Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

1-1-2007

Body Parts and Their Epic Struggle in Ovid's Amores

Leisa M. Muto
lmuto@ma.rr.com

Recommended Citation
Muto, Leisa M., "Body Parts and Their Epic Struggle in Ovid's Amores" (2007). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones.* Paper 325.

Body Parts and Their Epic Struggle in Ovid's *Amores*

Thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in Latin

by

Leisa M. Muto

Dr. Caroline Perkins, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson
Dr. E. Del Chrol, Ph.D.

Marshall University

August 2007

ABSTRACT

Body Parts and Their Epic Struggle in Ovid's *Amores*

By Leisa M. Muto

This thesis examines how body parts in Ovid's *Amores* provide the location for an epic battle between the conflicting genres of Tragedy and Elegy. The first chapter summarizes past Ovidian scholarship. The second chapter examines how Ovid separates body parts of the *amator* and the *puella* in *Amores* 1.4 and 1.5 in order to deny the lovers complete unification. The third chapter expands the conclusion of the second by analyzing poems in Books 2 and 3, which contain a significant number of body parts, to determine how the *amator's* interaction with the *puella's* body parts reflects his lack of union with her in public and private spheres. The fourth chapter rereads the *puella's* body parts, and the *amator's* relationship with them, with a view to establish the *puella* as either Tragedy or Elegy and to theorize how the *amator's* relationship with the *puella* symbolizes the *poeta's* relationship with his poetry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW

I. Introduction

Extensive study of Ovid's poetic talent and the literary value of his *Amores* has resulted in a body of scholarship which is as varied and complex as the *amator* whom Ovid created in his elegies. Recent scholarship, which hails Ovid's abilities to use subtle poetic techniques to change considerably the elegiac genre, has supplanted early study of the *Amores*, which undervalued (and even dismissed) Ovid's contribution to elegy. Before the 1960's, study of Ovid's *Amores* concentrated primarily on their function as the first step in Ovid's literary career (Otis) and on their literary (in)sincerity compared to his elegiac predecessors Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (Allen). After the mid-twentieth century, some scholars renounced these previous, narrow conclusions about the *Amores* and they opened up the scope of Ovidian study by researching the *Amores* with a view to call attention to their literary significance. The 1960's ushered in an increased interest Ovid's *Amores* in their own right as research centered on, among many things, Ovid's awareness of his audience (Curran) and his unconventional treatment (generally parodic) of traditional elegiac themes (Khan, Sullivan). Scholarship focused solely on the *Amores* continued at an equal pace in the 1970's as scholars revisited previously established issues and produced new ideas, some of which focused on Ovid's shattering of genre constraints through innovative style (Du Quesnay, Elliott, Fyler, Tracy). The concentration on individual poems and Ovid's style in the *Amores* continued in the 1980's when research revealed that the *Amores* was a multifaceted literary achievement which contained complex literary allusions mocking the conventional elegiac lover (Davis, Lyne, McKeown) and exemplifying the Callimachean ideal (Hinds). The

hypothesis that women in elegy symbolize elegy itself was set forth at the close of the decade and greatly influenced subsequent research about the elegiac *puella* (Wyke).

Research on the *Amores* exploded in the last decade of the twentieth century and has carried on after the turn of the century. In the 1990's, Ovidian study addressed a wide variety of themes. Scholars expanded upon previous scholarship concerning the various ways in which Ovid pushed elegiac limits (Buchan, McKeown) and the theory of the *puella* symbolizing elegy (Keith). New issues included the concept of the *puella* as *materia*, as a girl who is "merely a projection of the speaker's erotic and literary imaginations" (Greene 418) and Ovid's use of the *Amores* to comment both on his literary predecessors (Keith, Miller) and on the conventions of the genre (Athanassaki, Morrison). As the trend to study Ovid's *Amores* continued through the early twenty-first century, new study focused on identifying Ovid as an elegiac innovator (Boyd) and reading the *Amores* from the viewpoint of the *puella* (James). Although decades of research on the *Amores* has treated a wide variety of topics, there are ten common areas of interest: poetic sincerity; parody; Propertian imitation; literary techniques and style; manipulation of the audience; Ovid's unique treatment of the love is war theme; the elegiac *puella*; the *Amores* as a political commentary; perception of *vates*; expansion of the elegiac genre by infusing it with elements traditionally found in other genres, particularly epic; and by creating an *amator* who is distinctly separate from the writer himself.

II. Sincerity

The prevalent opinion that Ovid was not as sincere an amatory poet as his predecessors led to narrow study of *Amores* which viewed the composition as merely a

building block for Ovid's later works. In 1950 Allen set ancient and modern concepts of literary sincerity against each other in order to prove that Ovid was a sincere poet by ancient standards which considered a writer sincere if style appropriately reflected content. Since Ovid's controlled mastery of elegy in the *Amores* was consistent with Ovid's *amator's* views on love that "passion, although it can and should not be denied, must in some manner be mastered and placed under restraint by the lover," Ovid is a sincere Roman elegist (Allen 157). From this point forward, most scholars agreed with Allen's conclusion that contemporary notions of sincerity (i. e., sincerity is characterized by a poem's representation of a true relationship between a poet and a non-fictional girl) should no longer be a criterion upon which the *Amores* should be judged (Sullivan).

Although critics abandoned the quest for genuineness in Ovid's emotions, they nevertheless continued to question the sincerity of Ovid's fictional *amator* because he combines cool rationality with emotional senselessness (a characteristic traditionally associated with one consumed by the fires of love). The *amator* repeatedly seeks to convince the reader that he has surrendered to emotion (be it love or sorrow or regret) only to reveal, at the very end, that he actually is in control of his logic and the situation. This is in contrast to the servile *amators* who preceded him because in the *Amores*, "the final image is of a triumphant Ovid who had cleverly robbed the girl of her initial advantage" (Tracy 348).   A path of reasoning is especially present in *Amores* 1.2, as the *amator* takes himself, along with the reader, down this path to conclude that events in 1.1 actually happened (contrary to the *dicitur* in 1.1) and therefore have caused the physical and emotional suffering present in 1.2 (Moles). Moles argues that through this poem the reader is introduced fully to the "schizophrenic figure, part rationalist…part lover" that is

present throughout the *Amores* (554). Even *Amores* 3.11, a poem which superficially

seems to betray logic, exhibits inherent logic behind the lover's "reversal" of attitude

(Perkins 124).

The use of rhetoric throughout the *Amores* emphasizes the presence of logic and

thus destabilizes the characterization of a sincere, emotionally-driven *amator*. In *Amores*

1.14, Ovid takes a topic found in two Greek epigrams by Meleager and Antipater and

expands it by making it a *suasoria* (Elliott). Following the rules of rhetoric, Ovid

constructs 1.14 like a "*suasoria* to Aurora to delay her coming" (Elliott 127). As such,

the poem is structured in the following way: an "*exordium*" (lines 3-4) followed by a

"*narratio*" (lines 5-8) and a "*probatio*" (lines 11-24) and a "*refutatio*" (lines 41-46)

(Elliott 128-130). Due to the highly structured nature of the poem, which follows the

rules of rhetoric and is thus rational, many critics consider it emotionless, but Elliott

stresses the originality Ovid used in his treatment of an old subject. Ovid's "rhetorical

training" was the catalyst for his desire to create different persona for an *amator* whose

character changes in order "to achieve his erotic ends" (Davis 3). Davis suggests that the

goal of a student of rhetoric, when performing a *controversia ethica*, is to assume the

character of all parties involved to win the argument (for personal glory, not for the well-

being of the defendant); therefore, by transforming himself into an elegiac poet (and as a

poet who is capable of transforming his *amator* into many characters), Ovid is seeking

not to make love prevail, but to be praised for his abilities.

This goal is made clear in *Amores* 1.15 where Ovid's poet contends that he, a poet

blessed with natural skill, is guaranteed immortality and neither *Livor* nor death itself can

rob him of that pleasure (Vessey). To get pleasure from such a notion reveals that an

elegiac poet, in profession of his undying love, is seeking really to be immortal himself. This confession exposes that the poet created the fictional *amator* not to expound on the trials of love but to flaunt his own skill through the exploitation of love's trials thereby exposing the insincerity of the *amator*. Vessey concludes, "In his exploration of the theme of immortality (as in his whole approach to the follies and vicissitudes of *amor*), Ovid prompts us to question received ideas and to see perhaps not so much the glory of the poet's calling but the vanity it shared with all other human ambitions *sub specie aeternitatis*" (617). For scholars to focus on the *Amores*' lack of sincerity is a waste of time because, as Barsby summarizes, "the *Amores* are essentially an intellectual and literary creation…they depend for their effect on the co-operation of the reader, who must be thoroughly familiar with the features of the genre and be able to appreciate the subtlety and originality of Ovid's treatment" (7).

III. Parody

Most scholars (see Sullivan, Stirrup, Davis, Barsby, and Lyne) find elements of parody (i. e., a humorous attitude toward the traditionally cruel affairs of love) in the *Amores* even though Boyd feels that Ovid's creative treatment of elegiac themes (in different context than originally used) should not be considered caricatures, but an attempt to change elegies to focus less on moral and political issues and more on personal amatory experiences. Generally speaking, Ovid is believed to parody any and all aspects of "the elegiac tradition" (Sullivan 535). His main modes of parody are his unconventional presentation of established elegiac subjects (see also Sections IV: Propertian Parallels, VII: Love is War and Triumph Theme, and X: *Vates*), unusual use of mythological *exempla*, and farcical characterization of the *amator*. Stirrup sees *Amores*

1.7 as a demonstration of how Ovid uses multifaceted irony (through "legal, military, and mythological themes") to parody the conventional elegiac theme of physical abuse (824). Like his elegiac predecessors, Ovid oftentimes uses mythological *exempla* either to "raise experience from an individual to universal level" or "as arguments to prove a point" (Davis 412). But to undercut such use, Davis shows how Ovid often concludes a grouping of otherwise appropriate *exempla* with incongruous *anti-exempla* which "represent stories which, according to Ovid's own rendition, did not take place in such a way as to show that his 'private experience is consonant with or justified by universal human experience' but which are applied to the situation anyway," thus mocking the traditional elegiac use of mythological *exempla* (415).

Barsby views the biggest target for parody in the *Amores* as "the persona which Ovid has himself adopted; and that persona is an amalgam based not only on Propertius but also on the other elegists and on the general conventions of the genre" (8). Lyne argues that in *Amores* Book 1, Ovid pokes fun at the elegiac tradition while assuming the "mask" of the elegiac lover; however, in Books 2 and 3 Ovid fully reveals himself as "a member of the anti-romantic reaction" (267). Ovid uses "logic" and "literalism" to provide a comedic look at the elegiac lover who rejoices in licentiousness and ridicules the lives of politicians, soldiers, and even elegiac poets (Lyne 252). He employs complex literary allusions in the *Amores* to humor the audience by making the "bumbling lover" and the "artificiality and affectation which characterized the literary love affair" the butt of his jokes (Davis 2465). In this way Ovid emphasizes the realistic nature of his own *amator* to mock the insincerity of those created before his. Early on in a poem, Ovid forces the audience to recognize the original work to which he alludes so that they can

appreciate his unconventional treatment of it which usually highlights the unrealistic nature of preceding literary love affairs.

IV. Propertian Parallels

The widely studied similarities between Ovid's *Amores* and Propertius' amatory elegies generally depict Ovid as a mere Propertian aspirant and offer another reason why Ovid's *Amores* have been disregarded as simple Propertian imitations. However, recent scholarship has pointed out two key problems with this perception. The first issue is the potential influence of G. Cornelius Gallus on Ovid (Cairns). Very little remains of Gallus' elegiac work, but opinions of ancient writers and modern literary historians credit him with creating the type of Roman elegy which Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid all perpetuated (Conte, Howatson). By illustrating that Ovid's *Amores* 1.3 is influenced not only by "a Greek epigrammatist and…Propertius" but also by a Gallan fragment, Cairns highlights the dangers of ascribing similarities in Ovid's *Amores* solely to Propertius' work (109). The inability to pinpoint which individual poet served as the model for Ovid's *Amores* further weakens the opinion of Ovid being a mere Propertian imitator. Boyd believes that when poets are tied together by significant words appearing in similar positions in lines, or significant words appearing in similar scenes, it may simply be due to poetic memory, not due to a poet's desire to imitate a predecessor. Therefore, Ovid's work references not only Propertius, but Gallus, Horace, Callimachus, Catullus, and even Ovid himself (Boyd). Nevertheless, the Propertian influence is obvious and there are many theories (aside from immature imitation) which discuss how and why Ovid used Propertian references.

Barsby believes that Ovid either uses "Propertius as a starting-point for a different development of the theme" or employs "the associations of the Propertius passage to highlight the irony of his own approach" (7). On the other hand Morgan, after pointing out that the use of standard elegiac themes was commonplace, focuses only on philological imitation of Propertius to demonstrate the ways in which Ovid imitated Propertius and concludes that Ovid uses various types of imitation for various reasons. Ovid discriminately and effectively uses brief Propertian imitations to parody the seriousness of the trials and tribulations of an *amator*; he employs complex, lengthy Propertian imitations either to "establish a specific background for his elegy" (44) or "to provide clues about the impending change [of mood]" (69); and in Book 3, where the *amator* begins his journey away from elegy and the *puella*, Propertian imitation is employed to accentuate the dismal end. Applying Harold Bloom's Freud-based theories about poetry to Ovid's works, Arkins disagrees with the abovementioned theories and postulates that Ovid, due to "anxiety of influence" used and modified Propertius' works in order to compromise the "serious intent of the genre" with a view to give himself a place in the literary hall of fame (826-827).

One specific poem, *Amores* 1.8, has garnered much attention in the debate of Propertius' influence on Ovid. The thematic similarity of Ovid's Dipsas poem and Propertius' Acanthis poem has invited intense discussion about the two, including, but not limited to, which was composed first (Courtney). Although both poems were shaped by literary precedents, Courtney and O'Neill concur that Ovid's Dipsas poem was written after (and modeled on) Propertius' Acanthis poem, but the two scholars disagree about the literary merits of *Amores* 1.8: Courtney believes Propertius' poem excels where

Ovid's merely over-extends, whereas O'Neill feels that Ovid uses the original to add literary depth to his poem. O'Neill states that

> "Several phrases in Ovid's poem represent different kinds of reflexive annotation. The location of those markers in the midst of several lines with strong verbal echoes of two other Propertian texts encourages us to use the Ovidian poem as a sophisticated commentary…The learned commentary can only make the fallacies in the construction of the Ovidian lover more obvious…the particular combination of the allusions presents the elegiac lover as a self-righteous fraud, who expects fidelity from his mistress despite the likelihood that he will eventually abandon her" (304).

In addition to studying the philological and thematic connections of the two poems, scholars have also examined the similarity of each poet's construction of the *lena*. Propertius and Ovid (and Tibullus) view the *lena* as a threat to their amatory and poetic undertakings (Myers). But Gross, who feels that too many scholars have focused for too long on comparisons of Ovid's treatment of the bawd theme with Propertius, chooses to focus on the way in which the structure of *Amores* 1.8 supports its content. By focusing on Dipsas' powers of *carmina* and *sermo*, Ovid fashions her as a rhetorical rival. Unlike Propertius, who merely states that his *lena* has the power to persuade, Ovid supports this fact by structuring Dipsas' speech (which comprises 89% of the poem) as an oration (Gross 199). In addition to possessing the same level of rhetorical skill as the *amator*, it is clear that Dipsas intends to use this skill for amatory pursuits: she adopts the *amator*'s language, "*mea lux*" and "*me miseram*," she gives advice which the *amator* himself employs in 2.7, and she gives advice which the *amator* himself gives in 2.19 (204). Myers' study both supports and expands this view by offering that the *lena*, as a teacher of love and composer of *carmina*, is, in addition to being a rival of the *poeta*, an embodiment of the narrator; therefore, she represents the *poeta* himself and "is complicit in his construction of the elegiac *puella* and in the creation of erotic discourse" (20).

V. Literary Technique and Style

Ovid's inventive use of language and arrangement in the *Amores* permeates the entire work. In addition to treating elegiac themes differently than his predecessors, Ovid departed from his predecessors in his use of the couplet to express a complete thought and in his expansion of poetic vocabulary by using words never before used in poetry, inventing new words, and using old words in new contexts (Du Quesnay).   Ferguson shows how Ovid uses a variety of tools (oftentimes more than one in a single poem) "to enable his language to operate on more than one level" (131). These tools include "mythological allusion", "literary allusion", "metaphor and simile", "puns", "assonance and alliteration…for bringing words into new relationships", "other juxtapositions of language, creating a relationship of ideas", the "superimposition of one image on another by a sudden twist", "illusion", giving "new lease of life to a cliché" and using the "final couplet to give a new dimension to the whole poem" (Ferguson 131).

Poems as a whole, or coupled with others, display Ovid's desire to create tension in his poetry. After defining "dramatic pairs" as poems linked "in such a way that the second poem serves not just as the thematic companion piece to the preceding but as its dramatic sequel, depending on the first for its dramatic point of departure," Davis examines how Ovid uses this technique in the *Amores* and concludes that Ovid's *amator* generally attempts to persuade in the first poem and reacts honestly, revealing his nasty side, in the second poem (19). Ovid also uses theatrical tactics, such as asides and soliloquies as in *Amores* 1.8, 1.4, and 3.2, to enhance tension throughout a poem and to increase pleasure and/or frustration with the outcome (Tracy 497). Finally, Suter adds "the transformation of image into narrative" to the growing list of poetic techniques used

by Ovid in the *Amores* (15). The use of this technique allows Ovid to comment on

literary style through the actions of such images in the poetry (Suter).

VI. Manipulation of Theme and Audience

Ovid's poetry reveals that he was always aware of his audience; therefore, it

follows naturally that his literary style involves (mis)leading his audience so that they can

admire his poetic prowess.   Ovid exploits his rhetorical training in elegy in order to cater

to the audience; instead of simply offering an introspective work, he addresses the

audience directly and creates dramatic developments and scenery (McKeown). Ovid

employs asides, "brief remark[s] made in the middle of a conversation which is not

intended for the second party in the conversation but rather for the audience or the

reader," for two main reasons: one, to express "second thoughts" about what has been

said; two, to give the reaction of the addressee (Davis 190-191). Davis finds roots for

both of these usages in several of Plautus' plays and concludes that "Ovid wants the

reader to sympathize with and be amused by his plight in much the same way that Plautus

wanted his audience to react to the predicaments of his characters" (192).

After connecting with the audience, Ovid, who relished his ability "to play upon

the reader's expectations," would influence the readers' reactions (Barsby 8). Curran,

using *Amores* 1.10 as an example, discusses how Ovid manipulates the theme and his

audience by constructing images with the sole purpose to destroy them, intentionally

(mis)leading the audience in order to deceive them.   By recalling specific poems,

themes, and situations of Horace, Virgil, Tibullus, and Propertius, Ovid invites the

audience to anticipate parallel events, only to surprise the reader by treating the situation

differently than his predecessors (Du Quesnay).

Curran also offers *Amores* 1.3 to show how Ovid hides clues within a common elegiac theme (the poor lover who has nothing to offer his *puella* except for fame through poetry) which uncover the true personality (different than the traditional, monogamous, elegiac lover) of the *poeta-amator*. He uses the stock theme to lead the audience one way with a goal to contrast his current stance. Ovid controls the reactions of his audience by giving readers cues to react in one way, but then persuades them away from this reaction by his ability to influence (Connor). Ovid skillfully constructs realistic settings, thoughts, and individuals then combines these with rhetorical skills to dupe the reader all the while acknowledging that without the reader, his accomplice, he would not be able to do anything (Connor). The importance of entertaining the audience is an intermediate step to Ovid's main goal of achieving recognition for his poetic expertise. Khan thoroughly analyzes *Amores* 1.7 to show how Ovid, writing about an incident of abuse, separates himself from the *amator* who perpetrated the abuse in order to delight in his poetic abilities.

VII. Love is War and Triumph Theme

Although the "love is war" theme was not invented by the Roman elegists, it was Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid who perfected treatment of the theme. Of the three, Ovid used the theme in all three books of the *Amores* and altered it according to context of individual poems (Thomas). Love as war in the *Amores* is most commonly studied through the lover as soldier imagery in *Amores* 1.9 and Ovid's treatment of the triumphal theme in *Amores* 1.2. Galinsky concludes that depending on the work (*Amores, Ars Amatoria*, *Tristia*, *Epistulae ex Ponto*), Ovid treats the triumphal theme differently. Furthermore Galinsky believes that in the *Amores*, Ovid uses the theme to elevate the

pursuits of erotic love, which devalues the official, revered triumphal process. Cupid's

triumph in *Amores* 1.2 can be interpreted as a restrained criticism on previous poets' use

of the theme and the practice itself in contemporary Rome: "the triumph of Ovid's Cupid

does cast ironic light, however playfully or obliquely, not only on the Roman institution,

a Tibullan reference to *triumphus*, Propertius as *poeta triumphans*, and Alexander's

victory parade, but also on Augustus himself" (Miller 294). Athanassaki agrees and feels

that through Cupid's triumph in *Amores* 1.2, Ovid comments on the "conventions and

themes" of elegiac poetry (138). The triumphal daydream ends unexpectedly with a

mention of Augustus which conveys the stark difference between love poetry and "the

official Augustan spirit" (Athanassaki 140).

Scholarship pertaining to *Amores* 1.9 focuses on both Ovid's innovation to the

soldier of love argument and the poem's function as the center of Book 1. When

previous elegists took the soldier of love stance it was in opposition to a life of activity,

an acceptance of a life of leisure (McKeown). In contrast, Ovid's solider of love

participated in an equally, if not exceedingly, active life of a military soldier. Ovid's

second innovation was the manner in which he presented the poem – not with a personal,

emotional investment – but from the viewpoint of a student of rhetoric. In order to fully

appreciate the poem, McKeown believes that less energy should be focused on the motive

for the poem and more focused towards the "verbal dexterity and cleverness" which is

found within (304). Murgatroyd agrees that in *Amores* 1.9 Ovid is not really trying to

prove that lovers and soldiers are one the same, rather "he is parodying rhetorical proofs

in general and the *comparatio* in particular" (570).

In *Amores* 1.9, Ovid not only points out both parallels and differences that exist between a lover and a soldier but he also conveys the idea that the roles of *amator* and *puella* constantly change in amatory battles (Olstein). Olstein sees these role reversals as key to the meaning of *Amores* Book 1, that "love is more warlike than war because of its unremitting role ambiguities and reversals" (291). Using *Amores* 1.9 as the center of Book 1 and 1.3 and 1.15 as the frames of this center, Olstein explains the ways in which the poems on either side of the center are paired to illustrate role reversals. The ultimate reversal, of course, is the *poeta's* reversal from epic poet to love poet and, it is only after being conquered by love that he is able to enjoy literary success.

The theme of conquering pervades all three books of Ovid's *Amores* throughout which Ovid's lover, in seeking to dominate his *puella*, ends up being subjugated, but the audience, due to Ovid's widespread use of violence, has been desensitized and does not sympathize with the male lover (Cahoon). Cahoon sees this as a reflection of society and that it "shows how attitudes of competition and hostility pervade Roman *amor* in men and women alike and perhaps even suggests that humiliation and subjection are the ultimate result of real as well as of metaphorical warfare and conquest" (306-307). Therefore, the triumphal theme in *Amores* 1.2 and the soldier of love theme in *Amores* 1.9 reinforce a social structure which perpetuates domination with a view to render its subjects powerless.

VIII. Elegiac *Puellae*

A belief held by Hallett that the *puellae*, as women, are the powerful players in elegy is superficial for two main reasons: one, because the *amator* has a financial advantage over the *puella* (James); two, the *poeta* has creative control over the

construction, and therefore actions, of the *puella* (Greene, Fear). The *amator* professes

poverty due to his decision to leave public life and write elegy. Likewise he expects the

puella, whom scholars assume to be a courtesan who earns a livelihood by getting paid

for sex, to embrace poverty by providing her services to him without payment (James).

"From her perspective, however, the lover can always return to other activities and

careers, but all she has to offer is the sex demanded by the lover in that *recusatio* [*Amores*

1.1]. Once she has given that up, she loses all her leverage in this relationship – a

relationship despite the protestations of the lovers, is unequal and temporary" (James

239). But James points out that this portrayal is necessary – to recognize that the

courtesan needs payment for sex to earn a living would be to acknowledge "that the

inequities in the elegiac love affair favor the lover, an admission that would topple the

inverted power structure of *servitium amoris*" (240), a figure which, according to

Murgatroyd, all the elegists employed to convey their "views on the whole nature of

love" (603).

Greene argues that poets create, manipulate, and dominate the *puellae* as *materia*;

as a result, "[t]he *puella's* identity as a woman, even a subordinated one, has been

subsumed entirely by her role as a literary construction in the *amator's* poems" (110).

Green offers *Amores* 1.7 to demonstrate this notion that, once possessed by the *amator*,

the *puella* is turned into the *poeta's materia*. The poem portrays the *puella* as "a resource

to be possessed and exploited" (409) and the *poeta-amator* gets "pleasure and self-

enhancement…from subjugating his mistress" (411) who "becomes merely a projection

of the speaker's erotic and literary imaginations" (418). However, Fear believes that the

successful manipulation of the *puella/materia* by the *poeta* has negative consequences for

the elegiac *amator*.   According to Fear, the *amator's* failure is due to the *poeta's*

success: "the sexualized female who functions as a metonym for the poet's verbal

product is also the desired female object of the narrator in the text. Hence, the more

successful the poet is in pimping his poetic wares, the less chance the elegiac narrator has

of success within the text" (232).

Recent research has shown how the *puella* in elegy may not depict an actual

person (neither in reality nor in poetry) because she can represent a poet's *materia* which

he seeks to dominate. Wyke argues that "The Elegiac Woman" in the *Amores* should not

be considered a reflection of a real woman because Ovid gives female bodies to poetic

forms in *Amores* 3.1 "in order to dramatize a Callimachean opposition between poetic

practices" (124). Keith expands on this concept by showing that the way in which Ovid

describes *puellae* in the *Amores* results in their being directly associated with, if not one

in the same with, the elegiac genre and that his changing love affairs with the *puellae*

represent his shifting relationship with elegy.

IX. Political Commentary

Ovid's *Amores* as a political commentary receives less attention than his

predecessors because some scholars, including Du Quesnay, agree that Ovid's amatory

love poetry is only anti-regime and anti-establishment because that was the pose of the

elegiac poets who predated him; his work should be appreciated and enjoyed more for its

poetic style and innovation than for political commentary. However, in a note reacting to

Curran's 1966 article "*Desultores Amoris*: Ovid *Amores* 1.3" in which Curran connects

Ovid's references to the *desultores* to Ovid's equestrian background, Holleman sees a

connection between *fides* and *equites*. Curran felt that the *poeta*/equestrian's protestation

16

of *fides* to his mistress was undermined by his association with Jupiter/*desultores* of love. Holleman believes that by alluding to his equestrian background and professing his rejection of it in favor of poetry, the *poeta* contrasts himself (and his possession of traditional *fides*) with those equestrians who were "abandoning their traditional position" (and thus traditional *fides*) by serving the emperor (177-178). As the *poeta* continues to contrast his *fides* with that of senators and then Jupiter, Holleman believes that the natural progression leads the audience to equate Jupiter with Augustus because "[t]his is consistent with Ovid's way of comparing Augustus with Jupiter elsewhere" (178). Therefore, *Amores* 1.3 is a reaction to the insincerity of *fides* amongst governmental officials. Davis sees the *Amores* as challenging not only politicians, but three major components of Augustan ideology: one, "emphasis on military success"; two, "exploitation of the Julian myth"; three, "attempt to restore what was conceived of as traditional morality, especially sexual morality" (434).

X. *Vates*

Early Augustan poets used the term *vates* to describe a poet who, through his divinely inspired words, educated those who read his works (Newman). But as time passed, some poets felt a need to reconcile the inability to be both a personal poet and a person who espouses on matters which affect all humans. Newman believes that Ovid did not face this dilemma because by the time he calls himself a *vates*, the concept had lost its divine affiliation and had been reduced to a mere poet, a reduction of meaning which Perkins has seen as deliberate. Ovid redefines the term *vates,* a term traditionally associated with noble, epic poets*,* in his *Amores* by claiming that a meager, elegiac poet is a *vates*. He achieves this mainly by reiterating that the elegiac *vates* is inspired by Cupid

17

(as opposed to the Muses or Apollo) and therefore is called to instruct individuals in the games of love and sex. Perkins states that this distortion of the concept of *vates* results in "a parodic and critical reaction to the lofty ideal of *vates*, to the elegiac innovation, and even to Ovid's own reconfiguration of the concept" (59). The significance of Ovid's transformation of *vates* from an epic to an elegiac concept can be supported by the importance of the conversion of Ovid's poet from a *poeta* to a *vates*. (Olstein). According to Olstein, "[b]y placing his stories of occupational metamorphosis in structurally important poems he [Ovid] indicates that transformations of status and balanced occurrences of an identical but often reversed situation are to be a basic thematic and structural principal of the work" (243).

XI. Transcending Genre Constraints

Scholars who view Ovid as an innovator agree that he, in an attempt to breathe life into a tired genre, widened the scope of the genre all the while acknowledging the difficulty of the task (Parker 96). Boyd recognized that Ovid was not trying to end the elegiac genre, but reinvent it with his *Amores*. According to Boyd, one of the ways in which he achieved this was to infuse elegy with aspects of other genres, but Ovid's use of similes which are better suited for epic and which are copied from predecessors is criticized frequently. Acknowledging that some scholars view Ovid's use of similes is in "bad taste" (90) and that they undermine the sincerity of the elegy, Boyd argues that Ovid's use of similes is misunderstood and that he extends common epic similes in order to "transcend the boundaries of a genre" (91).

In *Amores* 1.7 Ovid describes the *furor* of the *amator* by using mythological *exempla* which came from a variety of genres; therefore, the *poeta*, in pushing the limits

18

of elegy, is disobeying Cupid and only a crazy poet would go against his muse

(Morrison). [1] But by the end of the poem, both *amator* and *poeta* realize the severity of

their transgression and express a desire for things to return as they were before the poem

began. Since Callimachus used the erotic body to represent "desirable poetic qualities,"

it is not surprising that both Propertius' and Ovid's *amators* engage in violence against

puellae (whose whorish bodies merit punishment) and, as a result, are thrown

momentarily into the world of epic (Fredrick 461). Fredrick adds, "The wounded female

flesh is thus a blot on the self-representation of the poet, a transgression of his aesthetic

principles"; therefore, when the *puellae* are violated it is to be taken that the *poeta* has

lost control of his own composition and the elegy is violated as well (464). Nevertheless,

Ovid's work was a refined representation of Callimachean ideals written in such a way

that its style did not interfere with its presentation, thus making it even more

sophisticated and accessible for any audience (McKeown).

Cupid's role in the poet's defiance of elegiac conventions has been recognized by

Buchan, Gildenhard, and Zissos. By the end of *Amores* 1.2, Elegy and Augustus are

portrayed in the same way – as using sweet talk to hide brutal objectives (Buchan).

Stating that "Cupid is guilty of genre imperialism" because he forced his way into the

epic genre, Buchan implies that Ovid too extends elegy beyond its customary boundaries

and is thus an imperialist (65). Ovid uses Cupid's interventions in *Amores, Ars*, and

Remedia Amoris to "signal his generic affiliations, yet also remind the reader both of his

less than serious attitude towards his material and the artificiality of his voice"

(Gildenhard and Zissos 74). By conceding that although he is writing elegy he is not

---

[1] For the purpose of this thesis, I consider the narrator of *Amores* to be both the *amator* and *poeta* and it is through the characterization and actions of this narrator/*amator*/*poeta* that Ovid comments on his own poetic preferences.

speaking from the same point of view of the *amator* (as previous elegists had done), Ovid separates himself from the voice of his poetry. This separate voice convinced Boyd that two plots (other than amatory pursuits) saturate the *Amores*: one, the transition of writer from epic to elegiac poet; two, the immortality of the poet.

XII. Miscellaneous

Five pieces of research, unable to be grouped in the abovementioned categories, add to the diverse study of the *Amores*. Otis' 1938 article focuses on the role of Ovid's *Amores* in the development of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and concludes that Ovid's interest in myth, and his concentration on the psychology of mythological events, is evident in the *Amores*; therefore, the *Amores* contains unpolished glimmers of the *Metamorphoses* to come. Cameron, turning to the study of the *Amores* in their own right, debates previous scholars' conclusions about the first edition of *Amores*, rejecting the notion that Corinna was the subject of the first edition and that the individual poems within the *Amores* can be ordered according to chronological composition. He also believes that the second edition was an abridgment of the first and that the themes ("burlesque treatment of amatory themes," "unconcern about the identity of the beloved," and "irreverent attitude to the establishment") in the second edition were in fact present in the longer first edition (327). Cahoon's additional analysis of prominent themes in *Amores* 1.1, 2.1, and 3.1 reveals a theme of deception, reflecting declining morals of society, which corresponded with Ovid's diminishment of the importance of poetry. This reduction of the genre's worth is supported by Arkin's view that Ovid debased the genre of love elegy in three main ways: firstly, since Ovid's his *amator* focused on "sex, not sexual love," all the sincere relationships of previous elegists were being ridiculed; secondly, Ovid's works

were verbose; thirdly, by not properly employing the metaphor, by incorrectly using the word *amor* to refer to sex, and by not stretching thoughts over couplets, Ovid's work is repetitive and trite (828). In contrast to this view is the opinion that the *Amores* function not merely as amatory poetry, but as very insightful literary critique. Keith argues that due to Ovid's literary allusions to both Virgil and Propertius in *Amores* 1.1, the audience is invited "to make literary sense, not amatory sense, out of the poem" (336); specifically, *Amores* 1.1 "constitutes, in addition to its other aspects, one of the first critical discussions of Propertius' achievement in the *Monobiblos*; and the implications of Ovid's reading of Propertius 1.1 are of importance to the literary historian of the Augustan period" (344).

XIII. Conclusion

To this vast body of Ovidian scholarship, I will contribute research inspired by scholarship mentioned in sections VIII (*Elegiac Puellae*) and XI (*Transcending Genre Constraints*) of this chapter and by the presence of body parts in the *Amores*. Specifically, I will show that Ovid expands the traditional, personal, amatory scope of elegies because he constructs a battle in his *Amores*. Since he composes within the restrictions of elegy, he uses the amatory struggles of an *amator* and a *puella* to represent a *poeta's* fight with his *materia* as he seeks to join two separate genres, Elegy and Tragedy, in one work. In all three books of the *Amores* there are poems which contain a significant number (at least 20% of the lines) of body parts, which provide the location for the battle between both the *amator* and the *puella* and the *poeta* and his *materia*. Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis demonstrate how the *amator's* lack of interaction with the *puella's* body parts reflects his incomplete relationship with her. The fourth and

concluding chapter rereads the *puella's* body parts, which define her as either Elegy or

Tragedy, and the *amator's* relationship with them, in order to show that the *amator's*

relationship with the *puella's* physical body symbolizes the *poeta's* ambiguous

relationship with his literary body of work.

CHAPTER TWO: BODY PARTS, PHYSICAL PROXIMITY, AND *PUELLA* POSSESSION IN *AMORES* 1.4 & 1.5

I. Introduction

Amores 1.4 and 1.5 offer physical portraits of the *puellae* of Ovid's *amator*. *Amores* 1.4 contains mention of the *puella's caput* (head), *vultus* (face), *auris* (ear), *genae* (cheeks), *oscula* (lips), *collum* (neck), *papillae* (breasts), *manus* (hand), *pollex* (thumb), *digitus* (finger), *sinus* (lap), *femur* (thigh), *crus* (shin), and *pes* (foot). *Amores* 1.5 lists the *puella's collum* (neck), *umerus* (shoulder), *lacerti* (upper-arms), *papillae* (breasts), *latus* (side), *pectus* (stomach), *venter* (belly), and *femur* (thigh). I will demonstrate that Ovid's purposes of detailing the *puella's* physical attributes is not merely to praise her beauty but to demonstrate that the unnamed *puella* in 1.4 is the Corinna of 1.5 and 1.11.[2] Furthermore by confirming ownership of Corinna through contact with specific body parts in 1.4, the *vir* also establishes which body parts the *amator* must conquer in 1.5 in order to prove his right to be with her. In 1.4 the *amator* attempts, in vain, to separate the *puella's* body from the *vir* at a public banquet. As Ovid's *amator* desperately seeks physical possession of an already spoken for *puella*, he acknowledges victory in this amatory struggle not simply by winning the *puella's* love and attention, but by dominating her, a feat which he describes in 1.5, where he tells of conquering the *puella's* body in the privacy of his bedroom. Greene observes that "the later poems of the *Amores* [Book 2 and Book 3] blatantly depict women as objects of exchange between their husbands and lovers" (409). *Amores* 1.4 and 1.5 illustrate that this type of *puella* "exchange" also occurs in Book 1.

---

[2] Buchan believes that Ovid deliberately does not provide the name Corinna to the *puellae* in every poem; he creates an undefined *puella* in order to allow the audience to finish her construction thus giving them a personal role in his poetry which increases the acceptability (and therefore popularity) of his work.

Amores 1.5 demonstrates that an *amator*, although he may participate in *puella* "exchange" by handling the very body parts owned by the *vir* in 1.4, he will never experience absolute possession of the *puella*. In 1.4 the *vir*, as the husband, legally owns the *puella* and the body parts of the two freely interact with each other at a public dinner party against the wishes of the *amator*. Grammar, word choice, and word order of body parts in 1.4 all reinforce the *vir's* legal right to have physical contact with his *uxor*, the *puella*, and provide an explanation for why, in public, the *amator* never physically unites with the *puella*. The *amator's* only recourse in 1.4 is to establish his right to posses the *puella* by using legal language as he threatens to assume possession of her body. In 1.5 the *amator*, who has no legal claim over the *puella*, describes his ability to dominate her body (both against her will and against the law) in his own bedroom. Due to the private setting of 1.5 the *amator* does not express the same level of concern about the lawfulness of the union; instead he focuses on trying to establish control over the body touched by the *vir* in 1.4.

II. *Puella* Identification

Ovid never discloses the name of the *puella* in 1.4; therefore, it is necessary to identify the *puella* in 1.4 as Corinna in order to argue successfully that the *amator* in 1.5 seeks to possess that very *puella* which the *vir* owns in 1.4. An analysis of female body parts as described in 1.4 and 1.5 proves that the *puella* in 1.4 is Corinna, who is called by name twice in *Amores* 1 (1.5, 1.11) and through both poems the reader receives information about her body. [3] In 1.5, the *amator* gives the following glowing laundry list

---

[3] Ovid provides the name Corinna to the *puella* in 1.5 and 1.11, but the *puellae* in 1.4, 1.7, 1.13, and 1.14 go unnamed. The presence of multiple *puellae* and the notion that Ovid's *amator* pursued many women is not unfounded. Curran suggests that by associating himself with Jupiter, the seducer of many women, the

of Corinna's body parts: *candida colla* (beautiful neck, l. 10), *dividua coma* (disheveled hair, l. 10), *quos umeros*, *quales lacertos* (mind-blowing shoulders and upper-arms, l. 19), *forma papillarum apta premi* (squeeze-worthy breasts, l. 20), *castigato pectore* (small waist, l. 21), *planus venter* (flat stomach, l. 21), *quantum et quale latus* (an amazing side, l. 22), and *quam iuvenale femur* (an astoundingly youthful thigh, l. 22). What Corinna obviously lacks in poem 1.5, a head, is, in a few words, added to her depiction in 1.11 when Ovid gives her *oculos* (eyes, l. 17), a *frontem* (forehead, l. 17), a *tacito vultu* (silent face, l. 18), and also *digitos* (fingers, l. 23). The following body parts attributed to Corinna in 1.5 and 1.11 are connected to various body parts assigned to the unnamed *puella* in 1.4: c*ollum* (neck, l. 6, l. 35), *papillae* (breasts, l. 37), *femur* (thigh, l. 43), *vultu* (face, l. 15), and *digitos* (fingers, l. 26). Since all women have these body parts it is possible to suggest that they cannot, without a doubt, be attributed to the same person. However, significant links exist between the *papillae*, *collum* and *femur* of Corinna and the unnamed *puella* of 1.4.

The direct link between Corinna and the *puella* in 1.4 is their *papillae*, which are described similarly. In 1.5, Ovid describes the shape of Corinna's *papillae* as *apta* (**forma papillarum** *quam fuit* **apta** *premi*; how the shape of her breasts was ready to be pressed, l. 20) and in 1.4 the unnamed *puella's* breasts share the same characteristic (*nec sinus admittat digitos* **habilesve papillae**; your bosom and easily handled breasts shall not receive his fingers, l. 37). Even though the appropriate translation in 1.5 is "ready" and in 1.4 "easily handled," both words can be defined as suitable or fit.[4] Ovid does use *papillae* one other time in the *Amores* (2.15.11), but he does not describe the body part,

---

amator in *Amores* 1.3 cryptically declares that he will not be faithful to one girl, but will take pleasure in many throughout the *Amores* (48).

[4] q. v. L&S *apto* §IIc, *habilis*

thus increasing the significance of relationship between the *papillae* in 1.4 and 1.5. Moreover, *papillae* are not described in this manner by Propertius or Tibullus and are used only four times in Catullus' *Carmina*. Three out of the four times Catullus uses the word, he modifies it variously (the fourth instance, 66.81, lacks a modifier), but never with adjectives similar to either *apta* or *habiles*. Instead, Catullus describes breasts as *roseis* (rose-colored, 55.12), *teneris* (soft, 61.100-101), and *lactentis* (milk-white, 64.65). In spite of their various descriptions, every time Catullus mentions this body part it is associated with an adulterous spouse.

The *collum* and *femur* in 1.5 cannot be connected to the *puella* in 1.4 through matching modifiers, but the tense atmosphere in which they (along with *papillae*) are presented in 1.4 demonstrate that they are the significant body parts to be conquered in 1.5. In lines 16-26 of 1.4, the *amator* imagines furtive and unhindered interaction with the *puella*. He gently commands the *puella* by using imperatives *tange* (touch), *specta* (look), *excipe* (receive), *refer* (return); jussive subjunctives *pendeat* (may [your soft hand] rest) and *versetur* (may [your lock of hair] be twirled); and one future, active, indicative *leges* (you will read). In stark contrast, lines 35–44 of 1.4 describe the open and actual interaction of the *puella* and the *vir*, contact which the *amator* desperately attempts to prevent. By using *nec* six times in ten lines and issuing commands in the language of Roman law, the *amator* makes several frantic pleas to stop the interaction; nevertheless, the Corinna's *collum*, *papillae*, and *femur* remain in direct contact with *vir* in 1.4. When Corinna arrives in 1.5, Ovid will reintroduce these very body parts – neck, breasts, and thigh – in order to remind the reader of her character in 1.4.

III. *Amores* 1.4: Physical Proximity and *Puella* Possession

The *vir's* physical contact with the *puella's* body, specifically her *collum* (neck)

and her *oscula* (lips), in 1.4 reflects his legal ownership of her thereby establishing him as

her husband. Although Davis points out that Ovid never uses the proper legal terms

"*maritus*" and "*uxor*" when speaking about the *vir* and the *puella* in 1.4, there is

sufficient evidence to prove that the two are, in fact, married (67).[5] The *vir's* rightful

legal and physical possession of the *puella* is intertwined in three key lines in which the

vir governs the verbs which act upon the *puella's* body. Line 6 (*iniciet collo, cum volet,*

ille manum) poses a question early in the work. The *amator* wants to know if the *vir*

may, when he wishes, throw his arms around the *puella's* neck or "legally claim" her

(Perkins). In line 15 (*cum premet ille torum, vultu comes ipsa modesto*) the word *torum*

can mean a muscle/fleshy part or a spouse.[6] As a result, the clause *cum premet ille*

torum (when that man will touch the flesh/spouse) can convey both physical and legal

possession. Ovid's use of *torum* as spouse is not uncommon as it is found in his

Metamorphoses, *Fasti*, *Epistulae ex Ponto* and *Heroides*. The *puella* as *uxor* is

substantiated further in line 63 (*oscula iam sumet, iam non tantum oscula sumet*).

Grammatically speaking, the *puella's oscula* (mouth/kisses) are the objects of the *vir's*

actions (*sumet*). One potential meaning for *sumere* is to bring forward as proof;[7]

therefore, the *vir* will, at the end of the evening, prove that the *puella* is his by offering

her kisses as evidence and continue to "assert his rights" for the remainder of the evening

(Barsby 65).

---

[5] Whether or not the *vir* represents the *puella's* husband is irrelevant to Barsby who feels that "the important fact for this poem is the priority of the man's claim upon her, whoever he is" (57).
[6] q. v. L&S *torus* §II, IVB
[7] q.v. L&S *sumere* §F3

In 1.4, the *amator* acknowledges the *vir's* legal right to touch the *puella* as he attempts to compensate for his own lack of legal claim by speaking in legalese. In the following ten lines, the *amator* commands the *puella* to keep her body away from the *vir's* body:[8]

> nec premat impositis sinito tua **colla**^{P} **lacertis**^{V},
>   mite nec in rigido **pectore**^{V} pone **caput**^{P};
> nec **sinus**^{P} admittat **digitos**^{V} habilesve **papillae**^{P};
>   **oscula**^{P} praecipue nulla dedisse velis!
> **oscula**^{P} si dederis, fiam manifestus amator
>   et dicam 'mea sunt!' iniciamque **manum**^{A}.
> haec tamen aspiciam, sed quae bene pallia celant,
>   illa mihi caeci causa timoris erunt.
> nec **femori**^{PV} committe **femur**^{PV} nec **crure**^{PV} cohaere
>   nec tenerum duro cum **pede**^{V} iunge **pedem**^{P}. (l. 35-44)

> You shall not allow him to press your neck with imposed arms,
>   you shall not place your soft head on his hard chest;
> Your bosom and easily handled breasts shall not receive his fingers;
>   above all do not be willing to give any kisses!
> If you give kisses, I, your lover, shall make myself known
>   and I shall say, 'The kisses are mine!' and take possession.
> Still I shall see these things, but things which covers will conceal well,
>   those things will be the cause of hidden fear for me.
> You shall not unite thigh with thigh or shin with shin,
>   you shall not join your soft foot with his hard foot.

In addition to issuing firm commands to establish his legal right to touch the *puella*, the *amator* uses the commands themselves to try to separate the bodies of the *vir* and *puella* in lines 35, 36, 37, 43, and 44. The word order of line 35 (*nec premat impositis sinito tua colla^P lacertis^V*) reveals that the *amator* has good reason to be concerned. Generally speaking, the *vir* (*impositis lacertis*) surrounds the *puella* (*tua colla*). The *vir's* upper arms (*lacertis*) are near the *puella's* neck (*tua colla*), but the *amator's* command (*sinito*) divides the modifier (*impositis*) from the noun (*lacertis*). Line 36 (*mite nec in rigido*

---

[8] The body parts of each party are indicated by the following superscripts: *amator*^{A}, *puella*^{P}, *vir*^{V}, and *puella* and *vir*^{PV}.

pectore$^\text{V}$ *pone caput*$^\text{P}$) exhibits the most successful separation of *vir* and *puella*. The

command *nec…pone* completely cuts off the *puella* (*mite caput*) from the *vir* (*rigido*

pectore). In line 37 (*nec sinus*$^\text{P}$ *admittat digitos*$^\text{V}$ *habilesve papillae*$^\text{P}$) the *amator's*

forceful request (*nec…admittat*) somewhat separates the *vir* (*digitos*) from the *puella*

(*sinus*), but the *vir* (*digitos*) worms his way closer to the *puella* (*habiles papillae*). The

most frenzied line of all is 43 (*nec femori*$^\text{PV}$ *committe femur*$^\text{PV}$ *nec crure*$^\text{PV}$ *cohaere*).

Having admitted that he fears most what he cannot see, the *amator* himself cannot

distinguish between the *vir's* and the *puella's* body parts, which garments conceal. The

only way to separate the interacting body parts (*femori, femur, crure*) is by a connective,

imperative, connective, imperative sequence. The *amator* makes one last attempt, in line

44, to control what he cannot see as he commands that the feet of the couple do not join

together (*nec tenerum duro cum pede*$^\text{V}$ *iunge pedem*$^\text{P}$). Although the feet (*pede, pedem*)

are separated by the imperative (*iunge*), the soft (*tenerum*) and the hard (*duro*) remain

next to each other.

Ovid employs legal language in 1.4 not merely to express his own personal

distaste for current legislation, as suggested by Davis (66), or to increase the "irony"

because "his instructions will not be obeyed" (Barsby 61), but also to illustrate how his

amator, trying desperately to persuade the *puella* to obey him, responds to being ignored.

The *Amores* abound with examples of how Ovid's flexible *amator* changes his arguments

in order to persuade someone or something to yield to his desires. *Amores* 1.4 is no

different because the *amator* uses legal language to counteract the legality of the *vir* and

puella's interaction. As the events of 1.4 proceed and the *amator* realizes that he cannot

prevent the physical contact between the *vir* and the *puella*, he adds authoritative weight

to his orders by the repetition of negative requests (*nec*) and by the use of commands loaded with legal overtones (the future imperative (*sinito*) with the subjunctive (*premat*) and the phrase *nec...pone*). The *amator's* attempt to establish legal claim over the *puella* and to override the *vir's* valid physical and legal possession of her is confirmed by line 40 (*et dicam 'mea [oscula] sunt' iniciamque manum*) where he warns that he will take legal possession of the *puella's* kisses. This line is significant for two reasons: one, he uses the same legal language *manum inicere* here as in line 6 when speaking about the *vir's* possession of the *puella* (*iniciet collo, cum volet, ille manum*); two, the *oscula* which the *amator* desires to legally claim are the very evidence of the *vir's* ownership in line 63 (*oscula iam sumet, iam non tantum oscula sumet*). In stating that "*Amores* 1.4 is the work of a precarious young poet wanting to get attention through flaunting a new and unpopular law [*Lex Julia de Adulteriis Coercendis*]," Davis overlooks how the use of legalese contributes to the desperate persona of an *amator* scorned (69).

The *amator's* anxiety in 1.4 results from the physical distance separating himself from the *puella* at the dinner party; a separation which the *puella* and the *vir's* physical proximity, and therefore legally-sanctioned union, which the *amator* fails to prevent through his commands, exacerbates. Over one-third of the lines (twenty-four out of seventy) of 1.4 contain at least one body part. Of those lines, one contains only the *vir's* body part (.04%), six contain both the *puella's* and the *vir's* body parts (25%), seven contain only the *amator's* body part (29%) and ten contain the only the *puella's* body part (42%). The resulting imagery is that the *vir's* body is rarely alone and the *amator's* body never touches the *puella's* body.

30

An explicit separation of the speaker and the *puella* occurs in the following eleven

lines in which the *amator* discusses how and he and the *puella* might communicate

clandestinely at the dinner party:

> …ut accumbas clam mihi <u>tange</u> **pedem**[A];
> me <u>specta</u> nutusque meos **vultum**[A]que loquacem;
>   <u>excipe</u> furtivas et <u>refer</u> ipsa notas.
> verba **superciliis**[A] sine voce loquentia dicam;
>   verba <u>leges</u> **digitis**[A], verba notata mero.
> cum tibi succurret <u>Veneris</u> lascivia nostrae,
>   purpureas tenero **pollice**[P] <u>tange</u> **genas**[P].
> siquid erit, de me tacita quod mente queraris,
>   <u>pendeat</u> extrema mollis ab **aure**[P] **manus**[P].
> cum tibi, quae faciam, mea lux, dicamve, placebunt,
>   <u>versetur</u> **digitis**[P] **anulus**[P] usque tuis. (l. 16-26)

> …as you lie beside [the *vir*] secretly touch my foot;
> look at me and my noddings and my talkative expression;
>   receive secret messages and return them yourself.
> I shall speak chattering words without a voice with my eyebrows;
>   you will read words written in wine with my fingers.
> When the wantonness of our lovemaking occurs to you.
>   touch your rosy cheeks with your soft thumb.
> If there will be anything about me which you lament with a silent mind,
>   rest your soft hand by your earlobe.
> When I shall do things or say things, my love, which are pleasing to you,
>   continually twirl a lock of hair around with your fingers.

In individual lines the *amator's pedem* (foot), *vultus* (face), *superciliis* (eyebrows), and

digitiis (fingers) never meet the *puella's genas* (cheeks), *pollice* (thumb), *aure extrema*

(earlobe), *manus* (hand), or *digitis* (fingers). Furthermore, the *amator's* body parts are

contained in the first five lines and the *puella's* in the last five lines with Venus, in the

sixth line, separating the lines which contain their bodies. This obvious separation of the

two parties, which reflects their actual physical separation at the banquet, does not worry

the *amator*, who has devised plans to connect furtively with the *puella*. By giving orders

to the *puella* (and her body) using imperatives (*tange, specta, excipe, refer*), the future

indicative (*leges*), and jussive subjunctives (*pendeat, versetur*) the *amator* describes in detail how the separated lovers may communicate during the dinner party. With the help of Venus, who appears in middle of lines 16-26 and whose son Cupid is said to help *amators* sneak past watchful sentries (*Amores* 1.6.7-8), the *amator* will be successful in his quest to communicate secretly with the *puella* at a public function. However, success at the dinner party reveals itself not through contact of the *amator's* and the *puella's* bodies, instead union will be achieved through the *puella* touching her own body parts. The *puella's* own body parts experience successful union with themselves as demonstrated by the interlocking word order of lines 22 (*purpureas tenero pollice*[P] _tange_ *genas*[P]), 24 (_pendeat_ *extrema mollis ab aure*[P] *manus*[P]), and 26 (_versetur_ *digitis*[P] *anulus*[P] *usque tuis*). The absence of the *amator's* body in lines 22, 24, and 26 is offset by his presence in the alternating lines 23 (*siquid erit, de **me** tacita quod mente queraris*) and 25 (*cum tibi, quae **faciam**, mea lux, **dicam**ve, placebunt*), which although they do not contain any of the *puella's* body parts nevertheless cause the *puella* to touch herself in 22, 24, and 26. The body parts (*pollex*, *genae*, *extrema auris* and *manus*) associated with this atmosphere of victorious clandestine unification (without the *vir's* interference) are not referred to in 1.5 where real, physical contact between Corinna and the *amator* occurs.

IV. *Amores* 1.5: **Physical Separation and** *Materia* **Domination**

In contrast to the public dinner party in 1.4, the private setting of the *amator's* bedroom in poem 1.5 provides the *amator* and the *puella*, Corinna, with an ideal location to act without restraint and the plethora of body parts (limbs, eyes, bodies, neck, shoulders, upper-arms, breasts, waist, stomach, and thigh) reflects this license; however, an analysis of the presentation of each party's body parts reveals that that even when the

amator is alone with his *puella*, their body parts never directly unite.[9] An examination of nouns and adjectives related to the body parts in 1.5 shows that nine out of 26 lines (over one-third) of the poem list at least one body part.   Three of those lines contain only the *amator's* body part(s): *apposui medio membra*[A] *levanda toro* (I have lain down in the middle of the bed to rest my limbs, l. 2), *ut stetit ante oculos*[A] *posito velamine nostros* (as she stood before my eyes with her clothing taken off, l. 13), and *et nudam pressi corpus*[A] *ad usque meum* (I pressed the naked girl into my body, l. 24). The other six lines contain only the *puella's* body part(s):   *candida dividua colla*[P] *tegente coma*[P] (with disheveled hair covering her white neck, l. 10), *in toto nusquam corpore*[P] *menda fuit* (there was not a flaw on her whole body, 1. 18), *quos umeros*[P]*, quales vidi tetigique lacertos*[P] (what shoulders, what upper-arms have I seen and touched, l. 19*), forma papillarum*[P] *quam fuit apta premi* (how the shape of her breasts was ready to be pressed, l. 20), *quam castigato planus sub pectore*[P] *venter*[P] (what a flat stomach under her small waist, l. 21), *quantum et quale latus*[P] (how great and what a side, l. 22), and *quam iuvenale femur*[P] (what a youthful thigh, l. 22).

Word order and word choice further undermine the union of the *amator* and *puella* in lines 19, 24, and 25. Line 19*, quos umeros*[P]*, quales <u>vidi</u> <u>tetigique</u> lacertos*[P] (what shoulders, what upper-arms have I seen and touched) demonstrates that although the *puella's* body parts (*umeros*, *lacertos*) are the objects of verbs (*vidi*, *tetigi*) governed by the *amator*, the verbs (and their subject, the *amator*) are cut off from their objects by an adjective (*quales*) and an enclitic conjunction (*-que*). Although balance is achieved in

---

[9] Not all scholars view 1.5 as a blatant description of a sexual encounter. Nicoll believes that Corinna's arrival is an "epiphany" (46); Papanghelis adds that her arrival is "a divine epiphany *cum* [poetic] inspiration" (61); and Keith expands these ideas by noting that "Corinna's initial appearance" foreshadows "the divine epiphany of Elegia herself two books later" (29).

line 24, *et nudam*^P *pressi corpus*^A *ad usque meum*^A (and I pressed the naked girl into my

body), by placing the adjectives describing the bodies of the *puella* (*nudam*) and the

amator (*meum*) at the beginning and end of the line, nevertheless the balance is disrupted

by the fact that their bodies (i.e., adjectives describing their bodies) are kept far apart and

only one word, the first in the entire line, refers to the *puella* and the remaining four

words pertain to the *amator*. Initially line 25, *cetera quis nescit?* **lassi** <u>requievimus</u> **ambo**

(who does not know the rest? exhausted, we both rest), appears to offer the most

unmistakable union of the two because the *amator* and *puella* are described as one (*lassi*

ambo) and govern the same verb (*requievimus*) (Barsby). According to Huntingford,

"They are both ('ambo') tired and resting, implying an act in which participation was

equal, and, in view of the poet's happy concluding words (26), exhaustion and pleasure

mutual" (114). However, the separation that has occurred throughout the entire poem

and the lopsided nature of the encounter (as revealed in line 24) is reinforced by the

separation of *ambo* from its modifier, *lassi*.

The *amator's* domination, in spite of the fact that Corinna's appearance may

imply that "she regards the occasion as an intimate one," conveyed by the verbs governed

by both the *amator* (with *puella*-related objects) and the *puella*, overshadows any shared,

satisfying union of the couple in 1.5 (Barsby 67). The *amator* governs the verbs *deripui*

(I have removed violently, l. 13), *vidi* (I have seen, l. 19), *tetigi* (I have touched/struck/

beat, l. 19), and *pressi* (I have pressed, degraded, l. 24) and the *puella* is the subject of

two forms of *pugnare* (to fight, l. 14 and 15), *nollet vincere* (she preferred not to win, l.

15), *victa est* (she was conquered, l. 16), and *stetit* (she stood still, l. 17). Through these

verbs the *amator* takes the unwilling *puella* by force, degrades, and dominates her

throughout the poem. As the impassioned *amator* begins to satisfy his lust in line 24, the *puella* is represented not by name or pronoun, but by a substantive (*nudam*), the direct object of the *amator's* action (*pressi*).

The nude girl's lack of participation (aside from being an object of the *amator's* visual and physical pleasure) exposes itself in the lack of interlocking word order of lines 24 and 25: *et nudam*[P] *pressi corpus*[A] *ad usque meum*[A] / *cetera quis nescit? lassi requievimus ambo* (and I pressed the naked girl into my body / who does not know the rest? exhausted, we both rest). The lack of mutual involvement lines 24-25 becomes more evident when compared with lines 5-6 in *Amores* 1.13, which also describe lovers in embrace: *nunc iuvat in teneris*[P] *dominae*[P] *iacuisse*[A] *lacertis*[P] / *si quando, lateri*[A] *nunc bene iuncta*[P] *meo*[A] *est*[P] (at one time it is pleasing to have lain in my mistress' soft arms / if ever at another time she has been thoroughly to my side). In addition to interlocking word order, the lines from *Amores* 1.13 suggest that both the *amator* and the *puella* take equal roles in the physical relationship: in line 5 the body parts are the *puella's* and the subject of the verb is the *amator* and in line 6 the roles are reversed – the *puella* governs the verb and the body parts belong to the *amator*. *Amores* 1.5 lacks even a hint of this type of reciprocal participation. Further proof that the *puella* is a mere object and not a person specifically responsible for the *amator's* pleasure is provided in last line of the poem (*proveniant **medii** sic **mihi** saepe **dies***; may such afternoons happen to me often, l. 26*). In this concluding line, the *amator* hopes that such *medii dies* (afternoons) appear often, not such a girl. Furthermore, he wishes that the experience happen to *mihi* (me), not to both the *puella* and himself, as one would expect from *ambo* (both) in line 25.

Ovid's construction of the controlling *amator* and the objectified *puella* has a

parallel in *Amores* 1.7. Greene states that the *puella* in 1.7 is a "fetishized object of the

male narrator's gaze" which produces "a version of male desire that devalues women and

turns them into objects of male fantasies of erotic domination" (411). Since four lines in

1.5 contain words of vision (*ecce* (look, l. 9); *ante oculos nostros* (before my eyes, l. 13);

vidi (I have seen, l. 19 and l. 23)) and are followed by vivid descriptions of the *puella*,

there is no doubt the "narrator"/*amator* in 1.5 possesses this "gaze" (ibid.). The full force

of the stare is felt in seven lines as the conquered *puella* stands *posito velamine* (with her

clothing taken off) in front of the *amator*:

> ut stetit <u>ante **oculos**</u>[A] posito velamine <u>nostros</u>
>   in toto nusquam **corpore**[P] menda fuit.
> quos **umeros**[P], quales <u>vidi</u> tetigique **lacertos**[P]!
>   forma **papillarum**[P] quam fuit apta premi!
> quam castigato planus sub **pectore**[P] **venter**[P]!
>   quantum et quale **latus**[P]! quam iuvenale **femur**[P]!
> singula quid referam? nil non laudabile <u>vidi.</u> (l. 17-23)
>
> As she stood before my eyes with her clothing taken off
>   there was not a flaw on her whole body.
> What shoulders, what upper-arms have I seen and touched!
>   How the shape of her breasts was ready to be pressed!
> What a flat stomach under her small waist!
>   How great and what a side! What a youthful thigh!
> Why shall I relate individual things? I have seen nothing not praiseworthy.

Although the *puella* is called by name in line 9, from line 17 to the end of the poem

Corinna's name is never repeated and she ceases to be a person as she becomes an object

of the *amator's* gaze. This process begins in line 18 where the *toto corpore* (whole body)

alone becomes the focus and continues to be emphasized throughout the subsequent four

lines (*umeros, lacertos, forma papillarum, castigato pectore, planus venter, latus,*

iuvenale femur). Although the five-line homage to the body describes the naked Corinna,

there is no specific mentioning of her; she is not the subject of any verbs and she is not referred to explicitly as the possessor of the body parts. The objectification of the *puella* is complete by line 23 where even her body parts lose their individual identities as the speaker refers to them as neuter nouns (*singula* and *nil*).[10]

This process of subordinating the *puella* by turning her into an inanimate object for personal pleasure is expanded by Greene who proposes that the narrator/*amator* objectifies the *puella* with a view to control her as *materia* (418). As an *amator* (and not a *vir*), a man will always lack complete ownership of a *puella*; however, a narrator/*amator* can achieve absolute possession of a *puella* by turning her into *materia*, as in 1.5. The aim of controlling *materia*, not merely the *puella*, is obvious when the setting of 1.5 is considered. The *amator's* dominance of the *puella's* body, in an attempt to establish ownership of her, is worthless unless the *vir* knows of the *amator's* victory. But the private setting of 1.5 results in only three parties - *amator*, *puella*, and audience - who know of the encounter.[11] By creating a *puella* in 1.4 who refuses to obey his numerous commands, the narrator/*amator* creates a tension which he resolves in 1.5, where he finally masters the *puella*.[12] Since it is the audience who recognizes this dramatic struggle and knows of the *amator's* victory, successful manipulation of the *puella-materia* pleases the audience.[13] According to Fear, Ovid intends to involve the

---

[10] Elliott does not view this as degrading the *puella*, but comments "But as usual Ovid displays a sense of decorum. Never pornographic, he knows when (and where) to stop: '*singula quid referam*? *nihil non laudabile vidi*' (23)" (352).

[11] According to Davis, Ovid brings the audience into 1.4.45-48 as well through "a brief remark made in the middle of a conversation which is not intended for the second party in the conversation but rather for the audience or the reader" (190).

[12] Tracy notes that "He [Ovid] loves to set himself a problem and attempt some form of resolution" (497).

[13] Although Connor acknowledges that Ovid's audience participates in 1.5, he does not believe that the events of 1.5 pleased the audience. Instead, "the reader…is dumped at the end of the poem" because "Ovid in fact carried the reader along, tantalizing him, until (*cetera quis nescit*? 'who does not know the rest?' 25)

reader with his poetry through the presentation of the *puella*: "Just as the *ecce* of line 9

conflates the gaze of internal and external viewer, so, too, the positioning of Corinna

before *oculi nostri* reflects the presentation of her body both inside and outside the text"

(226).[14]

The *amator's* lack of *puella* ownership in public (1.4) and his desire to dominate

the *puella* in private (1.5) continues in *Amores* Book 2 and Book 3. The next chapter

identifies poems in Book 2 and Book 3 which contain body parts and which take place in

public or private spheres. Specifically, Chapter 3 shows that at least one rival is always

present in the public sphere and that the rival achieves a higher level of *puella* ownership

than the *amator*. The private setting poems expose both the *amator's* goal to traverse the

puella's body by any means possible and the *amator's* inability to consummate the

relationship when the *puella* plays an active role. Keith notes that in *Amores* 1.5,

"Corinna's physical features and personal style are consistently described in vocabulary

reserved for discussion of poetic principles, so that she herself may be said to embody the

stylistic principles of elegiac verse" (32); therefore, an analysis of the *amator's*

relationship with the *puella's* body reveals the narrator's relationship with elegy.

---

he deflates the tensions and mocks the reader" (28). Elliott agrees that Ovid creates tension in 1.5, but
believes that this "discreet silence" in line 25 adheres to "the conventions of Greek erotic epigram" (354).
[14] Keith explains how Corinna can be read as both a physical and literary body: "By employing the diction
of Latin literary criticism to characterize Corinna's corpus, Ovid implicitly conflates the physique of his
elegiac girl friend and the poetics espoused in his elegiac collection" (31).

CHAPTER THREE: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BODY PART POSSESSION IN
***AMORES* 2.5, 2.15, 3.2, AND 3.7**

I. Introduction

The public and private settings change in *Amores* Book 2 and Book 3, but in both

spheres the *amator's* goal to dominate the *puella* in order to establish rightful possession

of her remains constant. I will show that in public (2.5 and 3.2) the *amator* competes

with rivals who come into contact with the *puella's* body, acknowledges his role in

adultery through mythological *exempla* (specifically by associating himself with

Centaurs), and attempts to counteract his lack of rightful ownership by employing legal

language (2.5), issuing commands to both the *puella* (2.5 and 3.2) and rivals (3.2), and

seeking divine assistance (3.2). I will also demonstrate that the *amator* continues to have

unrestricted access to the *puella's* body in private (2.15 and 3.7), but the increase in the

puella's level of participation in the physical relationship undermines their complete

unification because when the *amator* encounters her, he either assumes another identity

(2.15) or becomes impotent (3.7).

Amores 2.5 and 3.2 present the *amator* in a public setting competing with rivals

for the possession of a *puella*, possession which is expressed through contact between

body parts. *Amores* 2.5 presents a situation similar to that of 1.4 because the *amator*

must deal with the dilemma of attending a dinner party along with another man (referred

to as *tertius*) and his *puella*, whose *supercilio* (eyebrow), *oculi* (eyes), *digitis* (fingers),

oscula (lips), *lingua* (tongue), *ora*, *vultu*, *faciem* (face), and *capillos* (hair) add physical

detail to her portrait. *Amores* 3.2 takes place in the most public of spheres, the races,

where the *amator* must contend with not just one, but many rivals (the jockey, fellow

spectators, the *puella's* garment and even a fleck of dust), as he strives for victory over the *puella's oculos* (eyes), *crura* (legs), *corpore* (body), *primos pedes* (toes), and *capillos* (hair).

Amores 2.15 and 3.7, like 1.5, both describe the *amator's* private, physical encounter with a *puella*. The physical union of 2.15 occurs in the privacy of the *amator's* mind as he wishes that he could be turned into a ring in order to gain unlimited access to his *puella's digitum* (finger), *articulis* (knuckles), *papillae* (breasts), *sinum* (bosom), *ora* (mouth), and *artus* (limbs). *Amores* 3.7 resembles 1.5 because the physical encounter takes place in a bedroom and the *amator* praises the *puella's bracchia* (arms), *oscula* (mouth), *lingua* (tongue), *femur* (thigh), *manu* (hand), and *pedes* (feet); however, the *amator* in 3.7 describes himself as languid due to impotence, not due to sexual exhaustion as in 1.5.

II. Public Poems: *Amores* 2.5 and 3.2

In *Amores* 2.5, as with 1.4, there is the overwhelming image of the union of the *puella* and the rival *tertius* and although the *amator's* body shares one line with the *puella's* body in 2.5 (compared to no lines in 1.4), this will prove to be a hollow victory. Over one-third of the lines of this poem contain the following body parts of the *amator*, *puella*, and *tertius*: *supercilio* (eyebrow, l. 15); *oculi* (eyes, l. 17); *digitiis* (fingers, l. 18); *lingua* (tongue, l. 24, 33, and 58); *manus* (hand, l. 30); *ora*, *vultu*, *faciem* (face, l. 34, l. 44, l. 47); *capillos* (hair, l. 45); *genas* (cheeks, l. 46); *lacerti* (arms, l. 47); *labellus* (lips, l. 57); and *oscula* (lips, l. 23, 50, and 59; substantives used in place of *oscula*, l. 31, 32, 52, 54, 55, 60, and 61). No lines contain only *tertius'* body part(s), in fact, his body parts are inseparable from the *puella's*, six lines (23%) contain both *tertius'* and *puella's* body

parts, thirteen lines (57%) contain only the *puella's* body part(s), one line (4%) contains both the *amator's* and the *puella's* body part(s) and three (13%) lines contain only the *amator's* body part(s).

The body parts of the *puella* and *tertius* cannot be distinguished from one another in two key events of the poem – the acts of furtive communication and kissing. The first event, comprised of eight lines, recounts how the *amator* witnesses the *puella* and *tertius* communicate secretly during the banquet. Body parts appear for the first time in the following lines, where the *amator* recounts seeing the unspoken communication between the *puella* and *tertius*:[15]

> Ipse miser vidi, cum me dormire putares,
>   sobrius adposito crimina vestra mero.
> multa **supercilio**[PT] vidi vibrante <u>loquentes</u>;
>   <u>nutibus</u> in <u>vestris</u> pars bona vocis erat.
> non **oculi**[P] tacuere tui, conscriptaque vino
>   mensa, nec in **digitis**[PT] littera nulla fuit.
> sermonem agnovi, quod non videatur, <u>agentem</u>
>   verbaque pro <u>certis</u> iussa <u>valere</u> <u>notis</u> (l. 13-20)

> I myself, wretched, saw, when you thought that I was sleeping,
>   your crimes, I was sober with my wine set aside.
> I saw you speaking many things with a quivering eyebrow;
>   a good part of your voice was in your nodding.
> Your eyes were not silent, and written with wine
>   on the table, there was writing under your fingers.
> I recognized that the conversation, which was not heard, was effective
>   and that words, told through established signs, succeeded.

The use of the present participle *loquentes* (speaking) to identify both the *puella* and *tertius* implicates both parties in the crime of speaking with their eyebrows. This dual implication continues in line 16 as both converse with *nutibus vestris* (nods of their heads) instead of voices. In the next line, however, the *puella* alone stands guilty as the

---

[15] The body parts of each party are indicated by the following superscripts: *amator*[A], *puella*[P], *tertius*[T], and *puella* and *tertius*[PT].

adjective *tui* (your) is used to modify her chatty *oculi* (eyes). In line 18, it is unclear once

more to whom the letter-writing *digitis* (fingers) belong, but lines 19-20 reveal that it

does not matter who perpetrates the action because the two are colluding. The *amator*

describes the silent *sermonem* (conversation) as both effective (*agentem*) and successful

(*valere*) due to the complicity (*certis notis*) of the *puella* and *tertius*.

      The high level of correspondence between 2.5.15-20 and 1.4.17-20 serves to

emphasize a significant difference between the events of the two poems. In 2.5.15-20,

the *puella* and *tertius* participate equally, but in 1.4.17-20 the *amator* alone engages in

the one-sided communication:

> me <u>specta</u> <u>nutus</u>que meos **vultum**[A]que loquacem;
>   <u>excipe</u> furtivas et <u>refer</u> ipsa notas.
> verba **superciliis**[A] sine voce loquentia dicam;
>   verba <u>leges</u> **digitis**[A], verba notata mero. (1.4.17-20)

> Look at me and my noddings and my talkative expression;
>   receive secret messages and return them yourself.
> I shall speak chattering words without a voice with my eyebrows;
>   you will read words written in wine with my fingers.

The similarities between 1.4 and 2.5 are communicating via *nutus* (nods), *superciliis*

(eyebrows), and messages written in wine with *digitis* (fingers). In 1.4, the nods,

modified by *meos* (my) belong explicitly to the *amator*, as do the body parts (*vultum,*

superciliis, digitis). He alone performs the action which he orders the *puella*, through

imperatives (*specta, excipe, refer*) and a future indicative (*leges*) to receive. Whether or

not she accepts his communication, and thus participates with him, remains unclear – a

stark contrast to her involvement with *tertius* in 2.5.[16]

---

[16] The similarities between 2.5.13-20 and 1.4.17-20 have long been recognized by scholars. Barsby notes that both Tibullus and Propertius treat similar themes in their elegies (498) and Tracy reiterates this observation with the comment that "the signs by which lovers communicate are, of course, conventional to love elegy" (498). Due to their obvious resemblance Ford states, "the banquet passage in II 5 [is] a

Two references to the kiss between the *puella* and *tertius* (l. 23-24 and l. 59-60) each includes a form of *iungere* and thus reinforces the union of the two parties already established by their collaborative communication. In lines 23-24, after the other dinner guests have left the banquet, the *amator* witnesses the *puella* and *tertius* kiss: *inproba tum vero **iungentes** oscula vidi / illa mihi lingua **nexa** fuisse liquet* (and then in fact I saw you exchanging wanton kisses / that your tongue had been interwoven was clear to me). The present active participle *iungentes* (exchanging) serves as a substantive representing both the *puella* and *tertius*, thus the *inproba oscula* (wanton kisses) belong to both parties. Since the verb *iungo* is used to express unions of marriage, the *amator* acknowledges that the *tertius* has an equal, if not greater, right to the kisses than he does.[17] Due to the inability to separate the two parties in line 23, the *lingua* in line 24 can belong to either, but the adjective *nexa* suggests that whosever tongue it is, it is interwoven, enhancing the intensity of the action.   When the same kiss is described once more, near the end of the poem (l. 59-60), the *amator* again uses a form of *iungo* to describe the two parties: *nec tamen hoc unum doleo—non oscula tantum / **iuncta** queror, quamvis haec quoque **iuncta** queror* (but I do not lament this alone – I not only lament interwoven kisses, although I also lament these interwoven kisses). This union (and the *amator*'s objection to it) is reiterated as *iuncta* is used twice in one line, placed next to *queror* each time, and heightened by alliteration (*queror, quamvis, quoque, queror*).

By uniting the *puella* and *tertius* with cognates of *iungere*, the *amator* encourages adultery by seeking possession of what is not legally his. In this role, he boldly declares

---

complement to that in I 4" (652). Lyne states that "1.4 rebounds in 2.5" (264) and Booth agrees that it is necessary to read 2.5 as an accompaniment to 1.4 in order to understand how "he [*amator*] makes himself, trick for trick, victim of his own ruses" (38).

[17] q. v. L&S *jungo* §IIB1

that by kissing her husband (*tertius*) the *puella* is cheating on him (*amator*). This is

evident in the *exempla* used to describe the kiss:

> qualia non fratri tulerit germana severo
>   sed tulerit **cupido mollis amica viro**
> qualia credibile est non Phoebo ferre Dianam
>   sed **Venerem Marti** saepe tulisse **suo** (l. 25-28)

> a sister would not give such kisses to an austere brother
>   but a yielding mistress would give that kind to an eager husband
> it is not likely that Diana gives such kisses to Apollo
>   but that Venus often has given that kind to her own Mars

Based on these *exempla*, the kind of kiss between the *puella* and *tertius* is the type that is

exchanged between a mistress (*amica*) and a husband (*vir*) (thus making her a mistress

and a wife at the same time) and is further substantiated by the parallel to Venus and

Mars. The *amator* continues the idea that he owns the *puella* when, after he berates her

for kissing *tertius*, he describes her shame using *exempla* which link her blushing with

marriage (l. 35-36): *quale coloratum Tithoni **coniuge** caelum / subrubet, aut **sponso** visa*

puella novo (just as the sky colored by the wife of Tithonus / or a girl having been seen

my her new bridegroom, she blushes).

      Regardless of his attempts to represent his relationship with the *puella* as stronger

than that between the *puella* and *tertius*, it is clear early in the poem that the *amator* seeks

to participate in adultery due to his association with Centaurs. In 1.4, the *amator*, in

expressing his nearly irrepressible urge to touch the *puella* aligns him with the Centaurs

who attempted to kidnap Hippodamia, taking the new bride away from the banquet and

her rightful owner (her husband) on her wedding night:

> desine mirari, posito quod candida vino
>   Atracis ambiguos traxit in arma viros;
> nec mihi silva domus nec equo mea membra cohaerent:
>   vix a te videor posse tenere manus. (l. 7-10)

it's no wonder that, when wine had been consumed,
    Hippodamia has attracted ambiguous in limbs;
My home is not the forest and my limbs are not consistent with a horse:
    I scarcely seem to be able to keep my hands away from you.

The connection with 2.5 occurs when the *amator* describes himself as *sobrius apposito…mero* (sober with his wine set aside, l. 14) before he witnesses the first kiss between the *puella* and *tertius*. These *exempla* carry into 2.5 to remind the reader that the *amator* really has no right to claim that he has been wronged when the *puella* kisses another man.

Choice of *exempla*, vocabulary, and word order both support the *amator's* Centaur-like behavior, which identifies him as an advocate of adultery, and betray his right to possess the *puella's oscula*; therefore, the *amator* employs legal language to strengthen his claim. The seriousness of *oscula* exchange in 2.5, and the *amator's* zealous desire to claim ownership through *oscula*, is evident throughout the poem which begins with the *amator's* wish to die because his puella has sinned (*peccasse*, l. 3). Although *peccasse* suggests a licentious transgression, the *amator* brings in legal language to add weight to the sin: his own eyes had informed him of the charge (*crimen*, l. 6), he wishes that would not be able to charge (*arguerem*, l. 7) the *puella*, he claims he has a good case (*bona causa*, l. 8), exclaims that lucky is the man who is able to defend (*defendere*, l. 9) that which he loves and unfeeling is the man who seeks a bloody prize from a conquered, feminine defendant (*rea*, l. 12).[18] He needs to fortify his claim because he is, after all, not legally entitled to possess the *puella*.[19]

---

[18] q. v. L&S *pecco* §B, *crimen* §I, *arguo* §IBa, *causa* §2E, *defendo* §IIB1, *reus* §I
[19] "By using a series of legal metaphors to express his feelings, Ovid, the self-confessed amatory adventurer, makes his current predicament sound uncommonly like that of a married man compelled under

The legal importance assigned to the act of kissing in 1.4 also continues in 2.5, where the crime of kissing and *tertius*' possession of the *oscula* override concerns of *tertius* touching the *puella's* body. In 2.5.29-32, after the *amator* sees the *puella* and *tertius* engaged in a passionate kiss he responds, *'Quid facis?' exclamo, 'quo nunc mea gaudia difers? / **iniciam** dominas in mea iura **manus'*** ("What are you doing?," I cry out, "Why now are you transferring my sensual pleasures? I shall take legal possession of my sweetheart according to my right"). The phrase *iniciam manum* appears in *Amores* 1.4 because in spite of all the body parts touched by the *vir* it is the thought of *oscula* possession which drives the *amator* to the brink of madness (1.4.38-40), possibly because the kisses themselves represent the *vir*'s proof of ownership at the end of the evening (1.4.63-64).

> oscula praecipue nulla dedisse velis.
> oscula si dederis, fiam manifestus amator
>   et dicam 'mea sunt' **iniciam**que **manum**. (1.4.38-40)
>
> above all do not be willing to give any kisses.
> if you give kisses, I, your lover, shall make myself known
>   and I shall say, 'The kisses are mine,' and take possession.
>
> oscula iam sumet, iam non tantum oscula sumet:
>   quod mihi das furtim, iure coacta dabis (1.4.63 – 64)
>
> at one time he will exact kisses, at another time he will exact
> not just kisses:
>   that which you give me secretly, you, forced by law, will give to him

After berating the *puella* in 2.5, he begs *oscula ne nobis deteriora daret* (that she give him better kisses, l. 50). The *puella* concedes, but the *puella's* kiss to him was not as intense as the one to *tertius*.

---

the terms of Augustus' *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* to divorce his wife because he has witnessed her adultery" (Booth 39).

Although the *puella* submits in 2.5 and gives the *amator* a kiss, the structure of

lines 57-58, which describe the eventual kiss, reveals a lack of mutual passion and

participation:

> …tota^{P} **labellis**^{A}
>   **lingua**^{P} tua^{P} <u>est</u> nostris^{A}, nostr**a**^{A} <u>recepta</u> tuis^{P}. (l. 57-58)

> ...your whole tongue
>   was received by my lips, and my tongue by your lips.

The meaning of the two lines conveys a feeling of reciprocity, but a perfect, passive verb

(*est…recepta*) separates the words associated with the *amator* (*nostris, nostra*) and the

puella (*lingua tua…tuis*). This structure resembles lines 25 and 27 which describe frigid

kisses between brothers and sisters because the verbs (*tulerit, ferre*) separate the

individuals involved (*fratri/germana*, *Phoebo/Diana*):

> qualia non **fratri** <u>tulerit</u> **germana** severo (l. 25)
> a sister would not give such kisses to an austere brother

> qualia credibile est non **Phoebo** <u>ferre</u> **Dianam** (l. 27)
> it is not likely that Diana gives such kisses to Apollo

Furthermore, the structure of line 58 differs from lines 26, 28, and 23-24, which describe

passionate kisses:

> sed tulerit cupido mollis **amica viro** (l. 26)
> but a yielding mistress would give that kind to an eager husband

> sed **Venerem Marti** saepe tulisse suo (l. 28)
> but that Venus often has given that kind to her own Mars

> inproba tum vero iungentes oscula vidi
>   illa mihi lingua nexa fuisse liquet (l. 23-24)

> and then in fact I saw you exchanging wanton kisses
>   that your tongue had been interwoven was clear to me

In lines 26 and 28, the kissing parties are located next to each other (*amica/viro*, *Venerem/Marti*). In lines 23-24, the level of participation is so mutual that the parties involved, *puella* and *tertius*, cannot be distinguished from one another. An observation which the *amator* recalls in lines 59-60 *nec tamen hoc unum doleo—non **oscula** tantum / **iuncta** queror, quamvis haec quoque **iuncta** queror* (but I do not lament this alone – I not only lament interwoven kisses, although I also lament these interwoven kisses) immediately after describing his kiss with the *puella*.

Amores 3.2 increases the publicity of the *amator's* and the *puella's* relationship and reveals that the presence of many rivals (none of which are the *puella's vir*) increases the *amator's* competition for his *puella's* attention, but nobody exhibits the level of ownership experienced by the *vir* in 1.4 and *tertius* in 2.5. Twenty-five percent of the lines (twenty-one out of eighty-four) of this poem contain the following body parts: *oculos* and *ocellis* (eyes, l. 6, 83), *vultus* (face, l. 16), *lateris* (side, l. 22), *crura* (legs, l. 23, 27, 29, 31, 63), *terga* (back, l. 24), *genu* (knee, l. 24), *digitis* (fingers, l. 26), *manibus* and *manu* (hand, l. 30, 38, 52, 72), *pectora* (chest, l. 40), *corpore* (body, l. 42), *linguis* (tongues, l. 43), *primos pedes* (toes, l. 64), *capillos* (hair, l. 75), *sinus* (bosom, l. 76). Of these twenty-one, six contain only the *puella's* body part(s) (29%), three contain only a rival's body part(s) (14%), one contains both the *puella's* and a rival's body part(s) (5%), one contains both the *puella's* and the *amator's* body part(s) (4%), four contain only the *amator's* body part(s) (19%), and the remaining six lines (29%) do not contain body parts which belong to the *puella*, *amator*, or a rival.

This poem resembles other public poems (1.4 and 2.5) because the *amator* establishes himself as the Centaur-kidnapper-adultery supporter. Imagining himself in

the role of the jockey, the *amator* likens his inability to focus on the race, due to the

distraction of the *puella's* beauty, to *exempla* pertaining to Hippodamia: *at quam paene*

Pelops Pisaea concidit hasta / dum spectat vultus, Hippodamia, tuos (ah, how the spear

of Pisa nearly cut Pelops to pieces / when he caught sight of your face, Hippodamia, l.

15-16). For the third time in as many books, the *amator* forces the reader to think of him

as the pursuer of what is not rightfully his, of trying to take a married woman away from

her husband. This idea that the union of the *amator* and *puella* is not publicly sanctioned

is reinforced by structure of line 19, *quid frustra refugis cogit nos linea iungi* (Why do

you run away in vain? The boundary of the seats forces us to be joined). Although Ovid

cleverly suggests that the two are joined (*iungi*), the subject (*linea*) of the introductory

verb (*cogit*) separates the accusative subject (*nos*) from the objective infinitive (*iungi*),

thus emphasizing the public separation of the *puella* and the *amator*. When compared to

Ovid's use of *iungere* several times 2.5 as a plural participle and substantive to describe

the lawful union of the *puella* and *tertius* at the dinner party, the use of the verb in 3.2

stresses the current, failed union of the *puella* and *amator*.

Similar to 1.4 and 2.5, public rivals have a higher level of impact on the *puella*

than does the *amator*, but the *amator* in 3.2 not only bids the *puella* to act in a certain

way (as in 1.4 and 2.5), but also issues commands to the rivals with a view to control

their behavior towards her. The *amator* acknowledges his first rival, a charioteer for

whom the *puella* cheers in lines 5-6 as he encourages the *puella tu cursus spectas, ego te*

spectamus uterque / quod iuvat atque oculos pascat uterque suos (you watch the race, I

watch you, we both watch that thing which delights and also gratifies our eyes). This is

the only line in which the *puella's* and the *amator's* body parts are described as one

(*oculos suos*), but the meaning conveyed by these lines betrays this fact – the very feelings which the *amator* has towards the *puella* she directs towards the charioteer. The following verbs which the *puella* governs that have the charioteer as their objects emphasize further her emotional attachment to him: *favere* (to favor), lines 2, 7, 67; *iuvare* (to delight), line 6; *pascere* (to gratify), line 6; *studere* (to be attached to), line 67.[20] Knowing that the *puella's* happiness is directly related to the charioteer's success, and that his own pleasure depends upon the *puella's* blissful state of mind, the *amator* openly roots for the charioteer's success (*cui tamen ipsa faves vincat ut ille precor*, l. 2). When the charioteer begins to lose the race, the *amator* orders him to make the reins tense (*tende, precor, valida lora sinistra manu*, l. 72) and when the charioteer nears victory the *amator* commands him to rise up into an open space (*nunc saltem supera spatioque insurge patenti*, l. 79). The *amator's* rooting pays off, for the charioteer wins, the *puella* laughs (*risit*, l. 83), and the very eyes which watched the charioteer at the beginning of the race promise him something, but at another time (*risit et argutis quiddam promisit ocellis / hoc satis est, alio cetera redde loco*, l. 84).[21]

Body parts emerge during the course of the race as the *amator* attempts to control the actions of the two fellow audience members, the *puella's* garment, and dust as they violate the *puella's terga* (back, l. 24) and *corpore* (body, l. 42) and conceal her *crura* (legs, l. 27). This is a marked reversal from the previous public displays of 1.4 and 2.5 in which the *amator* issues numerous commands to the *puella*, but never to the rivals. The first two rivals are spectators; one is the person sitting on the right of the *puella* and the

---

[20] q. v. L&S *faveo* §I, *juvo* §II, *pasco* §BII1, *studeo* §IIA
[21] Tracy observes that "[t]he situation, the uncertain outcome of the race, increases tension which is reserved in the epilogue as Ovid looks beyond his rival's success to anticipate his own satisfaction with the girl" (498).

other sits behind the *puella*. The *amator* orders one not to injure (*parce*, l. 21) the *puella*

and the other to draw in (*contrahe*, l. 23) his legs and not to press upon (*nec preme*, l. 24)

her back. These imperatives, along with the verb *laeditur* (she is injured, l. 18), suggest

that the *amator* is concerned more with the *puella's* physical safety than with possessing

her:[22]

> tu tamen a dextra, quicumque es, <u>parce</u> puellae:
>   contactu **lateris**[R] laeditur ista tui.
> tu quoque, qui spectas post nos, tua <u>contrahe</u> **crura**[R],
>   si pudor est, rigido <u>nec preme</u> **terga**[P] **genu**[R]! (l. 21-24)
>
> However you from the right, whoever you are, spare the girl:
>   she is injured by the contact of your side.
> you also, you who watch behind us, draw in your legs,
>   if there is decency, do not press her back with your hard knee!

In these four lines the prevalence of rival body parts and the presence of the *amator*,

through the imperatives, diminish greatly the participation of the *puella*, who appears

only as a passive participant.[23]

The third and fourth rivals (the *puella's* mantle and a speck of dust) interact with

the *puella's crura* (legs, l. 24) and her *corpore* (body, l. 42), but do not pose a physical

threat to the *puella*. However, the *pallia* (mantle, l. 25) tortures the *amator* because it

covers the *puella's bona crura* (sexy legs, l. 24). After ordering the *puella* to lift up her

dress and threatening to do so himself if she does not comply, he expresses envy for the

garment which sees the legs which are hidden from his view:

> Sed nimium demissa iacent tibi pallia terra.
>   collige — vel **digitis**[A] en ego tollo meis!
> invida vestis eras, quae tam bona **crura**[P] tegebas;
>   quoque magis spectes — invida vestis eras! (l. 25-28)

---

[22] Rivals' body parts are indicated by the following superscript: [R].

[23] Tracy comments, "He [*amator*] becomes a believable 'human' personality full of solicitous concern for his girl" (498).

> But your falling mantle lies on the ground
> > gather it up – or, see, I lift it up with my fingers!
> You were a hated garment, you who covered such good legs;
> > And the more you might have looked – the more you were hated!

As demonstrated in the lines above, the *amator's digitis* (fingers) never meet the *crura* (legs) of the *puella*, which are the object of the *pallia's* actions. But the *amator* again blames the rival for his failure (*invidia vestis eras...bona crura tegebas*), not the *puella* who ignored his order to gather up (*collige*) her mantle. The final rival is a speck of dust which lands on the *puella's* clothing:

> dum loquor, alba levi sparsa est tibi **pulvere**[R] vestis
> > sordide de niveo **corpore**[P] **pulvis**[R] abi (l. 41 – 42)

> while I speak, your white garment was besprinkled with a little dust
> > go away from her snow-white body, filthy dust

The word order places the *puella* (*tibi, corpore*) next to the dust in each line. The *amator* recognizes this and, true to the pattern established with other rivals, orders the dust to go away from her snow-white body, instead of bidding that the *puella* brush off her garment. The rivals in 3.2 all achieved successful contact with the *puella* while the *amator* simply shouted commands to each one from his seat. By seeking to control the rivals, the *amator* reinforces the image of the *puella's niveo corpore* (pure body) receiving disgraceful (*sordide*) advances from unworthy rivals.

In contrast with 1.4 and 2.5, the *amator* in 3.2 seeks divine (not legal) support to exert his right to possess the *puella*. Divine presence is introduced in the second line of the poem (containing forms of the verbs *favere* (to abstain from evil words) and *precari* (to pray) and continues for sixteen lines (beginning in line 43, almost the exact center of the poem), which describe a solemn procession of deities who are listed in the following order: Victory, Neptune, Mars, Phoebus, Minerva, Ceres, Bacchus, Pollux, Castor,

Venus, and Cupid.[24] In describing the procession, the *amator* proclaims that a person

should praise the deity who can guarantee the person success in whatever profession he

or she is engaged. The *amator* reveals that his profession is love and he needs both

Victory and Venus on his side – Victory to ensure that the charioteer for whom the

puella roots wins (so that she will be happy) and Venus to guarantee that the happy

puella will transfer her joy to loving him. When it seems as though the *puella's*

charioteer will lose the race, the religious language appears again in lines 71-73: *vota*

(solemn promises)*, precor* (I pray), *sinistra* (auspicious), and *favimus* (we favor).[25] After

such language the Roman citizens in the audience decide that the race should start over.

The favored charioteer wins the new race and the action culminates with the following

line which attributes the victory and possession of the *puella* with divine intervention (l.

80-82): *sint mea, sint dominae fac rata **vota** meae / sunt dominae rata **vota** meae, mea*

***vota** supersunt* (make it so that my solemn pledges and my mistress' solemn pledges are

ratified / my mistress' solemn pledges are ratified, my solemn pledges survive). Unable

to control the activities of those who surround him, the *amator* forgoes legal language

and pursues divine assistance because it is the only force which prevails against rivals in

public realm.

III. Private Poems: *Amores* **2.15 and 3.7**

In contrast to the public settings of 2.5 and 3.2, *Amores* 2.15 takes place in the

most private of settings, the *amator's* mind as he imagines the unlimited access he would

---

[24] q. v. L&S *faveo* §IIA, *precor* §I
[25] q. v. L&S *votum* §A, *precor* §I, *sinister* §IIC, *faveo* §I

have to the *puella's* body if he were a ring on her finger.[26] The *amator's* daydream

begins after he asks a ring, which he intends to give the *puella* as a gift, to make his girl

happy. As soon as the *amator* realizes the benefits of being worn on the girl's finger he

envisions himself as the ring and fantasizes about the experiences that he, as a ring,

would have. Since the *amator* pictures himself as a ring in 2.15, his body includes both

human parts and ring parts (*anulus, orbe* and *gemma* – and this is not too implausible

since alternate meanings for *anulus* and *orbe* are ringlet of hair and eye, respectively).[27]

In regard to body parts, I will examine the ring's parts when it is a rival (as the true ring)

and when it is the *amator* (when he pictures himself as the ring) to determine each party's

relationship with the *puella's* body parts. With this revised classification of body parts,

over half of the poem (16 lines) contains body parts. Of those lines, one contains only

the ring's (as ring) body part (6%), two contain both the ring (as ring) and the *puella's*

body parts (13%), eight contain only the *puella's* body parts (50%), one contains both the

amator (as ring) and the *puella's* body parts (6%), three contain only the *amator's* (as

ring) body parts (19%), and one contains only the *amator's* (as man) body parts (6%).

      The ring (as itself) shares more lines with the *puella's* body parts than the *amator*

(as both the ring and the man); it touches her *digitum* (finger) twice in lines 1 and 6 and

her *articulis* (knuckles) once in line 4. What is of greater importance is that the body part

shared, her finger, reinforces the notion that the rival (whoever or whatever it may be)

assumes the body part of the *puella* because it is only fitting:[28]

---

[26] Booth states, "The wish for transformation into some object or entity in physical contact with the beloved
is a recurrent motif in Greek epigram from Hellenistic to Hadrianic times…But no Greek precedent
survives for Ovid's longing to become a signet-ring" (74).

[27] q. v. L&S *anulus* §IIC, *orb* §I

[28] The ring's parts are indicated by the following superscript: [R].

> **Anule**[R], formosae **digitum**[P] <u>vincture</u> puellae,
>   in quo censendum nil nisi dantis amor,
> munus eas gratum! te laeta mente receptum
>   protinus **articulis**[P] <u>induat</u> illa suis;
> tam bene convenias, quam mecum convenit illi,
>   et **digitum**[P] iusto commodus **orbe**[R] <u>teras</u>!
> Felix, a domina <u>tractaberis</u>, **anule**[R], nostra;
>   invideo donis iam miser ipse meis. (l. 1 – 8)

> Ring, about to encircle the finger of a beautiful girl,
>   worth nothing except for the love of the one giving,
> may you be a pleasing gift! may you be welcomed with a happy mind
>   and may that girl on the spot wear you on her knuckle;
> may you be as well-suited to that girl as she is to me,
>   and may you rub her obliging finger with your easy ring!
> Lucky ring, you who will have been handled by my mistress;
>   already I, myself, wretched, am envious of my gift.

While wishing the ring well, the *amator* becomes aroused as he realizes that the ring will encircle (*vincture*, l. 1), be involved with (*induat*, l. 4), and be handled (*tractaberis*, l. 7) by the mistress (*domina*, l. 7). Recognizing that the ring will have unrestricted access to the consenting *puella's* body, the *amator* grows jealous (*invideo*, l. 8) of his newfound rival and deals with it by wishing to become the ring in lines 9 - 10: (*o utinam fieri subito mea munera possem / artibus Aeaeae Carpathiive senis!*; oh how I wish I were suddenly able to become my gift by means of the crafts of Aeaea or the old Carpathian). This type of wish is also expressed in 2.5.7 (*o utinam arguerem sic, ut non vincere possem!*; oh how I wish I could charge you guilty in such a way that I would not be able to win!) and expresses the impossibility of the *amator's* daydream turning into reality.

After becoming the ring, the *amator* imagines himself conquering the *puella's* *papillas* (breasts), *digito* (finger), *sinum* (bosom), *ora* (mouth) and *artus* (limbs); body parts possessed both by the ring in the beginning of 2.15 and the *vir* in 1.4. Posing as a ring on her *laevam manum* (left hand, l. 12), when the *puella* inserts her hand (and

therefore him) into her tunic to touch her *papillas* (breasts, l. 11), he plans on sliding off

her *digito* (finger, l. 13) and falling into her *sinum* (bosom, l. 14). In this way, the *amator*

gains access to the very parts of the body conquered by the *vir* in 1.4.37 (*nec sinus*

admittat digitos habilesve papillae; your bosom and easily handled breasts shall not

receive his fingers). He then imagines that he will be of other use to her as he will be

able to seal letters and under the guise of this sort he will gain access to her *umida ora*

(wet mouth, l. 16). After encountering these most lurid body parts (*papillae*, *sinus*, *ora* –

suggesting *oscula*), which never come into contact with the parts of the *amator*/ring, the

amator/ring returns to the *puella's* upper body:

> si dabor ut condar loculis, exire negabo,
>   adstringens **digitos**[P] **orbe**[A] minore tuos.
> non ego dedecori tibi sum, mea vita, futurus,
>   quodve tener **digitus**[P] ferre recuset, onus.
> me gere, cum calidis perfundes imbribus **artus**[P],
>   damnaque sub **gemmam**[A] fer pereuntis aquae (l. 19-23)

> if I shall be given to be put away in a little box, I shall refuse to go,
>   clinging on your finger with a smaller circle.
> I am not a future source of dishonor for you, my life,
>   or a burden which your delicate finger would refuse to bear.
> Wear me, when you moisten your limbs in a hot shower,
>   and allow the damage of water running under the ring.

Although the *puella's digitos* (fingers) and the *amator*/ring (*orbe*) are placed directly next

to each other in the same line (l. 20), the meaning of the line (I shall refuse to go, clinging

on your finger with a smaller circle) undermines the structure because the *puella* seeks to

get rid of him/it. The *puella's* contemplation of rejection (*recuset*, l. 21) continues as the

amator/ring tries to convince her that he is neither dishonorable (*ego dedecori*, l. 21) nor

burdensome (*onus*, l. 22). The structure of line 22 confirms this separation since the

amator/ring (*me*) is completely separated from the *puella's* limbs (*artus*).

By seeking to be placed on the left hand of the mistress, the *amator* wishes not merely to become a ring, but to become a symbol of marriage, since married women wore rings on the third finger of their left hands (Tingay and Badcock 74).[29] The association of ring and *vir* (husband) is evident from line 26 (*et peragam partes anulus ille viri*; and I, that ring, shall accomplish the duties of a husband). However, the *amator* does not desire the role of ring/husband for its connection with *fides* (line 26), but for the physical perks of such a relationship.[30] The *amator* has employed a ring as an assistant to sexual encounters in the past. *Anulus* occurs in only one other poem in the *Amores* (1.4.25-26), where it plays a role in the silent signs to be given by the *puella* to the *amator* at a public banquet (*cum tibi, quae faciam, mea lux, dicamve placebunt / versetur digitis **anulus** usque tuis*; when I shall do things or say things, my love, which are pleasing to you continually twirl a lock of hair around with your fingers), in defiance of the *fides* between *puella* and *vir*.

Amores 2.15 exhibits characteristics of the previously analyzed poems which take place both in the public and private spheres. *Amores* 2.15 is similar to 1.5 in three ways: one, the action takes place in a private setting; two, there are a larger percentage of body parts in this poem compared to those taking place in the public; three, although sixteen of the twenty-eight lines contain at least one body part (57%) – eleven of which contain at least one of the *puella's* body parts – the *puella's* body and the body of the *amator* (as himself) never meet. In contrast to 1.5, the *amator* in 2.15 has a rival, a ring which is a gift from the *amator* to the *puella*, and the *amator* contends with this rival in the same way in which a rival was handled in 3.2. In 3.2 the *amator* both wished to become the

---

[29] The ring also could have been a simple "love-gift" (Booth 74).

[30] Booth notes that "for all its sensuality, there is unromantic detachment about Ovid's elegy in that the beloved is unnamed and unappreciated for any personal qualities other than her sex-appeal" (75).

charioteer whom the *puella* wants to win a race and issued orders to his rivals, similarly, the *amator* in 2.15, after bidding the ring please his *puella*, imagines life as a ring which touches the *puella's* body.

In *Amores* 3.7 the *amator* experiences unprecedented contact with the *puella's* *bracchia* (arms), *oscula* (lips), *lingua* (tongue), *femur* (thigh), *manu* (hand), and *pedes* (feet); however, this physical encounter emasculates the *amator* because he is impotent. The *amator's* inability to consummate the physical relationship with the *puella* diminishes her physical presence in 3.7 and the *amator*, although he expresses frustration, is concerned about disappointing his own body, not the *puella's*. This fact reveals itself through the overwhelming presence of the *amator's* body parts in the poem: Seventeen out of eighty-four lines contain body parts (20%). Of these seventeen lines, eleven contain only the *amator's* body part(s) (65%), five contain only the *puella's* body part(s) (29%), and one contains both the *puella's* and the *amator's* body part(s) (6%).

Not only is this the first body part poem in which the *puella's* body parts do not comprise the highest percentage, but it is also the first poem in which the *puella* assertively acts upon the *amator's* body. The first mention of body parts occurs in the following lines:

> illa quidem nostro subiecit eburnea **collo**[A]
>   **bracchia**[P] Sithonia candidiora nive
> **oscula**[A]que inseruit cupida luctantia **lingua**[P],
>   lascivum **femori**[A] supposuitque **femur**[P] (l. 7-10)

> that girl even threw around my neck her ivory
>   arms, whiter than the Thracian snow
> and her lustful tongue implanted wrestling kisses,
>   and her lewd thigh set under my thigh

While physically dominating her *amator*, the *puella* also dominates the structure of these four lines. With the exception of one adjective (*nostro*), all the adjectives in this section modify the *puella* or her body (*illa, eburnea, candidiora, cupida, luctantia, lascivium*). Furthermore either the *puella* or her body governs all three verbs (*subiecit, inservit, supposuit*) which have the *amator's* body as objects (*collo, oscula, femori*); she throws her arms around the *amator's* neck, gives him kisses, and puts her thigh next to his. Since all these actions are ones which the *amator* begged the *vir* and the *puella* not to engage in during the dinner party in 1.4, one would expect the *amator* not only to savor the experience but also to boast about his experience.

This first, undeniable union of the body parts of the *puella* and the *amator* is deflated both before and after their appearance because the *amator* confesses his impotence throughout the poem by using the following variety of nouns, adjectives, and verbs to describe his useless condition: sluggish (*languidus*), inactive (*pigro*), exhausted (*effete*), slack (*segnia*), incompetent (*iners*), useless (*inutile*), they are listless (*languent*), unproductive (*sterilem*), to be torpid (*torpere*), prematurely dead (*praemortua*), rather dull (*languidiora*), sick (*male sane*), unwilling (*invitum*), and tired (*lassus*). However, in only two lines (15 and 65) does the impotent language meet the *amator's* body, suggesting that the condition is separate from the *amator*. The *amator* supports this notion by attributing his lack of performance to both witchcraft (*quid vetat et nervos magicas torpere per artes*, l. 35) and a treacherous penis (*quae nunc ecce vigent intempestiva valentque / nunc opus exposcunt militiamque suam*, l. 67-68).

Initially it does not appear that the *puella* has anything to do with the *amator's* impotence, but closer examination reveals that her association with witchcraft places the

59

blame upon her. Although the *amator* praises the *puella's* beauty and charm at the onset

of the poem (*at non formosa est at non bene culta puella*; by no means [do I think that]

the girl is not shapely and not well polished, l. 1) and the *puella's* ability to stimulate him

with affection and flattery (*et mihi blanditias dixit dominumque vocavit / et quae*

praeterea publica verba iuvant; and she spoke flatteries to me and she called me master /

and in addition spoke words which generally help, l. 11-12), nevertheless the censure

aimed at witchcraft in lines 27-36 is also directed at her. The two are linked by the use of

per artes in the final position of pentameters which describe the *amator's* impotence. In

lines 27-36, the *amator* laments the malevolent power of incantations to stop life forces –

they can bring about famine and drought and his own impotence (*quid vetat et nervos*

*magicas torpere **per artes***; and what prevents my penis from being inactive through

magic arts, l. 35). The *puella*, in contrast, has the power to breathe life into dying things.

The *amator* claims that she can make legendary elderly men feel young again (l. 39-40),

arouse even the most unyielding products of nature (l. 57-60), but she cannot stimulate

him: *hanc etiam non est mea dedignata puella / molliter admota sollicitare manu / sed*

*postquam nullas consurgere posse **per artes** / immemoremque sui procubuisse videt* (my

girl has not even refused this / to arouse me with her hand moved softly / but after she

was not able to raise my member with her skills / she sees that it, heedless of her, has

bent down, l. 73-76). Although the *amator* does not explicitly blame the *puella* for his

condition, by associating her abilities to arouse other men (but not him) with witchcraft,

he curses her obliquely for not being as effective with her *artes* as the witches who

brought about the condition.

IV. Possession without Commitment

The public and private relationships between the *amator* and the *puella* (whoever she may be) changes throughout the three books of the *Amores*. In 1.4 the *amator* seeks to interact with the *puella* while the rival *vir* is present, but near the end of the poem we learn that, according to the *amator*, this is a girl who, even if she is legally bound to the *vir*, returns the interest: *quod mihi das furtim, iure coacta dabis* (1.4.64). In 2.5 the *amator* seeks again to get the same action which the *puella* gives to another man in his presence, but the *puella* still has some attachment to the *amator*; she blushes when the *amator* berates her for her adulterous actions (thus revealing at least some level of shame for her betrayal) (*at illi / conscia purpureus venit in ora pudor*, 2.5.33-34) and gladly kisses him at his request (*risit et ex animo dedit optima* [*oscula*], 2.5.51). In 3.2 the *amator* is desperate for attention from the *puella* – he wants to sit near her and talk with her and look at her, but she wants to get away (*quid frustra refugis? cogit nos linea iungi*, 3.2.19). In 1.5 the *amator* describes a physical encounter with a *puella* who arrives in his bedroom and willingly has sex with him. Aside from the feigned struggle in lines 15-16 (*cumque ita pugnaret tamquam quae vincere nollet / victa est non aegre proditione sua*), there is no indication that the *puella* is not interested in him. In 2.15 the *puella* has no objections to the *amator's* contact with her body; however this is not a straightforward encounter for two reasons: one, because the action occurs in the *amator's* mind as a daydream; two, there are no objections by the *puella* because he is in disguise, as a ring. *Amores* 3.7 reveals that the *puella* desires to have sex with the *amator*, but the inability for her to stimulate him causes him to be impotent.

The *puella's* body in the *Amores* may represent poetry and, depending on the representation, may symbolize the dichotomous figures of elegiac and tragic poetry (Wyke 129). From this approach, the *amator's* relationship with a *puella's* body can represent the *poeta's* relationship with his *materia*, a relationship which begins in *Amores* 1, evolves in *Amores* 2, and terminates in *Amores* 3 (Keith). In Book 1, as the *poeta* acquaints himself with the *materia* of love elegy, the *amator* familiarizes himself with the games of love and the recreation of sex. By Book 2, the *poeta* has established himself and must work hard to preserve his skill and the loyalty of his audience, just as the *amator* has acquired the *puella* and must vary his approach in order to keep the girl's (and his own) interest. In Book 3, the *poeta* confesses that his relationship with elegy's *materia* will be coming to an end; similarly, the *amator* discovers that his body (*opus*) is no longer stimulated by the *puella*. From the beginning of Book 1, the *poeta* never makes an eternal commitment to elegiac *materia*; therefore, it would be an error to conclude that the *amator* sought to commit seriously to any *puella* in the *Amores*.[31]

---

[31] Keith views *Amores* 2.4 and 2.10 as not only the *amator's* admission to love many types of women, but also the *poeta's* declaration to enjoy the various aspects of elegy (33-37).

CHAPTER FOUR: BODY PARTS REREAD AND REVEALED

I. Introduction

Chapters 2 and 3 demonstrated that the *amator's* desire to dominate body parts corresponds with his quest to establish ownership of the *puella* in public and private domains. But body parts in the *Amores* may also represent poetic genres. Wyke analyzes *Amores* 3.1 where, "The narrator (as poet) recalls his encounter there with two writing-practices in female form; Elegia and Tragoedia" (117) and concluded that "entitled Elegia and Tragoedia, these women have only a precarious signification as individuals, so that a catalogue of their physical features functions more importantly as a catalog of stylistic practices" (118). Wyke supports this claim by discussing the human representations of each genre contained within 3.1.7-10 (the arrival of Elegy) and 3.1.11-14 (the entrance of Tragedy), by focusing on Elegy's description as "levis" (122) and Tragedy's as "gravis" (122), by pointing out that Elegy, as a "*meretrix*…is provided with both a sexually provocative dress, *vestis tenuissima* v.9, and expression (v.9 and v.33)" and that Tragedy as a "*matrona*… clothed in the concealing garments of a respectable Roman wife, *palla iacebat humi* (v. 12), adopts highly dignified gestures (vv.31-32)" (124). Based on Wyke's findings, this chapter will reexamine body parts of both the *puellae* and the *amator* in 1.4, 1.5, 2.5, 2.15, 3.2, and 3.7 in order to establish both as either Elegy or Tragedy with a view to provide insight to the *poeta's* relationship with a poetic genre. Since Wyke points out that the *poeta*, too, can be described in the manner of a genre as in 2.18.15-16 where he adorns himself with three symbols of tragedy *pallam, pictos*

cothurnos, and *sceptra*, his characterization will also be considered (121). Finally, this chapter will show how the struggles of both the *amator* with the *puella's* body and the *poeta* with the poetic body reveal Ovid's commentary on poetic conventions.

The importance of revisiting the poems which have been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 can be found in the content of *Amores* 3.1. In 3.1.17, Tragedy reproaches the *poeta* for talking about activities which occur at drunken feasts, the public setting of both 1.4 and 2.5: *nequitiam vinosa tuam convivia narrant* (they [poems] relate your worthlessness at wine-filled banquets). In 3.1.51, Elegy states that she taught Corinna *delabi toro tunica velata soluta* (to descend from her bed, covered by a loose tunic), which refers to the private-setting body part poems of 1.5 (*ecce, Corinna venit tunica velata recincta*; look, Corinna arrives, veiled with a loosened tunic 1.5.9) and 3.7 (*nec mora, desiluit tunica velata soluta*; without delay, she dismounted, veiled with a loose tunic, 3.7.81). In 3.1.57-58, Elegy laments *quid, cum me munus natali mittis, at illa / rumpit et apposita barbara mergit aqua* (how when you sent me as a birthday gift, and that rude girl broke me and plunged me into nearby water), which recalls the *munus* (gift) of 2.15.22-23 (*me gere, cum calidis perfundes imbribus artus / damnaque sub gemmam perfer euntis aquae*; wear me [gift], when you moisten your limbs in a hot shower / and allow the damage of water running under the ring). Throughout 3.1, Tragedy reinforces herself as a public genre and Elegy a private genre, but throughout the *Amores*, Ovid combines public and private, tragedy and elegy.

In Book 1 the *poeta* begins to deconstruct elegy through the use of tragedy. In Book 2 he realizes that the standards established by his predecessors limit his ability to innovate. In Book 3 he realizes that he lacks interest for pure elegy. In Book 1, we meet a *poeta* divided because he began to write epic, but Cupid intruded and forced him to switch to elegy. Therefore the identity of the *poeta* is ambiguous as he tries to figure out how, with the skills of an epic *poeta*, to write elegy. In 1.4 he takes what he thinks is the elegiac approach and tries (unsuccessfully) to appropriate the genre in a public setting. In 1.5 the epic *poeta* still attempts to figure out how to write elegy and uses tragic violence to strip the genre down to its bare parts. From there, the epic *poeta* will begin to try to reconstruct the elegiac genre. In 2.5 the *poeta* acknowledges the enormity of his undertaking when he realizes that previous elegiac poets have shaped the genre in a way that hinders his quest to transform the genre. In 2.15 the *poeta* discovers that through transformation and deception elegy can be uncovered and its true nature revealed. The *poeta* uses 3.2 as an opportunity to demonstrate that elegy revealed is merely tragedy deformed. In 3.7, the *poeta* endures the humiliating consequences of choosing one genre in lieu of the other, which forces him to define his poetic identity. Throughout the *Amores*, a relationship with elegy stimulates the *poeta* only when he is able to be with her in dual-elegy/tragedy fashion; a task which he achieves through grand measures.

II. *Puellae Ambiguae*

An analysis of the bodies, descriptions, and actions of the *puellae* in *Amores* 1.4, 1.5, 2.5, 2.15, and 3.2 shows that each one represents both Elegy and Tragedy as

personified in *Amores 3.1*. In *Amores* 1.4, the *puella's vultu* (expression) and *pallia*

(cloak) establish her poetic identity as Elegy and Tragedy, respectively. The description

of the *puella's* expression occurs in 1ine 15 (*cum premet ille torum, **vultu** comes ipsa*

modesto (when that man rests upon the couch, you, his companion, with an

inconspicuous expression, l. 15). Although the *puella's modesto vultu* (inconspicuous

expression) differs from that of Elegy's loving (*amantis*) countenance in 3.1.9, closer

examination of how Ovid uses the word throughout the *Amores* illustrates that *modesto*

can be associated with Elegy. The adjective *modestus* is used three other times in the

Amores (2.4, 3.6, and 3.14). In both 2.4.11-12 and 3.6.67, the adjective modifies *deiecta*

(downcast) eyes and it is a girl with these modest, downcast eyes who arouses the

amator. In 3.14.16, the *amator* begs his *puella* to feign modesty in public through

modesta verba (modest words). The *puella* in 1.4 may exhibit the modest expression

associated with Elegy, but she wears the *pallia* (cloak) of Tragedy: *haec tamen aspiciam,*

*sed quae bene **pallia** celant* (yet I shall see these things, but those things which the cloak

conceals, l. 41) and *conscia de tergo **pallia** deme tuo* (remove the knowing cloak from

your back, l. 49). Although the *pallia* in 1.4 does not match exactly Tragedy's *palla* of

3.1, nevertheless it describes a garment which covers more than it exposes.

     As in 1.4, the *puella* in 1.5 represents both Elegy and Tragedy personified, as the

following lines reveal: *ecce, Corinna venit **tunica velata recincta*** (look, Corinna arrives,

veiled with a loosened tunic, l. 9), *deripui **tunicam** nec multum **rara** nocebat* (I tore off

her tunic and the thin garment was not injured much, l. 13), ***pugnabat** tunica sed tamen*

illa tegi (but still she kept fighting to be covered by that tunic, l. 14), *cumque ita*

pugnaret *tamquam quae vincere nollet* (and so she fought in this way as if she wished not

to win, l. 15). The *puella* in 1.5 connects with Elegy through her clothing and Tragedy

through her actions. In 1.5.9, the *puella*, Corinna, wears a *tunica velata recincta*

(loosened tunic) and Wyke points out in that in 3.1.51 Elegy describes Corinna similarly

(*tunica velata soluta*) while praising her abilities to assist the *amator* (123). The second

description of Corinna's tunic in 1.5.13, *rara* (thin), continues the parallel with Elegy's

clothing, which Wyke identifies as being described as *vestis tenuissima* (very thin) in

3.1.9 (124).[32] Although covered in Elegy's garb, the verbs (*pugnabat*, 1.5.14; *pugnaret*,

1.5.15) which Corinna governs while she struggles to remain clothed exhibit the fighting

characteristics of Tragedy whom Elegy claims attacked (*pugnasti*, 3.1.38) her in 3.1.

While covered, the *puella* retains the fighting characteristics of Tragedy.

The time of day in 1.5 which allows for the arrival of *verecundis puellis* (virtuous

girls, 1.5.7), juxtaposed against the arrival of the shameless Corinna encourage the

dichotomous reading of the *puella* as both Elegy and Tragedy. Since public view is an

alternate meaning for *lux*, lines 7-8 associate both *verecundis* (virtue) and *timidus pudor*

(fearful decency) with public life and Tragedy, which is represented in these lines as the

verecundae puellae hope that the half-light will provide a *latebras* (cloak) for their taboo

sexual encounters.[33] Although Elliott believes that lines 7-8 intentionally mislead the

---

[32] Keith, too, notes that similarities exist between Elegy's and Corinna's attire and he adds that by associating the noun *menda* (which is "regularly employed metaphorically in discussions of specifically literary faults or blemishes") with Corinna's body, "Ovid implicitly conflates the physique of his elegiac girl friend and the poetics espoused in his elegiac collection" (31).
[33] q. v. L&S *lux* §BIIA

audience to expect a chaste girl in order to surprise them with brazen Corinna in line 9, I

propose that Corinna, depending on the circumstance, is either sexually oppressed and

concealed by a cloak in public or sexually uninhibited and naked in private. Wyke states

that "Elegia and Tragoedia are clearly differentiated as respectively *meretrix* and

matrona" (125); therefore, Corinna, by being both a harlot and a married woman,

represents both genres. Covered up, she embodies the proper, restricted, genre of

Tragedy, but when the genre is allowed to be exposed, Elegy is revealed.

The *puella* in 2.5 represents Elegy through adjectives (*nexus, mollis, tener*) used

to describe various body parts and through her actions (*pudor venit, risit*), but retains one

characteristic (*supercilius*) of Tragedy. The *puella's* first association with Elegy occurs

in 2.5.24 as her *lingua* (tongue) is described as *nexa* (coiled), just as Elegy's hair is

described as perfumed and curled in 3.1.7 (*odoratos Elegia **nexa** capillos*; Elegy coiled

with respect to her perfumed hair). The connection with Elegy continues through two

analogies used to describe the kiss in 2.5.26 and 2.5.28 where the use of the adjective

mollis (soft) aligns the *puella* with Elegy, as does her association with Venus: *sed tulerit*

*cupido **mollis amica** viro* (but [the kind of kiss which] a soft courtesan will have given to

her desiring man) and *sed **Venerem** Marti saepe tulisse suo* (but [the kind of kisses

which] Venus is believed to have given to her own Mars). In 2.5.46, the *puella's genas*

(cheeks) are described as *teneras* (soft), an adjective which Tragedy uses in 3.1.27 to

describe the types of *tenerae puellae* (soft girls) found in Elegy's verses. After being

berated for openly kissing another man in public, *pudor* (shame) enters the *puella's* face

in 2.5.36. Tragedy mentions *pudor* (shame) in 3.1.22 when she criticizes the poet who

had openly discussed his shameful deeds through Elegy. In 2.5.51, the *puella risit*

(laughs), an action attributed to Elegy throughout the *Amores*: in 3.1.33, Elegy laughs

before responding to Tragedy's criticism of the genre; Cupid (1.1.3 and 1.6.11) laughs

before stealing a foot from the poet's verse (1.1) and before instructing an apprehensive

amator how to steal through the night (1.6); Amor (2.18.15) laughs when he sees the poet

decked out in tragic garb; and cheating *puellae* laugh twice (3.2.83 and 3.3.20) in the

Amores. On the other hand, this overwhelmingly elegiac *puella* in 2.5 contains one

important feature of Tragedy, *supercilio vibrante* (quivering eyebrows, 2.5.15) a body

part specifically attributed to Tragedy in 3.1.48.

The *puella* in 2.15 embodies both Elegy and Tragedy; she represents Elegy

through her *sinum* (bosom, l. 15), *tener digitus* (tender finger, l. 22), and *tunicis* (tunic, l.

13) and Tragedy through the use of her *laevam manum* (left hand, l. 13). In 2.15.14, the

amator seeks access to the *puella's* bosom as he states *inque **sinum** mira laxus ab arte*

cadam (I, loose, shall fall into her bosom by my amazing skill). The bosom is also an

important location to Elegy in 3.1.14, where she describes the forbidden places where her

work had been hidden: *quin ego me memini, dum custos saevus abiret / ancillae miseram*

*delituisse **sinu*** (In fact I remember that I, wretched, have concealed myself in the bosom

of the maid, until the fierce guard went away). Lines 2.15.12-13 connect the *puella* with

both Tragedy and Elegy (*cum libeat…et **laevam tunicis** inserviusse **manum***; when it

pleases her to put her left hand into her tunic). Of the nine times *tunica* is used in the

69

Amores, it always has sexual, and therefore, elegiac overtones: 1.5.9 and 1.5.14 (Corinna is dressed in a loose tunic and ends up having sex with the *amator*), 3.7.40 and 3.7.81 (the overtly sexual *puella* who fails to arouse the *amator* is dressed in a loose tunic), 1.7.47 (in describing a girl whom the *amator* had physically abused), 3.14.21 and 3.14.27 (donned by a girl who is very sexually active). In spite of this overwhelming association with Elegy, mention of the *puella's* left hand associates her with Tragedy in 3.1.13 who brandishes her scepter in her left hand (**laeva manus** *sceptrum late regale movebat*; her left hand was shaking a royal scepter extensively).

In *Amores* 3.2 the *puella* does not break the pattern established in the previous poems because she symbolizes both Tragedy, through her clothing (*pallia*), and Elegy, through her clothing (*tenui veste*), physical description (*argutis ocellis*), and her action (*risit*). The *puella* is associated first with Tragedy through her clothing in 3.2.25 as the *amator* observes that her dropped mantle hangs lose on the ground (*sed nimium demissa iacent tibi* **pallia** *terra*). *Pallia* is used only three other times in the *Amores*: in 1.4.41 (*haec tamen adspiciam, sed quae bene* **pallia** *celant*; still I shall see these things, but things which covers will conceal well); in 1.4.50 (*conscia de tergo* **pallia** *deme tuo*; remove the knowing cloak from your back); and in 1.2.2 (*neque in lecto* **pallia** *nostra sedent*; and the sheets on my bed are not fixed). In all four instances the function of this type of material is to cover – be it a bed, table, sexual deeds, or in the case of 3.2, sexy legs. Although *pallia* differs from the *palla* worn by Tragedy in 3.1.12, *pallia* nevertheless functions as a symbol of tragedy. This is supported by the fact that Ovid

70

pairs the noun in 3.2.25 with the same verb and imagery in 3.1.12 to describe Tragedy's

entrance and the fact that her mantle was hanging loose on the ground (**palla** *iacebat*

humi). *Palla* is used only three other times in the *Amores* (1.8.59, 2.18.15, 3.13.26). In

1.8, Apollo, god of *vates*, is dressed in a golden mantle; in 2.18, the *poeta* himself wears

the cloak and, as a result, endures *Amor's* ridicule; and in 3.13 it is the attire of maidens

in procession honoring the goddess Juno. Since the *palla* is worn only by (or in the

presence of) divinities, *pallia* offers an alternative which expresses the same idea.

Although in the beginning of the 3.2 the *puella* is dressed as Tragedy (as a proper

matron would be attired at the very public function, the races), when the *amator* thinks

about the *bona crura* (sexy legs, 3.2.27) hiding beneath the *puella's pallia*, he not only

curses the cloak for covering up the *puella's* assets, but becomes aroused and begins to

describe the *puella* in elegiac terms. The *puella's pallia* changes from a concealing cloak

to a *tenui veste* (thin garment, 3.2.36) just as Elegy's dress in 3.1.9 is described as *vestis*

tenuissima (very thin). Not only is the *puella's* clothing connected Elegy, but with

argutis ocellis (sly eyes) she *risit* (laughs, 3.2.83) in the same manner as Elegy in 3.1.33

(*altera, si memini, limis surrisit ocellis*; the other one [Elegy], if I remember, laughed

with eyes askew). Furthermore, the *amator* seeks to hide her in his *sinus* (l. 76), just as

Elegy's verses were hidden in a bosom in 3.1.56 (*quin, cum ego me memini, dum custos*

saevus abiret / ancillae miseram delituisse sinu; in fact I remember that I, wretched, have

concealed myself in the bosom of the maid, until the fierce guard went away).

For the first time in the three books of the *Amores*, the *puella* corresponds solely

to Elegy in 3.7 because of how she and her body are described (*lascivum, luctantia,*

tenera), how she acts (*sollicitare*), and how she is dressed (*tunica velata soluta*). In 3.10,

the *puella's femur* (thigh) is described as *lascivum* (wanton), an adjective which modifies

Amor in 3.1.43, whose mother is influenced by Elegy (*rustica sit sine me **lascivi** mater*

Amoris; without me [Elegy] the mother of wanton Amor would be simple). Similarly, the

present participle *luctantia* (wrestling) which modifies the *puella's lingua* (tongue) in

3.7.9 cannot be directly linked to Elegy in 3.1. However, Ovid uses the adjective only

two other times in the *Amores* (1.2.9 and 3.11b.1) and in both instances it describes the

amator's struggles with emotions of love, thus equating the adjective with Elegy. The

puella's act of trying, in vain, to *sollicitare molliter* (stimulate softly) the impotent

amator in 3.7.74 and 3.7.56 connects her with Elegy in two ways: one, Elegy uses the

verb *sollicitare* in 3.1.50 to relate how she taught Corinna to seduce faith; two, the adverb

mollliter reinforces the association with soft Elegy. The dress of the *tenera* (soft, 3.7.53)

puella, a *tunica velata soluta* (3.7.81), directly connects her to Elegy who, in discussing

her influence on Corinna in 3.1.51, described Corinna's outfit in the same manner.

III. *Poeta Ambiguus*

Just as the *puellae* in the *Amores* represent different genres, the *amator* (and

therefore the fictional *poeta*) as well can be read as both Elegy and Tragedy, which

provides insight into Ovid's goal to combine different genres in a single work. In *Amores*

1.4 the *poeta* establishes himself as both an elegiac and an epic poet and will continue

72

this representation throughout the *Amores*. In 1.4.8, when the *amator* compares himself with the Centaurs, he admits that he is an uncertain man (*ambiguos viros*). Since 1.4 follows three poems in which the *poeta* professes to be an epic poet who was forced to write elegy, it would be in line with the program to read *ambiguos* as a description of a *poeta* who represents more than one genre. Ovid uses the adjective *ambiguos* only two other times in the *Amores* (2.9b.50 and 3.12.28). In 2.9 the adjective describes the wavering joys which love brings; in 3.12 it is used in the same way as 1.4, to describe half-human, half-animal creatures. The myth referred to in 3.12 inverts the situation of 1.4 because in 1.4 the horse-men are ambiguous in shape and they kidnap Hippodamia and in 3.12 the bird-maidens have ambiguous shapes and they capture men. If that which is *ambiguus* has the power to capture, a *poeta* who, although in his heart remains loyal to epic, refuses to define his genre as either elegy or epic will captivate his audience.

The *amator's superciliis* (eyebrows, 1.4.19) exhibits this power to gain control and, although seemingly weakens the *poeta*'s ambiguity, actually strengthens the force of indistinctness. Ovid mentions eyebrows only two other times in the *Amores*: once, in 2.5.15 to describe how a *puella* speaks using her eyebrows during a dinner party; again, in 3.1.48 where Elegy admits that she has endured much more than Tragedy's arrogance (*supercilio*) would allow. By using the same word to describe both Tragedy's arrogance and the elegiac body parts in 1.4 and 2.5 employed to brazenly flaunt communication between a *puella* who is owned by another (*vir* in 1.4 and *tertius* in 2.5), Ovid establishes a preference for ambiguity.

The representation of the *amator/poeta* in 1.5 continues to be uncertain, but the influence of Tragedy still remains. The *poeta* retains ambiguous poetic identity through an early allusion to the Centaur myth as mentioned in 1.4. The use of *membra* (limbs) in 1.5.2 followed by *silvae* (woods) two lines later recall line 1.4.9 (*nec mihi silva domus, nec equo mea membra cohaerent*; my home is not the forest and my limbs are not consistent with a horse). At first this seems to negate the association with the Centaurs (*ambiguos viros*) in 1.4.8, but in 1.4 the *amator* says that he can identify with the Centaurs who kidnapped Hippodamia because she was *candida* (beautiful*, 1.4.7) just like Corinna in 1.5.10 (*candida colla*). When Tragedy is introduced in 3.1 she is described as *violenta* (violent, 3.1.11) (Wyke 121) and Elegy discusses how Tragedy has oppressed (*premis*, 3.1.36) and attacked (*pugnasti*, 3.1.38) her. The *amator's* similar violent actions towards the *puella* in 1.5 (*deripui*, l. 13 and *premi*, l.20) align him with Tragedy.

Continuing the pattern established in Book 1, the *amator/poeta* maintains an air of uncertainness in 2.5, 2.15, 3.2, and 3.7. Although his ambiguous nature continues to be indicated by veiled allusions (2.5.14 and 3.2.16) to the Centaur myth found in 1.4, the *poeta* remains tragic in 2.5. He begins 2.5 by asking quivered Cupid (and thus Elegy) to go away (*abeas pharetrate Cupido*, 2.5.1) and in 2.5.47 he describes his arms (*lacerti*) as strong (*fortes*), a characteristic which Elegy attributes to Tragedy in 3.1.41-42 as she highlights the differences between the two, *sum levis, et mecum levis est, mea cura, Cupido / non sum materia fortior ipsa mea* (I am light and my love, Cupid, is light with me: I am not stronger than my very subject matter). In 2.15 the *amator*, by describing

himself variously as *angustus* (narrow, 2.15.13), but also *laxus* (loose, 2.15.14), exalts in

his *mira arte* (amazing skill, 2.15.14) to change himself as the situation demands and

exposes the *poeta's* desire to participate in both the elegiac and the tragic genres. The

amator/poeta in 3.7 still exhibits capricious tendencies, as he endures the tragic

consequences of colluding with Elegy. By being the subject of the verb *ludis* (you play)

in 3.7.77, the audience is made aware that the *amator/poeta* has engaged in elegiac

composition.[34] After having an affair with (and thus composing) Elegy proper, the *poeta*

feels useless because he no longer controls his output. He describes himself variously as

languidus (useless/powerless, 3.7.3), *pigro* (inactive, 3.7.4), *effeti* (past producing, 3.7.6),

segnia (unproductive, 3.7.14), *iners* (incompetent, 3.7.15), *inutile* (unprofitable, 3.7.15),

and *lassus* (exhausted, 3.7.80). He has engaged in elegy, is now worthless, and is

ashamed of his inability to perform poetically. *Pudor* (shame) is something associated

with Tragedy, who in 3.1.22 rebukes the *poeta*, *dum tua praeterito facta **pudore** refers*

(where you announce your exploits with shame past and gone).   Poem 3.7 presents four

instances where the *poeta* expresses shame (*pudor* is employed twice in line 37 and once

in line 72 and *turpiter* is used in 3.7.66) for his inability to force his member to

cooperate; however, his shame may also be due to his inability to define his own personal

style because *et non exactum corpus an umbra forem* (I was not sure whether or not I was

a body of work or an imperfect copy/representation, 3.7.16). This lack of identity

---

[34] The various meanings of the verb *ludere* include to frolic and to compose (q. v. L&S *ludo* §IB, §IIA).

continues in line 60 when he says that he is neither alive nor is he the man he used to be (*sed neque tum vixi nec vir, ut ante, fui*).

IV. Elegy vs. Tragedy: A Battle of Epic Proportions

As the relationship between the *amator* and *puella* of each poem is reinterpreted to represent the *poeta's* relationship with a genre it becomes clear that throughout the *Amores*, the *poeta* never relinquishes wholly his original allegiance to epic and that he constantly grapples with his poetic identity in the *Amores*. *Amores* 1.4 represents both the ongoing transition of the *poeta* from writing epic to writing elegy and Ovid's commentary that tragedy and elegy can be embodied in the same work because writing poetry is the same regardless of the genre. *Amores* 1.4 is a poem about deception (*ambiguos*) which requires the key participants to play different roles: the tragic (*superciliis*) poet must pretend to be an *amator* as he writes elegy and the *puella* must be both the rightful property of the *vir* and lover of the *amator*. This *puella*, a "*matrona*" to the *vir* and a "*meretrix*" to the *amator*, is then aptly represented as both Tragedy and Elegy (Wyke 124). Like the *amator*, who is a mere observer at the dinner party, the *poeta* sees only the external nature of the *puella*/genre. In order to strip Tragedy down to Elegy, he must appropriate Elegy from his rival poets. Therefore, the *amator's* lack of success at the dinner party, and his frantic attempts to keep the *puella* away from the *vir*, exposes the *poeta's* inability to take Elegy away from his predecessors, thus revealing Ovid's immense challenge to succeed in writing his own elegies.

In 1.5, the *amator* establishes his ownership of a *puella* by acting forcefully upon

her; similarly the *poeta*, faced with the difficult task of proving himself in conventional

genre, conquers Elegy in 1.5 by using tragic tactics similar to those described in *Amores*

3.1:

> quid gravibus verbis, animosa Tragoedia,' dixit
>   'me **premis**?' an numquam non gravis esse potes?
> imparibus tamen es numeris dignata moveri;
>   in me pugnasti versibus usa meis' (3.1.35-38)

> "Tragedy, why do you oppress me with heavy words?" Elegy said,
>   "and why are you never able to be light?
> But still you think it fit to be moved by unequal lines; you, having taken
>   advantage of my verses, have fought me."

The oppressing action (*premi*) in 1.5 occurs when the *puella*/genre is naked, implying

that the *poeta* must conquer and strip the genre in order to write elegy. This exposure is

highlighted by the mention of body parts which are, in public, concealed by a cloak:

corpore (l. 18), *umeros* and *lacertos* (l. 19), *forma papillarum* (l. 20), *castigato*, *pectore*

and *venter* (l. 21), *corpus* (l. 24). With the basic components revealed, the *poeta* can now

manipulate the poetry into elegy.

The relationship between the *amator* and the *puella* in 2.5 reveals the *poeta's*

anger and realization of the limitation of his poetic abilities. In the poem, the *amator* gets

angry when he sees his own *puella* kiss another man in public, reprimands the *puella*,

considers beating her for the crime, and then demands a kiss himself. The kiss is so

amazing that the *amator* realizes that someone else, more skilled than he, has taught the

puella the art of kissing, but the identity of the teacher is not as important as the influence

of these teachings on the *puella*. The *poeta* stripped down the genre in 1.5 in an attempt

to make it his own, only to realize in 2.5 that this task is difficult since the elegiac genre

has been influenced by many rivals (elegiac predecessors). The not-so-exclusive

relationship between the *amator* and *puella* in 2.5 uncovers Ovid's insecurities regarding

his relationship with the elegiac genre. Just as the *amator* recognized his inferiority as a

lover when the *puella* kissed him, so Ovid becomes conscious of the superiority of his

predecessors' poetry.

      Amores 2.15 represents both the *amator's* and the *poeta's* realization that in order

to achieve success one must adapt himself and his skills because, as discovered in 2.5, he

cannot replace his amatory rivals/predecessors. Due to the *amator's* ability to change

shape from a man into a ring in 2.15, the *puella* has no objections to the *amator's*

traversing of her body. But she does not realize that he is doing the action – she is

deceived – she thinks a ring is on her, not a man. Disguised as an elegiac poet, the *poeta*

likewise will trick audiences into the elegiac mindset all the while presenting them with

epic. Through this, Ovid condemns the unrealistic standards held by society that poetry

must conform to one genre and seeks to shatter this rule by conquering multiple genres in

the same poetic body. [35]

      In *Amores* 3.2 the *puella*, for the last time, embodies both Tragedy and Elegy, but

during the course of 3.2 she is transformed into Elegy and appears as that genre in

Amores 3.7. In 3.2 the *amator* expresses a preference for a *pallia*-clad "*matrona*" (Wyke

124) in the public sphere (the races) just as a *poeta* seeks socially-acceptable Tragedy

---

[35] Fyler notes that Ovid's elegiac poetry offers "a skeptical examination of the limitations of genre as an ordering principle" (196).

when placed under society's microscope, but as the *amator* pursues something which he

cannot have he becomes aroused and, since it is a taboo to chase a married woman, the

poeta transforms Tragedy into sexually-charged Elegy. [36] In the end, the elegiac

puella/genre prevails, as in line 83 the *puella risit* (laughs) with *argutis ocellis* (sly eyes).

The transformation of the *puella* into sheer Elegy is complete in 3.7 and the *amator's*

lack of excitement for the *puella* correlates with the *poeta's* inability to produce poetry in

a restricted genre.[37] In spite of Elegy's seductive ways and her abilities to stimulate even

the most stubborn, she is unable to move the *poeta* in 3.7. The *poeta* expresses grief

because he finally has everything for which he has wished, but he cannot deliver because

he is restrained by the very genre in which he wanted to compose. This becomes clear in

the following lines:

> at quae non tacita formavi gaudia menta?
>   quos ego non finxi disposuique modos?
> nostra tamen iacuere velut praemortua membra,
>   turpiter hesterna languidiora rosa (l. 63-66)

> But what delightful things have I not composed with a silent mind?
>   What rhythms have I not composed and set in order?
> Still my member hung loose, as if prematurely dead,
>   shamefully, more languid than yesterday's rose.

This is not simply the *amator* imagining all the different ways in which he could be

having sex, but a *poeta* visualizing all the different ways in which he could have

configured the genre. This is supported by literary connotations of *formare* (to compose),

---

[36] Keith observes, "The new *puella* who is the focus of *Amores* 3.2 alone in the book stimulates the poet-lover's interest to the same extent as the *puellae* in *Amores* 1 and 2" (37).
[37] Keith also identifies the *puella* in *Amores* 3.3 as overwhelmingly elegiac and believes that the poet-lover's dissatisfaction with her infidelity ("a conventional feature of the mistress' *mores* in elegiac verse") reveals "Ovid's…dissatisfaction with the limitations of elegiac poetry" (38).

modus (rhythm), *fingere* (to compose), and *disponere* (to set in order). As a *poeta* he is

ambiguous (capable of composing in a variety of genres) only if the poetry itself cannot

be restricted to one genre.   An undeniable connection between 1.5.19 (*quales vidi*

tetigique lacertos!) and 3.7.39 (*at qualem vidi tantum tetigique puellam*) forces the

audience see the drastic difference between the two poems.[38] In 1.5, the *puella* embodies

both Tragedy and Elegy and the *amator* consummates the relationship; in 3.7 the *puella*

is pure elegy and she cannot arouse the *amator*.[39] This trend carries on, as Keith states:

> "The *puellae* of *Amores* 3 continue to be endowed with the personal style that
> embodies elegiac poetic style, for they are beautiful, learned, lascivious, seductive
> flatterers who know how to dress their hair to advantage and clothe themselves in
> robes of exquisite delicacy (*Am*. 3.2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14). But the poet-
> lover's attitude to their physical and sartorial charms is no longer one of
> enthusiastic appreciation as in *Amores* 1 and 2. The lover's new ambivalence to
> elegiac *puellae*, dramatized in *Amores* 3.3, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 14, complements on
> the erotic level the poet's half-hearted commitment to elegiac composition
> playfully enunciated in *Amores* 3.1 and fittingly brought to a close in *Amores* 3.15
> (39).

This directly reflects the *poeta's* inability to find inspiration in a limited genre.

In his *Amores*, Ovid represents the process of writing poetry not as a struggle to

choose between public Tragedy and private Elegy, but a constant battle to join the two

opposing genres in one work.   Through the bodies of both the *puellae* and the *amator*,

Ovid consistently combines Tragedy and Elegy, public and private, all the while

maintaining the inherent tension between the two genres and their respective spheres. As

---

[38] Keith notes, "*Amores* 3.7 echoes and reverses elements of *Amores* 1.5…This encounter with a compliant *puella* fashioned in elegiac style, unlike the early encounter with Corinna, excites no interest in the poet-lover" (38).

[39] "In *Amores* 3.7 the poet-lover is represented as indifferent to the female physique, in a metaphorical dramatization of disengagement from the elegiac project that retails an unsuccessful erotic encounter with a would-be elegiac puella" (Keith 38).

a result, Ovid conquers both Tragedy and Elegy and parades them in front of his

audience,[40] achieving in his *Amores* not only a literary work which combines both

Tragedy and Elegy, but also one which realizes his initial design set forth in *Amores* 1.1,

to write events worthy of epic treatment.

---

[40] A pattern of poetic domination is established by Cupid in 1.1 who "is guilty of genre imperialism; he refuses to stay within the confines of elegy, but instead incorporates Ovid's epic talents into his sphere, thus creating a *novum…opus*" (Buchan 65-66).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Archibald. "'Sincerity' and the Roman Elegists." Classical Philology 45.3 (1950): 145 – 160.

Arkins, Brian. "The Anxiety of Influence: Ovid's Amores as 'kenosis'." Latomus 49 (1990): 826 – 832.

Athanassaki, Lucia. "The Triumph of Love and Elegy in Ovid's Amores 1.2." Materiali e Discussioni per L'analisi dei Testi Classici 28 (1992): 125 – 141.

Barsby, John. Ovid: Amores Book 1. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1973.

Barsby, John. Ovid. Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics, No. 12. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1978.

Booth, Joan. Ovid: Amores II. England: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1991.

Boyd, Barbara Weiden. Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the *Amores*. USA: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Buchan, Mark. "*Ovidius Imperamator*: Beginnings and Endings of Love Poems and Empire in the Amores." Arethusa 28.1 (1995): 53 – 85.

Cahoon, Leslie. "A Program for Betrayal: Ovidian *Nequitia* in *Amores*." Helios 12 (1985): 29 – 39.

Cahoon, Leslie. "The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*." Transactions of the American Philological Association 118 (1988): 293 – 307.

Cairns, Francis. "Imitation and Originality in Ovid *Amores* 1.3. Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Rhetoric and Poetry." Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar 7 (1993): 101 – 122.

Cameron, Alan. "The First Edition of Ovid's *Amores*." The Classical Quarterly 18.2 (1968): 320 – 333.

Connor, Peter. "His Dupes and Accomplices: A Study of Ovid the Illusionist in the *Amores*." Ramus 3 (1974): 18 – 40.

Conte, Gian Biagio. (1994). Latin Literature: A History. (J. B. Solodow, Trans.). Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Courtney, E. "Three Poems of Propertius." Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London 16 (1969): 70 – 87.

Curran, Leo C. "*Desultores Amoris*: Ovid *Amores* 1.3." Classical Philology 61 (1966): 47 – 49.

Curran, Leo C. "Ovid *Amores* 1.10." Phoenix 18 (1964): 314 – 319.

Davis, John T. "*Amores* 1.4, 45 – 48 and the Ovidian Aside." Hermes 107 (1979):
    189 – 199.

Davis, John T. Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid. Noctes Romanae
    15: Bern and Stuttgart, 1977.

Davis, John T. "Exempla and Anti-Exempla in the *Amores* of Ovid." Latomus 39 (1980):
    412 – 417.

Davis, John T. *Fictus Adulter*: Poet as Actor in the *Amores*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben,
    1989.

Davis, John T. "*Risit Amor*: Aspects of Literary Burlesque in Ovid's Amores." ANRW 4
    (1981): 2460 – 2506.

Davis, John T. "Thou Shalt Not Cuddle: *Amores* 1.4 and the Law." Syllecta Classica 4
    (1992): 65 – 69.

Davis, P. J. "Ovid's Amores: A Political Reading." Classical Philology 94 (1999):
    431 – 449.

Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M. "The *Amores*." Greek and Latin Studies: Classical Literature and Its
    Influence: Ovid. Ed. J. W. Binns. London, 1973. 1 – 48.

Elliott, Alison G. "*Amores* 1.5: The Afternoon of a Poet." Collection Latomus Studies in
    Latin Literature and Roman History 1 (1979): 121 – 132.

Elliott, Alison G. "*Amores* 1.14: Ovid's Art." Classical Journal 69 (1973): 127 – 132.

Fear, Trevor. "The Poet as Pimp: Elegiac Seduction in the Time of Augustus." Arethusa
    33 (2000): 217 – 240.

Ferguson, John. "Notes on Some Uses of Ambiguity and Similar Effects in Ovid's *Amores*,
    Book I." Liverpool Classical Monthly 3 (1978): 121 – 132.

Ford, Gordon B. "An Analysis of *Amores* 1.4." Helikon 6 (1966): 645 – 652.

Fredrick, David. "Reading Broken Skin: Violence in Roman Elegy." Latin Erotic Elegy: An
    Anthology and Reader. Ed. Paul Allen Miller. London and New York: Routeledge,
    2002.

Fyler, John M. "*Omnia Vincit Amor*: Incongruity and the Limitations of Structure in
    Ovid's Elegiac Poetry." Classical Journal 66 (1970 – 1971): 196 – 203.

Galinsky, Karl. "The Triumph Theme in Augustan Elegy." Wiener Studien 82 (1969):
    75 – 107.

Gildenhard, Ingo and Andrew Zissos. "Inspirational Fictions: Autobiography and Generic
     Reflexivity in Ovid's Proems." <u>Greece & Rome</u> 47.1 (2000): 67 – 79.

Greene, Ellen. <u>The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love
     Poetry</u>. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Greene, Ellen. "Travesties of Love: Violence and Voyeurism in Ovid *Amores* 1.7."
     <u>Classical World</u> 92.5 (1999): 409 – 418.

Gross, Nicolas P. "Ovid, Amores 1.8: Whose Amatory Rhetoric?" <u>Classical World</u> 89.3
     (1996): 197 – 206.

Hardie, Philip R. <u>Ovid's Poetics of Illusion</u>. United Kingdom: Cambridge University
     Press, 2002.

Hinds, Stephen. "Generalising About Ovid." <u>Ramus</u> 16 (1987): 4 – 31.

Hallett, Judith P. "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism" <u>Latin
     Erotic Elegy: An Anthology and Reader.</u> Ed. Paul Allen Miller. London and New York:
     Routeledge, 2002.

Holleman, A. W. J. "Notes on Ovid's *Amores* 1. 3, Horace *Carm*. 1. 14, and Propertius
     2. 26." <u>Classical Philology</u> 65.3 (1970): 177 – 180.

Howatson, M. C. (Ed.). (1989). <u>The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature</u> (2nd ed.).
     Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Huntingford, N. P. C. "Ovid *Amores* 1.5." <u>Acta Classica</u> 24 (1981): 107 – 117.

James, Sharon L. "The Economics of Roman Elegy: Voluntary Poverty, the Recusatio, and
     the Greedy Girl." <u>The American Journal of Philology</u> 122.2 (2001): 223 – 253.

Keith, A. M. "*Amores* 1.1: Propertius and the Ovidian Programme." <u>Collection Latomus
     Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History</u> 6 (1992): 327 – 344.

Keith, A. M. "*Corpus Eroticum*: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*."
     <u>Classical World</u> 88.1 (1994): 27 – 40.

Kenney, E. J. "*Nequitiae Poeta*." <u>Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide Publiees a l'occasion du
     Bimillionaire de la Naissance du Poete</u>. (1958): 201 – 209.

Kenney, E. J. "Ovid and the Law." <u>Yale Classical Studies</u> 21 (1969): 243 – 263.

Khan, H. Akbar. "*Ovidius Furens*: A Revaluation of *Amores* 1.7." <u>Latomus</u> 25 (1966):
     880 – 894.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. <u>The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace</u>. Oxford: Clarendon
     Press, 1980.

McKeown, J. C. "*Militat Omnis Amans*." <u>The Classical Journal</u> 90.3 (1995): 295 – 304.

McKeown, J. C. Ovid: *Amores*: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary, Volume I. Great
 Britain: Redwood Burn Ltd, 1987.

Miller, John F. "Reading Cupid's Triumph." Classical Journal 90 (1995): 287 – 294.

Miller, Paul Allen (ed). Latin Erotic Elegy: An Anthology and Reader. London and New
 York: Routledge, 2002.

Moles, John. "The Dramatic Coherence of Ovid, *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2." The Classical
 Quarterly 41.2 (1991): 551 – 554.

Morgan, Kathleen. Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the *Amores*. Leiden: E. J.
 Brill, 1977.

Morrison, James V. "Literary Reference and Generic Transgression in Ovid, *Amores* 1.7:
 Lover, Poet, and *Furor*." Latomus 51.3 (1992): 571 – 589.

Murgatroyd, P. "*Servitium Amoris* and the Roman Elegists." Latomus 40 (1981): 589 – 606.

Murgatroyd, P. "The Argumentation in Ovid *AMORES* 1.9." Mnemosyne 52 (1999): 596 – 572.

Myers, Sara K. "The Poet and Procuress: The Lena in Latin Love Elegy." The Journal of
 Roman Studies 86 (1996): 1 – 21.

Newman, J. K. The Concept of *Vates* in Augustan Poetry. Collection Latomus 89.
 Brussels, 1967.

Nicoll, W. S. M. "Ovid, *AMORES* 1.5." Mnemosyne 30 (1977): 40 – 48.

Olstein, Katherine. "*Amores* 1.3 and Duplicity as a Way of Love." Transactions of the
 American Philological Association 105 (1975): 241 – 257.

Olstein, Katherine. "*Amores* I.9 and the Structure of Book I." Collection Latomus 164 and
 168: Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History I and II (1979): 286 – 300.

O'Neill, Kerill. "Ovid and Propertius: Reflexive Annotation in *AMORES* 1.8."
 Mnemosyne 52.3 (1999): 286 – 307.

Otis, Brooks. "Ovid and the Augustans." Transactions and Proceedings of the American
 Philological Association 69 (1938): 188 – 229.

Papanghelis, T. D. "About the Hour of Noon: Ovid, *AMORES* 1,5." Mnemosyne 62 (1989):
 54 – 61.

Parker, Douglas. "The Ovidian Coda." Arion 8 (1969): 80 – 97.

Parry, Hugh. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape." Transactions
 and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 95 (1964): 268 – 282.

Perkins, Caroline A. "Ovid's Erotic *Vates*." Helios 27.1 (2000): 53 – 62.

Perkins, Caroline A. "Protest and Paradox in Ovid's *Amores* 3.11." <u>Classical World</u> 95.2
      (2002): 117 – 125.

Stirrup, Barbara E. "Irony in Ovid *Amores* I, 7." <u>Latomus</u> 32 (1973): 824 – 831.

Sullivan, J. P. "Two Problems in Roman Love Elegy." <u>Transactions and Proceedings of the</u>
      <u>American Philological Association</u> 92 (1961): 522 – 536.

Suter, Ann. "Ovid, From Image to Narrative: *AMORES* 1.8 and 3.6." <u>Classical World</u> 83.1
      (1989): 15 – 20.

Thomas, Elizabeth. "Variations on a Military Theme in Ovid's *AMORES*." <u>Greece & Rome</u> 11.2
      (1964): 151 – 165.

Tracy, Valerie A. "Dramatic Elements in Ovid's *Amores*." <u>Latomus</u> 36 (1977): 496 – 500.

Tracy, Valerie A. "One Aspect of *nequitia* in Ovid's *Amores*." <u>Collection Latomus Studies in</u>
      <u>Latin Literature I</u> (1979): 353 – 348.

Vessey, D. W. T. "Elegy Eternal: Ovid *AMORES*, I. 15." <u>Latomus</u> 40 (1981): 607 – 617.

Wyke, Maria. "Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3.1." <u>History as Text: The Writing of Ancient</u>
      <u>History</u>. Ed. Averil Cameron. London, 1989. 111 – 140.

Yardley, J. C. "Four Notes on Ovid, *AMORES* I." <u>L'Antiquite Classique</u> 49 (1980): 265 – 268.