Classical Quarterly **43** (ii) 458–467 (1993) *Printed in Great Britain*

OVIDIANA*

1. A MATERIAL POINT

Beetle sat down relieved, well knowing that a reef of uncharted genitives stretched ahead of him, on which in spite of M'Turk's sailing-directions he would infallibly have been wrecked.
KIPLING, 'Regulus'

Investigations apropos of the passage in Ovid to which we shall ultimately come have revealed that one kind of Latin genitive at least is still far from satisfactorily charted by authorities more eminent even than M'Turk. This is the genitive of material. More often than not grammarians and commentators do not distinguish this usage from the genitive of definition.[1] So for instance at Ovid, *Met.* 3. 315 the phrase *lactis alimenta* is identified by Bömer *ad loc.* and by H. J. Roby (*A grammar of the Latin language from Plautus to Suetonius* (1896), ii. §1302) as genitive of definition. This is correct as far as it goes, in the sense that *lactis* defines the *alimenta*; but the definition is *what they were made of*, their material. So again at *Met.* 1. 111 *flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant* (on which Bömer does not comment) the rivers *consisted of* milk and nectar. This passage, however, was classified by J. N. Madvig (*A Latin grammar for the use of schools*, trans. R. Woods, 4th ed. (Oxford, 1859), p. 249) under expressions involving number, measure or quantity. This is not unreasonable, but Madvig's examples illustrate the need for care in drawing the line. They include, for instance, *aceruus frumenti* (the genitive with *aceruus* is of course common) and *uini tres amphorae*. Now a heap may be thought of as containing its constituents, but it also *consists of* them, which is not true of a vessel and its contents. Thus, though there is some semantic justification for including both these expressions, as Madvig did, under the 'measure or quantity' rubric, they are nevertheless grammatically distinct. The fluidity (!) of the borderlines in this area is evident also in *flumina lactis*, an undeniable genitive of material which is, however, clearly analogous to a not uncommon class of expressions such as *riuus/fons aquae*, *lapidum imber*, *uolumina fumi*, *campus harenae*, *silicum uenae*, ὕδατος ῥόος, κρήνη ὕδατος, ἀργύρου πηγή, etc., in which the notion of quantity as well as composition is present.

A genitive of material is explicitly recognised by C. E. Bennett (*Syntax of early Latin* (Boston, 1914), ii. 12–13), but his examples ('all that I am disposed to admit') are mostly of expressions involving number, measure or quantity, and some of these are borderline cases. Those that seem to me to pass muster as genitives of material proper are included in the list below. J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr (*Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), p. 52), though stating that 'Bereits altlateinisch ist der Gen. part. [*sic*] bei Stoff bezeichnungen' [their emphasis], offer no example

* I am grateful to Mr A. S. Hollis for helpful criticisms and suggestions, particularly with regard to Aesacus (part 3). A much earlier version of that note was also read and criticised by Dr J. Diggle and Dr R. G. Mayer. Professor R. G. G. Coleman has kindly read a first draft of part 1, which has profited greatly from his comments and suggestions. I am also indebted to Dr J. Chadwick for additional examples of the genitive of material.

[1] Itself, as Professor Coleman remarks, not an entirely satisfactory term, since it is the general function of the genitive case to define.

relevant to materials. Of the standard Greek grammars, R. Kühner and B. Gerth (*Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Satzlehre, 4. Auflage (Hanover, 1955), i. 264) under the heading 'Der Genetiv statt des Adjektivs' begin by stating that 'Sehr häufig, sowohl in der Dichtersprache als in der Prosa, wird statt eines einen Stoff ausdrückenden Adjektivs der Genetiv gesetzt, als: *ἔκπωμα ξύλου, τράπεζα ἀργυρίου*'. However, no references are given for these expressions, which I have failed to run to earth in any Greek author and which appear to have been fabricated *ad hoc*. The examples that follow are all of poetic extensions of the postulated primary usage.[2] More helpful is E. Schwyzer (*Griechische Grammatik* ii. *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, A. Debrunner (ed.) (Munich, 1950), p. 129). Under the heading 'Der adnominale Genetiv des Stoffes' he gives half-a-dozen examples from Homer (incorporated with one exception[3] in the list below) and those from Aristophanes and Thucydides also listed below. His other examples belong under the 'number, quantity or measure' rubric.[4]

In fact what I have called the genitive of material proper[5] in Greek and Latin is not as rare as the reticence of the authorities might suggest, and I have thought it worth while to collect enough examples at any rate to support this modest claim. The lists that follow are of passages in which the word in the genitive defines the *material* of which something is composed. The examples are exclusively of physical objects. Doubtful or borderline cases are not admitted.[6] It will be seen that the Greek list tails off after Homer; apart from the striking instance noted above (n. 2) I have found no example in the tragedians. This of course does not mean that there are none, but I shall be surprised if further enquiry unearths many. Later poets are, so far, represented only by Callimachus.

Greek

Iliad 4.350 *ἕρκος ὀδόντων*, 5. 726 *πλῆμναι ... ἀργύρου*, 6.244, 248 *θάλαμοι ξεστοῖο*[7] *λίθοιο*, 11. 24–5 *τοῦ δ' ἤτοι δέκα οἶμοι ἔσαν μέλανος κυάνοιο, | δώδεκα δὲ χρυσοῖο καὶ εἴκοσι κασσιτέροιο*, 11. 34–5 *ἐν δέ οἱ ὀμφαλοὶ ἦσαν ἐείκοσι κασσιτέροιο | λευκοί, ἐν δὲ μέσοισιν ἔην μέλανος κυάνοιο*, 18.564–5 *περὶ δ' ἕρκος ἔλασσε | κασσιτέρου*, 18.613 *κνημῖδας ἑανοῦ κασσιτέροιο*, 20.271 *τὰς δύο [πτύχας] χαλκείας, δύο δ' ἔνδοθι κασσιτέροιο*, 21. 592 *κνημὶς νεοτύκτου κασσιτέροιο*, 23. 561 *χεῦμα φαεινοῦ κασσιτέροιο*, *Odyssey* 4. 124 *τάπητα ... μαλακοῦ ἐρίοιο*, 7. 87 *θριγκὸς κυάνοιο*, 8. 404 *κολεὸν ... νεοπρίστου ἐλέφαντος*, 21. 7 *κώπη ... ἐλέφαντος*, *Hom. Hymn* 4.41 *γλυφάνῳ πολιοῖο σιδήρου*, 6.9 *ἄνθεμ' ὀρειχάλκου χρυσοῖό τε τιμήεντος*, [Hes.] *Sc.* 143 *κυάνου ... πτύχας*, Ar. *Ach.* 992 *στέφανος ἀνθέμων*,[8] Callim. fr. 756 Pf. (= *Hecale* 166 Hollis) *μύρσον ἐς ὠτώεντα παλαιφαμένης ἄγνοιο*,[9] Dem. 22. 70 *[στεφάνους] ἴων ἢ*

[2] The list omits what must surely be one of the most striking instances in the whole of Greek, Aesch. *Ag.* 306 *φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα*; cf. Eur. fr. 836 N.[2] *πώγωνα πυρός*. This is indeed practically a genitive of material in the primary sense.

[3] *Il.* 4. 137 *ἕρκος ἀκόντων* (!).

[4] Xen. *Anab.* 6. 4. 4 *κρήνη ἡδέος ὕδατος* is glossed 'etwas anders' without further comment.

[5] Professor Coleman suggests as the identifying characteristics of the genitive of material: (i) That it is interchangeable with the adjectival phrasing: *uincula ferri / ferrea uincula*. (ii) That it represents a nominalization of the predicate: *uincula ferri = uincula quae e ferro facta sunt*.

[6] Such as Virg. *Aen.* 3. 483 *auri subtemine* or Ov. *Met.* 11. 514 *tegmine cerae*. Also omitted are instances with *aceruus* et sim. connoting number, measure or quantity as well as composition.

[7] It will be evident that the presence or absence of one or more qualifying adjectives in these expressions is immaterial to the point at issue.

[8] But cf. below, n. 10.

[9] Contributed by Mr Hollis, who notes that 'theoretically there might have been a participle meaning "made" [cf. next n.] at the start of the following line, but my instinct is against that'.

ῥόδων ὄντας ἀλλ' οὐ χρυσίου,[10] Hdt. 4. 79. 2 λευκοῦ λίθου σφίγγες τε καὶ γρῦπες, 4. 87. 1 στήλας ... δύο ... λιθοῦ λευκοῦ, Thuc. 2. 76. 1 τάρσοι καλάμου.[11]

Latin

Lucil. 1077M *ius maenarum*, 1192M *plumbi pauxillum rodus linique metaxam*, Lucret. 4. 727 *brattea ... auri*, Virg. *Aen.* 5. 559 *flexilis obtorti ... circulus auri*, 686–7 *glandes | liuentis plumbi*, 10. 482 *tot ferri terga, tot aeris, Copa* 30 *crystalli ... nouos calices*, Ov. *A.A.* 2. 46 *lini uincula, Met.* 1. 98 *non tuba derecti, non aeris cornua flexi*, 12. 158 *longa ... multifori ... tibia buxi, Fast.* 1. 208 *leuis argenti lammina*, Lucan 2. 72, 3. 574 *uincula ferri*, Sen. *Oed.* 171 *Taenarii uincula ferri*, Sil. *Pun.* 14. 524 *uincla ... ferri*, 16. 582 *thoraca ... multiplicis auri*, Juv. 9. 141, 10. 19 *argenti uascula puri*, Claud. 3. 377 Hall *grauibus ferri ... catenis, R.P.* 3. 94 *rigidi ... uincula ferri*, Livy 38. 5. 4 *libramenta plumbi aut saxorum*, 42. 63. 4 *libramento plumbi*, Tac. *Hist.* 3.47.3 *sine uinculo aeris aut ferri.*

Incomplete as these lists must necessarily be, I think they will suffice to demonstrate that the genitive of material *stricto sensu*, though not nearly as common as the complementary adjectival construction, has impeccable Homeric credentials and is regular in Latin prose and verse of the classical period. In view of the apparent paucity of examples in early Latin writers and their comparative frequency in poetry, it is natural to wonder whether Greek, specifically Homeric, influence has been at work. However, Professor Coleman points out that the genitive of material occurs in Sanskrit and other IE languages, so that there is nothing in principle exotic about it. The adjectival construction is no doubt the older usage, but there is, as both he and Dr Chadwick have remarked to me, one practical reason for preferring the alternative investigated here: that it allows further adjectival qualification. 'White stone sphinxes' is all right in English, but not in Greek: it must be λευκοῦ λίθου σφίγγες. Similarly 'grey lead bullets' = *glandes liuentis plumbi.*

These soundings recorded on the chart, we may now essay to navigate with greater confidence the shoals separating us from the passage of Ovid that is the object of the voyage.

Fasti 3. 115–16 are printed by most editors as follows:

> illa [*sc.* signa] quidem feno, sed erat reuerentia feno
> quantam nunc aquilas cernis habere tuas.

feno ... feno AUM ω: *feno ... feni* IG ς: *feni ... feno* D. *illaque de feno* ς, prob. Scaliger, rec. Heinsius: *illa quidem e feno* Par. Lat. 8245, rec. Alton–Wormell–Courtney. (Variant spellings of *f(a)enum* ignored.)

The added *e* of the Parisinus gives a lift to the syntax with great economy, but it leaves the rhetoric in the lurch. Polyptoton was one of the most favoured devices of the Latin poets, not least Ovid, but variation of case unaccompanied by change of inflexion affords no pleasure to the ear and does not deserve the name. That Ovid made effective use of this figure whenever he got the chance perhaps needs no demonstration, but as I have failed to find a *locus classicus* in the standard

[10] Adduced by H. W. Smyth (*Greek grammar*, rev. G. M. Messing (Cambridge, MA, 1963), p. 318, §1324). This is an interesting case, neatly straddling the borderline noticed above: a chaplet of flowers might reasonably be classified under the rubric of number or quantity, but not one made of gold. Formally different again are expressions in which there is a verb of making, as at e.g. *Il.* 18. 574, *Od.* 19. 226, Mosch. *Eur.* 44, 47, 54, Thuc. 4. 31. 2 (cf. Kühner–Gerth i. 376, Gow on Theoc. 28. 8, Gow–Page, *HE* ii. 140), but the genitive is of precisely the same kind.

[11] Contrast 2. 75. 4 ξύλινον τεῖχος.

commentaries,[12] a representative anthology culled from *A.A.* 1, *Met.* 1 and *Fasti* 1–3 may not come amiss. It is confined to examples relevant to the present discussion, the repetition of a noun in a different inflexion.[13] Those in which the nouns stand before the penthemimeral caesura and at the end of the verse, as in our passage, are marked with *.

A.A. 1. 63 *siue cupis iuuenem, iuuenes tibi mille placebunt*, 113 *in medio plausu (plausus tunc arte carebant)...*, 121 *nam timor unus erat, facies non una timoris*, 140 *iunge tuum lateri qua potes usque latus*, 166 *et qui spectauit uulnera, uulnus habet*, 310 *siue uirum mauis fallere, falle uiro*, 357 *illa leget tempus (medici quoque tempora seruant)*, 557 *munus habe caelum: caelo spectabere sidus*, 581 *huic, si sorte bibes, sortem concede priorem*, 659 *et lacrimae prosunt: lacrimis adamanta mouebis*, 673 *uim licet appelles: grata est uis ista puellis*; *Met.* 1. 292 *omnia pontus erat, deerant quoque litora ponto*, 311 *maxima pars unda rapitur: quibus unda pepercit...*, *393 *magna parens terra est: lapides in corpore terrae...*, 412 *missa uiri manibus faciem traxere uirorum*, *556 *oscula dat ligno, refugit tamen oscula lignum*, 576 *undis iura dabat nymphisque colentibus undas*, 619 *hinc dissuadet amor. uictus pudor esset amore...*; *Fast.* 1. 25 *uates rege uatis habenas*, 184 *tetigi uerbis ultima uerba meis*, 233 *causa ratis superest: Tuscum rate uenit ad amnem...*, 553–4 *uires pro corpore, corpus | grande*, 669 *pagus agat festum; pagum lustrate, coloni*; 2. 65 *dent tibi caelestes, quos tu caelestibus, annos*, 85–6 *saepe sequens agnam lupus est a uoce retentus, | saepe auidum fugiens restitit agna lupum*, *165 *ut tetigit lucum (densa niger ilice lucus)...*, 169 *dixerat et nymphis: nymphae uelamina ponunt*, 215 *campus erat, campi claudebant ultima colles*, 280 *hic ubi nunc urbs est, tum locus urbis erat*, 401 *ferret opem certe si non ope mater egeret*, 421 *illa loco nomen fecit, locus ipse Lupercis*, 579 *uina quoque instillat; uini quodcumque relictum est...*; 3. 227–8 *scutoque nepotem | fert auus; hic scuti dulcior usus erat*, 395 *arma mouent pugnas, pugna est aliena maritis*, *651 *uentum erat ad ripas; inerant uestigia ripis*, 733 *nomine ab auctoris ducunt libamina nomen*, 767 *cur hedera cincta est? hedera est gratissima Baccho*, 775 *seu quia tu pater es, patres sua pignora...*, *883 *Luna regit menses: huius quoque tempora mensis...*

To come at last to the point: it having been established (*a*) that Ovid was fond of this form of polyptoton and (*b*) that the genitive of material is a regular construction in Latin, we may reasonably conclude that what Ovid wrote at *Fasti* 3. 115 is most likely to have been what is offered by D (Monacensis Lat. 8122, *quem honoris causa nomino*):

illa quidem feni; sed erat reuerentia feno...

It is perhaps worth adding that the following couplet reads:

pertica suspensos portabat longa maniplos,
unde maniplaris nomina miles habet.

Even without this reminder Ovid's readers would have been well aware that the ordinary prose expression for the object that he was alluding to was *manipulus feni*.[14]

[12] I know of no general discussions since those of G. Howe, 'A type of verbal repetition in Ovid's elegy', *Studies in Philology* 13 (1915), 81–91, and Elizabeth Breazeale, 'Polyptoton in the hexameters of Ovid, Lucretius, and Vergil', ibid. 14 (1917), 306–20. Breazeale notes (307) that polyptoton is more frequent in Ovid than in Lucretius or Virgil.

[13] That the definition of polyptoton was always in practice elastic is shown by Quint. *I.O.* 9. 3. 37; cf. Hofmann–Szantyr, pp. 707–8. For Ovid's use of it with proper names cf. e.g. *A.A.* 1. 27 *Clio Cliusque sorores*, 545, 2. 573, 3.11, *Rem.* 64, *Fast.* 1. 704, 2. 39, 525, 3. 199; and cf. McKeown on *Am.* 1. 10. 19.

[14] *Adnot. super Luc.* 4. 31 Endt *a Romulo coepit hoc signum, ut faeni manipulus praeferretur*. For more examples of *manipulus* with *feni* and other genitives see *TLL* s.v. 316. 57ff.

2. *ARS DISSIMULATRIX*

The episode of Daedalus and Icarus at the beginning of Book II of the *Ars amatoria* has exercised the interpreters. Ovid's own explanation of its presence has failed to give satisfaction:

> non potuit Minos hominis compescere pinnas,
> ipse deum uolucrem detinuisse paro. (2. 97–8)

This burkes the obvious fact that the centre of interest in the story as Ovid tells it is not the success of Daedalus, but the tragic failure of Icarus. Is the couplet a lame attempt to paper over a yawning thematic crack? Is Professor Rudd right to pronounce that 'Ovid has been less clever than usual'?[15] If so, he compounded his lapse by committing it just where it was bound to attract notice. His readers would surely expect to find in this first *exemplum* of the new book an unequivocal reinforcement of the introductory proclamation:

> nec minor est uirtus, quam quaerere, parta tueri:
> casus inest illic, hoc erit artis opus. (2. 13–14)

Nec minor = *et maior*; though art played some part in the successes presumed in Book I, it is only now that it will really be put to the test. One would naturally assume that what follows will illustrate its ability to pass that test with flying colours. Instead we have a story of at least partial failure. Hence one thoughtful critic's chilling inference: 'Even for the supreme *artifex* Daedalus, *ars* is shown to have limits. It was all a wonderful game, the poem seems to suggest, until the waves washed Icarus away'.[16]

Was? We are less than 100 verses into the second half (as the *Ars* was originally planned) of the game. It will be another 600-odd verses before the poet blows the whistle with 'finis adest operi'. If this were the *Tristia* or even the *Metamorphoses*, such a sudden access of honest doubt might be plausible; but in the *Ars*? Whence such an abrupt loss of confidence? and why here? The proem to Book I had set forth the poet's credentials and qualifications for his task. As Seneca was later to put it:

> nihil est tam difficile et arduum[17] quod non humana mens uincat et in familiaritatem perducat adsidua meditatio, nullique sunt tam feri et sui iuris adfectus[18] ut non disciplina perdomentur. (*De ira* 2. 12. 3)

Ovid's credo to a T; and nothing could be more characteristic of him than the way in which he asserts his mastery of the *feri adfectus* of *saeuus Amor*. As Mr A. S. Hollis has pointed out to me, Ovid is here reversing the relationship between master and pupil depicted in the opening lines of what was clearly to Augustan poets the best-loved episode of the *Aetia*, the story of Acontius and Cydippe (fr. 67. 1–4 Pf.). There it was Eros who taught Acontius how to win Cydippe:

> αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν Ἀκόντιον, ὁππότε καλῇ
> ᾔθετο Κυδίππῃ παῖς ἔτι παρθενικῇ,
> τέχνην—οὐ γὰρ ὅγ' ἔσκε πολύκροτος—ὄφρα λεγο..[
> τοῦτο διὰ ζωῆς οὔνομα κουρίδιον.

Now the boot is on the other foot, and it is Love who is under instruction. In turning a motif from the *Aetia* on its head Ovid was repeating a trick that he had played with no less brilliance in the first poem of the *Amores*, where Cupid is made to usurp the

[15] N. Rudd, 'Daedalus and Icarus (i)', in C. Martindale (ed.), *Ovid renewed* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 22. Cf. Molly Myerowitz, *Ovid's games of love* (Detroit, 1985), p. 153.

[16] Myerowitz (n. 15), p. 167.

[17] Cf. *Ars* 2. 537 *ardua molimur, sed nulla nisi ardua uirtus.*

[18] Cf. *Ars* 1. 9 *ille quidem ferus est et qui mihi saepe repugnet.* If ever a god was *sui iuris* it was Eros/Amor.

role of Apollo in the canonical apotropaic theophany.[19] It is also more than probable that, as suggested by Hollis (*ad* 1.7ff. and Appendix II), he expected his readers to recall the lines of Bion in which the poet is set by Aphrodite to teach music to Eros and is instead taught by him (fr. 10 Gow). Hence the implicit boast: where the *ars* of other poets has failed, mine will triumph.

All this being so, one asks again: why on earth should he go out of his way at the beginning of Book II to subvert the image of absolute mastery of his undertaking so wittily and cheekily established at the outset? Whence the impulse to sabotage an eminently successful *jeu d'esprit* by such inopportune reservations? Whatever was the point? *Sic notus noster*?

In one crucial particular Myerowitz's analysis seems to me to misrepresent the textual evidence. It is going beyond anything that can be extracted from Ovid's words to conclude that 'Daedalus succeeds as an *artifex* but fails utterly as a teacher and father.'[20] It is *Icarus*, the pupil, who fails, because he does not do as he is told. 'Sit tua cura sequi: me duce tutus eris': could any instruction be clearer? If teachers are to be judged by their failures in such cases, who shall 'scape whipping? As to fatherhood, Daedalus, not being a prisoner of our neurotic culture, was not bound after the debacle to ask himself (and in Ovid's narrative does not ask himself) 'where did I go wrong?'; and a twentieth-century critic is not entitled to ask and answer the question for him.

The reductive reading (to get this wicked word in first) towards which I am moving receives some support from a consideration of the proem to Book I. Mario Citroni, following a hint first thrown out by William H. Race, has demonstrated[21] that at *Ars* 1. 3–8 Ovid evidently had in mind the speech in which Nestor briefs his son Antilochus before the chariot-race in the funeral games of Patroclus. Antilochus' horses are not fast; he must rely on tactics. Nestor's repeated emphasis on craft in μήτι ... μήτι ... μήτι (*Il.* 23. 315–18) is echoed unmistakably by Ovid's threefold *arte ... arte ... arte* (1. 3–4). This passage, and what follows it, well illustrates Ovid's masterful, indeed arbitrary, way with his literary sources and models. In fact Antilochus does not win the race, and only secures the second prize after heated altercations with Achilles and Menelaus. If Ovid remembered that, it clearly did not worry him.[22] He also appears to have relied on the selective memory of his readers in choosing Automedon as the charioteer *par excellence*:

> Tiphys et Automedon dicar Amoris ego. (1. 8)

As to the qualifications of Tiphys there can be no doubt;[23] Automedon is an impostor. What he was famous for was driving to the common danger.[24] In Homer he is merely a stand-in for the dead Patroclus, and an incompetent one at that.[25] The

[19] See McKeown *ad loc.*, Kenney in *Ovid. The Love Poems*, trans. A. D. Melville (Oxford, 1989), p. xiv.

[20] Myerowitz (n. 15), p. 161.

[21] M. Citroni, 'Ovidio, *Ars* 1, 3–4 e Omero, *Iliade* 23, 315–18: l'analogia tra le *artes* e la fondazione del discorso didascalico', *Sileno* 10 (1984) (*Studi in onore di* A. Barigazzi i), 157–76.

[22] The speech was probably more generally familiar than the sequel, for it enjoyed some independent currency as a *locus classicus* for Homer as an authority on τέχναι: Citroni (n. 21), 161, citing Plat. *Ion* 537a–b, Xen. *Symp.* 4. 6.

[23] A.R. 1. 105ff.

[24] Cic. *S. Rosc.* 98, Varr. *Sat. Men.* 257, Juv. 1. 61; 'the symbol of a tearaway' (Green on Auson. *Epist.* 8. 10). Myerowitz (n. 15) uncritically follows Ovid in stating that he was 'legendary for ... mastery of ... [the] chariot' (p. 79).

[25] *Il.* 17. 459ff., especially Hector's comment at 486–7, on which see Edwards *ad loc.* Cf. T. Krischer, 'Patroklos, der Wagenlenker Achills', *RhM* 135 (1992), 97–103, esp. 98 'Es gibt ... nicht den geringsten Zeifel, dass der eigentliche Wagenlenker Achills Patroklos ist und nicht Automedon.'

only occasion in the *Iliad* in which he drives Achilles is to the final encounter with Hector, which is taxi-work. It is a fair guess that he owed his promotion to Ovid's recollection of his single appearance in Virgil:

> equorum agitator Achillis
> armiger Automedon. (*Aen.* 2. 476–7)

This is not to say that he does not pull his literary weight in the proem, for he helps to prepare for the entrance of the figure on whom the ensuing comparison pivots: Achilles.[26] It is on that comparison that Ovid rests his claim:

> Chiron : Achilles : : Ovid : Amor

Returning to Book II, I suggest that in Daedalus' instructions to Icarus we can hear an echo of the gist of Nestor's (characteristically prolix) advice to *his* son: 'me duce tutus eris'. By way of reasserting (not deprecating) his mastery of his craft Ovid graphically depicts what is liable to happen when the student does not follow the textbook to the letter. The message is not that art has its limits, but that it is, though foolproof, not bloody-foolproof: *caveat lector*. Thus far my interpretation agrees substantially with that of Peter Green: this is

> an illustration (*paradeigma*) of the dangers attendant upon *ars* incorrectly applied or wilfully ignored ... If Ovid, like Daedalus, personifies the true *artifex*, then the wing-clipping, the control of flight at which he aims has as its object not merely Love (*Amor*) *qua* anthropomorphized deity, but also unruly passion as manifested in the unwise student. Icarus, in fact, is the symbol of the rash, headstrong, uncontrolled lover, an awful example of what may happen when passion throws off the prudent guidance of *ars*, of rational technique. The parental bond linking Daedalus and Icarus is analogous to the teacher–student relationship between Ovid and the young gallant he is addressing: it also recalls Chiron and Achilles in the proem to Bk I. The moral is simple, almost Horatian: follow reason and avoid extremes; otherwise you are liable to wind up like Icarus.[27]

We are, however, not quite out of the wood. There remains the paradox that, in a story ostensibly intended to exemplify the difficulty of controlling a divine winged boy, the emphasis should be on the tragic *death* of a human winged boy. What are we to make of this? One critic at least has concluded that if there is a point here, Ovid ignored or muffed it: 'the connection of Amor with Icarus, so frequently exploited in the later tradition, is not established here.'[28] Our brief examination of the proem to Book I has indeed suggested that Ovid's treatment of the sources that he laid under contribution can be opportunistic or downright cavalier; and it is not unlikely that the *Ars* was written *citius quam curatius*.[29] It may be that we should not necessarily expect anything like an exact correlation between theme and illustration. Here, however, the context suggests that we should. In this position in Book II Daedalus in his capacities of *artifex* and *praeceptor* necessarily recalls the appearance of the poet in those same roles in the corresponding position in Book I.[30] That in turn suggests an implied relation between the characters concerned answering more

[26] Discussion of the role of Achilles would take us too far afield. Myerowitz (n. 15), pp. 43–7, is unsatisfying.

[27] *Ovid: the erotic poems*, trans. with an introduction and notes by Peter Green (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1982), p. 363. I have reservations about 'Horatian', but they do not affect the point at issue.

[28] Rudd (n. 15), p. 23.

[29] See for the chronology R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 13–15. The case for postulating a 'first edition' of the *Ars* dating to 7 B.C. or possibly earlier (ibid. 18–19) is not, however, compelling: cf. Kenney, op. cit. (n. 19), p. 235.

[30] *Ars* 1. 7, 17; cf. Myerowitz (n. 15), pp. 162–3, Green, loc. cit. (n. 27).

precisely than has hitherto been understood to that established in the proem to Book I. That is to say, to the comparison

Chiron : Achilles : : Ovid : Amor

there is now seen to correspond the comparison

Daedalus : Icarus : : Ovid : Amor.

Thus Icarus *is* connected with Amor; and not merely connected but implicitly *identified* with him. The moral then turns out to be more specific, and more stark, than that provisionally formulated above: if Amor (Icarus) does not do precisely as he is told by Ovid (Daedalus), he will come to grief as Icarus did. The opening image of the poet as Cupid's teacher, apparently 'virtually abandoned by line 24 [of Book I]',[31] now unexpectedly reappears in an even more daring guise in this second proem. If Amor does not submit to his tutor's discipline, *he will perish*: that is, the barque of true (Ovidian) love will be shipwrecked, and there will be no survivors. This is one of those places where modern typographical conventions actively hamper understanding. Like many allegories, this one exploits an ambiguity: though *Amor* is immortal, *amor* may die as Icarus did.[32] Moreover, like all good allegories, this one is not spelled out.[33] The connexion between Icarus and Amor, and the moral, the reader is left to make out for himself: Ovid's own gloss, as we have seen, being unhelpful—I suspect deliberately so.

The plausibility of this interpretation must turn on the reader's sense of what is more or less inherently probable in this poem and this poet. Ovid being Ovid, *amator ingenii sui*, and the poem being what he himself describes as sport (*lusus*, 3. 809), failure of technique (Rudd) and loss of nerve (Myerowitz) seem to me equally unlikely. I prefer to believe that he knew exactly what he was about and that his failure to explain himself was an artful tease, the *doctus poeta* at play. But *tot Ovidii quot critici*: the reader must choose for himself.

3. WHOSE 'INSTRUCTIONS'?

uix mihi credetis, sed credite: Troia maneret,
praeceptis Priami si foret usa sui. *A.A.* 3. 439–40

priami a ς: *priame* RA ς *sui* a ς: *tuis* RA ς: *senis* ς

'Ut omittam inepte suum Priamum dici, nihil Priamus dixisse narrabatur et praecepisse, cui si Troiani obedissent, urbs mansisset... Apta est autem una Cassandra, dei iussu non unquam credita Teucris ...'.

So Madvig, *Adversaria Critica* i (1871), 114; and this is the view of the matter that has commended itself to, among others, G. P. Goold (*HSCP* 69 (1965), 85–7), who brilliantly restored l. 440 as

praeceptis Priamo si foret usa satae.

However, the second stage of Goold's palaeographical reconstruction (*usasate* > *usate* > *usatuis*) is hardly as 'inevitable' as his discussion suggests; and one premiss of the argument invites further scrutiny—'*una* Cassandra'.

[31] A. S. Hollis *ad* l. 17.

[32] *Rem.* 139 *periere Cupidinis arcus*, 653–4 *fallat et in tenues euanidus exeat auras | perque gradus molles emoriatur amor* and Lucke *ad loc.*, citing Plat. *Symp.* 203e καὶ οὔτε ὡς ἀθάνατος πέφυκεν οὔτε ὡς θνητός, ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας θάλλει τε καὶ ζῇ, ὅταν εὐπορήσῃ, τότε δὲ ἀποθνῄσκει, πάλιν δὲ ἀναβιώσκεται... If Ovid ever read any Plato, the obvious candidates are the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus*.

[33] Cf. Kenney in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine literature* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 197–8.

If the allusion is indeed to Cassandra, as the emphasis in 'credetis... credite' admittedly seems to indicate, the occasion that Ovid must have had in mind was Hecuba's pregnancy with Paris, when she dreamed that she was delivered of a firebrand which set Troy ablaze. For Cassandra as the interpreter of the dream and the author of the advice to kill the infant Paris we have the brilliant testimony of Euripides:

> ... ὅτε νιν παρὰ θεσπεσίῳ δάφνᾳ
> βόασε Κασσάνδρα κτανεῖν
> μεγάλαν Πριάμου πόλεως λώβαν.
>
> *Andromache* 296–8

But that is not the only, or indeed the canonical, version. Most authorities, including Ovid himself in the *Heroides*, refer to a plurality of interpreters.[34] Moreover, according to Apollodorus (3. 12. 5. 6), Cassandra was born *after* Paris, and it was Priam's son Aesacus, described as ὀνειροκρίτης, whom he consulted about the dream (ibid. §3). In Apollodorus' account his advice was to expose the child; Lycophron, however, implies as clearly as his habitual ambiguity allows that he counselled putting both mother and child to death and that his advice was not followed:

> μηδ' Αἰσακείων οὐμὸς ὤφελεν πατὴρ
> χρησμῶν ἀπῶσαι νυκτίφοιτα δείματα,
> μιᾷ δὲ κρύψαι τοὺς διπλοῦς ὑπὲρ πάτρας
> μοίρᾳ, τεφρώσας γυῖα Λημναίῳ πυρί·
> οὐκ ἂν τοσῶνδε κῦμ' ἐπέκλυσεν κακῶν.
>
> *Alexandra* 224–8

It may therefore be that Ovid was following this less immediately familiar, though by no means ill-attested, version of the story, and that he wrote, what requires somewhat less palaeographical ingenuity to account for:

> praeceptis Priamo si foret usa sati.

There remains the problem of *praeceptis*, to which Housman objected (*ad* Luc. 8. 251) that the word suits Cassandra less well than Priam. The objection can be met, as Professor R. J. Tarrant has pointed out to me, and as Housman himself later noted in his own copy of his Lucan, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge,[35] by appealing to Virg. *Aen.* 2. 345–6 *infelix qui non sponsae praecepta furentis | audierit*. However, *praecepta* in its obvious sense of 'teachings', 'instructions' (*OLD* s.v. 1) suits interpretation better than vaticination; Cassandra was not given to explaining herself. On the other hand, the categories of seer and interpreter are not mutually exclusive. Aesacus is styled ὀνειροκρίτης by Apollodorus, *uatem* by Servius on *Aeneid* 2. 32 (Euphorion, fr. 55 Powell);[36] and in Paris' version of the episode as recreated by Ovid Priam's request to several *uates* is answered by one of their number, who is not named:

> territa consurgit metuendaque noctis opacae
> uisa seni Priamo, uatibus ille refert.
> arsurum Paridis uates canit Ilion igni;
> pectoris, ut nunc est, fax fuit illa mei.
>
> *Her.* 16. 47–50

[34] Ov. *Her.* 16. 47–50 (see below), 17. 239–40 *et uatum timeo monitus, quos igne Pelasgo | Ilion arsurum praemonuisse ferunt*; cf. Hygin. 91. 2 *coniectoribus*, Dict. Cret. 3. 26 *aruspices*, and the scholiasts on Homer and Euripides (H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge, 1967), p. 222).

[35] I owe this information to Dr R. G. Mayer.

[36] Lycophron, predictably, is difficult to pin down.

Did Ovid mean his readers to identify this anonymous *uates* as Aesacus? He may have been a more familiar figure in Hellenistic poetry than the extant remains imply. As has been noted, Euphorion mentioned him;[37] for the story of his metamorphosis as told by Ovid Boios is a plausible source;[38] and *pace* Rudolf Pfeiffer he may have been treated by Callimachus.[39] Ovid's omission to name him at *Her.* 16. 49 might reflect the learned poet's self-conscious awareness of divergences in the literary tradition: in Ennius' *Alexandra* (58–61 Jocelyn) the advice came from the oracle of Apollo.[40] Be that as it may, *praeceptis* at *A.A.* 3. 440 is at least no less appropriate to Aesacus than to Cassandra, perhaps marginally more so. As to the apparent pointer to Cassandra in 'credetis ... credite', Ovid may simply have been teasing, as it has been suggested he did elsewhere in the *Ars* (above, part 2). After all, according to Lycophron, Aesacus too was not believed. In any case, I suggest that he deserves honourable mention in the apparatus criticus, though it will be a bolder editor than I who installs him in the text.

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

[37] Fr. 55 Powell; cf. *SH* 453. [38] Bömer on *Met.* 11. 749–95 (p. 430).

[39] See Hollis, *ZPE* 92 (1992), 109–10, arguing for the genuineness of fr. [815] Pf.

[40] Cf. Stevens on Eur. *Andr.* 296, Jocelyn (n. 34), pp. 222–3. On traces of Ennius in the letters of Paris and Helen see H. Jacobson, *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 299–303; Diana G. White, *HSCP* 74 (1970), 187–91; Kenney, *CQ* 29 (1979), 398.