

Verbera, Catenae, Concubitus: Slaves, Violence and Vulnerability in Ovid's Amores

Katherine R. De Boer

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Classics (Latin).

Chapel Hill
2010

Approved by:

Sharon L. James

James J. O'Hara

Eric S. Downing

© 2010
Katherine R. De Boer
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

KATHERINE R. DE BOER: *Verbera, Catenae, Concubitus*: Slaves, Violence and Vulnerability in Ovid's *Amores*
(Under the direction of Sharon L. James)

This thesis investigates two anomalous factors in Ovid's *Amores* that differentiate this work from the rest of Roman elegiac poetry: the large and varied cast of slave characters who interact with the poetry's speaker, the *amator*, and the speaker's focus on the female body. It argues that these factors are related: by juxtaposing the desired body of the female love-object with the brutalized bodies of slaves, Ovid exposes the reality of the elegiac woman's social inferiority to the *amator* and her consequent physical vulnerability to violence at his hands.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Professor Sharon James, whose work has been a source of great inspiration for me and without whose constant and extremely generous support this thesis could not have been completed. I would also like to thank my readers, Professors Jim O'Hara and Eric Downing, for their advice and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
I. SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	2
II. LITERARY BACKGROUND.....	20
III. <i>AMORES</i> 1.5-1.8.....	34
IV. THE DIPTYCH POEMS.....	53
V. CONCLUSION.....	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	85

INTRODUCTION

Ovid's *Amores* are unique in Roman elegiac poetry because they foreground the physical experiences of the *puella*, the generic object of the lover-poet's impassioned versification. In fact, the *puella* of the *Amores* suffers numerous physical assaults and indignities, including a beating from her *amator* (1.7), the loss of her hair (1.14), and an abortion (2.13-14). Furthermore, the *Amores* contain a large cast of slave and subaltern characters who are also physically vulnerable and portrayed as such: the *ianitor* of 1.6, the *lena* of 1.8, the letter-carrying *ancilla* of 1.11-1.12, the *custos* of 2.2, and the *ornatrix* of 2.7-2.8. Surprisingly, this sizable group of slaves and their vulnerable bodies has attracted very little critical attention. The recurrent presence of threatened lower-class bodies is a striking feature of Ovid's poetry which is absent from the rest of the elegiac corpus and, as I will argue here, serves to draw attention to the vulnerability of the most important body of the genre: that of the *puella*. The presence of numerous slave characters who are threatened—both directly and indirectly—with violence and figured as potential—and actual—victims of abuse draws attention to the subordinate status of the elegiac *puella*, who is also a social inferior of the *amator* and, despite his protestations of devotion, is vulnerable to physical attack. Thus, I will argue that the poet of the *Amores* repeatedly juxtaposes the brutalized bodies of slaves with the body of the elegiac beloved in order to expose her social inferiority and consequent physical vulnerability—realities which are elided or ignored by the other elegists.

CHAPTER 1:

Social and Historical Background

In order to investigate the role of slave and subordinate characters in Ovid's poetry, it is first necessary to establish the socio-historical context in which these characters operated. This chapter will show that the slave and the *meretrix*—or free high-class prostitute, a class to which the elegiac *puella* must belong¹—existed on a continuum of violence: the *meretrix*, although a free woman, was subject to the same kinds of physical assaults that were the everyday lot of slaves. Her social subordination—which was, as will be shown, in many ways comparable to that of a slave—placed her in a hazardous position in relation to the *amator*, an elite male Roman citizen whose higher social status gave him a license and control over his beloved's body similar to his license and control over his slaves'. The *puella*'s social class is elided by the other elegists, but Ovid, by linking her body to the bodies of slave characters, exposes her status as *infamis* and thus demonstrates the extent of the inequality behind the relationship between *amator* and *puella*. By establishing the vulnerability of the slave's body to the will of a citizen master, this chapter will show just how disturbing Ovid's association of slave and *puella* is, in view of the scope and horror of the violence exercised against slave bodies.

¹ See James (2003a): 36-52 with discussion below (page 13).

According to Roman law, a slave was a piece of property, a chattel. Thus, Cato the censor's chilling advice on the responsibilities of the male citizen farmer: "he should sell the old cows, the blemished cows, the blemished sheep, wool, hides; the old wagon the old tools, the old slave, the sick slave, and whatever else is superfluous" (*boves vetulos, armenta delicula, oves deliculas, lanam, pelles, plostrum vetus, ferramenta vetera, servum senem, servum morbosum, et si quid aliud supersit, vendat, De. Agr.2.10*). Yet the slave was also a human being, and his servile status could be transitory: manumission was a regular occurrence for domestic slaves, and a man who could be beaten to death today might tomorrow put on the Cap of Liberty and become a citizen, albeit of a second-class sort. Moreover, enslavement was a possibility, although an unlikely one, for a Roman citizen as well. This is suggested by the numerous kidnap plots of Roman comedy and is confirmed by the later legal sources, which show that children who were exposed by their parents could be raised as slaves.² Varro's paradoxical characterization of the slave as a "speaking instrument," (*instrumentum vocale, RR 1.17.1*) reflects what McCarthy (2000: 22) describes as the slave's "unresolved subjectivity": a slave was property, but it was also a human being with human feelings.³ Slaves were, as Fitzgerald (2000: 5) puts it, "a shadow humanity": a group of people that

² See Evans-Grubbs 2007. Cf. Walters (1997): 39; Fitzgerald (2000): 87.

³ As Gaius Matius, Caesar's boyhood friend, wrote to Cicero: *At haec etiam servis semper libera fuerunt, ut timerent, gauderent, dolerent, suo potius quam alterius arbitrio* ("Even slaves have always been allowed to feel fear, joy, or grief by their own will rather than another's," *Ad Fam.* 11.28.3). Cicero himself provides a good example of a *dominus* who recognized the innate humanity of his slaves: in his letters, he fairly dithers over the health of his beloved freedman Tiro, showing his concern for and reliance on his former slave: *Tu autem tibi hoc persuade: si commodo valetudinis tuae fieri possit, nihil me malle quam te esse mecum; si autem intelliges opus esse te Patris convallescendi causa paullum commorari, nihil me malle quam te valere* ("But rest assured, if your health permits, then there is nothing more important to me than your presence with me, but if you think that you need to delay a little at Patrae for the sake of your convalescence, then there is nothing more important to me than your health," *Ad. Fam.* 16.1.2).

retained the feelings and impulses of human beings without the corresponding freedoms of autonomy and self-determination.

This paradox was, naturally, a matter of concern to slave-owners: they lived cheek by jowl with a group of people who legally belonged to them but whose subjectivity represented a constant threat. Thus Seneca quotes the well-known maxim “You have as many enemies as you have slaves” (*totidem hostes, quot servos esse, Epist. 47.5*). As Pliny the Younger puts it, when describing the gruesome fate of a master murdered in his bath by his slaves, “You see what dangers, what indignities, what insults we are subject to; nor can anyone be safe because he is lenient and kind” (*vides quot periculis quot contumeliis quot ludibriis simus obnoxii; nec est quod quisquam possit esse securus, quia sit remissus et mitis, Epist. 3.14.5*). An epigram of Martial reveals the jeopardy in which an elite man placed himself every day, simply by sitting down for his toilette: “What if my barber first brandished his drawn razor, then demanded freedom and riches?” (*quid si me tonsor, cum stricta novacula supra est / tunc libertatem divitasque roget, Epig. 11.58.5-6*; cf. Cic. *De Offic. 2.25*). The most frequent means of controlling the slave’s subjectivity, of preventing his rebellion, was intimidation: as Propertius says, “The fearful slave has greater loyalty” (*maioremque timens seruus habere fidem, Prop. 3.6.4*).⁴ This is the justification for the custom that, if an owner was killed by a slave, all the other slaves in the household, regardless of their complicity, should suffer the same reprisals. As Tacitus, in a speech given by Gaius Cassius, explains:

⁴ Cf. Cicero *De Offic.* 2.24: “But violence must be employed by those who keep the conquered under control by force, as you will do to your slaves, if they cannot be controlled otherwise” (*Sed iis, qui vi oppressos imperio coercent, sit sane adhibenda saevitia, ut eris in famulos, si aliter teneri non possunt*).

suspecta maioribus nostris fuerunt ingenia servorum, etiam cum in agris aut domibus i[s]dem nascerentur caritatemque dominorum statim acciperent. postquam vero nationes in familiis habemus, quibus diversi ritus, externa sacra aut nulla sunt, conluviem istam non nisi metu coercueris.

The dispositions of slaves were mistrusted by our ancestors, even when they were born in the same estates or houses and immediately received the affection of their masters. But now that we have nations amongst our households who have different customs, whose morals are different or nonexistent, you will not repress such a cesspit except through fear.

(*Ann.* 14.44.3)⁵

Violence was thus a master's right towards his slaves (as property) and his defense against them (as human beings). Torture was regularly employed as means of discipline, but the slave owner's entitlements extended to casual and gratuitous brutality that created a climate of fear and violence.

The comedies of Plautus provide an excellent source on the ways and means of slave torture because they are, as Fitzgerald (2000: 37) puts it, "saturated with references to punishment." Libanus, the clever slave of the *Asinaria*, demonstrates the scope of the punishments to which slaves were subjected in his catalog of the torture devices he has suffered in the past, but has 'defeated' on this occasion by fulfilling his master's orders:

stimulos, lamminas, crucesque compedesque,
nervos, catenas, carceres, numellas, pedicas, boias
indoctoresque acerrumos gnarosque nostri tergi,
qui saepe ante in nostras scapulas cicatrices indiderunt.

Whips, brands, crosses, and shackles,
ropes, chains, prisons, cables, fetters, yokes,
and those taskmasters, vicious and well-acquainted with our backs,

⁵ Similarly, Parker (1989: 233-246) argues that the abundance of reference to and jokes about slave torture in the comedies of Plautus reflects Roman society's increasing fear of slave subjectivity in the form of the unprecedented number of servile revolts that occurred following the influx of slaves into Italy during Rome's early wars of expansion.

who have often made scars on our shoulders.
(*Asin.* 548-551)⁶

These instruments of torture are not only available as punishments for extreme disobedience, but could be part of the day-to-day routine for many domestic slaves. Hence Demipho, the *senex* of *Mercator*, casually includes beatings in the daily lot of female slaves:

nihil opust nobis ancilla nisi quae texat, quae molat,
lignum caedat, pensum faciat, aedis verrat, vapulet,
quae habeat cottidianum familiae coctum cibum.

We have no need for a slave girl, except one who can weave, grind flour,
chop wood, spin wool, sweep the house, take a beating,
and cook the daily meal for the household.
(*Merc.* 397-399)

In a similar vein, the pimp of Plautus' *Pseudolus* complains that his slaves' backs are so hardened by the scars of previous beatings that striking them now hurts him instead of them (*ita plagis costae callent | quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas*, 135-136). Although Plautus might be accused of comic exaggeration, his representation of slave torture as routine and commonplace has been confirmed by the so-called *Lex Libitina Puteolana* (AE 1971 88 & 89), a set of inscriptions unearthed at Puteoli that establish the prices for, among other things, having your slaves tortured or crucified by a professional *carnifex*: private citizens pay only four sesterces for this service and magistrates may have the public slaves tortured for free (88.2.10-14). The ultimate penalty was, of course, crucifixion; what Cicero calls the "the extreme and supreme punishment of slavery" (*servitutis extremum summumque supplicium*, *In Verr.* 5.169) and the "the cruelest and

⁶ Wiseman (1985: 5-6) provides detailed references on Roman instruments of torture, including the barbed lash (*flagellum*, *stimulus*), the rack (*eculeus*, *fidiculae*), and the red-hot plates (*lamminae*).

most offensive punishment” (*crudelissimum taeterrimumque supplicium*, *In Verr.* 5.165): the form of death that offered the most excruciating torture and was reserved specifically for slaves.⁷

In addition to their physical vulnerability—to beatings, torture, and execution—slaves were also subject to numerous other threats and means of control. The most prominent of these, a regular feature of threats against slaves in Roman comedy, was relegation to the mill (*pistrinum*), where slaves were subjected to hard labor, grinding grain into meal by hand, until they died. Slaves in comedy frequently express fear of the mill: Libanus of *Asinaria* describes it as “the place where worthless men weep as they grind the barley, amidst the lands of club-thwacking and chain-rattling” (*ubi flent nequam homines, qui polentam pinsitant | apud fustitudinas, ferricrepinas insulas*, *Asin.* 32-33).⁸ Over three hundred years later, Apuleius paints a grim portrait of working conditions in the mill in the *Metamorphoses*:

Dii boni, quales illic homunculi vibicibus lividis totam cutem depicti
dorsumque plagosum scissili centunculo magis inumbrati quam obtecti,
nonnulli exiguo tegili tantum modo pubem iniecti, cuncti tamen sic
tunicati ut essent per pannulos manifesti, frontes litterati et capillum
semirasi et pedes anulati, tum lurore deformes et fumosis tenebris
vaporosae caliginis palpebras adesi atque adeo male luminanti et in
modum pugilum, qui pulvisculo perspersi dimicant, farinulenta cinere
sordide candidati.

⁷ Cicero’s outrage in the *In Verrem* is caused by the fact that this “punishment for slaves” was directed against a Roman citizen: although his victim protested *civis Romanus sum*, he was nevertheless born away to be crucified (5.168; cf. 5.170: *facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, prope parricidium necare: quid dicam in crucem tollere?*); cf. Tacitus *Hist.* 4.11 (*servile supplicium*); Valerius Maximus 2.7.12 (*supplicium in servilem modum*).

⁸ Cf. *Bacchides*, 779-780; *Menaechmi*, 974-979; *Mostellaria*, 15-16; *Persa*, 420 (*pistrinorum civitas*); and *Pseudolus*, 494-501.

Ye gods, what pathetic little men—painted all over their bodies with livid welts; their beaten backs shaded rather than clothed in tattered rags, some wearing scraps that covered only their genitals, but all clothed in such a way that their bodies were visible through their rags, their foreheads branded, their hair shorn, and their feet shackled, They were ghastly pale and their eyes were worn by the smoky gloom of the humid darkness so they could hardly see, and they were like boxers who fight coated with dust, in that they were whitened by the dirty ash of the flour.
(*Met.* 9.12)

A related threat is the fear of re-sale and consequent upheaval—a prospect which could easily be terrifying, even for a slave leaving an abusive household. As Fitzgerald (2000: 3) points out, a domestic slave had the advantage of regular interaction with the slave-owner and was therefore more likely to receive a wage (*peculium*) and eventually be manumitted (and also enjoyed certain creature comforts). Re-sale, especially with bad references, could lead to the mill, the mines, or the *ergastula*, the chain-gang barracks of the wealth landowner's estates, and a life of hard labor with almost no prospect for eventual freedom. In addition, while slaves were usually permitted to form relationships and produce children,⁹ their 'marriages' had no validity in law and, as Bradley (1984: 53) demonstrates, the papyrological evidence indicates that slave owners had no interest in keeping families together.¹⁰ Even if the slave was not being separated from family or loved ones, his experiences in the markets were, as Bradley shows, humiliating and degrading: he could be subjected to a variety of cosmetic treatments to make him appear

⁹ In fact, as Bradley (1984: 55) shows, female slaves were often bought specifically for breeding purposes: as he writes, "there is no example on record of a female slave being sold who might not have been expected to bear children after sale."

¹⁰ The papyrological evidence includes no cases of a husband and wife being sold together, although occasionally mothers were sold with young children. Thus, as Bradley writes, "it seems on statistical grounds alone that slave-owners were not affected when they sold slaves by any interest in preserving whatever familial ties their slaves had formed, with one or two exceptions" (1984: 53).

healthier or more attractive and then examined like a piece of goods.¹¹ Moreover, the experience of being trafficked was necessarily one of alienation and upheaval, as is shown by the pathetic question “Whose am I?” (*quoia sum*, Plaut. *Merc.* 528), put in the mouth of a female slave who has been dizzied by the sudden change in her ownership. A slave being sold would be uprooted from his home, from any ties of family or friendship he had formed, and sold to a stranger, whose rules and requirements he would have to learn—or suffer the consequences.¹² He might be transported to another part of the world where he could be unfamiliar with the local language or customs, a situation which would, as Marshall (forthcoming) points out, result in an increased dependence on the slave-owner. Re-sale thus presented numerous hazards and could provide another motivation for obedience.

In addition to their vulnerabilities to torture, hard labor, and re-sale, slaves of both genders were also subject to sexual abuse. It is clear from the countless references to sexual relationships with slaves in Roman literature that such relationships were the norm rather than the exception, and many slaves (such as Pasicompsa, the *meretrix* of Plautus’ *Mercator*, referred to above) were bought solely for sexual purposes.¹³ While there was a strong taboo against relationships between free women and slaves,¹⁴ there was no such prohibition on relationships between a free man and slaves of either gender. Nor was

¹¹ Bradley (1984): 115-117.

¹² James (2010) demonstrates how Pasicompsa, the much-trafficked *meretrix* of Plautus’ *Mercator*, immediately—and cleverly—sets herself to discovering her new role and ingratiating herself with her new master.

¹³ Cf. Walters (1997: 39): “The fact that a slave, male or female, was at the disposal of his or her master for sexual use was so commonplace as to be scarcely noted in Roman sources.”

¹⁴ See Watson (1987): 10-11.

there any acknowledgment that sex with a slave constituted abuse: as Saller (1998: 89) points out, while Seneca criticizes a married man's uses of slaves for sexual purposes on the grounds that it was an *iniuria* to his wife, no one appears to have considered that such practices may have constituted an *iniuria* to the slave. Similarly, while Martial criticizes one Quirinalis for producing *equitibus vernis* ("knight-slaves," 1.84.4) with his *ancillae*, his complaint is that Quirinalis (a play on *Quiris*, "citizen") refuses to have a wife and so is not fulfilling the obligation of a citizen to produce legitimate offspring.¹⁵

The casual attitude towards sex with slaves is indicated by another famous epigram, 6.39, in which the *matrona* of the household has born seven children—to her slaves. Says Martial to the wronged husband: "Screw your son, if you want—it's not a sin" (*percide, si uis, filium: nefas non est*, 6.39.14). Equally chilling is the case of Plautus' *Casina*, in which the eponymous slave girl, who has been brought up by the lady of the household "like a daughter" (*quasi si esset ex se nata*, 46), becomes, upon reaching puberty, an object of lust for every man in the house: the *senex*, who has acted as her father; the *adulescens*, his son, and the slaves who are co-opted by the free men to 'marry' her so that their masters may secure sexual access to her (*Cas.* 47-49). It is significant that, although the mistress of the house sides with her son and attempts to thwart her husband by marrying Casina to one of her own slaves, she does not object to Casina's sexual initiation outright—it is apparently accepted without question that Casina must be used by someone, even if that use amounts to rape. While Casina herself does not appear on stage, another *ancilla*, Pardalisca, enacts the despair and anger that would naturally be felt by a young girl who has become nothing more than an object to men she

¹⁵ Cf. Fitzgerald (2000): 52.

grew up with and trusted (*Cas.* 621-719).¹⁶ As Bradley (1984: 118) writes, “Sexual abuse was to be expected by [slaves] just as much as other forms of maltreatment, and...there is likely to have been in consequence much dehumanisation at work in slave life about which nothing is heard in conventional sources.”

A slave’s life was, therefore, lived on a razor’s edge: slave-owners had absolute power and could mete out torture or punishment for even the most trivial offenses. Roman literature abounds in stories of masters administering horrific punishments on a whim: the woman who whips her slaves because her husband slept with his back to her the night before (Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.475-480), the glutton who beats his slaves if they cough or sneeze or hiccup during his dinner (Seneca, *Epist.* 47.3), and, perhaps most horrific, the slave who barely escapes being eaten alive by lampreys because he broke a crystal bowl (Seneca, *De Ira* 3.40.2; Dio 54.23.1).¹⁷ As Bradley (1984, 121) puts it, “The omnipotence of the master over the slave was such that the way was open not just for the exercise of these, as it were, standard types of physical punishment and mistreatment, but also for the devising of exceptional acts of cruelty in which sadistic tendencies on the part of some owners stand out clearly.”¹⁸

¹⁶ See Gellar-Goad (2009): 8 and Andrews (2005): 455.

¹⁷ In this case, the emperor Augustus happened to be present and pardoned the slave, but we can imagine how many others were not so lucky.

¹⁸ It should be noted that one of the responsibilities of the *praefectus urbi* at Rome (an office established by Augustus) and of the governor abroad was to hear complaints and petitions from slaves seeking refuge from excessive cruelty. Yet, as Bradley (1984: 124) points out, this right was most likely of little use—not only was an elite slave-owner likely to favor another elite slave-owner over a slave, but the slave’s master, as Bradley puts it, “cannot be expected usually to have given permission to leave the household or estate for complaints to be made against himself.”

Most importantly, it is the vulnerability to these kinds of punishments that distinguished slave from free: as Walters (1997: 30) writes, “social status was characterized on the basis of perceived bodily integrity and freedom, or the lack of it, from invasion from the outside.” This invasion could take the form of either sexual assault or beatings: as violent assaults undertaken by a figure of superior power on an inferior, the two were “structurally equivalent.”¹⁹ Furthermore, the free citizen’s protection from physical assault was, as Edwards (1993: 124) points out, “one of the hallmarks” of his citizen status: “Liability to corporal punishment was one of the most vivid symbols of the distinction between free and slave in Rome.” That this distinction was legal as well as social is made clear by Cicero’s *Pro Rabirio*: “The Porcian law removed the rods from the bodies of all Roman citizens” (*Porcia lex virgas ab omnium civium Romanorum corpore amovit*, 12) as well as the *In Verrem*, in which Cicero expresses outrage at Verres’ flogging of a Roman citizen:

at quam ob causam, di immortales! tametsi iniuriam facio communi
causae et iuri civitatis; quasi enim ulla possit esse causa cur hoc cuiquam
civi Romano iure accidat, ita quaero quae in Servilio causa fuerit.

But for what reason—ye gods! Although in asking I am injuring the
common cause and the rights of citizenship, as if there could be any
reason why such a punishment could lawfully be administered against a
Roman citizen, still I ask, for what reason it was administered against
Servilius.

(*In. Verr.* 5.141)

The primary distinction between free and slave is, therefore, one of physical integrity and autonomy: the slave is defined as a person whose body can be raped or beaten, while a

¹⁹ Walters (1997): 37. Thus, Adams (1982: 145-149) lists several examples of Roman words for striking or beating that were used as expressions for sexual penetration (e.g. *caedo* and *battuo*). Cf. Saller (1991): 151-154.

free man is defined as someone whose body cannot.²⁰ I therefore turn, now, to the other kind of vulnerable body displayed by Ovid's poetry: that of his mistress, the elegiac *puella*.

While the elegiac beloved—elegant, independent, with her learned literary tastes and her house full of servants—may seem as far removed as possible from the brutalized slave with his back hardened by scars, in fact her social condition was not so very different from his. As James (2003a: 36-52) has shown, the elegiac *puella* is a *meretrix*, a high-class professional sex worker, comparable to the Greek *hetaira* or the French courtesan. Her literary ancestor is not Catullus' Lesbia, the degenerate scion of a noble Roman family, but the *meretrices* of Plautus and Terence; women who might be free or freedwomen, but were certainly not, and could never be, citizen wives. As James (2003a: 37-39) points out, the similarities between the elegiac *puella* and the comedic *meretrix* are manifold: both are independent and sexually active women who run their own households and have many lovers who must compete for their attentions via financial support. Furthermore, elegy draws on several comedic type scenes and characters, such as the *paraclausithyron* and the advice of the *lena*, or courtesan-*emerita-cum-procuress*. In addition, as James (2003a: 39) points out, the elegists sometimes compare their *puellae* to famous courtesans of Greek literature and history (Prop. 2.6.1-6; 4.5.43-44; *Am.* 1.5.11-12; *Ars* 3.604). These textual clues all indicate that the elegiac mistress, far from being a wife or marriageable woman, was a member of the *meretrix* class and thus

²⁰ Free citizen women and children cannot be legally raped or beaten but, as Walters (1997: 41) points out, this is due to their relationship with a free citizen man: assault on a man's wife or child was a crime against him and punishable as such.

subject to a set of vulnerabilities—physical, social, and legal—that put her on similar footing to a slave.

The *meretrix*'s legal and social vulnerabilities arise from her status as *infamis* (“disreputable,” “shameful”). Along with other *infames*, such as gladiators and actors, who put their bodies on display or allowed them to be used for profit, prostitutes suffered a number of legal disabilities based on their perceived moral failings. Prominent among these is their citizen status: as was established in the *Lex Iulia* of 9 BCE and reinforced in the *Lex Papia Poppaea* of 18 BCE, an *infamis* could not marry a freeborn Roman (Ulpian, *frag.* 13).²¹ Of greater importance, however, is the *infamis*' vulnerability to corporal punishment: as Edwards (1997: 76) writes “Those who sold their bodies for the pleasure of others forfeited the protection Roman law accorded to the bodies of other citizens.” Their behavior was considered servile and they themselves were therefore legally assimilated to slave status: as Flemming (1999: 57) puts it, prostitutes were considered “more as products than producers, more as wares than workers.” Similarly, Edwards (1997: 76): “they too served the pleasures of others, they too had no dignity, their bodies too were bought and sold.” Thus, like slaves, the bodies of *infames* were vulnerable to physical attack: they were not protected by citizen status or the citizen status of husband or father; they, like slaves, were “penetrable” and could be beaten and raped under the law.

²¹ While, as McGinn (1998) concedes, the legal view of prostitute marriage before Augustus is uncertain, he nevertheless concludes that there was a “broad continuity” in the treatment of prostitutes before and after the Augustan laws and that “Augustus can be considered as having done no more than codify an aspect of the *regimen morum*” (90).

That this legal and physical vulnerability extended to wealthy and independent *meretrices* like the elegiac *puella* is demonstrated by numerous examples in the comedies of Plautus. For example, the *miles gloriosus* of *Truculentus* responds to his mistress' disdain of him by threatening violence not only against her but her entire household, saying "it wouldn't take much to get me to break the ankles of everyone in this house" (*quantillo mi opere nunc persuaderi potest / ut ego his suffringam talos totis aedibus*, *Truc.* 637-638). Later in the play, he responds to his mistress' flirtation with another man by threatening to kill them both (*Truc.* 926-927). It is telling that these threats are leveled against the most manipulative and calculating and least dependent of Plautus' *meretrices*.²² As James (2006: 238-239) writes, "The very status of these women puts them beyond the control of any man....The frustration engendered by this situation regularly seeks an outlet in physical, verbal, and emotional violence, as if force offers the elite male his only recourse against the woman who is proof against his position." Thus, far from being protected by her freedom and independence, the wealthy, autonomous *meretrix* is, in fact, particularly vulnerable.

Nor is it only the aggressive, overbearing soldier-figure who represents a physical threat to the *meretrix* and her household. The opening speech of Astaphium in Plautus' *Truculentus* indicates that an independent *meretrix* is generically vulnerable to the violation of her home by wayward *adulescentes*, who feel justified in robbing those they consider thieves (*Truc.* 95-111).²³ Similarly, the old men of *Bacchides* descend on the

²² See Anderson (1993): 82-87 for a description of the characterization of Phronesium.

²³ Aulus Gellius relates the tale of a curule aedile who brought a lawsuit against a courtesan named Manilia for injuring him with a stone thrown from inside her house (4.14). Manilia responded that the aedile had attempted to break in (*cum vi*, 4.14.5) and that she had been within her rights to drive him off. The court found in favor of the courtesan. McGinn (1998) considers this an example of the legal rights accorded to

house of the *meretrices* who have “corrupted” their sons, demanding payback and threatening to break down the doors to get it (*Bacch.* 1118-1119; 1146-1148). The seductive wiles of these women are their only means of protection against the plight of, for example, Pamphila in Terence’s *Eunuchus*, who is raped in the home of her foster-sister, an independent *meretrix* who has taken her in to protect her from that very fate.²⁴ Significantly, the rapist, a young man named Chaerea, justifies his invasion of the *meretrix*’s house and rape of her (supposed) slave by reference to the character and cruelty of all *meretrices*, saying “Now I’ll pay back those tormenters who hold us and our youth in contempt and who torture us in every way” (*illis crucibu', quae nos nostramque adulescentiam / habent despiciatam et quae nos semper omnibus cruciant modis / nunc referam gratiam, Eun.* 383-385). The *meretrix*, as a prostitute and therefore *infamis*, has it coming: her profession is taken as a sign of immorality, and attacks on her and her household are both justifiable and legal.

Perhaps the most disturbing example of disregard for the rights of a *meretrix* occurs in Plautus’ *Miles Gloriosus*, in which a free and independent courtesan named Philocomasium is carried off against her will (*invitam*, 113) by the eponymous *miles* and forced into a state of virtual sex slavery.²⁵ Although many of Plautus’ *meretrices* were

prostitutes, saying “They were not such outcasts as to be denied every protection or redress under the law” (61). It is significant, however, that *redress* is not at issue here: there is no question of Manilia’s having the right to bring suit against the offending aedile for his attack on her home. She is protected only to the extent that she is not found guilty on an unjust charge, not to the extent that she is able to bring a charge herself.

²⁴ See Konstan (1986): 369-393 for a discussion of Pamphila’s rape and the characterization of her rapist.

²⁵ While the *miles* refers to her as his *concupina*, it is plain that her side of the relationship is involuntary: she explicitly tells the clever slave, Pistoclerus, that she continues to love his former master and hates no one more than she does the soldier (*ait sese Athenas fugere cupere ex hac domu / sese illum amare meum erum, Athenis qui fuit / neque peius quemquam odisse quam istum militem, Miles* 126-128).

kidnapped and sold to pimps as infants, too young to protest or assert their claims to citizenship, Philocomasium is the only *meretrix* kidnapped as an adult and, as the play makes clear, she has no legal recourse: she has been living with the *miles*, though unwillingly, for some time; the protagonists must resort to a complicated scheme to trick the *miles* into voluntarily relinquishing her; and while the *miles* receives his comeuppance in the end, it is a purely private rather than legal matter.²⁶ Another of Plautus' *meretrices*, Samian Bacchis of *Bacchides*, likewise fears that a *miles* to whom she has contracted her sexual availability will keep her as an *ancilla* after the contract expires (*Bacch.* 45). In these cases, the *meretrix*'s *infamia* clearly allows her to be assimilated to slave status, denied her very freedom of movement and self-determination.

In addition to the legal and social vulnerabilities that result from the *meretrix*'s status as *infamis*, she suffers under a number of handicaps arising from her profession as a sex worker. The most obvious of these is the need to maintain her physical attractions: as Gutzwiller (1985: 110) points out, the high-class courtesan must maintain an appropriate level of elegance and fashion in her hairstyle and dress in order to attract wealthy men willing to pay for her company. A related handicap is the *meretrix*'s susceptibility to age: as the *lenae* of comedy and elegy regularly remind their young charges, they will one day grow old and ugly, and at that point they must have enough money saved to support themselves, or they will wind up *ancillae*—or worse. As Bacchis of Terence's *Self-Tormenter* says bluntly:

²⁶ Unlike, for example, the punishment meted out to the pimp of *Persa*, who is to be subjected to legal penalties for purchasing a citizen girl (*Persa* 745-752).

quippe forma impulsus nostra nos amatores colunt;
haec ubi immutata est, illi suum animum alio conferunt:
nisi si prospectum interea aliquid est, desertae vivimus.

It is by our beauty that lovers are driven to take care of us;
when that is gone, they take their love off to someone else:
unless we have made some provision meanwhile, we live abandoned.
(*HT* 389-391)

Furthermore, the *meretrix*, like every other female sex worker before the twentieth century, was at constant risk of pregnancy, which without antibiotics and blood transfusions was a matter of life and death.²⁷ In addition, it was a financial burden: the *meretrix* could not, obviously, continue to service her lovers throughout a pregnancy and the resulting stretch marks were, as James (2003a: 174) points out, “a significant professional hazard” given the elegiac *amator*’s demands for physical perfection.²⁸ Yet the *meretrix* was caught in a cleft stick because abortion was equally life-threatening and could result in scars or internal damage that might also hamper her professionally (see the discussion of *Amores* 2.13-14 below, pages 66-71). The *meretrix* must also have been vulnerable to venereal disease—particularly given the fact that so many of her customers appear to have been professional soldiers with girls in every port—but on this subject the ancient sources are almost entirely silent.

Thus, it is evident that the *meretrix*’s vulnerability is very similar to the slave’s: they are both members of a subordinate class that does not share the rights and privileges

²⁷ McKeown (1998): 277; cf. James (2003a): 173-183.

²⁸ Thus, while the *meretrices* of New Comedy are often interested in having children because, they believe it will secure their future livelihood—whether via support from the putative father or the eventual prostitution of a female child—yet few are willing to undergo the actual rigors of pregnancy and instead resort to ‘borrowing’ (Phronesium of *Truculentus*) or adopting an abandoned child (Melaenis of *Cistellaria*).

of a citizen and whose subordination is particularly marked through the vulnerability of their bodies. This vulnerability means that they must live in fear, constantly adapting and accommodating themselves to the power of their free citizen superiors. As will be discussed in the following chapter, the elegiac *puella*'s social status is a subject avoided by the other elegists, yet the reality of her situation seriously undermines the claims of the elegiac lover to *servitium amoris*. In fact, the power dynamic in the relationship is all in the *amator*'s favor and Ovid exposes this reality by repeatedly linking the *puella*'s body with those of other social subordinates, especially slaves.

CHAPTER 2:

Literary Background

The genre of Roman love elegy emerged, flourished, and faded in a few brief decades during the reign of the emperor Augustus. Only five major elegiac poets are known: Gallus (of whom only eleven lines of poetry survive), Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, and Sulpicia (the only female elegist, with only six surviving poems, her biography—and even her gender—is much debated). Of these, Gallus was acknowledged the original elegist, Tibullus and Propertius followed in his footsteps, and Ovid was, as he himself claims, the successor to all three:

...nec avara Tibullo
tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae.
successor fuit hic tibi, Galle, Propertius illi;
quartus ab his serie temporis ipse fui.

...nor did the greedy fates
give me the opportunity for friendship with Tibullus.
He was your successor, Gallus, and Propertius was his;
I was the fourth after them in the sequence of time.
(*Tristia* 4.10.51-54)

Therefore, to understand the innovations in Ovid's treatment of the bodies of slaves and the elegiac beloved, it is first necessary to review their treatment in Propertius and Tibullus, whose poetry forms the *materia* of Ovid's own and whose conventions he exploits and overturns.

It must also be acknowledged that, in their focus on heterosexual love affairs with a specific, named mistress, Propertius and Tibullus (and Gallus!) themselves owe a debt to Catullus, whose poems on his beloved Lesbia are often cited as the literary ancestor of Roman elegy. Yet Catullus should not be overestimated as a model for the later elegiac poets—until recently, scholarship has, to paraphrase Wray (2001: 4), tended to privilege his life over his works and the Lesbia poems over the rest of the corpus. Yet, of the 116 poems and fragments in the Catullan corpus, only thirteen mention Lesbia by name and perhaps a dozen others may be interpreted as referring directly to her.²⁹ Furthermore, Catullus depicted his relationship with his beloved quite differently than did the later elegists: while they, as we shall see, often presented their *amatores* as helpless slaves to cruel and dominating mistresses, Catullus, strikingly, refers to the *amator's* relationship with Lesbia as “this eternal pact of holy friendship” (*aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae*, 109.6).³⁰ As Ross has pointed out, *foedus* and *amicitia* are terms that refer to political and social alliances between men³¹ and this observation is supported by the *amator's* remarkable claim, in *Carmen* 73, “I loved you then not just as most people love their girlfriends, but as a father loves his sons and his sons-in-law” (*dilexi tum te non*

²⁹ The poems which refer to Lesbia by name are *Carmina* 5, 7, 43, 51, 58a, 72, 75, 79, 83, 86, 87, 92, and 107. Those which refer to a *puella* or *deliciae* who may be identified as Lesbia include *Carmina* 2, 3, 8, 11, 37, 56, 60, 68b, 70, 76, 104, and 109. It is interesting that the addressee of *Carmen* 42, referred to as a *putida moecha* who has stolen the poet's writing tablets, is seldom identified as Lesbia—perhaps because the sentiments of the poem are considered too unattractive to be applied to the putative love of Catullus' life. Yet Lesbia was certainly a *moecha* (cc. 51; 83) and her lovers are identified as *moechi* in *Carmen* 11.

³⁰ Cf. 87.3-4: *nulla fides ullo fuit umquam in foedere tanta | quanta in amore tuo ex parte repta mea est* (“there was never such great faithfulness in any treaty | as that found—on my part—in my love for you”).

³¹ Ross (1969): 80-94.

tantum ut vulgus amicam / sed pater ut gnatos diligit et generos, 72.3-4). Catullus' use of the vocabulary of male relationships to describe the romance with Lesbia and his comparison of the *amator*'s love for her to that of a father for his male relatives indicates that Catullus saw their relationship as a bond between equals—a far cry from the enslavement envisioned by Propertius and Tibullus.

Furthermore, while the poetry of Catullus is populated by a wide-ranging and engaging cast of characters—including beloved friends, despised enemies, and some of the most prominent political figures of the day—most appear to be the poet's social equals or superiors. Exceptions include several “girlfriends” (*deliciae, amores*) of the speaker's friends, who appear to be *meretrices* and are described in contemptuous terms: the “feverish whore” (*nescio quid febriculosi / scorti*, 6.4-5) who is wearing out the bedstead of Flavius and the “little tart” (*scortillum*, 10.3) who is associating with Varus. The only named examples of this type are Ipsitilla, to whom the poet addresses an urgent missive requesting “nine continuous fuck-fests” (*novem continuas fututiones*, 32.8) and Aemeana, the “girlfriend of the bankrupt from Formiae” (*decoctoris amica Formiani*, 41.4; 43.5), whom the speaker calls “that fucked-out girl” (*puella defututa*, 41.1) and compares unfavorably with Lesbia (c. 43). Slaves are almost invisible in Catullus' poetry, with the exception of a brief and somewhat mysterious poem in which the speaker describes a hilarious incident (*rem ridiculam...et iocosam*, 56.1): he found a slave boy “banging” (*trusantem*, 56.6) a girl and sodomized him (*hunc... protelo rigida mea cecidi*, 56.6-7) in turn.³² This is the only poem in the collection to treat the abuse of a slave, and

³² There has been widespread critical disagreement on the interpretation of this poem, with the major questions being the meaning of *trusantem* and the number of people involved. Housman (1931: 402) argues that the boy is masturbating alone when the speaker discovers him, but as Tanner (1972: 507) shows, the

the circumstances are left so vague as to be unrecoverable: is the boy the *puer delicatus* of the speaker or the *puella*? Is the *puella* the mistress of the speaker, specifically Lesbia? Who is the “Cato” to whom the poem is addressed and why is he expected to find particular pleasure in this anecdote? All that can be established is that slaves and their mistreatment by no means form a recurrent theme in the poetry of Catullus as they do in the poetry of Ovid.

Similarly, the beloved’s body is not the object of voyeuristic or violent attention for Catullus as it is for the later elegists. Lesbia is never described in detail, and when physical features are referred to, the speaker tends to describe *another* woman’s attributes, which, he concludes, are inferior to Lesbia’s. Thus, nose, foot, eyes, fingers, mouth, and tongue are described in *Carmen* 43—but these body parts belong to Ameana, and the poet simply concludes “Is my Lesbia compared with you? What a witless, tasteless age!” (*tecum Lesbia nostra comparatur? / o saeculum insapiens et infacetum!* 43.7-8).³³ Similarly, the poet seldom describes Lesbia, or his desire for her, in sexual terms: as Fredrick (1997: 177) points out “the physical contact allowed to [the beloved’s body] is oblique”—thousands of kisses are requested in poems 5 and 7, but the closest the Catullan lover-poet comes to a description of sexual intercourse with his mistress is “my darling ended up in my lap” (*lux mea se nostrum contulit in gremium*, 86b.132). As

usage *protelo* implies, as he puts it, a “*series triplex*” and this would fit with the identification of *puellae* as a “dative of motion towards” (Ellis 1876: 158). Most critics agree on the fate of the boy in line 7. The exception is Bailey (1976: 348) who amends *hunc* to *hanc*, thus normalizing the encounter to a respectably heterosexual one. Interestingly, Scott (1969: 26-27) identifies the *pupulum* as Clodius, the younger brother of Clodia Metelli, who is usually equated with Catullus’ Lesbia, and with whom Clodius was supposed to have had an incestuous relationship. While this is an intriguing suggestion, there is no textual support for it and the only other poem of the collection to treat Clodius (c. 79) is much less ambiguous, both in its use of the masculine form of “Lesbia” and its pun on his family’s cognomen *Pulcher* (*Lesbius est pulcher*, 79.1).

³³ Similarly, one Quintia is called “clear, tall, and straight” (*candida, longa / recta*, 86.1-2), but it is Lesbia who is *formosa* and *pulcherrima* (86.5).

Fredrick (1997: 176) points out, however, Lesbia's sexuality *is* explicitly described when she is being unfaithful to the poet. Thus, the speaker's friends Furius and Aurelius are directed to deliver her a message:

cum suis vivat valeatque moechis
quos simul complexa tenet trecentos
nullum amans vere, sed identidem omnium
ilia rumpens.

Long may she live and flourish with her gallants
embracing three hundred of them at once
loving none truly, but breaking all their cocks
over and over.

(11.17-20)

Similarly, in a poem addressed to Caelius, the speaker complains that his beloved Lesbia “now, in crossroads and alleyways, is jacking off the great-hearted descendants of Remus” (*nunc in quadriuis et angiportis / glubit magnanimos Remi nepotes*, 58a.4-5). Fredrick (1997: 176) argues that “the disfiguring effect of jealousy is projected, through Catullus’ invective, onto [Lesbia’s] body...Catullus’ attacks on Lesbia focus on specific sexual acts and the anatomy involved.”³⁴ Yet in poem 11, above, it is the anatomy of the *moechi*, not Lesbia, that is explicitly referenced and in poem 58a the word *glubit* is quite abstract, referring literally to “shucking” or “peeling.” Similarly, poem 37 describes a bordello and its habitués in graphic detail, but Lesbia has simply “taken up residence there” (*consedit istic*, 37.14). Thus, the poet is *not* explicit about Lesbia’s body: he does not expose her to the voyeuristic gaze of his readers or describe her in unambiguously sexual terms; he does not relentlessly seek sex with her or describe that sex—rather, his greatest desire is “that we may prolong for our whole lives this eternal pact of holy

³⁴ Cf. Greene (1999: 32): “[Lesbia] is no longer the beloved object of desire but an inhuman monster whom the speaker can mock and reject.”

friendship” (*ut liceat nobis tota perducere vita / aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae*, 109.5-6). Nor, although Fredrick (1997: 176) describes poem 11 as “a violent representation,” does the poet ever physically harm or threaten his mistress—even in the context of sexual play. Thus, the roots of the pattern of violence, vulnerability, and voyeurism that Ovid employs in the *Amores* must be sought in the works of the surviving Augustan elegists, Propertius and Tibullus.

Indeed, in the earlier elegists, the *puella*’s body is the object both of the *amator*’s sexual gaze and his impulse to violence. Although the two named *puellae* of the Tibullan corpus, Delia and Nemesis, receive very little in the way of physical description,³⁵ the Tibullan *amator* constantly returns to the theme of violence, exposing, as James (2003a: 188) writes, an anger that is “systemic, constant, but repressed, and always seeking an outlet.” The transitions from idyllic descriptions of love to scenes of violence are abrupt and jarring. Thus, in poem 1.1, the *amator* expresses his wish to die at Delia’s side (1.1.59-60) and reminds her that, since death is approaching, now is the time to enjoy sex (1.1.69-70). That enjoyment, however, is manifested in violence—specifically the attack on the mistress’ house (where she is presumably shut up with another man) and the *rixa*, or sexual quarrel, a form of play which, as James (2003a: 188) notes, may easily be elided with physical assault. Thus, the Tibullan *amator* urges: “Now’s the time to enjoy light-hearted sex, while it’s not shameful to break down door-posts and it’s pleasing to be involved in sexual quarrels” (*nunc levis est tractanda venus, dum frangere postes / non pudet et rixas inservisse iuvat*, 1.1.73-74). This formulation suggests that the violence of

³⁵ Cf. Fredrick (1997): 186;

the *rixa* and the assault on the beloved's house are a standard and pleasurable part of elegiac sex.

Similarly, when the lover-poet imagines himself dying on Phaeacia, he envisions the idyllic Elysium that awaits him, filled with choruses, sweet bird-song, flowering roses—and elegiac violence. Here in Elysium, where Venus rules (*ipsa Venus...ducet*, 1.3.58), “The crowd of young men frolics, mixed in with tender girls, and love constantly stirs up battles” (*ac iuvenum series teneris immixta puellis / ludit et adsidue proelia miscet amor*, 1.3.63-64). Furthermore, in poem 1.10, the Tibullan *amator* describes violence as the natural outcome of daily activities, in this case, a festal sacrifice: the *rusticus*, returning home with wife in children in tow, is “rather drunk” (*male sobrius*, 1.10.51) and, thus “the wars of Venus heat up” (*sed veneris tunc bella calent*, 1.10.53)—hair is torn, doors are broken, and cheeks are bruised (1.10.53-55). As Fredrick (1997: 187) notes, in this sequence “What begins as rustic rape...shifts to familiar elegiac ground”—the *rusticus* would hardly need to break down doors in order to gain sexual access to the wife he is bringing home from a festival, and the object of violence is first called *uxor* (1.10.52), then *femina* (1.10.54), and finally *puella* (1.10.59)—thus emphasizing that all classes and types of women are subject to this kind of assault. The poems of Tibullus' first book thus suggest that violence is a normal part of sex—whether elegiac or not—and the elegiac *puella* is, therefore, at constant risk of sexual assault.

Propertius, too, constructs the *rixa* as a standard—and enjoyable—part of elegiac sex. Furthermore, the *amator*'s beloved, Cynthia, plays a much greater role as a character in the text than Propertius' Delia or Nemesis, so the *rixae* that the poet describes are recounted as specific, rather than generic, events. Sexual violence is even described as a

source of inspiration for the lover-poet: as he writes, “If she struggles naked with me, her clothing torn away, then indeed we compose long *Iliads*” (*seu nuda erepto mecum luctatur amictu / tum vero longas condimus Iliadas*, 2.1.13-14). In fact, the Propertian lover-poet seems to find the *rixa* the most enjoyable part of sex. Poem 2.15, which opens with the poet’s cry of “oh, happy me!” (*o me felicem*, 2.15.1) then goes on to describe the joys he is celebrating:

quam multa apposita narramus verba lucerna,
 quantaque sublato lumine rixa fuit!
 nam modo nudatis mecum est luctata papillis,
 interdum tunica duxit operta moram.

How many words we spoke while the lamp was lit
 and what a great quarrel there was when the light was taken away!
 For first she struggled with me with her nipples bared
 and meanwhile, covered by her tunic, she caused a delay.
 (2.15.3-6)

Not only does this poem rejoice in sexual violence, it exposes Cynthia’s body to the voyeuristic gaze of the reader: her naked breasts (2.14.5), her mouth, her arms, and her lips (2.14.8-10) are all mentioned—but the poet wants more. The repetition of the adjective *nudus* in lines 13-16 leads up to a threat of real violence:

quod si pertendens animo vestita cubaris,
 scissa veste meas experiere manus:
 quin etiam, si me ulterius provexerit ira,
 ostendes matri bracchia laesa tuae.

“But if you stubbornly come to bed clothed
 your clothes will be torn and you’ll feel my fists:
 moreover, if anger provokes me further,
 you’ll show bruised arms to your mother.”
 (2.15.17-20)

The supposed playfulness of the *rixa* is, thus, easily transformed into real hostility. As James (2003a: 188) argues “The *rixa* substitutes for a physical assault by functioning as

the sanctioned outlet for the lover-poet's anger and violence, which are always simmering beneath the surface." The line between playful aggression and actual assault is unclear: at what point does the "struggling" (2.15.5) of the *rixa* lead to real violence and real fear?

In fact, both the Propertian and Tibullan lover-poets shrink from true violence and both condemn it. Although he will threaten Cynthia with bruising and torn clothes in poem 2.15, the Propertian *amator* explicitly disavows violence as punishment for Cynthia's infidelity in poem 2.5:

nec tibi periuro scindam de corpore vestis,
nec mea praeclusas fregerit ira fores,
nec tibi conexos iratus carpere crinis,
nec duris ausim laedere pollicibus.

I would not tear your clothes from your lying body,
my anger wouldn't break down closed doors.
Despite my anger, I wouldn't dare to tear your braided hair
or to bruise you with my hard fists.

(2.5.21-24)

The reason for this renunciation is simple: it is discreditable to hit a girl; it is the province of a *rusticus*, not a poet (2.5.25-26). Similarly, while the poet threatens to kill both Cynthia and himself in response to her leaving him for another man (2.8.25-26), this death is described as "shameful" (*inhonesta*, 2.8.27 & 28). Likewise, Tibullus, after describing the *veneris...bella* at 1.10.53-58), nevertheless cautions that there is a limit to allowable sexual violence:

a, lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam
verberat: e caelo deripit ille deos.
sit satis e membris tenuem rescindere vestem,
sit satis ornatus dissoluisse comae,
sit lacrimas movisse satis: quater ille beatus,
quo tenera irato flere puella potest.

Ah, he is stone and iron, whoever beats his girl:
he rips the gods from heaven.
It should be enough to tear her flimsy dress from her body,
it should be enough to have messed up her hairstyle,
it should be enough to have caused tears—the man is four times blessed
at whose anger a gentle girl can weep.

(1.10.59-64)

Thus, the Tibullan *amator* also draws a distinction between acceptable forms of violence and the unacceptable beating—but still acknowledges the *amator*'s generic anger against the *puella*, revealed in his desire to see her weep.³⁶

Thus, while the Propertian and Tibullan *amatores* both acknowledge the erotic pleasures of the *rixa* and the Propertian speaker occasionally threatens his mistress with violence, real violence is never carried out: as Barsby (1973: 91) points out, “Propertius and Tibullus talk about striking their mistresses without ever doing so.” Violence in the early elegists is imaginary, even wishful—but it is never actual. In fact, upon closer observation, the agent of the *rixae* described by Propertius may not be the *amator*, but Cynthia herself. She is the subject of the verb “struggled” in poems 2.1 and 2.15 (*luctatur*, 2.1.13; *est luctata*, 2.15.5) and, in poem 3.8, she curses the *amator*, up-ends a table, throws wine-goblets at him, and scratches his hair, face, and chest with her nails (3.8.2-8).³⁷ The lover claims to enjoy this abuse, calling it a “sweet quarrel” (*dulcis...rixa*, 3.8.1) and claiming that it offers “signs of true passion” (*veri...signa caloris*, 3.8.9). In fact, he wishes a kind-hearted girl on his enemies (*hostibus eveniat lenta puella meis*, 3.8.19) and prays that his friends may see his bruises (*vulnera, livor*) as proof that he belongs to Cynthia (3.8.20-21). These marks are reminiscent of the *bracchia laesa* with

³⁶ See James (2003b: *passim*).

³⁷ A similar brawl occurs in 4.8, but is less erotically enjoyable for the *amator*. See below, page 28.

which he threatened Cynthia at 2.15.20, but here the bruises are real, not imaginary. Thus, while violence is fantasized, described, and even threatened in the elegies of Propertius and Tibullus, it is never enacted by the lover-poet—it is left to Ovid, as we shall see, to introduce an *amator* who truly beats his mistress.

Similarly, the slave character, to whom Ovid gives such prominence, is almost entirely absent from the elegies of Propertius and Tibullus—unless, of course, you count the poet himself, who often describes himself as a slave to his demanding mistress. In fact, as Murgatroyd (1981: 597) points out, it is with the elegists that the term *domina* becomes a frequent epithet for the beloved, whereas, in Catullus, the usual descriptor was *puella*.³⁸ Thus, the Tibullan *amator* complains “the chains of a beautiful girl hold me captive” (*me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae*, 1.1.55), and he portrays himself undertaking the duties of a slave. In poem 1.5 he claims that, as a poor man, he will provide his mistress not with gifts, but with slave-like services. He will always be available to her (1.5.61-62), he will clear a path for her through the crowd (1.5.63), he will even help her visit other lovers in secret (1.5.65) and take off her sandals with his own hands (1.5.66). He goes further on behalf of Book 2’s Nemesis: in poem 2.3, he offers to act as a field hand in a chain-gang so that he may not be separated from his beloved while she is in the country, saying “Lead on: I’ll plow the fields under the command of my mistress, I do not deny myself chains and beatings” (*ducite: ad imperium dominae sulcabitur agros: non ego me uinclis uerberibusque nego*, 2.3.79-

³⁸ The only poems in which the Catullan *amator* describes his mistress as *domina* is *Carmen* 3, in which the poet refers to her as the mistress of a sparrow which has died (*ad solam dominam usque pipiabat*, 3.10) and poem 68, in which the poet thanks a friend for the loan of his house for a rendezvous with his mistress (*et domus in qua olim lusimus et domina*, 68.156).

80). In poem 2.4, the *amator* expands on this theme, saying “Here I see slavery and a mistress prepared for me: farewell, my ancestral liberty” (*hic mihi seruitium uideo dominamque paratam:/ iam mihi, libertas illa paterna, uale*, 2.4.1-2) and describing himself as bound by chains (*catenis*, 2.4.3) and fetters (*vincla*, 2.4.4).

Likewise, the Propertian lover-poet frequently describes himself as a captive to his mistress—most strikingly, in the opening line of his poetry: “Cynthia was the first to capture poor me with her eyes” (*Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*, 1.1.1). He is also the only one of the elegists prior to Ovid to depict violence against a named slave character: Lygdamus, who appears to belong to the *amator*, but who is threatened by Cynthia.³⁹ In poem 4.7, Cynthia speaks from beyond the grave, asking that Lygdamus be branded (*Lygdamus uratur*, 4.7.35), apparently for conspiring with Cynthia’s rival against her. In the next poem, Cynthia—now very much alive—returns unexpectedly from the countryside to find that the *amator* has been holding a party with some charming young ladies in her absence. She first attacks the women (4.8.54-62), then the *amator* (4.8.63-66), then Lygdamus, who had been serving as cup-bearer (*Lygdamus ad cyathos*, 4.8.37) and whom she considers responsible for the party. Dragged out from his hiding-place, Lygdamus prays to the *amator* for help, but, as he says, “Lygdamus, I could do nothing—I was a captive along with you” (*Lygdame, nil potui: tecum ego captus eram*, 4.8.70). Cynthia demands that Lygdamus be sold for his offenses against her, saying “Let him drag along chains on both feet!” (*pedibus uincula bina trahat*, 4.8.80). The *amator*,

³⁹ It is possible that Lycinna, a former lover of Propertius whom he begs Cynthia not to be jealous of in poem 3.15, is also a slave since it is unclear how else Cynthia would be in a position to “torment” (*vexare*, 3.15.43) Lycinna and the mythological *exemplum* adduced (3.15.11-30) is one of mistress (Dirce) and captive slave (Antiope). But nor is it clear how the lover-poet could have had an affair with (in fact, lost his virginity to: 3.15.3-4) Cynthia’s slave-girl three years earlier (3.15.7).

helpless, replies, “I will obey your laws” (*legibus utar*, 4.8.81). Thus, in poem 4.8, the theme of *servitium amoris* reaches its climax: the Propertian *amator* becomes a counterpart of his own slave. Both are subject to Cynthia as *domina* and both are threatened by her with violence.

Yet, as James (2003a: 145-150) remarks, the pose of *servus amoris* is just that—a fiction employed by the *amatores* of elegy as a means of gaining sexual access to their desired *puellae*. As discussed in Chapter 1, the *puellae* of Roman elegy are *meretrices*, professional sex-workers, and are therefore *infames*, without protection or standing under the law. The *amator*, on the other hand, is a wealthy, elite, Roman male: he shares the name and basic biography of the author, who is of equestrian status and is a friend of wealthy senators such as Maecenas and Messalla. Furthermore, as James (2003a: 36) points out, the *amator* “must be a member of the leisure class if he has time to devote himself to the full-time pursuit of love and poetry.” In terms of social status, he has every advantage over his mistress. The role-reversal inherent in the trope of *servitium amoris* is, thus, unconvincing. As Fitzgerald (2000: 73) puts it, the servile behavior offered by the elegists is “sufficiently remote and fictionalized to be harmless” and is, in fact, often contrasted with contradictory portrayals of their relative status—for example, the poem in which the Tibullan *amator* depicts himself as Delia’s faithful slave also depicts *her* serving dinner to Messalla “as the slave-girl” (*ipsa ministra*, 1.5.34). Furthermore, as James (2003: 147) points out, genuine slavery in the ancient world involved a great deal of labor, and—while the *amatores* of elegy often declare themselves willing to provide such labor or depict themselves as enslaved by love—“*servitium amoris* in Roman love elegy is both absurd and self-canceling, because it consists of prominent lamentation, but

very little work.” The *amatores*’ depiction of themselves as *servi amoris* is made even more absurd by the reality that a *meretrix* might well be a freedwoman herself, and would therefore be well aware of what actual slavery felt like.⁴⁰ In fact, as Copley (1947: 295) argues, the trope of *servitium amoris* further reveals elegy’s status as fiction: “The very absurdity of the situation points up, as clearly as can be, the complete unreality of the world of romantic love.” It is this unreality that, I shall argue, Ovid exploits: by juxtaposing the bodies of genuine slaves with the body of his mistress, he encourages the reader to recognize the vulnerability of both—thus exposing the social inequality between *amator* and *puella* that the earlier elegists seek to elide through their representations of themselves as *servi amoris*.

⁴⁰ Cf. James (2003a: 147).

CHAPTER 3:

Amores 1.5-1.8

The programmatic opening poems of Ovid's *Amores* provide a marked contrast with the poetry of the other elegists. While Propertius signals the magnitude of Cynthia's importance by making her name the first word of his book of poetry and Tibullus justifies a preference for the simple life over wealth and military service by means of a fantasy of life and death in Delia's arms, Ovid's lover-poet opens the *Amores* with a protestation that he is *not* in love. *Amores* 1.1, in fact, begins with a declaration of the lover-poet's preference for martial epic (*arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam | edere*: "I was preparing to tell of arms and violent wars in a weighty meter," *Am.* 1.1.1-2) and a reproach to Cupid, who has slyly stolen a foot from the poet's meter, forcing him to write in elegiac couplets instead of epic hexameter. The poet points out that Cupid has no business interfering with poets who are, after all, governed by the Muses (1.1.6) and Apollo (1.1.16). Finally, the lover-poet asserts that he has nothing to write about in the elegiac meter—which is fitting only for love poetry—because he is not in love: "I have no material that's fitting for lighter verses—neither a boy nor a girl with stylish long hair" (*nec mihi materia est numeris levioribus apta | aut puer aut longas compta puella comas*, 1.1.19-20).

As the lover-poet complains, however, Cupid shoots him, forcing him to fall in love—but the object of his passion is unspecified: in fact, the poet tells us *et in vacuo*

pectore regnat Amor (“Love rules in my empty heart,” 1.1.26). Thus, although Corinna will be the primary love-object of the first two books of the *Amores*, she, unlike Cynthia and Delia, remains unnamed and unpraised in Ovid’s opening poem. The principal relationship described is between the poet and Cupid and it is clearly an antagonistic one—the poet is the unwilling victim of a cruel joke played upon him by a malicious god. Although Propertius too presents his *amator*’s love for Cynthia as a violent imposition, using the word *capio* to describe her effects (see pages 28-29 above), and Amor as responsible for his suffering (*et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*, Prop. 1.1.4), and Tibullus acknowledges that his *amator* is abandoning wealth and glory for love of Delia, still both poets foreground the relationship with their respective *puellae*, while Ovid entirely neglects the object of his *amator*’s love. At the close of *Amores* 1.1, the audience is unaware even of the gender of the *amator*’s beloved, and her name will not be mentioned for several poems to come (1.5.9).

This pattern of the diminishing of the beloved's importance continues through the early poems of *Amores* 1 and serves to reinforce the vulnerability of the elegiac *puella* in comparison to her elite male lover. For example, in poem 1.2, the poet complains of his inability to sleep, ascribing his insomnia to Love—but, again, not to any particular beloved. While the Propertian lover-poet represents himself as a captive of his mistress, the Ovidian *amator* instead characterizes himself as a victim of Cupid, whom he represents as a triumphing general, leading the poet as an unwilling (*invitos*, 1.2.17) prize of war. The *amator* acknowledges the unassailable power of love, but again leaves the reader without any clues as to the name, gender, or attractive qualities of the object of his

love. She is wholly ignored as the poet focuses upon the humorous image of the boy Cupid leading a triumphal parade.⁴¹

The third poem of *Amores* 1 is the first that might realistically be called a “love poem,” but the lover continues to neglect the character of the beloved and slyly undermines his own protestations of undying devotion. He promises eternal fidelity (1.3.16) and imagines a lifelong relationship, ending with his beloved’s grief at his death (1.3.17-18). Moreover, he promises eternal fame in his poetry: “We too will be sung together all over the world, and my name will always be linked with yours” (*nos quoque per totum pariter cantabimur orbem / iunctaque semper erunt nomina nostra tuis*, 1.3.25-26). These protestations are, however, obviously tongue-in-cheek—for the beloved remains, as in the preceding poems, entirely anonymous!⁴² Her name, along with any more personal details about her beauty, her personality, or her sophistication—such as Propertius and Tibullus employ—are ignored in favor of a catalogue of the *poet’s* virtues—he is a protégé of Apollo and the Muses (1.3.11-12) and they have given him “loyalty that will yield to nothing, faultless morals, unvarnished honesty, and noble integrity,” (*et nulli cessura fides, sine crimine mores / nudaque simplicitas purpureusque pudor*, 1.3.13-14).⁴³

⁴¹ See Phillips (1980: 269-277) for a discussion of the political implications of Cupid’s companions (*Blanditiae*, *Error*, and *Furor*; 1.2.35) and the captives he leads (*Mens Bona* and *Pudor*, 1.2.31-32).

⁴² Cf. McKeown (*ad loc.*).

⁴³ Note that *Pudor* was one of the captives being led (along with the *amator*) in Cupid’s triumphal parade in the previous poem (1.2.32). At this point, as Curran (1966: 48) writes, “The cat is beginning to emerge from the bag. We begin to suspect not only that Ovid protests too much but also that the reader is expected to see through his protestations.”

More troubling still, the poet offers his beloved everlasting fame of the kind enjoyed by Io, Leda, and Europa (1.3.21-24)—all victims of rape. Nor are their experiences described in pleasant terms: Io, according to the poet, was “terrified” (*exterrita*, 1.3.21) by her undeserved metamorphosis into a cow; Leda was “tricked” (*lusit*, 1.3.22) by Jupiter’s avian disguise; and Europa was carried over the sea—away from her home and family—(*super pontum...vecta*, 1.3.23) by means of another deception (*simulato...iuvenco*, 1.3.23).⁴⁴ Thus, as Cahoon (1998: 295) writes, the *amator* “delights in being Cupid’s victim because he can thereby victimize others.” The first “love poem” of Ovid’s collection of “Loves” not only reinforces the disdain for the love object that was set in motion in the previous two poems, it also associates the poet’s love with rape and compares the poet’s still-unnamed beloved to the victims of a much more powerful elite male figure who was, through his power and status, able to take what he wanted from them without fear of reprisals. It is, in short, an ominous introduction of a theme that will pervade the first two books of the *Amores*: that of the *puella*’s social and physical vulnerability in the face of the elite male poet.

Ovid’s *puella* is, in fact, neither named nor described in detail until the fifth poem of the book, the first in a quartet of poems that reveal the disturbing vulnerability of the *puella*’s body by linking it to that most vulnerable and least autonomous body in Roman society: the body of the slave. In *Amores* 1.5, the *amator* not only names his *puella* for the first time (*ecce Corinna venit*, 1.5.9), but also enjoys her physically—the poem

⁴⁴ As Davis (1989: 71) writes, “The reader is invited to see that Jupiter’s posing as cloud, swan and bull is analogous to Ovid’s posing as a *seruus amoris*.” Not only does the poet’s language associate the *amator* with trickery and deception, as James (2003a: 80) points out, the listing of three separate love-objects weakens the *amator*’s claim that “you...will be my beloved forever” (*tu mihi...cura perennis eris*, 1.3.16): “Thus *Amores* 1.3 virtually assures even a minimally learned *puella* that this particular suitor will travel on at some point.” Cf. Curran (1966: 47); Olstein (1975: 244-246).

describes, in languorous detail, an afternoon sexual encounter between poet and mistress. The poet offers a lengthy sketch of Corinna, first declaring “there was no blemish anywhere on her body” (*in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit*, 1.5.18) and then rapturously describing her arms and shoulders, her breasts, her stomach, her flank, and her thigh (1.5.18-22). The poet then refuses to go into further detail (*singula quid referam?* 1.5.23)—leaving his beloved, surprisingly, without a head: her beauty has been entirely from the neck down; neither face, nor eyes, nor mouth is included in the poet’s catalogue of her features.⁴⁵ The fetishistic relish with which the poet lingers on the details of his *puella*’s body, combined with his indifference to her face, including eyes and mouth—her means of self-expression—serve to objectify Corinna: she is not a speaking, thinking subject; rather she is an object of the poet’s, and his readers’, gaze.

This objectification of the *puella* is further reinforced in *Amores* 1.5 by the poet’s description of a *rixa* that preceded his survey of the *puella*’s naked body:

deripui tunicam—nec multum rara nocebat
pugnabat tunica sed tamen illa tegi.
cumque ita pugnaret, tamquam quae vincere nollet,
victa est non aegre prodicione sua.

I tore off her tunic; it was thin and didn't cause much trouble,
but still she fought to keep it on—
but she fought as if she did not want to win,
and she was easily beaten by her own self-betrayal.
(1.5.13-16)

⁴⁵ Cf. Cahoon (1988): 296. This is particularly striking in comparison with the opening poem of Propertius, in which it is Cynthia’s “little eyes” (*ocellis*, Prop. 1.1.1) that are said to have “captured” (*cepit*) the poet.

Previous commentators have generally viewed this encounter as simply playful—a piquant prelude to the *amator*'s final gratification⁴⁶—and the *rixa* is, as discussed above (pages 25-28), a common feature of other elegy, one viewed with relish by the Propertian lover-poet in particular.⁴⁷ Yet Ovid's account has disturbing undercurrents: the words *pugnabat*, *vincere*, *victa*, and *proditione* have martial connotations. Thus, as Cahoon (1988: 296) has pointed out, *Amores* 1.5 is one of several poems in which the Ovidian *puella* is painted as an enemy combatant and, as such, subjected to physical violence, revealing the *amator*'s desire to subjugate his mistress rather than engage with her emotionally. Furthermore, the reader has only the poet's word that Corinna's resistance was feigned, a state of affairs which, given the absence of a face or mouth from the *puella*'s features and the lack of any quoted speech from her, raises the question of the *puella*'s ability to refuse sex to the *amator*. If any resistance on the *puella*'s part is generically considered play-acting, the *amator* has a ready-made excuse for rape—and the *puella*, with no voice or mouth with which to protest, is effectively silenced.

Amores 1.5, on the *amator*'s sexual gratification, is followed by a poem on his sexual frustration: a *paraclausithyron* in which the poet begs his beloved's doorkeeper to let him in. This is the first appearance of a slave character in the *Amores*, and the *amator*'s treatment of the doorkeeper is instructive: his primary strategy is to remind the

⁴⁶ Nicoll (1977: 46) describes it as a “tussle” and Panpanghelis (1989: 61) refers to it as a “sham” that “spice[s] up” the action.

⁴⁷ See especially Propertius 2.15 (*quantaque sublato lumine fixa fuit*, 2.15.4) and 3.8 (*dulcis ad hesternas fuerat mihi rixa lucernas*, 3.8.1) with discussion above. *Amores* 1.5 is closely related in many respects to Propertius 2.15, in which the *amator* ecstatically describes Cynthia's body and tussles with her over her tunic, but there Cynthia is emphatically *not* silenced: she speaks adamantly to the Propertian lover-poet, demanding that he awaken (*et dixit sicine, lente, iaces?* 2.15.8). Moreover, the Propertian poet quickly passes over the details of his encounter with Cynthia to a celebration of the power of love (2.15.23-36) and then to a meditation on the horrors of civil war (2.15.41-46).

doorkeeper of his physical vulnerability. In fact, the first words of the poem—the first words that the *amator* speaks to the doorkeeper—serve to draw attention to the slave’s helplessness: he is *dura religate catena* (“bound by a hard chain,” 1.6.1). The doorkeeper is literally chained to his door: forced to remain for hours in an uncomfortable position and deprived of any agency over his body. The poet then begs the doorkeeper to let him in, telling him that he has wasted away from love to such an extent that he will only need to open the door a crack (1.6.5-6) and urging him to open the door (only a little) so he can see the *amator*’s tears (1.6.17-18). When these pleas fail, however, the *amator* again reminds the doorkeeper of his vulnerability, painting a graphic picture of the kind of punishment he has suffered before:

certe ego, cum posita stares ad verbera veste,
ad dominam pro te verba tremente tuli.
ergo quae valuit pro te quoque gratia quondam—
heu facinus!—pro me nunc valet illa parum?

Surely when you were stripped for a flogging,
I spoke to your mistress on your behalf while you trembled.
Is that favor, then, that you once valued
worth too little to help me now (oh, criminal!)?
(1.6.19-22)

The *amator* thus attempts to convince the doorkeeper to disobey his mistress' orders by suggesting that the slave owes him a favor. This strategy, however, seems unlikely to succeed since it will serve only to remind the doorkeeper of the punishment that his mistress can inflict on him if he should fail in his duties and let in an unwanted visitor. Rather, the striking image of the naked and trembling slave serves to foreground again his physical vulnerability: he has been beaten in the past and, if he should give in to the *amator*’s blandishments and let him in, he is sure to suffer the same fate.

The poet has not yet threatened the doorkeeper directly, confining his descriptions of violence to that inflicted in the past by his mistress, but as his frustration with his continued exclusion mounts, he finally turns to intimidation. Although he had claimed earlier in the poem that he came in peace (1.6.30) and that he was in no condition to be perceived as a threat (1.6.39), the *amator* now threatens an assault:

Aut ego iam ferroque ignique paratior ipse,
quem face sustineo, tecta superba petam.
nox et Amor vinumque nihil moderabile suadent;
illa pudore vacat, Liber Amorque metu.

Or I'll be all the readier, with my steel and the fire
that I carry in my torch; I'll attack this haughty household.
Night and love and wine don't tend to urge me to moderation:
night frees me from shame and wine and love from fear.
(1.6. 57-60)

The *amator* thus threatens the kind of attack on the house of a *meretrix* described in New Comedy and actually undertaken by the *miles* of Terence's *Eunuchus* (see pages 15-16). A dissatisfied customer decides to take what he wants by force threatening, as the *ancilla* and the *miles* of Plautus' *Truculentus* both make clear, the safety, not just of the mistress, but of all her staff—particularly, in the case of *Amores* 1.6, the pathetic *ianitor*, who is chained to the door and unable to defend himself but has been ordered to keep out unwanted guests. The poet thus highlights the invidious position of the slave, who must weigh the conflicting demands of two minatory powers: his mistress, who has complete authority over his body—to chain him, to strip him naked, to beat him, even to kill him—and her lover, who also threatens the slave's body and who, as an elite male, is sheltered and favored by the law. The *amator* does not, in fact, act upon his threats and attack the doorkeeper because to do so would violate the terms of what James (2003a: 14) has

termed the “elegiac impasse”: if the lover could force his way into the *puella*’s household any time he wanted, he could no longer write elegies bewailing his exclusion. Yet the threat, and the graphic description of the slave’s previous beating, highlight the slave’s vulnerability to violence—and the poem’s placement further serves to draw attention to the analogous vulnerability of the *puella*.

For *Amores* 1.6, in which a slave is berated, threatened, and repeatedly reminded of his physical vulnerability (the *amator* even describes the doors the *ianitor* is guarding as *conservae...fores* [“your fellow-slaves,” 1.6.74]—a cruel reminder of the slave’s status as instrument and object) is placed between two poems in which the *puella* is also marked as physically vulnerable: poem 1.5, in which the *amator* struggles with and, perhaps, rapes her,⁴⁸ and poem 1.7, in which he beats her. The poem is couched as an apology in which the lover, after the fact, berates himself for injuring his mistress, but there are numerous hints that this remorse is insincere and that, in fact, the lover enjoys the physical power he has over his mistress’ body.

Violence is by no means absent from the relationships of the other elegiac poets (see pages 25-28), but Ovid is the only elegist to describe a full-scale assault inflicted by the *amator* upon his mistress. However, as Khan (1966: 880) was the first to point out, the poem is far from a genuine plea for forgiveness—rather, “A naughty, almost picaresque, element of humour pervades the entire poem.” Similarly, Stirrup (1973) has drawn attention to the multiple ironies arising from the poet’s play with legal, military,

⁴⁸ At the least, as Cahoon (1988: 296) puts it, the *amator* “find[s] feigned resistance arousing.” Whether we can take the *amator*’s word that Corinna’s resistance is indeed feigned is an issue which Cahoon does not address.

and mythological elements. These critics, however, fail to consider the disturbing implications of the *amator*'s treatment of this subject matter and it was left to later feminist scholars, including Cahoon (1988), Greene (1999), and James (2003a) to expose the disturbing power imbalance revealed by the *amator*'s insincerity and apparent sensual enjoyment of his physical superiority.

The artificiality of the *amator*'s remorse is revealed in the opening lines of the poem, in which the poet begs any friend who is nearby to bind the hands that have beaten his mistress (1.7.1-4) and then likens his behavior to a son injuring his parents or a man attacking the gods (1.7.5-6). This extravagant language and the extremity of the metaphors employed by the *amator* undermine any illusion of genuine regret—in fact, as Greene (1999: 412) points out, they serve to “trivialize the incident” by comparison. The *amator* goes on to liken himself to the mythical heroes Ajax and Orestes (1.7.7-10), thus again playing down the importance of the incident by comparison with much more serious acts of violence but also, as Khan (1966: 882) points out, flattering the *amator* himself and thus giving an “impression of smugness and even of satisfaction at finding himself in such renowned company.”⁴⁹ The poem thus opens with a series of overdone, overplayed rhetorical exaggerations that undercut the *amator*'s feigned remorse.

The lover continues by describing the injuries he inflicted upon the *puella*, particularly the tearing of her carefully arranged hairstyle. There is no hint of regret here: rather, the *amator* confesses, the *puella* is even more beautiful with her hair in disarray

⁴⁹ Khan further points out that the comparison to Ajax and Orestes will be paralleled by a similar set of mythological exempla in poem 2.8, where the *amator* will excuse his affair with a slave-girl by comparison with Achilles and Agamemnon—a likeness to which I shall return.

(*nec dominam motae dedecueret comae*, 1.7.12). He therefore pauses to compare her to various mythic heroines, including Atalanta, Ariadne, and Cassandra, pausing to remark coldly that Cassandra was somewhat less beautiful than the other women described because her hair was still bound by the *vitta* of her priesthood when she was raped in Minerva's temple (1.7.17). As Cahoon (1988: 296-297) points out, this final remark is "singularly heartless" and the *amator's* sexual admiration of the affects of his attack is disturbing: "To see his mistress victimized, helpless, disheveled, and distraught titillates him." In fact, it is clear the *amator* finds the *puella's* fear gratifying. As she stands silent, unable to speak from fear (*ipsa nihil; pavido est lingua retenta metu*, 1.7.20), the *amator* emphasizes that it is his physical strength that has allowed him to dominate her: he was possessed of "wild strength" (*vesanas vires*, 1.7.25) and he was "brave and strong" (*valui...fortis*, 1.7.26). The *amator's* pride in his physical prowess is further accentuated by another flattering mythological *exemplum* in which the *amator* claims to be the *alter ego* of Diomedes, who wounded Aphrodite in *Iliad* 5. The empowerment of the *amator* at the expense of his mistress is furthered by his description of himself as the general in a Roman triumphal parade, leading his mistress as a conquered captive. While the image is mocking—the *amator* has defeated a mere *puella*, not a genuine *hostis*—the tables have nevertheless been turned: while the *amator* was, in *Amores* 1.2, the captive of Amor's triumphal parade, here he has finally emerged as the *victor* (1.7.35; cf. 1.2.50). As Gamel (1989: 197) puts it, "His self-incrimination here does not mask his self-aggrandizement."

The *puella*, on the other hand, is objectified and marginalized. Like Corinna in *Amores* 1.5 she is voiceless—in fact, as quoted above, the poet goes out of his way to emphasize her silence (1.7.20). Furthermore, James (2003a: 189) has noted the numerous

references to her fear of the *amator*—of particular note are lines 51 (*astitit illa amens albo et sine sanguine vultu*; “she stood terrified, her face white and bloodless”) and 53 (*exanimis artus et membra trementia vidi*; “I saw her body fainting and her limbs trembling”).⁵⁰ The four similes used to describe her further objectify her: she is compared first to a statue of Parian marble, then she shakes like poplar leaves stirred by the breeze or a reed or a wave in the wind, then her tears flow like water melting from snow (1.7.52-58). These are all inanimate objects, without the powers of speech and independent movement, and, as Greene (1999: 416) points out, those from the natural world are all subjected to “a more powerful force of nature that controls their movement.” The *amator* goes on to describe how he begged forgiveness as a suppliant (*supplex*, 1.7.61) but his mistress pushed away his “fearsome hands” (*formidatas...manus*, 1.7.62). He then urges her to take revenge by injuring *him*, reassuring her that “anger lends strength to hands, however weak” (*quamlibet infirmas adiuvat ira manus*, 1.7.66). The contrast again serves to emphasize the *amator*’s physical power and his mistress’ corresponding vulnerability: his hands are *formidatae* while hers are merely *infirmas*. The *amator*’s indifference and lack of sincere remorse are confirmed by the final couplet, a so-called “Ovidian coda,”⁵¹ in which the poet suddenly changes tone—bored with his suppliant role, no longer concerned with lessening his mistress’ grief, he orders her to erase the signs of his misdeeds and rearrange her hair (1.7.67-68). This “heartless little joke at the end”⁵²

⁵⁰ James further notes lines 4 (*flet...puella*), 20 (quoted above), 22 (*lacrimis*), 39 (*tristis captiva*), 45 (*timidae...puellae*), 57 (*suspensaeque diu lacrimae fluxere per ora*), 60 (*lacrimae*), 62 (*formidatas manus*) and 63 (*dolorem*).

⁵¹ See Parker (1969): 80-97.

⁵² Cahoon (1988): 297.

exposes the insincerity and irony of the rest of the poem and the lover's lack of concern for the *puella*'s suffering. The *amator* has evidently grown bored with his expressions of remorse and wishes to re-exert his power over the *puella* by pressing her to conceal the signs of his assault.⁵³

Most importantly, however, in this poem in which the *amator* exults in his physical superiority over his mistress, describing in lavish detail her tears and bruises⁵⁴ and objectifying her as the weak and silent target of both physical attack and sensual appreciation, the poet also draws attention to her social status. In the midst of his self-castigation, the *amator* laments “if I had beaten the least *Quiris* of the people, I would be punished” (*si pulsassem minimum de plebe Quiritem / plecterer*, 1.7.29-30). Thus, the poet makes clear, the *puella* is not a *Quiris*, or citizen—and is therefore of far lower social status than the elite male *amator*. This, then, is why he can strike and abuse her—she is *not* his equal; she has no legal recourse. By specifically identifying the *puella* as a non-citizen in a poem in which the *amator* both beats her and enjoys it, Ovid draws attention to the vastly unequal power dynamic that exists between mistress and poet in all Augustan elegy. However passionately the *amator* may claim to be the *servus* to a *domina*, he is always her legal and social superior. She is physically vulnerable—*infirm*a—and may be beaten at his pleasure—not unlike the slaves and subalterns whose vulnerable bodies surround hers in poems 1.6 and 1.8.

⁵³ Cahoon (1988, 297) points out that *in statione* is a military metaphor consistent with the poet's use of military imagery elsewhere to reinforce the image of the *puella* as a subjugated victim.

⁵⁴ See James (2003a): 190.

For poem 1.7 is placed, significantly, between two poems that threaten violence against the poet's inferiors: 1.6, the address to the *ianitor*, and 1.7, an extensive example of erotodidaxis in which the lover overhears a *lena* named Dipsas advising his beloved to take advantage of her beauty and exploit her lovers. Her advice—to prefer money and gifts to poetry (1.8.62), to accept a freedman as a lover if he's wealthy (1.8.63-64), to lock out lovers to increase their interest (1.8.73-76), and so forth—enrages the amator so much that, when he is finally revealed, he almost strikes the *lena*:

at nostrae vix se continuere manus
quin albam raramque comam lacrimosaque vino
lumina rugosas distraherentque genas.

But my hands could scarcely restrain themselves
from tearing her white and straggly hair, her wine-
blurred eyes, and her wrinkled cheeks.

(1.8.110-112)

The verb *distrahere* is particularly violent: as McKeown (1989, *ad loc.*) points out, the word is often used of dismemberment. The *amator*'s threats against Dipsas are of particular importance because the *lena* is most likely a former courtesan herself and once enjoyed the role of the *puella* she advises: as she tells the *puella*, her precepts are “learned from long experience” (*usu...cognita longo*, 1.18.105).⁵⁵ This claim suggests that the *puella* and the *lena* are of equivalent social statuses—and that the violence the amator wishes to direct against the *lena* could be inflicted on the *puella* with equal ease.

⁵⁵ The identification of Dipsas as a retired courtesan is reinforced by the close relationship of the poem to scene 1.3 of Plautus' *Mostellaria*, in which the advising *lena* warns the young *meretrix* to avoid the mistakes she made when she was a young and beautiful courtesan (*Most.* 197-202). In addition, O'Neill (1999: 300) argues that allusions to Propertius 4.8 further suggest that Dipsas is a retired courtesan: “Dipsas therefore gains credibility as an adviser to the young woman as she is speaking from her own painful experience.”

Amores 1.8 is not the first elegiac poem to feature an evil *lena* whose interests run counter to the *amator*'s: both Propertius and Tibullus treat this theme, and in both cases the poets' *amatores* exhibit a sadistic hostility toward the *lena*. Propertius opens his poem with a curse on the *lena*, wishing that she may suffer even after death (4.5.1-4) and closes it with the promise of a sacrifice to Venus in gratitude for watching the *lena*'s last agonies—including the “bloody spittle” (*sputaque...cruenta*, 4.5.68) pouring from her mouth—before she dies, alone and in poverty, at a “freezing hearth” (*algenti...foco*, 4.5.70). Similarly, the Tibullan *amator* wishes a dreadful end on the *callida lena* (1.5.48) who has interfered with his *amores*:

Sanguineas edat illa dapes atque ore cruento
 Tristia cum multo pocula felle bibat;
 Hanc volitent animae circum sua fata querentes
 Semper et e tectis strix violenta canat;
 Ipsa fame stimulante furens herbasque sepulcris
 Quaerat et a saevis ossa relictata lupis,
 Currat et inguinibus nudis ululetque per urbes,
 Post agat e triviis aspera turba canum.

May she eat bloody food, and with gory lips
 drink from bitter cups filled with bile;
 may spirits always flit round her, bewailing their fate,
 and may a loud owl screech from her rooftops:
 with hunger goading her on, may she wildly seek grass from grave-tops
 and the bones left by savage wolves,
 and may she run with genitals bared and howl through the city
 and may a fierce crowd of dogs chase her from the cross-roads.
 (1.5.49-56)

While the Ovidian *amator* also curses the *lena*, he does so in a single couplet, saying “May the gods give you a homeless and indigent old age | and endless winters and eternal thirst” (*di tibi dent nullosque Lares inopemque senectam, | et longas hiemes perpetuamque sitim*, 1.8.113-114). The brevity of this final curse has led critics to argue

that the Ovidian *amator* is less hostile to the *lena* than the earlier elegists and that he is motivated, in Gross' words (1996: 206), "neither by hatred nor vilification....Rather he displays bemused discomfort at the inversion of his own amatory rhetoric."⁵⁶ Yet to reading Ovid's *lena* poem as more light-hearted and less vituperative than those of Propertius and Tibullus is to ignore a more fundamental difference: neither of the earlier elegists expresses a wish to physically harm the *lena* with his own hands. The Ovidian *amator*, on the other hand, can "scarcely restrain" himself from injuring her. Thus, however tame his ill-wishing might be, the Ovidian amator nonetheless expresses a much more violent inclination in his desire to personally attack the *lena*. The poet, therefore, again draws attention to the physical vulnerability of a social subordinate—and furthermore a social subordinate who is of comparable social status to the *amator*'s beloved; who is, in fact, what the *puella* may one day become.⁵⁷

These four poems, *Amores* 1.5-1.8, thus represent a quartet in which images of the *puella*'s vulnerable body alternate with images of the vulnerable bodies of slaves and subalterns. Poems 1.6 and 1.8 portray the extremes of violence to which subordinate bodies are subject in Roman society through the image of the slave, bound and stripped for punishment, and the intensity of the verb *distrahere*. Yet these poems are arranged around two poems that show the *puella* in similarly vulnerable positions: she too is stripped naked and struggles with the lover (*pugnabat*, 1.5.14), she too is beaten (*laesa puella*, 1.7.4), and the parts of Dipsas' body that the lover wishes to tear apart—hair,

⁵⁶ Cf. O'Neill (1999: 301): "In Ovid's elegy, the charges against the bawd are vaguer, and the curses less savage and heartfelt than those of the Propertian lover."

⁵⁷ Cf. Myers (1996): 5; James (2003a): 54.

eyes, and cheeks—are all injured (or give evidence of the *puella*'s injury) in poem 1.7.⁵⁸ Furthermore, the *puella* is, in poem 1.7, explicitly identified as a non-citizen, and, therefore, as someone who can be beaten with impunity. The links between the body of the *puella* and the bodies of a slave and a former *meretrix*, coupled with the overt identification of the *puella* as a non-citizen, serve to expose the extreme social inequality of the relationship between *amator* and *puella* and her consequent vulnerability to violence at his hands. It is only the code of the elegiac relationship that prevents the *amator* from raping or beating his mistress—and Ovid's *amator* consistently pushes the envelope, escalating the *rixae* of the other elegists into full-blown assaults.

Yet the *amator*'s threats reveal, not only the vulnerability of the *puella*'s body, but the *amator*'s own vulnerability in the face of a situation he cannot control. As James (2006: 224-251) has argued, the elegiac *puella*, as an independent *meretrix*, is uniquely unavailable: she is not a slave over whom the owner has total freedom, nor a common prostitute who can easily be bought, nor a wife who must legally submit to her husband, but a woman who must be persuaded—whether with (as the lover hopes) poetry, or with gifts. She is also, by virtue of her profession, available to be persuaded by other men—a fact that leads to what James (2003a: 185) calls “a state of constantly seething resentment against his beloved” on the part of the *amator*. As an elite citizen male, the *amator* finds his lack of total control demeaning and frightening. Thus, in *Amores* 1.6, the *amator* tells the doorkeeper “I fear you (you're too slow!), you're the only person I suck up to” (*te*

⁵⁸ The *amator* specifically mentions disarranging his mistress' hair (*ergo ego digestos potui laniare capillos? | nec dominam motae dedecuerere comae*, 1.7.11-12; cf. *albam raramque comam*, 1.8.111) and that he bruised her cheeks (*laesae...genae*, 1.7.40; cf. *rugosas...genas*, 1.8.112). In fact, *coma* and *genae* are repeated several times in poem 1.7 (*coma*: 1.7.12, 36, 54, 68; *genae*: 1.7.40, 50), as is *lacrimae* (1.7.22, 57, 60; cf. *lacrimosaque...lumina*, 1.8.111-112).

nimum lentum timeo, tibi blandior uni, 1.6.15). The verbs *timeo* and *blandior* addressed to a *ianitor*—the lowest of the low, the most menial household slave⁵⁹—are striking, and the *amator*'s description of the *ianitor*'s previous punishment soon follows. The *amator*, aware of the indignity of the position he has assumed vis-a-vis his mistress' slave, attempts to recover his normal status by reminding the *ianitor*—and himself—of the *ianitor*'s physical vulnerability.⁶⁰ His threats are the result of his awareness of his unaccustomed subordinate status—his insecurity in the face of others' power.

Similarly, Dipsas poses an intolerable threat to the *amator*—in fact, as James (2003a: 52) puts it, she is “a greater danger than all other obstacles put together.” Her advice runs counter to the lover's interests on all fronts: she advises the *puella* to entertain as many lovers as possible (1.8.43-44) and to refuse the poet-lover in favor of a rich man, even a freedman (1.8.57-66). She offers many suggestions on how to manipulate lovers to increase their affection and, thus, secure more loot. She is also, as a former *meretrix* who has evidently been reduced to dependency,⁶¹ a constant reminder of the dire straits the *puella* herself may one day face if she does not make hay, so to speak, while the sun shines. Thus, as Myers (1996: 10) puts it, “The *lena* threatens to sap the

⁵⁹ Cf. Aristotle, *Oec.* 1345a; Seneca, *Epist.* 12.3, *Dial.* 5.37.2; Tibullus 1.1.55. Watson (1982: 92-101) has argued that the entire poem is a “parody of a hymn” which is undertaken for “the sheer fun of addressing a prayer, which is normally directed to a god, to one who is, so to speak, at the extreme opposite end of the social scale” (101). The hymnic qualities Watson identifies can more usefully be seen to underscore the role-reversal that leads to the *amator*'s anger and desire for revenge.

⁶⁰ Cf. Watson (1982: 101), who argues that the image of the slave in chains serves to emphasize the “ludicrous incongruity between the slave's real status and that which he temporarily assumes in Ovid's eyes.”

⁶¹ Cf. 1.8.28: *non ego, te facta divite, pauper ero* (“I won't be poor as long as you're rich”).

male sexually, artistically, and economically”—by advising the *puella* to be unfaithful, to ignore the *suasoriae* of poetry in favor of her own advice, and to demand compensation from her lovers. That the Ovidian *amator* responds so violently is characteristic of the insecurity revealed in his treatment of the *ianitor*—threats inspire threats, and the more frightening the threat offered, the more aggressive the response.

But what threat did the *puella* offer that merited, not the mere threat of a physical attack, but an actual assault? The speaker does not tell us—nowhere, in over 65 lines of grandiose self-recrimination, does the *amator* reveal what prompted him to beat his girlfriend. McKeown (1989: 188) suggests that she has cheated on him and James (2003a: 190) agrees, saying “the elegiac injury to be avenged is always infidelity.” Yet I propose that, in this case, the injury is deliberately left vague—because the *puella*’s mere existence, representing what James (2006: 239) calls “the menace of independent female sexuality,” is enough to provoke the *amator*’s anger. Furthermore, the Ovidian lover-poet, as I have argued, regularly dehumanizes the *puella* by diminishing her importance as subject. Her role in *Amores* 1.7, as in the programmatic opening poems, is to serve as object—and, thus, whatever words or actions of hers provoked the *amator*’s anger are elided. She is a generic *puella*—unnamed in 1.7 as in the opening poems of the *Amores*—with generic qualities of sexual license, but also of physical vulnerability.

CHAPTER 4:

The Diptych Poems

The poems considered in the previous chapter formed, as I argued, a tightly woven structure in which the physical vulnerability of the elegiac *puella* was deliberately contrasted with that of a menial household slave and an impoverished former *meretrix*. The other poems of Ovid's *Amores* that treat the vulnerable bodies of *puella* and slaves are also linked—not, in this case, by their placement as a sequential group, but by their structure. For, strikingly, these poems are all diptychs—sets of paired poems that are linked both thematically and dramatically and which typically appear in sequence.⁶² The use of the diptych structure to treat the vulnerable bodies of slaves and mistress is significant because it focuses the reader's attention on these bodies and on their suffering. The reader, confronted with topics that may be unsavory or disturbing, is nonetheless forced to linger. It is a conspicuous feature of the *Amores* that slave characters—who receive almost no attention in the earlier elegists—are described, and directly addressed, in no fewer than three sets of paired poems.

⁶² Two of the poems I shall discuss (1.4 and 2.5) are not, strictly speaking, a diptych in that they are not sequential. They do, however, fit Davis' definition of a dramatic pairing in the sense that "the second poem serves not just as the thematic companion piece to the preceding but as its dramatic sequel depending on the first for its dramatic point of departure" (1977: 19). Without the background of 1.4, poem 2.5 loses much of its piquancy. These two poems are thus part of a related pattern in the *Amores*: pairs of poems that link *across* books in which the second poem provides a re-reading of or a new perspective on the first poem.

The first of these that I shall discuss follows directly upon the programmatic opening poem of Book 2. This diptych is addressed to a *custos*, or warden, named Bagoas, who has evidently been assigned to guard a courtesan whom the *amator* finds attractive.⁶³ The *amator* attempts to persuade Bagoas to allow him access to the girl by means of flattery, pleas, and threats. The basic situation is familiar from Poem 1.6, in which the *amator* also placed himself between a slave and his owner, attempting to persuade his mistress' doorkeeper to let him into the house against her orders. In this case, however, the *custos* is a eunuch, so when the *amator*'s attempts at persuasion fail he responds with mockery and abuse that is specifically directed at Bagoas' castrated state.

The *amator*'s attempts at persuasion in poem 2.2 bear many similarities to his *suasoria* to the doorkeeper of 1.6: he mingles his pleas with veiled threats in an attempt to persuade a slave to disobey the orders of his owner. In this poem, however, he adds a new tactic and promises rewards to the *custos* for his help—whereas the *ianitor* of 1.6 could surely expect nothing but punishment for such a gross failure of duty as to let in an unwanted guest, the *custos* of 2.2 is offered rewards on behalf of the girl he guards. These rewards are particularly tempting: the lover offers the *custos* his own freedom in exchange for the girl's (2.2.15-16) and promises him that, if he actively connives in her infidelity, his mistress will be in his debt (*domina est obnoxia servo*, 2.2.16), whereas at present, he is an annoyance (*quod nimium dominae cura molesta tua est*, 2.2.8). The *amator* further promises that, if Bagoas fears retribution, simple inactivity will also be

⁶³ On the question of whether poems 2.2 and 2.3 are in fact a diptych or should be combined to form a single elegy, see Damon (1990: 281-285). McKeown (1998: 29) refers to this as a “probably insoluble problem,” but strong cases for the separation of the two poems have been made by Lenz (1965) and Davis (1977: 86-97).

rewarded and lists the circumstances in which the *custos* may merely turn a blind eye (2.2.18-26). His collusion will, the *amator* promises, yield numerous benefits—a *consciis*, he is told, is a step above the other slaves:

ille placet versatque domum neque verbera sentit;
ille potens—alii, sordida turba, iacent.

He's in favor and gets free run of the house, he does not feel the lash;
he's powerful—the other slaves lie around, a sordid crowd.

(2.2.29-30)

Furthermore, if he follows the *amator*'s instructions, Bagoas' wages will increase (2.2.39) and he will soon be freed (2.2.40). The *amator* thus paints a very advantageous portrait of life as a *consciis custos*.

He also, however, attempts to persuade Bagoas by threatening him with punishments for obedience. Again, the focus is on the slave's physical vulnerability: if he does his duty and reports his mistress to her *vir*, he will suffer chains and prison (2.2.41-42). The *amator* illustrates with the mythological *exempla* of Tantalus and Argus, one of whom suffers eternal torture for tale-bearing and the other of whom was killed for his excessive zeal in guarding a girl (2.2.43-46). He then, more vividly, offers an example from his own experience, saying emphatically "I myself have seen" (*vidi ego*, 2.2.47) the consequences for a slave who told on his *puella*. The possible punishments for the slave are described in grisly detail: chains will be woven around his neck (*nexas per colla catenas*, 2.2.41), his prison will be *squalidus* (2.2.42), and his legs will be livid with bruises from the shackles (*conpedibus liventia crura*, 2.2.47). In fact, the *amator* argues, a tattletale deserves worse (*poena minor merito*, 2.2.49). The reason that obedience will

meet with punishment is simple: no man really wants to know his mistress is cheating on him (2.2.51-52). Furthermore, the girl will simply deny the accusations and her tears will move the *vir* to blame the messenger instead. As the *amator* asks “Why enter on an unequal contest? You’ll lose, and you’ll be beaten while she sits in your judge’s lap” (*quid dispar certamen inis? tibi verbera / victa adsunt, in gremio iudicis illa sedet*, 2.2.61-62). This final image of the girl and her *vir* sitting together to watch the punishment of the slave is chilling. Indeed, it introduces into elegy a type of casual brutality that is reminiscent of the treatment of slaves in the comedies of Plautus (see pages 4-6).

The *amator* thus presents Bagoas with a choice that seems obvious: turn a blind eye to your mistress’ infidelities and win *honores* (2.2.27) or inform on her and suffer terrible physical punishments. Yet, as in poem 1.6, the *amator*’s rhetoric puts a subordinate in an impossible position. As a slave, he must fulfill his duties and obey his master or else suffer physical harm, but, according to the *amator*, he will also be punished if he obeys and reports on the *puella*. The poem, in fact, drops hints of the true fate in store for Bagoas if he disobeys his master. The *vir* is called “that madman” (*ille furiosus*, 2.2.13) and thus hardly seems like someone who will be lenient with a disobedient slave. The *amator* also urges Bagoas to lull the *vir* into a false sense of security, telling him:

Sed tamen interdum tecum quoque iurgia nectat,
et simulet lacrimas carnificemque vocet.
tu contra obiciens, quae tuto diluat illa,
et veris falso crimine deme fidem.

But still, she must sometimes pick fights with you

and feign tears and call you a villain.
You, on the other hand, should accuse her of something she can safely refute—
destroy his belief in true crimes with a false charge.
(2.2.35-38)

Yet this situation is no different from the scenario the *amator* will shortly describe in which the slave will tell the truth to his master and suffer punishment—there, too, the *puella* will weep and deny the accusations and, according to the *amator*, the result for Bagoas will be a beating, not rewards (2.2.55-60).⁶⁴ The poet, thus, again depicts the slave caught between the conflicting demands of two superiors (*ambo domini*, 2.2.32). He is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't: he may be punished both for disobedience and for good behavior and, thus, is offered no possibility for reprieve or escape.

In addition, as in the case of the *ianitor* of poem 1.6 and the aged bawd of poem 1.8, it is evident that the *amator* feels threatened by Bagoas and therefore refers to the *custos*' physical vulnerability in order to overcome his fears of his own. As McKeown (1998, *ad loc.*) points out, the opening line of the poem (*quem penes est dominam servandi cura, Bagoa*) is “reminiscent of prayers addressed to deities”⁶⁵ and thus reveals the reversal of roles between the elite, male, lover-poet and the menial household slave. Further, the *amator* himself links his physical threats against the *custos* to his fear of him, saying “if you're wise, *custos*, believe me, stop earning hatred: everyone wishes that the person he fears were dead” (*si sapias, o custos, odium, mihi crede, mereri / desine: quem metuit quisque, perisse cupit*, 2.2.9-10). The *amator*'s words *te...timeo* to the *ianitor* of

⁶⁴ Cf. Davis (1977: 94): “Ovid suggested in vv. 31-38 that Bagoas concoct false accusations which the *puella* could easily dismiss and thus reap rich rewards. Here [at lines 55-60] he intimates that true accusations are just as easily dismissed by a beautiful girl and that only punishment will result.”

⁶⁵ McKeown cites Plautus, *Poenulus* 1187; Propertius 3.7.57; and Statius, *Silvae* 1.4.16.

1.6 are thus paralleled here with *quem metuit*. Again, the *amator* reflexively seeks to intimidate those who intimidate him—to reverse the role-reversal he experiences in asking favors from a slave and return to the *status quo* by drawing attention to the slave’s physical vulnerability.

The *amator*’s hostility to the slave he must conciliate is further shown by the second poem of the diptych, which follows upon Bagoas’ apparent refusal to yield to the *amator*’s rhetoric and allow him access to the girl.⁶⁶ No direct reference to Bagoas’ castrated state has been made in 2.2 although, as Davis (1977: 88) points out, “the name Bagoas was commonly associated with eunuchs”⁶⁷ so the audience may have been aware that the *amator* was addressing a eunuch from the opening line of the first poem (which would have made the *amator*’s subject position all the more piquant). In the second poem, the *amator*, apparently frustrated by his failure to convince the *custos* to abandon his duty, makes Bagoas’ enucleated testicles his main theme with a stream of insults and mockery. He blames Bagoas’ denial of his appeal on his castration, claiming that, if Bagoas were able to feel desire for a girl, he would sympathize with the *amator*’s plight (2.3.5-6). He then goes on to jeeringly list the activities that Bagoas, as a eunuch, is unable to participate in, concluding that Bagoas’ only option is to ingratiate himself with his mistress: “without her, what good are you?” (*si careas illa, quis tuus usus erit*, 2.3.12). Whereas in poem 2.2, the *amator* had implied that Bagoas’ connivance was necessary for his affair with the *puella* to proceed, in 2.3 he scornfully claims that the

⁶⁶ Cf. Davis (1977: 85-87) and Damon (1990: 284-285).

⁶⁷ Cf. Pliny the Elder, *NH* XIII.41: *in horto Bagou: ita vocant spadones, qui apud eos [the Persians] etiam regnavere*.

custos can easily be deceived and mere politeness has motivated his request (2.3.15-17). The poem ends on an ominous note: as the *amator* tells Bagoas, “we’re asking, while you still have a chance of earning rewards” (*rogamus / dum bene ponendi munera tempus habes*, 2.3.17-18). The pentameter strongly suggests that Bagoas will lose his position in the household if he does not cooperate—whether through demotion or resale is left unclear, but neither option is attractive. The diptych thus closes with the slave in an invidious position—trapped between two masters and guaranteed punishment on either side.

It is of further significance that this diptych is placed so early in Book 2: poem 2.2 follows immediately upon a much lighter poem in which the lover-poet reasserts his *recusatio* of epic in favor of elegy and it thus provides a sinister alternative to this traditional programmatic opening. Book 2, as we shall see, focuses heavily on the vulnerability of the *puella*’s body and the placement of the address to Bagoas at the opening of the second book of the collection encourages us to read her body in the following poems in light of the brutalized slave body that precedes it. As Bagoas is vulnerable to physical suffering at the hands of the *vir*, so is the *puella* vulnerable at the hands of the *amator*. Moreover, the invidious position in which the *amator* attempts to place the *custos* parallels the situation in which he regularly places his mistress: she must earn her living by selling her body but, as we shall see, the sexual side of her profession has dangerous consequences both for her life and her livelihood. Bagoas’ *catenae*, his *lividia crura*, and his *verbera* thus cast a shadow over the rest of the book and can be viewed as an alternative to the programmatic *blanditias elegosque leves* (2.1.21) of the preceding poem.

Indeed, the poem directly following the diptych on the attempted coercion of Bagoas returns to the body of the *puella* and, in fact, takes the objectification of the beloved introduced in *Amores* Book 1 to new heights. In poem 2.4, the lover-poet bewails his own promiscuity, saying “There’s not one fixed kind of beauty which attracts my attentions—there are a hundred reasons why I’m always in love” (*non est certa meos quae forma invitet amores | centum sunt causae, cur ego semper amem*, 2.4.9-10). He then goes on to describe the different behaviors and accomplishments that attract him: he likes women both provocative (*procax*, 2.4.13) and aloof (*aspera*, 2.4.15); both learned (*docta*, 2.4.17) and ignorant (*rudis*, 2.4.18); he likes girls who can sing—and those who can play the lyre—and those who can dance (2.4.25-30). He closes with physical types: he likes them both tall and short (2.4.33-36); fair and dark (2.4.39-44); old and young (2.4.45).

In describing his desire for these various anonymous types, the *amator* repeatedly imagines them in explicitly sexual positions: the provocative girl intrigues him because “she gives hope of being agile in the soft bed” (*spemque dat in molli mobilis esse toro*, 2.4.14); the girl who walks stiffly “could be softer at a man’s touch” (*at poterit tacto mollior esse viro*, 2.4.24), the tall girl “could lie spread over the whole bed” (*et potes in toto multa iacere toro*, 2.4.34). Even the girl who criticizes his poetry is sexually appealing: “I want to open the thighs of my critic” (*culpantis cupiam sustinuisse femur*, 2.4.22). The poet thus turns the reader’s attention from the brutalized slave body of the previous two poems to the sexualized—yet generic—body of the elegiac beloved. As in the early poems of *Amores* Book 1, the beloved is deliberately genericized—yet here the *amator* openly confesses (*confiteor*, 2.4.3) that he is not interested in women as

individuals, merely as sexual objects. This perspective is reinforced by the repetition of forms of the verb *placere* (*places*, 2.4.17; *placita*, 2.4.18; *placeo...placet*, 2.4.20; *placet*, 2.4.29; *placuit*, 2.4.43; *placet*, 2.4.46). While the diptych on the badgered *custos* of poems 2.2-2.3 may seem to have little in common with a catalogue of the various types of sexually attractive elegiac women, in fact the juxtaposition of these poems serves to reinforce the linkages forged in *Amores* Book 1 between the vulnerable bodies of slaves and the vulnerable body of the elegiac *puella*. Bagoas' body is an object, exposed both to the whip and to the gaze of the cuddling *puella* and *vir* (2.2.61-62), just as the bodies of these anonymous women are exposed to the fetishistic gaze of the *amator*.

The focus remains on the *puella*'s body in poem 2.5, which, while not a member of a diptych is nonetheless one of a pair: it is a reverse echo of poem 1.4, in which the *amator* worries over an upcoming dinner party he will be attending with his beloved and her *vir*, the man who has contractual rights over her.⁶⁸ He instructs her in various amorous tricks to communicate with him behind her *vir*'s back, but fears both the possibility of his beloved canoodling with another man under his very eyes and the reality that she will have sex with another man later that night.⁶⁹ The prospect of witnessing his *puella* kissing another man frightens the *amator* to such an extent that he threatens to become a *manifestus amator* and lay claim to the kisses, saying "I will lay hands on them" (*iniciam manus*, 1.4.40). The phrase *inicare manus* is a legal formula for claiming rights to or asserting ownership over stolen property and is here an idle (and ironic)

⁶⁸ See James (2003a: 41-52 and 2006: 271-277) on the identification of the *vir* as the primary customer of an independent *meretrix*.

⁶⁹ Cf. James (2006): 284.

threat—it is the *vir*, not the *amator*, who has legal rights over the *puella* (*iure coacta*, 1.4.64).⁷⁰ In poem 1.4, the *amator* can only watch helplessly as his mistress leaves with her *vir* and ask her, pathetically, to lie to him about their night together (1.4.69-70).

In poem 2.5, the tables have turned and the *amator* has become the *vir*—he is now forced to watch (*ipse miser vidi*, 2.5.13) his beloved engaging in the very same tricks he had taught the beloved of poem 1.4. It is the *puella*'s body which communicates illicitly with the other man of poem 2.5: agency is ascribed to her eyebrow (2.5.15), her eyes (2.5.17), and her fingers (2.5.18). As in poem 1.4, kisses are the last straw and the sight of them causes the *amator* to burst out with the same phrase *inicere manus* used at 1.4.40 (2.5.30). Yet in this case his hands are those of an owner (*dominas...manus*) and he will lay them on “what is mine by right” (*in mea iura*): the *amator* now has the legal control over the *puella* that he coveted in poem 1.4, but it has done him no good.

The *amator*'s anger and frustration at this situation impel him to physical violence: as he says, “I wanted to tear apart her hair, all done-up as it was | and to mount an attack on her soft cheeks” (*sicut erant et erant culti laniare capillos | et fuit in teneras impetus ire genas*, 2.5.45-46).⁷¹ Yet the beauty of the *puella*'s blush, described elaborately in a series of similes (2.5.35-40), disarms him: “When I saw her beauty, my strong arms fell” (*ut faciem vidi, fortes cecidere lacerti*, 2.5.47). Indeed, the *amator* is reduced to the status of a suppliant (*supplex*, 2.5.49), begging for the kisses he just saw

⁷⁰ Cf. Daube (1966): 226-227; McKeown (1989): *ad loc.*; Miller (2004): 180-182. Daube (1966: 225) argues that the prohibition *oscula praecipue nulla dedisse velis* also follows a legal formula, *ne quis fecisse velit*, concluding “That Ovid uses the form in the cause of precisely the opposite of public order and decency would tickle his readers.”

⁷¹ Note that it is also the *puella*'s cheeks and hair that he assaults in poem 1.7 (see page 46).

bestowed on another. Yet the poem closes with the *amator*'s fear that his beloved's kissing technique has improved (*haec quoque, quam docui, multo meliora fuerunt*, 2.5.55) and that it must have been learned in bed with another man (*illa nisi in lecto nusquam potuere doceri*, 2.5.60). As in poem 1.4, the *amator* fears what goes on when his beloved is out of his sight—and out of his control. As James (2006: 289) writes, “the lover's real concern...[is] the *puella*'s secret interiority and sexuality, unknown and unknowable.” When faced with the reality of this interiority and sexuality, his instinctual recourse is to violence. In poem 2.5, it is only the *puella*'s cleverly deployed body language—her *pudor* (2.5.34), her downcast eyes (*spectabat terram*, 2.5.43), and her sad face (*maesta...in vultu*, 2.5.44)—what James (2006: 295-299) has termed the “courtesan's choreography”—that protects her from violence at the hands of her *amator*. As the reader knows from poem 1.7, physical abuse is always a possibility for the elegiac *puella*.

I now turn to a pair of diptychs—poems 1.11-1.12 and 2.7-2.8—which, like poems 2.2-2.3, include *suasoriae* addressed to slaves. Although the first of this pair occurred in *Amores* Book 1, I treat it here because of its strong thematic links to the second pair, which is the central diptych of Book 2. Both diptychs in this pair include poems addressed to Corinna's female slaves and, thus, they introduce a new vulnerability for exploitation on the part of the *amator*: the social, legal, and physical vulnerability of the female slave to rape and sexual abuse.

The first of these diptychs is not explicitly sexual, but, when re-read through the lens of poems 2.7-2.8, becomes more disturbing. The *ancilla* introduced in poem 1.11 is (like the *ancilla* of poem 2.7-2.8) the final slave character of her book. She is a

hairdresser named Nape who is also the go-between between the *amator* and his mistress: she is asked to carry a letter from the *amator* to Corinna, requesting a meeting and, in poem 1.12, we learn the negative outcome of that request.

Poem 1.11, addressed to Nape, is closely related to poems 1.6 and 2.2. Like them, it is a *suasoria* addressed to a slave—but one who is apparently more cooperative than Bagoas or the unnamed *ianitor*. Yet there are echoes of the *amator*'s hostility towards both in his treatment of Nape. The *amator* put the doorkeeper and the *custos* in an untenable position by demanding that they disobey orders from their owners in order to indulge him. Similarly, in poem 1.11, the *amator* makes contradictory demands on Nape—first ordering her to wait until Corinna is unoccupied (*vacuae*, 1.11.15) to give her his letter, then telling her to be sure that Corinna reads it immediately (*continuo*, 1.11.16). Thus Nape must negotiate the contradictory instructions of the lover—another reminder of the difficulties slaves must face from the whims and impulses of their superiors.

Furthermore, there are hints that Nape must also negotiate between the demands of her mistress and of the *amator*, her social superior. The speaker tells us that Nape has often encouraged Corinna to visit him “when she was hesitating” (*dubitantem... Corinnam*, 1.11.5), indicating that he has prevailed on the slave to use her influence on his behalf—a risky business for an *ancilla*, who may annoy her mistress or find herself accused of disobedience and disloyalty if she goes too far.⁷² Indeed, the poet reveals that Nape “has often been found to be faithful to me in my difficulties” (*saepe laboranti fida*

⁷² For example, in Plautus' *Mostellaria*, the *meretrix* Philematium threatens her *ancilla* (and retired-courtesan-cum-adviser) with a beating if she doesn't stop giving Philematium advice she doesn't want to hear (*Most.* 239-240).

reperta mihi, 1.11.6). The use of *fida* to describe Nape's relationship with the *amator*, rather than her mistress, is surprising and indicates that she, like the *ianitor* and the *custos*, is also negotiating between competing demands from two different authorities.

Similarly, just as the speaker cruelly equates the *ianitor* with the doors he guards—with voiceless, inanimate objects—so Nape is equated with the tablets she carries:⁷³ as Henderson (1991: 75) notes, in Greek her name, *νάπη*, means “wooded grove.” Indeed, there is constant slippage between Nape and the tablets: in the close of poem 1.11, the *amator* promises to dedicate the tablets to Venus if they return victorious, saying he will name them, in the dedication, “faithful serving-girls” (*fidas...ministras*, 1.11.27). The use of *fidas*, echoing the *fida* applied to Nape in line 1.11.6, is particularly striking and is reinforced in the following pentameter when the poet further personifies the tablets by addressing them directly (*fuistis*, 1.11.28). The identification of Nape with the tablets serves to dehumanize her—and, indeed, displaces her from her previously central role as go-between to a mere vehicle of transportation. Where the poet had praised Nape in the opening of poem 1.11 by describing her skill as a hairdresser and recounting her many services to him and had emphasized the importance of her role as letter-carrier by overwhelming her with instructions on how she should present the tablets to Corinna, by the end of the poem it is the *victrices...tabellas* who are given responsibility for Corinna’s reply. It is the *tabellae*, after all, that carry the lover-poet’s own words; Nape

⁷³ Cf. *Ars Amatoria* 3.621-626, in which the *praeceptor amoris* urges the elegiac *meretrix* to deceive her *custos*, who may search her maid for concealed notes, to write directly on the slave’s back: “let her bear your words on her own body” (*inque suo corpore verba ferat*, 3.626). Thus, in this case, the slave literally becomes the tablets.

would speak for herself and is therefore not to be credited with the success or failure of the mission.

This diminishing of Nape's importance is carried over into poem 1.12, which is largely an invective directed against the writing tablets that have returned with Corinna's refusal. Yet, in the second couplet of the poem, the blame for this disaster is ascribed to Nape: she tripped when crossing the threshold (*ad limen digitos restitit icta Nape*, 1.12.4) and the poet therefore warns her to be more careful (*cautius; sobria* 1.12.6) in future. The rest of the poem is dedicated to castigating the tablets themselves—they were made by a criminal and from an unlucky tree that had been used to hang a murderer (1.12.15-16) and is nested in by birds of ill omen (1.12.17-20). Yet the poet has deliberately inserted a criticism of Nape before turning to the tablets—thus demonstrating that Nape will not receive credit if the tablets return with good news, but will be blamed if they return with bad. The poet, therefore, includes in poem 1.12 another reference to the difficult and delicate position of the slave—seldom praised but often blamed.⁷⁴

As poems 1.11-1.12 look back to poem 1.6, they also, as Henderson has pointed out, look forward to poems 2.7-2.8, the second diptych about one of Corinna's *ancillae*—but this servant has been the object of the poet's sexual abuse. The first poem of the diptych is addressed to the mistress and is a protest against her accusations of infidelity—accusations which the *amator* figures as constant (*semper*, 2.7.1; *totiens* 2.7.2) and unreasonable. In the middle of the poem, however, it becomes clear that the lover is

⁷⁴ Davis (1977: 81) suggests that the *amator*'s hostility towards the tablets (rather than Nape) is also based on self-interest: the tablets are “replaceable” whereas Nape is “indispensable” and the *amator* is therefore careful not to offend her as he will need her services in the future.

defending himself against a *specific* accusation: that of sex with another of Corinna's hairdresses, Cypassis. He responds to this charge with a dismissive, generic attack on the physical body of the slave: she is "filthy" (*sordida*), and "has a miserable lot in life" (*contemptae sortis*, 2.7.20). Moreover, as he asks rhetorically, "What free man would want to go to bed with a servant and embrace a back scarred by the lash?" (*quis veneris famulae conubia liber inire / tergaque complecti verbere secta velit?* 2.7.21-22). Thus, as James (1997: 67) writes, "in 2.7 [Cypassis] is figured as an unexceptional example of a social class whose existence is forcibly devoted to domestic labor for another class." She is therefore faceless and speechless, but not bodiless: her body, in fact, is the only concrete thing about her and it is defined as an object of physical violence.

The first surprise of the following poem is that Cypassis was actually present at the confrontation between her mistress and the *amator* and was thus forced to hear this abuse of her body firsthand. The second surprise is that Corinna's suspicions were justified: in the second couplet of the poem, the *amator* refers to the "secret pleasure" (*iucundo...furto*, 2.8.3) he has enjoyed with Cypassis. Because of their relationship, he is therefore obliged to backtrack and make excuses for his abuse of her in the previous poem. But, as James (1997: 67) points out, the *amator's* rhetoric is unpersuasive. He opens the poem with praise of Cypassis' skills as a hairdresser and thus, as James (1997: 67) puts it, describes her only "in terms of her *utility* to her owner and her owner's lover."⁷⁵ He also asks "how did Corinna find out about *your* trysts" (*sensit concubitus unde Corinna tuos?* 2.8.6), a question that places the blame for the relationship entirely

⁷⁵ The adjective *apta* recalls the description of Nape, in poem 1.11, as *utilis* (1.11.2).

on Cypassis and is, furthermore, reminiscent of the way the *amator* phrased his description of Corinna's accusation in the previous poem: *Cypassis*, he said, "is accused of violating her mistress' bed" (*obicitur dominae contemerasse torum*, 2.7.16). In both cases, then, the *amator* makes no reference to his (indispensable!) role in the affair.

The *amator* then attempts to excuse his earlier rhetorical question with another one, asking "So what if I said that anyone who could cheat with a slave-girl was out of his mind?" (*quid, quod in ancilla siquis delinquere possit,| illum ego contendi mente carere bona?* 2.8.9-10). He introduces the exempla of Achilles' passion for Briseis and Agamemnon's for Cassandra to justify himself. Yet, as James (1997: 68-69) points out, these two women were, although captives, nevertheless elite and "there is no chance that [Cypassis] is a princess whose land was sacked and family killed before she was taken captive, nor that a great hero like Achilles will claim he loves her and plans to wed her." The *amator*'s rhetoric thus serves only to remind Cypassis of her status as object—she is a slave, whose only purpose in life is to be of use to others; she is in a very dangerous position, accused of betraying her mistress; and she is no epic heroine.

The second half of the poem reveals just how precarious Cypassis' position is. The *amator* congratulates himself on his presence of mind in distracting Corinna from her charges of infidelity (2.8.16-17) and announces that he expects a sexual repayment (*pretium...dulce repende*, 2.8.21) for protecting their secret. Cypassis shakes her head (*renuis*, 2.8.23) and the *amator* responds angrily, calling her *ingrata* (2.8.23) and *stulta* (2.8.25) and threatening to turn informant and confess to Corinna:

quod si stulta negas, index ante acta fatebor

et veniam culpa proditor ipse meae
quoque loco tecum fuerim quotiensque, Cypassi,
narrabo dominae quotque quibusque modis.

But if you stupidly deny me, I'll be the informer,
I'll confess what we've done before and become the betrayer of my own guilt.
I'll tell your mistress where I was with you, Cypassis,
how often and how many times and in how many ways.
(2.8.24-27)

This vengeful threat carries with it a whole host of dangers to Cypassis: as James (1997: 67) observes, the word *domina* “means something very different to Cypassis than to the *amator*.” Corinna is literally Cypassis’ mistress, in the sense that she has absolute control over her fate: Cypassis, like Bagoas and the *ianitor* of the earlier poems, is subject to physical punishments ranging from beating to crucifixion and she may also be sold into circumstances much worse than serving as a hairdresser to a wealthy courtesan. The *amator*, of course, faces only the jealousy and anger of Corinna if he confesses, but Cypassis’ life and livelihood are at stake.

Furthermore, the *amator*’s threat exposes the terrible plight of the female slave who is also a sexual object: she must choose between rape at the hands of the *amator* or torture at the hands of her mistress. In addition to rape in the purest sense of unwanted sex, she also faces violent rape if she refuses and the possibility of pregnancy with the attendant risks of childbirth and of her mistress’ anger if she yields. Her position is thus by far the worst of any of the vulnerable slaves in the *Amores*: that her physical vulnerability is also a sexual vulnerability results in a self-replicating chain of consequences, all of which pose a physical danger.

That this sexual vulnerability is generic to female slaves is shown by the echoes between poems 2.7-2.8 and poem 1.11. Both McKeown (1989 on 1.11.1-8) and Henderson (1991: 76) have noticed the intertextual relationship between the diptychs on Nape and Cypassis. Poems 1.11 and 2.8 both open with long periods addressed to the *ancilla* that praise her skill at styling hair and there are strong echoes between the third lines of both these addresses: just as Nape is “known to be useful for her services in the stolen nights” (*inque ministeriis furtivae cognita noctis / utilis*, 1.11.3-4), so Cypassis, the hairdresser of poems 2.7 and 2.8, is “not inexperienced, as I know from our stolen pleasure” (*et mihi iucundo non rustica cognita furto*, 2.8.3). Both Nape and Cypassis are described as *docta* (1.11.2; *doctas...manus*, 2.7.24) and *fida* (1.11.6; 2.7.25)—although, ironically, Nape is “faithful” to the *amator* while Cypassis is “faithful” to her mistress. Cypassis is called a “pleasing servant” (*grata ministra*, 2.7.24) to her mistress and the writing tablets (which are, as I argued above, equated with Nape) are called *fidas..ministras* (1.11.27) and both slaves are called *ancilla* (1.11.2; 2.7.25; 2.8.9; 2.8.11). Furthermore, as *ancillae*, both are described in terms of their utility to others: Nape is called *utilis* (1.11.2) and Cypassis is called *apta* (2.7.4) As Henderson (1991: 76) argues, “Nape, then, pre-figures and is to be re-read through Cypassis.” On encountering the Cypassis poems of Book 2, the reader is invited to reconsider the role of Nape in poems 1.11 and 1.12 and the similarities between her and Cypassis raise the possibility that she too may have been a sexual conquest of the *amator*'s—and thus lend a new interpretation to the *ministeriis furtivae...noctis* referred to in 1.11.3 and to Nape's apparent willingness to aid the *amator* in his relationship with her mistress: perhaps she, like Cypassis, was

blackmailed or threatened into doing so.⁷⁶ At the least, the intertextual relationship between the two diptychs highlights the vulnerability of both *ancillae* since, whether the *amator* chose to rape Nape or not, he was certainly socially, legally, and physically capable of doing so—as the Cypassis diptych so clearly shows.

It is further worth noting that the Cypassis diptych reveals not only the *amator*'s sexual abuse of the female slave but his emotional abuse of his mistress. In defending himself against her accusations in poem 2.7, the *amator* casts Corinna as a carping, shrewish figure who views every expression on his face as evidence of infidelity. He then implies that her accusations will drive him to the very infidelity he is accused of: “You know, I wish I *were* guilty of some sin: those who deserve it can endure the penalty with resignation (*atque ego peccati vellem mihi conscius essem | aequo animo poenam, qui meruere, ferunt*, 2.7.11-12). Thus, as James (1997: 72) points out, both poems 2.7 and 2.8 are aimed at silencing a woman—“a silence that allows [the *amator*] unimpeded sexual access to both.” We may thus be reminded of the *amator*'s idealized description of the perfect woman in poem 1.5: a woman without a face or a mouth; a woman who never speaks. Furthermore, as McKeown (1998: *ad.* 2.7.22), the *amator*'s contemptuous remarks about slave bodies in poem 2.7 could be ill-received by a *meretrix* who may well be a freedwoman herself. It is, thus, not only Cypassis who is objectified and abused in these poems: the poet has further linked the vulnerable bodies of the slave and the elegiac *puella* by revealing that both are the objects of the *amator*'s sexual interest—and his

⁷⁶ Although there is no reason to suppose that a courtesan might not have several hairdressers, there is a possibility that the introduction of a new *ancilla* character in poems 2.7-2.8 hints that Nape was indeed sexually involved with the *amator*, that their liaison was discovered, and she was therefore replaced by Cypassis. “Replacement” here could of course mean either killed or sold.

anger. In poem 1.5, Corinna was subjected to a sexual assault; in poem 1.7, she was beaten, and, now, in poem 2.8, her slave is threatened with a beating (and who knows what else) and blackmailed into gratifying the *amator*'s sexual desires. Poems 2.7-2.8 thus serve to reinforce the equation of the *puella*'s body with those of her slaves: she has suffered what Cypassis has suffered and vice versa.

Although Corinna serves as a double of Cypassis in poems 2.7-2.8, the final poems I shall discuss constitute the only diptych to directly treat the body of the mistress. Furthermore, these two poems form the central part of a larger complex that focuses on the *puella*'s body: in poems 2.12 and 2.15, her body is the object of a fetishistic attention that continues the objectification and genericization of the elegiac beloved that has been a theme of the *Amores* since the opening poems of Book 1.⁷⁷ Poem 2.12 celebrates in militaristic terms the lover-poet's triumph over the *vir*, the *custos*, and the *ianua firma* (2.12.3) that have prevented him from gaining sexual access to his *puella*: as he exults, "I have conquered—look, Corinna is in my lap!" (*vicimus; in nostro est ecce Corinna sinu*, 2.12.2). The *amator* compares his acquisition of Corinna's sexual favors to the conquest of an enemy city, saying "a girl was captured under my generalship" (*est ductu capta puella meo*, 2.12.8). She is his "spoils" (*praeda*, 2.12.6)—an object of plunder—and the reader is reminded of the *amator*'s description of the *puella* as a "sad captive" (*tristis captiva*, 1.7.39) in a triumphal procession after his beating of her in poem 1.7. Yet here, the *amator* claims, his victory was bloodless (*sanguine praeda caret*, 2.12.6; *sine caede*, 2.12.27).

⁷⁷ Fredrick (1997: 184-185) was the first to identify the relationship between these four poems as a complex of violence and voyeurism.

The falsity of this claim is shown by the following poems, which reveal the full extent of the elegiac *puella*'s vulnerability as sexual *praeda*: in poem 2.13, Corinna is “in danger of her life” (*in dubio vitae*, 2.13.2) from a botched abortion attempt. Gamel (1989: 186) and others have noted the shocking juxtaposition of 2.12, with its triumphant rejoicing in a “bloodless” sexual victory, and 2.13, which shows the bloody consequences of even elegiac sex.⁷⁸ Although the *amator* claims that the child is (probably) his (2.13.5-6), yet, as Gamel (1989: 186) further points out, he accepts no responsibility for Corinna's condition—in fact, he is angry that she took such a risk without his knowledge (*illa quidem clam me tantum molita pericli | ira digna mea*, 2.13.3-4). Nor, as James (2003: 176) points out, does the *amator* express any interest in the child: although the reader is teased with the possibility when he prays to Isis to “spare two in one” (*in una parce duobus*, 2.13.15), in fact, the pentameter reveals that the second life is his own, not the baby's: “for you will give life to my mistress and she to me” (2.13.16)⁷⁹—a formulation which suggests that he is concerned with Corinna's fate, not for her sake, but for his own.⁸⁰

In fact, as Gamel shows, the lover-poet's focus remains, in 2.13, directed at himself: after describing Corinna's condition in the opening couplet of the poem, the *amator* turns to his own feelings on the subject and then to a long and flowery prayer to Isis on Corinna's behalf. This address to Isis, which comprises over a third of the poem,

⁷⁸ See Fredrick (1997): 184; McKeown (1998): 276-277; James (2003): 173.

⁷⁹ Cf. Gamel (1989): 188; McKeown (1998): *ad loc.*

⁸⁰ Cf. Watts (1973: 93): “Danger to Corinna is essentially a threat to Ovid. At best he has lost a perpetuation of himself; at worse he could have lost his mistress.”

is largely an elaborate description of Egypt, dotted with references to Isis' sacred rites and including several epicizing compound epithets (*palmiferamque Pharon*, 2.13.8; *corniger Apis*, 2.13.14). Gamel (1989: 188) points out that this prayer is “an ostentatious use of *commoratio*,” a rhetorical figure whose usage indicates that the *amator* is either indulging in an opportunity to show off his rhetorical and poetic abilities or that his is distracting the reader from his own culpability in Corinna's plight. In the close of the poem, the *amator* returns to his own experience with a promise to offer votive gifts if Corinna lives, reinforcing the focus on himself with the repetition of *ipse ego* (2.13.23) and *ipse* (2.13.24).⁸¹ Finally, the *titulus* he promises to set up in the goddess' honor again foregrounds the *amator* at the expense of Corinna: it will read, he promises, “Naso, for Corinna saved” (*SERVATA NASO CORINNA*, 2.13.25), with his name in the nominative and hers in an ablative absolute. Thus, as Gamel (1989:189) writes, “the syntax...epitomiz[es] the relationship between the *amator* and Corinna throughout the poem: he is the subject and the female is confined to a subordinate background position, a locus that makes his centrality and dominance possible.”

Thus, although Corinna's vulnerable body opened the poem with the image of her “lying exhausted” in grave danger (*lassa Corinna iacet*, 2.13.2), the *amator* does not dwell on it as he did in, for example, poem 1.7—in this case, while her body was also endangered by him, the actual abortion was undertaken without his knowledge and thus “demonstrates Corinna's independence from the *amator*” (Gamel 1989: 189). The *amator* thus attempts to regain control and agency by focusing on his own reaction and by

⁸¹ Cf. Gamel (1989): 188.

attributing Corinna's hoped-for recovery to himself—yet he cannot succeed in full. The image of Corinna's vulnerable body and the (unspoken) relationship between idealized elegiac sex and the messy realities of pregnancy and abortion overshadows the entire poem, despite the *amator*'s attempts to distract from it. No other poem in the surviving corpus of elegy explicitly acknowledges that the sexual access elegiac lover-poets so urgently seek may have concrete physical consequences, but, as Mack (1988: 62) puts it, “in real life people like Corinna could get pregnant.”⁸² Thus, all of elegy represents a threat to the *puella*'s body: its object is to have sex with her, but that sex may cost her her life—whether, as James (2003: 175) points out, through the very real hazards of childbirth in antiquity or the equally dangerous process of abortion.

The second poem of the diptych reinforces the first poem's acknowledgement of the dangers of abortion, but in this case the lover-poet's concern is not for his *puella*'s life—rather, he attacks the practice of abortion in general and with great vitriol. While the *puella*'s body was largely absent from the previous poem, here it returns to the foreground as the *amator* protests that “women suffer wounds from their own weapons” (*suis patiuntur vulnera telis*, 2.14.2). The whole poem, in fact, is filled with vivid imagery of pregnancy, blood, and death. The *amator* lists several heroes who would have been lost to history if their mothers had aborted, describing their pregnancies in vividly physical terms (*tumido...in ventre*, 2.14.15; *gravida...in alvo*, 2.14.17). Medea, who killed her sons, was “spattered with the blood of children” (*Colchida respersam puerorum sanguine*, 2.14.29). His depictions of abortion are both gruesome and detailed:

⁸² James (2003: 176-183) argues that *Amores* 2.13-14 raise the possibility that, indeed, the illnesses of earlier elegiac *puellae* may have been related to pregnancy and/or abortion.

the first woman to abort is described as “tearing out helpless fetuses” (*teneros convellere fetus*, 2.14.5) and he asks rhetorically “Why do you gouge out your own innards with probing weapons and give dreadful poisons to the unborn?” (*vestra quid effoditis subiectis viscera telis | et nondum natis dira venena datis?* 2.14.27-28). The *amator*’s language returns the focus to the vulnerability of the female body and makes luridly clear what kind of suffering Corinna was experiencing in the previous poem.

Moreover, according to the *amator*, such suffering is warranted. The first woman to abort deserved to die in the attempt (2.14.5-6), as, indeed, does any woman who dies in a botched abortion: when the crowd sees one carried out for the funeral pyre, they shout “she deserved it!” (*clamant ‘merito’*, 12.14.40). This passage, describing the death of women who attempt abortions, closes the poem and reinforces once again that elegiac sex represents, in James’s (2003: 181) words, “a constant occupational hazard” for the elegiac beloved—it may even be fatal. The phrase “she herself dies” (*ipsa perit*) is repeated twice, at end of the first line and beginning of the second line of a couplet (2.14.38-39), thus rendering the deadly consequences of elegiac sex inescapable. Indeed, words for death pervade the entire poem (*perire*, 2.14.6; *deperitura*, 2.14.10; *necasset*, 2.14.15; *necante*, 2.14.22; *caesum*, 2.14.30; *necat*, 2.14.38). The diptych closes with a direct threat, not to women who abort in general, but to Corinna in particular: the *amator* asks the gods that she may escape this abortion attempt unpunished, but closes with a request that “the second crime should pay the penalty” (*poenam culpa secunda ferat*, 2.14.44). Not only has the *amator* endangered Corinna’s life by means of the sex he so consistently demands—and celebrates—he actually prays that she may die if she offends his sensibilities with a second abortion attempt.

Thus, in *Amores* 2.14, the *amator*—having raped her,⁸³ beaten her, and otherwise abused her by silencing, cheating on, and deceiving her⁸⁴—finally threatens Corinna with death: both indirectly, by seeking sex that may result in pregnancy and/or abortion, and directly, by praying that she should die in a second attempt. Yet, as is typical of Ovid’s *amator*, his threats against others reveal his own vulnerability. As James (2003: 174-176) argues, abortion is very nearly a professional requirement for a *meretrix*. This fact is exposed by the *amator* himself: the only possible motive he attributes to a woman seeking an abortion is the avoidance of stretch marks (*ut careat rugarum crimine venter*, 2.14.7). Yet, as James (2003: 174) points out, the *amator* himself has indicated that his sexual appreciation of Corinna is based on her perfect body: in *Amores* 1.5 he exults “there was no fault anywhere on her whole body” (*in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit*, 2.5.18) and particularly mentions her “flat stomach” (*planus...venter*, 2.5.21).⁸⁵ As a professional sex worker, then, “Corinna’s putative fear of stretch marks is based not on vanity but on professional necessity” (James 2003: 175). Furthermore, a pregnancy would prevent her from practicing her trade for at least several months, and therefore

⁸³ As I argued above (see pages 35-36; 39), poem 1.5 may be interpreted as a poem of rape, since Corinna fights (*pugnabat*, 1.5.14) and the *amator*’s claim “she fought as if she did not want to win” (*quae cum ita pugnaret, tamquam quae vincere nollet*, 1.5.15) is suspect, given that he has effectively silenced Corinna by leaving her faceless and voiceless in this poem.

⁸⁴ Due (1980: 148) points out that the *amator*’s infidelity and deception are referenced in 2.14 when, referring to the mythological exempla of Medea and Procne, who killed their children to punish their husbands for infidelity, the *amator* asks “Tell me, what Tereus, what Jason provoked you to pierce your body with maddened hand?” (*dicite, quis Tereus, quis vos inritet Iaso | figere sollicita corpora vestra manu*, 2.14.33-34). The question “What Tereus, what Jason...” is meant to be rhetorical but the *amator*’s point is undermined by the fact that, as every reader knows, he has cheated on Corinna—as is clear from poems 2.7-2.8 and 2.10 and is implicit in poem 2.4.

⁸⁵ Cf. Propertius 2.15.21-22, in which the *amator* argues that Cynthia has no need to cover herself up but should come to bed naked because she has not yet been pregnant and so has no unattractive marks (*viderit haec, si quam iam peperisse pudet*), and *Ars* 3.785, in which the *praeceptor amoris* advises women “whose stomach Lucina [the goddess of childbirth] has marked with wrinkles” (*cui rugis uterum Lucina notavit*) not to expose her front to a man while having sex.

represents a significant loss of income. The mere fact that Corinna desires an abortion is, therefore, representative of her profession as a prostitute and, hence, her sexual independence—which the *amator* finds disturbing and intimidating (see the above discussion on poems 1.4 and 2.5).⁸⁶ He himself confesses in poem 2.13 that he cannot be sure Corinna’s child is his (2.13.5-6), reminding the reader that Corinna regularly has sex with other men. As Gamel (1989: 193) argues, even the elaborate prayers that the *amator* employs on Corinna’s behalf in poem 2.13 “reflect not confidence but insecurity, anxiety, awareness of his lack of power. He has no control over the powerful females he invokes. It is they who take action, while he only talks.” As we have seen throughout the *Amores*, the *amator* responds to his own vulnerability by lashing out against those who make him feel vulnerable. His threat against Corinna’s life is, thus, the ultimate—and final—response to the threat which she poses to him through her independence and sexual freedom.

Jarringly, the following poem is another fetishistic celebration of the *puella*’s body—a body that the reader has just been invited to imagine battered and bleeding from a botched abortion attempt. In this poem, the *amator* imagines himself as the ring he is sending as a gift to his mistress: as the ring, he could see and touch her breasts (2.15.11-14), he would be kissed before she sealed a letter (2.15.15-18), and even be taken to bathe with her. Yet, at that point, he would turn back into a man: “But I think if you were naked, my penis would swell with desire and that ring would fulfill the role of a man”

(sed, puto, te nuda mea membra libidine surgent / et peragam partes anulus ille viri,

⁸⁶ Cf. Fredrick (1997: 185): “Like the husband, guard, and locked door Ovid boasted of overcoming in 2.12.3, abortion is another barrier representing the mistress’s independent sexuality, her transgression of Callimachean *mollitia*, and the limits of aesthetic fetishism.”

2.15.25-26). As James (2003a: 175) argues, the fact that the abortion diptych is framed by two poems on the *amator*'s sexual desire for the *puella* makes the causal connection between that sexual desire and the threat to the *puella*'s body unmistakable. Poem 2.15 thus serves as a coda to the abortion poems, reminding the reader that the elegiac lover's unremitting, generic desire for the *puella*'s body can put that body in terrible danger. The juxtaposition of the *puella*'s torn and poisoned *viscera* in 2.14 with her perfect body in 2.15 is disturbing, particularly because it is this body that the *amator* has just threatened with death: the climax of all the other threats he has enacted against her in previous poems.

Indeed, the complex of poems 2.12-2.15 represents the end of the pattern of the juxtaposition of the *puella*'s body with those of her slaves—there are no more slave characters in the *Amores* and no more threats against, or fetishistic descriptions of, the *puella*'s. In fact, as Gamel (1989: 199) points out, Corinna herself begins to disappear at this point: the *amator* complains, in poem 2.17, that her beauty has made her proud and cruel but from then on she is referred to only in the past tense (2.19.9, 3.1.49, 3.7.25). In a 1988 article, Cahoon explores the theme of *militia amoris*, of love as warfare, in the *Amores* and also finds that militaristic descriptions of love cease after poem 2.14 (1988: 303). These poems, then, serve as both the culmination and the annihilation of the theme I have traced to this point—and, I propose, of the *amator*'s relationship with Corinna. She has been assaulted, beaten, and threatened with beating; she has been cheated on and deceived; she has undergone an abortion from which she nearly died—what more can this relationship hold? What more can Corinna suffer at the *amator*'s hands? As Gamel (1989: 196) incisively remarks, “what both poems [2.13 and 2.14] reveal about the

amator provide many reasons why a woman might not have wished to bear him a child”—or, indeed, to continue a relationship with him. As Cahoon (1988: 302) puts it, “To regard love as a kind of warfare is not just a funny conceit about the nature of the sexual act because real hostility and real violence result from such an attitude.” The *amator* has enacted real violence against his mistress and his hostility toward her is clearly shown in his repeated attempts to control her—culminating in his wish for her death if she undergoes a second abortion. The linkage of the *puella*’s body with the bodies of slaves and subalterns has shown the extent of her physical vulnerability—a vulnerability that was elided by the other elegists, who chose to ignore the realities of their mistresses’ social status in favor of a fallacious conceit that depicted elite *amatores* as the slaves of their lower-class girlfriends. Yet it has also shown the vulnerability of the *amator* who has not, for all his threats and posturings, been able to exert the control over his mistress that he so ardently seeks. Indeed, the closing poems of the *Amores* will explore the *amator*’s increasing helplessness as he becomes the prey of the women he originally intended to prey upon.⁸⁷

⁸⁷ See Cahoon (1988): 301-307.

CONCLUSION

As I hope to have shown, Ovid's *Amores* invite a reconsideration of the relationship between the *amator* and the elegiac mistress throughout Roman elegy by comparing her body to the brutalized bodies of other social inferiors. As an elite Roman male, the elegiac lover had absolute power of life, torture, and death over his slaves and the comparison of his mistress' body to the bodies of slaves is, thus, highly disturbing. It reveals that, despite the pose of subservience and devotion adopted by elegiac *amatrices*, their social status gives them an inordinate amount of power over their mistresses. An elite Roman male can legally rape and beat a non-citizen *meretrix* without reprisals (as the Ovidian speaker notes in *Amores* 1.7). The elegiac *puella* must therefore play a very dangerous game in order to secure her livelihood without arousing the anger of her lovers. It is this danger that Ovid exposes through the introduction of a large and varied class of slave characters—characters otherwise largely absent from previous elegy.

Amores 1.5-1.8 expose the vulnerability of the *puella*'s body by juxtaposing it first with the body of a menial domestic slave and then with the body of a dependent retired courtesan. All these poems emphasize the subordinate's physical vulnerability to the *amator*: in poem 1.5, he fights with his mistress and "conquers" her (*victa est*, 1.5.15); in poem 1.6, he imagines the doorkeeper bound and stripped to be beaten (1.6.19-20); in poem 1.7 he beats and terrifies his mistress; and in poem 1.8, he imagines

himself violently attacking the aged bawd (1.8.110-112). This complex of poems, opening with the *amator*'s sexual enjoyment of his mistress and closing with his near-attack on a former courtesan, makes the *puella*'s vulnerability unmistakable: for all his anger and threats against the *ianitor* and the *lena*, it is only the *puella* who suffers actual physical violence at the *amator*'s hands. These poems further expose the link between sexuality and violence in elegy: as I argued in Chapter 1, freedom from sexual penetration, like freedom from physical violence, is a marker of social status. In poems 1.5 and 1.7, the elegiac *puella* is shown to have neither.

Likewise, the diptych poems, which treat the slaves Nape, Bagoas, and Cypassis, further reveal the *amator*'s power abuse and manipulate his social inferiors, and his fondness for doing so. The Cypassis diptych most explicitly asserts the relationship between the bodies of slaves and the body of the elegiac *puella* by revealing that both are subject to both sexual and physical violence at the *amator*'s hands. The final diptych of *Amores* 2.13-2.14, and poems 2.12 and 2.15 bracketing it, again asserts the link between sex and physical vulnerability by showing that the *amator*'s generic sexual desire for his beloved may have deadly consequences. This pattern again serves to link the body of the *puella* with the body of her slaves: the *amator*'s sexual desire for Cypassis also threatens her life, since if Corinna discovers their relationship, Cypassis may be beaten or even crucified. It thus emerges over the course of Books 1 and 2 of the *Amores* that the status of the elegiac beloved in comparison to the *amator* is not so different from that of a slave. Indeed, the *puella* is not merely as vulnerable as the other subordinates in the Ovidian corpus: she is actually more so—she is the only character who is actually physically attacked by the *amator* and her sexual relationship with him almost costs her her life. Her

position as the object of both the *amator*'s desire and his resentment places her in a uniquely risky position and leaves her under constant threat.

I therefore propose that Ovid introduces an element of realism into the *Amores* that is absent from the work of the other elegiac poets. The presence of numerous named slave characters is anomalous in comparison with the rest of elegy, and yet would have been so routine as to be unquestioned in the “real life” of Roman social relationships: all of Roman domestic life was conducted in the presence of slaves.⁸⁸ In this, the *Amores* have more in common with Roman comedy than with previous elegy—comedic romance is constantly fostered and facilitated by slave characters who may simply carry messages or cook meals but also, quite often, run the show, devising the plots that allow the young *amatores* of comedy to obtain their beloveds. A similar element of realism is introduced by the physical “corporeality” (James 2003a: 166; cf. Hexter 1999: 331) of Ovid’s elegiac *puella*. Although, as McKeown (1987: 19) puts it, “It is the prevailing modern opinion that Corinna...either did not exist or is, at best, a *Konzentrationsfigur*, compounded of several different women,” in fact she is the most physically concrete of all the *puellae* of elegy, suffering numerous physical “adventures,” including beating and abortion. Thus, I argue, the revelation of the *puella*'s social inferiority and consequent physical vulnerability to the *amator* is in keeping with Ovid’s pattern of de-romanticizing the elegiac relationship. The anomalous factors in the *Amores*—the presence of slave characters and the focus on the *puella*'s body—are part of a larger project that exposes the messy realities beneath the smooth (*levis*) surface of Augustan elegy. Slavery, rape,

⁸⁸ See Fitzgerald 2000: 51-68.

violence, pregnancy, abortion, and death are all realities with which a Roman erotic relationship would have to grapple—and Ovid, the last of the Roman elegists, exposes them as such.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J.N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- Anderson, W.S. 1993. *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy*. Toronto.
- Andrews, N.E. 2004. "Tragic Re-Presentation and the Semantics of Space in Plautus' *Casina*." *Mnemosyne* 57: 445-64.
- Barsby, J., ed. 1973. *Ovid, Amores I*. Oxford. Reprint, Oxford. 1993.
- Bradley, K.R. 1984. *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire : A Study in Social Control*. Bruxelles.
- Cahoon, L. 1988. "The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*." *TAPA* 118: 293-308.
- Copley, F. 1947. "Servitium Amoris in the Roman Elegists." *TAPA* 78: 285-300.
- Curran, L.C. 1966. "Desultores Amoris: Ovid *Amores* 1.3." *CPh* 61: 47-49.
- Damon, C. 1990. "Poem Division, Paired Poems, and *Amores* 2.9 and 3.11." *TAPhA* 120: 269-290.
- Daube, D. 1966. "No Kissing, Or Else..." In *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. L. Wallach: 222-231. Ithaca.
- Davis, J.T. 1977. *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid*. Bern-Stuttgart.
- _____. 1989. *Fictus Adulter: Poet as Actor in the Amores*. Amsterdam.
- Duncan, A. 2006. "Infamous Performers: Comic Actors and Female Prostitutes in Rome." In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, edd. C. Faraone and L. McClure: 252-273. Madison.
- Due, O.S. 1980. "Amores und Abtreibung." *C&M* 32: 133-150.
- Edwards, C. 1997. "Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome." In *Roman Sexualities*, ed. J Hallett and M. Skinner: 66-95. Princeton.
- Ellis, R. 1876. *A Commentary on Catullus*. London.
- Evans-Grubbs, J. 2007. "Hidden in Plain Sight: Expositi in the Community." Paper delivered at the Vth Roman Family Conference: "Secrets de familles, familles

- secrètes: mémoire et identité familiales.” Université de Fribourg, 15 June, 2007.
- Fitzgerald, W. 2000. *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*. Cambridge.
- Flemming, R. 1999. “*Quae Corpore Quaestum Facit*: The Sexual Economy of Female Prostitution in the Roman Empire.” *JRS* 89: 38-61.
- Fredrick, D. 1997. “Reading Broken Skin: Violence in Roman Elegy.” In *Roman Sexualities*, ed. J. Hallett and M. Skinner. 172-196. Princeton.
- Gamel, M-K. 1989. “*Non sine caede*: Abortion Politics and Poetics in Ovid’s *Amores*.” *Helios* 16: 183-206.
- Gellar-Goad, T.H.M. 2008. “Pardalisca: *Ancilla callida* of Plautus’ *Casina*.” Paper presented at the 139th annual meeting of the American Philological Association. Chicago.
- Green, E. 1999. “Travesties of Love: Violence and Voyeurism in Ovid’s *Amores* 1.7.” *CW* 92: 409-418.
- Gross, N. 1996. “Ovid ‘Amores’ 1.8: Whose Amatory Rhetoric?” *CW* 89: 197-206.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1985. “The Lover and the *Lena*: Propertius 4.5.” *Ramus* 14: 105-15.
- Henderson, J. “Wrapping up the case: Reading Ovid, *Amores* 2.7(8) I.” *MD* 27 (1991): 37-88.
- _____. “Wrapping up the case: Reading Ovid, *Amores* 2.7(8) II.” *MD* 28 (1992): 27-83.
- Hexter, R. 1999. “Ovid’s Body.” In *Constructions of the Classical Body*, ed. J. Porter, 327-354. Ann Arbor.
- Housman, A.E. 1931. “Praefanda.” *Hermes* 66.1: 402-412.
- James, S. 1997. “Slave-Rape and Female Silence in Ovid’s Love Poetry.” *Helios* 24: 60-76.
- _____. 2003a. *Learned Girls and Male persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley.
- _____. 2003b. “Her Turn to Cry: The Politics of Weeping in Roman Love Elegy.” *TAPA* 133.1: 99-122.
- _____. 2006. “A Courtesan’s Choreography: Female Liberty and Male Anxiety at the Roman Dinner Party.” In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, edd. C. Faraone and L. McClure: 224-251. Madison.

- _____. 2010. "Trafficking Pasicompsa: A Courtesan's Travels and Travails in Plautus' *Mercator*." *New England Classical Journal* 37.1: 39-50.
- Khan, H. A. 1966. "Ovidius Furens: A Revaluation of Amores 1.7." *Latomus* 25: 880-94.
- Konstan, D. 1986. "Love in Terence's *Eunuch*: the Origins of Erotic Subjectivity." *AJP* 107.3: 369-393.
- Lenz, F.W. 1965. "'Ovidio: Amores II 2 e 3, una sola poesia?'" *Maia* 17: 119-124.
- Mack, S. 1988. *Ovid*. New Haven.
- McCarthy, K. 2000. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton.
- McGinn, T.A.J. 1998. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. Oxford.
- _____. 2004. *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World : A Study of Social History & The Brothel*. Ann Arbor.
- McKeown, J.C., ed. 1987. *Ovid, Amores: Text, Prolegomena, and Commentary in Four Volumes*. Vol. 1: *Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool.
- _____. 1989. *Ovid, Amores: Text, Prolegomena, and Commentary in Four Volumes*. Vol. 2: *A Commentary on Book One*. Liverpool.
- _____. 1998. *Ovid, Amores: Text, Prolegomena, and Commentary in Four Volumes*. Vol. 3: *A Commentary on Book Two*. Liverpool.
- Miller, P.A. 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton.
- Murgatroyd, P. 1981. "Servitium Amoris and the Roman Elegists." *Latomus* 40: 589-606.
- Myers, K.S. 1996. "The Poet and the Procuress: The Lena in Latin Love Elegy." *JRS* 86: 1-21.
- Nicoll, W. 1972. "Ovid, Amores I.5." *Mnemosyne* 30: 40-48.
- Olstein, K. 1975. "Amores 1.3 and Duplicity as a Way of Love." *TAPhA* 105: 241-257.
- O'Neill, K. 1999. "Ovid and Propertius: Reflexive Annotation in "Amores" 1.8." *Mnemosyne* 52: 286-302.
- Parker, D. 1969. "The Ovidian Coda." *Arion* 8: 80-97.
- Parker, H.N. 1989. "Crucially Funny or Tranio on the Couch: The *Servus Callidus* and Jokes About Torture." *TAPA* 119: 233-246.

- Papanghelis, T. 1989. "About the Hour of Noon: Ovid, *Amores* 1,5." *Mnemosyne* 42: 54-61.
- Phillips, C.R., III. 1980. "Love's Companions and Ovid, *Amores* 1.2." In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Vol. 2, ed. C. Deroux: 269-277. Brussels.
- Ross, D.O. 1969. *Style and Tradition and Catullus*. Cambridge.
- Saller, R. 1998. "Symbols of Gender and Status Hierarchies in the Roman Household." In *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, ed. S. Joshel and S. Murnaghan: 85-91. London.
- Scott, W.C. 1969. "Catullus and Cato (c. 56)." *CP* 64.1: 24-29.
- Stirrup, B. 1973. "Irony in Ovid *Amores* 1.7." *Latomus* 32: 832-841.
- Tanner, R.G. 1972. "Catullus LVI." *Hermes* 100.3: 506-508.
- Walters, J. 1997. "Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought." In *Roman Sexualities*, ed. J Hallett and M. Skinner. 29-46. Princeton.
- Watson, L. 1982. "Ovid *Amores* I 6: A Parody of a Hymn?" *Mnemosyne* 35: 99-102.
- Watts, W.J. 1973. "Ovid, the Law, and Roman Society on Abortion." *AClass* 16: 89-101.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1985. *Catullus and His World : A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.
- Wray, D. 2001. *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. 2001.