

ad cenam adducam, et primum hisce abdomina tunni
advenientibus priva dabo cephalaeaque acarnae.

I'll invite them to dinner, and when they first turn up I'll give them each tuna bellies and sea-perch head-pieces.

Puelma Piwonka sees in these lines evidence for Lupus' character as 'Gräkomane', the affectation of his speech expressive of 'das sinn- und maßlose Raffinement der Speisen und Getränke'.¹⁵ The epicure's absurd relish in naming the specific body-parts that will form his menu is surely comparable to the foible satirized by Horace not only in Catius' exposition of his unnamed master's *ars vivendi* in *Sat.* 2.4, but also in the lines on the provenance and weight of the glutton's favoured fish (2.2.31–8) which precede the discussion of Gallonius, the 'praetor' and Avidienus in *Sat.* 2.2.

In conclusion, if it is reasonable to surmise that Lupus was lampooned by Lucilius for (among other vices) an unusually *recherché* taste in affairs of the kitchen, the connection between the Lupus of earlier Roman satire and the *lupus* of Horace's proverb becomes a natural association to make. It provides an exact parallel to the relationship between Avidienus, nicknamed *Canis*, and the *canis* with whom he is identified at *Sat.* 2.2.64—and the precision of the parallel, far from detracting from the humour in Horace's punning use of the *verbum vetus*, adds yet another element to the cleverness of the poet's insertion of this proverb at this particular point in the poem (and the collection). It is only by avoiding the excesses of both the miserly Avidienus and Lucilius' extravagant villain that the reader of the *Satires* will be able to keep the wolf—and indeed the dog—from the door.

Trinity College, Cambridge

L. B. T. HOUGHTON
lbth2@cam.ac.uk

in this fragment appear in the elder Pliny's catalogue of fish *peculiares . . . maris* (Plin. *NH* 32.145–52—but note *thynni* also in *ibid.* 145, *amni . . . ac mari*) alongside the *squilla* and *acipenser* of the lines on Gallonius quoted above.

¹⁵ M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1949), 29.

ON THE NUMBER OF BOOKS IN OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*

None of the countless studies dedicated to the structure of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* has yet raised the question concerning the general number of the books that constitute the poem, that is, whether the number of fifteen books might itself be an expression of programmatic meaning, other than that it provides a useful foundation for the subdivisions into sections, parts, or pentads.¹

A proposal has been brought forward by Hofmann, in an article on Ovid's poetic:²

¹ I can name here only some of the many scholars who have dealt with the problem of the *Metamorphoses*' structure: W. Ludwig, *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen* (Berlin, 1965); B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge, 1970²), 45–90 and *passim*; A. Crabbe, *Structure and Content in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, *ANRW* 2.31.4.2274–327 (Berlin and New York, 1981); E. A. Schmidt, *Ovids poetische Menschenwelt. Die Metamorphosen als Metapher und als Symphonie* (Heidelberg, 1991); N. Holzberg, 'Ter quinque volumina as carmen perpetuum: the division into books in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *MD* 80 (1998), 77–98.

² H. Hofmann, 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses: carmen perpetuum, carmen deductum*', *PLLS* 5 (1985), 223–41.

according to him, this structure refers to the fifteen books of the first edition of Ennius' *Annals* and therefore to its characteristic of being a modern epic deeply influenced by Hellenistic poetry. Hofmann concludes: 'If the division of the *Metamorphoses* into 15 books was an early decision, and Ovid thought it significant, then it gave Ovid's epic a witty Ennian superstructure, in contrast to the *Aeneid*'s 12 books with their Homeric associations.' This idea has been resumed in part by Wheeler,³ who—while omitting Callimachism—singles out a strong connection between the *Annals* and the *Metamorphoses* which consists in the continuity and temporal completeness of the narration *ab origine mundi* up to the present period; Wheeler sets this in opposition to the Virgilian poem's resolute selection of its materials and to its beginning *in medias res*.

These two scholars may certainly take credit for having distinctly raised the issue of the number of the books and for having indicated a way to work it out, connecting it with the complex problem of generic definition posed by the *Metamorphoses*. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the explanation proposed by Hofmann shows far too much confidence in the presupposition that Ennius belongs among the adherents of Callimachism: among modern critics, this hypothesis has become widely accepted, but for Ovid and his contemporaries it was not. A further doubt concerns whether one may legitimately think of the first edition of the *Annals* exclusively. It is certainly true—as both Hofmann and Wheeler affirm—that this first edition was widely known in the Augustan age, but the second edition in eighteen books was well known, too, and in fact better known: the existence of a variant edition whose number of books was a multiple of six would have located Ennius' poem in the tradition leading from Homer to Virgil⁴ and in my opinion makes a precise and recognizable allusion to the first edition rather difficult. I wish to propose a different solution to the problem.

It is generally known that the poetry book of the Augustan age shows a strong predilection for multiples of five: ten is the number of Virgil's *Eclogues*, there are ten elegies contained in the first book of Tibullus, the first book of Horace's *Satires* contains the same number. Horace in particular is most diligent in following this principle: twenty is the number of poems contained in the second and thirty in the third book of his *Odes*, the fourth book contains fifteen, and the first book of the *Epistles* twenty.⁵ There are other collections, too, which display this tendency, for example the first book of Propertius (which contains twenty-two elegies, the last two of which have, however, the character of *sphragis*), and it is quite interesting that the *Catalepton*, while being most probably the work of a compiler, follows this principle as well: it contains fifteen epigrams.⁶ And last but not least, this widely spread preference for multiples of five is repeated over and over again in the Ovidian elegiac collections: if it is true that in many cases the exact number of elegies is uncertain (since there is often uncertainty with

³ S. Wheeler, *A Discourse of Wonders. Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Philadelphia, 1999), 24.

⁴ See S. Mariotti, *Lezioni su Ennio* (Urbino, 1991²), 23. A. Barchiesi, *The Poet and the Prince* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997), 270–1, demonstrates the specific influence that the conclusion of *Annals* 15 exercised upon the conclusion of Ovid's *Fasti*. With regard to our purpose here, this argument is a double-edged weapon as both these conclusions are in some way temporary.

⁵ Cf. W. Port, 'Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit', *Philologus* 81 (1926), 280–308 and 427–68; E. Fraenkel, 'Caratteri della poesia augustea', *Maia* 1 (1948), 245–64 at 253.

⁶ At least according to the majority of the editors who omit the *carmen* following 13 which is transmitted only in manuscripts belonging to the Z family. The *Catalepton*'s structure has been the object of research several times before, see the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (Rome, 1984), 698–9, under 'Catalepton' (by J. A. Richmond).

regard to the unity of single elegies), it is similarly true that on the whole, this general tendency reveals itself quite clearly. We are particularly struck by the fact that the first book of each of the three collections of elegies divided into several books (that is, *Amores*, *Tristia*, and *Ex Ponto*) seems without exception to be based upon this principle. *Amores* 1 contains fifteen elegies, *Tristia* 1 ten, and the epilogue, *Ex Ponto* 1, ten. It is quite obvious that Ovid picked up and systematically re-elaborated this characteristic widely spread among the poetry books of the early Augustan age.⁷

In accordance with this tendency, I hold that the attempt at giving a sense to the number of books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is more than legitimate: the division of the epic poem into fifteen books is another way of signalling its proper distance from the traditional epic which is instead characterized by a number corresponding to a multiple of six. In addition, it states its own new character and its staunch ties with that season of short genres which flourished during the Augustan age and which are to be interpreted as the specifically Roman fruits of Callimachism. Schematizing, we might say that the number of fifteen books repropose on a macroscopic scale that most complex and programmatic paradox comprehended in the expression *perpetuum deducite carmen* in *Met.* 1.3:⁸ it is well known that this expression blends the idea of an epic poem with a cosmic dimension (*carmen perpetuum*) with that of a polished, careful poem (*deducite carmen* reminds us of the *carmen deductum* of Callimachean memory in Verg. *Ecl.* 6.5). With regard to the paradox of an epic of the Callimachean type which transposes the refinements and the care otherwise dedicated to short compositions (*carmen deductum*) or to single *libelli* on to the larger scale of a *carmen perpetuum*, this might explain the apparent incongruity according to which the multiple of five characteristic of single books in early Augustan collections is being transferred in the *Metamorphoses* to the number of books making up a continuous epic.

Finally, taking into consideration the number of elegies comprised in each book of the *Amores*, we may propose another tentative hypothesis. From the point of view of the number of compositions we might establish a connection between Ovid's erotic elegy and his epic, especially if, with Kenney,⁹ we accept that the *Amores* follow the scheme of fifteen, twenty, fifteen elegies, or if, with Munari, we at least accept that the

⁷ Our argument becomes much less certain when we consider the books following the first in each of these collections: in the *Amores* the pattern of fifteen, twenty, fifteen elegies is temptingly inviting but unfortunately quite uncertain (see below), whereas the third, fourth, and fifth book of the *Tristia* contain fifteen, ten, fifteen elegies each, however, only on the condition that one agrees to subdividing 3.4 and 5.7 into two distinct compositions, as in G. Luck's edition (Heidelberg, 1967). In the remaining books of *Ex Ponto* (eleven, nine, sixteen elegies each) it is striking that the number of poems in each case is precisely one more or one less than a multiple of five: this may be an example of demonstrative casualness within a text which presents itself as an informal collection of letters to friends. In conclusion, we have got to remember that the first collection of the *Heroides* contains fifteen compositions (but it is obvious that there is the question of Sappho's letter, that is, in order to arrive at the desired number of fifteen, we must consider it genuine or else suppose that this letter had replaced an original Ovidian one that was lost).

⁸ Much has been written about that dense prefatory expression: I shall limit myself to mentioning—in addition to Hofmann's already quoted article—the copious bibliography quoted by Wheeler (n. 3) at 216, n. 48, and also F. Grewing, 'Einige Bemerkungen zum Prooemium der *Metamorphosen* Ovids', *Hermes* 121 (1993), 246–52 and C. Harrauer, 'Zitat und Originalität in Ovids *Metamorphosen*-Prooemium', *WS* 114 (2001), 297–302.

⁹ Cf. the *praefatio* of the Oxford edition (1961), at X. Against this hypothesis, see J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores, 1: Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool, 1987), 91, which follows the scheme of fifteen, nineteen, fourteen elegies. A specific analysis of the individual texts which editors either unify or split and especially of the authenticity of *Amores* 3.5 would of course exceed this note's aim.

first and the third books contain fifteen elegies each. Between the *Amores* and the *Metamorphoses* there exist complex and deep-rooted ties: his elegiac experience is not being cancelled or disowned but becomes—after being officially exhausted—one of the elements in the texture of an epic poem which for its greatest part is dedicated to the narration of the vicissitudes of love.¹⁰ The principle which governs the mechanism of metamorphosis requires that something of the previous form be maintained in the new one:¹¹ we can therefore include among the many footprints which the erotic elegy has left in the hexametric poem the structure based upon a total of fifteen books, an indication of continuity and transformation.¹²

*Seminar für Klassische Philologie,
Freie Universität, Berlin*

ELENA MERLI
elena.merli@berlin.de

¹⁰ On the relation between amatory elegy and Ovidian epic, cf. P. E. Knox, *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Tradition of Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge, 1986).

¹¹ With regard to that mechanism, see J. B. Solodow, *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Chapel Hill, 1998), 183–6 and Wheeler (n. 3), 12–13 and 33 (with emphasis on the poetic meaning).

¹² I wish to thank G. Rosati, S. Siegl-Mocavini, M. Telò, and C. A. Williams.

THE ELDER SENECA, *CONTROVERSAE* 2.1.1: *SUB DOMINO SECTORE**

In a paper on the role played by Mark Antony in liquidating the confiscated property of Pompey (*CQ* 54 [2004], 161–73), I had occasion to cite a passage from the Elder Seneca (*Controv.* 2.1.1) that, in my view, illustrates how Cicero's oft-repeated charge that Antony was the *sector* of Pompey's property has left its mark in later literature. Seneca quotes as follows from the rhetorician M. Porcius Latro, a contemporary and fellow-student of his:

Vidi ego magni exercitus ducem sine comite fugientem; vidi <ab> ambitiosa turba clientium limina deserta sub domino sectore venalia.

Some of the best modern Latinists have struggled to make sense of the phrase *sub domino sectore*. Winterbottom in his 1974 Loeb edition of the Elder Seneca translates *sub domino sectore venalia* 'put up for sale, its owner the auctioneer', commenting (p. 205, n. 3): 'But *sector* should = "bidder"; and Latro perhaps meant: "the former owner's master bidding for it".' Courtney¹ states 'unfortunately the meaning of Sen. *Contr.* 2.1 pr. [sic] *limina sub domino sectore venalia* is obscure; see Winterbottom's note'. And, finally, Watt² interprets the meaning as follows: 'a house is up for sale at auction and its owner is bidding for it: a strange procedure, for which one can only guess at a reason (perhaps to force up the price)'. Watt goes on to propose the emendation *suo* for *sub*. Later, to judge from the notation 'sub *del. Watt*' in Håkanson's 1989 Teubner edition of Seneca Maior, Watt apparently communicated to Håkanson (see p. xix, n. 1) a different solution of what still appeared to him to be a difficulty posed by the preposition *sub*.

* I thank the following scholars who kindly read an earlier draft of this paper and offered valuable advice and encouragement: Allan Kershaw, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, P. G. Walsh, and Michael Winterbottom. They are not, of course, to be held responsible for the views expressed.

¹ E. Courtney, *Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (London, 1980), 161.

² W. S. Watt, 'Notes on Seneca Rhetor', *Latomus* 47 (1988), 852–3.