politics and Poetics of self-sufficiency', *CQ* 54: 528-50.
- (2005) *Ovid and His Love Poetry*, London.
- (2006) *Cretan Women*, Oxford.
- Baldo, G. (1991) 'Libro secondo', in E. Pianezzola, G. Baldo, L. Cristante (eds.) *L'Arte di Amare*, Milan.
- Barchiesi, A. (1988) 'Ovid the Censor', *American Journal of Ancient History* 13: 96-105.

- (2001) *Speaking Volumes*, London.
- Barchiesi, A. and Hardie, P. (2010) 'The Ovidian career model: Ovid, Gallus, Apuleius, Boccaccio', in P. Hardie, H. Moore (eds.) *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception*, Cambridge.
- Barringer, J. (1996) 'Atalanta as Model: the Hunter and the Hunted', *Classical Antiquity* 15: 48-76.
- Beard, M. (2007) *The Roman Triumph*, London.
- Bertman, S. (1989) 'The Ashes and the Flame: Passion and Aging in Classical Poetry', in T.M. Falkner, J. de Luce (eds.) *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature*, Albany.
- Boardman, J. (1983) 'Atalanta', *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies* 10: 2-19.
- Bömer, F. (1969-86) *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen: Kommentar*, Heidelberg.
- Booth, J. (1981) 'Aspects of Ovid's Language', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 2.31.2688-2700.
- (1991) *The Second Book of Amores*, Warminster.
- Bradley, J.R. (1989) 'Ovid, *Ars* 1.39-40: Making Tracks: Speed, Ritual or Art?', *The Classical World* 83: 100-101.
- Brandt, P. (1902) *Ovid: De Arte Amatoria Libri Tres*, Leipzig.
- Braund, S.H. (1992) *Roman Verse Satire*, Oxford.
- Cairns, F. (1972) *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh.
- (2006) *Sextus Propertius: the Augustan Elegist*, Cambridge.
- Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton.
- Casali, S. (1997) 'Apollo, Ovid, and the Foreknowledge of Criticism (*Ars* 2.493-512)', *CJ* 93: 19-27.
- Clarke, J.R. (1998) *Looking at Love-Making*, London.
- Coleman, R. (1977) *Vergil: Eclogues*, Cambridge.

- Conte, G.B. (2007) 'Proems in the Middle', in G.B. Conte, S.J. Harrison (eds.) *The Poetry of Pathos*, Oxford.
- Copley, F. O. (1947) 'seruitium amoris in the Roman Elegists', *TAPA* 78: 285-300.
- Corbett, P. (1986) *The Scurra*, Edinburgh.
- Cyrino, M. (1998) 'Heroes in D(u)ress: Transvestism and Power in the Myths of Herakles and Achilles', *Arethusa* 31: 207-241.
- Damon, C. (1997) *The Mask of the Parasite: a pathology of Roman patronage*, Ann Arbor.
- Davis, J.T. (1989) *Fictus Adulter*, Amsterdam.
- Dench, E. (1995) *From Barbarians to New Men*, Oxford.
- Diggle, J. (2004) *Theophrastus: Characters*, Cambridge.
- Dimundo, R. (2003) *Ovidio Lezioni D'amore*, Bari.
- Durling, R. (1958) 'Ovid as Praeceptor Amoris', *The Classical Journal* 53: 157-67.
- Edwards, C. (1993) *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Farrell, J. (2002) 'Greek Lives and Roman Careers in the Classical *Vita* Tradition', in P. Cheney, F.A. de Armas (eds.) *European Literary Careers*, London.
- (2003) 'Classical Genre in Theory and Practice', *New Literary History* 34: 383-408.
- Fauth, W. (1980) 'uenena amoris: Die Motive des Liebeszaubers und der Erotischen Verzauberung in der Augusteischen Dichtung', *Maia* 32: 265-282.
- Fedeli, P. (1980) *Il primo libro delle elegie*, Firenze.
- (1984) *Sexti Properti Elegiarum libri IV*, Stutgardiae.
- (1985) *Il libro terzo delle Elegie*, Bari.
- (2005) *Elegie Libro II*, Cambridge.
- Fitzgerald, W. (2000) *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*, Cambridge.
- Fowler, D.P. (2000) *Roman Constructions*, Oxford.

- Fränkel, H. (1945) *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*, Cambridge.
- Frécaut, J-M. (1983) 'Une Scène Ovidienne en Marge de l'*Odyssee*: Ulysse et Calypso (*Art d'Aimer* II, 123-142)', in H. Zehnacker, G. Hentz (eds.) *Hommages à Robert Schilling*, Paris.
- Fyler, J. (1971) '*Omnia vincit amor*: incongruity and the limitations of structure in Ovid's elegiac poetry', *CJ* 66: 196-203.
- Galinsky, K. (1969) 'The Triumph Theme in the Augustan Elegy', *WS* 3: 75-107.
- Gamel, M. (1989) '*non sine caede*: Abortion Politics and Poetics in Ovid's *Amores*', *Helios* 16: 183-206.
- Gärtner, T. (2007) 'Apoll als elegischer Liebhaber', *Philologus* 151: 244-255.
- Gee, E. (2000) *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus*, Cambridge.
- Gibson, R. (1995) 'How to Win Girlfriends and Influence them: *amicitia* in Roman Love Elegy', *PCPS* 41: 62-82.
- (1998) 'Didactic Poetry as 'Popular' Form', *Nottingham Classical Literature Studies* 5: 67-98.
- (1999) 'Aeneas as *hospes* in Vergil, *Aeneid* 1 and 4', *CQ* 49: 184-202.
- (2000) 'Book endings in Greek poetry and *Ars Amatoria* 2 and 3', *Mnemosyne* 53: 588-91.
- (2003) *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 3*, Cambridge.
- (2007) *Excess and Restraint*, London.
- (2009) 'The *Ars Amatoria*' in P. Knox (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid*, Oxford.
- Gibson, R., Green, S., Sharrock, A. (2006) *The Art of Love*, Oxford.
- Gibson, R. and Kraus, C.S. (2002) *The Classical Commentary*, Leiden.
- Gildenhard, I. (2007) 'Barbarian Variations: Tereus, Procne, and Philomela', *Dictynna* 4: 1-25.

- Goold, G.P. (1983) 'The cause of Ovid's exile', *ICS* 8: 94-107.
- Gow, A.S.F. (1950) *Theocritus*, Cambridge.
- Graf (1982) 'Die Gallus-Verse von Qasr Ibrim', *Gymnasium* 89: 21-36.
- Grant, M. (1975) *Erotic Art in Pompeii: the secret collection of the National Museum of Naples*, London.
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: the early reception of epic*, Cambridge.
- Green, C.M.C. (1996) 'Terms of Venery: *Ars Amatoria* 1', *TAPA* 126: 221-263.
- Griffin, J. (1985) *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, London.
- Hanson, A.E. (1990) 'The Medical Writers' Woman', in D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, F.I. Zeitlin (eds.) *Before Sexuality*, Princeton.
- Hardie, A. (2007) 'Juno, Hercules, and the Muses at Rome', *AJPh* 128: 551-592.
- Hardie, P. (2002) *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge.
- (2009) *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature*, Oxford.
- Harrison, S. (2002) 'Ovid and Genre: evolutions of an elegist' in P. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge.
- Heinze, R. (1919) *Ovids Elegische Erzählung*, Leipzig.
- Heller, J.L. (1943) '*nenia paignion*', *TAPA* 74: 215-68.
- Henderson, A.A.R. (1979) *Remedia Amoris*, Edinburgh.
- Heyworth, S.J. (2007) *Classical Constructions*, Oxford.
- Heyworth, S.J., Morwood, J.H.W. (2011) *A Commentary on Propertius Book 3*, Oxford.
- Hinds, S.E. (1987) *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*, Cambridge.
- (1992) '*arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25: 81-154.
- (1998) *Allusion and Intertext*, Cambridge.

- Holleman, A. (1971) 'Ovid and Politics', *Historia* 20: 458-466.
- Holleran, C. (2012) *Shopping in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- Hollis, A.S. (1973) 'The *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*' in J.W. Binns (ed.) *Ovid*, London.
- (1977) *Ovid Ars Amatoria I*, Oxford.
- Hopkins, K. (1983) *Death and Renewal*, Cambridge.
- Houghton, L.B.T. (2009) 'Sexual Puns in Ovid's *Ars* and *Remedia*', *CQ* 59: 280-285.
- Hunter, R. (2006) *The Shadow of Callimachus*, Cambridge.
- Ingleheart, J. (2010) *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, book 2*, Oxford.
- Isbell, H. (1990) *Heroides*, London.
- James, S. (2003a) 'Her Turn to Cry: The Politics of Weeping in Roman Love Elegy', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133: 99-122.
- (2003b) *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion*, London.
- Janka, M. (1997) *Ovid Ars Amatoria Buch 2 Kommentar*, Heidelberg.
- Kennedy, B.H. (1962) *The Revised Latin Primer*, London.
- Kenney, E.J. (1958) '*Nequitiae Poeta*', in N.I. Herescu (ed.) *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide*, Paris.
- (1959) 'Notes on Ovid: II', *CQ* 9: 240-260.
- (1970) 'Doctus Lucretius', *Mnemosyne* 23: 366-392.
- (1996) *Heroides, XVI-XXI*, Cambridge.
- Knox, P. E. (1986) 'Adjectives in -osus and Latin Poetic Diction', *Glotta* 64: 90-101.
- Korzeniewski, D. (1964) 'Ovids Elegisches Proömium', *Hermes* 92: 182-213.
- La Penna, A. (1951) 'Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina', *Maia* 4: 187-209.
- Labate, M. (1984) *L'Arte di Farsi Amare*, Pisa.

- Leach, E.W. (1964) 'Georgic Imagery in the *Ars Amatoria*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Society* 95: 142-54.
- Lee-Stecum, P. (2008) 'Roman *refugium*', *Hermethena* 184: 69-91.
- Little, D. (1970) 'Richard Heinze: Ovids elegische Erzählung' in E. Zinn (ed.) *Ovids Ars amatoria und Remedia amoris*, Stuttgart.
- Liveley, G., Satzman-Mitchell, P.B. (2008) *Latin Elegy and Narratology*, Ohio.
- Loraux, N. (1990) 'Herakles: the Super-Male and the Feminine' in D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin (eds.) *Before Sexuality: the Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton.
- Lowe, J.E. (1929) *Magic in Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford.
- Lucke, C. (1982) *P. Ovidius Naso: Remedia Amoris: Kommentar zu Vers 397-814*, Bonn.
- Macintosh, Michelakis, Hall, and Taplin (eds) (2005) *Agamemnon in Performance 458 BC to AD 2004*, Oxford.
- Maltby, R. (1991) *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds.
- (2002) *Tibullus*, Cambridge.
- Mankin, D. (1995) *Epodes*, Cambridge.
- Martindale, C.A. (1993) *Redeeming the Text*, Cambridge.
- McCartney, E.S. (1939) '*Remigio Alarum*', *The Classical Journal* 34: 234-7.
- McGinn, T.A.J. (1998) *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- McKeown, J.C. (1979) 'Augustan elegy and mime', *PCPS* 25: 71-84.
- (1989) *Ovid, Amores I*, Leeds.
- (1998) *Ovid, Amores II*, Leeds.
- McKim, R. (1985) 'Myth against Philosophy in Ovid's Account of Creation', *CJ* 80: 97-108.

- McNelis, C. (2009) 'Ovidian Strategies in Early Imperial Literature' in P. Knox (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid*, Oxford.
- Miller, J.F. (1983) 'Callimachus and the *Ars Amatoria*', *Classical Philology* 78: 26-34.
- (1986) 'Disclaiming divine inspiration: a programmatic pattern', *WS* 20: 151-64.
- (1993) 'Ovidian allusion and the vocabulary of memory', *MD* 30: 153-64.
- (1997) 'Lucretian moments in Ovidian elegy', *CJ* 92: 384-398.
- Milnor, K. (2005) *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus*, Oxford.
- Muecke, F. (1993) *Horace: Satires II*, Warminster.
- Murgatroyd, P. (1975) '*Militia amoris* and the Roman elegists', *Latomus* 34: 59-79.
- (1980) *Tibullus I*, Bristol.
- (1981) '*seruitium amoris* and the Roman Elegists', *Latomus* 40: 589-606.
- (1984) 'Amatory Hunting, Fishing, and Fowling', *Latomus* 43: 362-8.
- (1994) *Elegies II*, Oxford.
- Myerowitz, M. (1985) *Ovid's Games of Love*, Detroit.
- Myers, K.S. (1994) *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*, Michigan.
- (2009) *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIV*, Cambridge.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (1990) *Georgics*, Oxford.
- Newman, J.K. (1967) *Augustus and the New Poetry*, *Latomus*.
- Nisbet, R.G.M., Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I*, Oxford.
- (1978) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M., Rudd, N. (2004) *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book III*, Oxford.
- Öhrman, M. (2008) *Varying Virtue*, Lund.

- Park, A. (2009) 'Two Types of Ovidian Personification', *CJ* 104: 225-240.
- Parker, D. (1969) 'The Ovidian Coda', *Arion* 8: 80-97.
- Parker, R. (1996) *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- Pease, A. S. (1935) *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*, Darmstadt.
- Pichon, R. (1991) *Index Verborum Amatoriorum*, Hildesheim.
- Platnauer, M. (1951) *Latin Elegiac Verse*, Cambridge.
- Platner, S.B. (2002) *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- Raval, S. (2002) 'Cross-Dressing and "Gender Trouble" in the Ovidian Corpus', *Helios* 29: 149-172.
- Richardson, L. (1977) *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*, Norman.
- Richlin, A. (1983) *The Garden of Priapus*, London.
- (1992) *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, Oxford.
- Riley, H.T. (1877) *The Heroides: or, Epistles of the heroines, the Amours, Art of Love, Remedy of love, and minor works of Ovid*, London.
- Risselada, R. (1993) *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin*, Amsterdam.
- Ross, D.O. (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Roth (1993) 'Der Jugend Blüten', *RhM* 97-101.
- Rudd, N. (1976) *Lines of Enquiry*, Cambridge.
- (1988) 'Daedalus and Icarus (i) From Rome to the End of the Middle Ages' in C. Martindale (ed.) *Ovid Renewed*, Cambridge.
- Rutherford, I (2001) *Pindar's Paeans*, Oxford.
- Saller, R.P. (1982) *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*, Cambridge.

- Salvadori, E. (1993) 'L'episodio di Calipso nella trasposizione ovidiana del modello omerico (Ars II 123-142)' in U. Albin, S. Feraboli (eds.) *Mosaico: Studi in onore di Umberto Albin*, Genua.
- Scullard, H.H. (1959) *From the Gracchi to Nero*, London.
- Segal, C. (1968) 'Circean Temptations: Homer, Vergil, Ovid', *TAPA* 99: 419-442.
- Segal, E. (1968) *Roman Laughter*, Oxford.
- Sharrock, A. (1987) 'Ars Amatoria 2.123-42: Another Homeric Scene in Ovid', *Mnemosyne* 40: 406-12.
- (1994a) *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria II*, Oxford.
- (1994b) 'Ovid and the Politics of Reading', *MD* 33: 97-122.
- (2002) 'Ovid and the Discourses of Love: The Amatory Works' in P. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge.
- (2003) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic*, by K. Volk. Reviewed in: *Classical Philology* 98: 306-9.
- (2005) 'Those Who Can, Teach: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and Contemporary Instructional Writing', in M. Horster, C. Reitz (eds.) *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt*, Stuttgart.
- (2006) 'Love in Parentheses: Digression and Narrative Hierarchy in Ovid's Erotodidactic Poems', in R. Gibson, S. Green, and A. Sharrock (eds.) *The Art of Love*, Oxford.
- (2009) *Reading Roman Comedy*, Cambridge.
- Sharrock, A. and Morales, H.L. (2000) *Intratextuality*, Oxford.
- Shulman, J. (1981) 'Te quoque falle tamen: Ovid's anti-Lucretian Didactics', *The Classical Journal* 76: 242-53.
- Smith, W. (1870) *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, London.
- Solodow, J.B. (1977) 'Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: the lover as cultural ideal', *WS* 11: 106-27.

- (1986) 'raucaae, tua cura, palumbes: Study of a Poetic Word Order', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90:129-53.
- (1988) *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, London.
- Sonderegger, E. (1986) 'Die Flügel des Dädalus', *Gymnasium* 93: 520-32.
- Studel, M. (1992) *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids Ars Amatoria*, Hildesheim.
- Stroh, W. (1979) 'Rhetorik und Erotik', *WJA* 5: 117-132.
- (1991) 'de amore senili quid ueteres poetae senserint', *Gymnasium* 98: 264-76.
- Thomas, R.F. (1983) 'Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry', *CQ* 33: 92-113.
- (1988) *Georgics*, Cambridge.
- Toohy, P. (1996) *Epic Lessons*, London.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. (1971) *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, London.
- Treggiari, S. (1969) *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic*, Oxford.
- (1991) *Roman Marriage*, Oxford.
- Trenkner, S. (1958) *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, Cambridge.
- Van Sickle, J. (1980) 'The Book-Roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book', *Arethusa* 13: 5-42.
- Verdière, R. (1987) 'Ovide, A.A., 2, 308', *Latomus* 46: 849.
- Viarre, S. (1988) 'Doublets mythologiques chez Ovide: de 'Art d'aimer aux *Métamorphoses*' in D. Porte and J.-P. Néraudeau (eds.) *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec* (Coll. *Latomus* 201, Brussels), 441-8.
- Volk, K. (2002) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic*, Oxford.
- Watson, A. (1971) *Roman Private Law around 200 BC*, Edinburgh.
- Watson, L. (2003) *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford.

- (2007) 'The Bogus Teacher', *RhM* 150: 337-374.
- Watson, P. (1983a) 'Mythological *exempla* in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*', *Classical Philology* 78:117-26.
- (1983b) '*puella* and *uirgo*', *Glotta* 61: 119-43.
- (1984) 'Love as Civiliser: *Ars Amatoria* 2.467-92', *Latomus* 43: 389-95.
- (1985) 'Axelson revisited: the selection of vocabulary in Latin poetry', *CQ* 35: 430-448.
- (2002) 'Praecepta Amoris: Ovid's Didactic Elegy', in B.W. Boyd (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden.
- Watts, W.J. (1973) 'Ovid, the Law and Roman Society on Abortion', *Acta Classica* 16: 89-101.
- Weber, M. (1983) *Die mythologische Erzählung in Ovids Liebeskunst*, Frankfurt.
- Wheeler, A.L. (1910) 'Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources. Part I', *CPh* 5:440-50.
- (1911) 'Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources. Part II', *CPh* 6:56-77.
- Wheeler, S.M. (1995) '*Imago Mundi*: Another View of the Creation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *The American Journal of Philology* 116: 95-121.
- Whitaker, R. (1983) *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy: a study in poetic technique*, Göttingen.
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1970) '*domina* in Catullus 68', *The Classical Review* 20: 290.
- Williams, R.D. (2004) *The Aeneid of Virgil*, Bristol.
- Winkler, J. (1990) *Constraints of Desire*, London.
- (1991) 'The Constraints of Eros', in D. Obbink and C.A. Faraone (eds.) *Magika Hiera*, Oxford.
- Wise, V.M. (1977) 'Flight Myths in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: an interpretation of Phaethon and Daedalus', *Ramus* 6: 44-59.

Yardley, J.C. (1973) 'Sick-Visiting in Roman Elegy', *Phoenix* 27: 283-288.

(1977) 'The Roman Elegists, Sick Girls, and the *Soteria*', *CQ* 27: 394-401.

Zetzel, J.E.G. (1996) 'Poetic Baldness and Its Cure', *MD* 36: 73-100.

Zingerle, A. (1869) *Ovidius und sein Verhältnis zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen dichtern*, Innsbruck.

Zinn, E. (1970) *Ovids Ars Amatoria und Remedia Amoris*, Stuttgart.