1990

Poem Division, Paired Poems, and Amores 2.9 and 3.11

Cynthia Damon
University of Pennsylvania, cdamon@sas.upenn.edu

Poem Division, Paired Poems, and Amores 2.9 and 3.11

Disciplines
Arts and Humanities | Classics

POEM DIVISION, PAIRED POEMS, AND
AMORES 2.9 AND 3.11*

CYNTHIA DAMON
Stanford University

The most recent editor of the *Amores*, J. C. McKeown, prints *Am*. 2.9 and 3.11 as single poems, though he concedes a doubt as to whether unity is "capable of definitive proof or refutation";[1] the editor of the Oxford Classical Text, E. J. Kenney, prints two separate poems under each number: 2.9a–b and 3.11a–b.[2] Rival iceberg tips, topping a dispute which has gone on for nearly a century and a half. A bewildering variety of proofs both for and against unity has been advanced, many of them based on aesthetic grounds; the present paper makes an argument from form. For once it is realized that the consecutive pair of poems was a legitimate compositional unit in Ovid's day, the arguments of the unifiers have to be ushered out of court.

The process begins with an examination of material evidence, indications of poem division in the manuscript traditions of works with a formal resemblance to the *Amores*, books, that is, built up of numerous relatively short poems.

Section 1: How the problem arose

Lucian Müller began his discussion of the merits of dividing *Amores* 2.9 and 3.11 with this reminder :

> Primum id monebo, quod nemo ignorat, elegias cum non sicut apud nos titulis aut numeris seiungerentur, sed sola littera maiore, facile potuisse fieri, ut aut iungerentur perperam aut etiam secernerentur carmina.[3]

Sola, however, is not entirely accurate, even for the medieval MSS of which he was thinking here, and it is probably not at all true of ancient manuscripts. Some of the evidence for ancient methods of indicating poem division in a context comparable to that of the *Amores* is direct; the earliest is provided by the 1st century B.C. papyrus fragment of Gallus, in which poem divisions are indicated not only by a large initial letter at the beginning of the new poem but also by a relatively large space between the last line of one poem and the first line of the next (approximately 3 times the average space between lines within a poem)

---

[1] *Ovid: Amores. Volume 1, Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool 1987) 92.
[2] *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris* (Oxford 1961).
[3] L. Müller, "De Ovidii *Amorum* libris," *Philologus* 11 (1856) 89.

and signs within that space.[4] The 4th and 5th century vellum codices of Virgil's *Eclogues* represent a different era, a different medium, a different genre and a different author, and show, not surprisingly, an entirely different method of indicating poem division. In MP (4th cent.) and R (5th cent.) most of the *Eclogues* are preceded by a list of speakers which is placed within the column of text and written with the same script and line spacing as that of the text, but at times in red ink instead of the text's black.[5] These lists resemble nothing so much as the lists of speakers at scene breaks in the contemporary Bembine MS of Terence. For two of the *Eclogues*, however, the *inscriptiones* (8, DAMONIS ET ALPHESIBOEI CERTAMEN, M; DAMONIS ET ALPHESIBOEI CERTATIO, P; 10, CONQUESTIO CUM GALLO POETA DE AGRIS, M; CONQUAESTIO DEAGRIS CUM GALLO CORNELIO, P) are more in the nature of poem titles, though they still list the participants. The headings of the fourth and sixth *Eclogues*, in which there is no major speaker but the poet, contain titles based on subject matter: 4, SAECULI NOVI INTERPRETATIO, R; 6, FAUNORUM SATYRORUM SILENORUM DILECTATIO, PR. It is worth noting that M and P have titles for every poem of which they contain the beginning, including the first poem in the book (P), while R has titles for all but the first.[6] There is also direct and indirect evidence for intra-columnar *tituli* in the archetype of Books 1–12 of the

---

[4] P. J. Parsons in R. D. Anderson et al., "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm" *JRS* 69 (1979) 129.

[5] In V (5th cent.) the red *inscriptio* of the one *Eclogue*-beginning (vi) contained in that fragment is illegible. None of the other early Virgil MSS is available for the *Eclogues*.

[6] The earliest surviving bit of Ovid (the *fragmentum Guelferbytanum* of the 5th century, containing bits of *ex Ponto* 4) does not preserve any poem junctions, but O. Korn (*P. Ovidii Nasonis ex Ponto libri quattuor* [Leipzig 1868] x) believes that it had no intra-column titles. He reconstructs an archetype without titles, too (xxxii). I do not know the basis of R. J. Tarrant's claim (in L. D. Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission: a Survey of the Latin Classics* [Oxford 1983] 203) that this archetype contained the poem titles found in later MSS, but there are no elements in these *tituli* that could not be derived from the poem (or from a nearby poem, as, e.g., the names Pompeius at 4.15 from the introductory poem 4.1, and Tuticanus at 4.14 from 4.12), in almost every case with very little trouble. (The one exception is the information that Cotys, the addressee of 2.9, was king of *Thrace*. This is preserved in Korn's τ, a "codex sine nomine ab Heinsio notatus." τ's one other unique bit of information, the *praenomen* Quintus at 1.2 is, in fact, erroneous.) There are, moreover, a number of differences in the *tituli* which suggest that at some point in the traditions of A, β, B, E and P (again, using Korn's sigla) scribes were creating *tituli* off their own bat: at 1.9 β's *titulus* is MAXIMO (from line 32 of the poem), B's is AD CELSUM (from line 1, both referring to the same person). Similarly, variation between the terms *sodalis* and *amicus* in the *tituli* for 3.6 suggests independent creation rather than copying. Clearly β's *titulus* AD CONIUGEM at 3.1.31 is an independent coinage designed to complement the false poem beginning made here. G. Luck's inference (*Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids* [Heidelberg 1969] 77; hereafter, "Luck") that the titles were located in the margin is not a necessary result of their absence in the column of text, nor even a likely supposition in view of the nonattestation of marginal titles before the 9th century.

Epigrams of Martial, which was in existence before A.D. 401 when Gennadius Torquatus completed his revision of it.[7]

For the 6th and 7th centuries we have evidence from the Bobbio fragment of Juvenal, which does not mark the beginning of *Satire* 15 with a title,[8] and from the earliest manuscripts of Prudentius (A and B), in which titles were left to the rubricator to be completed (A) or not (B). Like the *inscriptiones* in the earlier Virgil MSS, those of A lie within the column of text and are present at the beginning of every poem in the collections of short hymns (*Cathemerinon, Peristephanon*).

The red *inscriptiones* in the 8th century *Codex Salmasianus* of the Latin Anthology are generally longer than those found earlier, providing a title for each poem or excerpt, and occasionally other information such as the author's name, source of the excerpt, summary of what preceded an excerpted passage, etc. The first letters of the line following an *inscriptio* are similarly red, and occasionally enlarged or ornamented.[9]

We find a *littera maior* at poem beginnings again in an early 9th century MS which, among many other items, contains selections from Martial (H).[10]

[7] To give only one example. See W. M. Lindsay, *Ancient Editions of Martial* (Oxford 1903) 34–55. It is unlikely that the originals of the *tituli* preserved in Lindsay's A^A and C^A families were by Martial, but the presence of a few bits of information not derivable from the poems themselves led Lindsay (54) to propose for them, very tentatively, a date "not long after Domitian's reign." The case is very similar for the *tituli* of Statius' *Silvae*. These are hardly Statian, but they do preserve some details of nomenclature not given in the poems and are dated by K. Coleman to "within decades of Statius' death" (*Statius, Silvae IV* [Oxford 1988] xxviii–xxxii. To her list [xxviii] add the *nomen* Vettius in the *titulus* for 5.2). They are in any case likely to have been present in the text familiar to Sidonius Apollinaris in the mid-5th century. He uses "titles" to refer to four poems from the collection (*Carm.* 22 epist. 6, referring to 1.5, 2.3, 3.1, 3.4); these are *not* the *tituli* found in M, but rather *ad hoc* reminiscences combining elements from the *tituli* and the first lines of the poems. There is no information, however, about the position on the page of the *tituli* in this early edition.

[8] U. Knoche, *D. Iunius Iuvenalis Saturae* (München 1950) ad loc. Both R and UFl (Knoche's sigla), too, regularly omit *inscriptiones*. A library catalogue dated by B. Ullman to the late eighth century ("A List of Classical Manuscripts [in an Eighth-century Codex] perhaps from Corbie," *Scriptorium* 8 [1954] 24–37, a reference I owe to F. Newton) does refer to books 2 and 3 of the *Satires* by *tituli* appropriate to the first poem in each book. Yet the variant titles offered by the tradition for *Satires* 3 (QUARE UMBRICIUS URBEM DESERAT [the P reading] vs. DE URBIS INCOMMODIS ET DE DIGRESSU [vel EGRESSU] UMBRICII [MSS of the Φ group]), 4 (DE PISCIS MAGNITUDINE [P] vs. SATIRA DE ROMBO PISCE [vel sim.] or CATALOGUS AMICORUM DOMITIANI SATYRA DE RHOMBO PISCE [vel sim.] [Φ]), and 9 (QUAERELA NAEVOLI DE REGE IMPUDICO [P] vs. LOQUITUR AD PARASITUM QUENDAM QUI SERVIERAT REGIBUS [vel sim.] [Φ]) are so discrepant that in these cases, at least, no archetypal *inscriptio* can be assumed.

[9] A. Riese, *Anthologia latina sive poesis latinae supplementum, pars prior: carmina in codicibus scripta,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1894) 1:xiii.

[10] The *littera maior* had, however, been used for the first letter of a page or column, and sometimes (e.g. in the Bobbio Juvenal) also for the last letter of a page. (For a discussion of this characteristic of ancient MSS, see E. A. Lowe, *Palaeographical papers 1907–1965,* 2 vols. [Oxford 1972] 1: 196). In a 5th century MS of Cicero's *in Verrem* (Vatic.Regin.Lat. 2077=CLA i.115) the enlarged

This is a near contemporary of the archetype of RPSY of the *Amores* (=α). Poem titles in the Martial manuscript are still within the column of text, but are written in a larger script in black. Large initial letters are also found in the *florilegium Thuaneum* of the 9th or 10th century, again combined with intra-column titles.[11] And this brings us up to manuscripts in which we have direct evidence for poem division in the *Amores* (P, 9/10th cent., SY 11th cent.).

In PSY poem beginnings are regularly indicated by an enlarged initial letter. Additional notice is frequently given in P by capital letter titles in black in the right or left margin (only omitted at 1.6; 2.13, 18; 3.7, 10, 12 and at 2.19 where m[1] does not indicate the beginning of a poem). Similar titles (in small letters) are slightly less frequent in S (omitted at 1.4, 5, 6; 2.2, 8, 16, 18; 3.2, 6, 7, 9, and where no poem division is indicated: 1.1 [carrying on from the introductory epigram] 1. 2, 3; 2.13, 19) and infrequent in Y (present at 2.8, 9, 11, 12).[12] The agreement of such titles as are or are not present in PSY is one bit of evidence that Kenney and Munari use in determining their relationship as descendants of α, and Kenney believes that they were in the margin of α's exemplar.[13] The irregularity with which titles are present is in itself interesting. In the manuscripts of Virgil and Prudentius discussed earlier we saw that every extant poem beginning was marked by an *inscriptio*. It seems that titles relegated to the margin were more liable to damage and omission than the intra-column *tituli* of ancient texts.[14] That titles were useful in preserving poem divisions is shown by the fact that Y, with only 4 titles and 3 incipits, has 12 run-on poems (not counting 2.9a–b and 3.11a–b as run-ons for the moment), while P,

initial is used instead at the beginning of sections in a prose work, and in the 7th century *Codex Taurinensis* of Sedulius the initial letter of the page is a little larger than usual, but the initial letter of a section is about 4 times larger than the average letter in the text (see K. Zangemeister, *Exempla codicum latinorum litteris maiusculis scriptorum* [Heidelberg 1876] no. 16).

[11] At least, they are found towards the beginning of the codex. The poems on f. 20 have large initial letters, but on f. 51 the last few epigrams of Martial in this codex do not, although the scribe dignifies the beginning of Catullus 62 (which follows the Martial) with a large initial. Lindsay remarks in the preface to his OCT edition of Martial that the codex is "negligenter descriptus."

[12] I am including in the title category (for the moment) the incipits that begin each book. Because there are no poem titles in the principal MSS for the first poems in the books (where the incipit indicates poem division), it seems reasonable to infer that at least part of a title's function was to serve as divider. An interesting confirmation of this is found in P: the title SUASORIUM AD SE (not in SY) is placed beside the beginning of 2.2, for which it is not appropriate. Merkel (iv) thought it belonged to 2.1; it was apparently displaced by the incipit of Book 2 and transferred to the next possible location.

[13] F. Munari, *Il codice Hamilton 471 di Ovidio* (Rome 1965) 58 (hereafter, "Munari, Codice"); E. J. Kenney, "The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Amores, Ars Amatoria*, and *Remedia Amoris*," *CQ* 12 (1962) 7n. 3. See also Luck 44, although his hypothesis, that in α the poems were written without intervening spaces and with numbers or marks in the margin which were either unreadable or misunderstood by copyists, fails to account for the agreement of titles (where available) in PS and Y.

[14] Though problems in poem division occurred in the latter case, too. On the text of Martial, for example, see Lindsay (above, note 7) 40 with note h.

with 34 titles and 2 incipits has only 1. S, with 22 titles and 2 incipits, has
5.[15]

<div style="text-align: center">

RUN-ON POEMS

1.Ep.–1–2–3	$RSY=\alpha^{16}$
1.8–9–10–11	Y
1.13–14–15	Y
2.1–2–3–4	Y
2.12–13	S^{17}
2.18–19	$PSY=\alpha$

</div>

So that while Müller's *sola* was too pessimistic, it remains true that to varying
degrees in the various codices a somewhat larger and more ornate initial letter is
the most reliable indication of poem division. Just how unreliable it is, how-
ever, can be seen from the example of Y, where, as I have said, with the excep-
tion of 4 titles and 3 incipits, it is the only indication of poem division. In 6
places (apart from the normal poem beginnings) the initial letter of the line is
larger than usual, "quasi che il copista volesse indicare l'inizio d'una nuova ele-
gia."[18] P contains one such error,[19] and at 2.19.37 the scribe of S has left space
for a large initial letter and added the title AD AMICAM. With the exception of
this last, these errors are not recorded in other manuscripts.

<div style="text-align: center">

FALSE POEM DIVISIONS

1.2.15	Asper	Y
1.4.13	Ante	Y
1.6.9	At	Y
1.6.17	Aspice	Y
1.6.27	Ferreus	Y
2.3.15	Fallere	Y
2.19.37	At	S
3.7.19	A, pudet	P

</div>

[15] Cf. Luck 92, where he relates loss of titles to errors of poem division in the
archetype of Catullus.

[16] Since R ends at 1.2.50, only SY show the run-on continuing into 1.3.
Scholars are inclined to think that the missing part of R (1.2.51–end = R') was
the exemplar of P, because the bottom of the last folio of R (which contained 5
lines on the recto 1.2.20–24, and 4 or 5 on the verso 1.2.51–3.1 or 2) has been
torn off and 1.2 51 is found at the beginning of a gathering in P, which does not
contain the run-on between 1.2 and 3. See Kenney, (above, note 13) 6–7; G. P.
Goold, "Amatoria Critica," *HSCP* 69 (1965) 4; F. Munari, *P. Ovidi Nasonis
Amores: testo, introduzione e note* (Florence 1951) xix–xx; S. Tafel, *Die Über-
lieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Carmina amatoria* [diss. Tübingen 1910] 26–31.
Contra, D. S. McKie, *CQ* 36 (1986) 219–38.

[17] Note that PY have no title here, so perhaps the absence of a title in a led to
the run-on in S.

[18] Munari, *Codice* 17. He continues "Forse notevoli, ma per me inspiegabili,
sono qui tre fatti: 1) il fenomeno è limitato all'inizio del libro I (fatta eccezione
per l'ultimo esempio); 2) tutti i versi cominciano con A o F; 3) i primi due casi
si trovano nella prima riga della pagina." Observe that the errors of this sort in P
and S similarly involve A's.

[19] Müller (above, note 3) 89; Munari, *Codice* 60.

Errors of poem division, then, occur not infrequently in the *antiquiores*.[20] In order to correct errors already present in α (e.g. the run-ons 1.Ep.1–2–3[21] and 2.18–19) one may look at poem divisions in manuscripts of the β-strain and/or apply non-traditional criteria to evaluate the appropriateness of transmitted poem boundaries. In the absence of published collations of the *recentiores* it has been impossible to assemble a list of poem divisions shown by β's descendants[22] or to assess their influence on the divisions inserted by the correctors of P and Y at the "proper"[23] places in all the run-ons in their respective texts. The need for non-traditionary criteria by which to judge these divisions (and by extension Müller's divisions in 2.9 and 3.11, which are nowhere attested) remains, however, and an attempt to establish such will occupy the rest of this paper.

Section 2: Arguments for poem division

By the 12th century, Y, at least, had the poems divided in such a way as satisfied readers and critics until Scaliger and then Bentley objected to the separation of 2.2 and 3.[24] The unanimous consensus of the manuscripts as to the unity of 2.9 and 3.11 remained unchallenged much longer, until in 1856 L. Müller insisted, upon aesthetic grounds, on their division.[25] With this he set in

---

[20] S, in fact, demonstrates one source of this fallibility. Although the first line (6 times) or two (28 times) of each poem were indented to provide space for a large initial letter, it was never put in. While in some cases the appropriate letter (or letters—in 2.12 and 2.17 the first letter of the second line is omitted as well) is noted in the margin, the manuscript offered subsequent copyists plenty of opportunity for error, particularly since the indentation itself as well as the marginal help-letter was absent at 1.4, 2.2, and 2.5.

[21] 1.2–3 are joined in SY, hence presumably in α. Since the beginning of 1.3 is marked by a large initial letter and marginal title in P, however, and since S and Y both demonstrate an inclination to create original run-ons, there remains a possiblity that the division was present in α and that S and Y made simultaneous errors here. But cf. C. E. Murgia, "The Date of Ovid's *Ars* 3," *AJP* 107 (1986) 90n. 26, arguing that "the divisions of poems found in the MSS of not only Propertius, but Ovid's *Amores* and Tibullus, reflect medieval editorial decision rather than transmitted evidence."

[22] I have been able to glean only the following scraps of information: according to Munari's edition 1.Ep and 1.1 are separated by Politianus, Marius and the *Codex Arundelianus* (now Edinburgh, Bibl. Nat. 18.2.9. See M. D. Reeve *RhM* 117 [1974]: 142 and 138). 1.1 and 2 are separated in EX^2G^2 (Kenney's E^a, V^b second hand, A^b second hand). 2.18 and 19 are separate and have titles in B and H (Kenney's V^a and H). The false division of S at 2.19.37 is also present in BAJ (B=Kenney's V^a, others not in Kenney).

[23] The corrections to P are noted in Munari's collation of P (*SIFC* 23 [1948] 113–52), but not in his edition of the *Amores*. I am inferring from the phrase "nullum intervallum" in Lenz's collation of S (*RIL* ser.2, 69 [1936] 633–57) that the proper divisions were never indicated in S (by "proper" or "correct" poem divisions I mean simply divisions that have been accepted by editors and critics to date).

[24] For this they had the support of the 15th century *Codex Hafniensis*.

[25] "Haec in uno carmine coniuncta fuisse nunquam mihi persuadebo. Ita mutati animi exemplum in eodem carmine nusquam inveni, si exceperis de quo infra dicetur III 11; nec potest tale existere. Etenim non puerile modo, sed plane est inep-

motion a debate which continues even today.[26] The unifiers have been more diligent in seeking out arguments. Jacoby argues that 3.11 is a single poem since it is based on a single model (Catullus 85).[27] Jäger sees both 2.9 and 3.11 as poems of "seelische Entwicklung" and "innere Kampf" and of 2.9 concludes that "Die Einheit des ganzen Gedichts besteht wiederum darin, daß ein in sich zusammenhängender seelischer Vorgang unmittelbar dramatisch dargestellt ist."[28] Cairns provides generic arguments for unity: since 2.9 and 3.11 are *renuntiationes amoris* (and in this genre "change of mind" frequently occurs) the contradiction in the second halves of the poems of all that was said in the first halves is something one might expect to find, not an aberration to be dealt with surgically.[29] These arguments[30] share a fundamental weakness: they assume that

tum ita subito converti animum poetae, ut quod non uno alterove versu sed per tot disticha omnibus precibus devovit, id iam omnibus precibus expostulet et efflagitet. Hoc autem evenit, nisi putaris mecum a v. inde 25 novum carmen incipere" (90). The possibility of dividing a poem within the *Amores* had been considered and rejected 18 years earlier by Otto Gruppe (*Die römische Elegie* [Leipzig 1838] 375–79) who, however, was not concerned with consistency in poetic units, but was looking for arithmetical niceties in the collection.

[26] Kenney (above, note 2) notes with approval (x) that by removing 3.5 and dividing 2.9 and 3.11 he gets books with 15, 20 and 15 poems respectively (which, he says, could hardly have come about by chance). J. C. McKeown (above, note 1), after reviewing the numbers of poems in books of Augustan poetry (91–92), prints the poems as single units in his text.

[27] F. Jacoby, "Zur Entstehung der römische Elegie," *RhM* 60 (1905) 86–87. That is, from the unity of the model, the epigram, he infers the unity of the elegy. But why, in view of the clear reference to Catullus 8 in 3.11a (*perfer et obdura*, 7 cf. Cat. 8.11 *sed obstinata mente perfer, obdura*) and greater situational similarity of these two poems (i.e. making a resolution), should the slightly less direct echoes of Catullus 85 in 11b (*hac amor hac odium*, 34 cf. Cat. 85.1 *odi et amo*) lead us to posit unity of model? Moreover, Weinreich (*Die Distichen des Catull* [Darmstadt 1964] 72–76) has shown that Catullus 85 is not the only treatment of simultaneous hate and love, in other words that both poets were utilizing a *topos*, the earlier fashioning from it a 2-line epigram, the later finding in it matter for 25 couplets. Indeed, I think it is this, that Ovid took a demonstrably successful epigram theme and expanded it into a full-blown elegiac treatment, that is Jacoby's point, and when critics like Weinreich (104n. 41) and Jäger (*Zweigliedrige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare bei Properz und in Ovids Amores* [diss. Tübingen, 1967] 142; hereafter, "Jäger") say that he has made a strong case for the unity of 3.11 they are unduly stressing an almost incidental remark. Weinreich himself correctly perceives (72–76) that the "unity of model" argument does not apply here and claims that "Die innere Einheit des Gedichts kann darin erblickt werden, daß der erste Teil den Grund für das Hassen vorführt, während der zweite den Zwiespalt ausmalt." This analysis of the poem is unexceptionable enough, but is it proof of unity?

[28] Jäger 144–53. His views are largely echoed by G. Lörcher (*Der Aufbau der drei Bücher von Ovids Amores* [Amsterdam 1975] 15–23). The additional arguments she adduces (17, 22–23)—the equivalence of the *corona* of 3.11a.29 and the *votum* of 11b.40, and a 3-part structure for 2.9—are unconvincing. Jäger had criticized (149) Müller's argument for being "grundsätzlich subjektiv" and seems to feel that his defense of unity is somehow less subjective because the poems have been transmitted undivided. As we have seen, however, the transmission of poem divisions is not entirely reliable, and the archetype's divisions must be submitted to the same *examinatio* as its text.

the only compositional unit available to Ovid (or Propertius) in which artistically related sections sharing subject matter and language[31] were possible was the single poem.[32] A brief review of two poems, *Amores* 1.11–12, will make it clear that this is not the case.

These poems clearly have the same subject matter, the *tabellae* going to ask for a rendezvous and returning with the answer "no." The speaker and addressee are the same in both. Enough time has elapsed between poems, however, for Nape to deliver the letter and bring back the reply, so the situation is not quite identical.[33] As for artistic interaction, it is present at several levels. To begin with, it is difficult to understand the situation at the beginning of 1.12 without the background of 1.11: the addressee and contents of the *tabellae* are unknown, the reference to Nape tripping over the threshold (1.12.4) is obscure (who is Nape and what does she have to do with the *tabellae*?), the interlocutor at 1.12.5–6 unnamed. Then 1.12 clearly reflects the structure and language of 1.11, though I would not go so far as Davis and call it "a point-by-point contradiction of everything the poet said in the previous elegy."[34] He does, however, correctly point out that for there to be parallelism at all, one must oppose Nape

[29] This argument was initially advanced (in *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* [Edinburgh 1972] 139–40) for 3.11. Note that whenever Cairns uses generic considerations to defend the unity of a poem, that poem is a nonstandard member of its genre: on *Am.* 3.11, see p. 139, Prop. 1.8, p. 150, 2.28, p. 154. In "Self-imitation within a generic framework" (*Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, edd. D. West and A. J. Woodman [Cambridge 1979] 121–41) Cairns returned to the fray with a certain amount of exasperation, insisting that unity has been "amply demonstrated" or "demonstrated beyond doubt" for both 2.9 (127) and 3.11 (131). He too (127–32) catalogs "internal correspondences" between halves and diagrams structural relationships (ring structure in 2.9, parallel in 3.11). He also (130) points, Jacoby-like, to a reminiscence of Prop. 1.9.8 (*atque utinam posito dicar amore rudis*) in the crucial bridging lines 2.9.22–25 (noting *'posito', dicat 'amore'* [25, cf. *deposito*, 22] and the "witty" recall of Propertius' adjective *rudis* with the noun *rudis* [22]). With the exception of this last, the features he notices are present and important, but they cannot prove unity for reasons to be discussed.

[30] The argument from book structure—a clear book structure requiring either a single poem at the place where division might be made (as, e.g., in Prop. 4.1, on which see E. Courtney, *BICS* 16 [1969] 73) or two poems where one is currently found (as, e.g., at Prop. 1.8, on which see the lengthy note by J. T. Davis, *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid* [Bern 1977] 27–29n. 2; hereafter, "Davis")—has not been profitably applied to the problem of 2.9 and 3.11. The arguments of G. Wille ("Zum künstlerischen Aufbau von Ovids *Amores*," in *Navicula Tubingensis: studia in honorem Antonii Tovar*, ed. F. J. Oroz Arizcuren [Tübingen 1984] 389–423) are quite insubstantial.

[31] I have borrowed these criteria for unity from R. E. White, "The Structure of Propertius 2.28: Dramatic Unity," *TAPA* 89 (1958) 254.

[32] Jäger, for instance, says (148) of 3.11 "Leitmotive tragen dazu bei, die Einheit des Gedichts zu unterstreichen" and goes on to show verbal and metaphorical echoes of 11a in 11b.

[33] According to Davis (80 with note 18), the lover entrusted the tablets to Nape one evening to be delivered to the lady the next morning (*mane* 1.11.7), but there is no need to wring extraneous situational details out of the poem. *Mane*, after all, might be taken with *peraratas* to emphasize the lover's eagerness and volubility even at an early hour in the morning. So Lenz and Barsby commentaries ad loc.

(enjoying praise 1.11.1–6) in the first poem to the tablets (suffering blame 1.12.9–14) in the second. This substitution he explains by reference to Ovid's "self-interest and self-possession," noting that Nape will be needed *iterum* (1.12.5).[35] Verbal echoes make the new focus the clearer: Nape is *fida* (1.11.6) and *in ministeriis...utilis* (1.11.3–4), the tablets are *fidas ministras* (1.11.27) before they report the discouraging answer and *inutile lignum* after (1.12.13). The military metaphor, too, is applied to both Nape and the *tabellae* (*militiae signa tuere tuae* 1.11.12; *victrices tabellae* 1.11.25). The following chart shows the structural parallels, admittedly imperfect, between the two poems:

1.11	1.12
	(1–6 description of situation)
1–6 praise for Nape	7–8 command: *ite hinc...*
7–8 command: *accipe..*	9–14 blame for *tabellae*
9–12 why Nape is useful to carry love letters	15–20 why *tabellae* are not fit to contain love letters
(13–18 instructions)	(21–22 self-reproach)
19–24 what O. hopes the *tabellae* will be used for	23–26 what they should be used for
	27–28 self-reproach
25–28 their projected fate: dedication to Venus	29–30 their projected fate: decay

Finally, the charm of the poems lies in their interaction. The elated lover, who was so sure that he would get the answer he wanted that he had already composed an epigram dedicating the tablets to Venus, gets his come-uppance when they return with a "no" and is similarly extravagant in his depression. The "no," after all, only applies to that evening (*hodie*, 1.12.2). The *persona* of each poem taken by itself is the lover typical of elegy, the juxtaposition of the two creates a good-natured mockery of that *persona*.

No one, to my knowledge, has ever suggested that these two poems be combined into a single poem, but they clearly constitute a compositional unit with similar subject matter and artistic interaction between parts. In light of this, it seems that White's criteria for unity will not work, and if a pair of poems can be considered a structural unit, the other arguments for the unity of 2.9 and 3.11 are greatly undermined. In what follows I will look at the paired poems in the *Amores*—poems so closely linked by subject matter and situation as to form a compositional unit—to see if they can give us any tools with which to make either a confident division or a more secure internal bond for 2.9 and 3.11.

Section 3: Consecutive paired poems

Although the term "paired poems" can be used to describe poems related in many ways,[36] I will be considering here only those pairs that are related as

---

[34] Davis 81.
[35] Davis 84.
[36] Virgil's book of *Eclogues*, for example, contains thematic pairs (e.g. 1 and 9, both about land confiscations), formal pairs (e.g. 3 and 7, both amoebean

2.9a–b and 3.11a–b are related if they are pairs, that is, spatially (i.e. the poems are adjacent) and causally (i.e. the situation in the second poem presupposes the events of the first). There are four such pairs in the *Amores*: 1.11–12, 2.2–3, 7–8, 13–14.[37] These have been labelled "dramatic pairs" by Davis, and the discussion of them that follows is largely based on his analyses.

In Davis' model of the dramatic pair, the temporal relationship between poems is specified with some exactitude: the order in which they occur is irreversible, there is a pause between the two poems in which the action continues, and the entire three-episode incident is presented as if in progress. There is, furthermore, a causal relationship joining the three episodes: events arising out of the situation in the first poem occur during the pause, and the second poem contains the speaker's reaction to those events (and *not* to the first poem). One such event is frequently the departure of the addressee of the first poem, which changes the tone of the speaker's remarks about that person. In writing a dramatic pair the poet is confronted with the technical problem of signaling to the reader that the break between poems which he sees in his text (which looks, presumably, like any other poem division) is rather akin to a scene change than to a break between unrelated entities. This can only happen if the reader finds unambiguous situational and verbal references to the first poem in the first few couplets of the second. These features, then—a temporal and causal relationship of the three episodes contained in the two poems and the pause between them, and a clear indication of these relationships very early in the second poem— characterize this compositional type.[38] This model, however, is a composite put together from four Propertian and four Ovidian examples, and for the purposes of this paper is will be important to see how the real pairs in the *Amores* flesh out this skeletal model.[39]

We have already seen that the pair 1.11–12 is built out of three episodes— 1.11 contains the lengthy preliminaries to the dispatch of the *tabellae*, during the pause the request and reply are exchanged, in 1.12 the lover reacts to Corinna's *infelix littera* (2). The order of these events is clearly irreversible. At the beginning of 1.12 (which at first reading we expect to be an unrelated poem[40]), we hear that some *tabellae* have returned from somewhere (1) and that

---

dialogue) and pairs linked by source (e.g. 2 and 3, both imitations of Theocritus), and it is out of pairs such as these that the structure of the book is built up. In the *Amores*, on the other hand, there are pairs with close thematic links (e.g. 1.4 and 2.5, 2.19 and 3.4) which serve no obvious structural purpose.

[37] Jäger adds 2.11–12, but the term "pair" is uncomfortably strained by its application to 2.11–12, 2.11 being a *propempticon* and 2.12 a celebration, not of Corinna's safe return, but of her successful evasion of *vir, custos,* and *ianua* (2.12.3). Davis discusses four Propertian pairs as well: 1.8a–b 1.11–12, 2.28a–b, 2.29a–b.

[38] In Davis' view (21–22), 2.9 and 3.11 do not display all of the characteristics of this model. He does believe they should be divided, however. On this, see Section 4 below.

[39] I have preferred Davis' model to Jäger's because the latter—compactness of presentation, dramatic treatment and polar opposition of poems—is less clearly defined (35) and consequently more difficult to apply usefully.

[40] 1.11 appears a perfectly ordinary self-contained entity and we are satisfied that it has come to a close when we see important words from the beginning of the poem reappearing in the last couplet (*fidas sibi ministras*, 27, cf. *in*

Nape (who appears only in this pair) is again involved (4). The speaker is thinking of something that happened just recently (*modo*, 3) and which portended his present unhappy state (*omina*, 3). All this suggests a connection with the previous poem, in which Nape was entrusted with the delivery of some *tabellae* of which he had great expectations. The terms of the reply (*hodie posse negat*, 2) hint that perhaps the *tabellae* contained a request for an appointment, which accords too well with the situation of 1.11 (where the lover wants Corinna to think he is longing for an evening with her, *spe noctis vivere dices* 1.11.13) for there to be no connection between the two poems. Then, the gaps in the reader's understanding of the situation of 1.12 (to whom was the letter sent? was a rendezvous really the object? who is Nape and what does she have to do with the *tabellae*? who is being addressed in lines 5–6?) are filled in very nicely if he assumes that the situation sketched in 1.11 is retained in 1.12. The point of *cera referta* in 1.12.8, too, only becomes clear against the background of 1.11.19–24 where the lover speculates about just how full he would like the *cera* to be in Corinna's answer (and finally decides that a simple *veni* would be sufficient). Verbal echoes do not play a particularly important role in alerting the reader to the connection between 1.11 and 1.12, though *tabellae* (1.12.1) and *Nape* (4) do recall the situation of 1.11 by repeating the words for important elements of that situation.[41]

The Cypassis poems, 2.7–8, serve as Davis' paradeigmatic pair.[42] They show the characteristic irreversible three-part temporal and causal sequence: in 2.7 the lover hotly defends himself against the charge of infidelity, during a pause of uncertain but not momentary duration Corinna passes judgment and departs and the lover and Cypassis contrive a meeting (or are left together by Corinna, which seems less than probable), then in 2.8 the lover tries to recover Cypassis' goodwill, which probably withered somewhat under the scorn she had heard heaped upon the idea of an affair with a slave (2.7.19–22, 25–26, cf. 2.8.9–10). The first poem is brought to a neat close by the echo of the first line (*reus in crimina*) in the last (*criminis esse reum*). But this makes it all the more delightful when the situation sketched in the first two lines of the second poem—that a hairdresser is involved again (2.8.1, cf. 2.7.17, 23–24) and that it is the very Cypassis mentioned in the previous poem (and nowhere else)—demands that the two poems be read as a pair. A particularly nice feature of this pair is that 2.8 greatly improves our appreciation of 2.7 by showing that Corinna's accusation was, in fact, justified (which we may have suspected all

---

ministeriis utilis, 3 and *fida reperta mihi*, 6). For a general discussion of ring composition in the *Amores* see F. Bertini, "La *Ringkomposition* negli *Amores* Ovidiani e l'autenticità dell'Elegia III.5," *RCCM* 18 (1976) 151–60. In this case, the verbal echoes serve two purposes—in the context of the poem they give a sense of closure, in the context of the pair they ease the shift of focus from Nape to the *tabellae*. The dedicatory epigram, too, is frequently, though by no means always, encountered at the ends of poems (cf. *Am.* 2.6, *Her.* 2, 7, Prop. 4.3; Tib. 1.9, [3].2).

[41] The use of the epithet *inutile* (1.12.13) for the disappointing *tabellae* is certainly a reflection of the *utilis* used to compliment Nape at 1.11.4, but occurs too late to inform the reader that the poems are related, though it may confirm his impression that they are.

[42] Davis 19–21.

along). The discovery that Nape was present during that interview (2.8.15–16) also serves to make our picture of the situation clearer and explains why the sequel was necessary at all. At the end of the second poem we again find a reference back to its first line (*quotque quibusque modis*, 28, cf. *in mille modos*, 1), and the pair as a whole is drawn together and tied off, so to speak, by the recurrence of *index* (2.8.25), which recalls *indicio* (2.7.26) from the end of the first poem and *index* (2.8.5) near the beginning of the second.[43]

The last of the undisputed pairs is 2.13–14. In the first poem Corinna lies seriously ill from the effects of an attempted abortion.[44] The events of the pause between the poems are never explicitly described,[45] and we can only infer that Corinna's condition has improved by assuming that, if in 2.14 the speaker gives way to his *ira* (which was formerly restrained by his *metus*, 2.13.4, cf. 27), something must have happened during the pause to remove his fear. The first poem of the pair is brought neatly to a close—a dedication concludes the prayer section of the poem, and the hesitancy with which the final reproach is uttered (*si tamen in tanto fas est monuisse timore*) recalls the *metus* (4) of the beginning. At the start of 2.14, however, the reader is left groping for a context in which the exasperated but unspecific complaint of lines 1–4 makes sense. The discovery that it is an abortion (*teneros convellere fetus*, 5) that has provoked the speaker's anger and the continuation of the military metaphor from the last line of the preceding poem incline him to connect the two poems, and when he needs an identity for the addressee of 2.14 (at *tuae*, 8) the girl who attempted an abortion in 2.13 is the most likely candidate. These situational links are the stronger in that the subject of abortion is not treated elsewhere in the *Amores*, so that the relative scarcity of verbal echoes need not preclude a connection.[46]

The three episodes of the pair 2.2–3 are, in outline at least, quite similar to those of 1.11–12. In the first poem of each pair, the lover tries to persuade a slave from his mistress' household to do him a service, during the pause he receives a negative response (in the case of 1.11–12, a "no" from the recipient of the *tabellae*, not from Nape), and in the second poem he vents his anger on the conveyor of that response (in 2.3, on Bagoas himself, in 1.12, on the *tabellae*).[47] The duration of the pause between 2.2 and 3, however, need only be long enough for the *custos* to deny the lover's request for entrance, whereas between 1.11 and 12, Nape has delivered the *tabellae*, presumably dressed her mistress'

---

[43] The end of the conciliatory section of 2.8 (1–22), too, is signalized by ring composition: *concubitus...tuos* (22) recalls the same phrase from line 6.

[44] Davis argues (111–12) from the present tense of *iacet* (2.13.2) and the prayer addressed to the goddess who presides over childbirth, Ilithyia (19–26), that the actual miscarriage has not yet taken place during 2.13.

[45] Of course if the events of the pause were described in the same way as the events of the poems are described (i.e. as if in progress), they would not happen during a pause, but it would be possible to narrate what happened during the pause and still preserve the distinction.

[46] Such words as do recur (e.g. *ventre, gravida, temerasset* 2.14.15, 17, cf. *ventris, gravidi, temeraria* 2.13.1) are bound up with the subject of abortion.

[47] I shall use the eunuch's name throughout in the form to which Kenney emended it ("Notes on Ovid," *CQ* 8 [1958] 59–60).

hair,[48] and found an opportunity to return with the *infelix littera*. The order of events in 2.2–3 is irreversible. The feeling of closure at the end of the first poem is not particularly strong: there is no ring composition and the summary *precibus* in the last line merely indicates that one attempt at persuasion has come to an end and a response is expected.[49] When the reader starts on 2.3 thinking that he has a new poem in hand, he meets with an exclamation of distress (*ei mihi*, cf. *flete meos casus*, 1.12.1) which is "explained" by the fact that the addressee, a *custos*, is again a eunuch (*quod dominam nec vir nec femina servas / mutua nec Veneris gaudia nosse potes*, 1–2).[50] As was the case with Nape (1.11–12) and Cypassis (2.7–8), neither Bagoas nor any other eunuch in the role of a *custos* appears elsewhere in the *Amores*. The verbal echo of *dominam...servas* (1, cf. *quem penes est dominam servandi cura*, 2.2.1) provides a further link to the previous poem, and the form of *servas* shows that the addressee is the same in both poems.[51] Now, according to Davis, this is unusual in the context of a dramatic pair. With the partial exception of 1.11–12 (where Nape is the addressee in the first poem and for at least two lines, 5–6, near the beginning of the second),[52] dramatic pairs in Propertius and Ovid show different addressees in the two poems, with the result very often that "the person spoken to in the first poem is spoken about in the second as though they are not within earshot."[53] Several things then—the continued presence of Bagoas, the brevity of the pause (and perhaps also of the second poem), the similarity of situation between 2.2–3 and the single poem 1.6,[54] and the relatively open ending of

---

[48] Davis 80.

[49] *Pace* Lenz ("Ovidio: *Amores* II 2 e 3, una sola poesia?" *Maia* 17 (1965) 121; hereafter, "Lenz"): "Queste parole segnano inequivocabilmente la fine del discorso al guardiano." Comparison with 1.6 is instructive, for in that address the lover pauses three times (after lines 20, 26, 40) to see if the line of argument he is then following is having any effect. The comparison of 1.6 and 2.2–3 is also rewarding for its juxtaposition (incidental to our purpose, but none the less amusing) of the *ianitor* of 1.6, whose uncooperativeness is hypothetically ascribed to his being in bed with his own *amica* (45–47) and the uncooperative *custos* of 2.2–3, whose deficiences in that arena are dwelt on at some length (2.3.1–6).

[50] The citations provided by Brandt and Némethy (especially Pliny *N.H.* 13.41 *in horto Bagou: ita vocant spadones, qui apud eos [Persas] etiam regnavere*) sufficiently demonstrate the implications of the name Bagoas. Cf. L. Alfonsi (*Latomus* 28 [1969] 208): "Questa tradizione cospicua, filosofica e scolastica, formatasi in epoca ellenistica, ha fatto di Bagoo il tipo dello *spado* per eccellenza." See also his earlier note, *Latomus* 23 (1964) 349. For a detailed discussion of a famous Bagoas, see E. Badian, "The Eunuch Bagoas," *CQ* 8 (1958) 144–57.

[51] This echo at the beginnings of the poems is balanced by one at the ends (*precibus*, 2.2.66, 2.3.17) which serves to round off the pair very neatly. The same ring composition over the pair as a whole is found in 2.7–8 and 13–14.

[52] Though it has been argued that, in view of the 3rd person reference to Nape in line 4, lines 5–6 are an apostrophe. See Davis 79. Otherwise, of course, one assumes that the second couplet is an aside, not addressed to Nape though she is present.

[53] Davis 21.

[54] And this is so thorough as to show the identical exclamation of disappointment, *ei mihi* (2.3.1, 1.6.52), at the same strategic point—the transition from entreaty to threat—in the lover's discourse.

2.2—might induce one to wonder whether the poems ought, in fact, to be united. Scaliger's and Bentley's reasons for suggesting precisely this are unknown, and the support of the 15th century *Codex Hafniensis* is virtually worthless, yet the arguments for retaining the division have not been entirely convincing. Because this pair alone provides a precedent for the pause of only a moment's duration between poems of a pair, it seems worthwhile to examine in some detail the arguments for the division which the best manuscripts attest.[55]

In an article devoted to the question, F. Lenz makes the following main points[56]: 1) the ending of 2.2 would be spoiled by the immediate addition of 2.3, in which the request is made again (lines 17–18); 2) there is an important change in situation—in 2.2 the speaker has only just seen the *puella* (line 3) while in 2.3 there exist "rapporti intimi"[57] between the two and he can already speak for her (*fallere te potuit...non caret effectu quod voluere duo*, 15–16); and 3) there has been a concomitant change of tone—after a well-calculated progression from contempt[58] to amiability in 2.2, in 2.3 the speaker rudely refers to the eunuch's deficiencies.[59] Jäger notes the change of tone and adds two points:

---

[55] Pauses of a moment's duration are of course frequently found within single poems, generally in poems in which the action is presented dramatically rather than narrated. There are pauses before, e.g., 1.14.51, 2.8.23, 2.14.41, 3.2.19, 3.3.41.

[56] See above, note 49. I have omitted some of his arguments in this summary. He finds the combined length of the poems (84 lines or, if one omits the disputed verses, 74 lines) much longer than average for its book. (Average length for Book 2 [not including 2.9] is 42.1 lines, for Book 1, 51.1 lines and for Book 3 [not including 3. 5 or 11] 59.2 lines.) But this proves nothing, for both Book 1 and Book 3 also contain poems whose length is much longer than average: 1.8 (114 lines) and 3.6 (106 lines). One might point to the placement of 2.2–3 near the beginning of its book (the other long poems are more centrally located), but the argument would be tenuous at best. I cannot assess the value of Lenz's second point, that the mark separating 2.2–3 in Y differs from that which separates 2.3–4 or 2.4–5, since I have not seen a photograph of the poem division and the difference is not noted by Munari, but I do note that Lenz is mistaken in saying that 2.4–5 are run together in Y (2.1–2–3–4 are run on, but 2.5 is apparently separate). He also finds confirmation of his argument in Ovid's use of the πρῶτος εὑρετής theme (2.3.3–4), which, he says, marks the beginning of a poem. The *topos* of the πρῶτος εὑρετής does not seem to have a necessary affinity for any one position in a poem. It occurs at or near the beginning of *Am*. 2.11 and 2.14 and Tib. 1.10, mid-poem in Prop. 1.17.13–14, 4.3.19; Tib. 1.4.59–60; Hor. *Odes* 1.3.9–12 (to name only a few).

[57] Lenz 122.

[58] Lenz thinks that the parody of the too-solemn tone of the beginning of 2.2 implies "profundo disprezzo" (123). Yet the parody seems more for the perception of the reader than for Bagoas' ears, and I would say that the movement of the *suasoria* (as opposed to that of the poem) is from somewhat overdone flattery to the aforementioned amiability.

[59] Lenz finds the tone of 2.3.1–6 "più compassionevole e sdegnato che beffardo" (123), but it seems to me that, in view of *ei mihi* (1) and the Ovidian lover's well-known selfishness, the indignation of lines 3–4 is at least as much for his own sufferings (i.e. because what he is suffering at the moment is the indirect result of that first castrator's action) as for those of the eunuch. On the tone of 2.3 see also J. Booth, "Double-entendres in Ovid, *Amores* 2.3," *LCM* 8 (1983) 101–2.

4) the rhetorical *status* changes (in an unspecified manner) at the beginning of 2.3; and 5) because the reader has to deduce what happened during the pause, 2.2–3 is a dramatic pair (in which compositional type this indirectness is common) rather than a two-part poem (in which the events of the pause are explicitly described).[60] Davis observes further that the structure of 2.3 reflects that of 2.2 and considers the case for unifying 2.2 and 3 "all but closed."[61] But is it?

The amiable tone of the final request in 2.2, which Lenz considers suitable only for the end of a poem, is in reality equally (or more) suitable for the end of a *suasoria*, which need not coincide with the end of a poem.[62] That the request is repeated after a different kind of persuasion has been attempted need not violate the integrity of the first request.

As to the second point, if one could prove that a length of time sufficient for the development of "rapporti intimi" had elapsed between poems, one could with confidence enroll 2.2–3 among the other dramatic pairs. But the evidence for intimacy is thin indeed. Lenz's distinction between the meaning of *dominam* (sc. *tuam*) at 2.2.1 and that at 2.3.1 (sc. *tuam* or *meam*), in despite of the obvious verbal connection between the lines, is simply arbitrary.[63] Given the presence of the verb *servare*, which can mean "keep an eye on" or "observe," but is especially used for keeping something safe for someone, the surface meaning in both places is likely to be *dominam tuam*, but the ambiguity arising from the fact that the reader assimilates the word *dominam* in an elegiac context before fitting it to *servare* adds a touch of piquancy—also in both places. As additional proof of the new intimacy Lenz cites the non-gnomic perfect tense of *potuit* (2.3.15) and *voluere* (16), which he thinks must be based on some discussion, at least, between the lover and the *puella*. But in the immediately preceding lines the speaker has given one justification for his presumption in speaking on behalf of the girl: love is what is her beauty and age are fit for (*apti* 13) and it would be a shame to waste them (14), therefore she would have wanted what he wanted as soon as the opportunity presented itself (in the form of his note, 2.2.5), hence the perfect tense. We can see from her replies—she says that the rendezvous is not possible (not that she is not willing; *non licet*, 2.2.6) and that it is not possible because there is a *custos* in the way (not because she has scruples of her own, 8)—that indeed the lover is justified in his *voluere*. No greater degree of understanding between the "lovers" should be postulated for the background of 2.3.[64]

---

[60] Jäger 30.

[61] Davis 97 and 86n. 1.

[62] Of the poems containing *suasoriae* (using the term loosely for any monologue in which the speaker is primarily concerned with giving general advice, e.g. 1.8.23–108, or persuading the interlocutor to do something specific, e.g. 1.6) in the *Amores*, 5 also describe the aftermath or response to the speech (1.6, 8, 13; 2.8, 3.6) and 8 do not (1.3, 4; 2.3, 11, 18, 19; 3.4, 14). In the case of the *apologia* of 2.7, the response is given in the second poem of the pair. 3.2 is not exactly a *suasoria*, since much of the persuasion is non-verbal, but the girl's reply (also non-verbal) is described in the second to last line of the poem (83).

[63] Lenz 122.

[64] Davis (86n. 1) rightly dissents from Lenz on this point, though he accepts the rest of the argument.

Neither change of tone nor change of argument demands a new poem to accommodate it. In 2.8 the changes in the lover's tone are parallel to (and more extreme than) those in 2.2-3; he moves from the conciliatory flattery (1–4) and fond wheedling (21–22) which precede the proposition to reproach (*ingrata*, 23) and serious threats (25–28)[65] after Cypassis' "no," yet these changes are comfortably and effectively contained within the limits of a single poem. Different styles of argumentation, too, are found in single poems. In 1.6, for example, the alternative tactics of entreaty (3–39)[66] and threat (57–60) are the two halves of the single attempted subornation of the *ianitor* (as, indeed, the lover himself says: *omnia consumpsi nec te precibusque minisque movimus*, 61–62) and as such can (which is not to say must) be presented in a single poem.

Jäger's assertion that 2.2-3 belong to the category of dramatic pairs because of the way in which the reader learns what happened during the pause deserves careful consideration. He finds that in individual poems which contain a pause and situation change of some sort the reader is always informed as to exactly what event in the pause prompted the change of situation.[67] His examples are 2.8.23, where the change of tone from wheedling to threatening is explained by *quid renuis fingisque novos, ingrata, timores?*; 3.2.19, where the speaker is startled out of his enthusiastic imaginary race at line 18 and we learn from *quid frustra refugis? cogit nos linea iungi* that he was all the while inching closer to the girl on his right (in accordance with the precepts at *Ars* 1.139–42) while she tried to move away; and 1.14.51–52, where the lover's increasingly thoughtless diatribe is brought to an abrupt conclusion by the girl's flood of tears and blush of shame (*me miserum, lacrumas male continet oraque dextra / protegit ingenuas picta rubore genas*).[68] Specific details of this kind are lacking, he says, at the situation change between 2.2 and 3—the reader must infer from the contrafactual condition in 2.3.5–6 that Bagoas has not been helpful. The beginning of 2.8, where we find the lover busily patching up his relationship with Cypassis and must infer that Corinna has departed, is similarly oblique. The reader is left wondering what her verdict was, although in view of the speaker's lack of concern about the state of his affair with Corinna in this poem, his rather cocky *at quanto...praesentior ipse / per Veneris feci numina magna fidem* (17–18) and especially his claim to have done Cypassis a service (21) one may suspect that he had been forgiven. At the beginning of 2.14, only the license given to the lover's *ira* (formerly restrained by his *metus*, 2.13.4) informs the reader that

---

[65] The threat in 2.3.18 is mild by comparison with these.

[66] The lover tries one argument after another: it is only a small thing I ask (3–4), pity me, I am at your mercy (5–16), you owe me a favor (19–23), it is for your own good (25–26), what are you afraid of anyway? (27–39).

[67] Jäger 30n. 48; also p. 37. After all, if the events of a mid-poem pause were never referred to, it would be almost impossible for the reader to know that there had been a pause. In paired poems, however, a pause is inevitably the result of the physical break between poems and the poet can afford to be less explicit.

[68] There is a counter-example of sorts at 2.14.41—the angry lover has gone too far with his *merito* (40) and retracts his prognostications, but there is no indication as to whether it was Corinna's reaction to the sketch of 39–40 (i.e. a situation parallel to 1.14.51–52) or his own realization of what he had said (parallel to 2.9b, on which see below) that brought about the change of mind.

Corinna's condition has improved. The main event of the pause between 1.11 and 12, however, is fairly evident from the first couplet of 1.12—Corinna has said "no." Of course the pause also included Nape's going and coming, which is only hinted at by the reference to her tripping over the threshold (1.12.4)[69] so that the reader still has to make some deductions on his own. With the partial exception of 1.11–12, then, Jäger's perception of a difference in the treatment of situational changes in dramatic pairs and individual poems seems accurate. It is thus the only one of the many arguments for leaving 2.2–3 as a pair that stands up to much scrutiny, for Davis' observation that the structure of 2.3 reflects that of 2.2 is rendered useless (for the purpose of demonstrating a pair) by his own analysis of 2.2, according to which the two halves of the single poem are likewise reflections of one another.[70] Indeed this technique of conveying information indirectly, necessitating as it does the participation (hence enjoyment) of the reader, may be one factor contributing to the special kind of poetic success achieved by the dramatic pairs.

Our model dramatic pair, then, has the following characteristics. In two adjacent poems three episodes of a single incident are presented. Some of the events of the second episode (which occurred during the pause) must be deduced from the tone or underlying assumptions of the second poem. The pause may require a moment's time (2.2–3) or much longer (1.11–12, 2.7–8, 2.13–14). The connection of the second poem to the first is indicated by a strong situational similarity which becomes evident very early in the second poem, and the situational link is generally reinforced by verbal echoes throughout the second poem. The addressee may or may not be different in the two poems. 2.7 is addressed entirely to Corinna and 2.8 entirely to Cypassis, but in 1.11–12 and 2.13–14 the addressee at the junction (which is the crucial point for a reader trying to decide if he has a pair in hand or not) is the same in both poems, while in 2.2–3 the addressee is Bagoas throughout. The first poem of a pair generally comes to a convincing close, so that the addition of another poem comes as a surprise, while the conclusion of the pair is often indicated by the reappearance of terms which were prominent in both the first poem and the earlier part of the second. It remains to see how 2.9 and 3.11 compare with this composite dramatic pair.

Section 4: 2.9 and 3.11

In the first 24 lines of 2.9 the lover utters an elaborate complaint about the unfairness of Cupid's latest attack on him, Love's own soldier. He makes an oblique bid for an immediate cure with the story of Achilles and Telephus in lines 7–8 (cf. *Tr.* 5.2.15), then suggests that Cupid seek a kind of prey more productive of glory for its captor (13–18, cf. 6). He offers parallels which justify a more permanent solution, retirement from love's service (19–24), with the image of the lover as a soldier reemerging as the cap of the list and

---

[69] Davis notes (79) that this is "the only direct reference to an event which happened between two paired poems" in any of the pairs he discusses.
[70] Davis 94–97.

providing a sense of closure (23–24,[71] latent since line 4).[72] In line 25, the speaker suddenly distances himself from the advice *vive posito amore* (i.e., the sort of thing he was thinking he would like to have done in the first 24 lines) by supposing that it comes from outside himself (*si quis*). Because his hypothetical interlocutor is a god, his rejection of the rejection of love is the more emphatic. We have seen how this radical change of mind within the boundaries of a single poem bothered Müller, so let us suppose for a moment that a new poem begins at line 25. A reader thinking he was entering upon a new and unrelated poem here would first of all be struck by the prominence of *vive* (25), remembering that the previous poem ended *placide vivere tempus erat* (24). He would soon discover that the subject matter—renunciation of love—was the same as that of the preceding poem, and that the point of view taken was the opposite of that expressed before. But not diametrically opposite, for the speaker is not eager to fall in love, but rather an unwitting (*nescioquo*, 28) and unwilling (*miserae mentis*, 28) victim of the *incerta Cupidinis aura* (33), which is likened to the unopposable forces of an unruly horse and a strong wind at sea (29–32). Given the tense and mood of *pertaesum est* and *relanguit* (27), the *cum* is a generalizing "whenever," and lines 27–34 refer not to the present situation but to past renewals of love (cf. *saepe*, 33 and *vix illis prae me nota pharetra sua est*, 38). The reader will remember that the lover of 9a, too, had experienced frequent fallings into and out of love (*totiens*, 23).[73] In lines 34–37, we find Amor taking up his weapons again, recalling the beginning of 9a (5, 13–14, especially *fige*, 34 and *figit*, 5). This image may be too common to be an unambiguous link between poems, but the fact that the lover is in each poem *nudus* (13, 35), though admittedly in different senses, is more suggestive of connection.[74] Lines 39–42, with their discussion of the peaceful nights of the non-lover, carry the reader back to the last line of 9a, when the speaker says he deserved to retire and enjoy a life of peace (*defunctum placide vivere*, 24). The vigorous *stulte, quid est somnus gelidae nisi mortis imago?* (41) exploits the oxymoron latent in *defunctum vivere*.[75] At the end of 9b *indeserta meo pectore regna gere* (52) shows an attitude very different from the complaint *o in corde meo desidiose puer* (2) with which the lover began; we have already seen this

---

[71] For *merere* used absolutely to signify military service cf. *TLL* s.v. *mereo*, 803.44–57. *Sub* is used with a military *merere* at, e.g., *Fasti* 4.381, but not in any of the passages where *merere* used absolutely means "to deserve" (cf. *TLL* 807.80–808.3) or "to serve" (cf. *TLL* 809.78–810.3).

[72] Even Jäger, who views 2.9 as a two-part poem, admits (150) the strong ending of 9a: "Die ganze Argumentation ist von Anfang an auf diesen Schluß ausgerichtet, der das Gebet durch diese zielstrebig gebaute Reihe zu einem geschlossenen Ganzen abrundet."

[73] In fact, that is the point of writing *totiens* as opposed to *longum*, or a phrase like *qui dominae merui sub amore tot annos*.

[74] Cf. 1.2.29–31, for example, where the lover has been wounded by Love's weapons, but is not *nudus*. Also, the *exempla* of horse and ship are repeated in 9b (29–30, 31–32), although the old soldier and gladiator do not reappear.

[75] Cf. 1.8.108 *ut mea defunctae molliter ossa cubent*, where Ovid uses *defunctae* in the sense of "dead."

sort of ring composition over the pair as a whole in 2.2–3, 7–8 and 13–14.[76] It is reinforced by the recurrence of *populis* in the last line of the pair: in its first appearance, in 9a, Love's people were suffering from his attacks (*nos tua sentimus, populus tibi deditus, arma*, 11) but by the end of the episode Love is invited to enjoy the reverence of men and women alike (*ambobus populis sic venerandus eris*, 54). In other words, if one supposes a pair of poems here, one finds the same kind of situational and verbal links as we found in Davis' dramatic pairs. If it is a pair, what happened during the pause? In 9a the lover feels he ought to have finished his tour of duty as love's soldier and deserves a rest; in 9b he claims that whenever he gets to feeling tired of love something always stirs him up again. During the pause he must have been thinking over past occasions when he had thought his love had cooled, but was revived through no effort of his own. His perception of the inevitably cyclical nature of his loves changes his earlier petulance into a somewhat resigned acceptance of the new affair.

We have then the features of a dramatic pair, namely one self-sufficient poem followed by another poem with such surprising situational, verbal and structural references to the previous one that the reader soon suspects he is dealing with a diptych rather than two unrelated canvases. As in 2.7–8, the addressees of the two poems are different, at least at the juncture. 2.9a is, as the MSS *tituli* tell us, an address *ad Amorem*, but Amor is about the only being to whom the first 10 lines of 9b could not be addressed. The inferences one can make about what went on during the pause in light of 9b.25–28 explain the change of attitude which is troublesome if one reads 2.9 as a single elegy. And finally, one of the greatest benefits of dividing the lines between two poems is that, as in 1.11–12 and 2.7–8, the pair amounts to something better and more Ovidian than the sum of its parts. 9a contains a standard elegiac complaint—in his commentary Brandt produces many Greek and Latin parallels. It is a fairly straight-faced presentation of the serious lover; the military imagery with which it begins must be intended to recall 1.9, in which the lover has as serious and strenuous an occupation as the soldier. In 9b, on the other hand, the emphasis is on the fickleness of love (*incerta Cupidinis aura*, 33; *quod dubius Mars est, per te, privigne Cupido, est*, 47, cf. 49–50) and the lover is fully cognizant of the deceptions (43) and self-deceptions (44) involved. This, too, has its parallels in the elegiac corpus,[77] but the combination of two standard but elsewhere mutually exclusive types of lover in a single *persona* reveals clearly the preposterous amalgam that elegiac love is.

If, on the other hand, one tries to read 2.9 as a single entity, one is faced with a lover who in line 25 says he would refuse to do what he has been asking to be allowed to do for the previous 24 lines, and there would be no indication of a pause in which he could have reconsidered his decision. We have seen an exception to Jäger's claim that the events of a pause in a single poem are

---

[76] *Indeserta* makes its only appearance in classical Latin here; the litotes emphasizes the extent of the reversal. It is not accidental that we find a lover embroiled with two *puellae* in the subsequent poem (2.10).

[77] For Cynthia's perfidy, e.g., Prop. 1.8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18; also Tibullus 1.5, 1.6 and [Tib.] 3.16.

always clearly described, but nothing comparable to this unexplained and drastic reversal.

Jäger's comparison of 2.9 and 2.10 (both, in his analysis, two-part palinodes) only serves to make the difference between a pair of poems and a two-part poem the clearer. For him, the contrast between the complaints addressed to Venus in 2.10.11–14 and the increasingly enthusiastic acceptance of love in lines 15–38 is comparable to the change of mind experienced in 2.9a–b. Jäger's assumption that a wish to be freed from love is implicit in the complaints,[78] however, receives no support from the text—at most the speaker hints that he might like to be relieved of the supernumerary girl (12). He certainly does not suggest that trees be denuded of their leaves, or the sky of its stars, or the sea drained of its water (13–14). Furthermore, there is really no change of mind at all involved in the transition *sed tamen hoc melius* (15). The lover may still prefer to be troubled by only one girl, but, for all his complaining (*tamen*), realizes that two are better than none. He is simply following the rational course of trying out a different perspective on a painful situation, and he makes the procedure clear with a series of connective particles. And the compositional "cues" that alert the reader to the presence of a sequel are naturally absent from 2.10.

The change of mind that takes place at 3.11.33 has been less troublesome to critics that that of 2.9.25, and consequently fewer have argued for splitting up the poem. In 3.11 the lover's rejection of his mistress is by no means as unhesitating as the renunciation of love was in 2.9a—he has to gird himself (*perfer et obdura*, 7) for the painful process of applying remedies (*sucus amarus*, 8, cf. *Rem.* 299–308) in order to cure himself of his affliction. As in Catullus 8, the lover calls to mind the unpleasant episodes of the relationship (3.11.9–15, 21–26) and again like Catullus makes the "entscheidenden taktischen Fehler"[79] of recalling its pleasant aspects as well (*blanditias, verba potentia quondam*, 31). The lover uses Propertius' metaphor for the end of a love affair (the ship safe in harbor after an arduous passage, Prop. 3.24.15–17, cf. *Am.* 3.11.29–30) to align himself with a successful *renuntiatio amoris*, but Ovid's reader has already seen the involuntary renewal of love likened to a ship being swept back into mid-ocean (2.9.31–32). All of this makes the lover's relapse less surprising. The order of events at the beginning of 11b also makes the change of mind here less awkward than that at the beginning of 2.9b. In 3.11 the lover progresses from a denial of love to troubled uncertainty (*luctantur pectusque leve in contraria tendunt / hac amor, hac odium*, 33–34) to an increasingly confident reaffirmation of his love (*sed, puto, vincit amor*, 34, cf. *quidquid eris mea semper eris*, 49), whereas in 2.9 the speaker who expressed his desire to be retired from love's service without any misgivings in lines 1–24 declines the favor in line 25, giving no reasons but those implicit in the general remarks of 27–34. Even if comparison with 2.9 makes the change of mind at 3.11.33 seem less abrupt than it might be, however, the emergence of doubt (33–34) is still completely without explicit motivation. Something happened before line 33 to revive love, and that something must have happened during a

[78] Jäger 154.
[79] Jäger 146.

pause. The reader can only assume that, just as one cannot say "not A" without calling A to mind, so the lover's defiant *desine blanditias et verba potentia quondam perdere* (31–32) brought those able pleaders to life in his mind.[80] The pause may be of only a moment's duration, or more time may have slipped away while the lover's mind was occupied with such pleasing visions.[81] This lack of information about the events of the pause is, as we have seen, an important characteristic of the dramatic pair, so let us suppose here too that there is a new poem beginning at line 33 and see if the pair resembles the composite pair in other features as well.

Nothing in 11a prompts the reader to expect a sequel (which is not to say that, as in the case of 2.7–8, the presence of a sequel does not confirm the reader's suspicions that the speaker is protesting too much), indeed the lover's final *non ego sum stultus ut ante fui* (32) embraces both his desire to be freed from love (1–8, 28–30) and his shame at having behaved as he did in love (9–16, 21–26) and so rounds off the poem neatly. The closure is reinforced by the reappearance of *ferendis* and *duravi* in line 27 (cf. *ferre, tulisse*, 4; *obdura*, 6). Early in the second member of the pair we find the expected situational and verbal links to the preceding poem. In the first couplet it becomes evident that the situation involves the struggle between love and hate, which is what provoked words like *perfer et obdura, dolor* (7) and *sucus amarus* (8) in 3.11a. The verbal connection between poems is strong—*vincit* (34) cf. *vicimus* (5); *vitiis* (44) cf. *vitiis* (1)—and the insulted gods of 11a (*periuratos in mea damna deos*, 22) reappear in 11b (*fallendos...saepe deos*, 46). Finally, the recurrence of the ship/lover metaphor at the end of the pair (51) clearly recalls the use of that metaphor at the end of the first poem (29–30).

Our assumption, then, that 3.11a–b is a pair, has the advantages of explaining why the change of mind at line 33 is apparently unmotivated, of allowing the well-orchestrated conclusion of 3.11a its full effect and of producing both surprise (at the presence of a sequel) and gratification (from the confirmation of his previous suspicions) for the reader. Nothing in the pair sets it at variance with the model dramatic pair and it is only the internal nature of the events of the pause which differentiates this pair from Davis' dramatic pairs. Here, too, I think we can see Ovid using the pair format to make playful fun of elegiac

---

[80] The remembrance of Lesbia's kisses in Catullus 8 (a poem which the reader of 3.11 has repeatedly been invited to recall) had a similar effect on Catullus.

[81] Because of the multiplicity of addressees (*amor* 1–2; self 3–8; audience 9–10, 21–26; girl 11–20, 27–32) and the inconsistency in the form used to address the girl (1st person *noster*, 20 [cf. *vicimus, calcamus* in 5 where *nos*=the speaker alone]; 2nd person *tu* 11, *tuus* 18 [cf. *tibi*=speaker, 7]; 3rd person *erat*, 25, 26) the address of 11a would seem to take place entirely in the speaker's imagination. In 11b, there is only one 3rd person reference to the girl (*valet illa*, 44), who is otherwise the addressee. It would be possible—reading 44 as an aside—to assume that the girl arrived during the break between poems and that this is what caused the fresh outbreak of love in 33, but since the poem ends with the speaker urging a course of action upon himself (*dem, utar*, 51), I am inclined to see this poem, too, as taking place in the speaker's imagination. Cf. Lenz (commentary, ad loc.): "In dem Augenblick, da er wähnt, seine Leidenschaft habe den tiefsten Punkt erreicht und er sei jetzt sicher (29f.), tritt ihr Bild vor seine Seele, und er hört ihre Worte."

conventions. The situation of 11a is that of the angry lover who wants to put a halt to an affair. It is also found at, for example, Catullus 8 and Propertius 2.5 and 3.24. In the case of these poems we are never told about the aftermath—whether or not the lover perseveres—although their position in their respective corpora might incline one to think that the *renuntiatio amoris* of Prop. 3.24 was successful and to have strong doubts about the efficacy of Catullus 8 and Prop. 2.5. Ovid takes up this implicit change of heart and exposes it in all its *minutiae* to the light of day, again, I think, subtly mocking the elegiac lover. The germ of the idea can be found in Prop. 2.5 itself, where the angry lover urges himself to end the relationship quickly, before he changes his mind (9–14). The gentleness of the rest of that elegy rather belies his intent, and gives the cue for a display of Ovidian wit.[82] So much for the benefits of division. On the other hand, there is no advantage to be gained from reading 3.11 as a single poem (except fidelity to the manuscript tradition, which doesn't really deserve it), and the unexplained change of mind at line 33 is at least disturbing. If anything more is needed to incline the balance toward division of the poem, its similarity in theme and treatment to 2.9a–b (where the reasons for division are stronger) should do the trick.

---

[82] But cf. G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 508.