addocere (*Ep.* 1.5.18) 'teach an extra lesson', but of a kind that is perfectly natural in this kind of colloquial Latin. It was therefore almost inevitable that *adiub*- would generate the more obvious *adiuu*-, for in later antiquity *adiub*- was almost a standard spelling for *adiuu*-[8], both factors probably facilitating misapprehension and deliberate 'correction' of *adiubebo* with *adiuuato*.

With line 9 *uerum si quid ages*...Catullus is not just adding an afterthought ('P.S. But if you're really interested ...'; so commentators and translators); he is reverting to the bifurcation implicit in line 4 *et si iusseris* ... ; if she says yes, then ABC ...; but if she says no, then XYZ: 'but if (your reply states that) you are going to be busy / engaged (this afternoon) (a suitably euphemistic way for her to say 'no', and allowing us to wonder what sort of 'business' that might be ...!), then ... what about now?', and, while one is still reeling from the first comic bombshell *nouem continuas fututiones*,[9] he knocks us flat with an equally massive second – *pertundo tunicamque palliumque*.[10] It is of course quite wrong to compare the idiom common in Comedy *age si quid agis*, an impatient way of saying 'get on with it!', in support of the interpretation 'But if you're interested', 'if you're on', 'if you mean business', which surely quite misses the point anyway.

University of St Andrews   A. S. GRATWICK

[8] *iubeo hoc* / *illud*, as well as both *iube ueniam* (cf. 3) and *iubeo ut ueniat* are constructions attested from Plautus right through Latinity beside *iube me uenire*, *iubeo eum uenire*; but *iubeo ne ueniat* (as opposed to *ueto* [*ne*] *ueniat*) first appears only in Tertullian, cf. *TLL iubeo*. That rules out the punctuation *et si iusseris illud, adiubeto* (or *adiubebo*) / *ne quis*...*obseret tabellam*, but readily allows *iubebo illud, (scilicet), ne quis*...*obseret tabellam*.
[9] ...*paresque nobis* sounds as though it should lead innocently to '...a pleasant little lunch *à deux*' (e.g. '...*priuatim leue prandium iocosque*' or the like); the comic surprise is not only in the substance but in the way it is expressed – a concentrated tricolon crescendo, words two and three of increasing length.
[10] An equally massive three-word line, differently articulated. The close pairing *-que*...*-que* (itself mock-heroical) rules out the possibility of taking *pallium* as 'blanket': the point here is not that Cat. has just had breakfast in bed (Quinn *ad loc.*), but that he is dressed and ready to go – and in appropriately dandified garb. The last two words explicitly identify Don Juan as a greasy *Graeculus*, or a shamefully un-Roman Roman, cf. Cic. *Ver.* 5.31 *cum iste cum pallio purpureo talarique tunica uersaretur in conuiuiis muliebribus*, Suet. Tib. 13.1, etc. Dressing like that is a reproach in itself according to the conventional Roman *grauitas* at which this poem is so clearly cocking a cheeky snook.

THE DRAMATIC COHERENCE OF OVID, *AMORES* 1.1 AND 1.2

In his magisterial new commentary on the *Amores*[1] J. C. McKeown alleges an 'inconsistency' or 'flaw in the dramatic continuity' between *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2: 'whereas Ovid is fully aware in 1.1 that he is under Cupid's domination, he shows no such awareness in the opening lines of 1.2.' Previously A. Cameron had used this 'inconsistency', together with the evident programmatic character of 1.2, as an indication that the second poem must in fact have been the first poem of one of the original five books of *Amores*; then when Ovid decided to reduce the number of books from five to three, he wanted to keep *Esse quid hoc dicam* and had no choice but to put it as near as possible the front of the first book, immediately after that book's own introductory poem.[2] This reconstruction McKeown rightly rejects on the ground that

[1] *Ovid: Amores Volume II. A Commentary on Book One* (ARCA 22, Leeds, 1989), p. 33, cf. *Ovid: Amores Volume I. Text and Prolegomena* (ARCA 20, Liverpool, 1987), p. 93 n. 13.
[2] *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968), 320–2.

1.2's emphasis on Ovid's newness to love makes it out of place in any book other than the first.

Nevertheless, McKeown and Cameron at least agree on the 'inconsistency' between 1.1 and 1.2, although they disagree over its seriousness: for McKeown it 'is not a serious flaw, and may be dismissed as symptomatic of Ovid's lack of interest in providing the collection with a coherent framework'. Yet, as McKeown himself points out, the 'inconsistency' seems to be highlighted by the clear verbal parallels between the two poems (1.25f. *certas habuit puer ille sagittas:/uror, et in vacuo pectore regnat Amor*; 2.7f. *haeserunt tenues in corde sagittae,/et possessa ferus pectora versat Amor*), nor could the fault (if such it be) be restricted to these poems: it would affect the whole opening sequence which consists of the first three poems.

To be sure, there are many modern scholars who would find the very notion of 'flaws in the dramatic continuity' naïve: they would argue that such 'inconsistencies' are integral to Ovid's poetic art.[3] In many cases this must be true, but it is hard to give poetic value to the 'inconsistency' thus alleged between *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2. It is surely better in the first instance to consider the possibility that there is no inconsistency at all, or rather that Ovid teases us with an 'inconsistency', to which, however, he himself provides the solution.

In contrast to McKeown and Cameron, Barsby sees no difficulty, writing of 1.2 as follows:[4] 'Ovid is here using, as he does several times, the obvious device of arresting the attention by an opening piece of vivid description and of withholding temporarily the true subject of the poem in order to arouse curiosity. Here, however, we are scarcely deceived, either by Ovid's disingenuous rhetorical questions ... or by his ironic expression of doubt (*puto*, 5); after the opening poem of the book there can only be one explanation, and this is duly given in the fourth couplet – the physical torments ... are caused by the mental torments ... inflicted by Love.' These remarks are somewhat self-contradictory but draw attention to the formally deceptive quality of the opening lines (a factor also emphasised by McKeown),[5] suggest that the poem's initial effect depends on the interplay between the reader's ignorance and his knowledge, and by linking that knowledge partly to the reading of the first poem bring 1.2 into a degree of harmony with 1.1.

Barsby's position is, I believe, basically correct, but important additional points can be made.

The key lines are lines 3–4 of 1.1:

<div align="center">

risisse Cupido
dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem.

</div>

McKeown comments: '*dicitur* is problematic. It cannot be an appeal to literary authority ... because the experience here is personal. Nor can we compare the slight distancing which Propertius gives to his claim to inspiration on Mount Helicon in 3.3 through his opening words *Visus eram*, since Ovid's phrasing would then imply an element of scepticism not intended by Propertius and inappropriate here, where we are to be in no doubt that it was Cupid who sabotaged the epic.'

But Barsby again seems nearer the mark: 'the use of *dicitur*, 4, suggests that he is

[3] Cf. e.g. J. T. Davis in *ANRW* II.31.4 (1981), 2468–72, and indeed McKeown i.92–102. Neither in *ANRW* nor in his discussion of *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2 in *Fictus Adulter: Poet as Actor in the Amores* (Amsterdam, 1989), pp. 67ff. does Davis discuss the 'inconsistency' between the two poems.

[4] *Ovid: Amores Book 1* (Oxford, 1973), p. 45.

[5] Who rightly cites F. Cairns, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 166ff. as the basic modern discussion of this technique.

not entirely serious.' This observation may usefully be developed. 'It is said', 'they say', 'there is a story' etc. are often used as 'distancing' formulae whereby the writer does not commit himself to the veracity of certain material, particularly when it is of a supernatural character. He thus avoids violation of the canons of realism or the charge of personal naïveté. (The technique is of course particularly common in, though not restricted to, historiography.)[6]

Here we may regard Ovid as either using such a formula directly or knowingly alluding to it in, as it were, inverted commas: 'Cupid "is said" to have laughed.' In either case Ovid's application to what purports to be his own experience of a formula normally applied to material from which the writer distances himself creates an effect at once impudent, humorous, paradoxical, ironic and spuriously rationalist. It is true that after this initial oratio obliqua the rest of the poem is cast in straight narrative form; but this pattern of initial distancing or scepticism followed by apparent acceptance or of a mixture of oratio obliqua and oratio recta is again commonplace in the recording of such material.[7] Formally speaking, 1.1 remains a *legomenon*, as it has been so emphatically labelled in lines 3–4, a story from whose historicity the rationalising Ovid carefully distances himself; on the other hand, Ovid the dramatic character, the hapless victim of the divine epiphany, has naturally forgotten this by the end of the poem, as indeed have many of his modern readers.

> Esse quid hoc dicam, quod tam mihi dura videntur
> strata, neque in lecto pallia nostra sedent,
> et vacuus somno noctem, quam longa, peregi,
> lassaque versati corporis ossa dolent?
> nam, puto, sentirem, si quo temptarer amore –
> an subit et tecta callidus arte nocet?
> sic erit: haeserunt tenues in corde sagittae,
> et possessa ferus pectora versat Amor.

1.2 finds Ovid in bed, sleepless, aching and exhausted. The description, while formally puzzling or deceptive, suggests the well-known symptoms of love,[8] and of course for us, the readers, this interpretation is confirmed by the juxtaposition of 1.2 with 1.1, with its story of Cupid's epiphany to Ovid, and surely also by a verbal link between *vacuus somno* (1.2.3) and *vacuo pectore* (1.1.26). (Ovid is *vacuus somno* because his *pectus* is no longer *vacuum* but possessed by Love.)[9]

---

[6] Cf. e.g. the discussions of D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'* (translated by J. G. Howie, Leeds, 1989 = ARCA 21), pp. 157ff.; H. D. Westlake, '*Legetai* in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne* 30 (1977), 345–62; N. Horsfall, 'Virgil and the Illusory Footnote', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar, Sixth Volume, 1990* (Leeds, 1990), pp. 49–63, esp. 59–60.

[7] Cf. e.g. Liv. 1.6.3, 1.7.5, 1.34.9, 1.36.6, 1.39.4, 1.55.6; Plu. *Cic.* 49.2–3, *Brut.* 36.2–37.1; App. 4.134; G. L. Cooper, 'Intrusive Oblique Infinitives in Herodotus', *TAPA* 104 (1974), 23–76; P. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill, 1980), p. 106.

[8] This, the conventional reading, seems to me clearly correct. An alternative reading is suggested to me by Professor Woodman: Ovid thinks he is suffering the rigours of life on campaign (the lover being a soldier), *hoc* (line 1) is both prospective (looking forward to the *quod*-clause) and retrospective (looking back to 1.1.25ff.), and the point is that though Ovid fully recalls the events of 1.1 he did not expect his wounding by Cupid to have this particular effect. But (*a*) the details of 1.2.1–4 better suit the distracted lover, (*b*) the 'lover-as-a-soldier' is a much more active figure, and (*c*) the economy of *Amores* 1 requires that this motif be kept back until 1.9 *Militat omnis amans*.

[9] Interpretation of 1.1.26 is of course vexed (see McKeown *ad loc.*; Davis in *ANRW* 2468 n. 20), but the meaning 'hitherto empty' (not precisely 'fancy-free') seems to me guaranteed by the parallel 1.2.8 *possessa ferus pectora versat Amor* and by the apparent legal colour of *vacuo* (see McKeown *ad loc.*), which rules out the meaning 'still fancy-free', since *Amor* is now the *rex* of Ovid's *pectus*. (The pleasing paradox that Ovid is a lover without a beloved is not excluded by this interpretation.)

Ovid, however, does not at first recognise the symptoms, not only because he is new to love (as we know from lines 19–20 and 26 of 1.1) but because to the rationalising Ovid Cupid's epiphany in 1.1 remains at this stage just a *legomenon*. His initial response, therefore, is to try to analyse the situation rationally: *Esse quid hoc dicam* – perhaps one might even say that he tries to circumscribe τὸ ἄλογον with λόγος, and λόγος in the double sense of language and reason. Then, when he first raises, only to discount, the possibility that love is the cause, both reason and feeling come into play (*nam, puto, sentirem*) and reason is already a weakening force (*puto*).[10] Only with lines 6–8 does Ovid fully accept the validity of his supernatural encounter in 1.1. Love with as it were a small 'l' becomes Love the god himself; Love's arrows, allegedly discharged in 1.21–5, have in fact stuck fast; Love, allegedly king of Ovid's *pectus* in 1.26, is certainly now tormenting that *pectus*; Love is already working his insidious harm (the process described in 1.2.6 comes after, and validates, the fact of the initial wounding). In effect, then, lines 6–8 of poem 2 mean 'poem 1 was no mere *legomenon* – it was all true after all'.

This analysis brings out another link between the two poems. The first poem advances as an explanation for Ovid's writing of love poetry and falling in love a 'what-is-said' supernatural story; the second tries to explain perplexing physical symptoms by a rationalising process of 'saying'; both poems, in effect, broach different explanations for the same phenomenon, and both explanations are keyed by the word *dico*. In the event, rationalism proves inadequate and the supernatural 'what-is-said' story provides the true explanation.

There is then no inconsistency at all between *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2. Rather, the formal doubt, created by *dicitur*, over the veracity of Cupid's epiphany to Ovid in 1.1 inaugurates an interplay between ignorance and knowledge not only on the part of the reader but also on the part of Ovid the dramatic character, who is himself a schizophrenic figure, part rationalist, unconvinced of the truth of 1.1, part lover, driven by the crazy logic of the situation to final acceptance of the irrational. Such schizophrenia of attitude is of course the source of many of the most piquant effects in the *Amores*, few, however, as elegant and sustained as the seeming inconsistency between 1.1 and 1.2.[11]

University of Durham   JOHN MOLES

[10] Of course the sentiment of line 5 is also comically absurd, an absurdity pointed by (the often ironic) *puto* (surely one knows if one is in love), but that absurdity is evident only to those with some experience of love, not at this point in the narrative to Ovid the dramatic character.

[11] I thank Tony Woodman and Trevor Fear for comments on an earlier draft of this note.

ARIADNE'S FEARS FROM SEA AND SKY (OVID, *HEROIDES* 10.88. AND 95-8)

In Ovid, *Heroides* 10.79ff. Ariadne starts to consider various dangers which to her mind threaten her life as that of any deserted woman (80). She lists some of these dangers in the following catalogue (83–8):

> Iam iam venturos aut hac aut suspicor illac,
>   qui lanient avido viscera dente lupos.
> Forsitan et fulvos tellus alat ista leones?
>   Quis scit an et saevam tigrida Dia ferat?[1]

[1] This seems to be the best emendation of this line; see Palmer's apparatus criticus (A. Palmer, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides* [Oxford, 1898], *ad loc.*).