



Dictynna

Revue de poésie latine

11 | 2014

Varia

Lovers in Arms: Empedoclean Love and Strife in Lucretius and the Elegists

Donncha O'Rourke



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/1080>

DOI: 10.4000/dictynna.1080

ISSN: 1765-3142

Electronic reference

Donncha O'Rourke, « Lovers in Arms: Empedoclean Love and Strife in Lucretius and the Elegists », *Dictynna* [Online], 11 | 2014, Online since 19 December 2014, connection on 10 September 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/1080> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/dictynna.1080>

This text was automatically generated on 10 September 2020.



Les contenus de la revue *Dictynna* sont mis à disposition selon les termes de la Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Pas d'Utilisation Commerciale - Pas de Modification 4.0 International.

Lovers in Arms: Empedoclean Love and Strife in Lucretius and the Elegists

Donncha O'Rourke

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Initial research for this paper was conducted during tenure of a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Oxford. I am grateful also to audiences in Dublin, Glasgow, Manchester, and Seattle for helpful response to earlier versions; also to A. Hardie, S. Trépanier and C. Ware for valuable discussion and feedback; and to *Dictynna's* anonymous reviewers for robust and insightful criticism.

Introduction

- 1 This article presents three parallel case-studies in the reception of Empedocles, as mediated by Lucretius,¹ in Roman love-elegy.² The received text in each case is Lucretius' description of Mars and Venus *in flagrante* at the opening of the *De rerum natura* (*DRN* 1.29-43):³

effice ut interea fera moenera militiai
 per maria ac terras omnis sopita quiescant; 30
 nam tu sola potes tranquilla pace iuuare
 mortalis, quoniam belli fera moenera Mauors
 armipotens regit, in gremium qui saepe tuum se
 reiicit aeterno deuictus uulnere amoris,
 atque ita suspiciens tereti ceruice reposta 35
 pascit amore auidos inhians in te, dea, uisus,
 eque tuo pendet resupini spiritus ore.
 hunc tu, diua, tuo recubantem corpore sancto
 circumfusa super, suavis ex ore loquellas

funde petens placidam Romanis, incluta, pacem; 40
 nam neque nos agere hoc patriai tempore iniquo
 possumus aequo animo nec Memmi clara propago
 talibus in rebus communi desse saluti.

Cause meanwhile the savage works of war to sleep and be still over every sea and land. For you alone can delight mortals with quiet peace, since Mars mighty in battle rules the savage works of war, who often casts himself upon your lap wholly vanquished by the ever-living wound of love, and thus looking upward, with shapely neck thrown back, feeds his eager eyes with love, gaping upon you, goddess, and, as he lies back, his breath hangs upon your lips. There as he reclines, goddess, upon your sacred body, do you, bending around him from above, pour from your lips sweet coaxings, and for your Romans, illustrious one, crave quiet peace. For in this time of our country's troubles neither can I do my part with untroubled mind, nor can the noble scion of the Memmii at such a season be wanting to the common weal.

- 2 The Empedoclean significance of these lines is unlocked by the awareness that their Homeric source-text, the song of Ares and Aphrodite at *Odyssey* 8.266-366, was interpreted in the allegorical tradition not as a scandalous scene of adulterous sex but as an edifying symbolic expression of Empedocles' theory of the universe as a system of four elements whose cyclic union and dissolution is governed by the opposing cosmic forces of Love and Strife (Heraclitus, *Quaest. Hom.* 69.1-11; schol. *Od.* 8.267; Eustathius 1.298 [= *Od.* 310ff.] ad *Hom. Od.* 8.367).⁴ Whether or not this allegory dates to Empedocles himself (the fragments neither confirm nor exclude this view),⁵ it is agreed that Lucretius employs Mars and Venus in this vein to give allegorical and Empedoclean expression to the Epicurean principal that the nature of the universe consists in the eternal conglomeration and separation of its constituent atoms.⁶
- 3 In what follows, passages from Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid will be read for their intertextual traction with this Empedoclean-Lucretian source.⁷ Different models of intertextuality will be required by (or will themselves require?) the kind of ideological negotiation encountered at the interface between rational philosophy and irrational love-poetry.⁸ If degrees of tension can be witnessed in Lucretius-reception in contemporary non-elegiac genres,⁹ these tensions will be all the more acute in a genre in which the poet-lover is typically ruled by his passions, far removed from the *ataraxia* and *aponia* that are the principle tenets of the Epicurean lifestyle which Lucretius aims to promote.¹⁰ Lucretius' attack on love in *De rerum natura* 4 is above all an attack on love as conceptualised in erotic literature.¹¹ Thus, as P. Hardie has remarked of Virgil's reception of Lucretius, intertextuality here 'extends beyond the narrowly textual to encompass a debate about world-views'.¹² At the same time, however, it is clear that Lucretius' description of Venus and Mars in coital embrace will present ideas of specific interest to elegy as a genre of love. While erotic requital is rare in Latin elegy, Venus' dominance over her lover and his defeat by the wound of love (34 *deuictus uulnere amoris*, cf. *DRN* 4.1049-56) anticipate much that is characteristic of the elegiac genre.¹³ Whatever the disagreement between Lucretius and the elegists on the question of love, therefore, *militia amoris* and the poet-lover's *mollitia* contribute to a countercultural posture that potentially aligns elegy with Epicurean pacifism and political detachment.¹⁴ Since the apolitical stances of the elegist and Epicurean can in each case also be deconstructed (as the Caesarian association or reception of Venus in both Lucretius and elegy might alone suggest), the possibility will remain open for their alignment or opposition on the political axis.¹⁵ The elegists wrote in a context that saw itself in recovery from the long period of civil war from which Lucretius cries out for peace.

Politics thus complements erotics as a further motivation for elegiac interest in these lines of *De rerum natura* 1. In the context of general intertextual traction between the literary and ethical systems of elegy and Lucretian Epicureanism, this programmatic passage of *De rerum natura* 1 presents much of interest as a precursor of *militia amoris*. The question to be explored in what follows is whether the subtext of Empedoclean Love and Strife in Lucretius' anticipation of elegy imparts a philosophical dimension to the erotic and political aspects of elegiac *militia amoris*.

- 4 A test-case for the erotic, political and philosophical appropriation of Lucretius' Venus and Mars is found in Virgil, *Aeneid* 8, where Venus seduces her husband Vulcan to persuade him to make weapons for her son Aeneas (*Aen.* 8.370-4046).¹⁶ The bedroom scene and Venus' superiority bring the Lucretian framework to mind: Mars may no longer be in the picture, but in commissioning *arma* as a mother for her son Aeneas (383 *arma rogo, genetrix nato*, 'I ask for arms, a mother for her son') Venus signals her Lucretian heritage as the 'mother of the sons of Aeneas' (*DRN* 1.1 *Aeneadam genetrix*) and seductress of the god of war.¹⁷ Like Mars, Vulcan is no match for his consort, 'fettered in everlasting love' (394 *aeterno ... deuinctus amore*, cf. *DRN* 1.34 *aeterno deuinctus uulnere amoris*)¹⁸ and enervated in her embrace (405-6 *placidumque petiuit / coniugis infusus gremio per membra soporem*, 'he sought tranquil slumber through his limbs, melting in his wife's bosom', cf. *DRN* 1.33-4 *in gremium ... tuum se | reicit*, 39 *circumfusa super*, 40 *petens placidam ... pacem*).¹⁹ Edmunds has related the subordinate position of Mars and Vulcan in these passages to a *schema* familiar in Hellenistic erotic art and poetry (the *hupokolpios* position) but paralleled in Latin literature only here and in Propertius 3.4 (discussed below).²⁰ Further evocation of Venus' seduction of Mars in the *De rerum natura* occurs in Virgil's description of Aeneas' *arma* (*Aen.* 8.626-728):²¹ in the first scene depicted on the shield (8.630-34), the she-wolf of Mars nurses the twins Romulus and Remus 'with her smooth neck bent back' (633 *tereti ceruice reflexa*), aptly recalling the twins' father as described by Lucretius (35 *tereti ceruice reposita*, 'with his smooth neck bent back').²² Cicero and Ennius may mediate,²³ but the prevailing Lucretian interest is asserted in the supine posture of Virgil's she-wolf (631 *procubuisse*, cf. *DRN* 1.38 *recubantem*) and in how her twins hang from her udders (632 *pendentis*, cf. *DRN* 1.37 *pendet*). Virgil's engagement with the Lucretian tableau thus clusters around Aeneas' shield, uniting the scene of its commissioning with the description of its design and bridging thereby a narrative gap of over two hundred lines.
- 5 Lucretian allusion lends important and overlapping erotic, political and philosophical associations to this section of the *Aeneid*. First, from the erotic perspective, the conjugal union of Venus and Vulcan in Virgil contrasts with the adulterous coupling of Venus and Mars in Lucretius (and Homer) in a way that might be said to sanitize the latter in keeping with Augustan family-values. Ancient readers, however, were scandalised that Virgil depicted Venus seducing her husband to win a favour for her illegitimate son by Anchises: Servius has a lengthy note on the problem (*Serv. ad Aen.* 8.373) and a character in Macrobius opines that the immorality of the scene motivated Virgil's deathbed decree that the *Aeneid* be incinerated (*Sat.* 1.24.6-7). So too, for M. Putnam, the recollection of Venus' adulterous past 'adds to the moral dilemma in which Virgil deliberately places his reader.'²⁴ On Ovid's reading, albeit a tendentious one in the self-defensive context of his exile, the *incipit* of Lucretius' poem *Aeneadam genetrix* is already laced with the association of Venus' adultery: *Trist.* 2.261-2 *sumpserit Aeneadam genetrix ubi prima, requiret, | Aeneadam genetrix unde sit alma Venus* ('as soon as she picks up the Mother of the *Aeneadae*, she will ask how it is that nurturing Venus is the mother of the

Aeneadae').²⁵ In the *Aeneid*, then, so much the more dubious will be Venus' use of marital sex to obtain a favour for her extra-marital son. Two hundred lines later, this tension between marriage and adultery continues in the ecphrasis of the Martian she-wolf on the shield itself. If Virgil here employs Lucretian language to make the scene more edifying and to emphasise the she-wolf's maternality against a more rational – but rather less glorious – account of Rome's origins according to which the *lupa* was a prostitute (*OLD* s.v. 2),²⁶ he has chosen a distinctly problematic passage of Lucretius with which to do so. The vignette on the Shield might well be said to sublimate the Lucretian adultery-scene, but it cannot at the same time completely screen out uncomfortable reminders of illicit sex.²⁷

- 6 The political dimension of Virgil's erotic Lucretian intertext comes to the fore in the context of the epic's meditation on Roman war and peace. Observing the fusion of the martial and the peaceful in the *lupa* panel of the shield, P. Hardie observes: 'Both war and peace attend the foundation of Rome, although as yet both are present only potentially. It is the actualization of war which dominates the first seven hundred or so years of Rome's history, as it is the actualization of peace which will determine her future course.'²⁸ For M. Putnam, on the other hand, the *Aeneid* leaves little room for Epicurean goals: in using her charms to procure the *arma* with which Aeneas will wage war on Turnus and on which are depicted the conflicts of the Roman future, Virgil's Venus inverts the disposition of the goddess to whom Lucretius prays to pacify 'the savage works of war' (29 *fera moenera militiai*) through her seduction of Mars.²⁹ Between these readings there may be less distance than there appears: just as Lucretius requires the intercession of Venus to guarantee the conditions under which he can be an Epicurean poet, and just as the absence of those conditions requires Memmius' political activism (*DRN* 1.41-3), so too, in the *Aeneid*, it is the working through of divine destiny that brings about the Augustan peace under which Virgil can compose his epic. Venus not only brings arms to her son (*Aen.* 8.608-16), but intercedes at the Battle of Actium, too (*Aen.* 8.699).
- 7 The erotic and martial implications of the Lucretian tableau in the *Aeneid* introduce a third level of intertextual signification arising from the philosophical value of Lucretius' Venus and Mars as an allegory of Empedoclean Love and Strife. This subtext is activated in Virgil not only through allusion to Lucretius' Mars and Venus (and, by extension, to Homer's Ares and Aphrodite),³⁰ but also rather more obviously by virtue of the fact that Virgil's Shield of Aeneas overwrites Homer's Shield of Achilles, which itself was read by the ancient allegorists (Heraclitus, *Hom. All.* 49) as an emblem of Empedocles' motive forces (in depicting a city at war and a city at peace, the Homeric shield was said to have anticipated Empedocles' Love and Strife).³¹ The Empedoclean component of the Lucretian intertext therefore reinforces the status of Aeneas' shield as a cosmic icon which gives expression to war and peace as the two sides of one coin.³² As complementary opposites, the Augustan peace depicted at the conclusion of the shield is the corollary of the wars which precede, but (by extrapolation) only to the extent that the wars which precede are also the inevitable future of that peace.³³
- 8 Lucretius' Mars and Venus are not merely proto-elegiac lovers, then, but are charged with a political and philosophical symbolism that has considerable ramifications for any alluding text. In the *Aeneid*, the erotic, political and philosophical aspects of this Lucretian intertext complement and comment on the themes and ideology of the epic.

Elegy's relationship with epic, and with Virgilian epic in particular, suggest that the same possibilities should be considered in respect of the elegiac 'wars of love'.

Tibullus

- 9 In Tibullus, an affinity with the themes of Virgilian epic is most palpable in elegy 2.5. Celebrating the induction of Messalla's son into the priesthood of the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*, the elegy includes a prophecy of the future of Rome, as delivered by the Sibyl to Aeneas, and shares the prophetic, aetiological and golden age thematics of the *Aeneid*.³⁴ As in Virgil, Tibullus' interest in these themes can be traced to his earliest poetic output. In his opening elegy, the pastoral *otium* to which the poet-lover aspires owes much to the *Eclogues* and, via the *Eclogues*, to the *De rerum natura*, especially the culture-history of Book 5, in which Lucretius valorises early man as a proto-Epicurean exemplar.³⁵ To isolate one of several Lucretio-Virgilian inflections in this elegy, Tibullus conjures from the *longa uia* of military campaign a bucolic reverie of some undefined future in which he is able, 'when the Dog-star rises, to escape its heat beneath some tree's shade with a rill of water fleeting past' (27-8 *sed Canis aestiuos ortus uitare sub umbra / arboris ad riuos praetereuntis aquae*).³⁶ The couplet evokes both the simple life enjoyed by Lucretius' countryfolk (5.1393 *propter aquae riuos sub ramis arboris altae*, 'hard by a stream of water under the branches of a tall tree') and the shady 'green cabinet' of *Eclogue* 1 (cf. *Ecl.* 1.1 *tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*, 'as you recline under the canopy of a spreading beech'). Continuing in this vein, Tibullus prays in the lines which follow to be delivered from war into his mistress' embrace (Tib. 1.1.45-60):

quam iuuat immites uentos audire cubantem 45
 et dominam tenero continuisse sinu
 aut, gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster,
 securum somnos igne iuuante sequi!
 hoc mihi contingat: sit diues iure, furorem
 qui maris et tristes ferre potest pluuias. 50
 o quantum est auri pereat potiusque smaragdi,
 quam fleat ob nostras ulla puella uias.
 te bellare decet terra, Messalla, marique,
 ut domus hostiles praeferat exuuias:
 me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae, 55
 et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores.
 non ego laudari curo, mea Delia: tecum
 dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque uocer.
 te spectem, suprema mihi cum uenerit hora,
 te teneam moriens deficiente manu. 60

What delight to hear the winds rage as I lie and hold my love safe in my gentle clasp; or, when the stormy South Wind sheds the chilling showers, to seek sleep in safety, aided by a fire! This be my lot; let him be rightly rich who can bear the rage of the sea and the dreary rain. Ah, sooner let all the gold and all the emeralds perish from the world than any maiden weep for my journeyings. Tis right for you, Messalla, to campaign by land and sea that your house's front may show the spoils of foemen: I am a captive fast bound in the bonds of a lovely girl; I sit a janitor before her stubborn doors. I care not for glory, Delia dear; let me only be with you, and I will pray folk call me sluggard and idler. May I look on you when my last hour comes; may I clutch you, as I die, with failing grasp.

- 10 Given Tibullus' quasi-Epicurean desire to live a peaceful and secluded life, and the specific evocations of Lucretius earlier in the elegy, it is tempting to contemplate in

this picture of Tibullus, loving and dying in Delia's embrace at the opening of Book 1, an analogy with the embracing lovers Mars and Venus in parallel position at the opening of *De rerum natura* 1. Tibullus' soldier-lover yearns to recline (45 *cubantem*) with his girl in his embrace, as Lucretius' Mars reclines (38 *recubantem*) in Venus' bosom; Tibullus is passively bound (55 *uinctum*) to his mistress, as Mars is passively *deuictus uulnere amoris* (34); Tibullus imagines himself gazing at Delia (59 *te spectem*), his life ebbing away, as the languid Mars gazes (35 *suspiciens*) into Venus' eyes. However, where Tibullus' patron, Messalla, makes war on land and sea (53 *terra ... marique*), Lucretius invokes the same formula to ask Venus to calm war *per maria ac terras* (30), adding that in the current crisis he can no more write his poem with untroubled mind than Memmius (his patron?) can renege on the common weal (41-3). In both texts there is a tension between public and private: the Lucretian paradox of seeking Epicurean independence under the protection of a high-profile politician is comparable, *mutatis mutandis*, to Tibullus' predicament as a lover enlisted in Messalla's service.

- 11 Tibullus, then, aspires in elegy 1.1 to a 'golden age' of peace and love, but his aspiration is undercut by his prior commitment to the 'long roads' of Messalla's campaigns.³⁷ The implication that Tibullus lives in an 'iron age' reality is confirmed at elegy 1.3.35-50 where, stranded mid-campaign due to illness, he contrasts the glorious reign of Saturn, 'before the earth was opened out for distant travel' (35-6 *priusquam / tellus in longas est patefacta uias*), with the Jovian age of the present (49-50 *nunc Ioue sub domino caedes et uulnera semper, / nunc mare, nunc leti mille repente uiae*, 'But now that Jupiter is lord, there are wounds and carnage without cease; now the sea slays, and there are a thousand ways of sudden death'). Lucretius, in the proem to the *De rerum natura*, similarly writes from a notional 'iron age' of strife (it is perhaps not 'casual'³⁸ that he addresses Memmius at DRN 5.1282, the point at which he turns to the discovery of iron in his rationalized account of the Myth of Ages). The ascendancy of Venus for which Lucretius and Tibullus yearn may trigger further Empedoclean associations insofar as fr. B 128 DK (a passage which Lucretius may also have in mind in his proem)³⁹ describes a Golden Age in which Aphrodite (Cypris) was queen, and when there was no Ares or battle-din, no Zeus, Cronus, or Poseidon, and sacrifices were bloodless ones of icons, incense, and honey. In view of the possibility that Virgil may have Empedocles' Golden Age in mind at *Geo.* 2.458-542,⁴⁰ a passage which in turn informs Tibullus' many allusions to the Golden Age,⁴¹ it can be suggested that Tibullus may likewise associate Lucretius' yearning for an end to civil war with the Golden Age in his Empedoclean source. In particular, Tibullus 2.5, which shares so much with *Aeneid* 8, hails in golden age terms the inception of a new era (81-104)⁴² and asks Phoebus to guarantee peace among quarrelsome lovers: 105-6 *pace tua pereant arcus pereantque sagittae, / Phoebe, modo in terris erret inermis Amor* ('Phoebus, by your leave, let bows and arrows perish, so Love may rove unarmed upon the earth.'). The image of a god wandering over earth during the Golden Age is reminiscent of *Dike/Iustitia* in Aratus and Virgil (*Phaen.* 108-36, *Geo.* 2.473-4; cf. Hesiod, *Op.* 197-200); on an Empedoclean reading of Tibullus, that this god is Amor privileges a connection with Cypris in fr. B 128 DK. The cyclical interchange of Love and Strife imparted by this subtext complements Miller's political reading of the new golden era which Tibullus, based on his own experience with Nemesis, sees as tarnished by lovers' quarrels: 'Augustus' god of victory ended Rome's civil wars but, from the elegiac perspective, the *pax Augusta* is incomplete. Cupid is still on the loose, and needs be disarmed.⁴³

- 12 Further indication that Tibullus 1.1 is conversant with the proem of the *De rerum natura* and its Empedoclean intertext(s) comes in Tibullus 1.10. By virtue of its ring-composition, this final poem in Tibullus 1 mirrors and develops the themes and imagery of the opening elegy discussed above. Again, the elegy locates itself in the iron age: 1-2 *Quis fuit, horrendos primus qui protulit enses? | quam ferus et uere ferreus ille fuit!* ('Who was the first to invent terrifying swords? How brute and truly iron-brutal he was!'). In this context, it is instructive that the elegy's prayer for peace, parallel to that in 1.1 and likewise set against a backdrop of *militia amoris*, has for its part been compared with Lucretius' proem (1.10.45-68):

interea pax arua colat. pax candida primum 45
 duxit araturos sub iuga curua boues:
 pax aluit uites et sucos condidit uuae,
 funderet ut nato testa paterna merum:
 pace bidens uomerque nitent, at tristia duri
 militis in tenebris occupat arma situs.- 50
 rusticus e lucoque uehit, male sobrius ipse,
 uxorem plaustro progeniemque domum.-
 sed ueneris tum bella calent, scissosque capillos
 femina, perfractas conqueriturque fores;
 flet teneras subtusa genas: sed uictor et ipse 55
 flet sibi dementes tam ualuisse manus.
 at lasciuus Amor rixae mala uerba ministrat,
 inter et iratum lentus utrumque sedet.
 a lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam
 uerberat: e caelo deripit ille deos. 60
 sit satis e membris tenuem rescindere uestem,
 sit satis ornatus dissoluisse comae,
 sit lacrimas mouisse satis: quater ille beatus
 quo tenera irato flere puella potest.
 sed manibus qui saeuus erit, scutumque sudemque 65
 is gerat et miti sit procul a Venere.
 at nobis, Pax alma, ueni spicamque teneto,
 perfluat et pomis candidus ante sinus.

Let Peace in the meantime tend our fields. Bright Peace first led the oxen under curved yoke to plough. Peace made the vine plants grow and stored the grape juice that from the father's jar might pour wine for the son. In peace shine hoe and ploughshare, while in the dark rust attacks the grim arms of the cruel soldier, and the yeoman drives back from the grove, himself half sober, with wife and offspring in his wain. Then love's war rages hotly; and women lament that hair is torn and doors are broken. The fair weeps for the buffets on her tender cheek; but the conqueror weeps too that his mad hands were so strong; while freakish Love feeds the feud with bitter speeches, and sits in unconcern between the angry pair. Ah, he is stone and iron who would beat his lass: this is to drag the gods down from the sky. Be it enough to tear the light robe from her limbs, and to disorder the fair arrangement of her hair: enough to cause her tears to flow. Thrice happy he whose anger can make a soft lass weep! But he whose hands are cruel should carry shield and stake and keep afar from gentle Venus. Then come to us, gracious Peace; grasp the cornspike in your hand, and from the bosom of your white robe let fruits pour out before you.

- 13 Independently of consideration of Tibullus 1.1, H. Pillinger related these lines of elegy 1.10 to Lucretius' Mars-Venus tableau: '[i]t is the motif of peace, so prominent in the Lucretian hymn to Venus, that may have recommended the passage to Tibullus when he came to compose his own hymn to *alma Pax*'.⁴⁴ As Lucretius' hymn to Venus frames

the erotic tableau of Mars and Venus, so Tibullus' hymn to Peace in 1.10 frames a scene of *militia amoris* (53 *sed Veneris tum bella calent*, cf. DRN 1.32-3 *belli fera moenera Mavors / ... regit*). However, in this case the 'warfare of love' is scarcely metaphorical:⁴⁵ the pastoral scene of a tipsy farmer driving home his wife and child transitions to a darker vision in which the farmer and his wife are each in tears following an explosion of domestic violence. Remarking on this perversion of Lucretius' depiction of Epicurean harmony into an scene of elegiac strife, Pillinger concluded: 'What is elemental and sublime in Lucretius has become in Tibullus frivolous and conventional, but this noticeable disparity in tone corresponds quite properly to the wide stylistic gulf separating epic and elegiac composition'.⁴⁶ Frivolity, convention and generic tone may account for some of the differences, but the Empedoclean subtext of the Lucretian prayer suggests that the elegiac interchange of love and strife in Tibullus may yet have something in common with its philosophical intertext. A similar sense of cyclicity, moreover, is found in Tibullus 1.1, which begins by rejecting Mars (1.1.4) and ends by turning to Venus (1.1.73); but there, too, love turns sour, and the elegy concludes with the broken doors of the lovers' quarrel (1.1.73-5). In the first and last elegies of Tibullus 1, then, war yields to peace, and peace to *militia amoris*. Tibullus can thus be seen to have brought together two sections of the *De rerum natura*: the prayer for peace in Book 1 and the valorization of pre-militarized life in the *Kulturgeschichte* of Book 5. In uniting these passages, Tibullus, like Virgil in the *Eclogues* and beyond, projects onto an Empedocleo-Lucretian framework the Augustan dream of return, post-apocalypse, to a Golden Age of peace born from war. However, like Virgil, Tibullus also seems to imply that, once achieved, peace is inherently unstable and ephemeral.⁴⁷

Propertius

- 14 The elegiac opposition of war and peace, witnessed above in Tibullus, is especially prominent in Propertian elegy, as the principal title of H.-P. Stahl's 1985 study neatly encapsulates. The case for reading this Propertian nexus in the Empedoclean mode has been made for elegy 4.4, where inflections of Virgilian figures of Strife map Tarpeia's oscillation between love and war onto an Empedoclean framework that arguably promotes a view of the poem's violence as politically productive.⁴⁸ As the predicament of an elegiac lover, Tarpeia's conflict between Love and Strife is analogous to that witnessed in Tibullus above, and shows thereby the extent to which the elegiac scenario in general may be susceptible to Empedoclean interpretation. It is perhaps significant that, like Tibullus 2.5, this elegy and Propertius 4 as a whole are conversant with Virgilian epic and with *Aeneid* 8 in particular.⁴⁹ To the extent that the interplay of love and war in 4.4 also stages the generic project of the book as a dialectic between elegy and epic,⁵⁰ this interplay lends an Empedoclean cosmological perspective to Propertius' aetiological exploration of *maxima Roma* (4.1.1) and her remote prehistory⁵¹.
- 15 An earlier test-case for this mode of reading Propertius is presented by elegies 3.4 and 3.5, a doublet in which, apparently antagonistically, war and peace are juxtaposed in the opening lines:⁵² with conspicuous allusion to the opening lines of the *Aeneid*,⁵³ 3.4 begins with *arma* (1 *Arma deus Caesar dices meditatur ad Indos*, 'Divine Caesar plots war against rich India'); in contraposition, 3.5 begins *Pacis Amor deus est* (1 'Love is the god of Peace').⁵⁴ The political implication of this opposition is immediately established in the first of elegy of the pair (3.4.1 *Caesar*), in which Propertius imagines himself

watching Augustus' future triumphs from the sidelines as he lies on Cynthia's bosom⁵⁵ (3.4.11-22):⁵⁶

Mars pater, et sanctae fatalia lumina Vestae,
ante meos obitus sit precor illa dies
qua uideam spoliis oneratos Caesaris axes, 13
< >
tela fugacis equi et bracati militis arcus, 17
et subter captos arma sedere duces, 18
< >
ad uulgi plausus saepe resistere equos; 14
inque sinu carae nixus spectare puellae 15
incipiam et titulis oppida capta legam. 16
ipsa tuam serua prolem, Venus: hoc sit in aeuum 19
cernis ab Aenea quod superesse caput. 20
praeda sit haec illis quorum meruere labores:
mi sat erit Sacra plaudere posse Via.

Father Mars, and fatal lights of holy Vesta, I pray that before my death that day arrive on which I see the chariots of Caesar laden with spoils, < > the weapons of the fleeing horse and the bow of the trousered soldier, and captured leaders sitting beneath arms, < > horses often halting at the applause of the crowd; and leaning in the bosom of a dear girl I shall begin to spectate and to read off the captured towns from the inscriptions. Protect your own offspring, Venus: may this life that you see descends from Aeneas be for ever. This should be the booty for those whose labours have deserved it: for me it will be enough to be able to applaud on the Via Sacra.

- 16 Here another couple embraces in love (15-16)⁵⁷ as the world around them is at war. The forces of love and strife are visibly signalled in the text by the framing position of Mars (11) and Venus (19) who, with reference to the Romans generally and Caesar Augustus specifically, is invoked to preserve forever (*in aeuum*) her offspring descended from Aeneas (19-20), just as Lucretius' Venus, as *Aeneadum genetrix*, 'has willed [Memmius] at all times to excel, endowed with all gifts' (*DRN* 1.26-7 *tempore in omni | omnibus ornatum uoluisti excellere rebus*).⁵⁸
- 17 This intertextuality is consolidated in the second poem of the doublet, elegy 3.5, which contains what G.B. Conte has described as a 'humorous *recusatio*' of Lucretian didactic.⁵⁹ Here, committed to the life of love, Propertius postpones the study of natural philosophy for later life (*25 tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores*, 'then let it be my delight to learn the habits of nature'), but in doing so he outlines an extensive syllabus that already suggests more than passing familiarity with the *De rerum natura*,⁶⁰ wherein can be found answers to all of the questions and topics listed by the elegist: who made the world (26), the phases of the moon (27-8, cf. *DRN* 5.705-50), the origin of the winds (29-30, cf. *DRN* 1.271-97) and rain (30, cf. *DRN* 6.495-523), whether there will be an end to the world (31, cf. *DRN* 5.91-6), how a rainbow comes about (32, cf. *DRN* 6.524-6), the causes of earthquakes (33. Cf. *DRN* 6.535-607) and solar eclipses (34, cf. *DRN* 5.751-61), the movements of the constellations (35-6, cf. *DRN* 5.509-25, 614-49, 680-704), why the sea does not overflow its confines (37, cf. *DRN* 6.608-38), the four seasons (38, cf. *DRN* 5.737-47), whether the underworld and its punishments exist or are made up such that there is nothing to fear after death (39-46, cf. *DRN* 3.978-1023).
- 18 In this way, an allusion in Propertius 3.4 to Lucretius' allegory of the cosmic forces of creation and destruction is answered Propertius 3.5 by a survey of Lucretian cosmogony. The opposition between war and peace is expressed across the two elegies

through their opening lines and within each elegy in the rejection of war in preference for elegiac peace: thus the last couplet of 3.4 (lines 21-22, quoted above) reaffirms Propertius' choice of Cynthia's embrace over Caesar's triumphs, and the last couplet of 3.5 prefers philosophy to *arma* (47-8 *exitus hic uitae superest mihi; uos quibus arma / grata magis, Crassi signa referte domum*, 'This is the end remaining for my life; you to whom arms [and the *Aeneid*] are a greater delight, bring home the standards of Crassus [or bring home standards, fools]'). Nevertheless, while in 3.4 Propertius' erotic embrace and Augustus' military triumph ostensibly polarize the elegist and imperator, respectively, the Lucretian intertext simultaneously complicates the picture by aligning Propertius with Mars in the embrace of his Venus. This ambivalence is sustained in the opening couplet of 3.5 which, having signalled opposition to Caesar's *arma* in the previous elegy, proceeds to record Propertius' own *proelia dura* (2 'harsh battles') with his mistress. In the lines which follow, Propertius goes on to adopt the mode of elegiac Epicureanism familiar from Tibullus, borrowing like him from Virgil's golden age description of rural life at the end of *Georgics* 2,⁶¹ a passage in which Virgil similarly takes his distance from Lucretian rationalism, as Propertius does here. As in Tibullus, the Empedoclean as well as Lucretian associations of this model inform the elegiac text: arising from Prometheus' failure to equip mortals with intellect (7-10), mankind is now condemned to an Iron Age of strife (11-12 *nunc maris incauti uento iactamur, et hostem/ quaerimus, atque armis nectimus arma noua*, 'As things are, unwary of the sea, we are driven here and there by the wind, and we seek an enemy and bind new arms to old'). The rule of cyclic interchange implicit here applies even in the underworld where 'conqueror and conquered are intermingled alike' (15 *uictor cum uicto pariter miscetur*).

- 19 In this way, Lucretian intertext and Empedoclean subtext in Propertius 3.4 and 3.5 collaborate in the poems' presentation of love and war as forces both opposed yet also in some way reciprocal and interdependent. The implication that these forces cannot so neatly be separated is consistent with deconstructive readings of Propertian political opposition. For example, as Alison Keith has pointed out, the conditions which make Propertian love possible are themselves created by Augustan militarism:⁶² thus, in elegies 3.4 and 3.5, it is only as others make war that Propertius can indulge in *militia amoris* and engage in philosophy. As in the Empedoclean system, love and war in Propertius are complementary and interdependent opposites. If Tibullus implies that peace will be succeeded by war in a never-ending cycle, these elegies by Propertius suggest why this must be so: Propertian love depends for its existence on Augustan war.

Ovid

- 20 Research has shown that Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* draw significantly on Lucretius and Lucretius' Empedocles in formulating their cosmological and aetiological projects.⁶³ The different agenda of Ovidian erotic and erotodidactic elegy makes for a rather less likely host for the same material.⁶⁴ However, the *Ars Amatoria*, as an exposé of Roman love-elegy, provides a space in which the poet of the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* can bring his philosophical competence to bear on the Lucretian and Empedoclean subtexts taken comparatively more seriously by his elegiac precursors. In Ovid's catalogue of sexual positions at the end of the *Ars Amatoria*, where the *praeceptor* recommends that women

assume postures that maximise their assets or minimise their defects, occurs a conspicuous allusion to Lucretius' Mars-Venus tableau. However, the quasi-Socratic notion that girls should 'know themselves' at the start of this passage imparts a touch of philosophical parody to the context in which the Ovidian analogues of Mars and Venus will appear (*Ars* 3.771-4, 779-84):⁶⁵

nota sibi sit quaeque; modos a corpore certos 771
 sumite: non omnes una figura decet.
 quae facie praesignis erit, resupina iaceto;
 spectentur tergo, quis sua terga placent.

...

strata premat genibus paulum ceruice reflexa 779
 femina per longum conspicienda latus.
 cui femur est iuuenale, carent quoque pectora menda,
 stet uir, in obliquo fusa sit ipsa toro.
 nec tibi turpe puta crinem, ut Phylleia mater,
 soluere, et effusis colla reflecte comis.

Let each woman know herself; from your own bodies fix your methods; one fashion does not suit all alike. Let her who is fair of face recline upon her back; let those whose backs please them be seen from behind. ... A woman whose long flanks deserve to be seen should press the coverlets with her knees, her neck bent backward somewhat. If her thighs be youthful and her breasts without blemish, her lover should stand, and she herself lie slantwise on the couch. Nor think it unbecoming to loose your hair, like the Phylleian mother, and bend back your neck amid flowing tresses.

- 21 In his commentary on these lines, R. Gibson notes that the description of the woman advised to tilt her neck back a little (779 *paulum ceruice reflexa*) echoes both Lucretius' lover (*DRN* 1.35 *ceruice reposta*) and Virgil's she-wolf (*Aen.* 8.633 *ceruice reflexa*, see above).⁶⁶ Though lexically closer to the Virgilian phrase, Ovid's *ceruice reflexa* nonetheless occurs in a context otherwise replete with Lucretian allusions. Of particular interest to both the Empedoclean and Lucretian background of this model are the terms in which Ovid claims at the end of the catalogue that his poetry is a more reliable authority than Phoebus' tripod: 789-90 *sed neque Phoebai tripodes nec corniger Ammon / uera magis uobis quam mea Musa canet* ('But neither Phoebus' tripods nor horned Ammon will tell you more truth than does my Muse'). This couplet appropriates a claim twice made by Lucretius, first in respect of Empedocles and later in respect of his own *De rerum natura* (1.738-9 = 5.111-2 *sanctius et multo certa ratione magis quam Pythia quae tripode a Phoebi lauroque profatur*, 'with more sanctity and far more certainty than the Pythia who speaks forth from Apollo's tripod and laurel').⁶⁷ This 'double take' is surely of significance given the Empedocleo-Lucretian association of the swooning lover, especially as used in elegy to date.
- 22 The prevailing content of this reception-passage, however, seems to focus on Lucretian erotodidaxis almost to the exclusion of the Empedoclean cosmological subtext. In terms of general argument, by providing a catalogue of sexual positions (771 *modos*) designed to enhance the female physique, Ovid reworks Lucretius' erotodidaxis at *DRN* 4.1263-77, where positions (cf. 1263 *quibus ... modis*) more conducive to procreation (those employed by wives) are distinguished from positions which minimise the likelihood of conception and enhance sexual pleasure (those employed by prostitutes). In concentrating on pleasure and prostitution rather than on marriage and procreation, the *Ars* skews the emphasis of the Lucretian passage in a way that is consistent with Ovid's insistence that he is not writing for wives. More generally, where Lucretius' cure

for love relies on the perception of the beloved as she really is, and not as the infatuate mind idealises her, Ovid accepts the Lucretian reality that not all women are equally attractive, but recommends for that very reason the lover's collusion in his own deception. In this context, Ovid's advice in lines 797-804 that sexual pleasure should be faked by women who cannot experience it for real (797-8 *tu quoque, cui Veneris sensum natura negavit, | dulcia mendaci gaudia finge sono*, 'You to whom nature has denied the sensation of love, counterfeit the sweet bliss with lying sound') similarly distorts Lucretius' insistence at *DRN* 4.1192 (*nec mulier semper ficto suspirat amore*, 'nor does a woman always feign the passion which makes her sigh').

- 23 As in Virgil, Tibullus and Propertius, the precise moment of Ovid's engagement with Lucretius' Mars-Venus tableau is fleeting,⁶⁸ but occurs in a context otherwise replete with allusion to the *De rerum natura*. However, whereas his precursors harnessed the Empedoclean subtext of the Lucretian passage to offer a political meditation on war and peace as alternating forces in a cosmic cycle, Ovid fuses the erotic tableau of *DRN* 1 with the excursus on sex in *DRN* 4 to read Lucretius primarily as an erotodidactic text in the Ovidian tradition. The further allusion to Lucretius' praise of Empedocles draws attention to the philosophical model otherwise under erasure: as read by the *Ars*, Mars and Venus are Ovidian lovers rather than Empedoclean symbols. As a result, when Ovid's mistress, *ceruice reflexa*, recalls the she-wolf that nursed Romulus and Remus on Aeneas' shield, she does so without the political or philosophical symbolism that informs Virgil's Augustan icon, and accommodates herself instead to the context of a rather more Ovidian '*lupa*',⁶⁹ the prostitute whose valorisation in the *Ars* got Ovid into so much trouble. Retroactively, Ovid's lupine prostitute has the potential to remind the reader of *Aeneid* 8 of the tradition that Virgil may have hoped to erase: it suggests a very Ovidian reading of the *Aeneid* that the mother of Romulus and Remus should herself be a *lupa* of the human variety, a tradition rather at odds with the conjugal overtones of the Venus-Vulcan ménage of which Aeneas' shield is a product.
- 24 Although Ovid eschews any political appropriation of Lucretius' Mars-Venus tableau as an expression of the cosmic interchange of love and strife, the echo of the adulterous Mars and Venus in the context of a poem which claims not to infringe Augustan marital legislation is nonetheless political in a very different way. At *Ars* 2.561-88, the scandal of Venus' affair with Mars, and its detection by Vulcan, had been recounted as an *exemplum* to advise the aspiring lover to overlook his girlfriend's peccadilloes rather than to become a laughingstock like the jealous Vulcan.⁷⁰ Now, at the end of *Ars* 3, by implication of her intertextual alignment with both Lucretius' lover and Virgil's she-wolf, the *puella* is invited to identify both with the adulterous wife of Greco-Roman myth that the allegorists sought to sanitise and with the *lupa* of Roman foundation legend that Virgil sought to erase.
- 25 Structurally, the end of the *Ars Amatoria* looks to the erotic opening of the *De rerum natura*, and in this way bookends the Roman erotodidactic tradition as constructed by Ovid.⁷¹ In the absence of *Ars* 3, which is constructed as a last-minute supplement, the same might have been said for Ovid's retelling of Venus' affair with Mars in *Ars* 2, insofar as this too occurs towards the end of what, on a first reading, is the 'intended' final book of the poem. Having reopened the two-book *Ars* with a third book addressed to women, Ovid perhaps unsurprisingly revisits the Lucretian tableau at the end of *Ars* 3 to re-impose a very Ovidian closure on the erotodidactic tradition. In Ovid's cyclical return to Mars and Venus as he closes and reopens the battle of the sexes, there is

perhaps a trace of the Empedoclean interchange of Love and Strife, a cycle that rolls on beyond the *Ars Amatoria* into the *Remedia Amoris*.

Conclusions

- 26 The analysis of the case-studies presented above has suggested that Empedocles' cycle of Love and Strife, mediated by its emblematic expression in Lucretius' tableau of Venus and Mars, is pressed for its philosophical, erotic and political potential in various elegiac contexts. In Tibullus the cycle of love and strife between men and women becomes a philosophically informed inflection of contemporary politics: filtered through Lucretius and Lucretius' Empedocles, *militia amoris* becomes more than a countercultural trope, reflecting as it does contemporary anxieties about the durability of peace. This was a period in which the Caesar at the centre of Propertius 3.4 and 3.5 claimed that under his watch 'peace was born from war on land and sea' (*Res Gestae* 13, *terra marique esset parva uictoriis pax*), a Caesar in whose iconographic programme Mars and Venus were central figures.⁷² Propertius uses Lucretian and Empedoclean cosmogony to meditate on his own place in this world, and in particular on his ambivalent relationship with contemporary militarism. Although Ovid elsewhere engages with the technical arguments of Lucretian science, the *Ars Amatoria* conversely seeks to strip away the philosophical content both of *DRN* 1 and, by extension, of *Aeneid* 8, inversely exposing rather more Ovidian moments in each. The residual presence of Empedocles, under erasure, in Ovid's nexus of Lucretian allusion suggests, in contrast to Virgil, Tibullus and Propertius, a pointed refusal to dignify the contemporary ideology of 'peace born from war' with transcendent philosophical principles. Instead, Ovid recycles Lucretius' Empedoclean symbols to signal the development of his own erotodidactic poetry.
- 27 Taken together, these case-studies are ambassadors for a wider investigation of Lucretius and Lucretius' Empedocles as important and persistent subtexts in Augustan elegy. If the elegists, like Virgil, engaged with Lucretius and Empedocles in this way, then elegy's obsession with love and war, and perhaps even the elegiac conceit of *militia amoris*, encompass a much wider discourse about the cyclic interchange of *arma* and *amor* in the histories of nations no less than in the private lives of lovers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barchiesi, A. (2006) 'Women on top: Livia and Andromache', in R.K. Gibson, S. Green, A. Sharrock (eds.) *The Art of Love: bimillennial essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. Oxford. 96-120.
- Bucheit, V. (1965) 'Tibull II 5 und die Aeneis', *Philologus* 109.1: 104-20.
- Buffière, F. (1956) *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*. Paris.
- Cairns, F. (1979) *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.

- (2003) 'Propertius 3.4 and the *Aeneid* incipit', *CQ* 53: 309-11.
- (2006) *Sextus Propertius: the Augustan elegist*. Cambridge.
- Campbell, G.L. (2003) *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution: A Commentary on De rerum natura 5.772-1104*. Oxford.
- Casali, S. (2006) 'The Making of the Shield: Inspiration and Repression in the *Aeneid*', *G&R* 53.2: 185-204.
- Caston, R.R. (2012) *The Elegiac Passion: jealousy in Roman love elegy*. New York and Oxford.
- Clay, D. (1983) *Lucretius and Epicurus*. Ithaca, New York and London.
- Clay, J.S. (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- Conte, G.B. (2000) 'A Humorous *Recusatio*: on Propertius 3.5', *CQ* 50.1: 307-10.
- Costa, C.D.N. (1984) *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura V*. Oxford.
- Courtney, E. (1969) 'Three Poems of Propertius', *BICS* 16.1: 70-87.
- DeBrohun, J.B. (2003) *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor.
- Eden, P.T. (1975) *A Commentary on Virgil Aeneid VIII*. Leiden.
- Edmunds, L. (2002) 'Mars as a Hellenistic Lover: Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 1.29-40 and its Subtexts', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 8.3: 343-58.
- Estévez Sola, J.A. (2011) 'Milicia de Amor', in R. Moreno Soldevila (ed.) *Diccionario de motivos amorios en la literatura latina (siglos III A.C.-II D.C.)*. Huelva. 275-86.
- Fabre-Serris, J. (2005) 'L'élégie et les images romaines des origines: les choix de Tibulle', in J. Schwindt (ed.) *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne/ Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung*. Heidelberg. 141-157.
- (2008) *Rome, l'Arcadie et la mer des Argonautes: essai sur la naissance d'une mythologie des origines en occident*. Villeneuve d'Ascq.
- (2013) 'Genre et Gender : usages et enjeux de l'emploi de durus chez les élégiaques', *EuGeStA* 3: 209-39
- (2014) 'La réception d'Empédocle dans la poésie latine : Virgile (*Buc.* 6), Lucrèce, Gallus et les poètes élégiaques', *Dictynna* 11.
- Fantham, E. (1998) *Ovid, Fasti: Book IV*. Cambridge.
- Farrell, J. (1991) *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. Oxford.
- (2008) 'The Six Books of Lucretius' *De rerum natura*: Antecedents and Influence', *Dictynna* 5 (<http://dictynna.revues.org/385> [accessed 11.12.2014]).
- Fedeli, P. (1985) *Properzio: Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie*. Bari.
- Fowler, D. (1989) 'Lucretius and Politics', in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds.) *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford. 120-50.
- Furley, D.J. (1970) 'Variations on themes from Empedocles in Lucretius' proem', *BICS* 17: 55-64.
- Gale, M.R. (1994) *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge.
- (2000) *Virgil on the Nature of Things: the Georgics, Lucretius and the didactic tradition*. Cambridge.

- Garani, M. (2007) *Empedocles Redivivus: poetry and analogy in Lucretius*. New York and Abingdon.
- (2011) 'Revisiting Tarpeia's myth in Propertius (IV, 4)', *LICS* 10.3: 1-22.
- (2013) 'Lucretius and Ovid on Empedoclean Cows and Sheep', in D. Lehou, A.D. Morrison, and A. Sharrock (eds.) *Lucretius: poetry, philosophy, science*. Oxford. 233-59.
- Gee, E. (2013) *Aratus and the Astronomical Tradition*. Oxford.
- Gibson, R.K. (2003) (ed.) *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book 3*. Cambridge.
- Giesecke, A.L. (2000) *Atoms, Ataraxy, and Allusion: cross-generic imitation of the De rerum natura in early Augustan poetry*. Hildesheim.
- Gold, B.K. (2012) 'Patronage and the elegists: social reality or literary construction?', in B.K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. Malden, MA-Oxford. 303-17.
- Gordon, P. (2002) 'Some Unseen Monster: Rereading Lucretius on Sex', in D. Fredrick (ed.), *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power and the Body*. Baltimore. 86-109.
- Gransden, K.W. (1976) *Virgil. Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, A. (2013) 'Empedocles and the Muse of the *Agathos Logos*', *AJPh* 134.2: 209-46.
- Hardie, P.R. (1985) 'Imago mundi: cosmological and ideological aspects of the shield of Aeneas', *JHS* 105: 11-31.
- (1986a) *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- (1986b) 'Cosmological Patterns in the *Aeneid*', *PLLS* 5: 85-97.
- (1995) 'The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean Epos', *CQ* 45: 204-14.
- (2007) 'Lucretius and later Latin literature in antiquity', in S. Gillespie and P.R. Hardie (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge. 111-27.
- (2009) *Lucretian Receptions: History, The Sublime, Knowledge*. Cambridge.
- Harrison, S.J. (2007) *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.
- Heyworth, S.J. (2007a) (ed.) *Sexti Properti Elegi*. Oxford.
- (2007b) *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford.
- Hinds, S.E. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hollis, A.S. (2007) *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC-AD 20*. Oxford.
- Ingleheart, J. (2010) *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2*. Oxford.
- Inwood, B. (2001) *The Poem of Empedocles: A Text and Translation with an Introduction*. 2nd ed. Toronto.
- Janka, M. (1997) *Ovid Ars Amatoria Buch 2: Kommmtar*. Heidelberg.
- Keith, A.M. (2008) *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*. London.
- Kennedy, D.F. (1993) *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge.
- (2013) 'The political epistemology of infinity', in D. Lehou, A.D. Morrison, and A. Sharrock (eds.) *Lucretius: poetry, philosophy, science*. Oxford. 51-68.
- Kenney, E.J. (1961) (ed.) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford.

- (1970) 'Doctus Lucretius', *Mnemosyne* 23: 366-92.
- King, J. (1998) 'Erotodidaxis: *Iucunda Voluptas* in Lucretius 2.3 and Propertius 1.10.3', in G. L. Schmeling, J. D. Mikalson, P. L. MacKendric (eds.), *Qui Miscuit Utile Dulci: Festschrift Essays for Paul Lachlan MacKendrick*. Wauconda, IL. 201-22
- Knauer, G.N. (1964) *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis. Hypomnemata* 7. Göttingen.
- Maltby, R. (2002) *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 41. Cambridge: Francis Cairns.
- (2009) 'Tibullus and Ovid', in P.E. Knox (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid*. Malden MA and Oxford. 297-93.
- Martin, A. and Primavesi, O. (1999) *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665-1666): Introduction, édition, et commentaire*. Strasbourg, Berlin and New York.
- Merrill, W.A. (1917) *Lucreti de Rerum Natura Libri Sex*. Berkley.
- Miller, J. F. (1997) 'Lucretian Moments in Ovidian Elegy', *Classical Journal* 92: 384-398.
- (2009) *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge.
- Mozley, J.H., rev. G.P. Goold (1979) *Ovid: the Art of Love and Other Poems*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Murgatroyd, P. (1975) 'Militia Amoris and the Roman elegists', *Latomus* 34: 59-79.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (1969) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
- Nelis, D.P. (2001) *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (ARCA 39). Cambridge: Francis Cairns.
- (2004) 'Georgics 2.458-542: Virgil, Aratus and Empedocles', *Dictynna* 1 (<http://dictynna.revues.org/161> [accessed 17.11.2014]).
- (2009) 'Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.416-51: *Noua monstra* and the *foedera naturae*', in P.R. Hardie (ed.), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*. Oxford. 248-67.
- Nussbaum, M. (1994) *The Therapy of Desire*. Princeton.
- O'Brien, D. (1969) *Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle*. Cambridge.
- (2001) 'Empedocles: the wandering daimon and the two poems', *Aevum Antiquum* N.S. 1: 79-179,
- O'Rourke, D. (2010) 'Maxima Roma in Propertius, Virgil, and Gallus', *Classical Quarterly* 60.2: 470-85.
- (2011) 'Eastern' Elegy and 'Western' Epic: reading 'orientalism' in Propertius 4 and Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Dictynna* 8 (<http://dictynna.revues.org/699> [accessed 11.12.2014])
- (2012) 'Intertextuality in Roman Elegy', in B.K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*. Malden, Ma-Oxford. 390-409.
- (forthcoming) 'Make War not Love: *militia amoris* and domestic violence in Roman love-elegy', in M.R. Gale and D.H. Scourfield (eds.) *Texts and Violence in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.
- Pillinger, H.E. (1971) 'Tibullus 1.10 and Lucretius', *Classical Journal* 66.3: 204-8.
- Postgate, J.P. (1915) (ed.) *Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres* (2nd ed.). Oxford.

- Postgate, J.P., rev. Goold, G.P. (1988), in F.W. Cornish, J.P. Postgate, and J.W. Mackail, rev. G.P. Goold, *Catullus. Tibullus. Pervigilium Veneris*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (1980) 'Propertius and the new Gallus fragment', *ZPE* 39: 49-56.
- (1998) *Virgil's Epic Designs: ecphrasis in the Aeneid*. New Haven and London.
- (2005) 'Virgil and Tibullus 1.1', *CP* 100: 123-141.
- Quint, D. (1993) *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton.
- Rusten, J.S. (1982) 'Ovid, Empedocles, and the Minotaur', *AJPh* 103: 332-3.
- Schiesaro (2007) 'Lucretius and Roman politics and history', in S. Gillespie and P.R. Hardie (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge. 41-58.
- Schmidt, E.G. (1994) 'Die Schneeweissen Arme der Venus: zur Homer-Imitation in Vergils *Aeneis*', *RhM* 137: 101-17.
- Sedley, D. (1998) *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge.
- (2003) 'Lucretius and the New Empedocles', *LICS* 2.4: 1-12.
- Shulman, J. (1981) 'Te quoque falle tamen: Ovid's Anti-Lucretian Didactics', *Classical Journal* 76: 242-53.
- Smith, M.F., rev. Rouse W.H.D. (1992) *Lucretius. De Rerum Natura*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.
- Sommariva, G. (1980) 'La parodia di Lucrezio nell' *Ars* e nei *Remedia Ovidiani*', *A&R*: 123-4.
- Spies, A. (1930) *Militat omnis amans: Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*. Diss., Tübingen.
- Stahl, H.-P. (1985) *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War': Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley.
- Stuedel, M. (1992) *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids Ars Amatoria*. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York.
- Tränkle, H. (1960) *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der Lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Wiesbaden.
- Trépanier, S. (2003a) 'Empedocles on the Ultimate Symmetry of the World', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 24: 1-57.
- (2003b) "'We' and Empedocles' Cosmic Lottery: P. Strasb. Gr. Inv. 1665-1666, Ensemble A", *Mnemosyne* 56.4: 385-419.
- (2004) *Empedocles, An Interpretation*. New York and London.
- Wigodsky, M. (1972) *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Weisbaden.
- Zanker, P. (1988) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.

NOTES

1. Lucretius' association with Empedocles, signalled at *DRN* 1.716-33 and recognised implicitly at *Cic.*, *ad QF* 2.10.3, is explicated by Furley (1970), Clay (1983) 22-3, 49-52, 82-110, 253-7; Sedley (1998); Campbell (2003); Sedley (2003); Trépanier (2004); Garani (2007).
2. Garani (2013) proceeds on the basis that Lucretius was the 'primary conduit' (258) through which Empedocles was received by later Latin poetry. Previous studies corroborating this view include Hardie (1995) and Nelis (2009).
3. Text and translation: Smith/Rouse (1992).

4. Cf. esp. fr. B 17.16-20 DK: τοτὲμὲνγὰρἕνῃὑξήθημόνονοεῖναι | ἐκπλεόνων, τοτὲδ' αὖδιέφυπλέον' ἐξἕνὸςεῖναι, | πῦρκαὶὔδωρκαὶγαῖακαὶἠέροςἄπλετονὔψος, | Νεῖκόστ' οὐλόμενονδίχατῶν, ἀτάλαντονἀπάντη, | καὶΦιλότηςἐντοῖσιν, ἴσημῆκόςτεπλάτοςτε, 'for at one time it increased to be one alone of many, and at another grew apart to be many from one, fire and water and earth and the infinite height of air, and destructive Strife apart from them, entirely balanced, and Love in their midst, equal in length and breadth'. On the Empedoclean cycle, see O'Brien (1969); Martin and Primavesi (1998) 57-82; Trépanier (2003a); Trépanier (2003b); Trépanier (2004) esp. 184-92. On the Homeric allegoresis, see Buffière (1956) 168-72; Hardie (1986a) 62; Gale (1994) 41-2. O'Brien (2001) 119-23 proposes a different interpretation of Heraclitus and Eustathius that need not necessarily complicate the orthodox view of how the allegory is employed by Lucretius.
5. Sedley (1998) 27 with n. 98 is (cautiously) in favour of this view; *contra*, see O'Brien (2001) 117-19; Trépanier (2004) 40-41.
6. The philosophical and literary aspects of this Empedoclean subtext are emphasised, respectively, by Furley (1970) and Sedley (1998) 16-32, esp. 27. See also Clay (1983) 22-3, 82-110; Gale (1994) 41-2, 71-2, 219-20; Garani (2007) 37-43.
7. For Gallus and Lucretius/Empedocles, see Fabre-Serris (2014).
8. For example, the model of 'generic enrichment' proposed by Harrison (2007) is on the whole more conciliatory than the dynamics of intertextuality surveyed in Hinds (1998).
9. See, e.g., Hardie (1986a); Farrell (1991); Gale (2000); Hardie (2009); Nelis (2009); Giesecke (2000).
10. On the elegiac reception of Lucretius, see Sommariva (1980); Shulman (1981); Steudel (1992); J. F. Miller (1997); King (1998); Conte (2000); Farrell (2008); Caston (2012); Garani (2013); Fabre-Serris (2014). For an overview of elegiac intertextuality, with attention to Lucretius and other didactic models, see O'Rourke (2012).
11. See Kenney (1970) 380-90; Nussbaum (1994) 140-91.
12. Hardie (2007) 114.
13. Cf. Ovid, *Her.* 7.190 (Dido speaking): *ille locus saevi uulnus amoris habet*, 'that spot bears the wound of cruel love'. The tradition of *militia amoris* has Hellenistic antecedents, but female supremacy is a Roman innovation: see Spies (1930), Murgatroyd (1975), Estévez Sola (2011). O'Rourke (forthcoming) relates the Lucretian background to the non-metaphorical implications of elegiac *militia amoris*.
14. See Gordon (2002) for the argument that in the Mars-Venus tableau and DRN 4 Lucretius promotes an anti-Priapic (i.e. non-aggressive) ethic.
15. On elegy's imbrication with Augustan politics, see, e.g., Keith (2008) 139-65; Gold (2012); on Lucretian politics, see, e.g., Fowler (1989), Schiesaro (2007), and (diversely) Kennedy (2013).
16. Quotations from Virgil are taken from Mynors (1969) and translated originally.
17. See Putnam (1998) 170; Casali (2006) 189-91.
18. A correction to *P* (the fourth/fifth cent. Vaticanus Palatinus lat. 1631) and several ninth century mss (*cdhrstu*) have Vulcan *deuictus amore*, closer again to Lucretius' Mars (even if it is not what Virgil wrote, *deuictus* remains instructive as a correction made under the pressure of the prevailing intertextuality).
19. Wigodsky (1972) 134, citing Kroll ('die Stelle ist auch sonst von Verg. benutzt'), also compares *Aen.* 5.842 *fuditque has ore loquellas* with DRN 1.39-40 *ore loquellas | funde*. See also Merrill (1917) 136-7; Casali (2006) 193.
20. Edmunds (2002). As the 'on top' position of the female lover is not equally apparent in Lucretius, Virgil, and Propertius, the argument presented here is not dependent on this point.
21. Hardie (1986b) 90-95; Putnam (1998) 181-3.
22. Eden (1975) 167 quoting Bailey: 'Virgil loves to imitate Lucretius in a slightly less dignified context'; Gransden (1976) 164-5; Hardie (1986a) 361-2; Putnam (1998) 181-3 at 183: 'The feral

animal is appropriate nurse in Mars' cave for the twins of a god whom the ekphrasis will later show raging in the midst of the Actian battle lines.'

23. Virgil's phrase is actually closer to Cicero's description of the constellation Draco (*tereti ceruice reflexum*); Servius comments that the passage is Ennian (Serv. ad *Aen.* 8.631: *sane totus hic locus Ennianus est*). See Wigodsky (1972) 123-4, citing Norden 371 n. 3; Hardie (1986a) 361 n. 79. For traction between Lucretius and Cicero on this point, see Gee (2013) 85-6.

24. Putnam (1998) 169.

25. See Ingleheart (2010) 237-40.

26. So Gransden (1975) 164-5, citing Plutarch *Vit. Rom.* 4.3. See also Livy 1.4.

27. In the same way, the reminiscence of Lucretius' Mars-Venus tableau in the lupine scene operates in conjunction and in tension with Virgil's earlier reception of that passage at *Geo.* 2.523-4, where the description of the farmer's domestic bliss sanitises the Lucretian intertext it otherwise evokes: see Hardie (1986a) 361. The georgic passage also echoes *DRN* 3.894-9: see Gransden (1975) 164.

28. Hardie (1986a) 361.

29. See Putnam (1998) 181-3.

30. See Schmidt (1994) 112f.

31. See Buffière (1956) 159; Hardie (1985); Hardie (1986a) 340-41. On Virgil's reception of this tradition, see Knauer (1964) 259-62; Hardie (1986a) 336-76, esp. 340-41, 358-61; Nelis (2001) 345-59.

32. Hardie (1986a) 348f., 360f.; Nelis (2001) 345-7.

33. As Nelis (2001) 346 with n.76 observes, the ekphrasis locates Mars in its first line (630 *Mauortis*) and at its centre (700 *saevit medio in certamine Mauors*, 'Mars rages in the midst of the strife'), a line which inverts Empedocles fr. B 35.4 DK ἐνδὲ μέσηφιλότηςτροφάλιγγιγνήηται ('and love comes about in the midst of the whirl!'); Venus (699) and Discordia (702) are also present. For the view that Strife necessarily ensues, see Nelis (2001) 349; for tension between teleological and recidivist 'drives' in the *Aeneid*, see Quint (1993).

34. The question of priority no longer dominates this discussion: see Bucheit (1965) for the majority view of Tib. 2.5 as the later work; so too Cairns (1979) 68, but with an agnostic bottom line.

35. On Tibullus' and Propertius' commentaries on Lucretius' *Kulturgeschichte*, see Fabre-Serris (2005) and (2008) 40-46. On the *Eclogues* and Lucretius, see Hardie (2009). On Tibullus and the *Eclogues*, see Putnam (2005).

36. Text: Postgate (1915); translation (with the exception of 1.10.1-2): Postgate/Goold (1988).

37. See Kennedy (1993) 13-15.

38. So Costa (1984) 141.

39. See Sedley (1998) 26, who denies that the fragment necessarily comes from Empedocles' proem; so also Trépanier (2004) 15, 50. For possible lines of interpretation, see Inwood (2001) 63; Garani (2007) 34.

40. See Nelis (2004) esp. par. 15-32; Garani (2013) esp. 237-9 makes the case for Ovid's reading of the Empedoclean Golden Age at *Fasti* 1.337-48.

41. See Maltby (2002) 60, 63, 116-7, 150, 198-9, 381, 458-9; Putnam (2005) 133-5; Miller (2009) 262.

42. On the saecular theme of Tib. 2.5, see Miller (2009) 260-65.

43. Miller (2009) 264, continuing (with an emphasis different to that proposed here) 'Since this is an impossibility, the present request to Apollo gently undermines the surety of Tibullus' prediction above but in a funny, not a politically provocative, manner'.

44. Pillinger (1971) 206.

45. See the discussion in O'Rourke (forthcoming). On the rapprochement of military and elegiac *duritia* in Tibullus 1.10, see Fabre-Serris (2013) esp. 227-8.

46. Pillinger (1971) 207.

47. J. Clay (2003) 83-5 argues against Vernant's interpretation of the Hesiodic Golden Age as a phase in a cycle. Be that as it may, (some of) Hesiod's ancient readers may have viewed the myth of ages as cyclical and thus consistent with the Empedoclean framework.
48. Garani (2011).
49. See O'Rourke (2010) with bibliography at n. 5; within this journal, click through to O'Rourke (2011).
50. See esp. DeBrohun (2003).
51. The possibility of Callimachus' prior appropriation of Empedocles is of relevance here: see, e.g., A. Hardie (2013) 220 on Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe.
52. Stahl (1985) 192-202 reads the elegies as an expression of a tension between private and public in Propertius.
53. See Cairns (2003).
54. Text: Heyworth (2007a); translations: Heyworth (2007b).
55. This *mise en scène* may owe something to Gallus: see Putnam (1980), Cairns (2006) 406-12, Hollis (2007) 243-4; see, therefore, n. 7 above.
56. Heyworth's transposition, if correct, makes for a more immediate transition from embracing couple to the prayer to Venus, as in Lucretius. For the textual criticism, see Heyworth (2007b) 295-7.
57. Edmunds (2002) sees Propertius and Cynthia in the only other Roman example of the 'woman on top' *hupokolpios* schema outside of Lucretius and Virgil. See n. 20 above.
58. The use of compound adjectives, rare in Propertius (see Tränkle [1960] 58-9; cf. Fedeli [1985] 160), in periphrasis (2 *gemmiferi ... maris*, 'gem-bearing sea'; 8 *armigeri ... equi*, 'armoured horses' [though Heyworth's emended text takes *armigeri* alone as a noun: see Heyworth (2007b) 294-5]) is a Lucretian touch (cf. DRN 1.3 *mare nauigerum ... terras frugiferentis*, 'the sea fullladen with ships, the earth that bears the crops') that bears what Sedley 2003 identifies as an Empedoclean 'fingerprint' (cf. Sedley [1998] 24-5 on DRN 1.3). For Ovid's invocation of Empedocles by means of this technique, see Garani (2013) 240-41, 247.
59. Conte (2000).
60. Fedeli (1985) 175-6 at 175: '[r]eminiscenze del testo lucreziano sembrano indiscutibili'.
61. See Courtney (1969) 70-72; Fedeli (1985) 175. For allusion to Aphrodite as 'queen' of Empedocles' Golden Age (fr. B 128 DK) at Prop. 3.3.31 (*Veneris dominae uolucres columbae*, 'winged doves of our mistress Venus'), see Fedeli (1985) 141 ad loc.
62. See Keith (2008) 139-65 and (on elegies 3.4 and 3.5) 60-63.
63. See, e.g., Hardie (1995); Nelis (2009); Garani (2013).
64. One instance of Empedoclean allusion in the *Ars* is remarked by Rusten (1982) and Hardie (1995) 214.
65. Text: Kenney (1961); translation: Mozley/Goold (1979).
66. Gibson (2003) 394. See also Barchiesi (2006) 110-11.
67. On the Lucretian echo in *Ars* 3.789-92, see Steudel (1992) 40-42 and 135; Gibson (2003) 397.
68. To *ceruice reflexa* (779, cf. DRN 1.35 *ceruice reposta*), the following further parallels can be added: *resupina* (773, cf. DRN 1.37 *resupini*), *conspicienda* (780, cf. DRN 1.35 *suspiciens*), *fusa* (782, cf. DRN 1.39 *circumfusa*).
69. See Barchiesi (2006).
70. The Lucretian model is noted *en passant* by Janka (1997) ad loc.
71. For Ovid's similar move in the elegiac tradition, see Maltby (2009) on Ovid, *Am.* 3.9 and Fantham (1998) 37, 88-9 on Ovid's retrospection to *Am.* 3.15 in *Fasti* 4.
72. See Zanker (1988) 195-201.

ABSTRACTS

This article argues that Lucretius' 'tableau' of Mars and Venus at the opening of the *De rerum natura* (DRN 1.29-43) imparts to elegy's fixation with love and war a quasi-Empedoclean outlook on the creative and destructive forces that regulate the world and human life. In the context of an age that claimed to have begotten peace through war (cf., e.g., Augustus, *Res Gestae* 13), the elegiac opposition of love and war is a political theme with urgent philosophical ramifications. The implications of Lucretius-reception in Virgil (*Aeneid* 8) suggest parallel avenues for exploration in three elegiac case-studies: Tibullus 1.1 and 1.10; Propertius 3.4 and 3.5; Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.771-788. These examples suggest that elegy's manifold juxtapositions of Mars and Venus, peace and war, and even *militia amoris* may be more frequently informed by Empedocleo-Lucretian implications than we are accustomed to think.

INDEX

Mots-clés: Augustus, cosmic cycle, didactic, Elegy, Empedocles, Golden Age, Iron Age, Love, Lucretius, Mars, Ovid, philosophy, Propertius, Strife, Tibullus, Venus, Virgil

AUTHOR

DONNCHA O'ROURKE

University of Edinburgh