Transactions of the American Philological Association 126 (1996) 221–263

Terms of Venery: *Ars Amatoria* I*

C. M. C. Green
University of Iowa

I

STRANGER: Apparently you have never yet paid attention to the lovers' method of hunting...

Plato, *Sophist* 222d

The first art, before all the others, was the art of hunting. This is the art that shapes and defines Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and is the source from which the poet draws the narrative structure and the imagery of Book 1, creating resonances deeply relevant to the poet's greatest concerns: his pursuit of glory through love (if only in poetry); the unexpected impact of the erotic hunt upon masculine relationships; and in particular, the ambiguous, and perhaps even now dangerous, position in which such a hunt placed him vis-à-vis Augustus' Rome.

The art of the hunter freed man from his war with the beasts,[1] and led to all those other arts by which man exercises his reason and creates civilization out of the "mad violence" in which humankind lived with the beasts, so that the pursuit of a wild beast through the arts of hunting became a paradigm for the pursuit of anything in the light of reason, from the most banal—a rabbit for the pot—to the most elevated, such as the knowledge of the nature of being. This is the burden of the proem (1–23) to the didactic poem on hunting written by Ovid's friend Grattius. It is, however, by no means Grattius' own invention. Convoluted and

*The text is that of Kenney throughout. Hollis' commentary is indispensible, as are the introduction and notes to P. Green's translation (1982). My discussion is much indebted also to Myerowitz, particularly her insight into the the philosophical antecedents of Ovid's views about men and women. In Fränkel's very sympathetic discussion of the *Ars* (53–63), I was encouraged to find several anticipations of the direction taken by my argument; but at no point did he formally recognize the connection between hunting, the philosophical pursuit of the beloved, and Ovid's work.

[1]Grat. 13–15. The *bellum ferinum* ("War against the Wild Beasts," 13) alludes to the conventional names of wars and the works reporting on them, such as Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*, Naevius' epic *Bellum Punicum*, and the like. Yet *bellum ferinum* can also mean "the Beastly War." Grattius' pun is not original with him. Isocrates argued that "the most necessary and most just war is that which men wage together against the savagery of beasts, the second being that which the Greeks wage against barbarians" (*Panath.* 163).

unappealing though it may be, it restates a theme with a tradition common to epic, didactic and lyric poetry, as well as to philosophy and the visual arts, that goes back at least seven centuries. "The art of the hunt," understood as "the art of pursuing the thing desired," is a metaphor capable of the most subtle and compelling variations; one such variation, of course, is the art of pursuing the beloved, the *ars amatoria*. Ovid is no more an innovator in this regard than Grattius. He is working within the same antique tradition,[2] and before we begin to examine the use he makes of it, it is essential that we have some general understanding of the development of venery as a paradigm for all human arts.[3]

An examination of Ovid's poem, then, must begin with a brief re-examination of the tradition of the hunt and its importance as a metaphor in a remarkably diverse set of artistic, literary, and philosophical genres. First, instruction in the hunt was a fundamental paradigm for didactic training of all kinds, as Grattius says. The gods had entrusted Chiron with the invention of hunting, and with training the race of heroes in its practice.[4] As early as the seventh century B.C.E., Chiron was the iconic teacher of the young. In vase paintings, when the boy Achilles is shown being handed over to Chiron to be educated, Chiron is dressed and equipped as a hunter.[5] In the fifth century,

[2]The perception that Ovid was following the example set by Vergil's *Georgics* (for which view Leach's article is, rightly, the most influential) or, alternatively, by Lucretius (Krókowski provides a good summary of the scholarship in favor of this approach), is certainly justified in close analysis of the poetry, since Ovid's debt to his immediate Latin didactic predecessors is great; but it remains misleading in that it neglects important earlier influences.

[3]Capponi has devoted an entire monograph to Ovid's use of hunting techniques in both the *Ars* and the *Metamorphoses,* but, like most scholars who examine the imagery of the hunt in Roman art, he does not consider the "hunt" in the game preserves attached to Italian villas. Useful for a sympathetic general description of hunt-imagery in Theocritus and the Roman poets is Aymard 129–38, though his chapter on Ovid's use of the hunt (139–42) is concerned, oddly, only with the *Metamorphoses*. Dunn 261–95 is particularly valuable because she examines all Ovid's poems, not just the famous ones, and provides an good literary analysis of each separate appearance of hunting imagery.

[4]X. *Cyn.* 1.1. The *Cynegeticus* is now generally accepted as a work of Xenophon's, and the views on the moral training provided by hunting are confirmed by the *Cyropaedia* (cf. 1.6.28–29) as undoubtedly Xenophontic. The exordium, however, is agreed to be a later addition, probably from the Hadrianic era (Marchant xlii–xliii). Even so, it codifies a tradition that can be traced back to the archaic age. See next note for the evidence of the vase paintings.

[5]In the seventh century Chiron is regularly depicted in hunting costume, usually carrying a tree or a pole from which hang his hunting trophies: deer, fox, hare, birds (Gisler-Huwiler: e.g., no. 16, 525–500 B.C.E., Chiron, with "butin de chasse," giving a panther to Peleus). The scene of Chiron receiving the child Achilles into his care was a very popular subject for paintings (Gisler-Huwiler: e.g., no. 41, krater, 570 B.C.E., Chiron, carrying the "butin de chasse," among the gods; no. 44, amphora, 650–625 B.C.E., Achilles and Chiron with "butin

when Pindar depicts the young Achilles, it is as a triumphant hunter presenting his trophies of boar and deer to his teacher Chiron (*N.* 3.34–53). Achilles was, or became, only one of a long roster of such heroes—Jason, Herakles and Actaeon were others—whom Chiron taught.[6] As a paradigm for all didacticism, the hunt's central purpose is to subdue the wild through τέχνη. The τέχνη of the hunt was designed to resolve a conflict of overwhelming importance. The elements of the conflict can be represented in several ways: the wild and the tame, uncontrolled emotion and reason, ignorance and knowledge, nature and civilization. In each case, τέχνη is the means by which the tameness, reason, knowledge, or civilization is achieved, and at the same time it is an expression of those qualities in practice. The conflict can be entirely externalized, as it is in the hunt proper; but its artistic and philosophic development very early internalizes the hunt, and thus, while Achilles is taught to hunt by Chiron (the externalized conflict), he is also being taught to "tame" or "civilize" himself (the internalized conflict) through reason and art.

Plato and Xenophon were particularly influential in making the hunt central to Greek (and eventually Roman) cultural identity, since they, among others, elevated hunting to the level of a key function in the active cultivation of

---

de chasse"; no. 48, amphora, 520 B.C.E., Achilles and Chiron as hunter with hunting dogs). In these scenes the young Achilles sometimes has a hunting spear himself, and tame deer and hunting hounds often accompany Chiron (Kossatz-Deissmann: e.g., no. 19, lekythos, 500 B.C.E., Chiron, with a doe beside him, receiving Achilles, who carries a hunting spear; no. 27, oinochoë, 510 B.C.E., Peleus gives Achilles to Chiron, who is accompanied by a hound, with a companion oinochoë depicting Peleus in a hunting scene; and nos. 19–44 passim). Some scene similar to Pindar's (*N.* 3.43–53) may well have been part of the Χείρωνος Ὑποθῆκαι (*The Counsels of Chiron*), a didactic work traditionally assigned to Hesiod (Merkelbach/West *testimonia* and frs. 283–85).

The evolution of the "education of Achilles" myth during the Hellenistic period is a virtual blank in both visual and literary art. It reappears in Rome at the end of the Republic, and the iconography of Chiron the hunter-teacher of heroes then became a favorite for four centuries (Gisler-Huwiler 247–48). The earliest work in Rome of which we have knowledge is the marble sculpture, probably a copy of a fourth century B.C.E. Greek original supposedly by Scopas or Praxiteles, depicting Chiron teaching Achilles to play the lyre. It was set up in the Saepta Julia, whose reconstruction was planned by Caesar and completed by Agrippa in 26 B.C.E. (Pliny *HN* 36.29; Richardson, *Topography* s.v. "Saepta Julia"; Kossatz-Deissmann no. 50). The Saepta was one of the most frequented places in Rome.

[6]Jason: Hes. fr. 40 Merkelbach/West; Pi. *N.* 3.53–54; *P.* 4.102–3; Sch. Pi. *P.* 4.135; Sch. Hom. *Od.* 12.69; Herakles: Sch. Theokr. 13.95; Actaeon: Apollod. 3.4.4; *POxy* 2509. Cf. the list of heroes, among them Aeneas, taught by Chiron (X. *Cyn.* 1.1).

rational thought (καλῶς νοεῖν, *ratio*).[7] The τέχνη of the hunt was thus held to form the basis for excellence in all fields of manly endeavor, training a young man for everything from running his own household to governing a country or commanding an army. Plato's explicit connection (*Sph.* 222–23) of the hunt for the beloved with the arts of persuasion, that is, the rhetoric of philosophical and political discourse, makes this abundantly clear.[8] The *artes* of the hunt, as propounded by authors such as Xenophon and Grattius,[9] are therefore also instruction in the *bonae artes*, those practical virtues of fidelity, probity, and diligence that were supposedly the source of the greatness of the free city-state, whether Athens or Rome (X. *Cyn.* 1.15–17):

> These became the heroes they were through the care they learned from Chiron...therefore I charge the young not to despise hunting, nor any other education: it is from these that men become good (*agathoi*) in the things pertaining to war, and in other things, from which must come excellence in thought and word and deed.

The hunt as a formal preparation of the young man, in the heroic age as a warrior, and then, as the citizen of a free state, in the highest form of political morality, would be a familiar lesson to any student trained in Greek, whether or not he had ever actually hunted. Still, among the men in Ovid's audience, most had probably hunted at some time or another, and Sulpicia's adept use of the

[7]Pl. *Lg.* 823b; X. *Cyn.* 1.18: ἐκ τούτων γὰρ γίγνονται τὰ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἀγαθοὶ εἵς τε τὰ ἄλλα, ἐξ ὧν ἀνάγκη καλῶς νοεῖν καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν, cf. Grat. *Cyn.* 1–12. Grattius' lines are somewhat involuted, but confirm Xenophon's aristocratic confidence that hunting was the model for training the mind as well as the body ("...untrained men disturbed the forests with their naked courage and life was error in every respect. Afterwards, by another, more fitting way, and better trained, they took you, Reason, as ally for their undertakings...Diana, you thought fit, once your aids were discovered, to protect life apprehensive from the warfare of wild beasts, where most it needed help, and to deliver the world from this harm," 4–6, 13–15). Grattius says, in short, that primitive man thrashed about wildly, with only his strength to aid him, until the gods gave him *ratio*, which made possible learning *ex artibus artes / proserere* (to produce arts from arts). The first art was hunting. Cf. also X. *Cyr.* 1.6.19; 2.4.19.

[8]"The appropriative, coercive, hunting art which hunts animals, land animals, tame animals, man, privately, for pay, is paid in cash, claims to give education, and is a hunt after rich and promising youths, must—so our present argument concludes—be called sophistry" (*Sph.* 223b). It is clear that what is offensive about *this* sort of hunting is that its prey is a "tame animal," and it is done for pay. In the *Laws* Plato recommends the teaching of hunting, but with severe restrictions on the *kind* of hunting. See below, p. 238.

[9]*Dona cano divom, laetas venantibus artes / auspicio, Diana, tuo*, "I sing the gifts of the gods, the skills joyful to hunters under your auspices, Diana" (Grat. *Cyn.* 1–2).

hunt motif in her poetic pursuit of Cerinthus ([Tib.] 3.9) suggests that women who read poetry were expected to be familiar with the sport as well. This, after all, is the audience to which Grattius directed his poem. Their hunting for the most part would have been informal, casual, something one enjoyed when one was in the country, the sort of thing recommended by Ofellus (Hor. *S.* 2.2.1–20), or Cato the Elder in Cicero's *de Senectute* (56), though those who had great villas would probably also have steadings for wild animals (see below, pp. 230–33).[10]

The hunt as the perfection of τέχνη is therefore embedded in the entire range of Greco-Roman discourse and iconography—not least in erotic matters, where the imagery of the hunt impressed a heroic valuation on the pursuit of the beloved and made an Achilles of every hopeful lover. The hunter as lover had become a popular *topos* in the visual arts as far back as the sixth century B.C.E., and Plato, writing in the early fourth century, argued that the pursuit of the beloved was a legitimate kind of venery, and should be taught (*Lg.* 823b). The pursuit Plato had in mind, of course, was not sexual but metaphysical. Nevertheless, *eros* is the stimulus and the pursuit is a hunt. That some might mistake the metaphysical for the physical hunt was not lost on Plato, either. The friend who meets Socrates at the beginning of the *Protagoras* affects to believe that Socrates has been out with the hounds, hunting Alcibiades (309a).

The evidence suggests that there existed a significant type of handbook that was in fact a philosophical treatise on ἐρωτικὴ τέχνη, the "Art of Love."[11] This tradition goes back to Plato's *Phaedrus* and the *Alcibiades*, which was believed in antiquity to be a genuine work of Plato's, and was continued in the Hellenistic age by the Stoics Zeno and Cleanthes, who both composed works entitled *The Art of Love* (Ἐρωτικὴ τέχνη), and Chrysippus, who wrote *On*

[10]The origin of hunting as a Roman cultural practice is a very controversial question. The view that the Romans knew hunting *only* from the Greek tradition, and that hunting was introduced into Roman culture no earlier than the second century B.C.E., is enshrined in Orth's article in *Pauly* and repeated with even more exaggeration in *Kleine Pauly* by Gross, who ignores the major studies of Aymard, Hull and Anderson. For a full discussion of the evidence that the Romans did indeed hunt *ab initio,* including the archaeological and zoölogical discoveries of the last two decades, see Green 1996.

[11]Dillon 387. He compares Ovid's programmatic passage (1.35–40) to the Neoplatonists' explication of the *Alcibiades*; the three stages of γνῶσις, κτῆσις, χρῆσις correspond to Ovid's three-part outline: selecting a love-object (*quod amare velis, reperire labora*, 35); commending oneself to one's love (*placitam exorare puellam*, 37); and striving to make the love long-lasting (*ut longo tempore duret amor*, 38).

Love (Περὶ ἔρωτος).[12] It would be surprising if these serious works did not spawn a a sub-group of parodies, particularly in the Hellenistic age.

Thus the tradition of the hunt—that quintessential initiation into the heroic ethos, the civic ideals of the free city-state, and philosophic καλῶς νοεῖν, the art of thinking well—is also the conventional philosophical and artistic paradigm for teaching young men the skills of pursuing, taming, and keeping their beloved;[13] and Ovid's didactic pose, namely that he is teaching how to "hunt for women," far from being an innovative fancy, derives from a well-developed tradition in Greco-Roman art.

Thus the "love/hunt antinomy"[14] that some modern readers have detected in Ovid's discourse needs re-examination. Such an antinomy posits an underlying *opposition* between eroticism and the hunt. For the modern reader, this "opposition" between *amor* and *studium venandi* certainly exists; to Ovid's audience, however, the hunt was a paradigm for the process by which particular opposites (female and male, wild and tame, wildness and civilization, ignorance and knowledge) were brought into a relationship proper to each.

Having first re-established the genre of the didactic hunt for love, it is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate how Ovid takes the erotic chase and locates it in an intensely Roman, and particularly Augustan, context. The hunt is the paradigmatic τέχνη for both soldier and lover, to both of whom it teaches techniques of pursuit, engagement, and capture. In particular, I intend to demonstrate that the traditional connection between the erotic hunt and civic virtues—especially φιλία, the friendship binding men in society—explains and illuminates the conclusion of *Ars* I, which focuses not on the beloved at all, but on male friendship destroyed by the pursuit of the female. Thus the concluding two hundred lines form an increasingly sardonic, even bitter, commentary on the state of contemporary Augustan society and its lack of compatibility with either *eros* or φιλία—that is, with the essence of the hunt as the molder of civic virtue.

[12]There were, no doubt, others of whom we have not even heard. See Dillon on the *Phaedrus* and particularly the *Alcibiades* as sources for the Platonist tradition (387–90) and on subsequent Stoic treatments of the subject (390–91).

[13]Fifth century vase paintings seem to present the ephebe as the beloved most often, but not to the exclusion of the woman as the beloved: cf. Schnapp 82.

[14]Davis 15. Davis' concentration is on the *Metamorphoses* and the opposition between the hunt and *eros* as its own "intrinsic genre" (151–53). His discussion is illuminating in many ways, but it must be kept in mind that the opposition is a construct very dependent upon modern values related to *amor* and particularly to the *studium venandi*.

II

The nature of peacocks and doves is wild, and it is not relevant that they often have a habit of flying from and to [their homes]; for bees also do the same, and it is agreed that their nature is wild.

Digest 41 §1.5.5[15]

The conventional scene for both a hunt of wild animals and the pursuit of the beloved, in the *Metamorphoses* in particular, is a forest glade.[16] However, Ovid's erotic poetry, like all Roman elegy, is "marked by an original, inseparable tie to the city."[17] The importation of the hunt for the beloved into the city is part of the theme's early transformation from a charming allusion to a full-fledged philosophical, artistic and literary *topos*. Thus the resolution of this apparent contradiction between the hunt and the city—a resolution brilliantly exploited by Ovid, but by no means original with him—is inherent in the artistic tradition of the hunt.

It is important to recognize that the discussion of place for the hunt carried significant meaning in itself. In the first instance, one hunts one's wild prey in the wild, just as we would expect:

> It seems that there is no other pursuit more important than to gain an exact knowledge of one's own country. It is for this reason that the ephebe ought to run after the hare and engage in all other kinds of hunting, as much as for the pleasure or profit to be had from such occupations. (Pl. *Lg.* 763b)

The activity of hunting sends the young man out to learn his own country, and to test himself at its limits. He achieves his wisdom by knowing himself in and through nature. This is the traditional concept of the hunt, and it predominates in the didactic works on hunting. The hunt in the wild, just beyond the boundaries of the city, is the hunting that Plato and Xenophon knew. Four centuries later, Grattius, a contemporary and friend of Ovid's, describes

[15]"The underlying principle is that an animal does not cease to be *ferae naturae* because tamed": de Zulueta *ad loc.* All quotations from the *Digest* are taken from de Zulueta's translation and commentary for this section of the *Digest* on *usucapio*—the acquisition of ownership by long use or possession. Ovid served on the centumviral court (*Tr.* 2.93–96), which heard cases of *usucapio* (Cic. *Orat.* 1.173). See Kenney 1969 for a discussion of direct evidence of Ovid's legal knowledge.

[16]Perry 275–80.

[17]"L'elegia nasceva a Roma,...segnata da un legame originario, inscindibile, con la città": Labate 36.

Xenophon's sport in a way that is basically unchanged. Nemesianus, two centuries after Grattius, does the same.

But the pursuit of the beloved shifted the location of the hunt, because the prey's desirability is no longer defined by the natural wildness of the hare or the deer, but by the innocence of youth and the perfection of natural beauty. The goal is no longer to kill the prey, but, by the act of capture, to tame *and keep* the beloved. The iconography of the erotic hunt demonstrates this. In the fifth century, the iconography began to change; where once it had expressed the hunt as erotic aggression through the chase and killing of the prey, a hare or a cock, which was then triumphantly offered to the beloved, what the lover-hunter now offered was a living, tamed animal.[18] The τέχνη of the erotic hunt was thus extended to embrace both pursuit *and* "taming." The hare on a leash, in a cage, or sitting on the lover's lap became the symbol of love conquered through cultivation.

For quite different reasons, the actual practices of hunting produced another context for the pursuit of the beloved in conditions of civilization. This was particularly true for Romans of the first century B.C.E. In Book 3 of the *Res Rusticae*, Varro makes it clear that part of the function of a villa was the steading of animals meant to be hunted.[19] This is a very different kind of venery from that practiced by Xenophon and Grattius. To Varro and his friends, and therefore to Romans of the first century B.C.E., a well-disposed villa had aviaries and game

[18]"Thus little by little an eroticism of approaches and dodges is established, an art that makes use of shifting meanings and allusion rather than erotic aggression, that suggests love rather than representing it explicitly. The image of the hunt as such is no longer desirable because it suggests the animal's capture by force, the violence of pursuit, and the animal's death rather than its taming...the metaphor of the tame animal gradually replaces that of the hunted game....We might call these the two faces of the erotic—one turned towards the outdoors, the hunt, and the ambush, the other towards the inside, the gymnnasium, animals caged and tamed" (Schnapp 82–84; cf. Dover 87–91).

[19]Cornelius Merula ("Blackbird") describes the "steading" of a villa, and after identifying the divisions (birds, game, fish) and their subdivisions, he names the craftsmen who must be hired to maintain them: these are fowlers or bird-catchers, *aucupes*; hunters, *venatores*; and fishermen, *piscatores* (*R.* 3.3.4). Chickens, he claims, were the first to be raised in the villa, for the purposes of divination, then game was added *venationis causa* ("for the sake of hunting," 3.3.5). In earlier days, the head of the house never saw "any better game from his hunting than a paltry hare" (*lepusculum e venatione vidit numquam*, 3.3.8). As the discussion proceeds, it is apparent that much of this would be called game-farming by modern scholars. The aviaries are clearly regarded as financial propositions, with the intention of breeding non-domesticated birds for sale.

warrens where animals were raised, fattened, and presented for *hunting*.[20] Quite possibly, Scipio Aemilianus had brought the *idea* of game preserves back from Macedonia, where he learned to hunt in the royal parks (Plb. 31.29).[21] For Romans like Varro, the animal is no longer wild: the hunt is now conducted within the physical boundaries of the villa. The old central issues of the contest between human reason and the instinctual wild—the proving of manly strength and skill, the preparation for civil and military service—have all been left outside the villa gates.[22] Once we have examined Varro's charming and rather detailed description of the "hunting grounds" that could be attached to well-equipped villas, we can better understand why this manner of hunt was so much preferable when the *venator* was also the *amator*, and his beloved was female.

The villa hunting grounds were extensions of the garden, and the animals, like plants, were cultivated with attention to the ultimate pleasure of the owner. Country villas were extended—by small huts for birds or dormice, by miniature cities for animal citizens, by well-groomed parks inhabited by semi-tamed wildlife, by wilderness and wildlife alike enclosed in walls—so that the Romans could keep, raise, and fatten game for the "hunt" (Var. *R.* 3.3.8). Unfortunately, Varro does not give us a description of an actual hunt, and the suspicion that in most cases the sport was most like our own Easter egg hunt is hard to avoid.

[20]We should not imagine that animals were kept for either profit or pleasure exclusively. An abundance of pigeons or hare would provide large numbers that could be sent to market regularly, but this would in no way be inconsistent with the owner and his friends "hunting" those animals on his grounds whenever he wished. A thrifty villa-owner might well suppose he had found a way to have his pleasure and make a profit as well.

[21]Aymard 54–57, Anderson 84–85. The Macedonians were probably imitating the Persian παράδεισοι, such as those which, according to Xenophon (*Cyr.* 1.4.5), were filled with wild animals for the young Cyrus to hunt. For the Romans, however, the actual appearance of hunting parks was surely delayed (as our evidence suggests) until Varro's lifetime, and even then was commonly limited to the smaller, more easily maintained animals like hare. By then, however, the over-hunting of the countryside would have made these preserves highly desirable, if not essential. The Greeks and Romans had no apparent understanding of the consequences of uncontrolled hunting of females still raising their young. Xenophon recommends it, as a good way to catch a deer (*Cyn.* 9.1–7). He also advises hunting the smaller hare on islands (*Cyn.* 5. 24) which will abound in hare because hunters seldom visit them, and the islanders themselves are not φιλόθηροι, "sportsmen." Cf. Var. *R.* 3.3.8. The largest hunting park mentioned by Varro was in Gaul. It is unclear how the animals were kept in the park, or how poachers were kept out. An owner who wanted to keep hare (for profit and for hunting) would need only the space available to a reasonably sized country villa not so far from Rome.

[22]Aymard 68–73; Anderson 86–87.

Probably, though, those who were wealthy, and whose hunting had goals more ambitious than knocking off a clutch of fat conies or peahens, did actually in some fashion affect to imitate the Xenophontic hunt in their wooded deer-parks. Hunting may even have been done on horseback in those areas. It is certain, however, that the context—the wildness of both the territory and the animals—magnified the glory the hunter won, increased the potential for danger and disappointment, and inflated the cost. This is the sport of princes, the kind of hunting done by Persian and Macedonian kings. The fact that it is in so many respects identical to a true hunt in the wild, but is also a demonstration of awesome power over (theoretically) dangerous land and hostile inhabitants, both now enclosed to offer a prince entertainment and exercise, makes these *therotropheia* a metaphor in themselves for imperial rule and for the ruthless organizing power of imperial civilization. Wilderness and wild animals alike can be contained within the edifices constructed to display imperial control.

Varro, however, offers an even more apposite description for our study of Ovid. The aviary at his villa in Cassinum had its own colonnades, a wood, a rotunda, a bird-theater (*theatridion avium*) with brackets along the columns as bird-seats (*sedilia avium*), duck ponds with miniature ship-sheds (for shelter) along the edge like docks, a water clock, and an indoor weather-vane (*R.* 3.5.11–16).[23] If this aviary has the amenities of a city, and birds are its inhabitants, what are we then to think about Rome and Roman citizens?

Varro makes this clear to us, for his bird-conceit is fully realized at the beginning of the book. Its dramatic date is fixed by a historical event, the election of the aediles in 50 B.C.E—that is, before Caesar crossed the Rubicon—even though Varro did not write it until sometime after 36, at a time when Octavian had already established himself as sole power in Italy and the west.[24] The aediles were responsible for the temples, buildings, markets—and games, including the *venationes*, the wild beast hunts held in the forum or the circus. Varro and Quintus Axius, who belong to the same voting tribe, leave the elections in progress and decide to wait for the results in the shade of the Villa Publica. The

[23]Keil (cited by Hooper 454 n. 3) is surely right that Varro's *convivae* (3.5.14) are the birds, not human guests dining in the aviary. Varro has already mentioned that Lucullus had experimented with a dining room in an aviary but abandoned it because of the smell of the birds and their droppings (3.4.3), and the same conditions would apply if the birds were confined behind a netting in the colonnade around the dinner table and the ducks were swimming and walking about (and presumably flying short distances) around the stream surrounding the table. The circular dining table in Varro's aviary is certainly designed for birds.

[24]Thus Linderski, in a persuasively argued paper (1985), against the generally assigned date of 54.

Villa Publica was a park with trees, enclosed with porticoes around its boundaries. The census and levies of the army were held in the Villa Publica, and beside it was the Ovile, the "sheep pen" where Romans came to vote in the *comitia centuriata*.[25] At the Villa, Varro and Axius meet Appius Claudius, seated on a bench. Beside him are Cornelius Merula ("Blackbird"), Fircellius Pavo ("Peacock"), Minucius Pica ("Magpie") and Marcus Petronius Passer ("Sparrow"). Axius asks Appius if he and Varro might join his aviary, "where you sit among the birds" (*ubi sedes inter aves*, *R.* 3.2.1–3). Bird citizens of a city of birds of course constitute a literary joke that goes back at least to Aristophanes. Appius compares the "Public Villa" with its amenities favorably to the private villa owned by Axius (*R.* 3.2.3), and an amiable quarrel is joined over what constitutes a "villa."[26]

An aviary of birds, then, could be like a city; citizens could be "birds," and birds "citizens." Moreover, "hunting" (by Roman standards) might indeed be done in aviaries and warrens attached to a villa, including the "public villa," Rome itself.[27] Such a tradition presented Ovid with the perfect context in which to train the elegiac lover to be the ideal *venator/amator*. Let us see, now, how he employs the tradition of the hunt, so rich in intellectual, artistic, and poetic resonances, to fashion an erotic handbook suitable for Augustus' Rome.

III

The God of Love is a mighty hunter.

Symposium 203d

Chiron is Ovid's paradigm of the wise teacher, the master of the didactic art, the teacher of Achilles.[28] Ovid compares himself to Chiron: as Chiron made the wild,

[25]See Richardson, *Topography* s.v. "Villa Publica" and "Ovile."

[26]The answer (constituting the remainder of Book 3) is that a "villa" is distinguished from a town house by the productivity and abundance of its land, which (like the forum and the circus and other such areas around the "public villa") can be used for the profit of business or the entertainment of hunting.

[27]Cf. Leach on Ovid's imitation of Vergil's *Georgics*, particularly in equating the lover/hunter with Vergil's farmer and the female beloved with the animals, so that "...the lover, like the farmer, must know the proper lore..." (150). The equation is all the more vivid when we acknowledge Varro's testimony that the economy of a Roman villa could include the raising of beasts to hunt as well as domestic animals.

[28]Chiron was, in his own way, a *praeceptor amoris*. Jason proudly validates his erotic restraint by proclaiming that he spent twenty years living among the daughters of Chiron and never once did or said anything ἐντράπελον, "shameful" (*P.* 4.102–8). Apollo asks Chiron if it is right for him to have the nymph Cyrene; Chiron gives his approval because he can foresee

unruly Achilles civilized, so Ovid will tame the wild spirits of *his* unruly charge, Love. Reminded as we are by the poet that Achilles at his most heroic sacrificed his allies (the Achaeans and, of course, Patroclus) to his desire to have Briseis (13),[29] and slew Hector in a rage of grief-stricken love for the dead Patroclus (15–16), we are perhaps justified in thinking that Ovid has set himself the more difficult task. We may also wonder just how successful he expects to be.

The triadic division of Ovid's *partitio* (35–40) probably follows the pattern of the philosophical handbooks on the ἐρωτικὴ τέχνη: first, identify the prey and the proper hunting grounds ("To begin with, work out how to discover what you want to love," 35); second, learn to entice your prey to be caught ("next the task is to seduce and please the girl," 37); third, learn how to keep your prey ("the third task is to make sure love lasts a long time," 38). The envoi concludes with the image of Ovid as a charioteer turning the post (39–40).

The actual instruction follows the didactic pattern set out for ἐρωτικὴ τέχνη. Identifying the prey and the hunting grounds means learning where girls commonly can be found (43–50). Ovid has a little fun with a mythic allusion or two to heroes who had to travel in order to find the right girl to capture (Perseus and Andromeda; Paris and Helen), so as to emphasize that Rome is the best hunting ground there is (51–64). The whole point of a game preserve, of an aviary, of a fishpond, is that the prey, common or rare, domestic or foreign, is kept there in the preserve for you. Rome abounds with women because Rome is Venus' game preserve. The logic of Ovid's conceit is delectable. Venus—love—is in Rome, and that is where young men should do their hunting (67–100). He names the places that define the city: the theaters, the porticoes, the temples. This is the proper place for the erotic hunt. As we will see, the further the hunt for the beloved is removed from the city, the less it has in common with the traditions of Roman elegy, and the more dangerous and wild it becomes. Context is everything, in poetry, in love, and in the hunt.

Ovid compares women in the city to ants and bees, wild animals that are also quintessentially socialized beings, reflecting conditions of man's civilized

---

that the hero Aristaeus will be born from their union (*P.* 9.18–66). Similarly Chiron acted as matchmaker for the union between Peleus and Thetis, which produced Achilles (*Cypr.* fr. 2; Apollod. 3.13.3–5).

[29]All number references, unless otherwise noted, are to *Ars* I. My English renderings of quoted passages are based on Green's 1982 translation, but I have often made adjustments, employing a more prosaic word order or expression in order to clarify a specific point.

world.[30] Like women in the city they come out of their home, fetch food or nectar, and bring it back in organized columns (93–96). The orderliness and throughtfulness of their behavior is a kind of model for men, and yet they are still animals, and still "wild."

Thus, as Ovid observes the staggering abundance of women who rush out to attend the games, he is not unlike the guests in Varro's game preserve (*R.* 3.13), who sit among the forest animals summoned by Orpheus playing his lyre. In both situations, the men find pleasure in unfamiliar intimacy with what is otherwise beyond their ordinary experience, and in some ways contrary to ordinary expectation. Wild animals and women are normally difficult to approach; they do not share the same space with men. The cause is the same, though worked out in different ways. Civilization separates men from wild animals, and it is also the force that dictates the social separation between the spheres of men and women.

Ovid now deftly moves on to demonstrate that civilization has from the beginning seen to the stocking of Rome with women for the erotic hunt. Romulus provided an abundance of dove-like women when he organized the hunting of the Sabine women for his wifeless men (101–30). Again Ovid uses an animal comparison for the women: in this case an animal that is both wild and semi-domestic. Varro has a good deal to say about keeping doves, and about the distinction between "wild" and domestic breeds (*R.* 3.7.4–8.3).[31] He also notes that people were in the habit of bringing doves to the theater and letting them loose to fly home (*R.* 3.7.7). Ovid may well have had the image of doves fluttering out of the theater in his mind when he made the comparison between them and the Sabine women.

By including both foundation myths—that of Venus and Aeneas, as well as that of Romulus—Ovid makes sure his students recognize how inevitable it was that Rome should be a game park for the hunting of women. There is, besides, an implicit comparison between the *venationes* held at the games (*ludi*) along with the theatrical performances and the capturing of the Sabine women in the theater of early Rome. Roman women's ancestors had been brought in to be hunted. Their descendants are there to be hunted in similar circumstances.

[30]Ants: Verg. *A.* 4.402; Hor. *S.* 1.1.33. Bees: Verg. *G.* 4.8–115.

[31]*Dig.* 41 §1.5.5 is quite specific that doves and peacocks and bees are wild, even though they have the habit of returning to a "home" that can be "possessed" by a landowner. They are a possession only as long as they return.

The Sabine women made a *genialis praeda*, festive booty (125).[32] They are likened to doves and sheep (117–18),[33] and the men are likened to predators, the eagle (who will hunt doves) and the wolf (who will hunt sheep). The hunter *is* a predator. The hunt is training for being a soldier, but here the hunt for women is the *reward* for Romulus' soldiers (1.132).[34]

Ovid turns now from the theater to the races, circuses and the *naumachia* (135–76) provided by Augustus. In this way he approaches the antique moral purpose of the hunt, the training of the hero. It is in this context, the preparation of the hero for the greatest of all wars, the war against the barbarians, that the expected triumph of Gaius Caesar belongs (1.177–228). The anticipated spectacle offers not only a hunting-ground, but also a paradigm through which hunters in Ovid's audience can contemplate the modern image of the ephebe prepared in befitting magnificence to enter upon his heroic obligations.[35] The man who looks upon wounding may himself be wounded by love (*qui spectavit vulnera, vulnus habet,* 166), but as he is chasing light spirits (*levis animos*, 160, in contrast to the *feros animos* of Achilles, 12) any injury will, obviously, be only as grave as a light-hearted game might allow.

Gaius Caesar, who stands for all Roman youth in undertaking precisely those obligations for which hunting was once meant to be a preparation, is Achilles about to be sent out to defeat the latter-day Trojans, that is, the Parthians. But the heroic age is past, Achilles is dead, and Gaius is cheered as though in a theatrical tableau—"Scenes from the Parthian War," as it were—complete with vivid entrance (177–81), a tender address to the Hero (189), and

[32]There is a pun, of course, since *genialis* also means "of or connected with marriage or the marriage bed" (*OLD* s.v. "genialis" §2).

[33]Observe the parallel with Ovid's later advice: "The crop in your neighbor's field is always richer, and his herd has bigger udders" (*Ars* 1.349–50). The imagery may be more appropriate for farming than hunting (cf. Leach), but game-preserves, as Varro indicates, are part of the agricultural landscape. The predators, the eagle and the wolf, pay no attention to who owns the prey; nor does the hunter of love.

[34]There is another pun here, though of a milder form: *commoda* means both an advantage (*OLD* s.v. "commodum" §1), and a reward or remuneration for public service, of soldiers among others (*OLD* s.v. "commodum" §4, citing Cic. *Agr.* 2.53, *Phil.* 5.53, *Fam.* 7.8.1, all concerning the rewards owed, demanded, or expected for military service).

[35]"Hunting is in a certain sense the other side of war. The mastery of animals and the defense against other groups of men call for training, organization—in short, politics in the Greek sense" (Durand and Schnapp 61; the entire chapter "Sacrificial Slaughter and Initiatory Hunt" [53–70] is an invaluable analysis of the way in which war and hunting affirm an essential identity of the warrior-hunter and his society).

instructions to the Hero Parents as their child crosses before them (203). The conclusion is a prediction for a mighty triumph in the future (213–14). All this magnificent heroism will mean is that the captives and soldiers and placards portraying the battles, carried in the triumph, will offer the perfect opportunity to the poet for a catalogue, while his pupils will have a chance to chat up the girls in the crowd. Gaius conquers Parthia to provide a triumphal opportunity for his countrymen to hunt.

The contrast between the high tone of Ovid's theatrical *laudatio* and the proposed conduct of the attendant crowd as the triumph passes reminds the reader of a dangerous gap between appearance and reality. Everything beautiful, magnificent, or praiseworthy about Gaius' war can be enjoyed in the city; the war itself, with its fighting and possible death and destruction, is inappropriate and far removed. Gaius is safest when he is most a performer, and his deeds are staged heroics. His unfortunate death, though unforeseen, proved Ovid's point more emphatically than Ovid could have wished. There is a critical difference between the hunt which intends to capture and tame the prey and that which intends to kill and subdue it. Venus' descendants in the Julian line would have done well to attend to that distinction.

Ovid's hunt for the beloved thus reverses the conventions of a traditional hunt: precisely as we would expect for a discourse on ἐρωτικὴ τέχνη, instead of hunting in the wild, as a preparation for being civilized, the *amator* hunts best in civilization, in those very areas (forum, theater, temple) where man's creation of civilization is most prominently displayed. His hunt has turned away from wildness, danger, even from politics. The hunt for the beloved has long gone beyond the point at which the hunt is a self-affirmation of youth or an initiation into the higher responsibilities of manhood. Now it is public entertainment. Forum, temple, *naumachia* and triumph are all forms of open-air theater, and each in its separate way reflects the condition of the primitive theater where the Sabine women were captured. The prey is pre-captured and delivered to a park. Taming is unnecessary.[36]

All the hunting-grounds which Ovid has suggested up to this point have two things in common: first, they are very public, very much in the open; and second, the time for hunting in these places (portico, theater, triumph) is during

[36]To Xenophon's Cyrus, hunting in parks was just like hunting animals that were tied up (*Cyr.* 1.4.11). His description of the kind of animals found in a royal park (scrawny, mangy, maimed or injured) suggests the difficulty of finding, trapping and maintaining such animals.

the day, very much in daylight. The dinner-table of Varro's avian *convivae* suggests another place in the civic aviary that is, apparently, an attractive hunting-ground for females: the *convivium*, the banquet or dinner party. A hunt at a dinner party, however, is a hunt at night, and this affects the nature of the hunt. Plato condemns all hunting at night unequivocally (*Lg.* 824a), as characteristic of the slovenly and immoral, because night-hunting *required* the use of nets. That is, it involved trickery and deception, an explicit perversion of the morality of the hunt.[37]

Thus in the hunt there emerges a distinction between the exercise of *ratio* as part of the test undergone by the hunter, which makes him stronger and more honorable, more like Achilles, and the extension of *ratio* into realms of cunning deceit, which makes him more like Thersites, or, perhaps, the clever slave of the comic stage. In the pursuit of the beloved, on the other hand, the danger presented by the night hunt is somewhat different. The conditions for the hunt are better, but also more ambiguous.

The advantages of dinner parties (1.229–35; also, *Am.* 1.4), for instance, are quite apparent. Women and wine and passion go well together. "But nevertheless..." (*sed tamen*, 236) there is harm here, even in the apparently propitious sprinkling from wine shaken off Love's wings (236). Wine dissolves the control of *ratio*, of the civilizing mind that disciplines and regulates the animal passions. Ovid's mythical exemplar, Chiron, the wise teacher of hunting, knew all about mixing wine and amorous feelings. The battle of the Centaurs and Lapiths was a famous set piece on the conflict between wildness and civilization, as well as the dangers of mixing wine and women.[38]

Ovid tries to balance the advantages of wine against the disadvantages. Wine makes one amorous, dissolves care, brings laughter, renders even a poor man brave, and makes sadness, anxiety, and frowns disappear (237–40). He repeats the word *cura* twice in four lines, and we should attend carefully. *Cura* means "care," in both the negative sense (anxiety, worry) and the positive (attentiveness, carefulness); each definition is significant. The dangerous ambiguity of night hunting is that care of *both* kinds is diminished by wine.

The consequence, Ovid says, is simplicity (i.e., lack of artfulness and guile, lack of τέχνη). Yet, *cura*—care—is an essential component of *ratio*,

[37]Xenophon, as always, tempers his moral judgements with practicality: hunting at night is not condemned any more than the use of nets, a practical necessity, is rejected (*Mem.* 4.7.4, *Cyn.* 2.3–9).

[38]*Il.* 1.262; 2.742; *Od.* 21.295ff. with sch. *ad loc.*; Hes. *Sc.* 178ff.; Apollod. *Epit.* 1.21; Plu. *Thes.* 30; Paus. 5.10.8. The episode was treated at length by Ovid: see *Met.* 12.210–535.

judgement, and he who hunts without judgement is in a state of simple danger. Simplicity appears and *then* "girls often ravish the minds of young men" (243). Even when we allow for the irony, this line is, or should be, rather startling. The verb *rapere* (which is also used in 1.125, to describe the girls who have been *raptae*, seized, ravished, by Romulus' men), is all-important. It is as if the doves in massed attack had captured an eagle, or the lambs had cornered a wolf. Girls are not meant to be the ravishers, but the ravished.

What—at least on the surface—Ovid *means*, of course, is that a youth in a state of alcoholic intoxication is liable to become equally intoxicated with love for any girl who happens to be in the room. What Ovid *says* is that girls are liable, given these circumstances, to do to young men what the young men should be doing to them. Careless in both senses, the hunter has been caught by his prey; and in the following passage (245–52) Ovid contrasts knowing, seeing, daylight with not-knowing, blindness, night and darkness. The first group allows for the proper exercise of *ratio*;[39] the second encourages deception. If the hunter's judgement of form is destroyed (246) he is at risk of being deceived himself. Ovid's concern is with the danger to the hunter inherent in mental and physical blindness. *Forma* is, first, appearance, particularly a pleasing appearance; but it is also a shape or outline or pattern (*OLD* s.v. "forma"). It is the essence, the format as it were, of civilization. Though his *exempla* for "form" are ephemeral luxuries (one has to be careful about judging gems, dyed wool, or a woman's looks—all the product of artisans'skill), the underlying meaning is quite serious. Night and unmixed wine are equated with the loss of control, the mental darknesses that destroy one's judgement, that dissolve *cura* in its positive sense of carefulness, attention. It was daylight, not lamplight, that allowed Paris to see the goddesses, and to make the "right" judgement. So darkness harms the awareness, the judgement of the hunter, who then is captured by what is faulty, blemished and deceiving. The woman has used darkness and τέχνη to capture the man.

IV

> *The kind of hunting, the practice of idle men sleeping by turns, called night hunting... is not worthy of praise, nor is the hunting of men who subdue the savage strength of wild beasts with nets and traps, but not through the victory of a toil-loving soul, worthy of praise.*
>
> Plato, *Laws* 824a

Darkness is not the only factor which threatens to weaken *ratio*, and therefore to weaken a man's ability to see *forma*. It is critical that he is able to distinguish

[39] *Consule de gemmis, de tincta murice lana / consule de facie corporibusque diem*, 251–52.

between what is desirable—that which is beautiful, good, civilized—and what is not desirable—that which is blemished, imperfect, wild. The city itself, its monuments and *aedificia* among which Ovid tells his pupils to hunt, are the *formae* of civilization. The further away one goes from the structure of the city, from the *structures* of the city, the closer one is to its opposite, the uncontrolled, uncivilized state of nature. As Ovid begins to examine the dangers to the hunter—dangers that, to the uninitiated, may not seem threatening because of the attractive surroundings—he shifts the action from the city to a place that is mid-way between civilization and the wild: to Baiae, the popular resort on the bay of Naples. Baiae had the reputation of being a place where women could be independent of the traditional restraints of conventional society. In particular, it was the sort of place where sun, sand and sexual freedom seemed to be inextricably intertwined: the name had become a shorthand term for unchaste behavior at least a generation before Ovid. Cicero attacked Clodia with charges of *lusts, love-affairs, adulteries, trips to Baiae...*[40] It is possible that this reputation was the result of large numbers of women coming to Baiae for the healing sulphur springs. There, protected by the socially acceptable need to care for their health, they appeared to be independent of the restraints and the social controls of the capital. The roof, so to speak, had come off the aviary. To the novice hunter, blissfully unaware, a resort frequented by women might seem a potentially very rewarding place for his hunt.

At Baiae the women gathered on the shore or around the health-giving waters are extremely attractive to the hunter (253–58). They are like flocks of birds flying in to a favorite waterhole and they offer to the hunter an abundance of opportunity as well as a certain lack of awareness of their essential condition as prey. The women at Baiae also remind us of Varro's rock-pigeons (*agrestes*, *R.* 3.7.1), which are semi-wild and fly from the countryside to the turrets of the dovecote and back again as the fancy takes them (*suapte sponte*—observe the emphatic form of *suapte*). That is, they nest in the gable-tops of houses (buildings, particularly houses, are civilized by definition) but are still free to fly where they wish and enjoy themselves.

[40]*Accusatores quidem libidines, amores, adulteria, Baias, actas, convivia, comissationes, cantus, symphonias, navigia iactant*, "the accusers are dinning into our ears the words 'lusts,' 'love affairs,' 'adulteries,' 'trips to Baiae,' 'beach parties,' 'dinner parties,' 'carousing,' 'song-fests,' 'musical performances,' 'pleasure boats'" (*Cael.* 35). Cf. Prop. 1.11, on his fear of being deceived by Cynthia when she is at Baiae.

The waters of Baiae around which the women gather include not just the bay for swimming as well as sailing, but also the hot springs, which are curative (258). A cure presupposes something that must be cured; and thus Ovid returns, quite suddenly, to the image of the wound (256–57):

> hinc aliquis vulnus referens in pectore dixit:
> "Non haec, ut fama est, unda salubris erat."
>
> One man, returning from there bearing a wound to the breast, said:
> "That was not health-giving water, as its reputation asserts."

The remark reminds us that this unnamed gentleman with the wound in his breast was one of the amorous hunters, while the women around Baiae were the herd he was hunting. The wound he has received is an echo of the wound suffered by the young man at the dinner party, whose care, whose cure (for *cura* is also a cure, a treatment for illness) has fled him (243). Here at Baiae one young man, lulled into security by the deceptive *cura* of the waters, pays for *his* lack of care with a wound. The "care"-free hunter is in fact himself the prey; his hunting leads to his own ravishment.

So it appears that, just as at the dinner party, where the darkness and the wine obscure the essential *ratio* of the hunter, so separation from the civilized setting of the City also holds its dangers. Baiae is not a safe *therotropheion* because at Baiae women are dangerously on their own. Since women possess *ratio*, they are capable of becoming very civilized (*cultissima*) in the proper surroundings—i.e., Rome[41]—but nature retains an underlying attraction for them, an innate internal identification, which calls them away from the civilization where their *ratio* (and that of their guardians) is in control. Thus at Baiae, away from the reinforcement provided by the civilized conventions of the city, their freedom is without restraint, less than *cultus*; it stands in opposition to the order represented by Rome and all that is cultivated.

The issue at stake, therefore, despite all Ovid's teasing and word-play, is that of civilization, forever threatened by the destructive forces of nature, by the wildness out of which humans stepped when they drew the circle of the *pomerium*, called it Rome, and banished weapons from within that circle. Grattius' pun, the "wild-beast war" (*bellum ferinum*) or "the brutish war," for the miserable state

[41]See Myerowitz 1985: 41–72 for a discussion of Ovid's views, and Leach on the imagery equating the nature of women and animals. For a more general analysis of the theme in the western philosophical tradition, see McMillan 1–15.

humans were in when they were "in nature," is precisely Ovid's view.[42] *Ferinum* is the condition out of which hunting drew humans;[43] but—when hunting is conducted in the wild, and *particularly* when sex is involved—the danger is that wildness will reclaim the young hunters.

Baiae, though, is only midway to the wild. The sunlight and the sails weaving along just off-shore reassure, for these represent realities (daylight and crafts and craftsmen) associated with reason, good judgement, *ars regendi* (the skill of governing or guiding). The anonymous (but male) character who returns from Baiae wounded is a warning, although his wound is scarcely fatal. The fact that he is "returning" means he must be going back to Rome, and to safety. The would-be hunters have learned the dangers of the resort, the midpoint between city and wilderness. In the next lesson, the *magister amoris* will take them the rest of the way into the wild.

V

It is...the typical nightmare of the hunter that he might become the game and be hunted in turn.[44]

H. Fränkel, *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*

Ovid moves his readers from Baiae to Aricia in one line with a simple command, "Look! The forest-temple of Suburban Diana..." (258). Men came to Diana's forest temple to dedicate themselves to hunting;[45] women came to be cured,[46] for the cult of Diana in the Grove above Aricia was a famous healing

[42]Cf. *Ars* 2.467–76.

[43]*Tu trepidam bello vitam, Diana, ferino, / qua primam quaerebat opem, dignata repertis / protegere auxiliis orbemque hac solvere noxa*, Grat. *Cyn.* 13–15.

[44]Fränkel 98. Ovid plays with this inevitable threat to the hunter in the *Metamorphoses*, e.g., when Actaeon is turned into a stag (3.192–230) or the huntress Callisto is turned into a bear (2.476–95).

[45]Grat. *Cyn.* 482–96. Wissowa's insistence, without explanation, that we have no right to relate Grattius' description at this point in his poem to the sanctuary at Aricia ("...haben wir kein Recht, die Schilderung bei Grat. *cyn.* 483ff wegen der Wendung v. 484 *sacrum ad nemorale Dianae* auf das aricinische Heiligtum zu beziehen," 335) appears to have been made only because Wissowa believed the Italian goddess Diana could not have been, originally, a hunting goddess (328), a supposition which can no longer be defended. In Ovid's time there is no question Romans *did* hunt, and that Grattius reflects the practice (Aymard 89–90, particularly 94–95 on Grat.; Anderson 87–96). Aricia was a Latin city, and of centuries' older significance and familiarity to Romans than Tifata, the only other possible sanctuary of Diana to which Grattius could be referring. It is unlikely that he would leave the sanctuary unnamed if it were not the one most familiar to his Roman readers. The commentators on Grattius do not hesitate to identify the sanctuary as the one at Aricia (cf. Verdière 2.412–13). Neither should we.

[46]Both Propertius (2.32.8–12 Goold); and Ovid (*Fast.* 3.269–72) attest to its attraction for women. The general explanation is that Diana was a goddess of healing with especial concern

sanctuary.[47] The sanctuary would have been reflected on the glassy surface of the lake, the "mirror of Diana,"[48] during the day. During the night, the torchlights from the processions to the sanctuary refracted across the water would have been an even more dramatic sight.[49] So, if the sanctuary was rather like Lourdes, the hillsides surrounding it must have resembled nothing so much as Aspen or St. Moritz. What with the *haut ton* from Rome ensconced in holiday villas among the woods on the steep hillsides around the lake, the pregnant, ill, or merely unfortunate streaming up the ramp to take the cure in the sanctuary, and the travelers and tourists on the Appian Way who stopped for a rest before or after the day-long trek across the Pomptine Marshes, there must have been a substantial population in and about the grove during most of the year. Hence the mocking epithet "suburban" for Diana, the goddess of the wild and of hunting.

But despite the holiday and pilgrimage crowds, the sanctuary both encloses and presents the wild in its most numinous form, for it is also the refuge of the *rex nemorensis*, the priest who has obtained his kingdom "by the sword and an injuring hand" (260). This priest is the paradigm of the hunted hunter, "the priest who slew the slayer, / and shall himself be slain."[50] With Diana and her priest, Ovid has reached the most ancient and powerful source of the

---

for women's health. Grattius, however, says that Diana gave predictions for the future as well as protection and aid (*ergo impetrato respondet...seu vincere silvas / seu tibi fatorum labes exire minasque / cura prior, tua magna fides tutelaque Virgo*, 493–96). We must take seriously, then, the possibility that these were the attractions. It is important to remember that Diana was an extremely popular goddess, worshipped by all Italians, regardless of sex or age. *Omnisque pudicis / Itala terra focis Hecateidas excolit idus* ("all Italy observes Hecate's [i.e., Diana's] Ides with modest hearth fires," Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.59–60).

[47]It may or may not be relevant to Ovid's choice of locations that near Baiae (and perhaps attached in some way to the healing sulphur springs) was the other great Italian sanctuary to Diana, that of Diana Tifata. There are fragmentary inscriptions (e.g., *CIL* X 3795, 3796) and references in the literature (Paus. 5.12.3); but beyond the fact that it lay in the mountains above Capua, under the present-day basilica of Sant' Angelo in Formis, little is known about it. Cf. Heurgon 298–303; Weinstock 932.

[48]Serv. *A.* 7.515.

[49]Both Propertius (2.32.9–10) and Ovid (*saepe potens voti, frontem redimita coronis, / femina lucentes portat ab urbe faces*, "often a woman, her brows garlanded, whose prayer has been answered, carries burning torches from the city," *Fast.* 3.269–70) imply that suppliants carrying torches up the road from Aricia were not uncommon, and there is no suggestion that these processions occurred only on the Ides of August, Diana's great festival day. The Ides originally corresponded to the full moon of each month, and as Diana was the moon goddess, it is very possible that a personal celebration or dedication was appropriate at any full moon (or, perhaps, at any Ides).

[50]Macaulay, *The Lays of Ancient Rome,* "The Battle of Lake Regillus" X.

hunting theme. We are in the wild, and in the company of the goddess of hunters, and Diana's grove bristles with hostile, cold, and dangerous images:[51] here is the priest with his sword ever at the ready; here is, above all, Diana, who inflicts wounds because she "hates Cupid's arrows" (261–62).

These two images—the priest-hunter forever hunted, and the goddess of hunting, Diana, inflicting wounds—are readily understandable in the context of the hunt for wild animals, but we must now consider how they apply to the hunt for the beloved. That Diana inflicts wounds of erotic frustration and repressed sexuality is a construct that finds no echo whatsoever in the rest of Ovid's work, where virginity, especially in Diana's woods, is often a sign of vulnerability,[52] but is never actively hostile.[53] We should not, without more secure evidence, suppose that the wounds Diana inflicts are feelings of love. To clarify the issue, it seems most helpful to turn to the myth of Hippolytus, the young hunter so closely associated with the goddess and with the passions and wounds of love. He is the hunter and the beloved whom Phaedra pursues—to her death, and, ultimately, his. Hippolytus is particularly apposite because he will be cited by Ovid very soon, in the catalogue of terrible women (283–340), and because the Romans identified Hippolytus with Virbius, the Italic male god,[54] the goddess'

[51]See Parry 275–80 for an excellent analysis of the woodland as a setting for sexual violence. It is my view, however, that this setting has at least as much to do with the specific nature (both religious and physical) of the grove of Diana as with the "bucolic archetype." Parry rightly observes that Ovid presents a conventional landscape "as a preface to his scenes of violence—the quiet, unruffled pool, sheltered by encircling trees from the heat of the noonday sun, and sometimes including a temple or some other image of sanctity; and the rough, pathless country, where so often the recurrent chase which threatens to end in violence takes place" (275–76). The pool, the encircling trees, the temple and the rough country are poetic mirrors of the grove at Aricia.

[52]Parry 272–80 has a very perceptive discussion of the recurring and linked images of hunter, virgin, woodland: "Virginity invokes demonic passion and invites violation; yet in a sense nature here often is merely exacting requital for the virginal hunter's own sanguinary activities in the past" (278).

[53]The heavy weather made over the preceding line (261, turning on whether *quod* means "although" or "because") and the focus on the wounds as merely a variation on injuries from the love-arrows of Cupid have contributed to the difficulties. The two points are, however, closely connected. In particular, the ambiguity of *quod* tantalizes. Hollis thinks the phrase means "*because* Diana is a virgin," as against "*although* Diana is a virgin," which is Kenney's view. "Quod, *i.e. quamquam*," Kenney *ad loc.* Lenz (51) likewise takes *quod* as concessive: "Wenn sie auch Jungfrau ist und wenn sie auch Cupidos Geschoße haßt..."

[54]"Whoever you were, Hippolytus, now be the same as Virbius." (*Met.* 15.43–44). Virbius-Hippolytus, by a folk etymology, was "twice man": that is, he had died and was brought back to life by Asclepius at the request of Artemis/Diana (Serv. *A.* 7.761). Cf. Verg. *A.* 7. 774–77. A few lines earlier Virbius appears as the name of Hippolytus' son by Aricia, who was raised

beloved, who died and was brought back to life in the cult of Diana in the ritual at Aricia.

We do not know whether Virbius/Hippolytus and the *rex nemorensis* are different aspects of the same figure in the ritual, or whether they have discrete functions. Nevertheless, in their different ways they represent similar clusters of ideas: virginity (of the goddess but perhaps not of the priest; of Hippolytus but not of Phaedra), wounding, being hunted, and dying. He is the victorious hunter who has captured by force (*nocente manu*) not just a girl, nor even a nymph, but the goddess herself, by first cutting off the golden bough, and then challenging and killing the reigning king of Diana's kingdom in order to take his place. He makes himself her king; she is his queen.[55]

Diana's virginity must therefore not be confused with the civilized *pudor* of the young unmarried woman. Certainly the initiatory wounding of the tree, by cutting the golden bough with knife or sword, is an imagistically appropriate representation of the sexual "wound" of deflowering. This "wound" is not merely healed; the unwounded, uncut state is restored by the new growing of the bough.[56] Diana in fact is very concerned with with sexuality *in the wild*, for it is through this kind of sexuality that her forest kingdom is renewed and

---

in Egeria's groves (*A.* 7.761–63). Cf. also Paus. 2.27.4; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.55–57. According to Servius, Virbius was a divinity joined to Diana, just as Attis was to the Great Mother, Erichthonius to Minerva, and Adonis to Venus (*Virbius est numen coniunctum Dianae, ut matri deum Attis, Minervae Erichthonius, Veneri Adonis*, 7.761). See further Serv. *A.* 7.84.

[55]Seneca actually calls Diana *Regina Nemorensis*, "Queen of the Wood," *Phaed.* 406.

[56]Verg. *A.* 6.146: the bough bears leaves of the same (i.e., gold) metal. This suggests that (for the Romans at least) Diana's virginity was a ritual condition, violated as her tree was violated, and renewed in all its previous perfection as her tree was renewed. The bough allows the living possessor to enter safely into the underworld: Serv. *A.* 6.136. This is probably a journey which the man or woman wanting a "cure" also took ritualistically, to re-emerge "reborn," made whole and perfect again. Both the dependent cult of Virbius-Hippolytus, the beloved of Diana who was brought back to life, and the presence in historical times of a cult of Asclepius, in which healing through incubation was practiced, suggest the repeated and varied use of the injury/healing, death (or sleep) and birth metaphors throughout the sanctuary. In other hunting cults that have evolved into healing cults a similar process has been recognized. Luckert 151–65: "It is generally the case in Navajo chantway mythology that the hero of a myth—the first shaman of a particular chantway tradition—must, if he is to be an authentic healer, have himself suffered the same transformations and retransformations which later patients are to endure..." (quotation from 153–54). The cults of Isis and Persephone are in evidence at the Grove (Gordon 15–16), and both cults are concerned with death, the dead, and rebirth. Cf. Serv. *A.* 6.136, where possession of the golden bough, which permits the challenger to challenge the reigning King of the Wood, is the admission charge for participating in the rites of Persephone.

replenished. This wild sexuality is pure instinct. It has no restraint and is the sexuality of animals. That is why rape and the threat of rape are *rightly* placed in the frame of the apparently beautiful forest. In the forest humans (and the lesser divinities like nymphs and satyrs) are part of the wild and are necessarily potentially objects of sexuality in all its wildness and all its indifferent violence. Animal sexuality neither asks permission nor seeks approval.

Originally humans, Ovid says later, went blundering about the forests like animals and came together by accident; pleasure was their guide to sexuality, and matters like "adultery" were unknown to them (*Ars* 2.467–88).[57] The very concept of adultery requires that some definition of an exclusive relationship be established and recognized, since "adultery" is the violation of that exclusivity. In Roman law, if an animal is wild, it belongs to no one; it becomes the possession of whoever captures it. The right of possession lasts as long as the possessor controls the wild animal. If it escapes, it is free. In sexual matters, there is no adultery; nor is there incest, since that too is an artificial restriction of the freedom of the wild animal, on the one hand, and, on the other, of the freedom of any possessor. Instinct is all.

It is well known that hunters were required, on occasion, to abstain from sex.[58] Hunting is a ritual act, and that in itself is enough to require abstinence for those who participated. But it has a particular function in that it raised a barrier between humans, whose wildness (as predators) was temporary, and the animalistic freedom of the wild which they entered. Abstinence maintained the sexual control imposed by civilization that was seen to be essential *to* civilization: marriage was civilizing.

Hippolytus' rejection of marriage is, therefore, a rejection of the human alliances that protect and cultivate civilization. His attachments to Diana and, at the same time, to virginity are in fact incompatible. If he is going to live in the wild, he must be subject to the laws of the wild. As an animal, a sexual being,

[57]A similar passage in Lucretius (5.925–1027) paints the same picture, and concludes that *marriage* (or monogamous cohabitation) was the the civilizing force.

[58]The story of Hippolytus is the *locus classicus* of this requirement (E. *Hipp.*, e.g., Hippolytus' speech 983–1035); but see also Sulpicia ([Tib.] 3.10). Behind the charming conventions of elegiac poetry, there is the unmistakable fear of injury and death for the hunter; the "law" of chastity is preeminent, and there can be little doubt that the unfortunate rival who is to be torn to pieces would be a substitute "offering" for Cerinthus' violation of the law of chastity. Chastity during the hunt is commonly required in hunting cultures, even when the patron deity is not a virgin. For evidence for the requirement of chastity among hunters in other hunting cultures, see Luckert 145.

he *is* the sexual object of sexual desire whether he likes it or not, and Diana has no rules that protect him from the very crude predatory desire that inflames Phaedra. Hippolytus is therefore the paradigm of the hunter who is hunted in the hunt for the beloved. He flees sexuality, and wild sexuality turns on him and hunts him down. He was the sexual prey of a woman inflamed by incest, the most animalistic of passions.[59] The particular metamorphosis of Virbius/Hippolytus had considerable significance for Ovid.[60] Like the *rex nemorensis*, Hippolytus lives in the grove linked in some mysterious way to the anger of Diana. He dies and is brought to life again, to be pursued and die and be reborn; like the *rex*, he is forever the hunted hunter.

Hippolytus thus provides a clue to the wounds Diana inflicts because she hates Cupid's arrows. In her forest, in her sanctuary, brutal, instinctual passion destroys judgement, rationality, the ability to understand and regulate one's desire by the rules of civilized, human, society. These are the wounds inflicted by the wild, reminding human beings how closely they are related to animals. Virginity did not protect Hippolytus. Only civilization and all its restraints can do that. Once Ovid's young hunters have entered the wild, they—like Hippolytus—have left behind the protective structure of the city and civil society. The wounds of Diana are the wounds inflicted by uncontrolled wildness, by nature red in tooth and claw—and passion.[61]

So, when Ovid orders his readers to "look!" at the sanctuary of Diana and at the *rex nemorensis*, sword forever at the ready, he is reminding them of Diana's dispassionate cruelty and her power. The hunter of the beloved needs to be particularly aware that he must maintain his *ratio*, his judgement, when he hunts women in the wild, because his sexual nature makes him the obvious prey of the uncivilized, and therefore dangerous, wildness of the women[62] whom he is hunting.[63] To hunt woman in Diana's grove is to hunt her almost in her

[59]Myerowitz 1981-82: 41–42, with n. 31: "The violence of the female libido...is illustrated by the praeceptor's long list of mythological female figures (*Ars* 1.283–340) who almost to a woman ignored the incest-taboo regarded by many anthropologists as the most basic of human principles of social organization."

[60]Cf. also *Fast.* 3.261–74; 6.735–56.

[61]*Ars* 2.482–86.

[62]"[T]he greedy female is nature which threatens to confound and destroy..." (Myerowitz 1981-82: 44; cf. Myerowitz 1985: 104–28).

[63]This is the side of Diana that seems to contradict both her healing gifts and her benevolence to women. We will misunderstand this unless we see that Diana, as goddess of nature, is patroness of the entire circle of existence from birth through death to rebirth, and intimately concerned with these critical life-events of both women and men. It is probable that

natural state. So, while she can be captured, nevertheless—and this is the crux of Ovid's message—the hunter of girls must at all costs remember the rules of human society, otherwise he too will be overwhelmed by the wild. The hunter who wishes to remain civilized must keep his wits about him.

VI

> *Wild beasts and birds and fish become the possession of those who capture them...*
>
> *Whatever [wild animal] we have captured, is understood to be our possession as long as it is restrained in our custody: when it has escaped our custody and retreated into its natural freedom, it ceases to be ours...*
>
> *Digest* 41.1 §1—1.3

Nets are not needed to capture women in Rome. In Rome women are *cultissimae*: they parade like ants or bees, or they flock into the theater like homing pigeons. In the wild, though, the hunter must use all the tricks he knows. This is why Ovid has waited till now to instruct his pupils in the use of nets (263–66). As he sets out his nets, he must be particularly careful, or he will catch more than he can handle. Sex is the most powerful lure there is. We are now going to see why, when women are so ready to be caught (as Ovid will assure his students in a few lines, 269–70), it requires such particular skill to explain *how* the favored girl is to be captured. The answer is, of course, that the onrush of sexual energy contains so much potential danger in the uncontrolled circumstances of the wild that the hunter *himself* may be captured, and by the "wrong" girl—the very thing that could happen at a dinner party if he gets drunk, but, as we shall see, infinitely worse. All the images of blindness, lack of judgment, darkness, not-knowing, which lead to deception, harm and wounding, have been pointing towards this passage.

---

her healing functions were established in the earliest period, long before Asclepius joined her at Aricia (Grat. *Cyn.* 494–96). As goddess of the hunt, she supervises the killing of those inhabitants of the wood who are her particular charges; and as Hekate, she guides the dead to the Underworld. As Diana Opifer (e.g., *CIL* XIV 3537) she seems to be responsible for boons and a generic kind of aid and for predictions of the future (Grat. *Cyn.* 496). Neither the goddess nor Ovid, it is perhaps useful to note, is interested in the institution of marriage or the social contracts that attend the civil, legal, construct. The consequences of sex in the natural, experiential world—childbirth, change, and the consciousness of mortality, something that casts such dark shadows on Propertius' love poetry—are absent from Ovid's didactic lessons in the *Ars Amatoria*. The women that Ovid's hunters will pursue are drawn to Diana's cult by those fundamental issues that masculine rationality and civilization cannot control: birth (with all the health concerns of women related to reproduction) and death; he places them in the very environment, the wild wood (or what passed, formally, as such within the sanctuary), where the reinforcing restraints of society are subordinated to the goddess's rule.

Ovid now presents images of the instinctual sexuality of the female with three *adynata*. Two are delicately drawn comparisons: a woman is as ready to be loved as a bird is to sing or a cicada to chirp (271–72). The third comparison is not seductive: sooner will a hare offer itself to a hound than a woman will refuse to be caught. There is a warning in the παρὰ προσδοκίαν. Women are small, soft, domesticable, like the hare; but they are *not* like the hare, which instinctively runs from any and all hounds. The hunter must always keep his wits about him, and must be aware that the skill is in getting the right woman—that is, the woman he wants—instead of the woman who wants him.

This is a critical lesson in Ovid's training of the hunter of the beloved. The woman must be the prey, the man must be the hunter. Reason must supervise passion and instinct. The lesson that female passion is fiercer and wilder than a man's—and therefore dangerous to civilization as well as to individual men—brackets (280–81 and 341–42) the catalogue of terrible women. The first statement of women's wildness is preceded (269–80) and the second followed (343–49) by a passage detailing the deceptiveness of women in wanting to be asked, but being therefore the more dangerous because they can make the hunter become the hunted.

We see, then, that the infamous catalogue of women whose sexual wildness leads to overwhelming destruction of the men *and the families they love* (283–340) is not there simply to discredit the generic female character.[64] These are the horrors of the hunt for the beloved when the *woman* is the hunter.

Ovid begins with Byblis and Myrrha, the spring and the tree, who are symbolically connected to the complex of myths surrounding Diana. This is particularly true of Myrrha, who gives birth to Adonis, a figure parallel to the Virbius-Hippolytus tree-son. They are sister (Byblis) and daughter (Myrrha), and their several punishments (so far as these accounts are concerned) are confined to themselves alone. They have desired men (a brother, a father) whom they may not, by the law governing humans, have as lovers. As we saw with Phaedra and Hippolytus, such a law does not exist in nature; their punishment is that they lose their human forms and are subsumed into the wild. They have committed no violent act against anyone, and their transformation, while tragic, is equally tranquil.

[64]This in itself is well understood. Many other commentators (Leach, Myerowitz, P. Green, Hollis) have seen the themes in this passage, but they have not recognized how closely it is tied to what has gone before or how important it is for Ovid's purpose.

Pasiphaë and Aërope are wives, neither of whom is punished herself, but whose wildness produces figures that are half-human and half-wild. Pasiphaë gives birth to the Minotaur beast-man, violating both the human and the natural. Aërope's wildness causes her brother-in-law, her partner in adultery, to eat his children,[65] a man acting like a particularly savage wild beast. The sun turning in its course is nature's response when humans cross that fragile line between humanity and the wild. In each case, the act of admitting wildness into human behavior has concrete results—the spring, the tree, the Minotaur, the sun reversing its course demonstrate the terrible power of the unregulated wildness to disturb the most fundamental laws of "nature."

Scylla, like Aërope, seeks to transfer power to her lover, but here the dynamics of passion have changed. By cutting off her father's purple lock, the secret of his power, she is committing a symbolic act of castration.[66] The first four *exempla* all show the terrible consequences of behaving as wild animals do, for the natural state allows no recognition of the distinctions that make incest and the destruction—even the eating—of one's own family a crime. But Scylla's crime is sexual wounding taken to its crudest extreme, to the act of castration. She violates her father by cutting off the purple lock of his power. Her physical, sexual person is in turn wounded, as the raging hounds spring from her loins.[67]

Ovid now turns (333–40) to myths so widely known in epic and tragedy that his references become steadily more oblique and brief. He names not one of the women who pursues her beloved—instead the women are identified by the crimes they have committed in their hunt. These women *are* their crimes. Sketching the stories in swift, sure strokes, Ovid directs our attention to the way the woman as hunter engulfs her entire family, innocent and guilty alike, in

[65]In the *Metamorphoses* Ovid uses Thyestes eating his children to express the Pythagorean view that eating any meat was to eat, possibly, one's family (*Met.* 15.453–77). Ovid makes it explicit that this Pythagorean view is connected to Aricia, through Numa and Egeria first, and then by following this directly with Hippolytus' tale. According to Ovid's Pythagoras, killing a wild animal may be necessary, but *eating* either wild or domestic meat is not.

[66]*Filia purpureos Niso furata capillos / pube premit rabidos inguinibusque canes*, "his daughter, having stolen the red lock of hair from Nisus, beats down the enraged dogs at her loins and genitals" (331–32).

[67]Ovid has confounded the two Scyllas, one the Homeric sea-monster living opposite Charybdis (*Od.* 12.85ff.), the other the daughter of Nisus, king of Megara, in order to produce precisely this correspondence of sexual deformity. Traditionally, Nisus' daughter Scylla was turned into a bird, the *ciris*, which was pursued by her father, who had similarly been turned into a sea-eagle (A. *Ch.* 613–22). This story was told in the *Ciris* (contemporary with Vergil but not by him) and by Ovid himself (*Met.* 8.1–151).

disaster. Agamemnon is a "dire victim" (334),[68] Creüsa is engulfed in flames like a sacrificial beast,[69] while Medea's children are murdered by their mother, who is drenched, priest-like, in the victims' blood.[70] The family is a human sacrifice to a woman's passion.

Moreover, the wildness of the women now spreads to the men, infecting them so that they, like Medea, turn on their own offspring. Phoenix is blinded by his father after his stepmother (or father's mistress), Phthia, accuses him of rape.[71] He and Hippolytus make a pair: both sons, both innocent, both destroyed by fathers through the machinations of a wild stepmother.[72] Even the father, betrayed by his wife into unjustly and irremediably punishing his son, cannot escape retribution for the wildness which his rage has released in him. The punishment must recoil on Phineus' own head: *poena reversura est in caput ista tuum.*[73] We remember the unknown man who went to Baiae to be cured and came back wounded. The wound inflicted by wild desire gapes, and its mortification poisons the innocent as well as the guilty. Phineus finds that in wounding his sons he has wounded himself; in succumbing to female-inspired passion he has condemned himself to the blindness of irrational rage. Having wounded his son in turn, he is assailed by beast-women who embody feminine passion unchecked by masculine rationality. Ovid's rational male—when he has his eyes open, and is not fuddled by dark or liquor or a woman's deceit—has a *legitimum finem*, a proper boundary to his *libido* (281). The closing reiteration of words for eyes, and the recoiling blow to the head (*poena reversura est in caput*, "capital punishment" [340]: a death sentence, a wound to the head, a punishment for the mind, a punishment of the "head" of the family) reveal

[68]*Qui Martem terra, Neptunum effugit in undis, / coniugis Atrides victima dira fuit*, "the man who escaped Mars on land, and Neptune on the sea, the son of Atreus, was the dire victim of his wife" (333–34).

[69]*Cui non defleta est Ephyraeae flamma Creusae*, "who has not wept for the flames of Creüsa" (335). Observe the careful linking: relative *qui*, the first word of Agamemnon's couplet, becomes interrogative *cui,* the first word of Creüsa's line; *effugit* (333), *fuit* (334), *defleta* (335) and *flevit* (337) echo each other mournfully through the passage. Ovid's technical mastery is at the forefront here.

[70]*Et nece natorum sanguinolenta parens*, "and [who has not wept over] the parent, drenched in blood from the murder of her children?" (336).

[71]*Flevit Amyntorides per inania lumina Phoenix*, "Phoenix, the son of Amyntor, wept from sightless eyes" (337).

[72]*Hippolytum rabidi diripuistis equi*, "you maddened horses who tore Hippolytus to pieces" (338).

[73]*Quid fodis inmeritis, Phineu, sua lumina natis? / poena reversura est in caput ista tuum*, "Why, Phineus, do you jab out your undeserving childrens' eyes? The same punishment will fall on your head" (339–40).

Ovid's awareness that all depends on "seeing," "knowing" the right object of passion. The woman's inability to "see" that her passion is wrong, or to "know" how to control it, threatens to engulf the man, and his rationality, in disaster. Ultimately Phineus represents not only the husband-father who is punished for a crime instigated by a woman's passion, but also the masculine rationality that defines, organizes and governs human society, through knowledge rather than through instinct. That, ultimately, is what is blinded and persecuted by female passion.

So Ovid recommends that men do *not* hunt in the wild. If a man is tired of the familiar, he can hunt in his neighbor's villa (345–50). Poaching in another man's safe, domestic, civilized *therotropheion* is as dangerous as the hunt should ever get. That the woman "belongs" to another male implicitly adds spice to the hunt (and thus Ovid's moral structure again limits itself to that sexual world in which marriage, pregnancy, child-rearing, and all the other human and legal consequences do not exist). This is a foreshadowing of the theme of broken loyalties that will dominate the second half of the book.

But for now, he has brought his hunters back from "out there," as it were, to the safety of a gentleman's farm. From there it is an easy journey for him into the house, and indeed back to the city. The lady's maid, whom Ovid advises his hunters to get to know before they approach the lady herself (351–52), implies a villa or house, servants, and the boudoir: very safe territory indeed. In the boudoir, her own, civilized lair, the lady is a proper sort of game to hunt. Civilization, both in its social network of restraints and rewards and in its physical structure, gives women the *legitimum finem* they cannot shape for themselves in nature.

VII

STR. Apparently you have never yet paid attention to the lovers' method of hunting.

THEAET. In what respect?

STR. That in addition to their other efforts they give presents to those whom they hunt.

THEAET. You are quite right.

STR. Let us, then, call this the amatory art.

Plato, *Sophist* 222

In the boudoir, in the villa, in the city, the woman is in her civilized state. Unfortunately, in that condition she too has *ratio*, and her *ratio* becomes part of the hunt. Civilization dictates that her *sexual* desire may not function actively, lest she become a Byblis or a Phaedra, so her desire, and the hunting that fulfills

that desire, is displaced into a desire for possessions: she becomes a hunter of gifts (399–426).

It is through the negotiation between greedy lover and greedy lady that Ovid turns the hunt for the beloved back towards its more philosophical, more social form, the pursuit of φιλία, the friendship that binds men as soldiers and as citizens. Here in the city—built by its citizens, defended by its soldiers—the hunt for the beloved cannot coexist with the pursuit of φιλία. This is because the hunt for the beloved in the city is based on deceit, hers as well as his, and deceit is antithetical to true virtue, as Plato saw. It is no accident that, in the Stranger's discussion with Theaetetus, the lovers' method of hunting, the giving of gifts, is the Stranger's preliminary to distinguishing another "hunter of men" who hunts for pay, is paid in cash, claims to give education, and is a hunter of rich and promising youths—the sophist (*Sph.* 223b). Words are the perfect means for seduction. The passage on letters (453–86), opened with a mocking send-up of Virgil (*hoc opus, hic labor est*, 453),[74] is Ovid at his wittiest. A letter is a lovely snare, seducing the woman into the trap, weaving illusions, but not putting the lover at risk at all. Ovid is very good on ensnaring women in a net of fine-spun words. Deceptive, alluring words *spoken* at the right times will also bring her into the trap (487–504).[75]

Words are a lure, and the more deceiving, the more alluring. Appearance too is a lure, and it is a kind of wordless statement. Ovid's discourse cannot help turning to the darker side of successful hunting. The more it is based on illusion, on traps, on deceit, the further it is from virtue, the very soul of *amicitia*. Illusion and deceit are skills the hunter must possess, but the power that they grant is corrupting, for unfaithfulness (to oneself as well as to one's beloved) is inseparable from these skills. Ovid works the equation out for us. Physical appearance is a testimony to the hunter's person (he is a *real* man, 505–24); and to his feelings (he is *really* in love, 723–39). The mere fact of instruction in these two kinds of appearance proves that as witnesses they can, and do, lie.[76]

[74]Verg. *A.* 6.129. *There* the *labor* is the return from the Underworld.

[75]"Then, as it seems, according to our present reasoning, Theaetetus, the part of appropriative, coercive hunting art which hunts animals, land animals, tame animals, man, privately, for pay, is paid in cash, claims to give education, and is a hunt after rich and promising youths, must—so our present argument concludes—be called sophistry" (Pl. *Sph.* 223b).

[76]Between these two passages stand two mythical digressions, first on Bacchus and Ariadne (525–64), and then on Achilles and Deidamia (691–704). Within each of these myths there is a very subtle interplay with the ideas of appearance and reality, of capture and

Ovid's first advice on appearance is that the hunter/lover must look like a real man: that is, tanned, athletic, careless of his own looks, groomed but not over-groomed (509–13). The young hopeful should ensure as well that his clothes fit, that his teeth and nails are clean, that hair does not grow from his nose, and that he doesn't smell like a goat (515–22). All other niceties should be left to the girls, and to men who want to be chased by other men (523–24). At the conclusion of this timeless advice, Ovid is summoned, rather peremptorily, by Bacchus. Bacchus is closely associated with the hunt or, rather, with the conclusion to the hunt, when the young men laden with their captured prey gather around the god to share wine and, it would seem, to take part in a ritual.[77] Wine is another symbol of taming the wild, of agricultural taming in this case, and it brings men together in a spirit of conviviality; but wine is also a symbol of how what is tamed can, paradoxically, release all the wildness that taming was intended to remove. The poet responds to the summons by reminding his students that Bacchus can help the lover—advice he has already given (231–34). The accompanying warning, that too much wine can be harmful (235–44), will wait until after the digression on Bacchus and Ariadne.

In Bacchus the balance between wildness and tamed is undisturbable. He is the paradigm of masculinity that is not *bene cultus*. As with *cura*, we must be aware of the several senses of *cultus* here. On one level it means "cared-for," and even, regarding one's appearance, "refined" or "cultivated." But *cultus*, in its deeper poetic and didactic meaning, is "civilized," i.e., refined and sophisticated in one's tastes.[78] Bacchus is "not over-civilized"; he arrives in a parade of maenads and satyrs, announced by the clash of cymbals and drums, his chariot driven by tigers, all aspects of his wildness (537–50). Ariadne, abandoned on the Naxian shore by Theseus, is helpless. He could do with her whatever he might wish. What does he do? He presents himself as *tibi cura fidelior* (555), a splendid expression of multiple meaning. Bacchus will be a

captivity, and of the masculine taking possession of the feminine, with the consequences that result. This is not the place to enter into a full analysis of the myths as Ovid presents them here, but it is important to recognize that they are not digressions, but extensions of the themes he has been discussing throughout.

[77]Bérard and Bron 1989: on the connection of Dionysus to the hunt (131); on the ritual, and the potential for sexual excess by all except Dionysus himself (137–38). It may well be significant in this context, as Bérard and Bron point out, that Dionysus is the god of masks, which were originally magical in function (142). Masks, acting, performance, and illusion are all Dionysiac; they are all part of Ovid's poetic as well as his amatory τέχνη.

[78]*OLD* s.v. "cultus, -a, -um" §2 (cared-for); §3 (refined in appearance); §4 (refined in taste).

care more faithful (than the faithless Theseus who abandoned her); he will care for her, keep her, maintain her; he is a truer concern of hers, as well as a more trustworthy cure (for her desires which led her to trust Theseus). *Cultus* and the forms of *fides* (faithfulness), like *cura*, echo and re-echo through the poem. Bacchus then proposes marriage (*Bacchi Cnosias uxor eris*, 556).[79] The troop of maenads and satyrs celebrate the sacred marriage (563–64). We are reminded that *marriage* remains the great civilizer, as it was for Lucretius (5.925–1027).

The young hunter is thus advised to appear to be a Bacchus and the most appropriate conclusion to this wooing is, in fact, a wedding, the ritual that confirms the *cura fidelior*.[80] The marriage may be taken on a physical, a philosophical, or a moral level, but the conclusion is the same: the uniting of the masculine and the feminine as both a reward and a confirmation of the civilizing, didactic, process.

This is the ideal, but Ovid is very clear that it is something only a god can achieve (562). Non-mythic women, as he has been pointing out, make demands: they are not helpless, and such willingness as they may acknowledge is hedged about by conditions. Bacchus does not need to deceive Ariadne—the god of masks requires no masks to accomplish his will. For real men hunting real women, the situation is otherwise. Conditions protect the woman's civilization, and deception evades those protections. Deception is the key. The lesser human

[79]This particular plot (the loving and risk-taking heroine who is mistreated and abandoned only to be rescued in the ultimate moment of her despair by her true husband), together with the characterization of both Bacchus and Ariadne, forms the mainstay of so-called "romantic" fiction. The cover of such a tome might display the inimitable Fabbio (*nec bene cultus* indeed) as Bacchus, with the generically beautiful Ariadne, bodice suitably ripped (*tunica velata recincta*, 529), being borne in his arms to the tiger-drawn chariot. Feminists are much divided on the meaning of such stories for women, and, therefore, on the interpretation of the treatment of women in Ovid. Myerowitz (1985: 104–28, esp. 128) considers this issue most thoroughly from a classicist's point of view. Churchill argues that Ovid's narrative is unmistakably misogynistic and implicitly violent towards women. Hazen offers an excellent analysis of this kind of fiction, recognizing that women who enjoy such stories do not perceive the plot (or the parallel one of Deidamia and Achilles) as an account of rape, much less as a patriarchal justification for rape or misguided indulgence in socially created masochism ("One of the primary interests of the early gothics was the defilement of purity, and the most pure object available for exploitation was a young virgin, usually blond and always having large eyes," 35). Here is not the place to enter into this argument, but it should be noted that Ovid has created, within his lesson on the seduction of the female, a tale that demonstrably *does* seduce women again and again, if only as a literary device. It is equally important to recognize that the marriage and the pledge of fidelity are *essential* parts of Ovid's version of this tale.

[80]Xenophon would have agreed: cf. the "hunter-marriages" in *Cyn.* 1.6–9.

hunter, to gain *his* Ariadne, must pretend, must shape his appearance, must deceive. He must *pretend* to be drunk (597); he must—and this will be, for Ovid, the most crucial deception—pretend to be a friend to her *vir*, her husband or male protector (579–80). This leads to further pretense: he must pretend to be in love (610) and employ his skill, his technique, to make the appearance of trustworthiness (*fides*) through his art (*arte*, 612). The juxtaposition of *arte* and *fides* in 612 is telling: if the result is dependent upon skill and pretense, can it then be true *fides*? Of course not, but it might become so (618). Neither the woman nor her would-be lover can know for certain until they have tested his *fides*. Bacchus' promise to Ariadne leads us to trustworthiness, loyalty, fidelity, the subject of the final portion of Book 1, and the original spiritual goal of the philosophical *ars amatoria*.[81] *This* is the essential quality that elevates φιλία, *amicitia*—friendship in its deepest and most powerful sense—to a philosophical ideal.

VIII

> *A wild boar fell into a trap set by you for game, and when he was stuck there I extricated and carried him off; do you think the wild boar I carried off was yours?*
>
> *Digest* 41 §1.55

While the *amator* and his beloved avoid putting *fides* to the test by trying so hard to deceive each other, the *magister amandi* goes off on what seems to be a private digression. Only the worst-off woman will not be attractive to someone (*pessima sit, nulli non sua forma placet*, 614), and even a modest women likes public praise for her beauty (*delectant etiam castas praeconia formae*, 623). Then the surprising rhetorical question, which, through the explanatory connective *nam* (*OLD* s.v. *nam* §3) introducing the illustration, takes on the character of an *exemplum*. Why *are* Juno and Pallas ashamed that they did not win in the judgement of Paris? (615–16). Obviously, their shame is the result of the absence of praise for their beauty. A further example, that of Juno's own bird, underlines this: a peacock will display its feathers to praise, but hide them if spectators are silent (627–28). Juno is the paradigm of the wife and queen; Pallas the paradigm of the virgin and (parthenogenic, thus motherless) daughter.

[81]Cf. Dillon 388, particularly the following: "...this linking of a discussion of ἔρως to that of φιλία is both obvious enough and sanctioned by age-old usage. In Plato's *Lysis*, after all, a discussion of ἔρως leads into the more important attempt to analyse φιλία, while Aristotle in the *Nicomachaean Ethics* brings ἔρως in at *EN* VIII 4 (though without using the word), under the heading of 'friendship for the sake of pleasure.' Later, in the first century B.C.E., Arius Didymus mentions ἔρως just before φιλία in his review of Peripatetic ethics (ap. Stob. *Anth.* 2.142, 24–6 Wachsmuth)."

If we have a fleeting sense that Livia and the elder Julia may somehow be implicated in this little illustration, the following example of a racehorse responding to a curry-comb and a pat on the neck apparently dissipates the suspicion.

So the hunter is to entice his beloved indifferently with praises, promises, and oaths (631–32). We are back to the subject of *fides*—if, indeed, we ever left it. The gods are not interested in protecting *fides*, always supposing the gods exist, which is, Ovid says, an expeditious assumption (637–38). Surprisingly, this is not the end of the digression. Make sport of girls, and—in a magnificent and yet chilling *sententia* (645–46):

> fallite fallentes; ex magna parte profanum
> sunt genus: in laqueos, quos posuere, cadant.
>
> Deceive the deceivers; for the most part they are a sacrilegious group:
> let them fall into their own traps.

The *genus profanum* is generally taken as a collective description of untrustworthy women; and so, at a very superficial level, it should be understood. Yet there must be more to it. The hunters who are setting out the nets (*laqueos*) cannot be women. Moreover, if Ovid actually means the *genus profanum* to refer to women, it is most peculiar that neither of the two illustrations of the *sententia* concerns women, or love, or oaths.[82] The garish colors of Ovid's two *exempla* suit neither the mistress greedy for presents nor the chaste lady dreaming of praise for her beauty. The topos they do suit is the topos of *fides*, of trustworthiness, of loyalty *between men.*

It is critical to our understanding of Ovid's didactic narrative to work out precisely what constitutes the wrong-doing in the tales of Thrasius and Perillus, and, thus, to whom the moral of these tales should be applied. The deceivers are, as Ovid makes clear, those who set out the nets, the *artifices*. It is right, he says, for the *artifex* (the creator, the artist, the deceiver, the trickster) to perish through his own art (*neque enim lex aequior ulla est / quam necis artifices arte*

[82]The tales of Thrasius and Busiris (647–52) and of Perillus (653–54) are about grisly murder to aid (supposedly) gods, kings or tyrants. In the first tale, there is a drought in Egypt, which Thrasius shows will be ended when a human sacrifice is offered to Jupiter. Busiris makes Thrasius himself the first sacrifice (with an important play upon the similarity of the words *hospes* [guest] and *hostia* [sacrifice]). In the second, Perillus is the *auctor*, the creator, of a brazen bull, in which victims could be roasted to death. He offers this device to Phalaris, who immolates the inventor as the bull's first victim.

perire sua, 655–56). The taxonomy of the various deceivers, then, runs as follows: first, girls; then "those who set out snares"; then an *artifex* (no gender specified, but the two *artifices* in the tales are men); and lastly, women who have already perjured themselves. The female rhetorical embrace—at the beginning, girls to whom one may perjure oneself, and, at the end, women who have committed perjury already—should not distract us from the fact that at the center of Ovid's argument are two masculine categories, "those who set out snares" and the *artifex*.

Surely we do considerable violence even to the superficial construct of the poem and its thematic ideas if we read the words "those who set out snares" without thinking of the hunters who are Ovid's pupils. Similarly, it was Ovid who declared, at the beginning of his poem, *me Venus artificem tenero praefecit Amori* (7), and so he, and any other poet, *must* be considered an "*artifex*" in this context also. Both *exempla* feature men as the wretched authors of their own painful demise, hunters of rewards who were paid back by means of their own devices. We must see behind the masks of Busiris and Perillus the face of Ovid; and surely we must understand that the *opus* by which he must himself be destroyed is *his poetry,* perhaps the *Ars Amatoria*, but more likely the *Amores*.[83] There may well be a potential political sub-text accompanying the notion of self-destruction by poetry, since Ovid *was* eventually exiled by Augustus; but the *Ars* was published almost a decade before that particular crisis.

Each of these tales concerns deceit that deserves to be punished with death—but where is the deceit? On the surface, while both Thrasius and Perillus have been architects of murder, they have deceived no one; the deceit is practiced exclusively *against them*, and even so consists solely of the fact that, for doing what they perceive as a favor deserving a reward, they receive one, but not the one expected. They have hunted honor, but instead capture death. Each has betrayed his fellow-man, appearing to help a ruler while in fact contriving murder. Again, since the political resonances are so clear, we must

[83]For the possibility that the revised, three-book edition of the *Amores* was in part the consequence of the failure of Ovid's first marriage and his disillusionment with the wife who was *nec digna nec utilis*, see P. Green 1982: 21–24. The Perillus of the second *exemplum*, it is interesting to note, has a peculiar name—Roman and unevocative—for the semi-mythological, semi-past-historic context in which it appears. Ovid calls his step-daughter "Perilla" (*Tr.* 3.7), and he must have married her mother, his third wife, a few years before the publication of the *Ars*.

remind ourselves that the confrontation with Augustus is still in Ovid's future.[84] Still, the political message is unmistakable, quite apart from the biographical significance for Ovid's evolving problems with the emperor. Friendship with a tyrant is a deadly friendship.

We have moved from the trustworthiness of the gods, rulers of the universe, to that of tyrants, rulers of states, and must now return to the point of departure, women and their rulers, that is, their husbands. It is with new understanding that we look back to lines 579–80:

> sint etiam tua vota viro placuisse puellae:
> utilior vobis factus amicus erit.
>
> Let it be your intention to please your girl's man: once he has become a friend, he will be more useful to you.

The deceit of the female prey is legitimate; a man's *ratio* should be superior to a woman's. Likewise the control of the female prey is legitimate; once a man has captured her, he is her possessor. The deception of her legitimate ruler, her male protector, by the hunter in pursuit of her, introduces a new moral conundrum into the hunt.[85] Other men's women are very much fair game provided by the city for the erotic hunter, and the terms of venery do not allow for any kind of exclusion on the grounds that a certain woman has already been successfully captured by another hunter. But if men are allowed to deceive other men, where is the *fides* that will keep civilized society functioning? Ovid's light-hearted mockery of the didactic form is, whether intentionally or not, overturning the traditional morality of the male *fides* that hunting in its purest form was supposed to confirm. He is forced to spend the remainder of the

[84]Skinner's perceptive and thorough analysis of the Phalaris trope demonstrates that Ovid regularly used Perillus to describe his fate of being destroyed by his own poetry (306–7, on *Tr.* 5.1.51–54 and 5.12.43–48), but may well also have been following the recommendation of Demetrius Phalareus to use the example of Perillus as a form of figured speech to conceal an attack on a contemporary ruler—in Ovid's case, of course, Augustus (308–10 with n. 26). The groans of the *artifex* dying inside his own brazen bull become, as Skinner shows, the ultimate protest against the tyrant. As a textbook illustration of how to make a concealed attack on a ruler, this would soon cease to be quite as concealed as might be desirable, but there can be little doubt that Ovid could expect his audience to understand what he meant. Five of the six references to Perillus (that is, all except for this passage in the *Ars*) appear in the post-exilic poetry.

[85]"The notion of cultivating a lady's husband or other official escort, even if (601–2) you curse him under your breath at the same time, is something new on Ovid's part....The idea that husbands are more useful to the would-be seducer as friends...is not advice that Ovid ever portrays himself as having taken," Green 1982: 356–57.

poem balancing the need to deceive the woman against the certainty that this will lead to the deception of other men.

Dissimulation and pretence must be assumed in any relationship. This is the essence of the tale of Deïdamia and Achilles (682–704). A woman's nature leads her to want to be caught, but the very restrictions men have placed on her to protect themselves prevent her from ever acknowledging this herself.[86] Deïdamia must dissemble her love for Achilles, just as Achilles must dissemble his warlike character to remain with Deïdamia and escape the Trojan War. Once Achilles has revealed himself to her for what he is, he can no longer dissimulate, but neither can she. His revelation frees her, finally, to speak for herself, to reveal herself and her desire—at the precise moment (in dramatic time, as Ovid tells the story, if not factually) when he *cannot* yield to her. Ovid, it seems to me, sympathizes with her, without in any way doubting that civilization must keep her, and all women, mute while the situation is still in doubt. He also sympathizes with her desire to protect her own honor, to claim she was raped.[87] That this passage does not, on Ovid's part, necessarily validate rape has been well recognized.[88] Rather, he offers to believe her when she says that Achilles overpowered her, while allowing her own desire to be recognized as well. What follows seems to confirm this, for the pleasure of being seduced and seducing is mutual (705–22), and Ovid advises a strategic retreat (714–15) if the hunter encounters real rejection. Deïdamia and Achilles discover the truth of their relationship only through deception. The moment they cease to deceive each other, they must also acknowledge that they will be separated.

The young hunter, then, must at first appear not-over-groomed, manly, Bacchus-like, when he approaches the object of his desire. Then, having constructed his outward appearance—his physical mask—in order to deceive, he must concentrate on constructing his emotional appearance. Tears (659–60), a sign of weakness in men, will lead him, like Achilles in women's clothing, to

[86]The issue here is not to deny either that rape is rape (as Richlin argues we do) or that the situation could too easily be used to justify rape, but rather to point out that the woman in the *Ars Amatoria* is *unable* to consent to the sexual situations she encounters.

[87]*Viribus illa quidem victa est (ita credere oportet)*, "she was defeated by his strength (thus it is proper to believe)," 699.

[88]Leach 145 n. 3; Richlin maintains that "rape is actually rape," but it is, as Leach says, not at all clear that Deidamia has been raped, by any definition. To ask whether her desire is actually hers, or is a masculine projection that distorts her feelings to save Achilles' reputation, is a modern question which Ovid cannot have imagined ever being asked. He represents her desire as genuine.

his Deïdamia's bed. Once he has won the right to approach her, he must *pretend* to be in love (720–22). The manly tan acquired to impress her at the beginning of the seduction (513) should be seen to fade (729) and the vigorous physicality of outdoorsmen like Theseus, Hippolytus and Adonis (509–12) must give way to gauntness and a general appearance of sleeplessness, anxiety and yearning (735–36). The hunter must put on the mask of an elegiac poet in love.

To what end? That a public statement be made that he has "captured" his beloved—for not only the object of desire, but anyone who sees the young hunter will at once say: "You're in love" (737–38).

People will say he's in love—and his friends will start hunting his beloved for themselves (739–42). It is up to the reader to decide whether these lines (739–54) are sardonic, bitter, peevish or realistic. What they are *not* is light-hearted, mocking, or amused. Ovid started out all prepared to bring Love to heel, to train the young in mastering the outrageous passions of the heart by preparing them to pursue their love most carefully, in accordance with the ancient traditions of hunting. But Love, like wine, is a symbol of civilization even while it remains dangerously ready to unleash the very uncivilized behavior whose taming it is meant to celebrate. Love has forced Ovid to deconstruct the great hunting-hero tradition. The mask of the hunter of the beloved has cracked, and underneath the elegiac lover's fractured and peeling *savoir faire* the old, brute predator continues to stalk his prey. Open combat over a female may be avoided, but brutish and brutal conflict over a woman is still the rule. In the forest, the male must hunt his prey and not only capture it but fend off all other males; in Ovid's Rome, the hunter who captures his beloved must fend off friends and other amorous muggers demanding his honey or his wife.

The Stoic Chrysippus said, in his Περὶ ἔρωτος, that the purpose of noble love is friendship (φιλία or φιλοποιία).[89] So it may have been in Chrysippus' world; but in Rome the *amator* will find that "friendship" and "loyalty" are meaningless words (740). Training in the hunt for the beloved is a training in the *betrayal* of friendship. So there is one last deception that must be practiced. The wise hunter must become, like Proteus, ready to take on any and every mask, be it of prey or predator, complacent husband, eager lover, loyal friend, or passive backdrop (760–62). Proteus is all-seeming, all-deception. He

[89]Cf. Dillon 390–91; Chrysipp. *ap.* D.L. 7.129.

is also a *vates*—that ambiguous Latin word meaning both seer and poet.[90] Such Protean transformations allow the hunter to recognise, and thus to escape, all danger.[91] Safety and success will come when the hunter becomes wilder and wilier than his prey. No woman will seduce him; no girl will discover he has cynically seduced her; no man will find him betraying a friendship; no king will put him in the death-trap of his own making. The Poet-Hunter will escape them all, a mask for each, the true self for none.

Proteus is fluidity, change, lack of constancy. He has *fides* only to himself, existing outside civilization, looking in at the great flux of being, knowing what has happened and what will happen, and it is that knowledge (approachable by humans only in the role of *vates*) that permits him to be both hunter and hunted. That one *must* be both hunter and hunted is the great lesson of Book 1 of the *Ars Amatoria*.[92]

So, says Ovid, transforming himself once more, drying himself off, no longer the Protean *vates*, but now the *magister* signalling closure for his lecture: deception is all, and the best a decent lover can do is to drive a nice girl into the arms of some low cad (765–70). So much for the love of Atalanta for Meilanion; so much for the loyalty of Castor to Pollux and Orestes to Pylades, and of all those students of Chiron's who learned their heroic trade in the

[90]Verg. *G.* 4. 387–93.

[91]There is also an intimate relationship with magical transformations, which Diana, as Hecate, controlled. Cf. Medea's transformation of Aeson from old man into youth (Ov. *Met.* 7.162ff.). Medea learned her magic as a priestess of Artemis/Hecate. Observe also that transformations occur most often in the woods, generally under Artemis/Diana's supervision: thus Daphne, Byblis and Myrrha.

[92]In Book 2 (551–54) he will take the necessary measures to resolve this tension. There he will assign the feelings love arouses to the wild: *barbaria noster abundat amor*, "my love is brimming with wildness" (552). The wildness is the anger—and of course the sense of betrayal, the loss of friendship he has just mourned at the end of Book 1—when his beloved kisses another man. (Ovid doubles the joke on himself, since the man she kisses is "hers" [*suus*], thus making Ovid the thieving lover being jealous of a woman on whom he has no real claim, 2.561–92). By exiling the feeling that alienates him from his friends, by placing "jealousy" and "possessiveness" in the uncivilized wildness that belongs to barbarians, he successfully excludes from the civilized world the pain caused by the lack of *fides* in either the beloved or a friend. *Barbaria* is the offense the centaurs committed when they got drunk at the wedding of Pirithoüs; civilized men can avoid such brutishness by "not-knowing" (*sed melius nescisse fuit,* 2.555), by abandoning *ratio,* i.e., judgement: the kind of seeing that perceives the truth and grieves over it. The cautionary tale of Mars, Venus and the cuckolded and ridiculous Vulcan follows immediately and illustrates Ovid's point. Only the socially inferior Vulcan looks like a clumsy barbarian; Mars and Venus, aristocrats both, after the initial shock go right on doing what they had been doing before, only more openly.

hunting field. In the civilized city of Rome, you will be safe if you run from those you trust (752). This is the new code for heroes.

We began with hunting as the foundation of all civilization; through the hunter's knowledge and skills, humankind had set itself free from a life lived "trembling because of the warfare of wild beasts" (Grat. 13). The pursuit of the beloved, a seductive, persuasive process, transforms the lover's hunt into a paradigm of taming natural human wildness, with the paradigm applied to training youth, first for their role as citizen-soldiers and then for aspiration to the higher philosophical ideals. This magnificent construct—with all its attendant issues of what is wild, what is civilized; what is dangerous, what is safe; what is reality, what is appearance—is resolved by Ovid into one great question: what is, and what is not, fidelity. His terrifying conclusion, that there is no true fidelity, that the very notion of trust has become an illusion, has brought the hunter for love back to the wildest, most beastly war of all, the war for survival. In a famous line (which, characteristically, he later repudiated) Auden once wrote: "We must love one another or die." For Ovid the truth is far harsher. In Augustan Rome all the skills and arts of hunting are illusory, so that the survivor must himself be a master illusionist, a Protean poet who is everyone and everything at need and in turn. These are the terms of venery: as you are the pursuer, so are you also the pursued. There is no escaping the chase. Transform yourself—or die.

How far Ovid saw this as a symbolic paradigm of the new Roman political realities that in the end destroyed him is another story.

Works Cited

Anderson, J. K. 1985. *Hunting in the Ancient World.* Berkeley.
Aymard, J. 1951. *Essai sur les chasses romaines, des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins.* Paris.
Bérard, C., and C. Bron. 1989. "Satyric Revels." In Bérard, Bron *et al.*, eds., 131–49.
——— *et al.*, eds. 1989. *A City of Images: Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece.* Trans. D. Lyons. Princeton.
Butler, H. E., and E. A. Barber. 1933. *The Elegies of Propertius.* Oxford.
Camps, W. A. 1961. *Propertius, Elegies, Book I.* Cambridge.
Capponi, F. 1988. *Ovidius Cynegeticus.* Genova.
Churchill, L. J. 1985. *Heroic Erotics: The Anatomy of Misogyny in the Ars Amatoria.* Santa Cruz.
Davis, G. 1983. *The Death of Procris: "Amor" and the Hunt in Ovid's Metamorphoses.* Rome.
de Zulueta, F. 1922. *Digest 41.1 & 2, translation and commentary.* Oxford.
Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality.* London.
Dillon, J. 1994. "A Platonist Ars Amatoria."*CQ* 44: 387–92.
Dunn, H. D. 1980. *The Hunt as an Image of Love and War in Classical Literature.* Berkeley.
Earl, D. C. 1961. *The Political Thought of Sallust.* Cambridge.
Fränkel, H. 1969. *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds.* Berkeley.
Gisler-Huwiler, M. 1986. "Chiron." *LIMC* 3: 237–48.
Gordon, A. E. 1934. "The Cults of Aricia."*University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology* 2: 1–20.
Goold, G. P. 1990. *Propertius, Elegies.* Cambridge, Mass.
Green, C. M. C. 1996. "Did the Romans Hunt?" *CA* 15.2: 222–60.
Green, P. M. 1982. *Ovid: The Erotic Poems.* Harmondsworth.
Gross, W. H. 1979. "Jagd." In K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer, eds., *Der Kleine Pauly.* Vol. 2: 1298–99.
Hazen, H. 1983. *Endless Rapture: Rape, Romance, and the Female Imagination.* New York.
Heurgon, J. 1942. *Recherches sur l'histoire, la religion et la civilisation de Capoue preromaine.* Paris.
Hollis, A. S. 1977. *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book I.* Oxford.
Hooper, W. D., and H. B. Ash. 1935. *Marcus Porcius Cato On Agriculture; Marcus Terentius Varro On Agriculture.* 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge, Mass.
Hull, D. B. 1964. *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece.* Chicago.
Johannes, R. 1907. *De Studio Venandi Apud Graecos et Romanos.* Diss. Göttingen.
Kahil, L. 1988. "Harpyiai." *LIMC* 4: 445–50.
Kennedy, D. F. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy.* Cambridge.
Kenney, E. J. 1969. "Ovid and the Law." *YCS* 21: 243–63.
———. 1961. *Ars Amatoria.* Oxford.
Kossatz-Deissmann, A. 1984. "Achilleus." *LIMC* 1: 37–200.
Krókowski, J. 1963. "Ars amatoria—poème didactique." *Eos* 53: 143–56.
Labate, M. 1984. *L'arte di farsi amare: Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell' elegia ovidiana.* Pisa.
Leach, E. W. 1964. "Georgic Imagery in the Ars Amatoria." *TAPA* 95: 142–54.
Lenz, F. W. 1969. *Ovid: Die Liebeskunst.* Berlin.
Linderski, J. 1989. "Garden Parlors: Nobles and Birds." In R. I. Curtis, ed., *Studia Pompeiana & Classica: in Honor of Wilhelmina F. Jashemski. Vol. II: Classica.* New Rochelle. 105–26.
———. 1985. "The Dramatic Date of Varro, De Re Rustica, Book III and the Elections in 54." *Historia* 34: 248–54.

Luckert, K. W. 1975. *The Navajo Hunter Tradition.* Tucson.
Marchant, E. C. 1925. *Xenophon VII: Scripta Minora.* Cambridge, Mass.
McMillan, C. 1982. *Women, Reason and Nature: Some Philosophical Problems with Feminism.* Princeton.
Merkelbach, R., and M. L. West. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodea.* Oxford.
Myerowitz, M. 1981–82. "The Women of Ovid's Ars Amatoria. Nature or Culture?" *SCI* 6: 30–56.
———. 1985. *Ovid's Games of Love.* Detroit.
Orth, F. 1916. "Jagd." *RE* 9: 558–603.
Parry, H. 1964. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape." *TAPA* 95: 268–82.
Richardson, L., Jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Rome.* Baltimore.
Richlin, A. 1992. "Reading Ovid's Rapes." *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome.* Oxford: 158–79.
Schnapp, A. 1989. "Eros the Hunter." In Bérard, Bron *et al.*, eds., 71–88.
Skinner, M. B. 1993. "Perillus at Tomis." In H. D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt, eds., *Tria Lustra: essays and notes presented to John Pinsent.* Liverpool. 301–10.
Weinstock, S. 1937. "Tifata." *RE* II 6: 932–39.
Wissowa, G. 1905. "Diana." *RE* 5: 325–42.
Tatum, J. 1989. *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction.* Princeton.
Verdière, R. 1964. *Gratti Cynegeticon Libri Quae Supersunt I.* 2 vols. Wettern.