Asking for the Moon: An Intertextual Approach to Metapoetic Magic in Augustan Love-Elegy and Related Genres

CHADHA, ZARA,KAUR

Abstract

Asking for the Moon: An Intertextual Approach to Metapoetic Magic in Augustan Love-Elegy and Related Genres

Zara Kaur Chadha

This thesis offers a new perspective on the metapoetic use of magic in the love-elegies of Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid, a theme which, though widely acknowledged in contemporary scholarship, has so far received little comprehensive treatment. The present study approaches the motif through its intertextual dialogues with magic in earlier and contemporary texts — Theocritus' *Idyll* 2, Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, Vergil's *Eclogue* 8 and Horace's *Epodes* — with the aim of investigating the origin and development of love-elegy's self-construction as magic and of the association of this theme with poetic enchantment, deceit, and failure throughout the genre. While previous commentators have noted lexical and thematic similarities between magic in love-elegy and in other Augustan and Hellenistic poetic genres, they seldom pursue these parallels or interpret them as evidence of literary interaction. By reading these correspondences as signs of intertextual relationships, this thesis provides fresh examples of magic's metapoetic function in love-elegy — including practical rites alongside the recognised polysemy of *carmina* — which add to its status as a defining metaphor for the genre. This investigation tackles the subject through two complementary themes and two complementary genres. It first focuses on the relationship between magic and elegiac *carmina*, which develops in dialogue with Vergilian and Theocritean pastoral; it then explores magic and the beauty of the *puella* in her roles as narrative beloved and literary construct through its interaction with Horatian iambic. The study ends with a retrospective on elegiac love-magic via Ovidian erotodidactic elegy which unites both themes and in which the motif provides a "shorthand" for the genre. More broadly, this approach demonstrates that literary love-magic in its most recognisable form acts as an avenue for close and dynamic communication between poets.

Asking for the Moon:

An Intertextual Approach to Metapoetic Magic in Augustan Love-Elegy and Related Genres

Zara Kaur Chadha

PhD

Classics and Ancient History

Durham University

2013

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

CIL	Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae (ed.) (1893), *Corpus Inscriptiorum Latinarum*, Georg Reimer, Berlin.
DT	Audollent, A. (ed.) (1904), *Defixionum Tabellae Quotquot Innotuerunt Tam in Graecis Orientis Quam in Totius Occidentis Partibus Praeter Atticas*, Minerva GmbH, Frankfurt/Main.
DTA	Wünsch, R. (ed.) (1897), *Inscriptiones Graecae* Vol. 3, Part 3, *Appendix inscriptionum Atticarum: defixionum tabellae in Attica regione repertae*, in Oikonomides, Al.N. (ed.) (1976), *Inscriptiones Graecae IG* I^2, II/III^2 *Paraleipomena et Addenda: Inscriptiones Atticae Supplementum Inscriptionum Atticarum* Vol. 1, The Scholar's Reference Edition, Ares Publishers Inc., Chicago, pp.1-250.
Gager	Gager, J.G. (ed.) (1992), *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
OLD	Glare, P.G.W. (ed.) (1982), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
PDM	*Papyri Demoticae Magicae*, in Betz, H.D. (ed.) (1986), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation: Including the Demotic Spells*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
PGM	*Papyri Graecae Magicae*, in Preisendanz, K. and Heinrichs, A. (eds.) (1973-1974) (2^{nd} ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri I-II*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.
Preisendanz	*Papyri Graecae Magicae*, in Preisendanz, K. and Heinrichs, A. (eds.) (1973-1974) (2^{nd} ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri I-II*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.
RE	Pauly, A. and Wissowa, G. (eds.) (1830-1980), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Alfred Druckenmüller, Stuttgart.
Suppl. Mag.	Daniel, R.W. and Maltomini, F. (eds.) (trs.) (1990-1992), *Supplementum Magicum I-II*, Papyrologica Coloniensia Vol. XVI.1- 2, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen.
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (1900-), B.G. Teubner, Leipzig.

.

Acknowledgements

My supervisor, Peter Heslin, offered invaluable support, ideas, and time at every stage of my research and in its every aspect. I owe him great thanks for his confidence in me and in my work, for his kindness and patience in the face of my constant barrage of stress, and for his sense of humour; working with him has been a pleasure and a privilege. I also thank my secondary supervisor, Ivana Petrović, for her advice and guidance, and Justine Wolfenden for all her care and her constant encouragement.

My parents enabled me to undertake my postgraduate study and provided love and support throughout, without which I could not have succeeded; I cannot thank them enough for always answering the phone, no matter how late or how often I call. I owe them everything. I thank my brothers, Alexander and Theo, for their amazing friendship, for keeping me company and for making me laugh. Finally, thank you to my cousins, Lisa and James, for seeing me through my first years up North.

Introduction

"Poetry which speaks about magic *carmina* cannot help but reflect on itself."[1]

Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid each equate love-elegy with magic and its effects. This affinity between magic and poetry is a basic element of the Greco-Roman conception of both arts: in addition to sharing formal metrical and stylistic features, each relates to the belief that words exert a tangible effect in the world and can influence minds and emotions;[2] the Augustan elegists play on this inherent association to characterise their work as and through magic. My research explores the metapoetic function of this motif — its role in enacting elements of elegiac poetics in the narratives of individual poems — in Propertian, Tibullan and Ovidian love-elegy. This builds on and expands the initial work on elegiac magic in my MA dissertation;[3] I also take inspiration from Sharrock's treatment of the association of love-elegy with magic in Ovid *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108, and as Sharrock's chapter provides the context for my present approach to this topic it will be useful to begin with an overview of her work.

Sharrock reads elegy as a deceitful and seductive spell which acts on the internal addressees and the extratextual audience while being "potentially most effective on the self-absorbed lover himself". Sharrock observes that elegy "constantly poses as trying to create an opposition between […] magic and poetry" but this is "already collapsed into an identification" through the multivalence of *carmen* — poem, song, spell or prayer. This multi-applicability of *carmen* allows Ovid to use magic as a "*metaphor*" [Sharrock's emphasis] to surreptitiously illustrate the "seduction" enacted through his poem, characterising it as a spell and Ovid, as poet and as narrator, as a "seducer and a witch".[4] Sharrock's primary focus is on *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108; she highlights selected passages of magic in Propertius' and Tibullus' work as background

[1] Sharrock 1994 p. 64.
[2] Ronconi 1967 pp. 127-145; cf. Sharrock 1994 p. 63. On the effect of prose characterised as magic enchantment: De Romilly 1975. For the "performative" effect of words: Austin 1975; for "performative" language applied to magic incantation: Tambiah 1985 pp. 17-59, and cf. Collins 2008 pp. 22-24. For poetic enchantment conceived of as "the audience's emotional response to the performance of song" in ancient Greek poetry: Walsh 1984 p. viii.
[3] Chadha 2008.
[4] Sharrock 1994 pp. 50-86. For the "polysemy" of *carmen*: Ronconi 1967 pp. 127-145 and Abbaddo 1991 pp. 11-27. Cf. Habinek 2005 pp. 74-82 on the semantic field of *cano* and *carmen.*

for her discussion of Ovid's erotodidactic poem and illustrates the centrality of magic to the elegiac narrative and poetics through the *paraclausithyron* in Ovid *Amores* 2.1, where the narrator characterises his verses as magic *carmina* capable of opening doors (23-28):[5] despite these claims, the lover remains locked-out at the end of the poem, and is unable to overcome the *ianitor* with his poetry in *Amores* 2.2 and 2.3.[6] As Sharrock states, magic reflects the generic aims and themes of love-elegy: enchanting and seducing beloveds, opening doors and deceiving husbands and guards;[7] metapoetically, the lover's inability to persuade his obstacles to move indicates the generically necessary failure of elegiac seductions, which, by maintaining the lover's separation from his mistress, provides the poet with material and motivation for his compositions and ensures the continuation of the elegiac world.[8] Sharrock's discussion enables us to say that casting elegy as a spell highlights its enchanting nature and, consequently, the lover's deception of his beloved: as deceit is an inherent characteristic of poetry, which manipulates the minds of its audiences, the lover's poetic offerings to his beloved are fundamentally untrustworthy. In her reading of the duplicitous and enchanting nature of elegy and magic in *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108, Sharrock also foregrounds the effect of Ovid's verses on the extratextual audience who, despite recognising the magic of the verses in which Ovid purports to reject its use, are nevertheless enchanted by his work and "seduced" into reading on.[9]

Sharrock's focus on Ovid's erotodidactic work naturally takes a retrospective view of magic in Propertian and Tibullan love-elegy, which *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108 reacts to and develops. I expand on Sharrock's discussion by starting at the beginning of the Augustan elegiac tradition twice over to investigate the origins and development of love-elegy's construction as magic and of the motif's association with poetic enchantment, deception and failure throughout the genre; I return to Sharrock's work and to Ovid's erotodidactic elegies — particularly to the

[5] Sharrock 1994 p. 64.
[6] Sharrock 1995 pp. 164-165. For the connection with *Amores* 2.2 and 2.3: Armstrong 2005 p. 168 n. 24. Cf. Cahoon 1985 p. 32 and Booth 1991 p. 25 for alternative interpretations of Ovid undermining his claims of magic. We return to *Amores* 2.1.23-28 at the beginning of Chapter 2.
[7] This is encapsulated in Propertius' programmatic 3.3, where Calliope instructs the poet to write elegies whose effect she characterises as enchantment: "*ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas, | qui volet austeros arte ferire viros*" (49-50); cf. Marioni 1981 p. 27 and O'Neill 1998 pp. 62-65 and, conversely, Novara 2000 pp. 30-35. For love-elegy as *werbende Dichtung*: Stroh 1971.
[8] Sharrock 1994 p. 60, on Propertius 2.1, and Sharrock 1995 pp. 155-156, on Ovid *Amores* 3.7; cf. O'Neill 1998 pp. 63-64 in connection with Propertius 4.5.
[9] Sharrock 1994 pp. 82 and 86.

Medicamina faciei femineae — in my conclusion for my own retrospective view on magic in the genre. Within the elegiac narrative, the lovers use amatory spells — practical rites and *carmina* — to attract their mistresses or to elude rivals; they also adduce witchcraft to explain their own shortcomings, including sexual failure, infidelity and their inability to resist the physical charms of their mistresses, which they align with erotic magic. *carmina* and the feats they can accomplish represent the powers of poetry; as we will see, the practical instruments and techniques the narrators employ also symbolise elegy and its composition. In addition to commenting on generic characteristics, I suggest that the spotlight which magic shines on deceit also illuminates the illusoriness of the elegiac world for the extratextual audience: elegiac first-person narration by a homonymous poet-*persona* implies that the poems relate genuine autobiographical experiences; presenting elegy as a spell indicates the false realism of its narratives, drawing attention to the poet's power to create visions of impossible feats for his audience to "see" which, when expressed as magic, represent the composition of the text.[10] More broadly, magic, as I hope to illustrate, acts as a locus for opening and maintaining literary dialogues — between the elegists, and between love-elegy and contemporaries and predecessors working in different genres. The deep-seated association of poetry and magic enchantment suggests that this is a natural employment of the theme: as poets use magic to reflexively comment on their chosen medium or generic concerns, it seems likely that the same metaphor should be used to comment on their work in relation to that of others. We can read the attribution of magic power to the mistresses' beauty as working in the same way. In the fictional affair, the lovers' implications that their beloveds have targeted them with erotic spells betray an ambivalence and resentment beneath their obsessive devotion and self-imposed *servitium*; implying that magic causes their condition suggests that their mistresses control them by illegitimate means, and that the girls' physical "enchantments" are an illusion created by an

[10] Gordon 2009 pp. 225-226 highlights "testing the power of poetic language" as one function of magic in Augustan poetry, illustrating this with Tibullus 1.2.45-54, which we discuss below. Gordon comments on magic expressing poetry's influence over the external audience. This view is equally applicable to the internal addressees, though in their case the poetry continually fails to convince, while good poetry can successfully convince its audience of the realism of the feats it narrates. For Latin love-elegy as non-autobiographical fiction: Allen 1950a pp. 145-160 and Veyne 1988 *passim*.

artificial, external source of power.[11] Metapoetically, the *puellae* embody elegiac poetics and composition, and the equation of magic and poetic *carmina* encourages reading the association of the girls' beauty with magic as part of their representation of the elegiac text as fiction. This poetic element of the connection between the *puella*'s attractiveness and magic has been noted previously — by Sharrock and by Rimell — only in relation to Ovid's erotodidactic work;[12] as I will show by beginning from Propertius' and Tibullus' earliest collections, love-elegy foregrounds this aspect of its construction from the beginning of the genre.

To explore these suggestions, we approach this topic from an intertextual perspective, using a series of close readings of Tibullan, Propertian and Ovidian works which focus on their intrageneric relations and their interaction with earlier and contemporary texts — Theocritus *Idyll* 2, Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, Vergil *Eclogue* 8 and Horace's *Epodes* — in which magic also acts metapoetically to see how these can illuminate its role in love-elegy. I draw on Conte's theory of the poetic tradition, particularly his discussion of allusion's capacity to draw attention to the text as a work of art and to reflect on its differing levels of reality: those of the narrative fiction and of the extratextual poet and audience.[13] The points of contact among passages of magic in extant Augustan poetry and in Alexandrian literature, together with the allusive and self-conscious nature of both traditions, make this a natural framework for our investigation. While it is possible that Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid might have been drawing on the common lexicon of magic in Roman and Hellenistic literature, the otherwise widely-recognised interaction between their works and those of their contemporaries and predecessors — and particularly following the intergeneric dialogue already initiated between Vergil's *Eclogues* and Gallan elegy — encourages closer readings of the theme in the context of its relationship to this tradition. From this perspective, the recurring features in magic — which develop in a particularly concentrated form in love-elegy — appear less as "stock" examples of a conventional theme, and

[11] Commentators predominantly read the elegists as contrasting beauty and magic favourably: see, for example, Luck 1962 pp. 39-40 and Fauth 1999 pp. 155-164; I give full references below in Chapter 3.

[12] Sharrock 1994 pp. 74-76 notes the connection between beauty and magic in relation to Medea and Circe in *Ars amatoria* 2 which "highlights the enchantment of their physical attractions" and suggests that they cast "a more overtly erotic sort of spell" on their lovers, also commenting on this employment of the motif in Tibullus 1.5, Tibullus 1.8 and Ovid *Amores* 3.7; Rimell 2005 pp. 177-205.

[13] Conte 1986. For developments of Conte's theory and of intertextuality in Classics generally: Hinds 1998, Fowler 1997 pp. 13-34 and Edmunds 2001.

rather as signs directing the reader to interpret the motif not only as a comment on the poet's work but on the work in relation to a tradition; as we will see, the motif develops into a "shorthand" for love-elegy by Ovid's later epistolary and didactic works.[14]

There has been a considerable amount of scholarship on magic in Augustan love-elegy; as I aim to demonstrate, my present approach offers an alternative way of reading the motif across the genre.[15] Commentators regularly note the similarities between passages of magic in love-elegy and in Augustan and Hellenistic poetry; nevertheless, they seldom question the significance of these parallels or pursue them as evidence of literary interaction. Tupet's book, which remains the most comprehensive study of magic in Augustan poetry, exemplifies this trend. Tupet provides detailed surveys of magic practices, instruments and techniques which recur throughout Greek and Latin literature and of the themes in the Greek and Republican "sources" for the Augustan poets; she then applies this material to close commentaries on individual passages of magic in Vergil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid which focus on identifying the actions and their purpose.[16] Though Tupet notes features which recur throughout these texts, she does not interpret these correspondences in terms of mutual poetic interaction. Sharrock's work also remains one of the few detailed treatments of magic in love-elegy which develops the motif's metapoetic potential. More commonly, commentators highlight this tangentially to their main topic, or otherwise focus on the ambiguity of *carmen* or on one or two key texts in the genre — most popularly, Propertius 3.3.49-50 and Ovid *Amores* 2.1.21-25. Marioni's article on the magic power of love-elegy, for example, begins from this Propertian couplet and highlights only Ovid's catalogue of the abilities of *carmina* as an explicit example elegy's characterisation as magic; similarly, Fauth's chapter on magic and elegiac *carmina* in his study of magic across Roman poetry offers general remarks about their affinity before focusing

[14] For passages of magic in love-elegy as the handling of a "stock" theme: Putnam 1973 p. 66, Smith 1978 pp. 216-224, McKeown 1989 pp. 204-205, Stratton 2007 pp. 71-72, Gordon 2009 pp. 219 and 225, and Ogden 2009 pp. 124-125; cf. Bright 1978 p. 142. Graf 1997a p. 176 and Gordon 2009 pp. 211 and 213, who approach these texts as evidence for magic practices and discourse, do emphasise the intertextual and self-reflexive relationships between literary depictions of magic. For the fluidity of the poetic "tradition" and the potential for any text or author to create a new, "tendentious" literary history: Hinds 1998 pp. 99-144.

[15] I give full references where relevant in the following chapters.

[16] Tupet 1976; on Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid: Tupet 1976 pp. 330-417. Eitrem 1941 pp. 63-65 also reads the elegists as reflecting the realities of magic in contemporary Rome.

on *Amores* 2.1.[17] Other commentators, including Eitrem, Luck, Tupet, and Novara, maintain a more simplistic view of the relationship between love-elegy and magic — and of that between the extratextual poet and his fictional narrator — and read the lovers as merely contrasting their poetry with magic and asserting the superiority of their art.[18]

Prince's recent PhD dissertation, "Magic, Love, and the Limits of Power: The Figure of Medea in Latin Love Elegy", examines elegiac magic in connection with Medea and her presence as a mythological paradigm as a witch, lover, and forsaken woman. Prince briefly remarks on the equation of the lover's *carmina* with magic in connection with Medea in Tibullus 1.2 and Propertius 1.1; the Colchian princess's identity as a witch only forms one element of Prince's wider investigation and, as her study omits *Heroides* 6 and 12, we discuss few of the same texts. Prince also considers the elegiac Medea against the background of her lengthy mythological tradition and does not pursue the intertextual methodology I adopt here; consequently, we arrive at alternative, though complementary, conclusions.[19]

One area in which magic's association with elegiac verse through a female figure is well-established is in connection with the *lena* and her metaliterary role as the alter- and counter-ego of the lover-poet. The elegiac *lenae* — Tibullus' nameless procuress (1.5.47-60), Propertius' Acanthis (4.5) and Ovid's Dipsas (*Amores* 1.8) — are all accused of witchcraft by the narrators whose amatory relationships they obstruct. The Propertian and Ovidian lovers catalogue their rivals' incantatory powers (Propertius 4.5.5-18; Ovid *Amores* 1.8.5-18) and in doing so betray the affinity of their *carmina* with those of the *lena* and draw attention to their own intimate connections with magic.[20] O'Neill and Sharrock have treated the connection between magic and elegiac rhetoric in Propertius 4.5 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8 amply, and their works provide inspiration for my present research; as such I do not focus on these texts closely but introduce them where

[17] Marioni 1981 pp. 26-35; Fauth 1999 pp. 149-153.
[18] Luck 1962 pp. 44 and 58-59, on Propertius 1.10 and Ovid *Remedia amoris*; Novara 2000 pp. 30-42, on Propertius 3.3.49-50, 2.28 and 1.10, and Ovid *Amores* 2.1; Tupet 1976 pp. 385-386 on Ovid *Amores* 2.1. Eitrem 1941 pp. 63-65.
[19] Prince 2002. For Propertius 1.1 and Tibullus 1.2: Prince 2002 pp. 57-78; this discussion is published as Prince 2003 pp. 205-218.
[20] On the *lena* in love-elegy see especially Myers 1996 pp. 1-21, with O'Neill 1998 pp. 63-64.

they illuminate other passages.[21] The *lena*'s intimate association with the poet and narrator parallels that between the poet and his *puella*, providing a precedent for exploring the latter relationship more closely in terms of magic; as I will argue, recognising this connection between the personification of the elegiac text and magic opens an alternative route for interaction between poets which focuses around female embodiments of genre.

As I hope to demonstrate, intertextual investigations of magic in elegy can enhance our understanding of the theme's centrality to and function in the genre. Within the narrative, the interaction with other texts illuminates the situation of the present elegy and augments the characterisation of the narrator, particularly highlighting his untrustworthiness and fallibility and his capacity for self-delusion.[22] On the metaliterary plane, engagement with these models signals a poetic meaning to the magic imagery, alerting the reader to comments on generic poetics and drawing their attention to the fictive nature of the elegiac world and to the poet's creative and enchanting powers. Reading elegiac magic intertextually also enables us to identify a wider range of examples and ways in which the motif is used in this way — including the practical rites and techniques which the poets invoke — and provides new evidence to reinforce and supplement existing scholarship. By developing and exploring the elegists' use of magic in this way, we can further appreciate the prominence and importance of the theme in the construction and poetics of Augustan love-elegy as well as reading it as a medium for dynamic intra- and intergeneric literary dialogues.

Three criteria determine the elegiac passages we read in this study. Our focus on magic's metaliterary role and our intertextual approach firstly lead us to include those which explicitly mention song or incantation in connection with this theme; secondly, those which display lexical and thematic evidence of relationships with other texts which feature magic; and thirdly, those which reflect contemporary magic practices or related terminology and vocabulary.[23] These criteria cover all of the major passages of magic in the love-elegies of

[21] Sharrock 1994 pp. 84-86; O'Neill 1998 pp. 49-80. Cf. Myers 1996 p. 10.
[22] For the narratological function of intertextuality and allusion in elegy: Lively 2012 pp. 417-418.
[23] For Greco-Roman terminology for magic and its practitioners: Graf 1997a pp. 20-56, Gordon 1999 pp. 178-191, and Dickie 2001 pp. 12-17.

Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid.[24] A degree of selectiveness is also necessary in our treatment of Ovid's extant corpus, which covers a wide range of forms and genres. As I primarily concentrate on love-magic in amatory elegy, I restrict our focus to the *Amores*, *Heroides*, *Medicamina faciei femineae*, and *Remedia amoris*, though I acknowledge the strong intratextual links between these texts and Ovid's later works.[25] I omit a close reading of *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108 as Sharrock has treated this passage thoroughly; I will return to Sharrock's work to introduce our discussion of *Remedia amoris* in Chapter 2, and again when we consider Ovid's erotodidactic elegies more broadly in the conclusion. I predominantly follow Butler and Barber's 1933 text for Propertius' elegies, and I indicate textual problems or where I accept alternative readings; for Tibullus, I use Maltby's 2002 text. I follow Kenney 1994 for Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars amatoria*, *Remedia amoris* and *Medicamina faciei femineae*; and Knox 1996 and Bessone 1997 for Ovid's *Heroides* 6 and 12 respectively. For Horace's *Epodes*, I use Mankin 1995; I follow Gow 1950 for Theocritus' *Idylls*, Race 2008 for Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, and Clausen 1994 for Vergil's *Eclogues.*

Reading intertextually also encompasses the relationships between texts and the culture in which they are produced, expanding the potential for the creation of meaning in the work beyond the literary tradition.[26] A contemporary Roman audience would have brought their socio-religious as well as their literary background to readings of love-elegy; considering these texts alongside the practices and discourse of Greco-Roman magic can broaden our understanding of its use in the genre, as we will see in Chapters 2 and 3 in particular. It will be helpful to pause at this point and introduce some background to magic in antiquity, including erotic spells, the relevance of the extant evidence to Augustan Rome and the difference between everyday practice and magic in literature.

Magic was employed throughout the ancient world in all periods; its prevalence in Italy and Rome increased during the late Republic and 40s-30s BC as a consequence of the increasing

[24] Isolated, passing references to herbs and poison include Propertius 1.12 and 4.7, Tibullus 2.4 and Ovid *Amores* 1.14. For metapoetic interpretations of *Amores* 1.14: Zetzel 1996 pp. 73-100, Boyd 1997 pp. 117-122 and Papaioannou 2006 pp. 45-69.
[25] I exclude the *Fasti*, as the two instances of magic — the rite of Muta Tacita (2.571-582) and Cranae's defence of Proca against the *striges* (6.101-182) — are non-amatory and do not evoke love-elegy; I omit the *Ibis* on similar grounds. Neither *Tristia* nor *Ex Ponto* feature magic.
[26] Conte 1986 pp. 56-57; for an increased emphasis on the role of the reader's context in intertextuality: Fowler 1997 pp. 25-26.

Hellenisation of Italian and Roman culture and the political climate of the period.[27] In general terms, the practice can be expressed as rituals combining actions and incantations which were performed in secret to affect people or events by appealing to "supernatural" powers including deities, demons or spirits of the dead. Rites classified as "magic", and communal and individual attitudes towards this category, varied among societies and among individuals involved in accusations of its use; at the same time, the development of practices or people "traditionally" associated with magic in the Greco-Roman cultural consciousness led to a degree of standardisation in accepted signs of magic.[28] Amatory magic was always popular and was performed with a variety of aims: to attract a victim irresistibly to the practitioner (the *agōgē* spell); to separate a couple or to prevent their relationship (the *diakopē*); to constrain the will or actions of the victim, either to separate them from a current partner, to prevent potential rivals from entering into a relationship with the person desired by the practitioner, or to bind them forcefully to the practitioner (binding-spells: curse-tablets or *defixiones*).[29] The rites which the elegiac narrators employ and the effects they desire evoke those used in *agōgai* spells, which aimed to drag their targets to the practitioners by inflicting mental and physical torture — burning, madness, insomnia, starvation and thirst — upon them; the symptoms of elegiac love also correspond with the effects of these practices. There was significant overlap between these types of erotic spell, and their formulation and desired results displayed similarities with curses and prayers for other purposes: the violent language and imagery of *agōgai* spells, as Faraone highlights, bears a marked resemblance to non-amatory curses, while some amatory *defixiones*

[27] For comprehensive discussions of Greco-Roman magic: Faraone and Obbink 1991, Graf 1997a, Faraone 1999, Ankarloo and Clark 1999, Moreau and Turpin 2000, Collins 2008, and Ogden 2009. For magic in Rome and Italy, including its escalation during the transition to the Principate: Liebeschutz 1979 pp. 101-139, Graf 1997a pp. 36-60, Beard-North-Price 1998 pp. 149-156 and 211-244, Gordon 1999 pp. 253-265, Dickie 2001 pp. 124-191, and Gordon and Marco Simón 2010. For the increased focus on witches in Augustan literature: Gordon 1999 pp. 204-210 and Stratton 2007 pp. 71-105.

[28] For magic as rituals employing "supernatural" forces to alter the practitioner's environment: Faraone 1999 p. 16 and Versnel 2003 p. 909. For re-definitions of "magic" according to socio-historical contexts: Phillips 1986 pp. 2711-2733 and Beard-North-Price 1998 p. 154. On the division between magic and religion and the applicability of this dichotomy to ancient Greece and Rome see, for example: Phillips 1986 pp. 2711-2732, Faraone and Obbink 1991, Versnel 1991b pp. 177-197 and Bremmer 1999 pp. 9-12.

[29] Petropoulos 1988 pp. 215-222, Faraone 1991a pp. 3-32 and Faraone 1999 pp. 41-95. I expand on particular elements at relevant points in our discussion.

share common features with prayers for justice and revenge; we encounter a literary example of such a hybrid curse in Ovid *Heroides* 6 in Chapter 2.[30]

Evidence for Greco-Roman magic exists in spells and recipes on papyrus — now published as *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (*PGM*) and *Papyri Demoticae Magicae* (*PDM*) — and in examples of applied practice including curses on lead tablets and pottery fragments, and figurines. These texts and rites, as the locations of their discovery indicate, circulated widely around the Mediterranean and the borders of the Roman Empire. *PGM* and *PDM* are collections of magical texts of Egyptian provenance which are made up of handbooks of eclectic recipes and instructions for magic spells and ceremonies, as well as examples of short prayers and curses. The spells are primarily written in Greek and Demotic, incorporating a range of other languages and unintelligible *voces magicae*; the rites synthesise Greek, Egyptian, and Semitic religious practice and theology. The majority of these texts date to the third and fourth centuries AD; discoveries of texts and of evidence of applied practice which span from the fourth century BC through the Hellenistic period and which correspond to the recipes in these handbooks, and the textual traditions of the later papyri indicate that the collections transmit material with a far longer heritage.[31] This lengthy tradition suggests that similar practices would have been known in Rome of the 40s-30s BC, enabling us to draw on this evidence in relation to Augustan poetry.[32]

This leads us to the relationship between literary representations of magic and its everyday realities.[33] As a literary motif, we encounter magic as an "ideological" concept whose role Gordon expresses clearly:

[30] Faraone 1999 pp. 43-55 and 80-84.
[31] For introductions to the texts in *PGM* and *PDM*, including their history, textual tradition and modern publication: Betz 1986 pp. xli-lviii, Petropoulos 1988 pp. 217-218 and 221-222, Brashear 1992 pp. 25-59 (esp. 25-40), Brashear 1995 pp. 3380-3684 and Faraone 1999 pp. 33-36, who expands on the validity of these texts as evidence of earlier practices; cf. Faraone 2000 pp. 195-214. Material discovered after the publication of these *corpora* is collected in Daniel and Maltomini 1992 (*Suppl. Mag.*).
[32] Faraone 1999 pp. 32-38.
[33] On this issue: Graf 1997a pp. 175-185 and Gordon 2009 pp. 209-228; cf. Feeney 1998 for the relationship between Roman literature and religion more broadly. Graf and Gordon de-emphasise the extent to which poetic texts draw on the specifics of everyday magic.

> magic in the Graeco-Roman world became good to think with. Beneath the overt representations and images deeper questions are being raised, positions staked out: Where are we to locate the boundary between the possible, the marvellous, and the sheerly impossible, the fantastic? Between belief and credulousness? How far can we trust common sense? Can people control the inhabitants of the Other World? Can gods will harm? If so, ought they to do so? What are the limits of the power of utterance?[34]

This symbolic function makes magic a perfect image for exploring and staging the limitations and capabilities of poetry, as Sharrock and Gordon each highlight in relation to Augustan love-elegy.[35] Literary representations of magic can also engage closely with contemporary practice, adapting these to the needs of their new poetic context; one well-known Augustan example is Horace's *Satires* 1.8, in which Canidia's ritual — which involves two figurines, one of wax and one of wool, with the woollen effigy dominating the waxen one which kneels before it like a slave — parallels the configuration of effigies prescribed in the fourth-century AD *PGM* IV 296-434, an amatory spell which was in circulation around the Mediterranean from the first century BC onwards.[36] O'Neill's treatment of magic in Propertius 4.5, which inspires my handling of the topic in relation to the poetic texts, offers an elegiac example of this approach: O'Neill argues that the lover performs a ritual to kill Acanthis, the *lena* whom he accuses of using love-magic against him (5-18) but who mentions no magic in her embedded monologue (21-62) and who urges the *puella* she addresses to avoid the behaviour of "*improba*" Medea (41-42). O'Neill highlights parallels from the *PGM* and *defixiones* for the lover's sacrifice of doves and appeal to Venus (65-70), his curses on Acanthis (1-4; 75-78) and his catalogue of her magic skills which indicate the influence of contemporary magic practice on the poem and which, once this influence is acknowledged, prompt the reader to understand the lover as in the process of performing his ritual, and which open a fresh perspective on the linguistic idiosyncrasies of the text as reflecting the style of incantations.[37] While it is essential to bear in mind that these works are not accurate, historical records of everyday rituals, recognition of the practices which the poets evoke can add to our reading of the poetic texts.

---

[34] Gordon 1999 p. 162; cf. Sharrock 1994 pp. 51 and 63.
[35] Sharrock 1994 pp. 50-86; Gordon 2009 pp. 209-228 (esp. 225-228).
[36] For *PGM* IV 296-434 and Horace *Satires* 1.8: Faraone 2002 pp. 338-342.
[37] O'Neill 1998 pp. 61-75; for a similar approach cf. Fulkerson 2002 pp. 61-87 on Ovid *Heroides* 13. Petrović 2007 exemplifies this in her examination of the indebtedness of Theocritus *Idyll* 2 to prayers for justice in *defixiones*, which we touch on in Chapter 1.

Magic as an idea further resonates in love-elegy, particularly its invocation in personal relationships and its social gendering. Accusations of magic played a role in the social dynamics of Greek and Roman communities. In amatory situations, for example, the suggestion that a person's actions or a couple's relationship was influenced by a hostile third party provided a narrative which could excuse or justify behaviour — including sexual failure, waning desire, excessive passion, or infidelity — and account for and redress asymmetrical power-balances in relationships, allowing the supposed victims to save face before their peers; the subjectivity of such accusations means that they reflect more on the accuser than on the target.[38] Magic in the elegiac narrative echoes these social uses of the concept, especially the lover's attribution of magic to his mistress which ultimately illustrates his own duplicity and fallibility, as we explore in Chapter 3 in particular.[39]

Related to this is the social gender of magic. Though used by both men and women, and in hetero- and homosexual relationships, magic was gendered as "feminine" in Greco-Roman antiquity, defined as geographically and socially "foreign" or "Other" in opposition to the "legitimate" androcentric state religion and, as such, perceived as a menace to the established social norms.[40] Augustan love-elegy reflects this fluidity and the male lovers' recourse to erotic spells, including their own poetry, to influence and control their beloveds' feelings adds another layer to their flexible gendered stance, underlying their "feminine" position in relation to their *puellae*; this is intertextually reinforced by their self-alignment with the female practitioners in their poetic models. The gender flexibility in magic can, I suggest, also apply on a metaliterary level: love-elegy defines itself and, by extension, its poet-narrator as *mollis*, soft and "feminine";

[38] Gordon 1999 pp. 194-204 explores the variety of "narratives" which the concept of love-magic provided for navigating social situations in Greek and Roman societies; for a modern anthropological account of such narratives in the South African lowveld: Niehaus 2002 pp. 269-299, esp. 278-281. For functionalist, sociological approaches to magic in anthropology cf. Evans-Pritchard 1937 and Malinowski 1954. On magic as a subjective term which indicates more about its user than its object: Phillips 1986 p. 2729 and Winkler 1991 p. 215.

[39] Fauth 1999 pp. 129-149 — which condenses his earlier article, Fauth 1980 pp. 267-282 — also highlights the motif's metaphorical role in illustrating the intensity, irrationality, and irresistibility of passionate love, and in providing a means of self-justification for, and rationalisation of, the elegiac lover's amatory failures and misfortunes; Fauth, however, predominantly focuses on Ovid *Heroides* 6 and 12, treating Tibullan and Propertian passages less extensively.

[40] For the genders of practitioners of love-magic: Faraone 1999 pp. 27-28 and Dickie 2000 pp. 563-583; conversely, Winkler 1991 pp. 214-243 and Graf 1997a pp. 185-190 emphasise the imbalance between predominantly female practitioners in literature and male practitioners in everyday life. For magic as "Other": Gordon 1999 pp. 191-194; for late-Republican and Augustan Rome: Phillips 1986 pp. 2728-2729 and Beard-North-Price 1998 pp. 149-244.

its construction as magic *carmina* enhances this generic characterisation through its evocation of social discourse. This equally applies to the connection of magic with the embodiment of the poetic text: as we will see, only the appearance of the female elegiac beloveds is characterised as magic enchantment. Marathus, the Tibullan narrator's *puer delicatus* in elegies 1.4, 1.8 and 1.9, is not associated with magic. Notably, however, the elegiac lover expresses the boy's ability to deceive in terms which are strikingly reminiscent of the catalogues of the feats which duplicitous magic *carmina* can accomplish.[41]

Faraone also argues that erotic spells encompassed their own social constructions of gender, with spells to induce unbridled passion — those most explicitly associated with aggressive amatory pursuit — figuring their practitioners, male or female, as masculine.[42] In love-elegy, this redresses the gendered balance in the relationship as the lovers covertly express their masculine role in courtship through these spells; this reversal is reflected intertextually as the female witches in their models adopt similarly masculine roles in their courtships, particularly Theocritus' Simaetha.[43] Metapoetically, this expression of the narrator's masculine role through the discourse of love-magic mirrors the extratextual poet and his control over his text.

Over the course of this study we investigate elegiac love-magic in relation to two themes — magic *carmina* and the beauty of the *puella* — and this, together with my intertextual approach and my aim of chronicling the origins and development of the motif in Augustan love-elegy, determines the structure of my thesis. I divide the material into two parts, each of which treats one of our themes: the first half, which includes Chapters 1 and 2, treats the connection of magic with poetic *carmina*; the second, Chapter 3, focuses on the association of the mistress' beauty with magic, approaching the relationship between magic and *carmina* through the *puella*'s role as a literary construct — this thread runs through our whole discussion, but we develop it

[41] Tibullus 1.9.35-38: "*illis eriperes verbis mihi sidera caeli | lucere et pronas fluminis esse vias. | quin etiam flebas, at non ego fallere doctus | tergebam umentes credulus usque genas*." Lee-Stecum 1998 pp. 253-254 highlights the similarity between Tibullus 1.9.35-38 and the powers attributed to witches though he does not comment on magic's metapoetic significance or on Marathus as a personification of Tibullan love-elegy.

[42] Faraone 1999 pp. 146-160.

[43] On Simaetha's masculine behaviour in her use of magic and more broadly: Walker 1980 pp. 97-98, Griffiths 1981 pp. 261-262 and pp. 266-267, Burton 1995 pp. 43-44 and Faraone 1999 pp. 152-153. On the contradictions in the elegiac world and the lovers reinforcing the social norms they ostensibly reverse: Myers 1996 pp. 1-21.

most fully at this point. The first half of our study includes two chapters as the quantity of the Ovidian material which relates to the theme of magic and poetic *carmina* is great enough to warrant an individual chapter. Each of our themes plays out from the very beginning of love-elegy as we have it, though each engages in dialogue with a different poetic genre. The construction of elegiac *carmina* as magic develops through the genre's self-definition against Vergilian and Theocritean pastoral; the representation of the *puella*'s beauty as magic enchantment engages with Horatian iambic. Accordingly, each half opens from the start of the Augustan elegiac tradition and follows the theme chronologically through the genre; I postpone a discussion of the dating of Propertius' and Tibullus' first collections until Chapter 3, as it is most applicable to the dialogue between these books and Horace's *Epodes*.

We begin the first half of our investigation in Chapter 1 by exploring the relationship of early Propertian and Tibullan love-elegy with magic in pastoral poetry, specifically in Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2. I use close readings of magic in Propertius 1.1 and 2.4, Tibullus 1.2, Propertius 2.28 and Tibullus 1.8 to investigate how these elegists recall their predecessors' metapoetic use of the motif to give it the same charge in their own work while adapting it to foreground the characteristics of elegiac verse — its capacity for deceit and illusion, and its failure to enchant the beloved in contrast with its effects on the fictional lover and on the poet's extratextual audience — and to mark out the position of their work in the Neoteric and Alexandrian poetic traditions at Rome. Our second chapter builds on these readings to explore Ovid's development of the motif in *Amores* 3.7, *Heroides* 6 and 12, and *Remedia amoris*. Approaching magic in these texts through their intra- and intertextual dialogues with one another and with Propertian and Tibullan elegy can reinforce, and highlight new, examples of the motif which situate these works, particularly Ovid's epistolary and erotodidactic poems, in the elegiac tradition while reflecting on the ironies of the motif in the genre. In my discussions of *Amores* 3.7 and *Heroides* 6, I also combine evidence of Greco-Roman magical practice with Ovidian intratextuality to extend metapoetic readings of the motif.

In Chapter 3, the second half of the thesis, we again pick up from the beginning of Augustan love-elegy, this time to examine the characterisation of the *puella*'s beauty and its

effect on her lover in terms of magic. We firstly consider how this functions in the narratives of early Propertian and Tibullan elegy, and how the beloved's status as an embodiment of the poetic text relates to the poet's equation of his *carmina* with magic. Our initial survey of Propertian and Tibullan elegy also provides the basis for the rest of the chapter, in which the *puella*'s metaliterary association with magic forms the hub of an intertextual dialogue between Propertius' and Tibullus' first collections and Canidia, a witch and personification of iambic poetics, in Horace's *Epodes* 5 and 17. These readings of Horace's poems underline the prominence of magic and female beauty in early elegy, indicating that the theme was recognisable to a contemporary audience; they also illustrate an alternative use of magic to symbolise poetic interaction. We end this chapter by considering Propertius' response to Horace's "anti-Cynthia" in his elegy 3.6, and what the interaction between early love-elegy and the *Epodes* can add to our understanding of Canidia.

We conclude this study by briefly considering Ovid's erotodidactic elegy as a genre which emerges from Augustan love-elegy and which, through its continual self-definition through and reflection on this tradition, can offer a retrospective look at the material which we consider in Chapters 1-3. The bulk of this discussion will focus on Ovid's now-fragmentary *Medicamina faciei femineae*, an erotodidactic work which draws together magic, female beauty and elegiac verse in an extended illustration of elegiac poetics while it engages with Vergil's *Georgics* to root Ovid's new hybrid genre in the Augustan poetic canon.

Chapter 1. Magic between Pastoral and Elegy

We begin by considering elegiac interaction with magic in two pastoral texts: Vergil *Eclogue* 8 — the earliest extant treatment of magic in Latin poetry — and its model, Theocritus *Idyll* 2.[1] Both of these works narrate the performance of an amatory ritual, interweaving the recitation of the spell with the composition and recitation of the poem;[2] while commentators regularly cite both as parallels for magic in elegy, they rarely note or develop the implications of this metapoetic dimension for the elegiac texts. In this chapter, we look at magic in Propertian and Tibullan love-elegy which engages with these models to see how this interaction activates metapoetic subtexts in their poems, and how Propertius and Tibullus adapt their models to reflect the defining characteristics of their genre while using the background of these pastoral texts to augment the narratives of individual elegies. I firstly introduce Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8, highlighting how magic functions in them and suggesting reasons why the elegists draw on these models; this provides a basis for the rest of the chapter, in which we explore elegiac interaction with these works through close readings of five elegies — Propertius 1.1 and 2.4, Tibullus 1.2 and 1.8, and Propertius 2.28. Before we begin, a word is needed about Cornelius Gallus, Propertius' and Tibullus' generic predecessor, with whom Vergil's *Eclogues* already engaged in close intertextual dialogue and whose own love-elegy may have featured magic. It is, of course, possible that the later elegists recall Gallus' work in their metapoetic use of this theme; the near-total loss of Gallan love-elegy makes this impossible to determine with

[1] For Vergil *Eclogue* 8: Tupet 1976 p. 224 and Gordon 2009 p. 210. Catullus also adapted Theocritus *Idyll* 2 as Pliny *N.H.* 28.19 attests ("*hinc Theocriti apud Graecos, Catulli apud nos proximeque Vergilii incantamentorum amatoria imitatio*"): Wiseman 1985 pp. 193-194 and 198, Clausen 1994 p. 239, and Gordon 2009 pp. 210-211; Gordon 2009 pp. 210-212 emphasises the need to consider texts which are no longer extant as models for magic in elegy as well as *Eclogue* 8. Theocritus *Idyll* 2 is an urban mime; I use "pastoral" here as a shorthand to express the tension between city and countryside which plays into Theocritus' *Idylls*, Vergil's *Eclogues*, and Augustan love-elegy. For bucolic or pastoral elements in *Idyll* 2: Griffiths 1981 pp. 260-263 and 269-270, and Halperin 1983 pp. 126-129; Halperin 1983 pp. 118-137 discusses problems with equating ancient "bucolic" solely with the countryside or the modern concept of "pastoral" and with applying this distinction to Theocritus' corpus. Alternatively: Lawall 1967 pp. 14-33, Walker 1980 p. 34 and Gurtzwiller 1991 pp. 102-104 and 244 n. 94; cf. Berg 1974 p. 121 and Burton 1995 pp. 1 and 8-9. For the idealised, fictional world of elegy as "pastoral" despite its urban location: Veyne 1988 pp. 101-115.

[2] By describing the rites as they are performed, the poem can be seen, too, as analogous to the spell which accompanies ritual action in magic.

certainty.[3] As our readings in this chapter will show, however, the elegists' detailed engagement with the Vergilian and Theocritean works suggests that positing a lost Gallan model or models for magic in Propertian and Tibullan love-elegy is unnecessary.

Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8

Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8 associate poetry and magic through the narration of a magic ritual. Each poem raises the themes of deceit and self-delusion through magic and poetry which fail to control human emotions or the natural world: these themes are central to Latin love-elegy and recur throughout the metapoetic use of magic to comment on elegy and the character of the narrator. This discussion considers elements of the two texts which recur throughout this chapter; I introduce some particular points later as it will be more helpful to consider them alongside the individual passages they relate to. I summarise each work and outline their respective associations of poetry with magic, highlighting elements of deceit and failure, before commenting briefly on questions of genre.

Theocritus *Idyll* 2 is the "dramatic monologue" of Simaetha, a young girl attempting love-magic, accompanied by her maid, Thestylis, to regain the affections of her unfaithful beloved, Delphis.[4] The poem divides into two parts, each with a specific refrain: in the first section (1-63), Simaetha undertakes her fire-spells, punctuating each stanza by commanding her *iunx* to draw her man to her house ("*Ἴυγξ, ἕλκε τὺ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα*"); in the second (64-158), Simaetha tells the moon-goddess, Selene, the story of her love for Delphis, repeatedly exhorting Selene to perceive the origin of her love ("*φράζεό μευ τὸν ἔρωθ' ὅθεν ἵκετο, πότνα Σελάνα*"). Following her preparatory rites, Simaetha reveals Delphis' neglect and possible infidelity; she declares that she will confront Delphis the next day but now she will bind him with fire-spells (1-10). Simaetha begins her ritual by invoking Selene and Hecate, asking the latter to make her drugs as powerful as those of Medea, Circe or Perimede (10-16); she adds materials — including barley, bay, bran, and wax — to the flames, stating the sympathetic effect

[3] For the likelihood of magic as a theme in Gallus' elegies: Cairns 2006 p. 202 n. 41.
[4] Dover 1971 p. 94 and Goldhill 1991 p. 261 describe *Idyll* 2 as a "dramatic monologue".

she desires each to have on Delphis (17-29), and uses a bronze *rhombus* to draw him to her threshold (29-30). When dogs bark in the town she believes that they herald Hecate's arrival and she orders Thestylis to sound the bronze (35-36). In the ensuing silence, Simaetha libates to Artemis and prays thrice for Delphis to forget her rivals (43-46); she uses *hippomanes* to make Delphis come madly to her (48-51) and burns a fringe of his clothing (53-56) before revealing her plan to prepare a wicked drink for him the next day (58) and ordering Thestylis to knead their magic materials into his threshold (59-61). On Thestylis' departure, Simaetha laments her infatuation from her first sight of Delphis: she details the madness and the physical symptoms of her love (82-90) and augments her narrative by reporting four embedded speeches, including Delphis' seductions, which emphasise his untrustworthy and fickle character in contrast to her own truthfulness and to the reliability of the gossip who informed her of his infidelity (145-154). In the final lines, Simaetha reveals that she possesses powerful Assyrian drugs to use against Delphis if her current incantation fails (159-162) before she resolves to bear her love as she has done until now and bids farewell to the departing moon and stars (163-166).

Vergil *Eclogue* 8 presents a singing-contest between two shepherds, Damon and Alphesiboeus, each performing a monologue in a first-person *persona* which is introduced by the external narrating poet. The poem blends four of Theocritus' *Idylls*: Damon's song combines Thyrsis' song from *Idyll* 1 with the unsuccessful *komos* of *Idyll* 3 and Polyphemus' song from *Idyll* 11; Alphesiboeus' adapts Simeatha's rites from *Idyll* 2.1-63.[5] The narrator relates the powers of the shepherds' *carmina* (1-5) and dedicates the poem to an anonymous addressee

[5] Alpers 1979 p. 107, Coleman 1977 pp. 231-243 and 253-254, Clausen 1994 pp. 246-247 and 253-255 and MacDonald 2005 pp. 12-13 and 25-27; Garson 1971 pp. 200-202 highlights parallels with *Idyll* 23. For the edition of Theocritus' *Idylls* available to Vergil: Du Quesnay 1979 p. 38 and Perutelli 1995 pp. 38 and 40-41; cf. Harrison 2007a pp. 34-35.

(6-13) before introducing Damon's performance (17-60).[6] Damon's shepherd laments his love for the unfaithful Nysa, who now marries another (22-41). The shepherd declares Amor's cruelty and his destructive effect on humans (43-50), expressing the turmoil of the world through a series of *adynata* before threatening to cast himself into the sea (52-61). The narrator invokes the Muses' aid (62-63) before relating Alphesiboeus' reply (64-109).[7] Alphesiboeus' witch narrates her performance of love-magic with her companion, Amaryllis, to draw home her beloved, Daphnis. After extolling the powers of *carmina*, the witch performs sympathetic rites to influence Daphnis' feelings towards her — binding a figurine and leading it around her altar; weaving knots of Venus; adding wax, clay, and laurel to her fire; burying Daphnis' clothes under her threshold (64-80) — before revealing her possession of Moeris' Pontic herbs, the powers of which she witnessed (91-99). She orders Amaryllis to take the ashes of the burnt materials and toss them into the river, declaring that Moeris' herbs will force Daphnis to her since he cares nothing for songs (101-105). In the concluding stanza the fire reignites and the dog barks at the threshold, signs the witch interprets as signalling Daphnis' return (105-109); before ending her spell, however, she questions whether she can trust her senses or whether lovers only create dreams for themselves (108).

Theocritus *Idyll* 2 interweaves magic and poetry by drawing on contemporary magic practice. Simaetha's materials and actions in the first half (1-63) parallel those in the *PGM*; her incantation reflects the structure, language and formulae of prayers in the *PGM* and *defixiones*,

[6] The two possible dedicatees are Asinius Pollio or Octavian: the reference to the dedicatee's tragedies (*Eclogue* 8.10) most decisively favours Pollio, an identification agreeing with the traditional dating of the *Eclogues* between 42-39 BC; identification with Octavian downdates *Eclogue* 8, and the collection, to 35 BC. For Pollio: Levi 1966 pp. 73-79, Tarrant 1978 pp. 197-199, Mayer 1983 pp. 17-30, Farrell 1991 pp. 204-211, Coleman 1977 p. 228, Perutelli 1995 p. 29, George 1996 pp. 232-235, Thibodeau 2006 pp. 618-623, and Cairns 2008 pp. 49-75 (esp. 60-61 and 63-70); cf. Conington 1858 pp. 79-80, Sidgwick 1890 pp. 32-33, Page 1898 pp. 155-156, Syme 1937 pp. 47-48, Bosworth 1972 pp. 462-468 (esp. 466), Berkowitz 1972 p. 34 n. 53, Nisbet-Hubbard 1978 pp. 16-17 (cf. 19-20), and Williams 1996 pp. 121-122. For Octavian: Bowersock 1971 pp. 73-80 and Bowersock 1978 pp. 201-202, Clausen 1972 pp. 201-202 and Clausen 1994 pp. 233-239, Zetzel 1984 pp. 139-142, and Mankin 1988 pp. 63-76. Cf. Van Sickle 1981 pp. 17-34: Vergil addresses "a figure of current history thinly mythicized". On the scholiastic evidence providing the dating 42-39 BC: Bowersock 1971 pp. 74-75, Zetzel 1984 pp. 140-142, and Farrell 1991 pp. 209-211; cf. Van Sickle 1981 pp. 18-23. For the insecurity of dating the *Eclogues*: Conington 1858 p. 17, Van Sickle 1978 p. 26 and Perutelli 1995 p. 30.

[7] Commentators generally interpret *Eclogue* 8.62-63 as confirming the Vergilian narrator's powerlessness: Conington 1858 p. 85, Sidgwick 1890 p. 35, Page 1898 p. 161, Solodow 1977 pp. 761-762, Clausen 1994 p. 255; cf. Putnam 1970 pp. 277-278. For alternative readings: Richter 1967 pp. 103-104, Tupet 1976 p. 227, Alpers 1979 pp. 132-135, and Coleman 1977 p. 243.

with her lament (64-158), as Petrović argues, comprising a prayer for justice such as found on curse-tablets.[8] Faraone and Petrović highlight correspondences between *Idyll* 2 and a tradition of hexametrical incantations in magical and other ritual texts and in their poetic representations: Petrović suggests that Theocritus' use of this tradition underlines the realism of Simaetha's spell and promotes metrical incantation to the level of erudite poetry, making Simaetha a witch performing an incantation and a poet composing verses.[9] The importance of song for Simaetha's magic is reinforced by the first refrain (17-63) apostrophising the *iunx*, here signifying "charm" or "spell".[10] Petrović suggests that Simaetha's declaration that she will sing her spells ("*ἀλλά, Σελάνα, | φαῖνε καλόν· τὶν γὰρ ποταείσομαι ἄσυχα, δαῖμον | τᾷ χθονίᾳ θ᾽ Ἑκάτᾳ*", 10-12) and "lament" ("*δακρύσω*", 64) her tale to Selene indicates her appreciation of her status as a poet; nevertheless this self-awareness remains limited: Simaetha perceives her composition only as an incantation, unconscious that she is creating a poem, and so fails to cure her love through song or to influence Delphis through magic.[11]

Hints in the idyll that Simaetha is neither an experienced nor a proficient witch indicate that her love-magic fails. The young woman's reaction to the dogs' barking ("*ἁ θεὸς ἐν τριόδοισι· τὸ χαλκέον ὡς τάχος ἄχει*", 36) illustrates this: clashing the bronze dispels Hecate, whom Simaetha's rites aimed to summon; her desire for Thestylis' rapid action betrays her fear

[8] On the realism of the magic in Theocritus *Idyll* 2: Sutphen 1902 pp. 315-327, Gow 1950b pp. 33-63, Dover 1971 pp. 98-100, Faraone 1995 pp. 1-15 (esp. 11-13), Faraone 1999 pp. 142-154 (esp. 142-145) and Petrović 2007 pp. 1-113 (esp. 1-56 and 101-113). Graf 1997a pp. 176-185 emphasises the unrealistic nature of the composition of Simaetha's rites; cf. Tavenner 1942 pp. 17-37 and Pralon 2000 pp. 307-326 (esp. 325).

[9] Faraone 1995 pp. 1-15, and Petrović 2007 pp. 108-112. Cf. Duncan 2001 pp. 43-56 for Simaetha as a poet-figure.

[10] Petrović 2007 pp. 39-40; Faraone 1999 pp. 152-153 n. 74 suggests that Vergil's substitution of "*iunx*" with "*carmina*" in the refrain of *Eclogue* 8.64-109 indicates that he considered Theocritus' *iunx* to be synonymous with incantation; cf. Duncan 2001 p. 48 — Simaetha's *iunx* works "at several levels: at the literal, to cast her spell; on the literary, to allude to other poets and enchantresses; and on the figurative, to accompany her song with music, as a poet accompanied himself with a lyre." For the *iunx* associated with verbal persuasion and enchantment: Johnston 1995 pp. 177-206; conversely, Faraone 1993 pp. 1-19 examines the physical treatment of the *iunx* and wryneck bird in erotic magic.

[11] Petrović 2007 pp. 54-56, and cf. pp. 75, 112, and 266.

and inexperience.[12] Simaetha's recollection of visiting every magically-skilled old woman for help with her infatuation ("*ἢ ποίας ἔλιπον γραίας δόμον, ἅτις ἐπᾴδεν;*", 91) further implies her lack of expertise.[13] Simaetha's request that the goddesses enhance the potency of her drugs also suggests her ineptitude:

> *φάρμακα ταῦτ᾽ ἔρδοισα χερείονα μήτε τι Κίρκης*
> *μήτε τι Μηδείας μήτε ξανθᾶς Περιμήδας.*

(Theocritus *Idyll* 2.15-16)

"Perimede" only occurs here and in Propertius 2.4.7-8, a couplet which recalls these lines.[14] Simaetha likely means Agamede, described at *Iliad* 11.740-741 as blonde and skilled in all drugs ("*ξανθὴν Ἀγαμήδην, | ἣ τόσα φάρμακα ἤδη ὅσα τρέφει εὐρεῖα χθών*"), a mistake which betrays her amateurishness and also her shortcomings as a narrator; her choice of Circe and Medea, who could not retain their lovers by magic, as models for her love-spell compounds this error, foreshadowing her spell's failure to attract Delphis.[15]

Simaetha's questionable reliability as a narrator becomes more prominent in her lament to Selene. As a prayer for justice, Simaetha's narrative aims to provoke the goddess' sympathy and enlist her aid, as well as to explain her recourse to magic, by emphasising Delphis' guilt and unjust treatment of her and her own innocence.[16] Simaetha employs three main devices to influence the portraits of herself and Delphis. She characterises her beloved as heartless ("*ὤστοργος*", 112) and herself as too trusting ("*ταχυπειθής*", 138) framing Delphis' reported

[12] For clashing the bronze: Gow 1950b p. 43 and Rose 1955 pp. 171-172 n. 4. White 1979 p. 26 highlights *Idyll* 2.36 as comically illustrating Simaetha's "panic"; Petrović 2007 p. 14 as proving Simaetha's inexperience; alternatively cf. Hutchinson 1988 pp. 155-156. For the dogs' barking indicating the presence of Hecate: Gow 1950b p. 43 and Pralon 2000 p. 319.
[13] Petrović 2007 p. 52.
[14] Tupet 1976 pp. 358-359.
[15] On "Perimede": scholia ad Theocritus *Idyll* 2.15/16b Wendel 1967 p. 274, Gow 1950b p. 39, Dover 1971 pp. 102-103, suggesting that Theocritus was mistaken; White 1979 pp. 21-22 argues that Theocritus creates irony and "bathos" through Simaetha's slip, illustrating her lack of education and ability in witchcraft; cf. Petrović 2007 p. 52. On Medea and Circe as ominous *exempla*: Griffiths 1979 p. 85, Segal 1981c pp. 77-78, and Petrović 2007 p. 52; cf. Fantuzzi 1995 pp. 16-35 for Theocritus' negative mythological *exempla* in *Idylls* 1, 3, 6, 7, and 11. Tupet 1976 p. 153 and Burton 1995 pp. 64-65 alternatively read Simaetha as establishing herself in a powerful female magical line. For Simeatha's unreliability and untrustworthiness as a narrator: Goldhill 1991 pp. 265-272 and Andrews 1996 pp. 21-51.
[16] Petrović 2007 pp. 41-51 and Andrews 1996 p. 23.

speech to heighten the impression of his dishonesty.[17] Literary allusions in her narrative reinforce these pointed adjectives: Simaetha evokes Odysseus' deceitfulness at *Iliad* 3.216-219 to illustrate Delphis' dishonesty at the introduction of his seduction (112-113), and enhances her contrastingly genuine passion (106-110) by recalling Sappho fr. 31.7-13 LP.[18] Finally, Simaetha manipulates Homeric formulae to influence Selene's perception of the four speeches embedded in her lament and to guide Selene towards those which convey the "true" impressions of Delphis and herself which she wishes the goddess to believe: Simaetha's honest confession of her infatuation to Thestylis ("*τὸν ἀλαθέα μῦθον*", 94) and the mother of Philista and Melixo's truthful report of Delphis' infidelity ("*ταῦτά μοι ἁ ξείνα μυθήσατο, ἔστι δ' ἀλαθής*", 154).[19] As narrator, Simaetha's focalisation influences the content of these speeches, as verbal echoes in her monologue reveal: Simaetha's description of her infatuation as no light matter ("*ἀλλ᾽ ἦς οὐδὲν ἐλαφρόν*", 92), for example, resonates in Delphis' speech when he reports that his friends describe him as "*ἐλαφρός*" (124), fleet-footed and fickle.[20] This echo enhances Simaetha's presentation of Delphis' guilt by contrasting his character unfavourably with her passion and illustrates her involvement in his reported speech, destabilising her trustworthiness as a narrator and her self-represented honesty. Simaetha's prayer for justice makes the distortion of the truth integral to her magic, an element which resonates in elegiac magic. Simaetha's magic also illustrates her self-deception: her final resolution to bear her love as she has done so far indicates that she remains convinced of its power to change Delphis' feelings.[21]

---

[17] For the effect of "*ταχυπειθής*": Segal 1984 p. 201, Gross 1988 p. 56 and Andrews 1996 p. 47. For "*ὥστοργος*": Gow 1950b p. 55, Segal 1984 p. 201, Gross 1988 p. 138 (cf. 135), Goldhill 1991 pp. 262-263 and Andrews 1996 p. 38.

[18] Segal 1984 pp. 201-208, arguing that Simaetha is ironically unconscious of her allusions; cf. Goldhill 1991 pp. 267-272, and Petrović 2007 pp. 46-47, who suggest that Simaetha is less naïve.

[19] Andrews 1996 pp. 30-31 and 48-50 illuminates Simaetha's use of Homeric language to guide Selene and her manipulation of the reported speeches; cf. Segal 1984 pp. 203-204 for Simaetha's Homeric allusions, though with an alternative interpretation, and Gross 1988 pp. 137-139 for Simaetha's influence over her narrative, though Gross argues that this reflects Simaetha's personal analysis and understanding of Delphis and herself rather than an attempt to influence her audiences. For Simaetha as only partially aware of the significance of her speech: Segal 1984 pp. 201-209 and Goldhill 1991 pp. 262-272; cf. White 1979 pp. 20-22.

[20] On "*ἐλαφρός*": Goldhill 1991 pp. 266-268 and Andrews 1996 pp. 39-40 n. 76; cf. Hutchinson 1988 p. 157, and Burton 1995 p. 45.

[21] Petrović 2007 pp. 52-56 and cf. p. 65. For Simaetha's self-deception through magic and poetic enchantment: Griffiths 1979 pp. 81-90, though Griffiths argues that Simaetha's song eventually releases her from her infatuation.

Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109 modifies the realism of *Idyll* 2 to create a more "literary" representation of poetic composition and power.[22] The first three stanzas and the refrain of Alphesiboeus' song particularly emphasise the powers of poetry and incantation.[23] These passages are key for the elegies in this chapter, and it will be helpful to consider them here.

Alphesiboeus' witch introduces *carmina* as essential to her magic at the beginning of her rites:[24]

> *effer aquam et molli cinge haec altaria vitta*
> *verbenasque adole pinguis et mascula tura,*
> *coniugis ut magicis sanos avertere sacris*
> *experiar sensus; nihil hic nisi carmina desunt.*

(Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-67)

Vergil removes the narrative of Simeatha's abandonment by Delphis and her aim of confronting him the following day (8-9), concentrating the reader's attention on magic and *carmina* as his witch's tools and intensifying the focus on poetry.[25] The refrain reinforces this emphasis ("*ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin*", 68), with its repetition after each stanza affirming the centrality of poetry to the eclogue.[26]

---

[22] Segal 1987 pp. 168-181 discusses the "literary self-consciousness" in Vergil's adaptation of love-magic from Theocritus *Idyll* 2; cf. Cipolla 1987 p. 358. Putnam 1970 pp. 279-282 discusses Vergil's modifications of *Idyll* 2 to emphasise the centrality of song as a theme; cf. Sutphen 1902 pp. 315-318 (esp. 316) for Vergil's "less technical" modification and "softening" of Theocritus' magic, Tavenner 1942 pp. 33-37, and Cipolla 1987 pp. 358-365. Gordon 2009 pp. 211-212 highlights the importance of reading magic in Vergil *Eclogue* 8 through its intertextual relationship with Theocritus *Idyll* 2. For the connection of poetry and magic in *Eclogue* 8: Richter 1967 pp. 7-8 and 106-107, Putnam 1970 pp. 255-292, Tupet 1976 pp. 226-227, Solodow 1977 pp. 757-771 (esp. 758-762), Segal 1987 pp. 167-185, and Sallmann 1995 pp. 297-302; Papanghelis 1999 pp. 50-57 foregrounds the metapoetic nature of *Eclogue* 8, though not in relation to magic. For poetry as a central theme of the *Eclogues*: Fantazzi 1966 pp. 186-187 and 191, Putnam 1970 *passim*, Solodow 1977 pp. 757-771, Roberts 1982 pp. 39-47, Perutelli 1995 pp. 54-57 (emphasising metapoetic elements in *Eclogues* 6 and 10), and Papanghelis 1999 pp. 44-59 (emphasising metapoetic overtones in *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 10).

[23] Cf. MacDonald 2005 pp. 19-20. For the division of stanzas by omitting the refrain at *Eclogue* 8.76: Clausen 1994 p. 238 with n. 20 and p. 248 *ad* 28a; cf. Coleman 1977 pp. 233-23, retaining the refrains at lines 28a and 76.

[24] This contrasts with Simaetha specifying fire as central to her magic ("ἐκ θυέων", 10): Tavenner 1942 pp. 33-37 compares the use of fire in Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8 noting (p. 35) that in *Eclogue* 8 "no god is called upon […] the whole power lies in the *carmina* and the magic acts."

[25] Papanghelis 1999 p. 54.

[26] Richter 1967 p. 72; for Vergil's emphasis on poetry reflected in his modification of Theocritus' refrain: Berg 1974 p. 185, Segal 1987 p. 177 n. 34, Garson 1971 p. 203, and MacDonald 2005 p. 29.

The second stanza develops this theme, listing the powers of magic *carmina*:

> *carmina vel caelo possunt deducere lunam,*
> *carminibus Circe socios mutavit Ulixi,*
> *frigidus in pratis cantando rumpitur anguis.*

(Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69-71)

deducere (69), used programmatically by Roman poets for the composition of refined Callimachean verse, indicates the connection between these magic *carmina* and poetry. Vergil employs the verb in this sense in *Eclogue* 6: in the adaptation of Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue (3-5), Apollo tells Tityrus that a shepherd should rear a fat flock but sing a fine-spun song ("*pastorem, Tityre, pinguis | pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen*", 4-5); Linus, handing Gallus the pipes of the Muses, recalls how Hesiod drew trees from the mountains with their singing ("*ille solebat | cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos*", 70-71).[27] *Eclogues* 6 and 8 are the only poems in the collection which feature *deducere*; its explicit connection with poetry in the former affirms the association between magic and poetry in our text; an echo between *Eclogue* 8.69-71 and the introduction of the shepherds' songs internally cements this:

> *pastorum Musam Damonis et Alphesiboei,*
> *immemor herbarum quos est mirata iuvenca*
> *certantis, quorum stupefactae carmine lynces,*
> *et mutata suos requierunt flumina cursus,*
> *Damonis Musam dicemus et Alphesiboei.*

(Vergil *Eclogue* 8.1-5)

The pastoral Muse (1) and its influence over animals and the natural world (2-4) — aligning the shepherds with Orpheus and Linus in *Eclogue* 6 (30 and 67-73) — characterise both singers' *carmina* as poems.[28] "*muto*" (4) describes the effect of Circe's spells ("*carminibus Circe socios mutavit Ulixi*", 70) signalling that these, too, represent poetry.[29] The third stanza of Alphesiboeus' song narrates the binding of a figurine with multi-coloured cords and instructs Amaryllis to weave and knot the strands (73-78): "*necte tribus nodis* [...] | [...] *et 'Veneris' dic 'vincula necto'*" (77-78). Weaving was an established metaphor for poetic composition, one

[27] *OLD* s.v. *deduco* 4; for *Eclogue* 6.5: Ross 1975 pp. 19 and 26-27 with p. 27 n. 1, Deremetz 1987 pp. 764-770, and Zetzel 1996 pp. 78 and 97. For Vergil's programmatic adaptation of Callimachus' *Aetia* in *Eclogue* 6: Clausen 1964 pp. 193-195.

[28] On Orpheus and Linus in *Eclogue* 6: Ross 1975 pp. 18-38 and Martirosova 1999 pp. 86-91 (including their relation to Gallan elegy); cf. Torlone 2002 pp. 209-213. Cf. Solodow 1977 pp. 759-760.

[29] Putnam 1970 p. 257. Putnam 1970 pp. 255-257 and Coleman 1977 p. 228 — who cites Medea's association with reversing rivers — note examples of magical subtext in *Eclogue* 8.1-4; Solodow 1977 pp. 759-760 emphasises the power of song over rivers as primarily magical, juxtaposed with traditional powers of poetry.

employed at *Eclogue* 10.71 where the narrator weaves a basket representing the *Eclogues*.[30] Weaving the threads in *Eclogue* 8.77-78 combines this metaphor with practical magic, illustrating that the witch's spells dramatise poetic creation.

The witch expresses no doubt in the powers of *carmina* at *Eclogue* 8.69-71, nor in her corresponding description of the capabilities of Moeris' herbs (95-99). The association of these powers with Circe (70) and Medea ("*Ponto* […] | […] *Ponto*", 95-96) — evoking Simaetha's pairing at *Idyll* 2.15-16 — introduces doubts about their efficacy for love-magic or love-poetry.[31] The penultimate verse of the poem makes these doubts explicit when the witch questions her belief in magic: "*credimus? an, qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?*" (108).[32] This question stands between the apparently felicitous omens of Daphnis' homecoming and the witch's resulting conclusion of her *carmina* ("*parcite, ab urbe venit, iam parcite carmina, Daphnis*", 109), destabilising both and hinting that her spells have no impact on Daphnis.[33] *Eclogue* 8 also introduces deceit through poetry and magic, expressed as the self-delusion of lovers (108). *Fingo* connotes poetic composition; the witch's doubt suggests that lovers create fantasies for themselves by composing poetic *carmina* which are as powerless and illusory as magic.[34] The closing line of the eclogue confirms this self-deception and poetry's enchanting power over the poet: despite voicing her doubts in magic and acknowledging the dreams lovers weave, the witch

[30] On *Eclogue* 10.71: Fantazzi 1966 p. 184, Berg 1974 p. 145, and Harrison 2007a p. 74.
[31] Solodow 1977 p. 759 and MacDonald 2005 p. 19 highlight *Eclogue* 8.70 as alluding to *Idyll* 2.15-16, without developing the connection I suggest.
[32] Solodow 1977 p. 761 discusses the effect of Vergil "undercutting" his earlier presentations of the power of poetry here.
[33] For the ending of *Eclogue* 8: Williams 1968 p. 304, Putnam 1970 pp. 288-290, Berg 1974 p. 185, Solodow 1977 p. 761, Alpers 1979 p. 107, Segal 1987 pp. 176-177 and 180, Coleman 1977 p. 253, and MacDonald 2005 p. 23.
[34] Segal 1987 p. 177 interprets "*somnia fingunt*" as raising "the inventive power of poetry": he describes the witch's "dominant characteristic" as "her credulity and naiveté about the power of magic", only mentioning "self-delusion" in connection with Corydon in *Eclogue* 2; cf. Warden 1980 p. 102 on Propertius 4.1.135: "a common meaning of *fingere* is to devise something that is false and misleading […]." *OLD* s.v. *fingo* 6a; cf. *OLD* s.v. *somnia* 2.

concludes her spell and poem by affirming her belief in its success.[35] The elegists combine this element with Simaetha's deception of her internal audience and of herself in their enchantment of themselves and their beloveds.

We can highlight further reasons for the elegists' engagement with these Vergilian and Theocritean works, namely generic engagement and self-definition in the literary tradition. The *Eclogues* were a significant model for the love-elegy of Propertius, Tibullus and Ovid; as we noted in the introduction to this chapter, the collection had engaged in an intergeneric dialogue with the love-elegy of Cornelius Gallus, Vergil's fictionalised version of whom is a central figure in *Eclogues* 6 and 10.[36] *Eclogue* 8, too, blends elegiac love into the pastoral.[37] Each song relates a first-person narrator's unrequited love for an unfaithful or absent beloved: the "triangle" of Damon's shepherd, Nysa and Mopsus evokes the elegiac dynamic of the lover-narrator, unfaithful beloved and successful rival.[38] Nysa's former affection is characterised as worthless and fickle ("*indigno* [...] *amore*", 18), echoing in Gallus' elegiac passion in *Eclogue* 10 ("*Naides, indigno cum Gallus amore peribat*", 10);[39] Damon's shepherd describes himself as deceived by

[35] These implications of magic and poetic powerlessness are borne out by Moeris' fate in *Eclogue* 9; whether he should be read as the same Moeris of *Eclogue* 8 is unclear, but the repetition of the name in neighbouring poems creates an association between the characters. Moeris in *Eclogue* 9 is a shepherd whose *carmina* lacked the power to save his land from confiscations, in contrast to the powers over the land the witch claims for his Pontic herbs in the preceding poem. After the doubt raised about the power of *carmina* at the conclusion of *Eclogue* 8 — and the dubious association of his herbs with Medea — Moeris' reappearance in connection with failed *carmina* in *Eclogue* 9 affirms the futility of magic and poetry in *Eclogue* 8. Solodow 1977 pp. 757-771 reads the power and powerlessness of *carmina* developed "self-consciously" over *Eclogues* 8-10; cf. Segal 1987 pp. 181-185 and Hardie 2002 pp. 20-21.

[36] In addition to Gallus in *Eclogues* 6 and 10, *Eclogues* 2, 8, and 5 feature elegiac motifs: Putnam 1970 pp. 342-394, Ross 1975 pp. 85-106, Van Sickle 1978 pp. 220-223, Du Quesnay 1979 pp. 41 and 60-63, Kenney 1983 pp. 49-51, Conte 1986 pp. 97-129, Coleman 1977 pp. 108-109, 282-290 and 296, Martirosova 1999 (ideas from this PhD dissertation are published under the name Torlone) esp. pp. 69-137, Torlone 2002 pp. 204-220, Fantuzzi 2003 pp. 1-11 and Harrison 2007a pp. 59-74; cf. Zetzel 1977 pp. 258-259. Fantazzi 1966 pp. 171-191 notes similarities between the *Eclogues* and Roman love-elegy, but stresses their generic tensions; Papanghelis 1999 pp. 44-59 highlights potential elegiac elements in Vergil's *Eclogues*, ultimately offering an alternative perspective.

[37] For *Eclogue* 8 and elegy: Fantazzi 1966 pp. 179-182, citing Perret, J. (1961), *Les Bucoliques*, Paris, p. 85 for *Eclogue* 8 depicting "love's torments" similarly to Gallus; Richter 1967 p. 19, citing Perret, J. (1965), "L'amour romanesque chez Virgile", *Maia, Revista di letterature classiche*, 17 [*sic*]; Kenney 1983 pp. 52-58; and Papanghelis 1999 pp. 50-57, emphasising metapoetic song as the central theme rather than love. Garson 1971 pp. 200-202 emphasises epic and tragedy in Damon's song.

[38] Papanghelis 1999 p. 50.

[39] Putnam 1970 pp. 346-347, Papanghelis 1999 p. 52, Torlone 2002 pp. 214-215 and 214 n. 41; cf. Coleman 1977 pp. 27 and 295 for further resonances between *Eclogues* 8 and 10, and Clausen 1994 p. 246.

Nysa ("*deceptus*", 18) and his song as a "lament" ("*queror*", 19).[40] The combined allusion to Theocritus' *Idylls* 2.82 ("*χὡς ἴδον, ὡς ἐμάνην, ὥς μοι πυρὶ θυμὸς ἰάφθη*") and 3.42 ("*ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἅλατ' ἔρωτα*") at *Eclogue* 8.41 ("*ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error*") evokes the goatherd as *exclusus amator* from Theocritus' pastoral *paraclausithyron* and the maddening love inspired by first sight of the beloved.[41] Alphesiboeus' witch similarly calls Daphnis "*perfidus*" (91) and her description of the clothing he left behind suggests his betrayal of his amatory vow ("*pignora cara sui* [...] | *terra, tibi mando; debent haec pignora Daphnin*", 92-93), as does his disregard for the gods ("*nihil ille deos* [...] *curat*", 103).[42] Daphnis' infidelity is reinforced by his model, Theocritus' Delphis, and his namesake Daphnis who, according to the Sicilian version of his myth, broke his oath of fidelity to a nymph.[43] Daphnis' presence in the city and his disregard for songs ("*nil carmina curat*", 103) also associate him with the elegiac beloved.[44]

These elegiac elements are set in a pastoral frame: the competition structure detaches the singers from the experiences of their *personae* and creates the impression of a dialogue which contrasts with love-elegy's predominant first-person narration; the witch's command that her songs draw Daphnis back from the city ("*ab urbe*"), elegy's usual setting, reinforces the rural

[40] Putnam 1970 p. 263 highlights Damon's "quasi-elegiac tone of lament"; cf. Kenney 1983 p. 53.
[41] For *Eclogue* 8.41 alluding to Theocritus *Idylls* 2.82 and 3.42: Putnam 1970 p. 270, Kenney 1988 pp. 53-54, Coleman 1977 p. 237, Clausen 1994 p. 250, and MacDonald 2005 pp. 26-27. For *Eclogue* 8.41, "*perii*", as elegiac: Sallmann 1995 p. 293; conversely, Papanghelis 1999 pp. 52-53 reads this line as applying to pastoral love rather than to elegiac.
[42] Coleman 1977 p. 249 highlights the "legal metaphor" in *Eclogue* 8.92-93.
[43] For the Sicilian version of Daphnis' myth in *Idyll* 1: Ogilvie 1962 pp. 106-110, Williams 1969 pp. 121-123 and Gurtzwiller 1991 pp. 95-101. Conversely: Lawall 1967 pp. 19-27 and Walker 1980 pp. 39-43. Segal 1981a pp. 35-37 stresses the "mystery" and ambiguity of Theocritus' treatment of Daphnis; Alpers 1979 p. 223 and Halperin 1983 p. 219 emphasise Daphnis' essential association with love. For the different versions of Daphnis' myth: Gow 1950b pp. 1-2.
[44] Berg 1974 p. 121 describes Daphnis as the "ideal beloved"; cf. Martirosova 1999 p. 93 and Torlone 2002 p. 213. Daphnis corresponds to Alexis, the elegiacised beloved in *Eclogue* 2 who is connected with the city and a rich urban rival and scorns Corydon's songs (6); for Alexis: Kenney 1983 p. 4, Du Quesnay 1979 pp. 60-63 and 74, Coleman 1977 pp. 91, 92, 94, 104, and 108, Clausen 1994 p. 62, Martirosova 1999 pp. 73-74, and Papanghelis 1999 pp. 46-47, arguing that Alexis is pastoral rather than elegiac. For connections between *Eclogues* 2 and 8: Van Sickle 1978 pp. 215-217, Perutelli 1995 pp. 31-33 and MacDonald 2005 pp. 25-26 and 29-30.

location.[45] Vergil's christening of the witch's beloved "Daphnis" emphasises his pastoral connections through his namesake, the mythical shepherd and often-accredited inventor of bucolic song whose death and resistance to love Thyrsis relates at Theocritus *Idyll* 1.61-142.[46] Elegiac engagement with *Eclogue* 8 re-frames Vergilian pastoral in elegy, picking up the *Eclogues*' intergeneric dialogue with Gallan love-elegy from the opposite side and underlining the urban location through their engagement with Theocritus *Idyll* 2. Elegy removes the distancing frame of the pastoral song-contest with the result that the fictional lover-narrator, homonymous with the external poet, echoes the shepherds' *personae* in his own voice: just like Simaetha, a sole narrator with a self-conscious amatory lament. These adaptations assimilate the male elegiac narrators to the female Vergilian and Theocritean narrators and *personae*: as we will see, this equates the elegies with their predecessors' poetic spells and characterises the elegiac narrators in the light of these models. With this background established, we are equipped to consider the elegies. We begin with Propertius 1.1, a programmatic elegy which associates magic with poetry and which echoes throughout later metapoetic examples of the motif; taking this work as our starting point will provide a sound basis for exploring the rest of the texts in this chapter.

Propertius 1.1

Propertius 1.1 outlines the poetics and themes of Book 1.[47] Commentators recognise the petition to magic at 1.1.19-24 as relating to Propertius' poetry, particularly its inability to influence Cynthia's affections, and cite lexical and thematic parallels with *Eclogue* 8; few, however, explore these correspondences further. Ahl is a notable exception: commenting that

[45] On dialogue in the *Eclogues*: Alpers 1989 pp. 103-106 (esp. 103-104 on *Eclogues* 8-10); Perutelli 1995 pp. 32-33 and 53-54 and Sallmann 1995 p. 292 offer alternative views of *Eclogue* 8. For pastoral as the framing genre in *Eclogue* 8: Alpers 1979 p. 107, Harrison 2007a pp. 36-74 (esp. 59-74), and Torlone 2002 pp. 218-220. For elegy and the city: Martirosova 1999 pp. 96-97; cf. Coleman 1977 p. 249 and Papanghelis 1999 pp. 51 and 54; cf. Du Quesnay 1979 p. 38 for Vergil *Eclogue* 8 "purifying" the pastoral genre. Segal 1987 pp. 167-170 discusses the "singing-contest" framework as exemplifying the literary "artificiality" of *Eclogue* 8; Papanghelis 1999 pp. 55-56 argues that this framework transfers the focus of *Eclogue* 8 from the content of the songs to the nature of song itself.

[46] Berg 1974 p. 121; Van Sickle 1978 pp. 216-217 suggests that Vergil's selection of this name shows that he understood Delphis in Theocritus *Idyll* 2 as a "complement" to Daphnis in *Idyll* 1. For Daphnis as the creator of pastoral: Halperin 1983 pp. 79-80; cf. Segal 1981a p. 42.

[47] Ross 1975 p. 60.

Propertius 1.1.19-24 "recalls" *Eclogue* 8.64-109, Ahl suggests that Propertius' role as poet makes him "a practitioner of spells" similar to the witches — as "they may be able to draw down the moon, he may be able to lure Cynthia" — though he does not develop this observation.[48] Ross and Heyworth each propose poetic interpretations of 1.1.19-24 with reference to Vergil *Eclogue* 6: Ross suggests that "*deductae*" (1.1.19) recalls *Eclogue* 6.70-71 ("[…] *quibus ille solebat | cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos*"), with Propertius addressing Neoteric poets; Heyworth, developing Ross's reading, proposes that Propertius appeals to poets (1.1.19) and to witches (20).[49] I suggest, instead, that the context of magic and the similarity of 1.1.19 and *Eclogue* 8.69 indicates that we should read this passage as a condensed allusion to Vergil *Eclogue* 8 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2 through which Propertius introduces his elegiac poetics as an enchanting *fallacia*, expressing the duplicity of his poetic work and of the fictional world it creates, as well as establishing the failure of elegy to influence the beloved in the narrative. This suggests, in turn, that the "*vos*" to whom the narrator appeals are Alphesiboeus' witch and Simaetha, literary witches whose magic symbolises poetry and its composition.[50] We can also read 1.1.19-24 as the focal part of a structural allusion to *Eclogue* 8 across Propertius' elegy which foreshadows the introduction of magic and, in the second half of the poem, enacts the construction of love-elegy as a spell. Propertius introduces his Vergilian model at the beginning of 1.1 — as this allusion introduces themes expanded in the appeal to magic, it will be useful to start here. I offer a brief overview of the poem before considering the passages central to our investigation.

---

[48] Ahl 1974 p. 91 n. 24 and pp. 92-93; cf. O'Neill 1998 p. 74. For Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69 as a parallel for Propertius 1.1.19: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 155, Enk 1946 p. 12, Fedeli 1980 p. 79, Coleman 1977 p. 245, Greene 1998 p. 44 and Coutelle 2005 p. 106; cf. Zetzel 1996 p. 99. Commager 1974 p. 34, Prince 2002 pp. 71-72 and Prince 2003 pp. 210-211 highlight the parallel between Propertius' elegies and magic in 1.1.19-24 without reference to *Eclogue* 8.69-109. Zetzel 1996 p. 97 compares 1.1.19 with poetic composition: "Magic and poetry are in one sense the same." On Propertius 1.1 and Vergil *Eclogues*: Ross 1975 pp. 59-70, Fedeli 1981 p. 237, Batstone 1992 pp. 289-293, 295 and 297, and Coutelle 2005 pp. 92-103.

[49] Ross 1975 p. 66; Heyworth 2007b p. 10. The majority of commentators on 1.1.19-24 accept Propertius' addressees as being witches, but they do not identify them with literary figures or with Simaetha or Alphesiboeus' witch in particular: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 155, O'Neil 1958 p. 2, Camps 1961 p. 44, Luck 1962 p. 38, Ahl 1974 pp. 90-93, Cairns 1974 pp. 99-102, Tupet 1976 pp. 348-351, Stahl 1985 p. 43, Sharrock 1994 p. 57, Greene 1998 pp. 44-45, O'Neill 1998 pp. 65 and 73-74, Dickie 2001 p. 176, and Prince 2002 pp. 63-72.

[50] This expands an initial discussion of Propertius 1.1.19 as an allusion to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69 in my MA dissertation: Chadha 2008 pp. 36-40. As well as extending my previous consideration of the relationship between these poems and magic in elegy, my new interpretation differs in key points from that in my earlier thesis.

The narrator announces his infatuation — characterised simultaneously as magical enchantment, disease, and capture — with Cynthia (1-2).[51] He describes his domination by his mistress and by Amor, who taught him to hate *castas puellas* and to live a chaotic life (3-6): his *furor* has now lasted for a year (7). The lover offers his addressee, Tullus, the *exemplum* of Milanion conquering Atalanta to illustrate the value of prayers and services for lovers of old (9-16), but stresses that now *tardus Amor* furnishes him with no *artes* and forgets the well-trodden paths. The second half of 1.1 expands the hopelessness of the narrator's situation as he turns for aid to parties he presents as unable to help him: he demands that illusory magic force Cynthia to love him (19-24) and petitions friends for medical remedies or to accompany him to lands far from women (25-30). The narrator finally addresses happy lovers, contrasting their situations with his own bitter experience and urging them to heed his advice and avoid his curse or repeat his suffering in their turn (31-38).

Propertius firstly evokes *Eclogue* 8 to express Amor's ruthless treatment:

> *et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus,*
> *donec me docuit castas odisse puellas*
> *improbus, et nullo vivere consilio.*

(Propertius 1.1.4-6)

The combination of "*Amor* [...] | [...] *docuit*" (4-5) and "*improbus*" (6) recalls the brutality of love which Damon's shepherd laments:[52]

> *saevus Amor docuit natorum sanguine matrem*
> *commaculare manus. crudelis tu quoque, mater.*
> *crudelis mater magis, an puer improbus ille?*
> *improbus ille puer; crudelis tu quoque, mater.*

(Vergil *Eclogue* 8.47-50)

The "*mater*" (47) is Medea, whose abandonment and intense love drove her to infanticide.[53] Propertius' allusion to these lines concludes his programmatic adaptation (1.1.1-6) of Meleager's pederastic epigram *A.P.* 12.101. Propertius' modifications of *A.P.* 12.101 illustrate his elegiac

[51] For the subtext of magical enchantment in 1.1.1-2: Fauth 1980 pp. 277-278 and Fauth 1999 pp. 140-141, Kennedy 1993 pp. 47-48, Sharrock 1994 p. 57 and Chadha 2008 pp. 5-10. We expand on the narrator's characterisation of Cynthia's beauty as magic enchantment in Chapter 3.
[52] Fedeli 1980 p. 67 cites *Eclogue* 8.47-48 as a parallel for Propertius 1.1.5 and (p. 69) *Eclogue* 8.49 for *improbus* in 1.1.6; cf. Heslin 2010 p. 62. Batstone 1992 p. 295 notes that *Eclogue* 8.47-50 is "in some ways reminiscent" of Propertius 1.1.4-6 but argues that Propertius defines himself against Vergil *Georgics* 1.145-48.
[53] Coleman 1977 p. 239 and Clausen 1994 p. 252; cf. Richter 1967 pp. 53-54 and Solodow 1977 p. 760.

amatory position: Propertius alters the gender of Meleager's beloved, Myiscus; he replaces the dialogue of the epigram with the single voice of the lover-narrator; and omits Meleager's grandiose comparison of his plight with Zeus'.[54] These changes eliminate the generalising tone of *A.P.* 12.101, highlighting the uniqueness of the Propertian narrator's amatory experience and reflecting his effeminising *servitium* to Cynthia.[55] Propertius' allusion to *Eclogue* 8.47-50 replaces the epigram's final lines, complementing the adaptations of this work: Propertius removes Damon's expression of love's destructiveness from the de-personalising pastoral frame and the dialogue-form of the song-contest, presenting it in his single first-person voice; the heterosexual love of Damon's song underlines Propertius' modification of the pederastic epigram.[56] Most significantly for our focus on magic, Propertius' allusion to the Vergilian lines swaps Meleager's self-comparison with Zeus for Amor's domination of Medea. This emphasises the power of the god and of Cynthia, personalising the example further by making Propertius' narrator the subject of Amor's teaching (5); by replacing Medea in the Vergilian *exemplum*, Propertius underlines his narrator's violent, and potentially dangerous, passion and equates him with the witch early in 1.1, echoing the sequence of his model to foreshadow the reappearance of magic at the centre of the elegy.[57]

---

[54] Levin 1969 p. 228 calls Propertius 1.1.5-6 "quite distinct" from Meleager *A.P.* 12.101.5-6; cf. Levin 1975 pp. 219-220 and Coutelle pp. 71-72 for Propertius' Milanion-*exemplum* (1.1.9-16) replacing the end of Meleager *A.P.* 12.101.

[55] For Propertius' adaptation of Meleager *A.P.* 12.101: Allen 1950b pp. 264-269, Levin 1969 pp. 226-235 and Levin 1975 pp. 216-220, Hubbard 1974 pp. 14-20, Fedeli 1980 pp. 60-66, Stahl 1985 pp. 32-33, Lyne 1998c pp. 167 and 174, Miller 2004 pp. 85-87, and Coutelle 2005 pp. 71-72. Fedeli 1980 pp. 61-62 proposes that Propertius follows Catullus' adaptation of Meleager 4.1.1 in c.1; cf. Levin 1969 pp. 231-234, Coutelle 2005 p. 71 and Cairns 2006 p. 110. Cf. Fantuzzi 2003 pp. 5-6 for Vergil's "'programmatic' imitations" of Meleager *A.P.* 7.196 in *Eclogue* 1.1-2.

[56] Batstone 1992 p. 295 suggests that Propertius contrasts Damon's "abstract and general" song with his "personal narrative" and "implicit claim to an unchronicled experience", though Batstone does not mention Meleager *A.P.* 12.101.

[57] Propertius' removal of the singing-contest frame of *Eclogue* 8 also contributes to the elegiac lover's flexible gendered stance — at 1.1.4-6, echoing Damon's male *persona* underlines the reassertion of the lover's masculinity after his opening statement of servitude to Cynthia; equating himself with Medea immediately calls this reversal into question. In 1.1.19-24, Propertius' narrator aligns himself with Alphesiboeus' female speaker — again associated with Medea (24) — underlining his effeminised position alongside his recourse to a stereotypically "feminine" power; his evocation of the socially "masculine" use of erotic magic in *Eclogue* 8, and in *Idyll* 2, maintains the balance in the corresponding opening lines. For Propertius' inversion of gender roles in relation to magic in 1.1.19-24 cf. Greene 1998 p. 44. Solodow 1977 p. 759 highlights the references to Medea across *Eclogue* 8 in connection with magic: "The poem begins with suggestions of magic, which become explicit only later." For Medea as an "abandoned lover" in love-elegy: Prince 2002 pp. 142-164. Propertius's narrator makes himself a cautionary *exemplum* to other lovers at 1.1.31-38.

Magic lies at the heart of 1.1:

> *at vos, deductae quibus est fallacia lunae*
> *et labor in magicis sacra piare focis,*
> *en agedum dominae mentem convertite nostrae,*
> *et facite illa meo palleat ore magis.*
> *tunc ego crediderim vobis et sidera et amnes*
> *posse Cytaeines ducere carminibus.*

(Propertius 1.1.19-24)

This passage forms a condensed allusion to *Eclogue* 8. As we have noted, Propertius' appeal recalls *Eclogue* 8.69: "*carmina vel caelo possunt deducere lunam*"; *deducere* at 1.1.19 evokes Vergil's use of magic as a metaphor for poetic composition, and this is enhanced by "*deductae*" (19) also recalling "*deductum dicere carmen*" at *Eclogue* 6.3. The concluding couplet (23-24) confirms this suggestion. *carmina* are introduced emphatically as the final word of the section (24), associated with guiding stars and rivers. The latter power evokes that of the shepherds at *Eclogue* 8.4 ("*et mutata suos requierunt flumina cursus*"), acknowledging the lexical connection between poetic powers and magic *carmina* ("*mutavit*", 71); *deducere* (1.1.19) and *ducere* (24), connecting the opening and concluding lines, replicate this echo.[58] "*crediderim*" (23) also recalls the penultimate line of Vergil's work ("*credimus? an, qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?*", 108), concluding Propertius' abridged adaptation of the poem. Structurally, "*at vos*" (19) echoes the Vergilian narrator's central apostrophe to the Muses ("*haec Damon; vos, quae responderit Alphesiboeus,* | *dicite, Pierides* […]", *Eclogue* 8.62-63), underlining Propertius' transition to the connection between poetry and magic against the background of Alphesiboeus' song, and the elegiac union of poet, narrator and witch-*persona*; "*at vos*" (19), "*et vos*" (25) and "*vos*" (31) at evenly spaced intervals throughout the second half of 1.1 create a stanzaic arrangement which recalls the Vergilian poem and Theocritus *Idyll* 2, reinforcing the characterisation of Propertian love-elegy as magic.[59]

[58] On *deducere* and *ducere* as a simple verb expressing the meaning of its compound: Ross 1975 pp. 65-66; cf. Cairns 1974 p. 100 for the "chiastic" arrangement of the "thought-structure" of 1.1.19-24, and Butler and Barber 1933 p. 155. Cf. Parca 1988 p. 585 n. 6 for Propertius linking his elegy to the Neoteric tradition through *deducere*.

[59] Propertius 3.24.9-12, a passage which recalls 1.1.19-24 in Propertius' final renunciation of Cynthia, reinforces the establishment of elegiac poetics through magic in our passage.

Concentrating Alphesiboeus' song into six lines enables Propertius to foreground themes central to love-elegy: artifice and poetic powerlessness in love. 1.1.19 emphasises "*fallacia*", deception and illusion, as a defining feature of Propertian elegy.[60] Medea's introduction alongside *carmina* ("*Cytaeines* […] *carminibus*", 24) underlines this, opening a window allusion to Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* 4.59-60 where the Moon recalls how Medea often controlled her with "deceitful" spells ("*δολίησιν ἀοιδαῖς*", 59), a characteristic which Propertius picks up in "*fallacia*".[61] Propertius demonstrates that elegiac deception is directed three ways: towards Cynthia, towards his narrator, and towards his extratextual audience.

Lines 21-22 reveal the narrator's intention of deceiving Cynthia with his elegies: his demand that his mistress' face be paler than his own expresses his desire that she return his love to an even greater degree. As Bicknell highlights, "*convertite*" applies to the orbit of the moon, linking lines 21-22 with 19; "*convertite*" (21) also overlaps in sense with "*avertere*" (*Eclogue* 8.67) recalling the effect Alphesiboeus' witch desired her *carmina* to have on Daphnis' senses ("*nihil hic nisi carmina desunt*", *Eclogue* 8.67) and indicating that the lover desires his elegies to enchant Cynthia with their *fallacia* as they enchant the moon.[62] Cynthia's name cements this

[60] Some commentators dispute the reading "*fallacia*", favouring "*pellacia*" among the suggested emendations: Shackleton Bailey 1949 pp. 22-23 defends "*fallacia*"; cf. Shackleton Bailey 1967 p. 4 and Tupet 1976 pp. 348-349. Housman 1972 pp. 46-48 and Goold 1990 adopt "*pellacia*"; cf. Butler and Barber 1933 p. 155 and Heyworth 2007b p. 11 in favour of "*pellacia*", though both retain "*fallacia*". Stroh 1971 p. 108, discussing Propertius 4.1.135, notes that "*fallacia fingere*" concisely expresses "*carmina fingere*" and the seductive, bewitching effects of elegy. "*Cytaeines*" (1.1.24) is also debated by commentators: Enk 1946, Rothstein 1966, and Richardson 1977 adopt "*Cytaeines*"; Butler and Barber 1933, Camps 1961, and Heyworth 2007a adopt "*Cytinaeis*"; Fedeli 1980 retains the MSS reading "†*Cythalinis*†". For discussion see: Butler and Barber 1933 pp. 155-156, Enk 1946 pp. 15-16, Fedeli 1980 p. 82, and Prince 2002 pp. 64-65, who defends *Cytaeines*.

[61] Shackleton Bailey 1949 p. 22 highlights *Argonautica* 4.56-60 as a parallel for Propertius 1.1.19, stressing reservations about using the example due to a lack of Latin parallels; cf. Tupet 1976 p. 349. Novara 2000 pp. 37-38 suggests that Propertius 2.28.37 echoes *Argonautica* 4.60 to underline the failure of magic. Propertius 1.10.15-18 supports this parallel in 1.1.19-24: Medea's use of incantations to unbolt doors at *Argonautica* 4.41-42 corresponds with the skill Propertius claims for his elegies at 1.10.16 ("*et dominae tardas possum aperire fores*"). The anaphoric "*possum*" (1.10.15-18) echoes Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69-71, particularly preceding an echo of 1.1.4-5 in "*Cynthia me docuit* […] | […] *Amor"* (1.10.19-20); these correspondences between Propertius' explicit comment on the power of his elegies and 1.1.19-24 underline the metapoetic focus of the earlier passage. For 1.10.15-18 associating Propertius' poetry with successful magic: Luck 1959 p. 138, Luck 1962 p. 44, Zetzel 1996 pp. 96-97, and Fauth 1999 p. 150; Novara 2000 pp. 40-41 reads 1.10.15-18 as favourably contrasting Propertius' poetry with magic. I suggest, alternatively, that the echoes of 1.1 in 1.10.15-18 render Propertius' self-advertisement before Gallus ironic and humorous. For the term "window allusion": Thomas 1986 pp. 188-189.

[62] Bicknell 1984 p. 69. *OLD* s.v. *converto* 5d and 7b; cf. *OLD* s.v. *averto* 1 and 2.

analogy: as the feminine of "Cynthius", the Callimachean epithet for Apollo, it associates her with Diana, the earthly aspect of the *dea triformis* alongside chthonic Hecate and celestial Luna.[63] This etymological connection replicates that between Daphnis and the laurel Alphesiboeus' witch burns to affect him ("*Daphnis me malus urit, ego hanc in Daphnide laurum*", *Eclogue* 8.83), and the similar association of Delphis' name and the plant at Theocritus *Idyll* 2.23-26 ("*ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἐπὶ Δέλφιδι δάφναν | αἴθω*", 23-24), replicating the persuasive analogies through which Alphesiboeus' witch and Simaetha formulate their spells.[64] These connections indicate that the lover will attempt to captivate and seduce Cynthia with poetic illusions, suggesting his own untrustworthiness in the process.

Cynthia's association with the poetic enchantment of the moon also illustrates Propertius the poet's deceit of his external readers. Wyke demonstrates Cynthia's status as a "*scripta puella*", an embodiment of Propertius' elegiac poetics and text as well as a fictional beloved in the narrative: I suggest that 1.1.19 introduces this in the context of magic.[65] As we have noted, Cynthia's name associates her with Callimachean poetics, while *deducere* depicts the composition of fine, Callimachean verse: 1.1.19 thus addresses *carmina* which have the *fallacia* "of the drawn-out moon", with Cynthia's enchantment symbolising the composition of the elegiac text and its effect on the extratextual audience as well as its narrative aim.[66] We can clarify this suggestion with reference to Propertius 2.13.3-8, a passage through which Wyke outlines Cynthia's identification with Propertius' elegy and one which echoes our lines. At 2.13.7-8, Propertius recalls that Amor ordered him to compose poetry not to move trees and beasts but to amaze Cynthia: "*sed magis ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia versu: | tunc ego sim Inachio notior arte Lino*". Wyke argues that Cynthia's amazement "is expressed in the same vocabulary as the spellbinding of *natura*", illustrating "an analogous yet favoured form of poetic production"

[63] For Cynthia's etymological connection with *luna* in 1.1.21-22: O'Neil 1958 pp. 2-3, Ahl 1974 pp. 81 and 91, Commager 1974 pp. 33-34 and Bicknell 1984 p. 69. For "Cynthius" of Apollo in Callimachus and Vergil *Eclogue* 6.3: Clausen 1976 pp. 245-247 and Clausen 1977 p. 362; Wyke 1987 p. 59 and Wyke 1989a p. 33.

[64] For Daphnis and the laurel: Richter 1967 p. 150, Putnam 1970 p. 284, and Coleman 1977 pp. 247-248; cf. Van Sickle 1978 p. 139 n. 84 and O'Hara 1996 p. 250; for Delphis and the laurel: Petrović 2007 pp. 20-21.

[65] Wyke 1987 pp. 47-61 and Wyke 1989a pp. 25-47; for Cynthia as representative of Propertius' text in 1.3 and 1.11: Greene 1995 pp. 303-318.

[66] Wyke 1987 pp. 58-60 offers this explanation for how Cynthia's "stupefaction" by poetry represents the composition of elegy at Propertius 2.13.

to that expressed in *Eclogue* 6.71 ("*cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos*").[67] We can add that 2.13.7-8 recalls 1.1.19-24 through the wish to affect Cynthia's mind; "*magis* [...] | *tunc ego sim*" (2.13.7-8) also echoes "*magis* | *tunc ego crederim*" (1.1.22-23). "*stupefacio*" at 2.13.7 replicates the effect of the shepherds' songs at *Eclogue* 8.3 ("[…] *quorum stupefactae carmine lynces*"), recalling the dialogue with Vergil's work which we have traced in 1.1.19-24.[68] By alerting Propertius' audience to Cynthia's status as a poetic *fallacia*, 1.1.19 reveals the elegiac affair as being a literary construct. As we have highlighted, the first-person narration by a homonymous *persona* sharing Propertius' profession implies that the poems relate genuinely autobiographical experiences; by representing his poetry as a magic trick Propertius expresses the fictitiousness of his elegiac world. Revealing Cynthia's illusiveness by evoking the image of the drawn-down moon highlights Propertius' dexterity as a poet by demonstrating the enchanting power of his verses which can persuade his audience of the realism of his poetic subjects, however fantastic.

The narrator's appeal to magic despite his scepticism of its success also signals his capacity for self-delusion.[69] "*crediderim*" (23) underlines this by recalling *Eclogue* 8.108 ("*credimus?*"): Propertius' condensed allusion to Alphesiboeus' song juxtaposes the positive affirmations of the powers of *carmina* with their final destabilisation, emphasising the mutual hopelessness of magic and poetry in love and so the elegiac narrator's greater capacity for self-delusion.[70] By transposing the end of *Eclogue* 8 to the middle of his elegy and continuing the poem for fourteen lines in contrast to the single closing refrain, Propertius expands Alphesiboeus' witch's conscious self-deception through magic and poetry, structurally illustrating the bewitching effect of poetry's promises on the elegiac lover — the "*fallacia*" of the false hope of arousing Cynthia's affections.

[67] Wyke 1987 pp. 58-60.
[68] For 2.13.7 echoing *Eclogue* 8.3 cf. Wyke 1987 p. 59; Heyworth 1992 pp. 48-53 details Propertius' engagement with *Eclogue* 6 and Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* 1 in 2.13.3-14.
[69] Sharrock 1994 p. 51; cf. Fauth 1999 p. 141.
[70] The lover's self-delusions about the power of magic and poetry balance this failure, generating the hope which leads him to continue composing poetry. Cf. Caston 2006 pp. 275-276 for a similar balance between hope and amatory despair in elegy.

This scepticism also implies the failure of love-elegy to beguile the beloved, in contrast to its power over the audience. The background of *Eclogue* 8 and *Idyll* 2 aligns Propertius' elegies with love-spells which failed to influence their targets and associates Cynthia with unfaithful beloveds immune to magic and poetry, adumbrating the failure of his narrator's *carmina* to win her affection; Medea's inclusion in 1.1.19-24, as Prince highlights, reinforces these ideas of magic and poetic failure in love.[71] As we noted in the previous section, Medea already foreshadows the failure of love-magic in *Eclogue* 8 and *Idyll* 2; Propertius' concentrated allusion to these models intensifies her significance. In addition to the reference to Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* 4.59-60, Propertius' introduction of *sidera* (1.1.23) to the powers of *carmina* in *Eclogue* 8 suggests that his window allusion encompasses *Argonautica* 3.531-533, Argus' list of the feats Medea's drugs can accomplish: as well as quenching flames, Argus claims that Medea can stop rivers flowing ("*καὶ ποταμοὺς ἵστησιν ἄφαρ κελαδεινὰ ῥέοντας*", 532) and immobilise the moon and stars ("*ἄστρα τε καὶ μήνης ἱερῆς ἐπέδησε κελεύθους*", 533).[72] Through this dialogue with his predecessors, Propertius highlights Medea's importance as an ironic model for love-elegy, underlining his poetry's lack of success in love.[73]

Two examples from Propertius Book 4 support the suggestion that *fallacia* (1.1.19) establishes the nature of Propertius' elegy. In 4.1, love-elegy is described as *fallax*: the *vates* Horos, attempting to dissuade Propertius from his new aetiological program, reports Apollo's past order that Propertius compose elegies — "*at tu finge elegos, fallax opus*" (135).[74] The

[71] Prince 2002 pp. 71-72 reads Medea's presence in Propertius 1.1.24 as implying the failure of magic and, "by analogy", Propertius' poetry to influence his love affairs; Prince does not comment on Propertius' engagement with Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8 and with Medea in these models.

[72] Hunter 1989 pp. 154-155 notes the influence of *Argonautica* 3.531-533 on magic in Latin literature; Fedeli 1980 p. 82 cites *Argonautica* 3.531 as a parallel for 1.1.23-24.

[73] Prince 2002 p. 69 discusses Medea's association with treachery through magic but without reference to Propertius' elegies or narrator in 1.1. For Medea's magic and deceitful, enchanting speech in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, particularly 4.442-444: Hunter 1993 pp. 144-145 and 59-60 and Clare 2002 pp. 252-253; cf. Albis 1996 pp. 81-89 for a metaliterary reading of Medea's magic.

[74] The dominant reading "*fallax*" (4.1.135) is disputed; Murgia 1989 p. 268 and Goold 1990 adopt "*pellax*". For "*fallax*" and its interpretation: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 332, Camps 1965 p. 70, Shackleton Bailey 1967 pp. 224-225, Stroh 1971 pp. 107-108 n. 169, Nethercut 1976 pp. 30-38, Richardson 1977 p. 423, Kidd 1979 p. 177, and Coutelle 2005 p. 533; cf. Warden 1980 p. 102, Stahl 1985 p. 174, Janan 2001 p. 103; cf. Sharrock 1994 pp. 82-83 (on Ovid *Ars amatoria* 2). For *fallax vates*, spoken by Apollo, cf. [Tib.] 3.5.49-50: "*quare ego quae dico non fallax accipe vates, quodque deus uero Cynthius ore feram*": Newman 1967 p. 99.

catalogue of amatory *topoi* (136-146) indicates that "*elegos*" (135) are love-elegies; the echo of "*fallere*" for deception by a *puella* at the end of Apollo's speech frames the list of elegiac subjects ("*persuasae fallere rima sat est*", 146), affirming the artifice of the genre.[75] Commentators read *fallax* (135) either as illustrating elegy's aim of "deceiving" the beloved; as describing its allusiveness and technical complexity; or as highlighting the elegiac lover's deception by his mistress and by his poetry, which proffers hope of winning the *puella* but rarely satisfies it: as in 1.1.19, all of these interpretations are appropriate together.[76] Apollo's speech also echoes Propertius' earlier elegies: in particular, Stahl notes that 4.1.135-136 evokes 2.7, 2.10, and 3.1, works in which Propertius "attempts to define his own [poetic] position".[77] This cluster of allusions to elegies concerning Propertius' poetics increases the likelihood of "*fallax*" recalling "*fallacia*" in 1.1.19 and enhances our suggestion that this noun characterises Propertius' love-elegy in his inaugural poem.[78] In addition, Apollo's words are reported by Horos whose close connection with Propertius is signalled by his self-characterisation as *vates* (75) and his profession as an astrologer, a form of divination associated with magic in Greco-Roman tradition and, through the interpretation of heavenly bodies, particularly appropriate for Propertius' elegiac association with the moon.[79] Cynthia furnishes our second parallel: in 4.7, Cynthia's ghost returns to condemn her lover's infidelity to her spirit and his new beloved's contempt for her memory and household. Cynthia begins by asking if Propertius has forgotten their nocturnal

[75] Butler and Barber 1933 p. 332, MacLeod 1976 p. 147 and p. 148, Kidd 1979 p. 77 and Hutchinson 2006 p. 84 interpret "*elegos*" as love-elegies; cf. Stahl 1985 p. 274, Janan 2001 p. 103, and Keith 2008 pp. 11, 39 and 83. Sandbach 1962 p. 268, and Courtney 1969 p. 75 (cf. pp. 78-79) assert that Propertius and his audience did not distinguish amatory from non-amatory elegy. For 4.1.135 introducing Propertius' amatory-elegiac motifs: Debrohun 2003 p. 17. For *fallere* (146) responding to *fallax*: Marr 1970 p. 167 and Nethercut 1976 pp. 33-34.

[76] For the deception of the poet: Rothstein 1966 p. 216, Nethercut 1976 p. 30, Pasoli 1977 p. 111 and Stahl 1985 p. 274; of the beloved and of the poet by the beloved: MacLeod 1976 p. 153 n. 43 and Hutchinson 2006 p. 84. For elegy's technical sophistication: Shackleton Bailey 1967 p. 225 and Richardson 1977 p. 423; for its disingenuousness: Warden 1980 p. 102, referring to Book 4. Marr 1970 p. 167 reads *fallax* as illustrating amatory elegiac "*subject-matter*" [Marr's emphasis], quoting Lachmann: "'quod in fraudibus et fallaciis versatur'" [*sic.*].

[77] Stahl 1985 pp. 274-275, with p. 375 n. 7.

[78] Cf. Murgia 1989 p. 269 for 4.1.143 ("*illius arbitrio noctem lucemque videbis*") corresponding to 1.1.6 ("*nullo vivere consilio*").

[79] Stahl 1985 pp. 267-276 interprets Horos as a "mask" and "alter-ego" for Propertius; MacLeod 1976 pp. 143-145 discusses Propertius' prophetic role in 4.1 and (pp. 149-150) reads "Horos' character [as] exactly analogous to the one the elegist normally adopts", and the astrologer as "one version of Propertius' character and aims as a poet". For Horos as a credible prophet: Sandbach 1962 pp. 265 and 267, MacLeod 1976 pp. 147-148, Kidd 1979 p. 171, Debrohun 2003 pp. 20 and 73, and Keith 2008 p. 31. For Horos as a fraud: Courtney 1969 pp. 73-79, Stahl 1985 pp. 270-276, Warden 1980 p. 102, and Watson 2007 pp. 344-345 (cf. 348 and 353-354). For astrology associated with magic: Liebeschutz 1979 pp. 119-126 (esp. 126), Beard-North-Price 1998 pp. 231-233 and Moreau 2000 pp. 32-33; cf. Hutchinson 2006 p. 60.

adventures (15-20) and laments the oath he has betrayed, his "*fallacia verba*" (20). Cynthia's rebuke echoes "*fallax opus*" (4.1.135) but more precisely replicates "*fallacia*" at 1.1.19, the magical deceit which originally aimed to seduce and manipulate her.

The final point for us to address in relation to 1.1.19-24 is the identification of the narrator's addressees with the Vergilian and Theocritean witches and how this contributes to the metapoetic nature of the passage and Propertius' elegiac self-definition. As I suggested at the beginning of this section, Propertius' close engagement with his pastoral models suggests particular literary identities for these figures, Alphesiboeus' witch and Simaetha; the second line of the passage reinforces this association. "*magicis sacra* [...] *focis*" (1.1.20) recalls *Eclogue* 8.66 ("*coniugis ut magicis sanos avertere sacris*"), evoking the witch's preparatory rites and her aim and encompassing her "*altaria*" (64) and fire-spells (80-83); "*focis*" suggests a window allusion to Simaetha's more prominent use of fire. Both women mistakenly associate Medea with their love-magic, foreshadowing its failure and highlighting their shortcomings as narrators. While the Propertian narrator's scepticism indicates an awareness of Medea's inappropriateness in this context and of his predecessors' mistake, his own appeal to and conditional belief in these spells signal that he will repeat their error; the amplification of Medea's presence suggests the greater extent of elegiac failure and deceit.

Propertius 2.4

Propertius 2.4.1-22 provides a parallel instance of elegy's magic *fallacia*, emphasising the lover's deception by his allusive verses, by expanding the engagement with Theocritus *Idyll* 2. In 2.4.7-8 the narrator states that magic is powerless in love; in 2.4.15-16 he recalls futile attempts to cure his infatuation. These couplets allude to *Idyll* 2.15-16 and 90-91 respectively; Propertius 2.4.15-16 also echoes 2.3.51-54, an earlier reference to the *exemplum* of the prophet

Melampus in the goatherd's *komos* at Theocritus *Idyll* 3.43-45.[80] As in scholarship on 1.1.19-24, commentators rarely pursue these allusions to Theocritus *Idyll* 2 further: Papanghelis suggests that Propertius evokes the mixture of desire and destructiveness in Simaetha's witchcraft to illustrate his experience of love; Costanza reads 2.4.7 as evoking *Idyll* 2.10-15, including Simaetha's refrain, to illustrate Propertius' inability to escape love.[81] I suggest that the poetic component to Simaetha's spell and echoes of 1.1.19-24 and 2.3.51-54 in 2.4.7-8 and 15-16 encourage us to understand elegy as the magic which deceives and fails the lover here. I begin by summarising Propertius 2.4.1-22.

The narrator laments the torments a lover must suffer, particularly the frustration at his mistress' rejection (1-4), and recalls futile attempts to win admittance to her: perfuming his hair and approaching carefully by foot are in vain, and magic has no power to influence love (5-8). Medicine cannot help either (11-12): lovesickness is a sudden blow from a concealed source against which none can guard themselves (9-14); the lover has often been prey to a deceitful prophet and has asked old women to interpret his dreams to no avail (15-16). For these reasons, the narrator wishes that his enemies should love girls; his friends, boys: loving boys is a smoother river to sail, while girls will barely be softened by their suitors' blood (17-22).

The narrator lists love-magic among the unsuccessful attempts to seduce his *puella*:

> *non hic herba valet, non hic nocturna Cytaeis,*
> *non Perimedaeae gramina cocta manus.*
>
> (Propertius 2.4.7-8)

[80] For Propertius 2.4.7-8 and 15-16 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2.15-16 and 90-91: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 199, Enk 1962b pp. 81-82, Gow 1950b pp. 39 and 53, Rothstein 1966 pp. 239-240, Camps 1967 p. 85, Papanghelis 1987 p. 36, Fedeli 2005 p. 165, Heyworth 2007b p. 128, and Costanza 2009 pp. 205-206; cf. Richardson 1977 p. 223. I note scholarship on 2.3.51-54 below, as well as the textual problems with 2.3.45-53.

[81] Papanghelis 1987 pp. 36-37; Prince 2002 pp. 78-84 suggests a similar interpretation of Propertius 2.4.7-8, focusing on Propertius' reduplicated reference to Medea rather than on Theocritus *Idyll* 2; cf. Fauth 1999 pp. 143-144. Costanza 2009 p. 206 n. 32, also suggesting (pp. 205-206) that Propertius' echoes of *Idyll* 2.15-16 and 90-91 illustrate his narrator's servile debasement. Costanza notes that this echo of Simaetha's words also aligns the lover with Theocritus' witch; we can add that this colours the view of the lover as a narrator and poet as well as illustrating his amatory situation.

The Medea-Perimede pairing recalls Simaetha's prayer to increase the potency of her love-spell (*Idyll* 2.15-16), implying that the lover similarly attempted magic to attract his beloved.[82] Propertius' narrator inverts Simaetha's appeal which suggests his awareness of her inappropriate *exempla* and their detrimental effect on her love-magic. "*Cytaeis*" (7) duplicates "*Cytaeines*" at 1.1.24, recalling the deceitful *carmina* originally characterised as a *fallacia*: echoing this passage suggests that the lover now realises the ineffectiveness of his poetry for enchanting his mistress as well as the irony of its association with Medea.[83] By echoing "Perimede", however, the narrator indicates that he does not fully appreciate Simaetha's inaccuracy and Propertius deepens Theocritus' irony by indicating that the lover, despite his awareness of the failure of magic and poetry, is doomed to repeat his mistakes.

The second reference to magic extends this reading:[84]

> *nam cui non ego sum fallaci praemia vati?*
> *quae mea non decies somnia versat anus?*
>
> (Propertius 2.4.15-16)

[82] "*Perimedaeae* […] *manus*" (16) is Beroaldus' emendation for the transmitted "*per medeae* […] *manus*": see Fedeli 2005 pp. 164-165; cf. Butler and Barber 1933 p. 199, Tupet 1976 p. 358, Richardson 1977 p. 223, and Heyworth 2007b p. 128. Editors predominantly adopt a variation of "Perimede": Butler and Barber 1933: "*Perimedaeae* […] *manus*"; Rothstein 1966 and Richardson 1977: "*Perimedeae* […] *manus*"; Camps 1967, Goold 1990, Fedeli 2005, and Heyworth 2007a: "*Perimedaea* […] *manu*". Enk 1962a: "*Perimedeae gramina cocta manu*"; cf. Enk 1962b p. 81. Tupet 1976 pp. 358-360 defends "*per medeae* […] *manus*"; cf. Prince 2002 pp. 81-82. For alternative interpretations of the purpose of magic in 2.4.7-8: Luck 1962 p. 43, Rothstein 1966 p. 236, Camps 1967 pp. 85-86, Fauth 1980 p. 280, and Prince 2002 p. 82.

[83] For *Cytaeis* (2.4.7) echoing *Cytaeines* (1.1.24): Butler and Barber 1933 pp. 155-156, Enk 1946 p. 15, Camps 1961 p. 45, Rothstein 1966 p. 61 and 239, Richardson 1977 p. 149 and Fedeli 1980 p. 82.

[84] The MSS transmit this couplet at 2.4.15-16; commentators debate its position based on the progression of thought. Enk 1962a, Rothstein 1966, Camps 1967, Richardson 1977, and Heyworth 2007a accept the transmitted position; Butler and Barber 1933, Goold 1990 and Fedeli 2005 transpose 15-16 to follow 7-8. See: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 198, Enk 1962b pp. 72-73, Fedeli 2005 p. 165 and Heyworth 2007b p. 127; Papanghelis 1987 pp. 33-35 defends the thought-sequence without transposition. I support the transmitted position: Theocritus *Idyll* 2.90-91 suggests that Propertius 2.4.16 concerns curing love, fitting logically in the later context of remedies for infatuation; cf. Papanghelis 1987 p. 35 n. 39: "The reminiscences […] come from different points of Theocritus' poem […] they are likely to have been kept apart by Propertius". For 2.4.15 echoing 1.1.19: Rothstein 1966 p. 240 and Fedeli 2005 pp. 165-166, who also compares "*fallaci* […] *vati*" with Horos at 4.1.75 ("*vates*"). Alternatively, cf. Courtney 1969 p. 79 n. 4 for 2.4.15 as "irrelevant" to 1.1.19-24.

2.4.16 mirrors Simaetha's question at *Idyll* 2.90-91: "*καὶ ἐς τίνος οὐκ ἐπέρασα | ἢ ποίας ἔλιπον γραίας δόμον ἅτις ἐπᾴδεν;*".[85] "*decies*" (16) also matches the days and nights Simaetha suffered lovesickness and sought a cure, including visiting these women, before attempting love-magic ("*κείμαν δ' ἐν κλιντῆρι δέκ' ἄματα καὶ δέκα νύκτας*", 86).[86] Following its hexameter, 2.4.16 underlines the magic's ineffectiveness against love; recalling the context and purpose of Simaetha's statement suggests an alternative view of the narrator's question and a pattern emerges in the couplet which balances 2.4.7-8. To illuminate these points, we must first look at 2.4.15 and the poetic subtext activated by the combined echoes of 1.1.19 and 2.3.51-54.

In 2.4.15, the lover laments that he is prey to a *fallax vates*. This looks back to the *exemplum* of the prophet Melampus at 2.3.51-54; I summarise the textual problems with this passage and its relationship with 2.4.1-22 before discussing its significance for our argument. The division of Propertius 2.3 and 2.4 is contentious: scholars debate whether 2.3.45-54 belongs with 2.3.1-44, as the manuscripts transmit, or with 2.4.1-22. The predominant view is that 2.3.45-54 either begins 2.4.1-22 or is an earlier fragment of this elegy with the intervening lines lost.[87] Correspondences between the Melampus-*exemplum* and 2.4.1-22 support reading them together: alongside the echo of "*vates* […] *Melampus*" (2.3.51) in "*fallaci* […] *vati*" (2.4.15), "*praemia*" (2.4.15) reverses the profit Melampus refused ("*non lucra*", 2.3.53); Murgia and Costanza also highlight Melampus' healing skills in relation to medicinal cures for love at 2.4.11.[88] On the basis of these arguments, I accept 2.3.45-54 as an earlier section of 2.4.1-22; with this established, we can consider the *exemplum* in question.

[85] Butler and Barber 1933 p. 199, Rothstein 1966 p. 240, Papanghelis 1987 p. 36 and Fedeli 2005 p. 165; Gow 1950b p. 53 suggests that 2.4.15 [*sic*] is "probably an imitation" of *Idyll* 2.90.
[86] Alternatively, Fedeli 2005 p. 166: "*decies*" is hyperbolic.
[87] Butler and Barber 1933 p. 197 and Fedeli 2005 pp. 151-153 suggest that 2.3.45-54 is most likely a fragment of an otherwise lost elegy. Enk 1962a (see Enk 1962b p. 72), Rothstein 1966, Goold 1990, Murgia 2000 pp. 233-235 and Costanza 2009 pp. 200-213 begin 2.4.1-22 at 2.3.45; Camps 1967 p. 80 and Shackleton Bailey 1967 p. 67 keep 2.3.45-54 with 2.3.1-44. Richardson 1977 p. 218 advocates uniting 2.3.1-54 with 2.2; Heyworth 2007b pp. 124-125 suggests that 2.3.45-2.4.22 are "fragments drawn from a variety of original pieces, some […] possibly from the same poem, but with gaps intervening". For poem division in Propertius Book 2: Heyworth 1995 pp. 165-185, esp. 165-171.
[88] Murgia 2000 pp. 234-235 and Costanza 2009 p. 205; cf. Murgia 2000 p. 235, Heyworth 2007b p. 125, and Costanza 2009 p. 205 for the parallel between "*vates*" (2.3.51 and 2.4.15).

Propertius' narrator uses Melampus to predict a happy union with his *puella* after his shameful *servitium amoris*:

> *turpia perpessus vates est vincla Melampus,*
> *cognitus Iphicli surripuisse boves;*
> *quem non lucra, magis Pero formosa coegit,*
> *mox Amythaonia nupta futura domo.*

(Propertius 2.3.51-54)

Fantuzzi highlights similarities between this passage and Theocritus *Idyll* 3.43-45, where Melampus is an *exemplum* in the goatherd's unsuccessful *komos* to Amaryllis: Theocritus places Melampus' undertaking alongside his brother's marriage, eliding the reason for his quest to imply that Melampus endured torments because he loved Pero though she ultimately married his brother.[89] Melampus is one of three negative *exempla* the goatherd uses, each portending an unhappy outcome for his courtship which he fails to appreciate and comically illustrating his ineptitude as a lover.[90] Fantuzzi highlights that Propertius replicates Theocritus' irony: the oblique "*Amythaonia* [...] *domo*" (54) opens the possibility that Melampus did not ultimately marry Pero.[91] The negative *exemplum* reveals the Propertian speaker's shortcomings as a lover and narrator: his inability to appreciate the wider context of Melampus' story — particularly as employed in Theocritus' poem — blinds him to the unfortunate outcome he predicts for himself. Payne makes an alternative interpretation of Theocritus' *exempla* which supplements this reading. Payne emphasises that the goatherd's *exempla* best apply to himself which suggests that they are designed to persuade him, not Amaryllis, and to ease his despair based on "what he sees" as their common element — amatory success.[92] Propertius' narrator similarly uses Melampus to persuade himself of a happy future through his poetry: like Theocritus' goatherd, he aims to write himself his amatory reward without realising the negative implications of his *exemplum*.

---

[89] Fantuzzi 1995 p. 24; cf. Hunter 1999 p. 125. For the versions of Melampus' myth: Enk 1962b pp. 75-76 (citing Theocritus *Idyll* 3.43-45 as a parallel for Propertius 2.3.45-54), Gow 1950b pp. 73-74, Camps 1967 p. 84, Richardson 1977 p. 222, Fantuzzi 1995 pp. 23-24 with p. 33 nn. 53-57, Hunter 1999 pp. 124-125, Spelman 1999 pp. 140-143, and Fedeli 2005 pp. 155-156.

[90] Fantuzzi 1995 pp. 22-28; cf. Lawall 1967 pp. 40-41, Walker 1980 pp. 45-46, Segal 1981b pp. 71-72 and Rist 1978 p. 48.

[91] Fantuzzi 1995 p. 24 with p. 33 nn. 55-57; Costanza 2009 pp. 203-204; cf. Camps 1967 p. 84. Fedeli 2005 pp. 155-156 cites parallels between Propertius 2.3.51-54 and Homer *Odyssey* 15.225-238 — where Pero marries Melampus' brother — which reinforce reading Propertius' *exemplum* as ironic; Costanza 2009 p. 203, between Propertius 2.3.51-54, Theocritus *Idyll* 3.43-45 and Homer *Odyssey* 11.291. Spelman 1999 pp. 140-143 suggests that Propertius evokes both Homer *Odyssey* 15.225-238 and *Odyssey* 11.281-297, where Melampus appears to win Pero for himself.

[92] Payne 2007 pp. 65-66.

This leads us back to the characterisation of Melampus anonymously as "*fallax*" at 2.4.15. Following his recognition of Simaetha's ill-chosen mythological *exempla* (2.4.7-8), I suggest that Propertius' narrator retrospectively acknowledges Melampus' inappropriateness for his situation: applying "*fallax*" to "*vates*" broadens the applicability of the adjective, encompassing Melampus the false *exemplum*, the uselessness of magic to cure love, and, by echoing "*fallacia*" (1.1.19), the deceptive poetry which offers illusory hope.[93]

We are now in a position to consider the echo of *Idyll* 2.90-91 at 2.4.16 in relation to 2.4.15 and 2.4.7-8. In 2.4.7-8, the lover shows an awareness of the uselessness of love-magic and elegy to beguile his *puella* before repeating Simaetha's "Perimede", suggesting that he is destined to repeat his mistakes in love and poetry. This pattern underlies 2.4.15-16: acknowledging Melampus as a false paradigm, the narrator recognises elegy's duplicity and its helplessness to soothe love or to win his beloved. Simaetha's recollection of exhausting all magical assistance is, however, part of her spell, justifying her love-magic to Selene and contrasting her incurable passion with Delphis' fickleness; in contrast to the inversion of Simaetha's invocation at 2.4.7-8, the lover now repeats her question, implying that he is still attempting his own spell. As in the earlier lines, the echo of Simaetha's inexperience in magic reinforces the ineffectiveness of the Propertian narrator's poetry on his beloved, which he, too, does not recognise. The narrator's realisation of Melampus' deceptiveness as a happy model for his *servitium* appears doubly ironic in light of its hexameter — despite his momentary enlightenment, he is still victim of a *fallax vates*, namely himself.

[93] The references to profit in 2.3.53 and 2.4.15 reinforce this interpretation: in 2.3.53 Melampus offered his services for love, not material gain; Propertius' reversal of Melampus' motivation at 2.4.15 underlines that the example which the narrator once thought true for his situation was false. Camps 1967 p. 84 highlights the applicability of "*vates*" to soothsayers and poets, associating Melampus with Propertius in 2.351-54. Costanza 2009 p. 208 compares 2.3.51-54 with the Milanion-*exemplum* at 1.1.19-60; this underlines Melampus as a negative model for the Propertian lover, as well as furnishing a further parallel between 2.4.1-22 and Propertius 1.1.

Tibullus 1.2

Tibullus 1.2 demonstrates elegiac deceit and fantasy through a more extended example of the motif than we have seen so far. 1.2 is a *paraclausithyron* narrated by and focalised through the lover as *exclusus amator*.[94] This framework gives the poem a purpose — the narrator must use his elegy to convince Delia's door to open or Delia to deceive her guard and her husband.[95] Tibullus introduces magic in the figure of a *verax saga* who, he claims, has written him a spell to manipulate the senses and belief of Delia's *coniunx* (43-66); to convince Delia to perform the spell, the narrator stresses the witch's honesty and lauds her powers.[96] He also reports the ritual the witch performed to cure his passion, though he prayed that Delia reciprocate his feelings instead, complimenting her by affirming his devotion.[97] This section works logically in the lover's persuasion of Delia, though his elegy ultimately appears unsuccessful in influencing her. Commentators note the narrator's close association with the witch; we can add to these observations by highlighting Tibullus' engagement with *Eclogue* 8 and *Idyll* 2 to characterise his elegy through magic as we have seen in Propertius 1.1.19-24 and 2.4.1-22. I summarise 1.2 and outline how my reading supplements existing interpretations of Tibullus' relationship with his *saga* before we focus on the passage in question.

The narrator demands neat wine to drown his sorrows and reveals that a locked and guarded door separates him from his *puella* (1-6); he addresses the door, cursing it to endure violent weather before retracting his abuse and praying that his curses strike him instead (7-14). The lover encourages Delia to deceive her guard, promising Venus' aid and instruction (15-24). He describes the hardships being a lover protects him from (25-34) and warns witnesses to his suit to conceal what they see lest Venus punish them (35-42). This emphasis on secrecy

[94] For the *paraclausithyron* in Tibullus 1.2: Copley 1949 pp. 91-107, Putnam 1973 p. 61, Bright 1978 pp. 136-149, Cairns 1979 pp. 166-167, Ball 1983 pp. 47-49, Wimmel 1983 pp. 4-14 and 115-116, Lee-Stecum 1998 pp. 72-73 and Maltby 2002 pp. 152-153.
[95] Cf. Lee-Stecum 1998 pp. 73 and 77 for elegy as an essential instrument in the "power struggle" of the *paraclausithyron*.
[96] For Tibullus listing the *saga*'s powers to convince Delia to accept her spell: Luck 1962 p. 47, Tupet 1976 p. 337, Fauth 1980 p. 272, Murgatroyd 1980 pp. 83-84 and 88, Ball 1983 p. 41, Wimmel 1983 p. 36, Mutschler 1985 pp. 55 and 59-60, Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 91. Bright 1978 p. 142 reads 1.2.45-54 as a digression with no narrative function; cf. Copley 1949 p. 100.
[97] Murgatroyd 1980 p. 90 and Maltby 2002 p. 172 read 1.2.65-66 as a "compliment" to Delia.

introduces the *saga* whose magic, the narrator claims, can prevent Delia's *coniunx* from believing anything he hears about their liaison (42-43). The narrator details the witch's powers (45-54) and reveals the spell she has composed for Delia to deceive her husband's vision, stressing that he is the only lover it will conceal (55-60); he concludes this section by relating the witch's attempt to cure his love, during which he prayed for Delia to reciprocate his affection instead (61-66). After favourably comparing himself as a suitor with a soldier and offering penance to Venus (67-88), the narrator predicts humiliation as elderly lovers for youths who mock him now (89-98) and begs Venus for mercy, asking why she punishes her devoted servant (99-100).

Commentators highlight associations between Tibullus and the witch: Lee-Stecum emphasises the focus on the witch's voice, suggesting that her effective spells contrast with Tibullus' failure to persuade Delia through poetry; the *saga*'s powers over the dead and her connection with Medea's "*malas herbas*" (53) and Hecate's "*feros canes*" (54), however, imply that her magic may be less trustworthy than Tibullus claims and unsuccessful, even destructive, in love.[98] Prince reads Medea's inclusion in the catalogue and the characterisation of her herbs as "*malas*" (53) as implying the "evil, deceitful, and destructive" nature of Tibullus' *saga* and her magic's uselessness for influencing love or tricking Delia's *coniunx*, and as revealing Tibullus' lack of faith in the witch's powers with the result that "[i]f Tibullus has been trying to persuade Delia to use the witch's charm, his persuasiveness lacks something": Prince argues that the failure of the witch's spells forces Tibullus to use his elegies to win Delia with the result that "one can suspect the efficacy of the poet's *carmina*".[99] Putnam and Murgatroyd briefly comment on Tibullus' closeness with the *saga* in 1.2.55 ("*haec mihi composuit cantus quis fallere posses*"): Murgatroyd reads "*haec mihi*" as gesturing towards the intimacy between the two; Putnam notes that *compono* blurs the distinction between incantations and poetry.[100]

We can provide new evidence to crystallise these associations by investigating Tibullus' engagement with Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8 in 1.2.43-66: we can highlight allusions

[98] Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 87.
[99] Prince 2002 pp. 72-78; cf. Prince 2003 pp. 211-215.
[100] Murgatroyd 1980 p. 87. Putnam 1973 p. 68; cf. Tupet 1976 p. 341 and Smith 1978 p. 221. Bright 1978 p. 147 calls *compono* a "key-word" of 1.2, highlighting 1.2.93 ("*et sibi blanditias tremula componere voce*") as "a reflection of the poetic process", with (p. 147 n. 54) 1.2.22 ("*blandaque compositis abdere verba notis*") and 1.2.55.

to these works in the opening and closing couplets of 1.2.45-54, signalling the metapoetic element in the catalogue and aligning Tibullus' *saga* with Alphesiboeus' witch and, particularly, Simaetha.[101] The central lines echo Tibullus' elegies: following the allusive hint in 45-46, these echoes reveal that the *saga* and her incantations reflect Tibullus and his poetry. From a narrative perspective they underline Tibullus' focalisation of the catalogue, highlighting its tendentiousness and suggesting that the witch may not exist beyond his drunken imagination — rather, she may be an illusion conjured to persuade Delia to trick her guard and husband ("*haec mihi composuit cantus quis fallere posses;* | *ter cane, ter dictis despue carminibus*", 55-56) after Tibullus' previous encouragement failed ("*tu quoque, ne timide custodes, Delia, falle*", 15).[102] Tibullus' references to Theocritus *Idyll* 2 strengthen this suggestion: his report of the witch evokes Simaetha's techniques for manipulating the narrative in her lament to Selene, implying his construction of the *saga* to influence Delia. As in Propertius 2.4, the Tibullan lover's unconsciousness of Simaetha's failure to persuade Selene renders him unaware that modelling his witch on Theocritus' and replicating her narrative devices in his attempt to enchant Delia doom his elegy to failure. The same is true of the witch's attempt to cure Tibullus' love and his prayer that Delia should share his feelings: Simaetha's inability to cure her infatuation reflects badly on the *saga*'s skills in this area, as well as on the efficacy of Tibullus' request for mutual love. We begin with the catalogue at 1.2.45-54.

Tibullus introduces his witch through her honesty and her promise of deceiving Delia's husband ("*nec tamen huic credet coniunx tuus, ut mihi verax* | *pollicita est magico saga ministerio*", 43-44) before relating the wonders her spells can accomplish:

[101] For Tibullus 1.1.7-8 metapoetically engaging with the pastoral tradition through Vergil's *Eclogues* and Theocritus *Idyll* 1: Wray 2003 pp. 227-241, and Putnam 2005 pp. 130-141.
[102] With this reading I agree with the perspective on the *saga*'s existence Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 91 offers: Tibullus raises "the possibility that the whole tale of the witch has been made up […] as part of his argument to convince Delia not to fear the power of the *coniunx*."

hanc ego de caelo ducentem sidera vidi;
fluminis haec rapidi carmine vertit iter;
haec cantu finditque solum manesque sepulcris
elicit et tepido devocat ossa rogo.
iam tenet infernas magico stridore catervas;
iam iubet aspersas lacte referre pedem.
cum libet, haec tristi depellit nubila caelo;
cum libet, aestivo convocat orbe nives.
sola tenere malas Medeae dicitur herbas,
sola feros Hecatae perdomuisse canes.

(Tibullus 1.2.45-54)

The pairing of drawing the stars from heaven and reversing the flow of rivers (45-46) creates an allusion to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109 which parallels that in Propertius 1.1.19-24. Juxtaposing these powers condenses Vergil's alignment of the shepherds' songs (*Eclogue* 8.4) and magic *carmina* (69-71); replacing Vergil's "*deducere lunam*" (69) with "*ducentem sidera*" (1.2.45) perhaps parallels Propertius 1.1.23-24: "*sidera et amnes* | *posse* […] *ducere*".[103] Tibullus' claim that he has witnessed these feats creates an Alexandrian footnote directing the reader to recognise the allusions: "*ego* [...] *vidi*" (45) replicates the Vergilian witch's validation of Moeris' abilities ("*ego* […] | *vidi*", *Eclogue* 8.97-99), perhaps applying it to the powers and the association between magic and elegiac *carmina* "witnessed" in Propertius 1.1.19-24.[104]

This poetic element in 1.2.45-46 invites a similar reading of the witch's influence over the dead (47-50) and the weather (51-52). The witch's command of the *manes* ("[…] *manesque sepulcris* | *elicit*", 47-48) expands *Eclogue* 8.98 ("*Moerim, saepe animas imis excire sepulcris*") to dramatise *psychagōgia*, a term originally for necromancy which evolved to express poetry's persuasive effects on human emotions and which, through necromancy's association with ritual

[103] I discuss the dating of Propertius Book 1 and Tibullus Book 1 in Chapter 3; as both poets composed their first collections contemporaneously, mutual influence is likely. Murgatroyd 1980 p. 84: Propertius 1.1.23-24 "possibly inspired" Tibullus 1.2.45-46; cf. Wimmel 1983 p. 33 n. 52. Wimmel 1983 p. 36 equates "*ducentem sidera*" with "*lunam deducere*" (Tibullus 1.8.21).
[104] For the "Alexandrian footnote": Hinds 1998 pp. 1-3; cf. Ross 1975 pp. 78-79. Maltby 2002 p. 167 and Gordon 2009 p. 225 compare "*ego* […] *vidi*" (45) with Vergil *Eclogue* 8.97-99. For a character in a text recalling what he "witnessed" in another: Conte 1986 p. 59.

mourning, humorously plays on elegy's generic self-representation as complaint and lament.[105] 1.2.47-50 also reflects the prominence of death in 1.1.59-68, where Tibullus imagines Delia placing him on his funeral pyre ("*arsuro* […] *lecto*", 61; "*tepido* […] *rogo*" 1.2.48), and 1.3, in which Tibullus envisions his funeral (5-9), epitaph (53-56) and catabasis with Venus (57-82): the witch's hissing ("*magico stridore*", 49) anticipates Cerberus' ("*Cerberus ore | stridet*", 1.3.71-72).[106] The witch sprinkling the *manes* with milk to nourish and appease them ("*aspersas lacte*", 50) parallels Tibullus' placatory offerings to Pales at 1.1.36 ("*et placidam soleo spargere lacte Palem*"), a correspondence which highlights Tibullus' focalisation of her actions and their metaliterary identification, her command of the spirits enacting the poet's authorial control over his subject matter.[107]

Tibullus' distinctive claims of his *saga*'s meteorological powers reflect the conditions in 1.2 and 1.1: the cheerless ("*tristi* […] *caelo*", 51) and the summer skies ("*aestivo* […] *orbe*", 52) the *saga* commands echo those Tibullus describes at 1.1.49-50 ("*tristes* […] *pluvias*") and 1.1.27 ("*sed Canis aestivos ortus vitare sub umbra*").[108] At 1.2.7-8 the narrator curses Delia's door with storms ("[…] *te verberet imber, | te Iovis imperio fulmina missa petant*"); he later describes the rain ("*non mihi cum multa decidit imber aqua*", 32) and winter snow ("*non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis*", 31) he endures on her threshold. The urban *paraclausithyron* in 1.2 ruptures the rural fantasy of 1.1, developing the image of Tibullus chained outside Delia's door

[105] Murgatroyd 1980 p. 85 cites Vergil *Eclogue* 8.98 as a parallel for Tibullus 1.2.47-48. The emphasis on necromancy in 1.2.47-50 foreshadows Tibullus' elegiacisation of Homer's *Odyssey* in 1.3: Odysseus' actions in *Odyssey* 11.26-36 and 44-50 replicate Circe's instructions in *Odyssey* 10.515-537; Tibullus 1.2.47-50, anticipating the catabasis at 1.3.57-82, echoes this pattern. For *psychagōgia*: De Romilly 1975 p. 15; cf. Heyworth 2007b pp. 9-10. For elegy and lament: Maltby 2002 p. 157, noting the "technical" *queror* at Tibullus 1.2.9 ("*querelis*") and the etymological connection with *elegia*; cf. Myers 1996 p. 19. For the connection between necromancy, lament and song, reflected etymologically by *goēs* and *goēteia*: De Romilly 1975 p. 13 and Johnston 1999 pp. 101-118. Latin *nenia* — funeral dirges, magic incantations, and literary trifles — reflects this intersection between lamentation, magic and poetry: Richlin 2001 pp. 239-240 and 243.

[106] Cf. Tupet 1976 p. 339 on *stridor*.

[107] Smith 1978 p. 218 and Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 88 note that the *saga* replicates Tibullus' action at 1.1.36. For the function of the milk at 1.2.50: Tupet 1976 pp. 339-340. The military vocabulary in 1.2.50 — "*catervas*", "*tenet*", "*referre pedem*" — anticipates 1.2.69 ("*ille licet Cilicum victas agat ante catervas*") and parallels elegiac expressions of *militia amoris*; for this military terminology in 1.2.50: Maltby 2002 p. 168. On "*placidam*" (1.1.36): Cairns 1979 pp. 108-109.

[108] Smith 1978 p. 219 and Tupet 1976 p. 341 highlight raising snow in summer (32) as unique in extant poetry, otherwise attested only by Diodorus Siculus 5.55.3 of the Rhodian Telchines; cf. Copley 1949 pp. 95-96 for Tibullus' novel treatment of the weather in a *paraclausithyron*. For 1.2.51 echoing 1.1.49: Murgatroyd 1980 p. 86 [1.1.50].

(1.1.51-56);[109] the reversal of the weather reflects this, and we may add that Tibullus' endurance of snow on Delia's threshold (1.2.31) ironically reflects on his wish for their shelter together during winter storms ("*aut gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster | securum somnos igne iuvante sequi*", 1.1.47-48). By using the witch's powers to stage his creation of poetic fantasies Tibullus illustrates the association of magic, elegy and deceit; her preternatural abilities enact the elegist's ability to create realistic visions in the imaginations of his audience whilst drawing attention to the fictitiousness of his poetic world and their complicity in creating it by inviting them to "see" the magic feats focalised through his eyes ("*ego* […] *vidi*", 45).[110]

In the final lines, Tibullus introduces the *saga*'s rumoured possession of Medea's herbs and the ability to tame Hecate's dogs (53-54). "*dicitur*" (53) suggests a reflexive annotation complementing the introductory couplet, highlighting a combined allusion to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2.[111] Tibullus 1.2.53 echoes the Vergilian witch's possession of Pontic materials (*Eclogue* 8.95) and Simaetha's request for herbs as powerful as those of Medea, Circe, and Perimede (*Idyll* 2.15-16); in light of the hexameter, 1.2.54 evokes the silencing of the dogs following Hecate's dismissal at *Idyll* 2.35-36; these echoes of *Idyll* 2 perhaps encourage reading Tibullus' emphasis on the witch's singular skills ("*sola* […] | *sola*", 53-54) as associating

[109] For this relationship between 1.1 and 1.2: Bright 1978 pp. 133-148, Mutschler 1985 pp. 50 and 63-64, Lee-Stecum 1998 pp. 71 and 100; cf. Maltby 2002 pp. 50 and 153 for links between these elegies.

[110] Tibullus 1.2.45-54 enhances his demonstration of his poetic power through an ecphrasis of magic feats: the emphasis on sight and focalisation through the eyes of the narrator prompts the reader to visualise the scene (45); the present tense, sequential narration unfolds the scene "realistically"; the style and language — particularly the incantatory anaphora and the auditory vividness of *stridor* — complement the subject. Ecphrasis complements magic as a metaphor for poetic power, as it similarly works according to the perception of words exerting power over the minds and emotions of an audience. On ancient ecphrasis with particular emphasis on fiction and the imaginative participation of an audience: Webb 2009; Webb focuses on ecphrasis in rhetoric, but highlights the equal applicability of her discussion to poetic texts — on this point see, for example, Webb 2009 pp. 99-103 and 128-130. For Ovidian narratives of metamorphoses as ecphraseis of the text as a work of art: Hardie 2002 pp. 173-179; for the metafictional function of ecphrasis in the Greek novel cf. Webb 2009 p. 185: "Ekphraseis of all types of subjects, and not only those that present works of art, may therefore have a meta-fictional function […] causing the reader not only to reflect upon the nature of his or her experience of fiction but also […] making him or her *experience* in various ways the disjunction between the fictional world and reality". For the "musicality" of Tibullus' language in 1.2.45-54, which aids the visualisation of the magic powers: Wimmel 1983 pp. 86-88.

[111] Cf. Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 88: *dicitur* perhaps implies "the powers of lines 46-52 were heard of at second hand by the poet".

her primarily with Simaetha.[112] The *saga*'s alignment with Simaetha and Vergil's witch reinforces the association of her incantations with poetry, colouring both as deceptive and hopeless for aiding love. Maltby's interpretation of "*tenere*" (53) as "understands" makes the Tibullan lover's declaration of his *saga*'s proficiency doubly ironic: neither Simaetha nor Alphesiboeus' witch understand Medea's inappropriateness for their love-magic; the Tibullan lover fails to appreciate their error and misinterprets both witches as models for his successful enchantment of Delia.[113] His re-formulation of the Theocritean lines betrays the tendentiousness of his catalogue and his misreading of his model: though claiming the witch's mastery of Medea's herbs and Hecate's hounds attempts to heighten her power, Tibullus' narrator selects two elements from *Idyll* 2 which reveal Simaetha's shortcomings in magic and poetry, foreshadowing his inability to convince Delia through his elegy.

These echoes of *Idyll* 2 also make the curious introduction of the witch as "*verax*" more pointed: we noted in our discussion of Theocritus' text that Simaetha highlights honesty, including her own, in her unsuccessful appeal to Selene, betraying her disingenuousness in her attempt to influence her addressee. Tibullus' description of his *saga* as *verax* imports this irony into 1.2 — stressing his witch's honesty aims to increase Delia's faith in her magic; re-read in light of her association with Simaetha at 53-54, "*verax*" casts further doubt on her trustworthiness and capacity for deception.[114] Recalling Simaetha's emphasis on truthfulness also reflects back on Tibullus as a narrator, suggesting that he is replicating Simaetha's devices for influencing Selene to persuade Delia to help him gain entry: "*verax*" also evokes Simaetha's use of pointed adjectives and literary allusions to guide Selene's response to her narrative, with *Idyll* 2 now employed as the model.[115] Tibullus' adoption of Simaetha's narrative techniques now aligns him with Theocritus' witch, reinforcing his untrustworthiness and capacity for deceit with an amatory

[112] Murgatroyd 1980 p. 87 highlights "*sola* […] *sola*" as emphasising the witch's singular abilities.
[113] Maltby 2002 p. 169; Putnam 1973 p. 68 emphasises *tenere* as "regulate" or "hold".
[114] Putnam 1973 p. 66 and Maltby 2002 p. 166 note the rarity of *verax* in elegy; Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 87 suggests that "*verax saga*" may be read as "a contradiction in terms", especially (p. 87 n. 46) considering the untrustworthiness of witches like Medea or Circe.
[115] Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 90 highlights that the success of Tibullus' spell depends on Delia. The etymological association between Delia and Selene underlines their analogous positions as targets of deceit. For Delia's association with Luna, and Hecate, through Diana: Bright 1978 pp. 112-113.

goal — perhaps confirming our suspicions about his *saga*'s existence — and foreshadowing his failure to deceive and enchant Delia.

Tibullus returns to *Eclogue* 8 to explicate his self-deception: after warning Delia that he is the only lover the spell will conceal ("*tu tamen abstineas aliis, nam cetera cernet | omnia, de me uno sentient ille nihil*", 59-60), the narrator questions what he should believe and relates the witch's spell to cure his infatuation:

> *quid credam? nempe haec eadem se dixit amores*
> *cantibus aut herbis soluere posse meos,*
> *et me lustravit taedis, et nocte serena*
> *concidit ad magicos hostia pulla deos.*
> *non ego totus abesset amor sed mutuus esset*
> *orabam, nec te posse carere velim.*

(Tibullus 1.2.61-66)

"*quid credam*" (61) echoes the scepticism of magic at *Eclogue* 8.108 ("*credimus?*"), as in Propertius 1.1.19-24 ("*crediderim*", 24).[116] The question is placed strategically: following the lover's reports of the *saga*'s magic and his prohibition against Delia using it with his rivals, it implies his disbelief — raised by the preceding warning (59-60) — in magic and poetry and in Delia's fidelity; at the same time, it proleptically undermines belief in the lover's cure.[117] The ritual (63-64) parallels Tibullus' imagined offerings to the Lares at 1.1.21-22 ("*tunc vitula innumeros lustrabat caesa iuvencos, | nunc agna exigui est hostia parva soli*"), continuing the revelations of Tibullus' creation of elegiac fantasies and the witch as an extension of his poetry.[118] The *saga*'s previous association with Simaetha destabilises her ability to heal Tibullus' love and heightens the fruitlessness of his prayer for Delia's reciprocal affection (65-66), a further attempt at love-magic which, following his scepticism, illustrates the extent of his self-deception. It also exposes Tibullus' misleading of his audience about his relationship with Delia:

[116] Commentators debate the reading of "*quid credam*", offering "*quin credam*" as an alternative. On *quid credam*: Lee 1990 p. 118; cf. Wimmel 1983 pp. 38-39. For *quin credam*: Maltby 2002 p. 171. Wimmel 1983 p. 38 n. 60 compares "*quid credam?*" with Propertius 1.1.24 ("*crediderim*").
[117] For the lover's doubt in magic and words: Putnam 1973 p. 69. For the lover's doubt in magic: Smith 1978 p. 223. For Delia's suspect fidelity: Wimmel 1983 p. 39; cf. Bright 1978 p. 143. Conversely, Tupet 1976 p. 343, Murgatroyd 1980 p. 88 and Maltby 2002 p. 171.
[118] Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 92 notes that 1.2.63-64 echoes 1.2.21-22.

as Lee-Stecum notes, Tibullus' prayer admits of his one-sided affection, jarring with the impression of reciprocal-but-obstructed love so-far maintained.[119]

Tibullus' extended treatment of magic develops the motif into a performance of his elegiac capabilities: he creates an erotodidactic *saga* in his own image who, almost as a forerunner of the developed *lenae* Acanthis and Dipsas in Propertius 4.5 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8, is a counterpart of the poet with a role in constructing the *puella* — she, like Tibullus, will teach Delia to deceive.[120] Ovid *Amores* 1.8 in particular supports this reading of our Tibullan passage: in the opening frame of the elegy (5-18), Ovid lists Dipsas' magic powers, illustrating her rhetorical skills ("*nec tamen eloquio lingua nocente caret*", 20) in anticipation of her monologue (23-108) which characterises her as an elegiac poet and narrator in Ovid's image; Ovid hints at their affinity in the closing frame of the poem ("*vox erat in cursu, cum me mea prodidit umbra*", 109).[121] Dipsas' powers closely draw on those of the Tibullan *saga* at 1.2.45-54: *Amores* 1.8.9-10 ("*cum voluit, toto glomerantur nubila caelo;* | *cum voluit, puro fulget in orbe dies*") replicates the anaphora of Tibullus 1.2.51-52 ("*cum libet* [...] | *cum libet*"), and the *saga*'s meteorological powers; Dipsas' ability to extract blood from the stars ("*sanguine, si qua fides, stillantia sidera vidi*", 11) echoes Tibullus' "[…] *sidera vidi*" (1.2.45) in the same metrical position; the *lena*'s necromantic skill ("*evocat antiquis proavos atavosque sepulcris* | *et solidam longo carmine findit humum*", 17-18) also corresponds with that of the Tibullan witch: "*haec cantu finditque solum manesque sepulcris* | *elicit*" (47-48).[122] Ovid's close engagement with the Tibullan passage suggests that he, too, identified a metapoetic subtext to the *saga*'s powers, and that he drew on this model to characterise his own love-elegy in a recognised imagery, programmatically aligning his poetry with the Latin elegiac tradition — we will explore Ovid's development of this use of

[119] Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 92 suggests that 1.2.66 undermines the reader's trust in Tibullus and proposes that Tibullus' "self-delusion" motivated his earlier presentation of the relationship.
[120] This identification is reinforced in Tibullus 1.6.9-10, where the narrator tells Delia's husband that he taught her to deceive her guard: "*ipse miser docui quo posset ludere pacto* | *custodes*". On the metapoetic role of the elegiac *lena*: Myers 1996 pp. 1-21 and O'Neill 1998 pp. 63-64.
[121] For *Amores* 1.8.5-18 representing Dipsas' rhetoric: Gross 1996 pp. 197-198 and Myers 1996 pp. 9-10; cf. Kratins 1963 pp. 154-155. For Dipsas' monologue echoing the Ovidian love-narrator's words in the *Amores* and later erotodidactic elegies: Kratins 1963 p. 157, Sharrock 1994 pp. 85-86, Gross 1996 pp. 197-206, and Bontyes 2008b pp. 372-374; cf. Stapleton 1996 pp. 19-20. For *Amores* 1.8.109 highlighting Dipsas as Ovid's "shadow or counterpart": Sharrock 1994 p. 85; cf. Suter 1989 pp. 16-17, Stapleton 1996 p. 20 and Hardie 2002 pp. 1-2.
[122] McKeown 1989 p. 204: *Amores* 1.8.5-20 is "influenced particularly" by Tibullus 1.2.45-54; Thill 1979 pp. 323-333 and Bonytes 2008b pp. 367-371, citing the above parallels, emphasise the correspondence between these two passages.

magic in Chapter 2.[123] Commentators note that Dipsas' powers correspond with those which Ovid attributes to his elegies in *Amores* 2.1.21-28, a passage which retrospectively cements the metaliterary affinity between the lover-poet and the *lena*; for the reader approaching *Amores* 1.8 sequentially, the evocation of Tibullus 1.2.45-54 allusively alerts them to the equation between Ovid's elegiac rhetoric and the magic which he attributes to Dipsas.[124]

The catalogue of the witch's powers in Tibullus 1.2, in addition to sketching an avatar of the poet and lover through the interaction with literary models, illustrates Tibullus' poetic ability to inspire marvellous sights in his audience's imaginations, influencing them into "seeing" the sights he witnessed whilst his interaction with his Vergilian and Theocritean models maintains the failure of elegy within its fictional world. Tibullus 1.8, to which we turn next, offers a second example of the poet's evocation of these models to activate a metapoetic subtext to the motif of magic.

Tibullus 1.8

In 1.8, the narrator plays *praeceptor amoris* to Marathus, a *puer-delicatus*-turned-elegiac-lover, and his beloved, Pholoe, who spurns Marathus for an older man. The narrator emphasises his expertise in love: he does not need divination to recognise a secret affair; Venus bound and flogged him until she educated him thoroughly (1-6). Marathus should stop pretending and admit his infatuation (7-8). Tibullus warns that cultivating his appearance is futile — a girl's beauty pleases without cosmetics — (9-16) and offers magic as a reason for Marathus' passion (17-22). Nevertheless, Tibullus admits, there is little point in blaming witchcraft — beauty does not need magic, physical contact enchants alone (25-26). Tibullus asks Pholoe to be kind to Marathus: she should demand gifts from a *canus amator* but appreciate the boy's priceless youth (28-34). Venus enables clandestine affairs (35-38) and Pholoe should pursue love before youth and beauty pass and old age leaves her alone with her jewels (39-48); she should spare the lovesick Marathus (49-52). Tibullus illustrates Marathus' distress by reporting his

[123] On the "thematic importance" of *Amores* 1.8: Gross 1996 p. 119.
[124] On *Amores* 1.8.5-20 and *Amores* 2.1.21-28: Suter 1989 p. 17 and Myers 1996 p. 10; for an alternative interpretation of Ovid's presentation of his elegy as magic, and of the connection between these passages, cf. Tupet 1976 pp. 385-386 and Bontyes 2008b pp. 374-375.

lament in direct speech (55-66), then tells the boy to curb his tears as Pholoe will not be broken (67-68). He concludes by warning Pholoe against pride, illustrating its consequences with Marathus' own plight — he once mocked and spurned lovers but now hates pride and locked doors; Pholoe, too, will suffer if her arrogance continues (69-78).

Scholarship offers two interpretations of the Tibullan narrator's role and motives in 1.8. The traditional reading is that the narrator attempts to facilitate Marathus' affair with Pholoe despite his love for the *puer*.[125] Bulloch and Booth, on the other hand, interpret him as acting on Marathus' behalf only superficially while attempting to regain the boy as his beloved.[126] I suggest that the early introduction of magic supports the latter reading. The favourable comparison of Pholoe's attractiveness with witchcraft appears to admit its strength; nevertheless, lexical associations between the effects of magic and beauty slyly equate the two, detracting from Pholoe's natural charms and implying that Marathus' infatuation is the product of dangerous enchantment.[127] If Tibullus can convince Marathus that his passion is false and that Pholoe is attempting to manipulate him, Tibullus will be able to persuade the *puer* away from his new infatuation and back to himself.[128] 1.8.19-22 reveals Tibullus' intentions towards Marathus by alluding to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69-71 to cast 1.8 as a love-spell to draw back an unfaithful beloved. The Vergilian witch's failure adumbrates Tibullus', proven in 1.9 when Pholoe and Marathus are together and sharing Pholoe's *canus amator*; the catalogue also suggests that Tibullus' strategy of discrediting Pholoe through magic aims to persuade himself that Marathus' heterosexual infatuation is false.[129] Nikoloutsos reads Tibullus' curse against Marathus in 1.9.1-16 as a prayer for revenge after his attempt to win him back in 1.8 failed; this reinforces my reading of 1.8.19-22, balancing the first attempt at enchantment with a vengeful curse motivated by Tibullus'

[125] Bright 1978 pp. 242-247, Cairns 1979 pp. 147-151, Murgatroyd 1980 pp. 233-254, McGann 1983 p. 1996. Cairns 1979 pp. 148-149 discusses the effect which equating Marathus with his homonym in 1.4 has for reading 1.8.
[126] Bulloch 1973 pp. 88-89, Booth 1996 pp. 232-247 (esp. 233-240); cf. Nikoloutsos 2007 p. 78.
[127] We expand on the connection of magic with Pholoe's beauty in Chapter 3.
[128] Bulloch 1973 p. 88 suggests that 1.8.17-26 provides "a generous explanation for Marathus' infatuation", removing his responsibility for it, before "the more damaging conclusion that physical pleasure was the cause"; McGann 1983 p. 1988 interprets the magic as revealing Tibullus' "amused malice" at Marathus' situation.
[129] Booth 1996 pp. 240-243 reads 1.9 as cementing Tibullus' unsuccessful persuasions of Marathus and Pholoe; for the inter-relationship of 1.8 and 1.9 cf. Murgatroyd 1977 pp. 117-118, Bright 1978 pp. 249-250, Cairns 1979 pp. 151-153, Lee-Stecum 1998 pp. 247-248, and Verstraete 2005 p. 306.

realisation of his poetic failure.[130] Exploring Tibullus' engagement with his Vergilian model will clarify these suggestions.

Tibullus associates magic most immediately with Pholoe's beauty: his assertion of the girl's natural attractiveness introduces the theme ("*illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore | nec nitidum tarda compserit arte caput*", 15-16) and he follows it by admitting the enchantments of physical contact. This connection is an important element of 1.8, and one we will explore in Chapter 3; for now, our focus is the list of the powers of incantation at the heart of the passage:

num te carminibus num te pallentibus herbis
devovit tacito tempore noctis anus ?
cantus vicinis fruges traducit ab agris,
cantus et iratae detinet anguis iter,
cantus et e curru Lunam deducere temptat,
et faceret si non aera repulsa sonent.
quid queror heu misero carmen nocuisse, quid herbas?
forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis;
sed corpus tetigisse nocet, sed longa dedisse
oscula sed femori conservisse femur.

(Tibullus 1.8.17-26)

Lines 19-22 allude to *Eclogue* 8.69-71: the anaphora of "*cantus*" replicates that of "*carmina*" in the Vergilian catalogue; the feats combine those found in *Eclogue* 8.69-71 — controlling snakes and drawing down the moon — and 97-99, the enchantment of crops across fields.[131] The recollection of Vergil's catalogue synecdochically equates 1.8 with the love-spell to retrieve Daphnis; the detail of bronze influencing the moon (22) similarly aligns the elegy with Simaetha's magic in *Idyll* 2. At this point in 1.8, no addressee has been specified; the evocation of Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2 suggests that there is a beloved whom Tibullus targets with his persuasions, allusively supplementing the narrative in keeping with the gradual revelation of information.[132] The allusion to Vergil's poem also evokes the fantasies lovers create for themselves, raising the possibility that the narrator is attempting to persuade himself as much as Marathus that magic is behind the boy's passion.[133] The background of both models foreshadows the failure of Tibullus' elegiac love-magic; by referencing Simaetha's mistaken

[130] Nikoloutsos 2011 pp. 29-33.
[131] Tupet 1976 p. 345 notes the correspondence between Tibullus 1.8.19-21 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69-71.
[132] On the gradual revelation of information in 1.8: Bright 1978 pp. 240-248 and Cairns 1979 pp. 137-143 and 147-151; cf. Lee-Stecum 1998 pp. 227-245.
[133] For the possibility that the narrator is "deluded" about the power of magic here cf. Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 232.

desire for Thestylis to sound the bronze (1.8.22), Tibullus acknowledges the limitations of his narrator and his love-spell and the possibility of a physical counter-effect — in this case, the power of beauty — creating humour and irony as he continues his elegy for a further fifty lines.

We can reinforce this reading of 1.8.19-26 by looking back to the elegy's first reference to magic, which also evokes *Eclogue* 8:

> *ipsa Venus magico religatum bracchia nodo*
> *perdocuit, multis non sine verberibus.*
>
> (Tibullus 1.8.5-6)

"*Venus magico* [...] *nodo*" (5) echoes *Eclogue* 8.77-78 ("*necte tribus nodis* […] | *necte, Amarylli, modo et* '*Veneris*' *dic* '*vincula necto*'"); "*ipsa Venus* [...] | *perdocuit*" (5-6) also evokes *Eclogue* 8.47 ("*saevus Amor docuit* […]") in a manner similar to the *exemplum* of Medea educated by Amor which we met in Propertius 1.1.4-6.[134] Tibullus' combined allusion to both halves of *Eclogue* 8 is underlined by a reference to the opening lines of Callimachus' tale of Acontius and Cydippe at *Aetia* 3 (fr. 67.1-3 Pf.), which begins by saying that Eros taught Acontius the art by which to win Cydippe, and which Vergil also incorporates into Damon's song.[135] Booth interprets this Callimachean echo as signalling that the "supposedly detached Tibullus […] will be manipulating the situation in his own amatory interest"; this, together with Tibullus' allusions to *Eclogue* 8, anticipates the expansion of magical seduction and deception at 1.8.19-22.[136] The evocation of *Eclogue* 8.77-78 ("*necte* […] | *necte* […] *necto*") also foreshadows the metapoetic aspect of 1.8.19-22; in light of the later lines and the idea of magical and poetic failure in Vergil's poem, Tibullus 1.8.5-6 suggests that Venus has educated the narrator in enchanting elegiac poetry, further underlining the impression of his duplicity and the unlikelihood of his amatory success through his verses.

---

[134] For Tibullus 1.8.5 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8.78: Putnam 1973 p. 128, Tupet 1976 p. 344, Smith 1978 p. 342, and Maltby 2002 p. 304.
[135] Bulloch 1973 pp. 77 and 80 identifies Tibullus' allusion to the opening of Callimachus *Aetia* 3. For *Eclogue* 8: Kenney 1983 pp. 46-48 and 54-58.
[136] Booth 1996 pp. 239-240. Tibullus here follows the arrangement and use of Vergil *Eclogue* 8 we outlined in Propertius 1.1: an oblique reference to magic in the opening lines of the elegy developed explicitly later in the poem. Cairns 1979 p. 140 notes that Tibullus 1.8.19-22 expands the magic in 1.8.5-6; Fauth 1980 pp. 276-277 suggests that Tibullus 1.8.5-6 styles Venus as a witch to foreshadow love-magic and the "internal" magic of beauty at 1.8.23-26.

Tibullus' adaptation of Vergil's lines transforms his suggestion that Pholoe magically enchanted Marathus into a poetic spell which reveals his continuing attraction to the boy and his intentions towards him; by adumbrating the futility of his poetry and motives at this point Tibullus infuses the following lines with irony. We return to 1.8 in Chapter 3, where we will explore Tibullus' association of Pholoe's beauty with witchcraft.

Propertius 2.28

Propertius 2.28.35-38, our final text in this chapter, evokes the Vergilian and Theocritean models, signalling a metapoetic dimension to the list of magic rites which the narrator attempts and allusively reinforcing his attempt to seduce, rather than to heal, his mistress; rather than implying the ineffectiveness of his enchantment by echoing *Eclogue* 8.69-71, Propertius inverts his models, narrating the failure of his poetic magic and revealing his deception of himself and his extratextual readers in the process. Propertius also contrasts his narrator's failing *magicum carmen* with a *sacrum carmen* which he will dedicate to Jupiter; while the latter is usually read as successful, we can suggest that it is little different from his *magicum carmen* and destined to be equally ineffectual in love. Commentators debate the unity and theme of Propertius 2.28. These questions have implications for the presence and analysis of love-magic in the poem; as such, it will be helpful to summarise 2.28 and to review the differing interpretations of its theme and unity before we consider the magic more closely.

Propertius asks Jupiter to pity his afflicted beloved, warning him that he will be to blame if she dies; though he firstly suggests that the season's heat endangers his *puella*, Propertius soon reveals that it is her perjury and repeated disrespect for the gods (5-8). Propertius suggests to his beloved that insulting Venus, Athena and Juno and Athena with her arrogance in her beauty harms her (9-14) but assures her that immortality will compensate for her suffering as it did for Io, Ino, Andromeda, Callisto, and Semele: one day, she will warn Semele of beauty's hazards and will take first place among Homer's heroines (15-30). Nevertheless, Propertius encourages his mistress that Juno will pardon her as even Jupiter's wife cannot see such a girl perish (33-34). At this point, Propertius describes the failed magic rites (35-38); the dark omen concluding these

lines introduces his journey into the Underworld with his beloved (39-42). After asserting their joint fate, Propertius renews his appeal to Jupiter, promising him a *sacrum carmen* crediting him with the girl's salvation: she will sit at Jupiter's feet and tell him her trials (43-46). Propertius begs Persephone and her husband to be merciful as there is enough beauty in the Underworld already — attractiveness does not last and death is inevitable (47-58). In the final lines, Propertius advises his beloved to repay Diana and Isis, formerly Io, once she is free from danger — ten votive nights which will continue to keep them apart (60-62).[137]

Several editors — following the manuscript N which begins a second elegy at 2.28.35, the introduction of magic — divide 2.28 into either a pair or a cycle of three poems. The dominant view, however, is that 2.28 is a unified elegy with a gradually unfolding situation in the style of a mime, with key words and motifs connecting sections of the narrative and illuminating its central theme.[138] Commentators traditionally read this theme as the *puella*'s literal illness; this leads them to interpret the magic as healing or purificatory to explain its presence.[139] Hubbard proposes an alternative reading of 2.28 which several scholars supplement: the *puella*'s implied sickness results from an affair with Jupiter which has caused her to perjure her oaths to Propertius and has attracted Juno's vengeance.[140] The recurring motifs which unite the elegy support this interpretation: the ambiguous "medical" language ("*affectae*", 1; "*periculum*", 15, 27, 46, 59; "*saucia*", 31; "*salva*", 44); Jupiter's prominent connection with the *puella*'s welfare (1 and 44); her disregard for the gods (6) and her perjury (7-8) as the causes of her illness; the emphasis on

[137] Alessi 1985 p. 40 suggests this irony in 2.28.60-62; cf. Lefèvre 1966 p. 146 and Fedeli 2005 pp. 782-783 and 816.

[138] For the unity of 2.28: Godolphin 1934 pp. 65-66, White 1958 pp. 254-261, Enk 1962b pp. 349-350, Hubbard 1974 pp. 47-58, Richardson 1977 pp. 290-291, Yardley 1977 pp. 394-395, Williams 1980 pp. 140-144, Heyworth 1984 p. 403**,** Alessi 1985 pp. 39-48, Goold 1990, and Fedeli 2005 pp. 779-781. Butler and Barber 1933 p. 238 and Rothstein 1966 p. 386 divide 2.28 into three related elegies, Camps 1967 p. 186 into two, with the second beginning at line 35; Davis 1977 pp. 51-64 argues that 2.28 forms a dramatic pair, beginning 2.28b at line 35. Murgia 2000 pp. 235-236 divides 2.28 into two poems, beginning 2.28b at line 47. For Propertius' unifying techniques: Hubbard 1974 pp. 57-58; cf. White 1958 p. 254 and Williams 1980 pp. 140-144.

[139] For the *puella*'s literal illness: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 238, Godolphin 1934 pp. 65-66, Rose 1955 pp. 167 and 172**,** White 1958 pp. 254-261 (esp. 255), Rothstein 1966 p. 386, Camps 1967 pp. 186-193, Davis 1977 pp. 51-64, Williams 1980 pp. 140-144, Heyworth 1984 p. 403 and Heyworth 2007b pp. 236-236. For the magic as healing: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 240, Enk 1962b pp. 359-362, Camps 1967 p. 190, Fauth 1999 p. 142 and Heyworth 2007b p. 236.

[140] Hubbard 1974 pp. 53-57, supplemented by Whitaker 1983 pp. 100-104, Alessi 1985 pp. 39-48 and Fedeli 2005 pp. 782-783.

her beauty (2, 27, 49, 50, 51, 53, 57);[141] the catalogue of heroines loved by Jupiter and punished by Juno (17-28) and the *puella*'s close relationship with Semele (27-28); the recurrence of Io and her transformation into a cow (18 and 61), Jupiter's ploy to prove to Juno that he had not seduced the girl and which first established lovers' vows as worthless.[142]

Acknowledging the amatory theme of 2.28 clarifies the presence of love-magic in the narrative. Exploring the effect of Propertius' allusions to Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8 in this section, to which we turn shortly, can add new evidence to supplement this reading of the poem; they also complement the *puella*'s infidelity and perjury, as Simaetha and Alphesiboeus' witch undertook magic in response to their beloveds' faithlessness.[143] The *puella*'s illness is still central to this amatory reading — Yardley suggests that 2.28 draws on the myth of Acontius and Cydippe in Callimachus *Aetia* 3, where Cydippe's violation of her vow to marry Acontius causes her recurring sickness.[144] We can suggest that incorporating this tale allows Propertius to talk about his mistress' perjury and affair with Jupiter while idealising their relationship by offering a reason for their estrangement; recalling a tale where amatory perjury causes physical illness, however, destabilises the *puella*'s fidelity through the device which her lover employs to preserve it, and this in turn has ramifications for the narrator's reliability and the effectiveness of his *carmina*.

The *puella*'s perjury is tied with Jupiter's presence in 2.28; this connection will recur when we discuss the poet's *carmina*, so it is worth pausing to comment on it here. I suggest that

[141] On beauty as a unifying thread: Whitaker 1983 p. 101 and p. 101 n. 39 and Fedeli 2005 p. 780.
[142] For the heroines at 2.28.17-28: Butler and Barber 1933 pp. 239-240, Hubbard 1974 p. 54, Davis 1977 p. 58, Williams 1980 pp. 142-143, Whitaker 1983 pp. 102-103, and Alessi 1985 p. 43. Alessi 1985 p. 47 notes that Io unites 2.28 and comments on Jupiter's attraction to her, but not in connection with lovers' specious vows. Tibullus 1.4.23 alludes to Io in connection with Jupiter and amatory oaths: Smith 1978 pp. 270-271, Murgatroyd 1980 pp. 139-140, and Maltby 2002 pp. 221-222.
[143] Rose 1955 pp. 168-173 recognises that the rites are amatory, but suggests that 2.28.35-38 must be a fragment of Propertius' otherwise lost response to Vergil *Eclogue* 8 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2; cf. Yardley 1977 p. 395 n. 1. Hubbard 1974 pp. 55-56 suggests that the magic is antaphrodisiac; Alessi 1985 pp. 41 and 44 emphasises that the magic is amatory, citing (p. 44 n. 22) Theocritus *Idyll* 2 as the "*locus classicus* of the magical rites for an aphrodisiac". Cf. Papanghelis 1987 p. 157 n. 28 who associates Propertius 4.7 with Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8 through "the repossession of the straying or oblivious lover." Tupet 1976 p. 360 and Fedeli 2005 pp. 800-802 alternatively stress the failure of the magic as being an inauspicious omen.
[144] Yardley 1977 p. 401; cf. Fedeli 2005 p. 783. Reminiscences of 2.9.25-28 — Propertius recalling that he prayed for Cynthia's health when she lay sick and on the verge of the river Styx — aid the impression of the girl's sickness in 2.28; cf. Goold 1990 p. 147.

Propertius presents Jupiter in an ironically double role: as an amatory rival and as the god who ensures that lovers' vows are worthless and that breaking them goes unpunished. Both roles are indicated in 2.28.8 ("*quidquid iurarunt, ventus et unda rapit*"), which alludes jointly to Catullus 70.3-4 ("*dicit: sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti | in vento et rapido scribere oportet aqua*") and Tibullus 1.4.21-22 ("[…] *Veneris periuria venti | irrita per terras et freta summa ferunt*"), two lines which occur alongside references to Jupiter's amatory roles. In Catullus 70.1-2, the narrator says that Lesbia would wed him rather than Jupiter ("*nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle | quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat*"); in Tibullus 1.4.23-24, Priapus thanks Jupiter for ensuring that lover's oaths are meaningless ("*gratia magna Iovi: vetuit pater ipse valere, | iurasset cupide quidquid ineptus amor*").[145] Propertius' combined allusion reveals Jupiter's twin roles in our elegy: the Catullan context introduces Jupiter's function as Propertius' rival for his *puella*'s love; the Tibullan lines illustrate his involvement with lovers' vows. The introduction of these dual roles at the beginning of 2.28 establishes the irony of Propertius' appeals to Jupiter: the god whom Propertius petitions to protect his beloved from punishment for her perjury is the very god who has already guaranteed her safety by ensuring the worthlessness of amatory oaths; the same deity is also the rival whom the *puella* has attracted and whose attentions she can safely enjoy thanks to his protection of perjurous lovers. This also weakens the lover's suggestion of his mistress' sickness — if her vows are worthless, why would violating them affect her? — and indicates that the situation of 2.28 is not entirely as he presents it to his extratextual readers, demonstrating his desire to idealise his beloved and betraying his untrustworthiness as a narrator. We may even suggest that Propertius' introduction of Jupiter as a rival attempts to fool himself and his readers by casting a successful mortal rival as king of the heavens; this perhaps plays on Catullus 51.1 ("*ille mi par esse deo videtur*"), in light of the allusion to Catullus 70.3-4 at 2.28.8.

[145] Alessi 1985 p. 42 notes the context of Catullus 70.3-4, arguing that Propertius expands this epigram to develop Jupiter as an amatory threat. Fedeli 2005 p. 786 compares Propertius 2.28.8 with Tibullus 1.4.21-22 without commenting on Tibullus 1.4.23-24. Jupiter features as the lover's potential rival in Propertius 2.3: at 2.3.30, Propertius suggests that Cynthia's beauty will make her the first Roman girl to attract Jupiter ("*Romana accumbes prima puella Iovi*"). Jupiter is associated with punishing perjury in Propertius 2.16: at 2.16.16, the narrator addresses Jupiter when his beloved leaves him for a rich praetor ("*Iuppiter, indigna merce puella perit*"), later warning the *puella* that Jupiter punishes perfidious girls ("*non semper placidus periuros ridet amantes | Iuppiter* […] *periuras tunc ille solet punire puellas*", 47-53). Hubbard 1974 p. 54 and Alessi 1985 p. 43 compare Jupiter in 2.28 with Propertius 2.3.

These suggestions about Jupiter's roles are connected with the powers of magic and poetry, particularly Propertius' *sacrum carmen* which we will explore after first considering the magic.

Propertius introduces magic towards the end of his first address to his *puella*:

> *deficiunt magico torti sub carmine rhombi,*
> *et tacet exstincto laurus adusta foco;*
> *et iam Luna negat totiens descendere caelo,*
> *nigraque funestum concinit omen avis.*

(Propertius 2.28.35-38)

The lover's *rhombus* (35) corresponds with Simaetha's, spun to attract Delphis to her door (*Idyll* 2.29-30); the charred and silent laurel replicates that burnt by Simaetha and by Vergil's witch to arouse passion in their beloveds (*Idyll* 2.23-26; *Eclogue* 8.82-83), also echoing Propertius 1.1.20 ("*focis*").[146] The emblematic enchantment of the moon evokes the power of *carmina* to influence it at *Eclogue* 8.69, alongside Simaetha's lament to Selene and Propertius 1.1.19.[147] These correspondences indicate that the love-magic the elegiac narrator uses to win back his *puella* symbolises his poetry, and Propertius signposts this in the opening adaptation of *Idyll* 2.29-30 ("*χὠς δινεῖθ᾽ ὅδε ῥόμβος* […] *ἐξ Ἀφροδίτας, | ὣς τῆνος δινοῖτο ποθ᾽ ἁμετέραισι θύραισιν*"), substituting song ("*magico* […] *sub carmine*", 35) for the agency of Aphrodite which turns Simaetha's *rhombus* (*Idyll* 2.29).[148] The present tense narration creates the impression that the lover's spells are failing as the lines are spoken or read, dramatising the powerlessness of his on-going elegy to convince his mistress to change her behaviour, end her

---

[146] For 2.28.35 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2.29-30: Rose 1955 pp. 168-169, Enk 1962b p. 359, Rothstein 1966 p. 391, Camps 1967 p. 190, and Heyworth 2007b p. 236. For 2.28.36, *Idyll* 2.23-26 and *Eclogue* 8.82-83: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 240, Rose 1955 pp. 170-171, Enk 1962b pp. 360-361, Gow 1950b p. 36, who suggests that both Propertius 2.28.36 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8.82-83 "seem dependent on T.", Camps 1967 p. 190; cf. Fedeli 2005 pp. 801-802. The reading "*tacet*" (2.28.36) is Carter's conjecture to replace the transmitted "*iacet*"; this reading underlines the association between 2.28.36 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2.24, which specifies the sound of the burning laurel. Fedeli 2005 and Heyworth 2007 adopt "*tacet*"; Butler and Barber 1933, Enk 1962a, Rothstein 1966, Camps 1967 and Richardson 1977 maintain "*iacet*"; for discussion: Enk 1962b pp. 360-361, Fedeli 2005 p. 801, and Heyworth 2007b p. 236.

[147] For Propertius 1.1.19 and 2.28.37: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 241, Enk 1962b p. 361 (also citing Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* 4.59), Rothstein 1966 p. 391, Camps 1967 p. 190 (also citing Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69), Richardson 1977 p. 291, Alessi 1985 p. 44, Heyworth 2007b pp. 236-237; cf. Fedeli 2005 p. 802.

[148] "*sub*" (35) vacillates between the senses of "to the accompaniment of" and "under the power of" here: Fedeli 2005 p. 801. This implies that Propertius' *carmen* lacks the power to turn the *rhombus* and evokes the commands to incantations in the refrains of Theocritus *Idyll* 2.1-64 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109.

affair with Jupiter and return to him.[149] The love-magic clarifies the amatory theme after the ambiguity of the previous lines, dramatising the narrator's waning deception of himself and of his audience about his beloved's sickness and about their relationship.

The verbal echoes which unify 2.28 add to this reading. 2.28.35-38 recalls the beginning of the poem, particularly the description of *puella*'s condition in the narrator's opening appeal to Jupiter (1-8): the charred laurel ("*adusta*", 36) balances the scorching heat ("*torridus*", 3); the moon's refusal to descend (37) parallels "*caeli*" (5) and echoes the *puella*'s habitual disrespect for the gods ("*quam totiens sanctos non habuisse deos*", 6); the moon's defiance replicates her insult to Pallas ("*Palladis aut oculos ausa negare bonos?*", 12). These connections reinforce Propertius' use of magic to influence his unfaithful beloved by linking his description of her with the moon as a target of magic *carmina*; following 1.1.19, 2.28.37 illustrates the powerlessness of Propertius' poetic composition by visualising the moon in the sky as usual.[150] These links between the *magicum carmen* and Propertius' first petition to Jupiter prepare for the relationship between this magic song and the *sacrum carmen* in his second appeal, which again concerns the god ironically as both the protector of perjurous lovers and Propertius' rival.

Propertius promises Jupiter a *sacrum carmen* in exchange for his beloved's welfare:

> *pro quibus optatis sacro me carmine damno:*
> *scribam ego "per magnum est salva puella Iovem";*
> *ante tuosque pedes illa ipsa operata sedebit,*
> *narrabitque sedens longa pericla sua.*

(Propertius 2.28.43-46)

The parallel "*sacro* [...] *carmine*" (43) and "*magico* […] *carmine*" (35) invites comparison between the two. Commentators who note this detail generally suggest that the *sacrum carmen* is successful in contrast to the futile *magicum carmen*.[151] I propose, alternatively, that Jupiter's roles as Propertius' rival and as the guarantor of the worthlessness of lover's vows, which we outlined above, indicate that Propertius' *sacrum* elegy is as futile and misguided as his magic

[149] Alessi 1985 p. 44 interprets "*tacet*", "*negat*", and "*concinit*" as "aorist".
[150] This corresponds to the description of *Remedia amoris* 249-260, which lists things which magic cannot do, as as "negative ekphrasis" by Gordon 2009 p. 219 n. 40.
[151] Richardson 1977 p. 292, Alessi 1985 pp. 44-45, and Novara 2000 pp. 35-41.

verses; the link between the beloved and elegiac poetry in 2.28.37 also opens a new perspective on the *puella* in lines 45-46.

We should begin by establishing what Propertius desires to obtain with his offering. Under the reading of the *puella*'s illness, Propertius thanks Jupiter for his mistress' health ("*salva*", 44). *salvus* can also signify that a legal defendant is "immune from punishment" or "safe": in keeping with the theme of perjury and Propertius' first appeal to Jupiter, we can suggest that he now asks the god to spare the *puella*'s punishment for violating her oaths.[152] Line 44 ("*per magnum* [...] *Iovem*") also parallels Tibullus 1.4.23: "*gratia magna Iovi* […]". As noted above, Tibullus' line expresses gratitude to Jupiter for ensuring that lovers' vows mean nothing; Propertius' second echo of this sentiment links his two addresses to the god, reinforcing our reading of his request. The echo also undermines the usefulness of Propertius' prayer and the premise of his mistress' sickness — as Jupiter already guarantees her protection, she suffers no illness, making Propertius' offering redundant.

The description of the *puella* in lines 45-46 suggests that Propertius' *sacrum carmen* is unlikely to improve his romantic situation. These lines follow Propertius' report of his *sacrum carmen* (44) and appear separate from this.[153] The future tenses ("*scribam*", 44; "*sedebit*", 45; "*narrabitque*", 46) and the anaphoric "*-que*" (45-46), however, indicate a continuation between 2.28.44 and the *puella*'s actions which suggests that she and the *pericula* she will relate are part of Propertius' offering, embodying the *sacrum carmen*. The girl's position at Jupiter's feet evokes Thetis' supplication of Zeus in *Iliad* 1.498-502 and 1.512-513.[154] Alessi highlights Zeus' passion for Thetis prior to the *Iliad* and the danger for Zeus if he conceived a child by her which led him to end their relationship, suggesting that Propertius paints his beloved as Thetis to foretell

[152] *OLD* s.v. *salvus* 3 and 4a; for comparable legal language in "*damno*" (43): Butler and Barber 1933 p. 241, Camps 1967 p. 192 and Fedeli 2005 p. 806.
[153] Butler and Barber 1933 p. 241 describe 2.28.44 as Propertius' "summary of the votive vows", with 2.28.45-46 reflecting "the custom to remain awhile in the temple" following an appeal or offering; Fedeli 2005 p. 807 interprets 2.28.44 as a *sacrum carmen* separate from 2.28, which is not the *carmen* offered to Jupiter.
[154] Hubbard 1974 p. 56, Alessi 1985 p. 45, and Fedeli 2005 pp. 807-808.

her platonic devotion to Jupiter and to warn of the risks of the affair.[155] We can extend this parallel: the *puella*'s alignment with Thetis casts Propertius' narrator as her mortal husband, Peleus, his appeal to Jupiter aiming to persuade the god to grant the union he desires between himself and his beloved. The recollection of Thetis' resistance to her marriage, a displeasure she voices in the *Iliad* (18.432-434), subverts the favourable outcome that the lover attempts to ensure and precludes his happiness with his mistress even if she should end her affair with Jupiter.[156] The lover's *sacrum carmen* illustrates his limitations as a narrator in a manner similar to that we traced in 2.4 and Tibullus 1.2; Propertius here heightens the irony of his narrator's ineptitude as he offers his *puella* to Jupiter as the song which he pledges to secure his own future happiness with her away from his rival. The portrait of the *puella* as Thetis also picks up Propertius' declaration that his beloved will be first among Homer's heroines: "*et tibi Maeonias omnis heroidas inter | primus erit nulla non tribuente locus*" (29-30). By fulfilling this promise, Propertius demonstrates to his extratextual audience the power of his *carmen*, which can immortalise the *puella* and make her an epic heroine in elegy: as the *puella* here embodies Propertius' poem, his ability to immortalise her ensures the immortality of his work and illustrates that while the lover's verses are powerless to influence his beloved, Propertius the poet is the equal of Homer.

Conclusion

From the very beginning of the genre, Augustan love-elegy adopts the imagery and formulation of magic as it appears in Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8, pastoral models in which love-magic dramatises poetic composition and its enchanting effects. Propertius' and

[155] Alessi 1985 p. 45. Propertius underlines this new relationship by contrasting the *puella*'s predicted fate ("*narrabitque sedens longa pericla sua*", 46) with that imagined earlier: "*narrabis Semelae, quo sit formosa periclo*" (27); cf. Davis 1977 p. 61, who notes the contrast between these lines.

[156] Murgatroyd 1980 p. 175 lists sources attesting Thetis' danger to the Olympians and necessary marriage to a mortal: see esp. Pindar *Isthmian* 8.27-48 and Apollodorus *Library* 3.13.5. For Thetis' resistance to Peleus and the unhappiness of the match: Pindar *Nemean* 3.35-36, Pindar *Nemean* 4.62-65, Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* 4.866-879, and Apollodorus *Library* 3.13.5. Cf. Godwin 1995 pp. 136-137 and Slatkin 1991 pp. 70-77. On Thetis' attitude at Homer *Iliad* 18.432-434: Slatkin 1991 pp. 55-56. Tibullus 1.5.45-46 — Tibullus' comparison of Delia to Thetis travelling to her wedding with Peleus, implicitly casting himself as Peleus — provides a parallel for this reading of Propertius 2.28.45-46. On Tibullus 1.5.45-46: Murgatroyd 1980 p. 175 and Maltby 2002 pp. 252-253.

Tibullus' allusions to these works alert their extratextual readers to metapoetic subtexts in the motif, synecdochically constructing individual elegies, and the genre as a whole, as enchanting love-spells but also as fraudulent: the elegists' claims to enchant their *puellae* through their poetry are as much a self-deluding *fallacia* as the witches' claims to draw down the moon from heaven. The elegists' abbreviations of these works, particularly in early, programmatic poems such as Propertius 1.1 and Tibullus 1.2, foreground key elements of love-elegy and its fictional narrative: deception, enchantment, and failed seduction; at the same time, magic draws attention to the poet's artistic power and to the fictitiousness of his work by undermining the realism of the elegiac world he has persuaded his audience to believe in and by illustrating the composition of the poetic text. Propertius' and Tibullus' swift introduction of magic and their engagement with these models through this motif indicates that it was integral to their generic self-definition and to the construction of their fictional homonyms, whose (self-) alignment with Simaetha and with Alphesiboeus' witch allusively develops their identity as witches. This intertextual dialogue also integrates pastoral elements into love-elegy, enriching the genre and, particularly through the metaphor of magic, underlining the illusoriness and literariness of the elegiac world. Looking beyond Propertius' and Tibullus' early collections, we can read the common features which elegiac magic takes on through its intertextual relationships with *Eclogue* 8 and *Idyll* 2 as the emergence of a distinctive means of characterising and speaking about love-elegy and its relationship to the wider literary tradition. Ovid's close engagement with his elegiac forerunners — especially with Tibullus 1.2.43-66 — in his introduction of magic in *Amores* 1.8.5-18 supports this interpretation, indicating that this form and imagery had already become a recognisable symbol of the genre; in Chapter 2 we explore the development and use of the motif in Ovid's later love-elegies.

Chapter 2. *Aeaea carmina*: Ovid's Magic Words

Ovid develops the association of magic with elegiac poetry. Beginning his poetic career when the genre was established in Rome, Ovid sees and reacts to it as a tradition which he continues as well as experimenting with and developing it.[1] As I highlighted in the introduction, Ovid's extant work displays a range of forms and genres; for the purposes of this study I limit my readings of Ovid's work to his amatory elegies in which love-magic features metapoetically — the *Amores*, single *Heroides*, *Medicamina faciei femineae*, *Ars amatoria* 2, and *Remedia amoris*; I touch on *Amores* 1.8 and *Ars amatoria* 2 only tangentially as scholars have treated magic in these works amply. In the present chapter, we explore love-magic in *Amores* 3.7 — a poem which dramatises Ovid's declining interest in love-elegy and his imminent departure to tragedy — before investigating Ovid's treatment of the motif in connection with Medea and her role as an elegiac *exemplum* in *Heroides* 6 and 12, and magic's metapoetic significance in *Remedia amoris*. The epistolary and didactic poems offer alternative perspectives on the elegiac genre and fictional world through narrators distinguished from the traditional male *ego*, creating an extra dimension of irony and humour as they play with, deconstruct and parody elegiac conventions, and develop and expand the generic boundaries more overtly than in the *Amores*. In these poems, magic engages closely with the form and imagery of the motif in earlier love-elegy; I suggest that by reading these correspondences through an intertextual lens we can interpret magic in Ovid's epistolary and didactic works as an emblematic "shorthand" for love-elegy, affirming their place in this genre as well as evoking the works in which magic previously appeared in order to cast a new light on its role there. Ovid's treatment of magic in these works also affirms the theme's fundamental affinity with love-elegy and its importance for the genre's construction. *Medicamina faciei femineae* displays a similar relationship with magic in earlier love-elegy; we

[1] For Ovid writing late in the Latin love-elegiac tradition: McKeown 1987 pp. 12-15, Sharrock 1994 pp. 3-4, and Boyd 1997 pp. 3-9. For the chronology of Ovid's love-elegies, including the difficulties with establishing relative priority and the problems this creates for interpretation: Jacobson 1974 pp. 300-318, McKeown 1987 pp. 74-89, and Boyd 2002 pp. 110-111.

will consider this work in the conclusion of the thesis as it will be most relevant after we have considered the connection of magic with the *puella*.

First of all, *Amores* 2.1, a poem which commentators frequently highlight as illustrating the characterisation of elegiac *carmina* as magic, offers an introduction to magic and poetry in Ovid which will be useful for our present chapter and as magic in this elegy continues the intergeneric dialogue with Vergilian pastoral it provides a useful transition from our readings in Chapter 1; we pause briefly on it here — focusing tightly on the passage of magic rather than treating the poem in depth — to highlight some of the themes and images which we will encounter in the following sections. The narrator, advertising his credentials as a love-poet to his young readership, remembers giving up his gigantomachy when his beloved locked him out (1-17); he dropped Jupiter and his thunderbolts and picked up his elegies — poetry praising a mistress' beauty is more useful for winning her than songs of the Trojan War (17-34) and Ovid now commands beautiful *puellae* to turn to the *carmina* Amor bids him compose (35-38). When Ovid resumes his elegiac *carmina*, he lists their magic powers in familiar terms:

> *blanditias elegosque leves, mea tela, resumpsi:*
> *mollierunt duras lenia verba fores.*
> *carmina sanguineae deducunt cornua lunae*
> *et revocant niveos solis euntis equos;*
> *carmine dissiliunt abruptis faucibus angues*
> *inque suos fontes versa recurrit aqua;*
> *carminibus cessere fores, insertaque posti,*
> *quamvis robur erat, carmine victa sera est.*

(Ovid *Amores* 2.1.21-28)

Commentators note that Ovid styles his elegies as magic and that this catalogue evokes the structure and content of Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69-71 and Tibullus 1.8.17-22; they do not develop these relationships to suggest that Ovid engages in an intertextual dialogue with these models and

uses magic to characterise his *carmina* within the tradition of love-elegy.[2] Ovid's allusions to his pastoral and elegiac predecessors underline the lexical connections between the powers of his flatteries and light elegies to open doors (21-22) and of the *carmina* he styles as magic (27-28) and present his verses as love-spells directed, internally, towards his beloved and the *puellae* he addresses in the final couplet (37-38) as well as towards his extratextual readers. The allusions to these models intertextually expand his elegy's characterisation as "*blanditiae*" and "*leves*" (21) — hinting that the lover and narrator is similarly deceitful — and forecasts its failure in love despite the skill he extols. The conflict between the foreshadowed failure to win over the beloved and Ovid's expressed confidence in his poetry indicates the narrator's self-deception through his verses: the end of 2.1 increases this conflict when Ovid apparently remains excluded from his beloved despite confidently commanding girls to turn to his *carmina*. His unsuccessful cajoling and threatening of the *ianitor*, Bagoas, in the *paraclausithyra* of *Amores* 2.2 and 3 dramatises the powerlessness of his elegy to persuade its fictional addressees.[3] Scholarship on the *Amores* reads 2.1 as a poem which, in the *Amores*' meta-narrative of Ovid's evolution into a love-elegist, presents him as a fully-fledged elegiac lover and poet;[4] under this reading, we can suggest that Ovid's presentation of his elegies as magic *carmina* in form and imagery familiar from his predecessors indicates that the motif had become recognisable as a generic marker of Latin love-elegy.

In *Amores* 3.7, love-magic is linked with Ovid's literary progression from elegy to tragedy — his *Medea* — a programmatic theme of *Amores* 3 which the narrator's encounter with the anthropomorphised Elegy and Tragedy in 3.1 establishes, and which culminates in Ovid

[2] For *Amores* 2.1.21-28 presenting elegies as magic *carmina*: Thill 1979 p. 331-332, Marioni 1981 pp. 33-34, Sharrock 1994 p. 64, Myers 1996 p. 10, Fauth 1999 p. 152; cf. Suter 1989 p. 17 who highlights the correspondence between Dipsas' magic powers (*Amores* 1.8.5-18) and *Amores* 2.1.21-28. For *Amores* 2.1.21-28 celebrating the powers of poetry without presenting them as magic *carmina*: Tupet 1976 pp. 385-386, Martirosova 1999 pp. 101-102 and Bontyes 2008b pp. 374-375. For *Amores* 2.1.21-28 evoking Vergil *Eclogue* 8.69-71: Thill 1979 p. 331, Tupet 1976 pp. 385-386, Booth 1991 p. 103, McKeown 1998 p. 17, Martirosova 1999 pp. 101-102, and Novara 2000 pp. 41-42. For *Amores* 2.1.21-28 and Tibullus 1.8.17-22: Thill 1979 p. 331, McKeown 1998 p. 17 and Fauth 1999 p. 152. Thill 1979 pp. 330-332 also highlights Propertius 1.9 as a key model for the Ovidian passage.

[3] For the end of *Amores* 2.1 and elegiac failure: Sharrock 1995 pp. 164-165. For *Amores* 2.2 and 2.3: Armstrong 2005 p. 168 n. 24. Booth 1991 p. 25 comments that Ovid shatters the idea of "magic" elegies by showing that they work by flattering girls. For *levis*: Putnam 1973 p. 60.

[4] For the *Amores* incorporating a narrative thread of Ovid's development as a love-elegist: Boyd 1997 pp. 132-164 and Booth 2009 pp. 74-75.

announcing his tragic project in 3.15.[5] Our discussion of *Amores* 3.7 also provides a foundation for reading *Heroides* 6 — magic in the earlier poem overlaps in a rare detail with Hypsipyle's claims that Medea captivated Jason with witchcraft, and I offer a new interpretation of this point which prepares for reading magic in *Heroides* 6 as a metapoetic reflection on elegy and as anticipating Ovid and Medea's transition to tragedy in *Heroides* 12. I firstly summarise *Amores* 3.7.

Useless Wood: *Amores* 3.7

Ovid recalls his impotence with a beautiful girl: despite their mutual desire and the girl's physical and verbal efforts to arouse him, Ovid's body remained slack and useless (1-16). He expresses his shame and recalls other girls he satisfied repeatedly (17-26) before considering whether magic caused his condition (27-36). Ovid praises the *puella*'s revitalising talents, lamenting his inability to enjoy her company and comparing his situation with Tantalus' (39-54), and describing her seductiveness as powerful enough to move oak, adamant or stone (55-60); he recalls the ways he imagined their liaison and curses his body's deceitful promises and the humiliation it caused (63-72). Ovid relates his *puella*'s failed attempts to stimulate him by hand and reports the outburst this final insult provoked: the girl sarcastically repeated his suggestion of magical enchantment before she accused him of exhausting himself elsewhere (73-80). She leapt from the bed, barefoot and tunic unbound, and covered the shame with water to prevent her maids from suspecting that anything was amiss (81-84).

Scholars read Ovid's impotence as commenting on elegy and as embodying his wavering dedication to the genre. Sharrock interprets Ovid's condition as dramatising "writer's block" and meditating on elegy's reliance on separation and frustrated desire for its production: Ovid relates his impotence in vocabulary connoting sexual and poetic activity and describes his beloved in terms which characterise her as an elegiac Muse. Sharrock also reads a poetic element

[5] See esp.: *Amores* 3.1.67-70 ("*exiguum vati concede, Tragoedia, tempus!* | *tu labor aeternus; quod petit illa, breve est"* | [...] *teneri properentur Amores,* | *dum vacat; a tergo grandium urguet opus*"); *Amores* 3.15.17-19 ("*corniger increpuit thyrso graviore Lyaeus:* | *pulsanda est magnis area maior equis* | *inbelles elegi, genialis Musa, valete*"). For Elegy and Tragedy in *Amores* 3.1 embodying their respective genres: Wyke 1989b pp. 113-143 (esp. 118-124).

in Ovid's suggestion of magical enchantment; we return to this when we consider the passage in question.[6] Keith similarly suggests that the *puella* embodies Ovid's poetry, interpreting her inability to arouse her lover as representing his waning interest in elegy and her final departure ("*decuit nudos proripuisse pedes*", 82) as signalling his imminent withdrawal from the genre.[7] These readings dovetail well: Ovid's impotence can at once express elegiac failure and his declining interest in the genre. My analysis of magic in *Amores* 3.7 adds to these interpretations by focusing on the practical rites at lines 29-30; I quote the passage in full and summarise Sharrock's metaliterary reading before expanding on my suggestion.

Magic is the first explanation the narrator offers for his impotence:

num me Thessalico languent devota veneno
corpora, num misero carmen et herba nocent,
sagave poenicea defixit nomina cera
et medium tenues in iecur egit acus?
carmine laesa Ceres sterilem vanescit in herbam,
deficiunt laesi carmine fontis aquae;
ilicibus glandes cantataque vitibus uva
dedicit et nullo poma movente fluunt.
quid vetat et nervos magicas torpere per artes?
forsitan impatiens fit latus inde meum,
huc pudor accessit facti: pudor ipse nocebat;
ille fuit vitii causa secunda mei.

(Ovid *Amores* 3.7.27-38)

Sharrock reads the catalogue of *carmina* (31-34) as reflecting elegiac failure, suggesting that it inverts *Amores* 2.1.23-28, Ovid's "more confident" list of poetry that is still unable to open his *puella*'s door. Sharrock also interprets poetic significance in *Amores* 3.7.35-36: echoing the *nervi* of *Amores* 1.1.18, which associate the elegiac couplet with the penis, "*nervos*" (35), "*torpere*" (35) and "*impatiens* […] *latus*" (36) indicate that Ovid's literary capacity is diminished as well as his sexual potency.[8] We can also draw on this parallel between *Amores* 3.7.31-34 and 2.1.23-28 to reinforce Keith's reading of Ovid's declining elegiac inspiration. Ovid attributes to his *puella*'s *blanditiae* ("*illa graves potuit quercus adamantaque durum | surdaque blanditiis*

[6] Sharrock 1995 pp. 152-180.
[7] Keith 1994 pp. 37-38. For alternative metapoetic readings of *Amores* 3.7: Armstrong 2005 pp. 40-43 and Hallett 2012 pp. 277-281; cf. Holzberg 2009 pp. 933-940, who highlights the possibility of a metapoetic reading without developing this further.
[8] On *Amores* 3.7.31-34: Sharrock 1995 pp. 164-165; cf. Hardie 2002 p. 242. On *Amores* 3.7.35-36: Sharrock 1995 pp. 172-174 and cf. 158-159. On *Amores* 1.1.18: Kennedy 1993 pp. 58-63 (esp. 59).

saxa movere suis", 3.7.57-58) powers similar to his own ("*blanditias elegosque leves*", 2.1.21) over the door: "*carminibus cessere fores, insertaque posti, | quamvis robur erat, carmine victa sera est*" (2.1.27-28). The previous representation of Ovid's *blanditiae* as magic suggests a connection between the *puella*'s flatteries and the harmful *carmina* in our passage, associating her attempts to arouse Ovid with the magical cause of his sexual and poetic impotence: elegy's detrimental effect on Ovid's literary prowess reflects his decreasing motivation to compose his *Amores*.[9]

I propose that the metaliterary implications of lines 31-37 invite a similar reading of the preceding couplet (29-30). The red wax of the suspected *defixio* parallels the colour of the wax on the writing-tablets which are the focus of *Amores* 1.11 and 12 ("*at tamquam minio penitus medicata rubebas:| ille color vere sanguinulentus erat*", 1.12.11-12), a pair of elegies which stage poetic composition, voice and limitation.[10] I suggest that we can build on this echo and read the colour of the wax at *Amores* 3.7.29 as alluding back to Ovid's earlier diptych, adding to the poetic associations of the magic by transforming the writing-tablets into a curse-tablet. Scholarship on *Amores* 3.7 and on ancient magic highlights the distinctiveness of the practices in lines 29-30: Ovid offers rare ancient testimony for wax curse-tablets and is unusual in specifying a colour; Faraone, approaching *Amores* 3.7.29 as testimony of magical practice, suggests that writing-tablets covered by red "gum lac" may explain the shade of Ovid's *defixio*.[11] Piercing a figurine (30) is virtually unique in extant literary representations of magic — it only otherwise occurs in *Heroides* 6.92.[12] As I hope to illustrate, Ovid's intratextual echo provides the key to interpreting these idiosyncrasies; it will be helpful to review *Amores* 1.11 and 12 before suggesting how they apply to our passage.

In *Amores* 1.11, the narrator entrusts his tablets — their wax inscribed with messages to his beloved ("*cetera fert blanda cera notata manu*", 14) — to the hairdresser, Nape, the perfect

[9] Cf. *Amores* 3.1.59 ("*prima tuae movi felicia semina mentis*"), Elegy's claim that she made the seeds of Ovid's mind fertile, which perhaps resonates in our passage.
[10] Hardie 2002 p. 242 notes this correspondence between *Amores* 1.12.11 and 3.7.29.
[11] Faraone 1991a p. 25 n. 30 and Ogden 1999 p. 11; cf. McKeown 1989 p. 329 for red writing-tablets.
[12] For piercing a figurine: Tupet 1976 p. 388 and Knox 1995 p. 190; wax and effigies are otherwise melted, manipulated and/or bound in Theocritus *Idyll* 2.28-29, Vergil *Eclogue* 8.80-81, Horace *Satires* 1.8.30-33 and 43-44 and Horace *Epode* 17.76.

person to convey them to his mistress, gauge her reaction, and persuade her to respond (1-22). The narrator hopes that the tablets will bring a favourable reply, for which he will dedicate them in Venus' shrine (23-28). In *Amores* 1.12 the tablets return with a rejection (1-2). The narrator admonishes Nape for tripping on the threshold as she left (4) and condemns the tablets: he accuses their wax and wood of impurity (7-22) and the tablets of being "*duplex*" in name and nature (27), finally cursing them to be eroded by old-age and their wax to become white with neglect (29-30).

Scholarship on this pair interprets the writing-tablets as representing the elegies which the lover uses to woo his *puella*, poetic raw material and/or the poet himself, and Nape as a metaliterary construct — either a substitute poet-figure or identified with the tablets to embody the elegiac text.[13] Roman interprets writing-tablets in Latin poetry as symbolising the material medium of poetic production, the loss of which the poet curses — as in Catullus 42 and 50 and Ovid *Amores* 1.12 — or laments — as in Propertius 3.23 — but which ironically enables him to demonstrate the capacity of his work and voice for survival independent of a written form; this irony underpins Sharrock's interpretation of *Amores* 3.7: though sexual and poetic impotence rendered the narrator physically unable to perform or compose, he still produces an elegy on his incapacitation.[14]

I suggest that the red wax of *Amores* 3.29 recalls the accursed tablets which embody the poet's elegies in the earlier diptych and that, through this allusion, Ovid combines the metapoetic devices of writing-tablets and magic, literalising the equation of poetic and magic *carmina* in the wax of his curse-tablet. We can identify further correspondences between *Amores* 3.7 and 1.11 and 12 which underline their thematic relationship and reinforce my interpretation. The narrator's remembered impotence in 3.7 enacts absence and failed seduction, analogising his body to the earlier writing-tablets: he characterises both as useless wood ("*truncus iners iacui, species et inutile pondus*", 3.7.15; "*inutile lignum*", 1.12.13) and compares his physical condition

[13] Henderson 1991 pp. 75-81, Fitzgerald 2000 pp. 60-62, Papaioannou 2006 pp. 51-54, Roman 2006 pp. 366-378 and Papaioannou 2008 pp. 105-122; for an alternative reading of the writing-tablets in *Amores* 1.11 and 12 as reflecting on their utility for "communication among the living and as commemorative votive offering": Lowrie 2009a pp. 196-199. Baker 1973 pp. 109-113 argues that the writing on the tablets conveys Ovid's elegies.

[14] Roman 2006 pp. 351-388. Sharrock 1995 pp. 155-156 and 162.

to the effects of hemlock-poisoning ("*tacta tamen veluti gelida mea membra cicuta | segnia propositum destituere meum*", 3.7.13-14), echoing his accusation against the wax of the ineffective writing-tablets ("*quam, puto, de longae collectam flore cicutae | melle sub infami Corsica misit apis*", 1.12.9-10).[15] The writing-tablets' duplicity ("*ergo ego vos rebus duplices pro nomine sensi*", 1.12.27), which mirrors that of elegy's illusory promises and of Ovid as poet and lover, resonates in *Amores* 3.7 when the narrator berates his penis for similarly betraying his trust ("*tu dominum fallis, per te deprensus inermis*", 71).[16] These evocations of the earlier diptych also tie with Keith's reading of *Amores* 3.7 as illustrating Ovid's departure from love-elegy: Roman suggests that allusions to Propertius 3.23 in *Amores* 1.11 and 12 intertextually foreshadow the conclusion of the *Amores*;[17] we can add that recalling this pair in a metapoetic context at the centre of *Amores* 3 bookends the collection, underlining its imminent end.[18]

Ovid's suggestion that the witch has pierced his liver with a needle (30) reinforces my interpretation of *Amores* 3.7.29. The liver was believed to be the seat of the emotions, particularly sexual passion, in Greco-Roman culture, making it an appropriate spot for disabling a love-poet.[19] Additionally, Hardie notes that the *acus* (30) plays on a love-poet's stylus.[20] In light of the allusion to *Amores* 1.11 and 12 in line 29, we can read the *acus* as writing Ovid's harmful elegies, whose power the following catalogue details (31-34).

Towards the end of *Amores* 3.7, the *puella* witheringly reiterates the suggestion of magical involvement and proposes an alternative cause of Ovid's impotence:

> *'quid me ludis?' ait 'quis te, male sane, iubebat*
> *invitum nostro ponere membra toro?*
> *aut te traiectis Aeaea venefica lanis*
> *devovet, aut alio lassus amore venis.'*
>
> (Ovid *Amores* 3.7.77-80)

[15] Wood symbolises "literary raw material" to be crafted and shaped and to bear the poet's words: Roman 2006 p. 352. The echo of *Amores* 1.12.9-10 in *Amores* 3.7.13-14 underlines that the *puella*'s sweet elegiac *blanditiae* now harm Ovid physically and poetically.
[16] On the duplicity of Ovid and his writing-tablets: Roman 2006 pp. 366 and 374.
[17] Roman 2006 pp. 375-376.
[18] Keith 1994 p. 38 reads a similar reversal of Corinna's entrance in *Amores* 1.5 ("*ecce, Corinna venit, tunica velata recincta*", 9) in the *puella*'s departure at *Amores* 3.7.81 ("*nec mora, disiluit tunica velata soluta*"); cf. Cahoon 1988 pp. 302-303.
[19] For the liver as the seat of desire: Ingallina 1977 pp. 132-134.
[20] Hardie 2002 p. 242.

The *puella* introduces a new detail: an "*Aeaea venefica*" (79). *Aeaea*, an epithet for Medea and applied to Ovidian elegy at *Amores* 1.8.5 ("*Aeaeaque carmina*"), gains additional significance in *Amores* 3 where Ovid's switch from elegy to his *Medea* is a dominant concern.[21] The epithet can cut both ways here: following the implication that elegiac *carmina* no longer inspire Ovid (27-38), the girl's suggestion ironically admits that her enchanting *blanditiae* are causing his impotence; her accusation also implies that Ovid has been bewitched by his tragic *Medea*, with her realistic explanation (80) suggesting that he has been two-timing her with his new literary endeavour.

The *puella*'s introduction of the Aeaean witch maintains the metapoetic element of the magic in *Amores* 3.7, evoking Medea in her epic, tragic, and elegiac roles in connection with Ovid's amatory and literary activities elsewhere. Both passages in our poem resonate in *Heroides* 6: our interpretation of *Amores* 3.7.29-30 will reinforce the metapoetic reading I offer of Hypsipyle's allegations against Medea and raise the possibility of the Lemnian queen's letter becoming an elegiac writing-tablet bearing a potent prayer which will impel Medea and Ovid towards tragedy; on this note, we turn to the *Heroides*. I give a general introduction to the collection and its relationship to previous love-elegy before considering 6 and 12.

Sealed with a Curse: *Heroides* 6 and 12

The single *Heroides* cast mythological heroines as elegiac lovers and poets composing letters to male beloveds. The metre, the close focus on the first-person narrator's relationship and emotions, the subordination of all other concerns to love, and the generic motifs and vocabulary threading through the epistles characterise them as elegiac.[22] The heroines differ from the

[21] For the applicability of *Aeaea* to Medea: McKeown 1989 p. 205. Knox 1995 p. 175 comments that Hypsipyle's description of Medea as a "*barbara* [...] *venefica*" (*Heroides* 6.19) mirrors *Amores* 3.7.79.

[22] Barchiesi 2001b pp. 31-32; Rosati 1992 pp. 77-85 and 93-94, and Spoth 1992 *passim*; cf. Anderson 1973 pp. 65 and 69-70. Lindheim 2003 pp. 15-35 explores the combination of elegiac and epistolary genres in the *Heroides*. On the heroines in the *Heroides* as female elegiac lover-narrators: Rosati 1992 pp. 77-94, Fulkerson 2005 *passim*; cf. Boyd 2002 p. 96. On Hypsipyle, Medea and the other heroines as "models for the figure of the poet": Fulkerson 2005 pp. 145-146.

generic elegiac *ego*, a fictional male lover homonymous with the extratextual poet: as female narrators with independent literary histories in epic and tragedy they are clearly distinguished from the poet Ovid. The mythological narratives distance the epistles from elegy's contemporary Roman setting, placing them in a more overtly fictional environment chronologically prior to Latin love-elegy.[23] The letters are also set in or alongside specific epic or tragic literary texts which provide their narrative and character background; the elegies supply the extratextual reader with clues to their chronological position within or in relation to these texts.[24] This is usually at a critical point in the narrative, a gap in the text into which Ovid inserts an elegy which has no influence over the outcome of events but which alters the audience's perception of the narrative and of the heroine by presenting her first-person, love-driven perspective; the contrast between the heroine's limited point of view and the information available to readers familiar with the background-texts of her letter creates irony and tension in the elegy.[25] The letters also influence the audience's perception of the elegiac genre by reworking its conventions and motifs in new contexts: the female narrators embody the "feminine" posture of the male lover; the tragic and epic mythological narratives and locations provide the potential for literalising elegiac metaphors and motifs such as *servitium* and *militia amoris* and, most relevant for us, magic.[26] The majority of the heroines are mythological *exempla* in earlier elegy: the *Heroides* expand these characters into lovers and narrators enacting the situations and metaphors they previously illustrated in the contexts of their epic and tragic narratives, offering new, often ironic and frequently funny, views on the elegiac genre and on the male narrator and his employment of the heroines as *exempla*.[27]

[23] For fictional and literary historical chronology in the *Heroides*: Kennedy 2002 pp. 226-227.
[24] For the single *Heroides* indicating their position in specific literary texts: Kennedy 1984 pp. 416-422.
[25] Barchiesi 2001b pp. 30-31. This powerlessness in love enhances the letters' affiliation with elegy. For the heroines' letters as powerful and effective poetry as they augment their narratives: Fulkerson 2005 *passim*.
[26] For the heroines created externally to Latin love-elegy and allowing distanced portraits of the elegiac relationship: Barchiesi 2001b pp. 33-34. For the heroines embodying the "feminine" aspect of the male elegiac *persona*: Rosati 1992 pp. 84-85 and 93-94 and Spoth 1992 pp. 59-62. For the *Heroides* literalising elegiac metaphors and motifs: Spoth 1992 pp. 130-136; cf. Rosati 1992 p. 79 for elegiac conventions becoming dramatic reality in the *Heroides*.
[27] Barchiesi 2001b pp. 34-39 and 42; Spoth 1992 pp. 135-154, esp. 135-142.

We focus on *Heroides* 6 and 12, the letters of Hypsipyle and Medea to Jason, in which love-magic is most prominent.[28] These epistles engage in a close intratextual dialogue: in addition to sharing an addressee, they are set against the same literary texts and echo one another in the themes and content of their narratives, in the heroines' self-presentation and character progression, and in specific lexical points which create the impression of a dynamic relationship between them.[29] I offer some background to the letters and to their relationship which is relevant for our discussion before I introduce their use of magic; after this, we treat each poem individually in greater detail, beginning with *Heroides* 6.

Heroides 6 and 12 unfold against Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* and Euripides' *Medea.* Hypsipyle's letter picks up from the end of the epic: her narrative encompasses her relationship with Jason in *Argonautica* 1 and his adventures on Colchis in *Argonautica* 3 — focusing on his illicit affair with Medea — and foreshadows Medea's tragedy at the conclusion of Euripides' play.[30] *Heroides* 12 is poised on the brink of Euripides' drama and likely Ovid's lost *Medea*: the heroine recalls her love for Jason against the events of *Argonautica* 3 and their aftermath until Jason's new wedding, which passes her house as she writes; as her letter

[28] *Heroides* 9.143-144 ("[…] *scribenti nuntia venit | fama virum tunicae tabe perire meae*") mentions the poison Deianira sent to Hercules as a love-philtre; this seems to be a narrative detail of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, the background text for *Heroides* 9, rather than commenting on elegiac *carmina*. Alternatively: Fulkerson 2005 pp. 116-119.

[29] Verducci 1985 pp. 56-81, Hinds 1993 pp. 27-34, Bessone 1997a p. 18 and *passim*, Bloch 2000 pp. 197-209, Jolivet 2001 pp. 278-283, Lindheim 2003 pp. 114-133, Fulkerson 2005 pp. 43-55.

[30] For *Heroides* 6 and Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*: Winsor 1963 pp. 384-395, Jacobson 1974 pp. 95-97, Leigh 1997 pp. 605-607, Bloch 2000 p. 199, Fulkerson 2005 pp. 41-42, and Drinkwater 2007 pp. 380-381. For Euripides' *Medea*: Jacobson 1974 pp. 102-103 and Leigh 1997 pp. 605-607. *Heroides* 6.151-164 also correspond with Hypsipyle's fate, exiled from Lemnos after her countrywomen discover that she saved her father during the massacre of the island's men; the possibility remains that Ovid drew on Euripides' *Hypsipyle*: Fulkerson 2005 pp. 41-42; cf. Bloch 2000 p. 204.

progresses, she foreshadows her revenge against her husband and his young bride.[31] Each woman presents the events of the *Argonautica* through the elegiac lens of her passion for Jason and its concomitant emotions: fear and hatred of a rival (6.81-82, 95-108, 127 and 149; 12.178-182), betrayal and anger (6.41, 146; 12.91-92, 119-120, 207-210) at Jason's deceit and infidelity (6.63, 109-110; 12.12, 19, 72). Each offers herself to Jason as a slave or suppliant (6.118; 12.185), and recalls her labours on his behalf to compare herself favourably with her replacement and persuade him to return (6.55, 73-74, and 129-138; 12.53 and *passim*).

With the aim of influencing Jason's present actions, the heroines alter details of the epic narrative, illustrating the facility for verbal deception which characterises each woman in the *Argonautica*: Apollonius' Hypsipyle uses artful, persuasive words ("*μύθοισι* […] *αἱμυλίοισιν*", 1.792), despite assuring Jason that she will be honest ("*κακότητα δὲ πᾶσαν | ἐξερέω νημερτές*", 796-797), to conceal the massacre of the Lemnian men and to persuade the Argonauts to help repopulate the island; Medea speaks deceitfully to her sister (3.686-692) and to her handmaidens (3.902-911), and plots to betray her father by helping Jason (3.741-743) and to ensnare Apsyrtus ("*μέγαν δόλον*", 4.421). Medea's false speech is also associated with magic in the epic: as we noted in Chapter 1, the Moon describes her incantations as deceitful ("*δολίησιν ἀοιδαῖς*", 4.59); Medea enhances the beguiling power of her untruthful message for Apsyrtus with drugs whose powers match those of Orpheus' poetry ("*τοῖα παραιφαμένη θελκτήρια φάρμακ' ἔπασσεν | αἰθέρι καὶ πνοιῇσι, τά κεν καὶ ἄπωθεν ἐόντα | ἄγριον*

[31] For Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, Euripides' *Medea* and *Heroides* 12: Anderson 1896 pp. 93-130, Jacobson 1974 pp. 109-110, Bessone 1997a pp. 19-23 and *passim*, Fulkerson 2005 p. 42. For the relationship between *Heroides* 12 and Ovid's *Medea*: Knox 1986 pp. 209-215, Hinds 1993 pp. 34-43, and Bessone 1997a pp. 14-19 and 21-22 n. 27. For the relative chronology of Ovid's tragedy and the *Heroides*: Jacobson 1974 p. 316, Bessone 1997a p. 15 n. 9 and p. 34 n. 64 and Heinze 1997 pp. 21-24; cf. McKeown 1987 pp. 86-89. Commentators contest the authenticity of *Heroides* 12: the predominant view favours Ovidian authorship while noting that the elegy's literary merits and close relationship with *Heroides* 6 encourage reading a dialogue between the poems even if the authenticity of *Heroides* 12 remains undecided — for arguments in favour of Ovidian authorship: Heinze 1991-1993 pp. 94-97, Hinds 1993 pp. 9-47, Bessone 1997a pp. 18-19 with n. 17, Heinze 1997 pp. 51-55, Landolfi 2000 pp. 123-161 (esp. 123-124, 129, 132-133 and 148-149), Lindheim 2003 pp. 124-125, and Fulkerson 2005 p. 43; against Ovidian authorship: Knox 1986 pp. 207-223, cf. Tarrant 1981 p. 152 n. 39.

ἠλιβάτοιο κατ' οὔρεος ἤγαγε θῆρα", 4.442-444).[32] In the *Heroides*, this capacity for deceit, particularly linked with magic, aligns Hypsipyle and Medea with the male elegiac narrators and their poetry. As we saw in our reading of Propertius 1.1.19-24, Argus' list of the capabilities of Medea's drugs (*Argonautica* 3.531-533) and the Moon's recollection of Medea's deceitful spells (4.59-60) resonate in the powers of Propertius' poetry, characterising elegiac *carmina* as false and incapable of successfully influencing love, and the lover-narrator as fallible and untrustworthy with a dormant potential for bitter vengeance. The heroines' self-represented credulity ("*credula res amor est* […]", 6.21; "*puellae | simplicis*", 12.89-90 and "*tu fraudis poenas, credulitatis ego*", 120) underlines this resemblance: the male lover claims "*credulitas*" and "*simplicitas*" for himself, as well as finding these qualities attractive in a *puella*.[33] The lover is neither as gullible nor as artless as he claims: his credulity is the carefully contrived result of his self-delusions about his mistress and their relationship and a part of his calculated appeal to his beloved's pity or blame for her treatment of him, making it an element in — and ironically highlighting — his deceit and persuasion.

Medea's magic is central to the heroines' attempts to influence Jason in the *Heroides*. Hypsipyle claims that Medea captured Jason with love-magic — charming and subduing him as she did Aeetes' bulls and the snake guarding the Fleece ("*scilicet ut tauros, ita te iuga ferre coegit | quaque feros anguis, te quoque mulcet ope*", 6.97-98) — and lists her powers and activities (83-94); the Lemnian queen ends her letter by demanding that Jupiter punish Medea for

[32] For Hypsipyle's deceit and *Argonautica* 1.792: Levin 1971 pp. 75-78, George 1972 pp. 58-59, Beye 1982 p. 91, Pavlock 1990 pp. 47-48, Clauss 1993 pp. 131-135 and Clare 2002 pp. 270-271. Commentators on *Heroides* 6 generally de-emphasise Hypsipyle's guile in the *Argonautica*, instead focusing on her divergence in the elegy from her "traditional" gentleness and piety: Jacobson 1974 p. 106, Verducci 1985 pp. 61-62, Jolivet 2001 p. 280; cf. Fulkerson 2005 pp. 53-54. For Medea's speech and enchantment in the *Argonautica*, particularly 4.442-444: Hunter 1993 pp. 144-145 and 59-60 and Clare 2002 pp. 252-253; cf. Albis 1996 pp. 81-89 for a metaliterary reading of Medea's magic.

[33] For *simplex* (*Heroides* 12.90) indicating Medea's revision of her character: Cecchin 1997 p. 75 and Lindheim 2003 pp. 130-131, and cf. Töchterle 1998 p. 163; Jacobson 1974 p. 118 notes that Medea's self-presentation as *simplex* is unique in the *Heroides*. For the elegiac lover's credulity: Propertius 1.15.34 ("[…] *saepe mihi credita perfidia est*"); 2.25.21-22 ("*tu quoque qui pleno fastus assumis amore, | credule, nulla diu femina pondus habet*"); Tibullus 1.9.37-38 ("*quin etiam flebas, at non ego fallere doctus | tergebam umentes credulus usque genas*"); Ovid *Amores* 1.3.13-14 ("*et nulli cessura fides, sine crimine mores | nudaque simplicitas purpureusque pudor*"); *Amores* 2.9.43 ("*me modo decipiant voces fallacis amicae*"); *Amores* 2.11.53-54 ("*omnia pro veris credam, sint ficta licebit: | cur ego non votis blandiar ipse meis?*"); *Amores* 3.14.30 ("*et liceat stulta credulitate frui*").

her amatory crime (151-164). Medea presents her magic undertakings as the *labores* which saved Jason's life and earned his love; inverting her predecessor's claim, she laments her powerlessness to influence Jason's love or her own with witchcraft (12.163-172): "*serpentes igitur potui taurosque furentes, | unum non potui perdomuisse virum*" (163-164). Commentators highlight *Heroides* 6.83-94 and 12.163-172 as a point of dialogue between the epistles — Medea refuting Hyspipyle's charges — and as echoing magic in prior love-elegy; an element of these earlier passages which remains unremarked in scholarship is their metapoetic function.[34] Fulkerson's recent study of the *Heroides* does highlight the prominence of magic in connection with elegy, commenting that the heroines are "inextricably linked to the supernatural […because] they write *carmina*" and suggesting that some of the women associate themselves with magic to enhance their status as poets: "magic […] may be read metonymically for the women's desire to assert authorial control". Fulkerson's consideration of magic and poetry in the *Heroides* focuses primarily on the letters of Deianaira (9) and Laodamia (13); she also suggests that Medea may have "ghostwritten" magic into these epistles or that Hypsipyle's curse may ricochet into them after hitting *Heroides* 12.[35] Fulkerson focuses on the collection's intratextual relationships, however, and omits the letters' contact with specific passages of magic, or Medea's place, in earlier love-elegy.

We approach magic in *Heroides* 6 and 12 intertextually: building on our investigations in Chapter 1, I hope to offer a new reading of the motif in these epistles as a commentary on the male lovers' characterisation of their elegy as magic associated with Medea. Each letter independently comments on the connection of Medea's magic with love-elegy; their dialogue intensifies the irony of this connection by offering distinct but complementary perspectives on it: in the mythological world of the *Heroides*, Medea is Hypsipyle's amatory rival in *Heroides* 6 and

[34] For *Heroides* 12.163-172 answering 6.83-94: Bessone 1997a pp. 221-222, Cecchin 1997 pp. 78-81, Bloch 2000 pp. 200-202, Landolfi 2000 p. 133 and Fulkerson 2005 p. 50; cf. Lindheim 2003 pp. 131-132. Heinze 1997 p. 194, without suggesting that the passages are in dialogue. For *Heroides* 6.83-94 echoing magic in earlier love-elegy: Michalopoulos 2004 pp. 102-110; for 12.163-172: Bessone 1997a pp. 220-221.

[35] For magic and "authorial control": Fulkerson 2005 p. 111. On *Heroides* 9 and 13: Fulkerson 2005 pp. 111-121; cf. Fulkerson 2002 pp. 61-87 on *Heroides* 13. Fulkerson 2005 pp. 55-66 interprets similar interpenetration between Medea, Hypsipyle and Oenone's prophecy for Paris' future in *Heroides* 5 and her inability to cure love. I read *Heroides* 5, by contrast, as emphasising Oenone's medical skills rather than love-magic, balancing Medea's powerless to control love with witchcraft by treating the motif of love as an incurable disease.

an elegiac lover in *Heroides* 12, roles which dramatise the ironies of her presence as an *exemplum* for the power of elegiac love-poetry and the character and amatory experience of the narrator. *Heroides* 6 presents the elegiac lover's inapposite connection of Medea with seductive love-magic and elegy when Hypsipyle accuses the witch of successfully enchanting Jason with poetry before revealing her own employment of an elegiac spell; *Heroides* 12 explicates and reflects back on Medea in elegy and on Hypsipyle and her accusations when the witch asserts the powerlessness of her love-magic while demonstrating her poetry's ineffectiveness on her beloved.[36]

This reading supplements scholarship which notes metaliterary aspects of the letters. Commentators highlight the tension between tragedy and elegy in Medea's epistle, which comes to the fore when she characterises her elegiac supplication of Jason (183-206) as words "too small" for her spirit ("*animis* […] *verba minora meis*", 184) and in her closing lines (207-212) when she anticipates her revenge on her husband and Creusa.[37] Tragic language in lines 207-212 coupled with allusions to a Propertian comment on generic elevation (2.34.65-66) and Ovid's programmatic statements of his progression from elegy to tragedy in *Amores* 3.1 and 3.15 create the impression that Medea is leaving elegy for her tragic text; Barchiesi and Bessone suggest that *Heroides* 12.211 presents Medea as a tragic poet as well as a dramatic character.[38] Reading a metapoetic element to Medea's magic in *Heroides* 12 which amplifies her status as a negative *exemplum* for elegiac poetry enhances the strain between genres in her letter; alongside the echoes of *Amores* 3.1 and 3.15, Medea's move from elegy to drama parallels Ovid's transition from elegy to his *Medea* in *Amores* 3. *Heroides* 6 ends with Hypsipyle imagining taking violent revenge on Medea as if she were the witch herself ("*Medeae Medea forem!* […]", 151) and praying to Jupiter for her rival's punishment (151-164), detailing the events of Euripides' *Medea*

[36] For *Heroides* 6 introducing a third perspective on Medea and her myth: Jacobson 1974 pp. 108, Verducci 1985 pp. 64-66 and 80-81, and Bloch 2000 p. 204; cf. Cecchin 1997 pp. 180-181.
[37] On *Heroides* 12.184 as programmatic: Bessone 1997a pp. 30-31; cf. Barchiesi 1993 p. 343.
[38] On *Heroides* 12.207-212 metapoetically foreshadowing Medea's tragedy: Barchiesi 1993 pp. 343-345, Bessone 1997a pp. 32-41. On tragic vocabulary in *Heroides* 12.207-212: Knox 1986 pp. 209-214, Barchiesi 1993 pp. 343-344, Hinds 1993 pp. 34-43, and Töchterle 1998 pp. 167-168. On *Heroides* 12.212 ("*nescioquid certe mens mea maius agit*"), Propertius 2.34.65-66 ("*cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai! | nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*"), *Amores* 3.1.24, 3.1.69-70, and 3.15.17-18: Spoth 1992 pp. 203-204, Barchiesi 1993 pp. 344-345, Hinds 1993 pp. 42-43, Bessone 1997a pp. 33-34, and Töchterle 1998 pp. 167-168. For Medea as a tragic poet: Barchiesi 1993 p. 343 and Bessone 1997a pp. 37-39.

which begin unfolding in *Heroides* 12; commentators highlight this thread between the letters, suggesting that Hypsipyle's curse can be read as "causing" Medea's later life and advancing her towards her tragic text.[39] Identifying a metapoetic element in *Heroides* 6.83-94 adds to this transition — in her description of her rival's powers, Hypsipyle presents her as an elegiac poet before outlining her tragic identity in lines 151-164, prefiguring Medea's development in *Heroides* 12. With this background, we can now treat each work separately: I begin with *Heroides* 6, offering an overview of the letter and then focusing on the role which magic plays in its narrative.

Heroides 6

Hypsipyle congratulates Jason on reaching Thessaly with the Golden Fleece; she complains that he did not send the letter she deserved but let rumour and a messenger convey news of his deeds on Colchis and of the *barbara venefica* who has replaced her in his bed (1-40). Hypispyle contrasts her legitimate marriage to Jason with his clandestine affair with Medea and recalls the Argonauts' stay on Lemnos: Jason remained for two years before he was dragged away, bidding her farewell with tears and false promises of fidelity (40-72); she offered prayers and vows for his safety — now that Medea will benefit, she is loath to fulfil them (73-78). Medea could not have won Jason by beauty or merits — she must have used love-magic, enchanting him like the beasts on Colchis (83-104). Hypsipyle demands to be Jason's wife again, stressing her lineage and offering him her kingdom, and reveals that she has borne twins; she had planned to send them to Jason but fear of Medea prevented her (109-128). Hypsipyle contrasts her filial loyalty and patriotism with Medea's treachery, reiterating that witchcraft caused Jason's infidelity (129-138). The queen now understands how passion provoked the Lemnian massacre and she imagines what she would have done if the guilty pair had drifted to Lemnos: her gentleness would have spared Jason; her mercilessness towards Medea would have matched Medea's own (139-150). Hypsipyle petitions Jupiter to make Medea suffer the injuries she perpetrated against others, finally damning the marriage-bed the witch shares with Jason (151-164).

[39] Bloch 2000 pp. 207-209, Jolivet 2001 pp. 279-283 and Fulkerson 2005 pp. 50 and 53-54.

Hypsipyle's claims that Medea bewitched Jason function logically in persuading the hero to leave his new wife:[40] her emphasis on Medea's negative love-magic — which dominates men ("*scilicet ut tauros, ita te iuga ferre coegit | quaque feros anguis, te quoque mulcet ope*", 97-98) rather than inspiring true affection — contrasts with her genuine love and the pious services ("*preces castas*", 73) she undertook to protect Jason, implanting the suspicion that his passion for the witch is false while presenting herself favourably. As the queen's letter progresses, her situation and character grow to parallel Medea's until she imagines becoming her rival — "*Medeae Medea forem*" (151) — and turns to the magic she had condemned. Commentators read Hypsipyle's curse (151-164) as completing her identification with and transformation into Medea, either, as Lindheim and Fulkerson suggest, to enhance her attractiveness for Jason or, as Verducci argues, showing her real character — her "suppressed […] potential for vindictive rage and hatred" behind her affected gentleness and decency.[41] These three interpretations all focus on Hypsipyle altering her self-presentation and adapting the truth to win Jason with words and on the connection of these strategies with magic: we can develop these common factors by approaching magic in *Heroides* 6 from its intertextual dialogue with prior Latin love-elegy and by highlighting parallels with Greco-Roman magic to suggest an alternative reading of Hypsipyle's relationship with witchcraft over her poem.

As we have noted, *Heroides* 6.83-94 draws on passages in love-elegy where magic functions metapoetically, indicating that Hypsipyle styles Medea as an elegiac poet whose *carmina* bewitched Jason; her connection of Medea's *carmina* with magic associates her own poem with witchcraft, revealing that she is composing a spell to enchant her beloved — these correspondences destabilise Hypsipyle's claims about her rival and her self-presentation, and foreground the irony of Medea's generic association with elegiac love-magic. Hypsipyle's appeal to Jupiter (151-164), which introduces a second internal addressee of her letter, evokes prayers for justice in Greco-Roman magic which require validation for the target's punishment.

[40] Cf. Michalopoulos 2004 pp. 101 and 110.
[41] Lindheim 2003 pp. 114-124 and 133 and Fulkerson 2005 pp. 47-54. Verducci 1985 pp. 63-66; cf. Winsor 1963 pp. 393-395. On Hypsipyle's character-progression and identification with Medea cf. Jacobson 1974 pp. 102-106, Bloch 2000 pp. 202-203, and Jolivet 2001 p. 281.

While the majority of the punishments Hypsipyle requests match Medea's crimes and anticipate her tragic future, Medea's sabotage of Hypsipyle's marriage with love-magic is unique to the queen's letter. Verbal links associate Hypsipyle's prayer with her rival's amatory magic: I suggest that Hypsipyle's fabricated claims are part of her spell, legitimating her magic and persuading Jupiter to fulfil her prayer by heightening the justice of Medea's punishment and her own innocence. Hypsipyle's false allegations also parallel *diabolaí* ("slander-spells") where the practitioner maligns their target before a god to persuade the deity to punish them; the two extended examples of *diabolaí* in the *PGM*, IV.2441-2621 and VI.2622-2707, are primarily *agōgai* spells though VI.2622-2707 can be adapted to other ends, including targeting enemies ("*ἀγαιρεῖ ἐχθροὺς μεταστρέφον|τός σου τὸν λόγον*", 2625-2626). It is characteristic of *diabolaí* that the contrived accusations and blasphemies relate the practitioner's actions, making both, as Winkler observes, "a version of [the performer's] own truth" — this chimes with Verducci's interpretation that Hypsipyle's Medea is "a figment of what she, Hypsipyle, is".[42] Under this reading, Hypsipyle is engaging in poetic magic against Jason and Medea throughout her letter, deceiving and enchanting her beloved, extratextual readers and divine addressee with poetry to ensure her successful seduction of Jason or, failing this, her vengeance against Medea. Propertius 4.5 furnishes an elegiac parallel for the *diabolē*: the lover accuses the *lena*, Acanthis, of targeting him with magic and catalogues her powers (5-18), presenting himself as his *amica*'s husband and unjustly victimised by Acanthis' witchcraft ("*posset ut intentos astu caecare maritos,* | *cornicum immeritas eruit ungue genas*", 15-16); Acanthis' monologue, however, mentions no magic. In the elegy's final frame, Propertius sacrifices doves to Venus and describes Acanthis' death (65-74), actions which, O'Neill argues, reveal the narrator as the true practitioner of magic: his false accusations against Acanthis aim to gain Venus' support for his spell as in a *diabolē*, though Acanthis' monologue reveals the tendentiousness of his allegations and characterise him as deceitful, vicious and petty.[43] We consider each passage in *Heroides* 6 sequentially. Two allusions to earlier elegies which signal that Hypsipyle is misleading her

[42] On *diabolaí*: Eitrem 1924 pp. 50-52; cf. Versnel 1999 p. 147. Winkler 1991 p. 228. Verducci 1985 p. 65; cf. Jacobson 1974 p. 99 n. 12 and Cecchin 1997 p. 78. For *diabolaí* in extant curse-tablets: *DT* 295 (a non-amatory *defixio*) and 188 (a non-amatory *defixio* from possibly the fourth century BC). On *DT* 295: Versnel 1991 p. 95 n. 23 and Versnel 1998 p. 147 n. 71; on *DT* 188: Jordan 1994 p. 123 and pp. 123-124 n. 22.

[43] O'Neill 1998 pp. 61-73. Just as Acanthis' monologue contradicts Propertius' accusations, Medea's literary history and *Heroides* 12 refute Hypsipyle's claims.

audiences and which alert us to her knowledge of magic, preparing us for reading lines 83-94 as part of her spell, precede this section; it will be useful to consider these first.

After relating the Argonauts' departure, Hypsipyle recalls her prayers for Jason's safety:

adde preces castas immixtaque vota timori,
nunc quoque te salvo persolvenda mihi.
vota ego persolvam? votis Medea fruatur?

(Ovid *Heroides* 6.73-75)

Hypsipyle's services evoke the elegiac lover's *labores* for his beloved, as an allusion to Tibullus 1.5 underlines: the Tibullan lover relates the magic ("*ipseque te circum lustravi sulpure puro,* | *carmine cum magico praecinuisset anus*", 11-12) he performed to save Delia's health only for a rival to enjoy her company:[44]

vota novem Triviae nocte silente dedi
omnia persolvi: fruitur nunc alter amore,
et precibus felix utitur ille meis.

(Tibullus 1.5.16-18)

The narrator fantasises a rural life with Delia (19-36) before re-introducing his rival as a source of harm to his relationship ("*haec nocuere mihi quod adest huic dives amator.* | *venit in exitium callida lena meum*", 47-48) and cursing an unnamed *illa* (49-56): the demand that dogs chase *illa* from the crossroad ("*e triviis*", 56) echoes the location of his prayers (16), connecting his performance of the curses with his former aid.[45] Evoking Tibullus 1.5.16-18 underlines Hypsipyle's devotion to Jason; she omits the Tibullan lover's involvement with magic, maintaining her contrast with Medea, but the allusion to the Tibullan poem recalls that the lover's aid for Delia was magic which he also performed more viciously, undermining Hypsipyle's self-presentation. Her self-alignment with the Tibullan narrator raises the possibility that she knows more witchcraft than she claims; her suppression of this element of her model indicates her attempt to deceive Jason, her extratextual audience and presumably Jupiter. Hypsipyle recalls

[44] Rosati 1992 p. 82; Bessone 1997a p. 232, noting that Hypsipyle's curse completes the parallel with Tibullus 1.5.

[45] On magic in Tibullus 1.5.49-56: Tupet 1976 pp. 332-334, Murgatroyd 1980 pp. 176-181 and Wimmel 1987 pp. 231-248. In my MA dissertation I cite parallels from the *PGM* which underline the erotic nature of these curses, suggesting that the obscure identity of the target implies that they are an *agōgē* spell directed at Delia rather than the *lena*: Chadha 2008 pp. 44-50. For debate over whether "*haec*" (1.5.47) refers to the *lena* and the rival or to Delia's beauty: Smith 1978 p. 301 and Murgatroyd 1980 p. 176.

Tibullus 1.5.47 immediately before she introduces Medea's love-magic ("*Argolidas timui: nocuit mihi barbara paelex*", *Heroides* 6.81): by evoking the Tibullan lover's curses, this echo destabilises her contrast with Medea when she stresses it most strongly, prefiguring her concluding prayer and hinting that her accusations are connected with this.

The opening line of Hypsipyle's accusations against Medea ("*nec facie meritisque placet, sed carmina novit*", 83) reinforces these suggestions: *Heroides* 6.83 recalls Propertius 3.6.25, a neglected *puella*'s assertion that her rival conquered her lover with magic rather than character: "*non me moribus illa sed herbis improba vicit*". The Propertian *puella* details the other woman's activities (26-30), indicating her own familiarity with magic and destabilising her opposition to her rival. The girl's monologue concludes with a curse on her lover's bed ("*putris et in vacuo texetur aranea lecto: | noctibus illorum dormiet ipsa Venus*", 33-34) which echoes her anger over his neglect ("*gaudet me vacuo solam tabescere lecto?*", 23), punishing him appropriately to his crime.[46] Hypsipyle's letter parallels this sequence, following the list of her rival's practices by cursing the bed her unfaithful beloved shares with Medea; the allusion to Propertius 3.6.25 at line 83 combines with those to Tibullus 1.5 to undermine Hypsipyle's contrast between herself and Medea before her accusations, alerting the reader that the practices and powers she details reflect her own and anticipate her curses.

Hypsipyle expands her suggestion that Medea has bewitched Jason by listing her skills:[47]

[46] Rosati 1992 pp. 80-81 highlights that *Heroides* 6.83 parallels Propertius 3.6.25; Rosati 1992 pp. 89-90 n. 47 notes the corresponding catalogues, the focus of Propertius' *puella* and Hypsipyle on the beds their unfaithful beloveds share with their rivals, and their final curses. We explore Propertius 3.6.25-30 more fully in Chapter 3.

[47] Cf. Tupet 1976 pp. 387-388 who discusses the suggestion that *Heroides* 6.91-92 is interpolated.

nec facie meritisque placet, sed carmina novit
diraque cantata pabula falce metit.
illa reluctantem cursu deducere lunam
nititur et tenebris abdere solis equos;
illa refrenat aquas obliquaque flumina sistit;
illa loco silvas vivaque saxa movet.
per tumulos errat passis discincta capillis
certaque de tepidis colligit ossa rogis.
devovet absentes simulacraque cerea figit
et miserum tenues in iecur urget acus,
et quae nescierim melius. male quaeritur herbis
moribus et forma conciliandus amor.

(Ovid *Heroides* 6.83-94)

Medea's abilities match those representing poetry in love-elegy and Vergil *Eclogue* 8: drawing down the moon (85), reversing rivers (87) and obscuring the sun (86), which echoes *Amores* 2.1.24 ("*et revocant niveos solis euntis equos*") — where it is similarly paired with controlling the moon (23) — as well as *Amores* 1.8.9 ("*cum voluit, toto glomerantur nubila caelo*") and Tibullus 1.2.51-52 ("*cum libet, haec tristi depellit nubila caelo; | cum libet, aestivo convocat orbe nives*"). Hypsipyle echoes the powers Argus attributes to Medea at *Argonautica* 3.531-533 — immobilising rivers (532) and the moon (533) — which we have seen underline the association of elegiac *carmina* with the Colchian witch.[48] Moving rocks and stones (88) recalls the effect of the *puella*'s elegiac seductions at *Amores* 3.7.57-58 ("*illa graves potuit quercus adamantaque durum | surdaque blanditiis saxa movere suis*"), as well as the powers of Orpheus' poetry as, for example, in *Argonautica* 1.26-31.[49] Medea's physical activities have a similar poetic undertone: "[…] *tepidis colligit ossa rogis*" (90) evokes elegiac enchantment in Tibullus 1.2.48 ("[…] *tepido devocat ossa rogo*");[50] fashioning wax figurines and piercing the liver parallel *Amores* 3.7.29-30 in which, as we have seen, elegiac wax-tablets refashioned as a *defixio*

[48] Knox 1995 pp. 188-189, Cecchin 1997 p. 80 and Michalopoulos 2004 pp. 103-104 highlight that *Heroides* 6.85-87 draw on Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* 3.531-533. Knox 1995 p. 188 also suggests that "*carmina*" (83) allude to those with which Medea charmed the snake guarding the Fleece, while "*dira pabula*" (84) evoke the drugs which defended Jason from the bulls' flames; we can add that evoking these powers in connection with Medea's love-magic underlines Hypsipyle's mistaken application of Medea's powers in the *Argonautica* to love-elegy.

[49] Knox 1995 p. 189 and Michalopoulos 2004 p. 105 note that *Heroides* 6.88 evokes Orpheus more immediately than Medea. For Orpheus' poetry and magic in *Argonautica* 1.26-31: Clare 2002 pp. 232-234; Clare 2002 pp. 252-253 highlights the recollection of Orpheus' powers in those of Medea's drugs and speech at *Argonautica* 4.442-444 ("*τοῖα παραιφαμένη θελκτήρια φάρμακ' ἔπασσεν | αἰθέρι καὶ πνοιῇσι, τά κεν καὶ ἄπωθεν ἐόντα | ἄγριον ἠλιβάτοιο κατ' οὔρεος ἤγαγε θῆρα*"); cf. Hunter 1993 pp. 144-145 and 59-60.

[50] Palmer 1898 p. 333 and Knox 1995 p. 189 cite Tibullus 1.2.48 as a parallel for *Heroides* 6.89-90; Michalopoulos 2004 pp. 106-107 suggests that *Argonautica* 4.50-53, recalling Medea's hunts for corpses, inspires *Heroides* 6.89-90 and notes *Amores* 1.8.17-18 as a parallel.

represent harmful poetic enchantment.[51] The initial emphasis on *carmina* directs the reader to understand these as the power behind, and illustrated by, Medea's achievements, particularly as "[…] *carmina novit*" (83) replicates the line-ending of *Amores* 1.8.5 ("[…] *Aeaeaque carmina novit*").

Hypsipyle's claims allusively draw Medea as an elegiac poet, suggesting that she bewitched Jason with poetry; the passages she evokes — most notably, Ovid *Amores* 1.8 and 3.7 and Tibullus 1.2 — characterise elegy as deceitful magic ill-suited to enchanting the beloved through their reference to Medea and her powers. Rather than using Medea as an *exemplum* illustrating elegy, Hypsipyle accuses the witch of successfully employing the love-poetry which she herself brands as ineffective for winning a beloved. In doing so, Hypsipyle amplifies the irony of Medea's association with elegy by undermining her statements as she makes them and prompting humour through her exaggerated and plainly false claims. This feeds back into the elegiac passages which Hypsipyle's catalogue evokes, enhancing the irony and comic value of Medea's presence as her entertainingly incongruous claims resonate for the extratextual audience re-reading prior love-elegy.

Heroides 6.83-94 illustrates how Medea's association with love-elegy reflects onto the elegiac lover as a narrator through Hypsipyle herself. The queen's accusations unwittingly connect her poetry with Medea's magic, characterising her letter as a love-spell which aims to deceive and persuade Jason, and also foreshadowing its failure in this endeavour; Hypsipyle's unconsciousness of this error illustrates her fallibility as a lover and narrator. At the same time, Hypsipyle's catalogue illustrates elegy's creative power and capacity to deceive its extratextual audience: the description she offers of the Colchian princess's feats begins the Apollonian Medea's transformation into an elegiac witch and poet in the minds of her audience. This expansion of the earlier mythological *exemplum* into an elegiac witch and poet playfully implies the greater powers of invention and persuasion of Hypsipyle's, and Ovid's, elegy to that of their

[51] For the parallel between *Amores* 3.7.30 and *Heroides* 6.91-92 with an alternative interpretation: Tupet 1976 pp. 302-303 and Michalopoulos 2004 p. 108. Gager 1992 p. 251 n. 25, reading *Heroides* 6.83-94 as testimony of magical practice, highlights that 89-92 recall criteria for implementing curses — a tomb for depositing a tablet (89) and contact with something belonging to or resembling the victim (91-92).

predecessors; it also balances the tragic Medea whom our narrator forcefully sketches in her concluding lines and the precarious union of the two in *Heroides* 12. Hypsipyle's invocation of Jupiter reveals a second internal addressee whom we may suspect has been listening all along: while her portrait of Medea fails to convince Jason or her extratextual readers, the intratextual success of her curse suggests that the image she conjures is vivid and persuasive enough to convince the divine recipient of her prayer.

It is to Hypsipyle's prayer that we now turn. As we noted above, this evokes prayers for just vengeance and lines 83-94 help to validate the queen's appeal and increase its efficacy.[52] The allusion to *Amores* 3.7.29 ("*sagave poenicea defixit nomina cera*") at lines 91-92 enhances this suggestion: while Hypsipyle omits writing on wax in favour of piercing waxen *simulacra* (91), the possibility remains that she inscribes her epistle on elegiac wax *tabellae*. Curse-texts and prayers on lead tablets were occasionally styled as letters from the practitioner to the spirits or deities they invoked; evidence suggests that such tablets were atypical, but *Heroides* 6 perhaps modifies the practice to Ovid's epistolary collection, evoking the realities of magic ritual to literalise Hypsipyle's poetic spell and its effects.[53]

Hypsipyle requests that Jupiter justly punish Medea according to her crimes:

[52] Michalopoulos 2004 p. 112 notes that *Heroides* 6.151-152 corresponds with prayers for justice but does not develop this parallel.

[53] For curse-tablets referring to themselves as letters: Faraone 1991a pp. 4-5 (*DTA* 102 and 103, both fourth-century BC), and Graf 1997a pp. 130-131 (second or first century BC); Versnel 1991a pp. 64-65 includes *DTA* 102 and 103 in the "border area" between *defixiones* and prayers for justice. Cf. Johnston 1999 p. 92 n. 24, noting *DTA* 102 and 103 as "two curse tablets that read a bit like letters insofar as they open with an address like that used in a letter" but stressing that these appear to be the only examples so far discovered.

Medeae Medea forem! quod si quid ab alto
iustus adest votis Iuppiter ille meis,
quod gemit Hypsipyle, lecti quoque subnuba nostri
maereat et leges sentiat ipsa suas;
utque ego destituor coniunx materque duorum,
cum totidem natis orba sit illa viro.
nec male parta diu teneat peiusque relinquat:
exulet et toto quaerat in orbe fugam.
quam fratri germana fuit miseroque parenti
filia, tam natis, tam sit acerba viro.
cum mare, cum terras consumpserit, aera temptet;
erret inops, exspes, caede cruenta sua!
haec ego, coniugio fraudata Thoantias, oro.
vivite devoto nuptaque virque toro!

(Ovid *Heroides* 6.151-164)

Hypsipyle's supplicatory address of "*iustus* […] *Iuppiter*" (151-152) and her emphasis on just reprisal for Medea's crimes evokes the category of curse-texts which Versnel terms "judicial prayers", "prayers for legal help", or "prayers for justice", and which, though distinct from revenge-curses, seek justified vengeance for the practitioner for wrongs committed against them by their target. These prayers for justice are distinct from amatory or competitive *defixiones*: in the latter, which cannot justify the curse beyond the target's status as the practitioner's rival, the aim is to bind or restrict the target's will or actions through the agency of the practitioner ("I bind […]"); the former entrust the enactment of the retribution to a deity and provide validation for the victim's punishment. At the same time, these categories overlap in content, language, and formulation to the extent that "hybrid" texts combining elements of the *defixio* and the prayer for justice are the norm; erotic curses seeking to attract a target (*agōgai*) often emphasise the victim's injustices towards the practitioner to gain divine support for the spell.[54] This blurring of distinctions allows space to read Hypsipyle's prayer as a literary adaptation of a prayer for justice in an amatory elegiac letter which combines a love-spell directed towards Jason and an appeal to Jupiter for the deserved punishment of Medea and the hero: the Lemnian queen's primary focus is the damage to her marriage with Jason (153-156; 163-164), making her prayer one of revenge

[54] Versnel 1991a pp. 60-72 and Versnel 1998 pp. 263-264; cf. Faraone 1999 pp. 43-55 and 80-84 for the similarities between erotic magic and prayers for justice. Hypsipyle omits a request for protection from the effects of her magic, a flaw which perhaps cements the future which parallels her rival's. Petrović 2007 pp. 41-51 discusses unrequited love as an injustice in amatory *defixiones*, arguing that Simaetha's portrait of her relationship with Delphis in Theocritus *Idyll* 2.64-158 is a literary representation of this practice; considering Tibullus' and Propertius' interaction with *Idyll* 2, the Hellenistic work may provide a precedent for Hypsipyle's depiction of Medea and of her relationship with Jason in relation with magic. Versnel 1998 p. 264 n. 131 contrasts injustice in amatory spells with "legal" prayers for justice.

for an amatory injustice; her curse on the bed indicates that her desire for retribution now outweighs her wish to motivate Jason's return.

Hypsipyle validates Medea's punishment by listing her misdeeds (153-162); verbal echoes link these lines with earlier points in the letter at which Hypsipyle highlights the legitimacy of her own position or the moral wrongs of her rival, reinforcing the justification for her revenge and indicating that her whole letter is part of her magic ritual.[55] "*subnuba*" (153) balances the queen's legitimate wedding to Jason ("*non ego sum furto tibi cognita; pronuba Iuno | adfuit*", 43-44); her abandonment with her twin sons (153) recalls their introduction as pledges of Jason's loyalty ("*felix in numero quoque sum prolemque gemellam | pignora Lucina bina favente, dedi*", 121-122); Medea's betrayal of her family (159) picks up Hypsipyle's contrast between her filial devotion and Medea's actions (135-136), and the description of Apsyrtus' murder (129-130). The queen's demand that Medea wander in exile (162) and her curse on the couple's bed (164) echo her list of Medea's love-magic powers: "*per tumulos errat passis discincta capillis*" (89); "*devovet absentes simulacraque cerea figit*" (91). The other alterations to the narrative of *Argonautica* 1 reinforce this reading: Hypsipyle extends Jason's stay on Lemnos to two years ("*hic tibi bisque aestas bisque cucurrit hiems*", 56) and emphasises their formal marriage (43-44) in contrast to the Argonauts' relatively brief sojourn in *Argonautica* 1 (861-862) and Jason's parting refusal of her kingdom (902-903);[56] she also emphasises his reluctance to leave Lemnos (56-65), inverting his haste to board the Argo in Apollonius' epic (*Argonautica* 1.910; "*ultimus e sociis sacram conscendis in Argo*", *Heroides* 6.65). Hypsipyle's revisions emphasise the legitimacy of her relationship with Jason and exaggerate the injustice of Medea's actions, attempting to increase the efficacy of her final prayer.[57]

[55] Jolivet 2001 p. 282 notes that Medea's punishments suit her crimes. *PGM* XL, a fourth-century BC prayer for justice which demands that the target suffer the same pains he caused to the female practitioner and her children before requesting that he perish on land or sea, closely parallels the formulation of *Heroides* 6.151-164; for *PGM* XL: Versnel 1991a pp. 68-69.
[56] For Jason's refusal of Lemnos in *Argonautica* 1: Knox 1995 p. 172.
[57] For these revisions reinforcing Hypsipyle's rights as Jason's wife or intensifying his betrayal without reference to magic: Jacobson 1974 p. 107 and Bloch 2000 p. 199; cf. Knox 1995 pp. 179 and 184.

Hypsipyle's evocation of prayers for justice in her final lines aims to give her own use of magic an element of legitimacy and to distance her from Medea's punishment by placing it Jupiter's hands. The echoes of her earlier catalogue of the abilities of Medea's love-magic (89 and 91) undermine this impression of validity, however, as her extratextual readers know that these claims have been entirely fabricated and that, as in the *diabolē*, they reflect Hypsipyle's own use of elegiac *carmina* to influence Jason rather than her rival's actions.[58] Hypsipyle's inability to recognise her error illustrates the fallibility of the elegiac lover, and it is symptomatic of the Lemnian queen's myopic, elegiac view of Medea that she includes the witch's heinous actions towards her family, which do deserve punishment, only to extend the range of her crimes and bolster her amatory sins; ironically, it is these details which give her curse its force.

Heroides 12 dramatises the next step in Medea's journey. Medea presents the irony of her association with elegy from the perspective of the lover and poet, lamenting her magic's powerlessness in love while demonstrating her elegiac inability to charm Jason. *Heroides* 6.83-94 prepares the extratextual audience to recognise this metapoetic element in the magic in *Heroides* 12, which retrospectively deepens the irony of Hypsipyle's accusations. I summarise *Heroides* 12 before concentrating on the magic.

Heroides 12

Medea recalls listening to Jason's appeal for help and declares that she should have died then, asking why the Argo came to Colchis and why she delighted too much in the hero's appearance and deceitful speech — if she had not, he would have faced Aeetes' tasks without magic and her misfortunes would have been spared. Medea will enjoy her last pleasure from Jason: reproachfully reminding him of her services (1-22). She recalls the Argonauts' arrival and her immediate infatuation with their leader (23-38) and describes the tasks her father set — including capturing the Fleece (39-50) — and her sleepless night imagining them (57-60). Medea met with Jason and his false words and tears captured her innocent heart (61-92) —

[58] Commentators who note the echoes of lines 89 and 91 in 162 and 164 suggest that they underline Hypsipyle's identification with and metamorphosis into Medea: Lindheim 2003 p. 124 and Michalopoulos 2004 pp. 112 and 114 n. 114.

protected by her drugs, he accomplished his trials (93-100); she charmed the snake and retrieved the Fleece (94-108), betraying her family and abandoning her land, now deserving divine punishment and death (109-128). In Corinth, Medea and her children hear Jason's wedding (129-152); Medea describes her violent reaction (153-158), declaring herself justly punished for her crimes (159-162). She bewails her powerlessness to inspire or cure love with magic and laments that her services for Jason benefit a *paelex*, vowing revenge for her mockery by the new couple (163-182). Medea begs Jason to take her back, presenting her aid and his life as her dowry (183-206); she breaks off predicting his punishment, resolving to follow her anger — her mind compels something greater, she does not clearly know what (207-212).

Medea repeatedly dwells on Jason's tasks and her magic's role in his success ("*ars mea*", 2; "*praemedicatus*", 15; "*devota* […] *manu*", 46; "*aliqua* […] *arte*", 50; "*medicamina*", 97; "*medicato* […] *somno*", 107; "*quaeque feros pepuli doctis medicatibus ignes*", 165), presenting her achievements as the *labores* which earned his love in contrast to Jason's new bride, Creusa, the *dives amator* ("*quam pater est illi, tam mihi dives erat*", 26) her efforts benefit.[59] Like Hypsipyle, Medea evokes the lover's services in Tibullus 1.5: her indignation at aiding a rival ("*quos ego servavi, paelex amplecitur artus | et nostri fructus illa laboris habet*", 173-174) and her assertion that her only joy will be detailing her services for Jason ("*hac fruar, haec de te gaudia sola feram*", 22) echo the Tibullan lover's frustration: "*omnia persolvi: fruitur nunc alter amore, | et precibus felix utitur ille meis*" (1.5.17-18).[60] In Tibullus 1.5 and *Heroides* 6, the lovers' emphasis on their aid precedes their vengeful curses on the beloved and the obstacle to their affair when their poetic persuasion fails; each remains within elegy, taking revenge through words — although Hypsipyle's effective prayer for revenge draws her closer to Medea, she only imagines adopting her rival's physical actions ("*Medeae Medea forem*", *Heroides* 6.151) and only becomes the elegiac Medea she constructed. In *Heroides* 12, this pattern foreshadows Medea's violent retribution ("*dum ferrum flammaeque aderunt sucusque veneni, | hostis Medeae*

[59] For "*ars*" (2) indicating Medea's magic: Palmer 1898 p. 387, Bessone 1997a pp. 61 and 65, Heinze 1997 p. 85 and Fauth 1999 p. 131. For alternative interpretations of "*devota* […] *manu*" (46): Palmer 1898 p. 390, Bessone 1997a p. 116 and Heinze 1997 p. 130.

[60] For *Heroides* 12.173-174 and Tibullus 1.5.17-18: Fauth 1980 p. 274, Rosati 1992 p. 82, Spoth 1992 p. 200, Bessone 1997a p. 232 and Heinze 1997 p. 197; cf. Fauth 1999 p. 137. Spoth 1992 p. 200 n. 11 compares "*illa ego*" (*Heroides* 12.105) with the elegiac lover's emphasis on his personal services for the beloved.

nullus inultus erit", 181-182) in the dramatic genre capable of physically expressing her anger; her *venenum* (181) proleptically literalises her use of magic for revenge.[61] Medea's focus on her witchcraft throughout her letter illustrates its formidable power, intensifying the contrast with its helplessness in love (163-172); recognising a metapoetic level to Medea's powers, particularly at 163-172, magnifies her role as a negative model for love-elegy — whilst answering Hypsipyle's accusations — by associating her poem with her non-amatory magic.

Ovid incorporates echoes of earlier elegiac love-magic into *Heroides* 12 before lines 163-172: it will be helpful to begin with these as they introduce the conflict between Medea's non-amatory magic in the *Argonautica* and her association with love-elegy and the character of the lover-narrator. One example is Jason yoking Aeetes' bulls and ploughing the earth: "*iungis et aeripedes inadusto corpore tauros | et solidam iusso vomere findis humum*" (93-94). "*solidam* […] *findis humum*" (94) recalls Dipsas and the *saga* of Tibullus 1.2 — both associated with Medea's *carmina* and *herbae* — cleaving the earth with song ("*et solidam longo carmine findit humum*", *Amores* 1.8.18; "*haec cantu finditque solum* […]", Tibullus 1.2.47); "*inadusto*" (*Heroides* 12.93) echoes *Heroides* 12.13-14 ("*isset anhelatos non praemedicatus in ignes | immemor Aesonides oraque adusta bovum*") associating Medea's magic with Jason's achievement and with the love-poetry of the elegiac *sagae* and poets.[62] A second example is Medea recalling that Jason enchanted her with his beauty and his eyes: "*et formosus eras et me mea fata trahebant: | abstulerant oculi lumina nostra tui*" (35-36). Medea's experience parallels Propertius' characterisation of his love for Cynthia in 1.1.1 — "*Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*" — shortly preceding his self-equation with Medea (4-6) through the allusion to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.47-50.[63] By echoing Propertius' first image of his passion, Ovid inscribes his Medea into the tradition of elegiac love and Propertius into the tradition of Medea's infatuation,

[61] Spoth 1992 p. 130 suggests that *Heroides* 12.181-182 and 167-168 literalise the metaphor of burning passion. Landolfi 2000 p. 155 highlights *Heroides* 12.181-182 as Medea assuming her tragic identity by adumbrating her revenge.
[62] Bessone 1997a p. 158 notes that *Heroides* 12.94 parallels *Amores* 1.8.18 but does not pursue the correspondence.
[63] "*abstulerant*" (*Heroides* 12.36) evokes magic enchantment by echoing Hypsipyle's assertions that Medea bewitched Jason: "*hanc, o tu demens Colchisque ablate venenis*" (*Heroides* 6.131); "*paelicis ipsa meos inplessem sanguine vultus, | quosque veneficiis abstulit illa suis*" (149-150): Jacobson 1974 p. 115 n. 15, Bessone 1997a pp. 108-109, Bessone 1997b p. 213 n. 25, and Heinze 1997 pp. 125-126; cf. Palmer 1898 p. 390. For Propertius 1.1.1 and *Heroides* 12.36: Bessone 1997a p. 108, without developing the parallel.

elegiacising the Heroidean Medea and reinforcing, and retrospectively sharpening the irony of, Propertius' initial application of her powers to his poetry (1.1.19-24).[64]

We can identify a third instance in Medea's focus on the snake. In the *Argonautica*, Medea captivates and subdues the dragon with incantations ("*οἵμη θελγόμενος*", 4.150; "*ἀοιδαῖς*", 157) and drugs ("*ἀκήρατα φάρμακ'*", 157), allowing Jason to take the Fleece (162); Ovid amplifies Apollonius Rhodius' characterisation of the creature as a guardian ("*φρουρὸν ὄφιν*", *Argonautica* 4.88), styling it, I suggest, as an elegiac *custos* and aligning its enchantment with the *paraclausithyron*.[65] Medea introduces the beast in elegiac terms:

> *lumina custodis succumbere nescia somno,*
> *ultimus est aliqua decipere arte labor.*
>
> (Ovid *Heroides* 12.49-50)

The description of the reptile as an unsleeping guardian (49) recurs through the letter: "*pervigil anguis*" (60); "*insopor* […] *vigil*" (101).[66] In love-elegy, "*custos*" calls to mind the beloved's sharp-eyed guard;[67] "*pervigil*" (60) characterises the *ianitor* of Ovid's first *paraclausithyron*, *Amores* 1.6: "*pervigil in mediae sidera noctis eras*" (44). The elegiac lover employs poetic deception to elude or sway the guard: Tibullus bids Delia to deceive her custodian ("[…] *custodes, Delia, falle*", 1.2.15); in *Amores* 3.1, Elegy recalls teaching Corinna to do the same: "*per me decepto didicit custode Corinna*" (49). Tibullus claims that the *saga*'s spell will deceive the eyes of Delia's *vir*: "*ille nihil poterit de nobis credere cuiquam, | non sibi, si in molli viderit ipse toro*" (57-58); this resonates in Medea's emphasis on the eyes of the snake (49). Evoking the *paraclausithyron* in Medea's successful enchantment of the reptile juxtaposes her non-amatory incantations with elegiac *carmina* through a motif central to the genre; the fantastic

[64] I draw here on the reading which Hinds 1993 pp. 23-24 offers of the allusion at *Heroides* 12.33 to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.41: its effect is "to write the Virgilian Damon's words *into* [Hinds' emphasis] the myth against which the Virgilian Damon had measured his own experience of erotic infatuation and embitterment."
[65] For "*custos*" (49) echoing *Argonautica* 4.88: Bessone 1997a p. 117 and Heinze 1997 p. 132; cf. Anderson 1896 p. 104. On the *Heroides* as *paraclausithyra*: Spoth 1992 pp. 33-34.
[66] Cf. *Heroides* 6.13: "*pervigilem* […] *draconem*".
[67] Tibullus 1.2.5 and 15; Propertius 2.6.37 and 39; Ovid *Amores* 1.6.7, 2.2.9, 3.4.1, and 3.8.63.

alignment of the house-door or *ianitor* with a gigantic snake points to the comic potential of the witch's association with the elegiac lover and his verses.[68]

Medea's direct answer to Hypsipyle's suggestion that she captivated Jason as she did the bulls and snakes draws together and explicates these metapoetic hints:

> *serpentes igitur potui taurosque furentes,*
> *unum non potui perdomuisse virum;*
> *quaeque feros pepuli doctis medicatibus ignes,*
> *non valeo flammas effugere ipsa meas.*
> *ipsi me cantus herbaeque artesque relinquunt;*
> *nil dea, nil Hecates sacra potentis agunt.*
> *non mihi grata dies, noctes vigilantur amarae,*
> *et tener, a! miserae pectora somnus habet.*
> *quae me non possum, potui sopire draconem:*
> *utilior cuivis quam mihi cura mea est.*
>
> (Ovid *Heroides* 12.163-172)

Echoes of Tibullus 1.2.45-66 associate Medea's ineffective love-magic with elegiac poetry.[69] The rare "*perdomuisse*" (164) and the description of the flames as "*feros*" (165) recall 1.2.51-52 ("*sola tenere malas Medeae dicitur herbas,* | *sola feros Hecatae perdomuisse canes*"), as does Medea's itemisation of the expertise which fails her (167-168); *pello* (165) evokes the Tibullan *saga*'s control over clouds ("*haec tristi depellit nubila caelo*", 1.2.51), a skill which Hypsipyle attributes to Medea ("*nititur et tenebris abdere solis equos*", *Heroides* 6.86).[70] Medea's failure to cure her passion with magic (169-172) parallels Tibullus' unsuccessful attempt to remedy his love for Delia with magic or elegy (1.2.61-66). Hypsipyle draws on Tibullus 1.2.45-66 to characterise her rival as an elegiac poet; echoes of the Tibullan lines highlight the metapoetic level of Medea's pendant lament. *Heroides* 6 presents the association of Medea's witchcraft with love-elegy from the perspective of an elegiac lover and poet mistakenly associating the Colchian princess's skill with love-magic. As an elegiac lover, poet and narrator in *Heroides* 12, Medea

---

[68] For a metapoetic interpretation of Medea's enchantment of the snake at *Argonautica* 4.147-150: Albis 1996 pp. 86-87.

[69] Bessone 1997a pp. 220-221 suggests that *Heroides* 12.163-174 fuses Medea's myth with elegiac magic by echoing Tibullus 1.2.51 and 59-60, Propertius 2.4.7ff., and Theocritus *Idyll* 2.15ff.

[70] Bessone 1997a pp. 224-225 compares *Heroides* 12.164 with Tibullus 1.2.51-52. For the rarity of *perdomuisse*: Murgatroyd 1980 p. 87 and Maltby 2002 p.169. "*pepuli*" (165) is an emendation for the transmitted "*repuli*": Bessone 1997a p. 225 and Heinze 1997 pp. 194-195. Bessone 1997a p. 225 also compares "*perdomuisse*" (*Heroides* 12.164) with "*domuisse*" at Propertius 1.1.15; this evokes the contrast between the powerlessness of the lover's *Cytaeines carmina* to seduce Cynthia and the success of Milanion's physical *labores* in conquering Atalanta (1.1.9-16), underlining Medea's inappropriateness as an *exemplum* for elegy's seductive power.

embodies this connection between her magic and love-poetry; unlike the generic elegiac lover, Medea knows the limitations of her powers and states them openly, consciously expressing the irony of which the elegiac lovers, including Hypsipyle, are partially aware at best. While this partial awareness condemns the lovers to repeat the mistake of invoking the witch as an *exemplum* for their poetic power, Medea's understanding of her magic's flaws allows her to break free of her ill-suited generic confines to find a more effective, dramatic stage for her revenge.

Fool Me Twice: *Remedia amoris*

Our final text in this chapter is Ovid's erotodidactic elegy, *Remedia amoris*. The metre, amatory subject-matter, language and motifs of Ovid's erotodidactic works align them with the elegiac genre, and the *praeceptor*-narrator identifies himself as an elegiac lover who draws on his experiences — often those documented in the *Amores* — to illustrate his precepts.[71] Like the *Heroides*, these works offer a distanced view of love-elegy: the didactic form makes the narrator an instructor on love and love-elegy rather than an active participant in an affair: he dissects the feelings, situations, and actions of his students and the objects of their attentions to advise on arousing love and navigating the elegiac relationship (*Ars amatoria* 1-3 and *Medicamina faciei femineae*) or on extricating oneself from destructive passion (*Remedia amoris*). The translation of elegiac subject-matter into the didactic form inverts the generic situations and motifs, foregrounding the calculating guile behind the lover's actions and poetic seductions and shattering his pose of "sincerity" and true love as the *praeceptor* outlines the motives behind his seductions of his beloved.[72] The erotodidactic works incorporate a metapoetic level, commenting on the art and skill of the extratextual poet distinct from the homonymous *praeceptor* as well as on elegiac conventions; pertinent to our discussion is the use of magic to highlight poetic deception — by the *praeceptor* of his students, the students of their beloveds, prospective lovers

[71] For Ovid's erotodidactic work blending elegiac and didactic genres: Dalzell 1996 pp. 136-146 and Boyd 2009 pp. 115-118.

[72] For elegy's adaptation to didactic altering the perspective on the elegiac world: Myerowitz 1985 pp. 34-35, Dalzell 1996 pp. 139-144 and Boyd 1997 pp. 204-211. For the *praeceptor*'s instructions destabilising the lover's pose of sincerity and foregrounding deceit: Dalzell 1996 pp. 144-145 and 150; cf. Durling 1958 p. 157, and Wright 1984 p. 12 and Volk 2002 pp. 162-163 on the relationship of the *praeceptor* with the narrator of the *Amores.*

of themselves, and the extratextual poet of his audience — and failure.[73] We presently focus on the intertextual relationship of *Remedia amoris* with magic in earlier love-elegy; we will return to Ovid's erotodidactic elegies in the conclusion to the thesis to investigate its role in *Medicamina faciei femineae* and to briefly consider *Remedia amoris* 249-290 in the context of its dialogue with *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108.

Remedia amoris, Ovid's last erotodidactic elegy, illustrates the power of his magically enchanting poetry. Following *Ars amatoria* 1-3, the title of the *Remedia* promises its students cures for love caused by following the instructions in these works.[74] Ovid's opening dialogue with Cupid, who has read the title as a declaration of war against love, reveals that the *Remedia* will not unravel the elegiac world ("*nec te, blande puer, nec nostras prodimus artes, | nec nova praeteritum Musa retexit opus*", 11-12) but only intends to prevent lovers' suicides.[75] Scholarship on the *Remedia* highlights its unsuitability for curing love: the majority of the "cures" metaphorically illustrate amatory pursuit; Ovid's advice frequently focuses on love, sex and the *puella*'s body, preventing his students from forgetting love as he instructs them to, and he recommends the *Ars amatoria* for pupils seeking new affairs to remedy the old ("*quaeris ubi invenias? artes tu perlege nostras: | plena puellarum iam tibi navis erit*", 487-488).[76] The elegiac metre is also inherently associated with seduction, as Ovid emphasises in his defence of his "*Musa proterva*" (362) against his critics (357-396) and his warning that reading elegy endangers the cure (757-766).[77] Rather than heal love completely, Ovid's *Remedia* deceives its students into believing that they are being cured ("*ad mea, decepti iuvenes, praecepta venite, |*

[73] For Ovid's erotodidactic elegies as metapoetic: Myerowitz 1985, Sharrock 1994, Rimelll 2005 pp. 177-205 and Boyd 2009 pp. 105-110.
[74] For dating *Remedia amoris* subsequent to *Ars amatoria* 1-3 and *Medicamina faciei femineae*: Brunelle 1997 pp. 10-19 and Gibson 2003 pp. 37-43. For dating *Remedia* prior to *Ars amatoria* 3 and *Amores* 3: Murgia 1986 pp. 203-220.
[75] For *retexo*: Prinz 1914 p. 37, Geisler 1969 pp. 38-39, and Hardie 2006 p. 167.
[76] Henderson 1979 pp. xii-xiii, Brunelle 1997 p. 137, Brunelle 2000-2001 pp. 123-140, Sharrock 2002 pp. 160-161, Fulkerson 2004 pp. 213-223, Rosati 2006 pp. 151-157 and 163-165; cf. Shulman 1981 pp. 250-253, Davisson 1996 pp. 240-261 (esp. 253-256) and, alternatively, Jones 1997 p. 62. For *renuntio amoris* as part of elegiac love: Sharrock 2002 p. 160 and Rosati 2006 p. 165.
[77] Brunelle 1997 pp. 108-130 and Brunelle 2000-2001 pp. 123-140.

quos suus ex omni parte fefellit amor", 41-42) while it prepares them to return to the *Ars amatoria* to continue their pursuit of elegiac love.[78]

Early in the poem Ovid warns his students to beware magic *carmina* as remedies (249-260). He lists magic feats which his leadership will not produce and illustrates the uselessness of witchcraft with the *exempla* of Medea and Circe, reporting Circe's fruitless persuasions of Ulysses in direct speech. Ovid relates that Circe rushed back to her "accustomed arts" without success before repeating his exhortation against trusting potions and *carmina*. *Remedia* 249-260 communicates closely with the parallel warning about retaining love with magic at *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108: the opening line of Ovid's caution in the *Remedia* ("*viderit, Haemoniae siquis mala pabula terrae*", 249) and his first line after Circe's monologue ("*ardet et assuetas Circe decurrit ad artes*", 287) echo the introduction to the pendant section ("*fallitur, Haemonias si quis decurrit ad artes*", *Ars amatoria* 2.99); Circe's speech expands the earlier statement that she could have held Ulysses if magic really aided love — "[…] *Circe tenuisset Ulixem, | si modo servari carmine posset amor*" (*Ars amatoria* 2.103-104).[79] Sharrock's discussion of *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108 illuminates Ovid's use of magic in this passage as a metaphor for his elegy: as Sharrock's work provides a springboard for my reading of *Remedia amoris* 249-290 I summarise her analysis before we continue.

Sharrock argues that magic at *Ars Amatoria* 2.99-108 metaphorically illustrates the poem's enchantingly seductive nature. While Ovid rejects witchcraft, the language of his condemnation evokes incantations, dissolving the opposition between his *Ars amatoria* and deceitful *artes Haemoniae*: he warns his readers against trusting magic *carmina* to hold *puellae*

[78] Following this proem and Cupid's reaction to the title, Ovid's address of his students as "*decepti iuvenes*" with the delayed "*amor*" (42) implies that they are misled by the poem's name: cf. Rosati 2006 p. 147 and Davisson 1996 p. 242. For Venus and Cupid as "possible models for Ovid's readers' own response" in the *Fasti*: Hardie 2006 p. 173; cf. Boyd 2009 pp. 105-106: the "double-proem" creates "a model for the kind of reading Ovid asks his audience to undertake". On the "double-proem" indicating the *Remedia*'s alignment with Ovid's previous love-elegy: Prinz 1914 pp. 36-41, Geisler 1969 pp. 37-38, Conte 1994a pp. 57-58, Brunelle 2000-2001 p. 130, Hardie 2006 pp. 171-173, Rosati 2006 pp. 144-146, and Boyd 2009 pp. 105-106; cf. Korzeniewski 1964 pp. 207-208. For the *Remedia* returning students to the *Ars*: Sharrock 2002 pp. 160-161 and Fulkerson 2004 pp. 211 and 220-223.

[79] Geisler 1969 p. 289; cf. Pinotti 1988 p. 171 and Janka 1997 p. 112. For *Remedia amoris* 249-260 and *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108: Prinz 1914 pp. 48-49, Geisler 1969 pp. 272-273, Henderson 1979 p. xvi, Pinotti 1988 p. 166 and Janka 1997 pp. 109-115.

but gives his advice through a *carmen*; the equation between elegy and magic shows that Ovid is seducing his readers into trusting the very means he cautions them against. At the same time, Sharrock notes, Ovid's exploitation of the double-sense of *carmen* cuts both ways: "if love cannot be kept by song, then it cannot be kept by the *Ars*" and Ovid "humorously undercuts the strength of his erotodidaxis." Nevertheless, Ovid's poetic enchantment and the promise of the *puella*, encapsulated in Calypso's *fallax figura* (143), are powerful enough to hold the reader and lead him through the illusory promises of Ovid's instructions.[80] Sharrock highlights the same identification of magic and elegy in the *Remedia*: though Ovid denounces magic as a cure for love, his "rejection is problematized by the essential connection between magic and medicine […]. The unhappy lover will be saved by *sacro carmine* […] not by *infami carmine* […]. The two are only as different as the two sides of the pharmacological coin."[81]

We can build on the association of magic and elegiac *carmina* in this work. The caution against trusting to magic to heal love alerts Ovid's students that the *Remedia* will not cure their passions as they believe and warns them of the elegy's duplicitous agenda. This early warning, I suggest, is a test for his pupils — if they recognise the identification between the *Remedia* and "old" elegy they will follow Ovid's advice and beware his poem. Veiling the warning against the *Remedia* as one against magic illustrates the deceptive, enchanting force of Ovid's poetry, persuading his students to keep reading even as he tells them not to.[82] Ovid's confidence in his elegiac captivation allows him to offer this warning early, certain that fewer students will abandon his teachings than will be seduced into finishing the poem and returning to the *Ars*. As I highlighted above, we return to consider this relationship between these erotodidactic works in the conclusion; in our present discussion, we focus on the *Remedia*'s intertextual engagement with earlier Tibullan elegy and Ovid's *Amores*. The introductory catalogue (249-260) inverts Ovid *Amores* 1.8.5-20 and Tibullus 1.2.45-54, as well as drawing on magic throughout elegy. Furthermore, the arrangement of *Remedia amoris* 249-290 replicates *Amores* 1.8 — the male

[80] Sharrock 1994 pp. 50-74, esp. 63 (quotations: pp. 63 n. 65 and 82-83); for an alternative reading of magic in *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108: Janka 1997 pp. 107-116.
[81] Sharrock 1994 p. 56. Sharrock 2002 p. 160 characterises the *Remedia* as a "seductive song" which entices the reader through its teachings, though without reference to magic; cf. Luck 1962 pp. 58-59: *Remedia amoris* 249-260 rejects magic but reveals the poet as the true magician whose art can subdue love.
[82] For an alternative interpretation of Circe's monologue as a test for Ovid's students: Brunelle 2002 pp. 56-68.

narrator reports an embedded monologue in direct speech by a female character, introducing her words with a catalogue of magic powers. Pursuing these correspondences can highlight how the warning against magic creates a warning against the *Remedia* which maintains the presentation of its subject matter through metaphors for elegiac love, and can suggest a new perspective on how Circe's monologue relates to this advice. I begin by reviewing the *Remedia*.

Remedia amoris opens with two proems: the first (1-40) reassures Cupid that, despite the title, the *Remedia* will not undo Ovid's previous amatory works; the second (41-78) addresses Ovid's prospective students, promoting his healing abilities. After this, Ovid delivers his remedies for unhappy love: resisting infatuation from the outset or treating it quickly (79-134); occupying oneself with war, agriculture or business (135-224); travel (237-248); self-deception and deceiving the beloved about one's feelings (211-212, 291-356, 491-522); bad or excessive sex (399-488, 529-542); focusing on other worries (543-574); avoiding solitude (579-608) and reminders of or contact with the beloved (621-740). Students should also avoid friends who talk about love (609-614) and arts which include or stimulate passion, including elegiac poetry (751-766). Ovid concludes by assuring his pupils that they will dedicate votive offerings to the poet whose song has assisted them (813-814).

Ovid's caution against magic contrasts the *Remedia* with magic's *infame carmen*:

> *viderit, Haemoniae siquis mala pabula terrae*
> *et magicas artes posse iuvare putat.*
> *ista veneficii vetus est via; noster Apollo*
> *innocuam sacro carmine monstrat opem.*
> *me duce non tumulo prodire iubebitur umbra,*
> *non anus infami carmine rumpet humum,*
> *non seges ex aliis alios transibit in agros*
> *nec subito Phoebi pallidus orbis erit.*
> *ut solet, aequoreas ibit Tiberinus in undas;*
> *ut solet, in niveis Luna vehetur equis.*
> *nulla recantatas deponent pectora curas,*
> *nec fugiet vivo sulpure victus amor.*
>
> (Ovid *Remedia amoris* 249-260)

The powers of this *infame carmen* parallel those we have seen associated with elegy throughout the previous poems; the closest models for structure and content are Ovid *Amores* 1.8.5-20 and

Tibullus 1.2.45-54.[83] The opening couplet (253-254) foregrounds this, replicating *Amores* 1.8.17-18 ("*evocat antiquis proavos atavosque sepulcris | et solidam longo carmine findit humum*") and echoing Tibullus 1.2.47-48 ("*haec cantu finditque solum manesque sepulcris | elicit*");[84] the meteorological power (256) evokes Ovid *Amores* 1.8.9 ("*cum voluit, toto glomerantur nubila caelo*") and Tibullus 1.2.52 ("*cum libet, aestivo convocat orbe nives*").[85] In the final couplet (257-258), Ovid reverses Tibullus' paired enchantment of rivers and the heavens ("*hanc ego de caelo ducentem sidera vidi; | fluminis haec rapidi carmine vertit iter*", 1.2.45-46), echoing the anaphoric structure of both the earlier catalogues which evokes the style of incantations.[86] These allusions identify the *infame carmen* with earlier elegy, opposing it to Ovid's new work; the close relationship with *Amores* 1.8 and Tibullus 1.2.45-54, however, recalls the false opposition between Ovid and Dipsas and the identification between Tibullus and his *saga*, leading the reader to suspect Ovid's current protestations.[87] The evocation of magic in earlier love-elegy continues the reminders of amatory metaphors and *topoi* which ensure that Ovid's students remain focused on love; it also evokes love-elegy itself, eliding the distinction between the *Remedia* and the "*vetus via veneficii*" Ovid now presents as harmful to his students, indicating that his new work is no different from the poetry he cautions them against.

Ovid promotes the *Remedia* over the *infame carmen* by advertising the lack of effect it will have — spirits will not be summoned; heaven and earth will continue as normal. This emphasis on the poem's ineffectiveness, however, suggests that it will not remove love, just as magic in earlier love-elegy indicates the powerlessness of poetry to win it. The end of the

[83] Geisler 1969 p. 270 notes the structural and stylistic similarity between *Remedia amoris* 251-258 and *Amores* 1.8.5-20; cf. Henderson 1979 p. 73 for Tibullus 1.2.43-52 [Henderson uses these line numbers].
[84] Geisler 1969 p. 281 compares "*carmine rumpet humum*", 254 with *Amores* 1.8.18 and Tibullus 1.2.47; Pinotti 1988 p. 169: Tibullus 1.2.47, Vergil *Eclogue* 8.99 and Horace *Epode* 17.79 ("*possim crematos excitare mortuos*"). The enchantment of crops and sun similarly recall Tibullus 1.8.20 and Vergil *Eclogue* 8.99: Geisler 1969 p. 281 and Pinotti 1988 p. 170.
[85] Geisler 1969 pp. 281-282: Tibullus 1.2.51-52 [Geisler uses these line numbers] and *Heroides* 6.86; Henderson 1979 p. 74: Tibullus 1.2.50; Pinotti 1988 p. 170: *Heroides* 6.85-86.
[86] On stylistic similarities between *Remedia amoris* 249-260 and incantations: Geisler 1969 p. 270 with n. 3, and Jones 1997 pp. 74-75 and 90.
[87] Sharrock 1994 pp. 85-86 highlights the affinity between Dipsas in *Amores* 1.8 and Ovid, "a seducer and a witch", in *Ars amatoria* 2; Brunelle 2005 pp. 149 and 157 nn. 19 and 20 compares Ovid in the *Remedia* to the lover and the *lena* in *Amores* 1.8.

passage confirms this suspicion: "*nulla recantatas deponent pectora curas*" (259).[88] The identification between love-elegy and magic makes this a statement that the *Remedia* will not help lovers set down their cares: *recano* underlines this by echoing *retexo* in Ovid's assurance to Amor that his *Remedia* will not unweave his earlier elegies — "*nec nova praeteritum Musa retexit opus*" (12).[89] Ovid repeats his caution against having faith in *carmina* in the last couplet of the section:

> *ergo, quisquis opem nostra tibi poscis ab arte,*
> *deme veneficiis carminibusque fidem.*
>
> (Ovid *Remedia amoris* 289-290)

On the surface, these lines encourage abandoning faith in magic to gain help from Ovid's art; the collapsed opposition between the two forces reveals Ovid frankly telling his students to beware the *Remedia*.[90] Conveying this message through a warning against magic screens its openness with the metaphor which expresses elegiac duplicity. By demonstrating the magically enchanting power of his verse as he admits its ineffectiveness as a cure, Ovid captivates his students and dupes them with the promise of a remedy; for the reader who recognises Ovid's revelation, the charm of his verses will inspire them to keep reading.

The central *exemplum* of Circe expands these clues. Commentators debate the relationship of Circe's monologue to the framing warnings: her speech contains no magic and when Ovid resumes his commentary on her actions he recalls that she rushes back to her accustomed arts in vain. Sharrock and Davisson each posit an association between Circe's words and poetry. Sharrock highlights the similarity between elegiac and magic *carmina*, questioning "where does Circe's magic end and her non-magical fascination begin?" and commenting that "the *ars* of words having failed she tries the *ars* of spells" which are "not so very different after all". Davisson suggests that the sharp transitions from magic to unsuccessful poetry blur the distinction between the two, perhaps making the final instruction to abandon magic *carmina*

[88] "*me duce*" (253) echoes Ovid's promise at *Remedia amoris* 69-70 ("*me duce damnosas, homines, compescite curas* | *rectaque cum sociis me duce navis eat*"), linking the warning against ineffective magic to Ovid's teachings in the *Remedia*; cf. Pinotti 1988 p. 169, who suggests, on the other hand, that this echo captures the poet's distance from the witch.
[89] Pinotti 1988 p. 171 highlights the equivalence of *recano* and *retexo*; cf. Rosati 2006 p. 150.
[90] Davisson 1996 pp. 251-252 makes a similar point in connection with Circe's speech, which I note below.

(289-290) an oblique caution against faith in poetry.[91] We can sharpen these observations by pursuing the close relationship between *Remedia amoris* 249-290 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8 introduced in the opening catalogue. As noted above, *Remedia amoris* 249-290 matches the structure of the earlier elegy. In *Amores* 1.8, the catalogue of Dipsas' powers, including her "*Aeaeaque carmina*" (5), characterise her as an elegiac poet and narrator in Ovid's image while he attempts to establish her opposition to himself; her speech underlines their identification by echoing the narrator's words in the *Amores* and the erotodidactic elegies.[92] The matching structure of *Remedia amoris* 249-290 produces, I suggest, the same relationship between Ovid's poem, magic and Circe's *Aeaea carmina* — the preceding catalogue associates the *Remedia* and its effects with earlier amatory elegy and Circe's speech with the same medium, inverting *Amores* 1.8 with Ovid now in the primarily didactic role framing a monologue by a female elegiac lover.[93]

This suggestion is reinforced by Circe's monologue expanding *Ars amatoria* 2.103-104 and by parallels with Ovid's *Heroides*. Despite recognising links between Circe's speech and the *Heroides*, commentators rarely note that this makes Circe a counterpart for the male lover and poet with Ulysses as the indifferent beloved: Davisson, for example, reads Circe as a negative model for female students of the *Remedia*; Brunelle interprets Ulysses as a "positive" model for male pupils to follow, successfully conquering his passion by enacting Ovid's later instructions and ignoring his beloved, while Circe is a negative example — she reflects the *Remedia*'s uselessness for female pupils in particular and her speech represents the *puella*'s appeals which male students must ignore (687-698).[94] We can add to these suggestions by taking a cue from

[91] Sharrock 1994 p. 56. Davisson 1996 p. 252. Brunelle 1997 pp. 46-47 rejects reading Circe's speech as associating poetic and magical *carmina*; cf. Brunelle 2002 p. 59. For alternative interpretations of the applicability of Circe's monologue to Ovid's argument: Geisler 1969 p. 270 and Jones 1997 p. 56.

[92] For *Amores* 1.8.5-18 representing Dipsas' rhetoric: Gross 1996 pp. 197-198 and Myers 1996 pp. 9-10; cf. Kratins 1963 pp. 154-155. For Dipsas' monologue echoing the Ovidian love-narrator's words in the *Amores* and later erotodidactic elegies: Kratins 1963 p. 157, Sharrock 1994 pp. 85-86, Gross 1996 pp. 197-206, and Bontyes 2008b pp. 372-374; cf. Stapleton 1996 pp. 19-20. For *Amores* 1.8.109 highlighting Dipsas as Ovid's "shadow or counterpart": Sharrock 1994 p. 85; cf. Suter 1989 pp. 16-17, Stapleton 1996 p. 20 and Hardie 2002 pp. 1-2.

[93] *Amores* 1.8.1-2 ("*est quaedam (quicumque volet cognoscere lenam,| audiat) est quaedam nomine Dipsas anus*") introduces Ovid in a didactic role, underlining his affinity with Dipsas.

[94] Davisson 1996 pp. 250-253. Brunelle 1997 pp. 46-59 and Brunelle 2002 pp. 60-67; cf. Boyd 2009 pp. 116-117, and Hardie 2006 p. 177 for Ulysses as a "straightforward *exemplum* of escape from erotic entanglement".

Sharrock's interpretation of Calypso as representing both the didactic narrator and the elegiac *puella* in *Ars amatoria* 2.123-144 — each drawing the student and the extratextual audience into the poem — and read Circe as an analogue for the didactic narrator and the male lover, both roles which match Ovid's relationship to Dipsas in *Amores* 1.8 and which Ovid highlights in Circe's monologue and the preceding catalogue.[95]

Circe's passion indicates that she represents students of the *Remedia*, male and female. She tried everything to retain Ulysses and to assuage her love but it persisted ("*longus in invito pectore sedit Amor*", 268); this statement echoes Ovid's advice that applying remedies late will make love harder to remove: "*et vetus in capto pectore sedit amor*" (108).[96] Parallels with the *Heroides* underline Circe's equation with the elegiac lover. Commentators predominantly note Circe's correspondences with Dido in *Heroides* 7;[97] the witch's pairing with Medea (261-264), however, suggests reading her monologue alongside her niece's letter and *Heroides* 6, and verbal and thematic echoes link Circe's speech with these letters.[98] Presenting Circe as an elegiac lover underlines the association of Ovid's present elegy with magic and illustrates the inability of "*Aeaea carmina*" to maintain love as well as the *Remedia*'s lack of intention of curing it.

---

[95] On Calypso: Sharrock 1994 p. 82. Cf. Brunelle 2002 p. 60 n. 18: "in her own way, Circe is just as humorously unsuccessful as the narrator of the *Amores*".

[96] Geisler 1969 p. 294 notes that *Remedia amoris* 268 varies 108. Cf. *Amores* 1.1.26 ("*uror, et in vacuo pectore regnat Amor*") of Ovid as elegiac lover and poet.

[97] Geisler 1969 pp. 296-304, Pinotti 1988 pp. 176-178, Davisson 1996 pp. 251-253, Barchiesi 2001a pp. 13-14, Hardie 2006 p. 177; cf. Sharrock 2006 p. 29. Janka 1997 p. 112 notes that Circe's speech is analogous to Calypso's at *Ars amatoria* 2.123-144 which Janka (pp. 128-141) also compares with the *Heroides*, especially 1 and 7, and Vergil's Dido. Brunelle 1997 pp. 48-49 and Brunelle 2002 p. 60, alternatively, stresses the contrast between Circe's speech and "the monologue of the abandoned heroine".

[98] *Remedia amoris* 267 ~ *Heroides* 12.165-166; *Remedia amoris* 263 ~ *Heroides* 12.168; *Remedia amoris* 284 ~ *Heroides* 6.117; *Remedia amoris* 276 ~ *Heroides* 6.8 and 112-113; *Remedia amoris* 274 and 277 ~ *Heroides* 6.73-74; *Remedia amoris* ~ *Heroides* 6.66. Davisson 1996 p. 250 n. 33 notes that *Heroides* 12, like Circe's monologue, explores the witch's inability in love-magic. Geisler 1969 p. 298 cites *Heroides* 6.117, 115f., and (p. 299) 133ff. as parallels for *Remedia amoris* 284 and 275-276, respectively; Bessone 1997a p. 223 compares *Heroides* 12.163-164 ("*potui* […] | […] *non potui*") with *Remedia amoris* 269-270. *Heroides* 6.114-115 mentions Hypsipyle's descent from Bacchus, though this couplet may be an interpolation: Knox 1995 pp. 194-195. Circe's monologue and *Heroides* 12 both open with "*memini*" (*Remedia amoris* 273; *Heroides* 12.1); cf. Hardie 2006 p. 177: "*memini*" (273) "remembers" Vergil *Aeneid* 4.431 and Ovid *Heroides* 7.167. For the authenticity of *Heroides* 12.1: Kirfel 1969 pp. 74-77, Bessone 1997a pp. 60-61, and Heinze 1997 pp. 80-81; Reeve 1973 p. 337, by contrast, argues that neither *Heroides* 12.1-2 nor 0a-b are the correct opening of the elegy.

Ovid the narrator points to his similarity with Circe by echoing the contrast between her power to physically transform men into thousands of shapes and her failure to change her spirit ("*vertere tu poteras homines in mille figuras; | non poteras animi vertere iura tui*", 269-270): he claims that he can vary his advice to suit any spirits and that there are as many remedies as diseases — "*nam quoniam variant animi, variabimus artes; | mille mali species, mille salutis erunt*" (525-526). Like Circe, the narrator cannot change his own nature ("[…] *ego semper amavi, | et si, quid faciam, nunc quoque, quaeris, amo*", 7-8), even with the remedies he offers his students: "*curabar propriis aeger Podalirius herbis | (et, fateor, medicus turpiter aeger eram)*" (313-314). Such statements cast doubt on the narrator's proficiency as *praeceptor amoris* and healer of love and reinforce his proclaimed identity as an uncured elegiac lover; following the equation of Ovid's elegy with ineffective magic, Circe's inability to influence love through *carmina* reinforces the doubts in the *Remedia* to do the same.[99]

The instruction not to trust magic precedes Ovid's later, unambiguous advice on avoiding pantomimes, the theatre, and love-elegy:

> *eloquar invitus: teneros ne tange poetas;*
> *summoveo dotes impius ipse meas.*
> *Callimachum fugito, non est inimicus amori;*
> *et cum Callimacho tu quoque, Coe, noces.*
> *me certe Sappho meliorem fecit amicae,*
> *nec rigidos mores Teia Musa dedit.*
> *carmina quis potuit tuto legisse Tibulli*
> *vel tua, cuius opus Cynthia sola fuit?*
> *quis poterit lecto durus discedere Gallo?*
> *et mea nescioquid carmina tale sonant.*
>
> (Ovid *Remedia amoris* 757-766)

Ovid adds his own elegies, including the *Remedia*, at the beginning and end of the catalogue of dangerous love-poets (758 and 766) and identifies their effects with those of his predecessors' work: "*et mea nescio quid carmina tale sonant*" (766).[100] As Brunelle remarks, this helpful

[99] Cf. Davisson 1996 p. 257: "while the immediate context indicates that the *adsuetas ... artes* (287) and *carmina* (290) […] were magic spells, the passage may also warn us against expecting either techniques or poetry to change our own nature." For the *praeceptor*'s fallibility illustrating the artistic control of the extratextual poet throughout Ovid's erotodidactic elegies: Durling 1958 pp. 157-167, Wright 1984 pp. 1-15, Myerowitz 1985 esp. pp. 37 and 92-97 and Watson 2007 pp. 337-374; for a contrasting interpretation of the competency and success of the Ovidian *praeceptor*: Volk 2002 pp. 188-195 and cf. 159-166.

[100] For *Remedia* 766: Brunelle 1997 pp. 109-119, Brunelle 2000-2001 pp. 128-131 and Rosati 2006 p. 164; Boyd 2009 p. 114 highlights 758 as referring to Ovid's own works; cf. Houghton 2009 pp. 282-285.

advice comes late — only when his students are approaching the end of the work does Ovid openly say that avoiding his poem would have been a better cure for love.[101] I suggest that these lines about the danger of his poetry and its ineffectiveness for curing love explicate the earlier warning given through the identification of his *Remedia* with magic *carmina*. Through this equation, Ovid reveals the seductive deceptiveness of the *Remedia* and advises his students to beware; the guise of magic obscures this warning, rendering it another instance of elegiac duplicity and misdirection even as the identification with magic *carmina* reveals the trick.

Conclusion

Ovid's use of magic throughout his amatory elegiac corpus illustrates the emblematic status of the motif for Augustan love-elegy. *Heroides* 6 and 12 and *Remedia amoris* demonstrate this particularly clearly: both the epistolary and erotodidactic works develop and expand the genre through the integration of new generic forms and conventions, though Ovid indicates that they remain firmly grounded in love-elegy. Both of the *Heroides* and the *Remedia* continue the same form and imagery of magic as in the *Amores* and in Tibullan and Propertian elegy; more than this, each example engages self-consciously with specific passages of the same theme in Ovid's earlier work and that of his predecessors. This close intertextual bond with a key metapoetic theme highlights the identification of these works with love-elegy, and links them into the wider tradition which extends back through to Vergilian and Theocritean pastoral; this use, which *Remedia amoris* 249-290 particularly exemplifies, allows us to read magic as an established shorthand for love-elegy which was recognisable to contemporary audiences, and which was synonymous with poetic flair and creativity as much as with amatory deceit and failure. Ovid's interaction with magic in earlier love-elegy also acts reciprocally, as *Heriodes* 6 and 12 illustrate well. By offering new perspectives on the genre in a mythological world chronologically "prior" to Augustan Rome, Ovid integrates his heroines into elegy's literary background, preparing them to become *exempla* for the male narrators. In addition to elegiacising the heroines, for our purposes this causes *Heroides* 6 and 12 to intensify the fallibility of the Tibullan and Propertian lovers as they now provide clear elegiac examples of

[101] Brunelle 1997 p. 120 and Brunelle 2000-2001 p. 132.

Medea's inapplicability both to love and to the genre. More than this, this new elegiac heritage for the genre's characteristic style of love-magic creates a literary tradition for the motif "independent" of Vergil and Theocritus, one which amplifies the genre's affinity with magic and with Medea.[102] This brings us to the end of our focus on the explicit connection of magic *carmina* with elegiac verses. In Chapter 3, we return to the beginning of the genre to pick up the second theme of our study: the Tibullan and Propertian lovers' construction of their mistresses' attractiveness through magic enchantment.

[102] For Ovid *Heroides* 20-21 creating a new myth for the "origins" of Augustan love-elegy cf. Barchiesi 1993 pp. 360-363.

Chapter 3. Fairest of them all? Magic and the *puella*

In our final chapter, we turn to the elegiac lover's association of magical enchantment with his mistress' beauty. We encountered this theme in relation to Tibullus 1.8 at the end of Chapter 1; here, we investigate this use of the motif to consider how the lover's suggestion that magic inspires his attraction to his mistress reflects on his presentation of their relationship and on his character and reliability as a narrator. I took initial steps in this area in my MA dissertation;[1] I now explore the relationship between the narrator's association of his *puella*'s physical charms with witchcraft and her metapoetic status as the Muse and embodiment of the elegiac text and its composition. We can identify this association from the earliest Tibullan and Propertian collections: while commentators note the elegiac lovers' comparison of their mistresses' beauty with magic, they predominantly read this as elevating the girls' attractiveness above witchcraft and any metaliterary relationship between the *puella*'s bewitching loveliness and the elegiac text remains unremarked.

We begin by highlighting the association of the *puellae* with magic and poetry in Propertius 1.1, 1.5 and 2.1 and Tibullus 1.5 and 1.8. Our consideration of the *puella*'s association with magic in Propertius' and Tibullus' first collections lays the groundwork for the second half of this chapter. Here, I suggest that we can identify a contemporary acknowledgement of the motif's role in these books by exploring magic and Canidia in Horace's *Epodes* 5 and 17 as parodically inverting and literalising the metaphorical association of the elegiac *puella*'s looks with witchcraft, offering new readings of the Horatian poems as engaging in dialogue with early Propertian and Tibullan elegy through the metaphor of magic.[2] Allusions to *Epode* 5 in Propertius' later 3.6 — our final text in this chapter — demonstrate, I suggest, the elegist's response to Horace's critique of the *puella*'s characterisation through magic.

[1] Chadha 2008 pp. 3-52, esp. 5-20.
[2] The competition between Elegy and Tragedy in Ovid *Amores* 3.1, which we noted in our reading of *Amores* 3.7, is a comparable use of female personifications of genres used to negotiate poetic choices.

Puellegy

The metaphorical association of the *puella*'s appearance with magic is most prominent in the first collections of Propertius and Tibullus, where the lovers indicate that witchcraft is behind their mad and debilitating passion.[3] As we have seen in our readings so far, both poets employ the same metaphor to speak about their poetry. Scholarship increasingly understands the elegiac *puellae* in Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid as personifications of the poets' texts; it seems natural, therefore, to read a triadic relationship between magic, the *puella* and elegy in these works, whereby the enchanting power of the girls' physical beauty reflects the same feature of the poet's *carmina*. In this section, we look at how the mistresses' connection with magic functions in the fictional and metapoetic narratives simultaneously in Propertius' and Tibullus' first books. I highlight the prominence of the girls' beauty as a source of attraction for the elegiac lovers and as a device for commenting on the style and composition of the text before focusing on examples of this combination to see how recognising this interlacing of magic, poetry and beauty can enhance our understanding of the motif in these two collections.

The elegiac narrators mention a variety of attributes which attract them to their beloveds — including, especially in Propertius' work, negative character traits such as spite, jealousy, anger and violence — but they foreground beauty as the primary inspiration for their love.[4] Propertius' first book begins with the lover attributing his infatuation to Cynthia's eyes (1.1.1-2) and in 1.4 the narrator follows a description of Cynthia's charms (5-10) by saying that she has other, more attractive features, only to focus immediately on her physical beauty once more ("*haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoris;* | *sunt maiora* […] | *ingenuus color et multis decor artibus* […]" , 11-13); Tibullus' narrator introduces Delia ("*me retinent vinctum formosae vincla puellae*", 1.1.55) and Pholoe ("*illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore* | *nec nitidum tarda*

[3] In Tibullus 2.4.55-60, the sole instance of magic in Book 2, the narrator associates Nemesis with the concoction of potions — the drugs of Circe and Medea (55), Thessalian herbs (56) and *hippomanes* (57-58) — which he claims his willingness to drink if this would inspire his mistress' favour ("*si modo me placido videat Nemesis mea vultu,* | *mille alias herbas misceat illa, bibam*", 59-60); Tibullus does not, however, mention Nemesis' beauty in connection with magic as he does Delia's and Pholoe's.

[4] Cf. Lilja 1965 pp. 111, 117 and 119-132 for beauty arousing love in elegy; Lilja 1965 pp. 110-155 reviews the "sources" of the narrator's love.

compserit arte caput", 1.8.15-16) by their beauty before he gives their names.[5] Both lovers illustrate the irresistible force of their attraction by favourably comparing their mistresses' appearances with magic; the terms in which they draw these comparisons, however, collapse the distinction between these forces, implying that their *puellae* bewitch them magically after all.[6]

At first glance, this favourable comparison of beauty and magic compliments the girls; aligning the effect of their good-looks with magic, however, suggests that it originates from a source external to the *puella*, justifying the lover's excessive amatory *servitium* and removing his responsibility for it by implying that it stems from a supernatural force beyond his control, rather than from physical attraction to a pretty girl. The elegiac *amator*'s implicit characterisation of his beloved, her attractiveness and his love for her in terms of magic betrays an ambivalence towards his mistress and his passion for her which lurks beneath his overt flatteries and supplications and his ostensibly willing servile devotion which is, ironically, self-imposed and from which he seldom attempts to remove himself: connecting his mistress with an illegitimate, artificial and potentially harmful source of power suggests a resentment of his situation and an awareness of a need to justify it to himself and to his peers.[7] The introduction of magical enchantment into his amatory relationship ultimately reveals more about the lover than about his beloved, highlighting his capacity for self-deception and for justifying his actions to himself and to his readers — both of which extend to constructing the image of his mistress best suited to his current needs — and illustrating his fallibility and untrustworthiness as a narrator.[8]

Metapoetically, the mistress' association with witchcraft unites the characterisation of elegy as magic *carmina* and the *puella*'s role as the embodiment of the text. The physique and charms of the Tibullan and Propertian *puellae* illustrate elegiac poetics and aesthetics and

[5] Lilja 1965 p. 134.
[6] Chadha 2008 pp. 3-52. For the elegiac "pseudo-opposition" between magic and love, rather than magic and beauty: Sharrock 1994 pp. 58-61; cf. Sharrock 1994 p. 74 for magic power enhancing the physical attractiveness of Calypso and Medea in Ovid *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108.
[7] For the social function of accusations of love-magic for rationalising or justifying behaviour in Greco-Roman culture: Gordon 1999 pp. 194-204**;** in non-amatory situations: Graf 1997b pp. 104-109; cf. Evans-Pritchard 1937 pp. 63-83 for a parallel function among the Azande.
[8] For accusations of magic revealing more about the accuser than their target: Winkler 1991 p. 215.

showcase the artistry of the poet's work.[9] Propertius 1.2 is the best-established, and perhaps the clearest, example of this in early love-elegy: the narrator encourages Cynthia to eschew artificial adornments and cosmetics and to let her natural beauty shine (1-8). He offers examples of the uncultivated beauty of nature (9-14) and of mythological heroines (15-24) and stresses that if Cynthia — whom Apollo, Calliope, Venus, and Minerva decorate — renounces gratuitous cosmetics she will ensure his devotion (25-31). Though the narrator emphasises simple, uncontrived beauty in the central *exempla* ("*litora nativis persuadent picta lapillis* | *et volucres nulla dulcius arte canunt*", 13-14; "[…] *succendit* […] | *Pollucem cultu non Hilaira soror*", 15-16; "*nec Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum* | […] *Hippodamia*", 19-20), he speaks of heroines who were as naturally beautiful as if the artist Apelles had coloured them ("*sed facies aderat nullis obnoxia gemmis* | *qualis Apelleis est color in tabulis*", 21-22). This hints at the highly sophisticated artifice behind the beauty of the *exempla*, signalling that the "natural" look the lover desires for his beloved results from great artistic skill. As the narrator constructs Cynthia's beauty through his verses, her "simply" shimmering appearance illustrates his literary artistry, which creates convincingly lifelike images through a clear and unaffected poetic style.[10] Connecting this appearance with love-magic gives another dimension to the enchanting power of the poet's *carmina* by expressing this element of his verses through his mistress' physical attributes; the illusoriness of the *puella* and the poetic *labor* masked by her apparently simple appearance reflect elegy's *fallax* nature. This level to the bewitching force of the *puella*'s beauty adds humour to the narrator's self-serving association of his beloved with witchcraft, as the source which enables the *puella*'s hold over him is none other than his own poetry.

We can explore these suggestions by looking at love-magic in Propertius 1.1, 1.5 and 2.1, and Tibullus 1.5 and 1.8. The first line of Propertius 1.1 ("*Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*") foregrounds Cynthia's beauty as the instrument behind the narrator's infatuation and enslavement, whilst implying that she has captivated him with magic wielded through her

[9] For Cynthia illustrating Propertius' poetics: Veyne 1988 pp. 3-14 and 50-63, Wyke 1987 pp. 47-61, and McNamee 1993 pp. 215-248; for Delia and Pholoe in Tibullus Book 1: Bright 1978 pp. 99-123, Veyne 1988 pp. 50-66, Maltby 2002 pp. 42-45, and Nikoloutsos 2007 pp. 59-61.

[10] For 1.2 illustrating Propertius' literary skill by presenting Cynthia's "natural" beauty as a work of art, including the significance of Apelles and his particular painting technique: Ross 1975 pp. 58-60 and 102, Sharrock 1991 pp. 39-40 and McNamee 1993 pp. 224-225 and cf. Curran 1975 pp. 1-16; Zetzel 1996 pp. 89-90 suggests that 1.2 makes a statement about Propertius' elegy by illustrating "how *not* to write" poetry [Zetzel's emphasis].

eyes.[11] Beginning his programmatic first elegy with magic indicates that this is fundamental to Propertius' *puella* and his work, and encourages his audience to associate Cynthia, and his narrator's love for her, with enchantment throughout his subsequent poems. The narrator's appeal to magic at 1.1.19-24 develops this subtext; the metapoetic significance of this passage, which we discussed in Chapter 1, reveals that Cynthia represents Propertian elegy and its composition as well as the object of his narrator's affections. This invites the reader to reinterpret the opening line of 1.1 as illustrating the poet's fascination by the enchanting realism of the work and the mistress he has created, alongside the lover's captivation by his beloved.[12]

Propertius next connects Cynthia and her effect on him with magic in 1.5, likening his infatuation to drinking Thessalian potions: "*et bibere e tota toxica Thessalia*" (6).[13] The narrator warns Gallus (31) against pursuing Cynthia: his beloved is angry, insensitive to prayers, and constantly tortures suitors (1-10); insomnia, disorientation, pallor and emaciation result from devotion to the jealous and possessive girl who will defame unfaithful lovers (11-26). Propertius can offer his friend no cure, only the promise of comfort and a warning to cease enquiring about his mistress (27-32). The comparison of loving Cynthia with the effects of witchcraft features early in 1.5, raising the association between the following descriptions of the lover's maladies and the effects of *agōgai* spells and presenting Cynthia as a practitioner of erotic enchantment.[14] The position and addressee of 1.5 prompt us to read a poetic element to Cynthia's association with love-magic: "Gallus" evokes Propertius' elegiac predecessor Cornelius Gallus, particularly following Propertius' polemical response to the iambographer, Bassus, in 1.4; the introduction of Gallus' name is delayed until the end of 1.5, encouraging the reader to elide the division between this poem and 1.4 and to understand 1.5 as still addressing Bassus, making him the victim of her

[11] On Cynthia captivating Propertius with magic in 1.1.1: Fauth 1980 pp. 277-278 and Sharrock 1994 p. 57; cf. Richardson 1977 p. 146 and Fauth 1999 pp. 140-141. For the multivalence of *capio* in 1.1.1: Kennedy 1993 pp. 47-48.

[12] For the elegiac lover and poet seduced by the woman he creates and by the process of her creation, without reference to magic: Sharrock 1991 pp. 36-49.

[13] For Propertius 1.5.6 illustrating his experience of love: Luck 1962 p. 39 and Fauth 1980 pp. 279-280; for 1.5.6 contributing to Cynthia's characterisation as a "magical spirit" in 1.5: Zetzel 1996 pp. 92-97, though Zetzel argues that Propertius opposes witchcraft and Cynthia's magical effect on her lovers to his poetic enchantment which emerges between 1.8A and B and 1.10. Lyne 1974 p. 263 highlights Cynthia's alignment with a goddess in 1.5.

[14] Cf. Zetzel 1996 p. 95, who compares the symptoms of love in 1.5 with those in an *agōgē* spell, *PGM* IV.1508ff. and 350ff.

love-magic.[15] Propertius does not introduce Cynthia's appearance in 1.5, but the poem's initial implicit continuation of 1.4 carries over the previous emphasis on her charms (1.4.5-14). 1.5 thus tightens the connection of Cynthia's magic power with her introduction as a bewitching artistic creation and style of poetic composition in 1.1, reinforcing the centrality of the theme to Propertius' elegy in his first book.

Propertius 2.1 reinforces this reading of Cynthia's beauty, magic, and poetry in Book 1.[16] The narrator focuses on his beloved's physical attractions from the beginning ("*sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere cogis | totum de Coa veste volumen erit*", 5-6); though he details Cynthia's accomplishments, his focus on her body and movement — on her forehead as well as her artfully arranged hair ("*seu vidi ad frontem sparsos errare capillos, | gaudet laudatis ire superba comis*", 7-8); on her hand and fingers when describing her musical ability ("*sive lyrae carmen digitis percussit eburnis, | miramur facilis ut premat arte manus*", 9-10); on her eyes as she sleeps ("*seu compescentis somnum declinat ocellis*", 11) — betrays these as the source of his fascination. These attributes also inspire the narrator's elegies ("*non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo: | ingenium nobis ispa puella facit*", 3-4; "*invenio causas mille poeta novas*", 12), characterising Cynthia as his Muse as well as his literary creation; as Sharrock highlights, the detail of the girl's ivory fingers ("*digitis* […] *eburnis*", 9) draws attention to her status as a work of art.[17]

At the centre of the poem, the narrator connects his love for Cynthia with magic:

[15] For the delayed introduction of Gallus as the addressee in 1.5: Cairns 1983 pp. 95-96. I expand on the significance of Bassus in 1.4 and of Cynthia's erotic magic power in 1.5 when we turn Horace's *Epodes* 5 and 17. For 1.4 and 1.5 as a pair: Cairns 1983 pp. 61-103; cf. Sharrock 2000 p. 270. For identifying "Gallus" in 1.5 with Cornelius Gallus: King 1980 pp. 212-230, Cairns 1983 pp. 79-88, Miller 2004 pp. 60-94 (esp. 78-83), and Cairns 2006 Chapters 3-7 (esp. pp. 77-80 and 201-202); against this identification: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 161, Hubbard 1974 p. 25, Syme 1978 pp. 99-103, Anderson-Parsons-Nisbet 1979 pp. 154-155, and Fedeli 1980 p. 153.

[16] My comments on Propertius 2.1 revise my discussion of this elegy in my MA dissertation where I highlighted the connection of Cynthia's appearance with magic but did not incorporate the *puella*'s connection with the elegiac text: Chadha 2008 pp. 11-15. For 2.1 recalling magic in 1.1 and 1.5: Papanghelis 1987 pp. 30-33.

[17] Sharrock 1991 p. 40.

seu mihi sunt tangenda novercae pocula Phaedrae,
pocula privigno non nocitura suo,
seu mihi Circaeo pereundum est gramine, sive
Colchis Iolciacis urat aena focis,
una meos quoniam praedata est femina sensus,
ex hac ducentur funera nostra domo.

(Propertius 2.1.51-56)

Commentators offer various interpretations of this passage and of the witches — Phaedra, Circe, and Medea — Propertius includes; most relevantly for our purposes, Luck suggests that Propertius associates Cynthia's attractive appearance and accomplishments with magic to create a contrast between her "internal" enchantment and the "external" practical witchcraft.[18] I differ from Luck in that, rather than opposing internal and external magic, I suggest that Cynthia's inclusion in the catalogue of witches aligns her with them, equating her physical enchantments with the spell which ensnares her lover's senses; the balancing anaphora of 2.1.5-16 and 51-56 encourages this link.[19] Cynthia's association with art and Propertius' poetry in the previous lines now aligns with her association, as in 1.1.19-24, with magic either inappropriate for love (2.1.53-54) or openly unsuccessful in achieving it (51-52).

Tibullus associates female beauty with magic in 1.5 and 1.8. In 1.5, the narrator, having sworn to renounce Delia, recalls his impotence in the arms of another woman (39-40); when the girl blames Delia's witchcraft for his condition, the narrator claims that Delia's charms are so great that she does not need spells:

tunc me, discedens, devotum femina dixit,
heu pudet, et narrat scire nefanda meam.
non facit hoc verbis; facie tenerisque lacertis
devovet et flavis nostra puella comis.

(Tibullus 1.5.41-44)

[18] Luck 1962 pp. 38-39. For alternative interpretations of Propertius' association between Cynthia, magic, love and death in 2.1: Papanghelis 1987 pp. 27-33 and Prince 2002 pp. 93-104; for love-philtres linking the witches: Tupet 1976 pp. 353-358. For the witches indicating Propertius' resistance to political pressure to compose epic: Heiden 1988 pp. 358-359.
[19] Miller 2002 p. 185 notes that the anaphora of 2.1.51-56 "directly recalls" 2.1.5-16.

Despite this protest, repeating *devoveo* (41 and 44) equates the effects of Delia's beauty with those of magic and presents his infatuation as resulting from witchcraft.[20]

This reading explicates a suggestion of magical enchantment in the opening lines of the elegy when the narrator, regretting his earlier harshness and his separation from Delia (1-2), compares his present state with a whipped top:

> *namque agor ut per plana citus sola verbere turben*
> *quem celer assueta versat ab arte puer.*
>
> (Tibullus 1.5.3-4)

Commentators predominantly read the *turbo* (3) as a spinning-top and interpret the simile as expressing the narrator's physical and mental agitation. *turbo* can also signify a magical instrument synonymous with the *rhombus* Simaetha uses to draw Delphis to her door at Theocritus *Idyll* 2.30-31 ("*χὠς δινεῖθ᾽ ὅδε ῥόμβος ὁ χάλκεος ἐξ Ἀφροδίτας, | ὡς τῆνος δινοῖτο ποθ᾽ ἁμετέραισι θύραισιν*").[21] Horace *Epode* 17.7 ("*citumque retro solve, solve turbinem*") provides a unique contemporary parallel for *turbo* as a magical instrument — we return to the relationship between this text and Tibullus 1.5 in the second half of this chapter. A closer look at Theocritus *Idyll* 2.30-31 can reinforce this reading of our Tibullan couplet: Simaetha's incantation uses persuasive analogy to compel Delphis to replicate the action of her *rhombus*; the Tibullan narrator inverts this formula and presents himself as the victim of love-

[20] Similarly Sharrock 1994 p. 75: Delia's beauty is "supposedly non-magical but […] described in terms of magic". Elder 1962 pp. 77-78 highlights that in 1.5.43-46 "magic *is* the beauty" [Elder's emphasis], but reads the subsequent Thetis-*exemplum* as focusing the reader's attention on Delia's attractiveness. Luck 1962 pp. 49-50 and Fauth 1980 p. 274 read Tibullus 1.5.41-44 as opposing external witchcraft to the internal magic of beauty, and using magic as a metaphor for irrationally overwhelming attraction; cf. Putnam 1973 p. 104, Murgatroyd 1980 p. 174, and Fauth 1999 pp. 137-138. For 1.5.41-44 contrasting magic and beauty and emphasising the latter: Musurillo 1970 p. 391, Bright 1978 pp. 160-162, Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 171, and Maltby 2002 pp. 251-252.

[21] Fauth 1980 p. 273 similarly makes this point, highlighting Theocritus *Idyll* 2.30 as a parallel. I independently argue that *turbo* activates a magical subtext in Tibullus 1.5.3-4, using Horace *Epode* 17.7 as a parallel, in my MA dissertation: Chadha 2008 pp. 15-18. My present comments on the *paraclausithyron* context of Tibullus 1.5 and my comparison with Theocritus *Idyll* 2.29-30 add to my previous interpretation of the Tibullan couplet and to Fauth's remarks. Smith 1978 p. 291 disputes the applicability of Theocritus *Idyll* 2.30 to Tibullus 1.5.3. For Horace *Epode* 17.7 and Tibullus 1.5.3 cf. Cairns 1979 p. 170. For Tibullus 1.5.3-4 illustrating the lover's mental state: Putnam 1973 p. 98, Smith 1978 p. 291, Murgatroyd 1980 p. 162 and Maltby 2002 p. 242; for the *puer* identified with Amor/Cupid: Putnam 1973 p. 100, Smith 1978 p. 290, Murgatroyd 1980 p. 162 and Maltby 2002 p. 242. For debate, ancient and modern, over the identification and function of *rhombus*, *turbo*, and *iunx*: Tavenner 1933 pp. 109-127, Gow 1934 pp. 3-8, Tupet 1974 pp. 50-55, Faraone 1993 pp. 11-16, and Johnston 1995 pp. 180-191; cf. Faraone 1999 p. 63 n. 102 for a survey of opinions and additional bibliography.

magic by comparing his action with that of the *turbo*, suggesting that a spell, not his own desire — or, as we learn at 39-44, his impotence — induced his return to his beloved.[22] This inversion allusively aligns him with Theocritus' Delphis and his addressee with the witch, Simaetha; the *puer* (4) stands for Cupid, whose control over the *turbo* echoes Aphrodite's agency at *Idyll* 2.29 ("*ἐξ Ἀφροδίτας*").[23] The introduction of Delia's doorstep as the setting of Tibullus 1.5 ("[...] *nec verbis victa patescit | ianua* [...]", 67-68; "[…] *quidam iam nunc in limine perstat*", 71; "[...] *et ante ipsas exscreat usque fores*", 74) retrospectively underlines the lover's self-equation with Delphis and his implicit characterisation of Delia as Simaetha. The narrator's allusive hint of a magical element at work in his return to Delia's threshold excuses his behaviour, suggesting that he is not acting independently; the later, explicit connection of his beloved with witchcraft (41-44) builds on the earlier couplet, reinforcing Delia's association with magic to justify his romantic incapacitation as well as his return to her after he had sworn to renounce her (1-2). By echoing the Theocritean lines, Tibullus also recalls the wider context of Simaetha's incantation, underlining the metapoetic connection between his elegy and magic; the following association of magic with Delia's physical attractions (41-44) explicates the suggestion that she controls the *turbo* in lines 3-4, associating her beauty, like that of her Propertian counterpart, with the magic of Tibullus' text which was illustrated in 1.2.45-54.[24]

The narrator of 1.8 suggests that magical enchantment has caused Marathus' infatuation with Pholoe:[25]

[22] The narrator's curses on the *lena* (1.5.49-56) expand the characterisation of elegiac verses and magic *carmina*.
[23] "*ab arte*" is a rare, poetic form of ablative of manner, first extant in Tibullus 1.5.4: Smith 1978 p. 291, Murgatroyd 1980 p. 162 and Maltby 2002 p. 242; the syntax maintains the echo of Theocritus *Idyll* 2.30.
[24] Combining Delia's beauty, magic and poetry in the force which compels the narrator to return to her, we can perhaps read the *discidium* with which the poem opens (1.5.1) as a literary one, especially considering the previous poem on Marathus (1.4) and Tibullus' elegiacisation of Homer's *Odyssey* in 1.3 which separates him geographically and generically from Delia's elegiac threshold. For "*asper eram*" (1.5.1) as a direct contrast for the generic elegiac "*mollis*": Cairns 1979 p. 178 and Lee-Stecum 1998 p. 156.
[25] Bright 1978 pp. 242-243 notes the similarity between 1.8.17-24 and 1.5.43-46.

num te carminibus, num te pallentibus herbis
devovit tacito tempore noctis anus?
cantus vicinis fruges traducit ab agris,
cantus et iratae detinet anguis iter,
cantus et e curru Lunam deducere temptat,
et faceret si non aera repulsa sonent.
quid queror heu misero carmen nocuisse, quid herbas?
forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis;
sed corpus tetigisse nocet sed longa dedisse
oscula sed femori conservisse femur.

(Tibullus 1.8.17-26)

The narrator appears to elevate Pholoe's charms above witchcraft (23-26); repeating *noceo* (23 and 25) equates the effects of physical contact with a girl who is naturally beautiful ("*illa placet, quamvis inculto venerit ore | nec nitidum tarda compserit arte caput*", 15-16) with magic.[26] We previously discussed lines 19-22 as characterising Tibullus' elegies as magic *carmina* by alluding to Vergil *Eclogue* 8.64-109; the seamless transition to the enchanting powers of Pholoe's attractiveness encourages us to understand her, too, as a *scripta puella* whose bewitching, "natural" beauty is an extension of the poet's art. Bright interprets 1.8 as a distanced treatment of Tibullus' relationship with Delia mediated through Marathus and Pholoe; Drinkwater extends this suggestion to read the poem as "a microcosm of male-female elegy within the male-male frame of the speaker's own suffering", in which Marathus develops into an elegiac lover and poet as the narrator grants him an embedded lament (1.8.55-66).[27] Pholoe's connection with the elegiac text through magic in our passage provides an additional indication of the metaliterary thread in the narrative of 1.8, anticipating Marathus' role as an elegiac lover and poet enchanted by his textual beloved; that Pholoe appears here as an extension of the narrator's *carmina* rather than of the boy's maintains the gradual revelation of the narrative and balances Marathus' immediately preceding introduction as a *scriptus puer* (1.8.9-14), signalling to the reader that the young couple are both literary constructs guided by Tibullus the poet — just as his narrator attempts to influence their affair — to present an objective reflection on elegiac poetics.

[26] Cf. Sharrock 1994 p. 76. For Tibullus 1.8.17-26 as opposing beauty and magic: Luck 1962 pp. 51-52, Wimmel 1968 pp. 59-61, Putnam 1973 p. 130, Tupet 1976 p. 345, Bright 1978 pp. 242-243, Cairns 1979 p. 140, Ball 1983 p. 128, and Maltby 2002 p. 307.
[27] Bright 1978 pp. 240-248; Drinkwater 2012 pp. 431-438; for Marathus as *scriptus puer*: Nikoloutsos 2007 pp. 55-82 (esp. 61-72), Nikoloutsos 2011 pp. 33-41, and Drinkwater 2012 p. 441.

These examples illustrate that the triangular relationship between magic, elegiac poetry, and the beauty of the *puella* recurs in Propertius' and Tibullus' early works. In Propertian elegy, Cynthia's connection with the poet's *carmina* is given particular prominence in the opening poems of each of his first two books, and in each text the effect of her physical appearance on her lover — and that of love-elegy on the extratextual audience — is represented in terms of erotic enchantment. This association of magic with the beauty of Cynthia, Delia and Pholoe as well as directly with poetic *carmina* further indicates that the theme was fundamental to the construction and self-representation of Augustan love-elegy, in this case for illustrating its power to enchant and delight an audience. Within the narrative the same association of the *puella*'s beauty with magic continues to highlight the elegiac lover's capacity for self-deception and justification — as well as his ambivalence towards his mistress and the, ironically self-imposed, amatory servitude which he claims to be willing to submit himself to — as he transfers the blame for his situation away from his own susceptibility to a pretty face by characterising his beloved as a practitioner of erotic magic. The expression of this ambivalence in the guise of a compliment to the *puella*'s incandescent beauty highlights the elegiac *ego*'s untrustworthiness both as a narrator and as a lover, and his readiness to adjust his attitude towards and representation of his beloved according to his own needs and circumstances.

These observations now prepare us to begin the second half of this chapter, in which we explore a contemporary response to Propertius' and Tibullus' association of magic with the *puella*: Horace's Canidia, a witch with a metaliterary function whose appearance and association with magic in *Epodes* 5 and 17 similarly illustrate her connection with the poet's work. Canidia, I suggest, parodies the elegiac *puellae*, as well as embodying Horatian iambic: her age, white hair and unkempt appearance invert the bewitching youth and natural loveliness of the elegiac mistresses, leaving her with only practical magic to bind suitors to her. Horace's caricature targets the lover's willing subservience to a woman whom he presents as forcefully arousing and controlling his desires, and enables him to define his iambic poetics against the elegiac. This provides another example of magic as an avenue for intergeneric dialogue through its inherent link with poetry and the women who embody it. Before we continue, we must first confront the issue of relative chronology: according to the customarily accepted sequence of publication, the

Epodes predate Propertius' and Tibullus' first collections. Several possibilities exist for the connection of magic and the elegiac beloved appearing in Horace's *Epodes* and in early Propertian and Tibullan elegy: Gallus' work might have provided a common source for all three poets; social and professional interaction might have facilitated their contact during the composition of their collections.[28] A further possibility for us to consider is the earlier public release of Propertius' and Tibullus' work, placing them chronologically closer — even prior — to the publication of the *Epodes*, and I here expand on the criteria for dating the collections.

A Question of Priority

Horace's *Epodes* were published between late 31-30 BC. The book is dated by the Battle of Actium of 2nd September 31 BC, which provides the context for *Epodes* 9 and 1 and furnishes the latest date in the collection.[29] Propertius Book 1 and Tibullus Book 1 are traditionally dated to 29-28 BC and 27-26 BC respectively, based on the internal evidence of Propertius 1.6 and Tibullus 1.7. Recent scholarship demonstrates that the criteria for dating Propertius 1.6 and Tibullus 1.7 remain open to interpretation, and foregrounds the possibility of earlier dates for the publication of each elegist's first collection.

In 1.6, Propertius declines to accompany his addressee, Tullus, on a mission to Asia ("*Asiae*", 14):

> *tu patrui meritas conare anteire secures*
> *et vetera oblitis iura refer sociis.*
>
> (Propertius 1.6.19-20)

Tullus' uncle (19) is L. Volcacius Tullus (*cos.* 33 BC); "*secures*" (19) alludes to his proconsulship in Asia. Epigraphic evidence (Ehrenburg-Jones 1955 no. 98) confirms Volcacius Tullus' proconsulship, but this inscription dates to approximately 9 BC and does not provide a date for his office. Commentators relate Propertius 1.6.20 to the period following Actium, suggesting that the mission to Asia aimed to restore order to the province in the wake of

[28] For magic as a likely theme in Gallus' elegies: Cairns 2006 p. 202 n. 41.
[29] Nisbet 1984 pp. 8-18. *Epode* 9: Mankin 1995 pp. 9-10 and 159-182, Johnson 1997 pp. 327-31, and Watson 2003 pp. 310-313; *Epode* 1: Mankin 1995 p. 49 and Watson 2003 pp. 51-58. Thompson 1970 pp. 328-34 dates *Epode* 1 to 36 BC.

Anthony's administration, and so date L. Volcacius Tullus' proconsulship to 30 or 29 BC.[30] Accordingly, Propertius 1.6.19-20 traditionally provides a *terminus post quem* of 29-28 BC for Book 1.[31] In a recent article, Heslin emphasises that Propertius looks forward, rather than back, to Tullus' mission to Asia and his uncle's proconsulship and that 1.6 provides a *terminus ante quem* for Propertius collection, rather than a date after which the book must have been published. Heslin suggests that Propertius' silence with regard to Actium in Book 1 indicates that the collection is better understood as published prior to this battle, and argues that 1.6.19-20, with its veiled criticism of Antony's conduct in the East, better applies to the political context of 33 BC than of late 31 BC. As a result, Heslin proposes a new date of composition for 1.6 "most probably in the early months of 33", with the completed book published shortly afterwards.[32] Heslin's revised dating of Propertius Book 1 harmonises with that suggested by Luther, who offers M. Licinius Crassus' Balkan campaigns of 30-29 BC as a new *terminus ante quem* for the collection based on Propertius' reference to this undertaking at 2.7.18 ("*gloria ad hibernos lata Borysthenidas*") in relation to his own literary fame.[33] These arguments for re-dating Propertius Book 1 convincingly suggest that the collection was published in advance of Horace's *Epodes*, allowing greater opportunity for dialogue between the two books during their composition.

Tibullus 1.7 opens by commemorating Messalla's triumph for ending a revolt by Celts in Aquitania:

[30] Ehrenburg-Jones 1955 no. 98; cf. Jones 1955 pp. 244-245, Syme 1962 p. 152 and Syme 1978 p. 98. For fuller discussion of dating L. Volcacius Tullus' proconsulship see Hubbard 1974 pp. 42-43, Lyne 1998b p. 521 and Heslin 2010 p. 55. The *Fasti Venusini* record Tullus' consulship in 33 BC: Degrassi 1947 XIII.1 pp. 81 and 254-255 (with 251-252). For Propertius 1.6.20 in relation to Antony in Asia: Butler and Barber 1933 pp. 162-163, Lyne 1998b p. 521, Luther 2003 p. 802, and Cairns 2006 p. 43.

[31] Butler and Barber 1933 p. xxvii (cf. pp. xxv and 162-163), Enk 1946 pp. 16-17, Richardson 1977 pp. 7-8, Fedeli 1980 p. 168 (cf. pp. 9-10); Batstone 1992 pp. 301-302 suggests possible publication in August 29-spring 28 BC, with 1.6 providing a *terminus post quem* of "spring 30 (or […] 29)"; Lyne 1998b p. 523 suggests 28 BC as an "approximate" publication date. Camps 1961 pp. 6-7 dates 1.6 to 30-29 BC according to L. Volcacius Tullus' proconsulship, but relates Book 1 as a whole to 30 BC; Barsby 1974 p. 128 n. 5 gives 1.6 an "approximate" date of 30 BC.

[32] Heslin 2010 pp. 54-61 (quotation: p. 61).

[33] Luther 2003 pp. 803-806. Propertius' reference to the opening of the portico to the temple of Palatine Apollo at 2.31.1-2 offers a traditional *terminus ante quem* of October 28 BC: Butler and Barber 1933 p. xxvii, Camps 1967 p. 204, Fedeli 1980 p. 10 and Luther 2003 pp. 802-803; cf. Enk 1946 pp. 16-17 for "*Caesar*" at 2.31.2 suggesting October 28 BC as a *terminus ante quem*.

hunc fore Aquitanas posset qui fundere gentes,
quem tremeret forti milite victus Atur.
evenere: novos pubes Romana triumphos
vidit et evinctos bracchia capta duces;
at te victrices lauros, Messalla, gerentem
portabat nitidis currus eburnus equis.

(Tibullus 1.7.3-8)

The *Fasti Capitolini* record Messalla's triumph as 25 September 27 BC ("727 M. Valerius M. f. M. n. Messalla. A. DCCXXVI | Corvinus procos. ex Gallia VII k. Oct.").[34] As Tibullus presents the celebration as a past event, 1.7 provides the *terminus post quem* for Book 1, suggesting its publication between late 27 BC-26 BC.[35] In a recent article, Knox, beginning from Ovid's sequence of the Roman love elegists at *Tristia* 4.10.51-54 and 2.445-268, argues for an earlier *terminus post quem* for Tibullus 1.7 and for the final issue of the completed Book 1.[36] Knox highlights the indeterminate chronology of Messalla's career between 31-27 BC, particularly of his Aquitanian proconsulship and his Syrian activities. Emphasising that the precise dates of these undertakings are unknown, Knox argues in favour of the view that Messalla was in Aquitania "the year after Actium", before his time in Syria, rather than in 28-27 BC immediately preceding the recorded date of his triumph; accordingly, Knox proposes that Tibullus' reference to Messalla's Aquitanian victory offers a *terminus post quem* of 30 BC for 1.7.[37] Messalla's Aquitanian campaign may arguably have occurred in 30 BC; however, this has no immediate impact on the dating of Tibullus 1.7, as the dominant reading of "*portabat*" at 1.7.8 presents Messalla's triumph as a past event. Knox advocates reading "*portabit*" and emending "*at*" (1.7.7) to "*ac*" so that Tibullus foreshadows the postponed triumphs of Messalla and his

[34] *CIL* I.i p. 50.
[35] For cautious dating of Tibullus Book 1 to 27-26 BC: Butler and Barber 1933 p. xxxv, Syme 1984 p. 958, Smith 1978 p. 43, Murgatroyd 1980 pp. 11-15, Lee 1990 p. ix and Lyne 1998 pp. 521-522; Bright 1978 p. 265 notes that the release of the book "is generally set at about 26 or 25 BC".
[36] Knox 2005 pp. 204-216. Ingleheart 2010 pp. 346 and 356 counters Knox's interpretation of Ovid *Tristia* 2.463-464; cf. Bright 1978 p. 265 on Ovid *Tristia* 2.463-464 in relation to dating Tibullus Book 1.
[37] Knox 2005 pp. 206-207. For debate over the chronology of Messalla's career in 31-27 BC and problems with determining the priority of his Aquitanian and Syrian activities, including the evidence of Tibullus 1.7: Postgate 1903a p. 113, Hammer 1925 pp. 46-79, Hanslik 1955 pp. 147-153, Schmitthenner 1962 pp. 81-85, Elder 1965 pp. 97-98, Scheid 1975 pp. 50-58, Valvo 1983 pp. 1669-1673, Syme 1986 pp. 200-226 — noting (pp. 209-210) that Messalla could have been in Syria in either 31/30 BC or 28/29 BC, though stating his preference for 31/30 BC — and Vitucci 1986 pp. 267-273; cf. Drinkwater 1983 p. 121, and Cairns 1999 p. 230.

contemporaries which will take place after Octavian's own triple celebration in 29 BC.[38] Knox highlights two further criteria for dating Tibullus 1.7 — the reference to Messalla's repairs on the Via Latina (1.7.57-62), and the hymn to Osiris (1.7.29-48). Tibullus 1.7 provides the only evidence for Messalla's roadworks, leaving their location and date unknown: Knox suggests that Messalla is more likely to have financed the repairs during his consulship in 31 BC than during Augustus' later attempts to involve celebrators of triumphs in maintenance works.[39] Knox also argues that the hymn to Osiris indicates an earlier date for Tibullus Book 1, as Augustus forbade worship of Egyptian divinities in Rome in 28 BC.[40] Based on these criteria, together with his reading of Ovid *Tristia* 4.10.51-54 and 2.445-268, Knox proposes 29 BC for the publication of Tibullus Book 1.[41]

Knox's interpretation of the criteria for dating Tibullus 1.7 is noteworthy as it highlights the instability of these details and illustrates the potential for considering earlier publication of Tibullus Book 1. Tibullus' presentation of Messalla's triumph as a past event, however, remains an obstacle to accepting Knox's argument unreservedly. Accepting Knox's emendations of Tibullus 1.7.7-8 also makes it necessary to consider the question of how far in advance a triumph would have been publicly confirmed, as it is unlikely that Tibullus would publically commemorate an honour for his patron which was as yet unguaranteed.[42] The fact of postponed triumphs contemporary to Messalla's — namely, those of Marcus Licinius Crassus in 27 BC for his Balkan campaigns in 29 BC, and of C. Carrinas and C. Calvisius Sabinus, who both celebrated in 28 BC for victories in Spain in 31 and Gaul in 30 BC, respectively — reinforces the possibility that Messalla's honour may have been announced earlier than it was finally awarded. If Messalla indeed accompanied Octavian to Rome for the triple triumph in 29 BC it is perhaps possible that his own was announced then, though this raises the further question of Octavian

[38] Knox 2005 pp. 208-209.
[39] Knox 2005 pp. 209-212. Syme 1939 p. 402 n. 4 cites only Tibullus 1.7.57-62 as evidence of Messalla's repairs; cf. Hammer 1925 p. 81 and McCracken 1932 p. 347.
[40] Knox 2005 pp. 213-214; on Tibullus' choice of hymn cf. Koenen 1976 pp. 135-157 and Lambert 2003 pp. 47-60, both maintaining the traditional dating of 1.7.
[41] Knox 2005 p. 216.
[42] Knox 2005 p. 209 n. 24 acknowledges that poetic predictions of triumphs were "presumably made with some assurance of their likelihood".

allowing the declaration of future awards to distract from his glorious occasion.[43] Nevertheless, even if Knox's arguments for the emendation of Tibullus 1.7.7-8 do not convince, it is highly probable that Tibullus could have gained fame by releasing single elegies before publishing Book 1, providing just one way for Horace to encounter his work well in advance of 27 BC.[44] Lexical and thematic links between *Epodes* 5 and 17 and elegies in Tibullus' first book indicate Horace's knowledge of Tibullus' early work, as well as of Propertius' first completed collection.[45]

Even if we maintain the traditionally accepted dates for Propertius and Tibullus Book 1, Horace will surely have encountered poems from each elegist's first book prior to publication. Horace compiled his *Epodes* over approximately ten years between 42-30 BC; Propertius and Tibullus likely worked for comparable periods on their collections, and as such all three poets will have been composing their works contemporaneously.[46] Poets' interaction with one another's work pre-publication was central to Roman literary culture in the 30s BC. The intermingling of the "circles" and networks around central patrons such as Maecenas, Messalla, and Pollio — as particularly illustrated by Horace *Satires* 1.10.81-90 — allowed poets to disseminate work widely among peers by reciting early compositions and exchanging written drafts for feedback, and through recitations or publication of finished poems before the completed book. Socialising and resources such as Rome's public libraries would also have

[43] Knox 2005 pp. 207-208, suggesting Octavian's triumphal celebrations of 29 BC as the cause for the deferrals; cf. Hanslik 1955 pp. 149-150, Scheid 1975 p. 54 n. 2**,** Vitucci 1986 pp. 270-271, and Lambert 2003 p. 53. Cairns 2006 p. 74 comments on Augustus' limiting of rewards for his generals following Actium, noting that Augustus appears to have been "hyper-sensitive to anything which might detract from his own image as the victor of the Civil Wars." On Crassus' triumph, including the possibility that it was announced in 29 BC but not awarded until 27 BC: Schmitthenner 1962 pp. 33-34. For Messalla's presence in Rome in 29 BC and his likely participation in Octavian's triumphs: Hammer 1925 p. 60, with n. 209, Schmitthenner 1962 p. 81, Scheid 1975 p. 54 n. 2, and Syme 1986 p. 209 n. 67. Beard 2007 pp. 199-205 examines the involved process of applying for a triumph; cf. Beard 2007 pp. 294-305 for Crassus, and for developments of the triumph under Augustus.

[44] Bright 1978 p. 265; cf. Cairns 1979 p. 228.

[45] Cf. Maltby 2002 p. 131: the "most immediate model" for Tibullus 1.1.27-28 is "probably Hor. *Epod.* 2.23-5 […] although in an age when poets would have heard each other's work at private recitations before actual "publication" it is difficult to establish priority."

[46] Horace's *Epodes*: Watson 2003 p. 1 and Carruba 1969 pp. 15-17; cf. Babcock 1966 p. 411 n. 21. For the dating of individual *Epodes*: Fraenkel 1957 pp. 24-75, Nisbet 1984 pp. 1-18, D'Anna 1996 p. 262, and Watson 2003 *passim.* Syme 1984 p. 958, Smith 1978 p. 43, and Camps 1961 p. 6 suggest lengthy periods of composition for Tibullus and Propertius; conversely, Richardson 1977 p. 8 views the production of Propertius Book 1 as "relatively rapid." Lyne 1998b p. 522 n. 10 comments that Propertius and Tibullus "must have overlapped" whilst writing their respective first books.

facilitated contact between poets.[47] These avenues would have granted Horace, Propertius and Tibullus ready access to each other's work and opportunities for mutual creative involvement during its composition. Commentators regularly acknowledge the importance of literary interaction through such pre-publication circulation of poetry: Watson and Maltby, for example, respectively commenting on Horace's *Epodes* and Tibullus Books 1 and 2, each cite this as a means of Horace and Tibullus alluding to Vergil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid* before the publication of the Vergilian works.[48] What, then, should prevent the same means of interaction between Horace's *Epodes* and the first books of Propertius and Tibullus?

We are now prepared to examine Horace's engagement with Propertian and Tibullan love-elegy more closely. I begin by introducing Horace's recognised dialogue with this genre in *Epode* 11 and then summarise relevant interpretations of Canidia.

Black Mirror: Horace's iambic *puella*

Horace uses love-elegy as a foil for defining his poetics throughout his career, regularly focusing on the elegists' emotional excesses and obsessive devotion to beautiful but unattainable, cruel, and unfaithful beloveds.[49] *Epode* 11 is well-established in scholarship as an iambic parody

[47] On the flexibility of poetic "circles": Ullman 1912 pp. 161-164 (on Horace *Satires* 1.10.18-90), Quinn 1982 p. 141 n. 212, and White 1993 pp. 35-45. For recitations of drafts and finished works: Quinn 1982 pp. 141-145 and Dupont 1997 pp. 44-59; for circulation of written drafts: Quinn 1982 pp. 80-88. On libraries: Marshall 1976 pp. 252-264, Quinn 1982 pp. 125-128, White 1993 pp. 54 and 59, and Fantham 1996 p. 14; cf. Goldberg 2005 pp. 189-203.

[48] Maltby 2002 pp. 39-40: "Possible echoes of Virgil's *Aeneid* in Tib. 2.5 need not mean that book two was composed after the publication of the *Aeneid*, but simply that T. had heard pre-publication recitations of parts of the work." Watson 2003 pp. 76-77: "That the *Georgics* were published after the *Epodes* proves nothing […] it seems virtually certain that Horace, as a fellow poet and close friend, was party to the occasional recitations which […] Vergil gave […] and that in consequence Horace was acquainted with the *Georgics* long before their formal publication."

[49] For Horace using elegy to define his lyric ethos in *Odes* 1.5, 1.33, 2.8, 2.9 and *Epistles* 1.4: Commager 1962 pp. 239-241, Putnam 1972 pp. 81-88, Davis 1991 pp. 39-60, 184-186 and 224-233, Lowrie 1997 pp. 77-93 and 266-297 (*Odes* 3.7 and 3.11). For Horace's literary interaction with Tibullus in *Odes* 1.33 and *Epistles* 1.4: Putnam 1972 pp. 81-88 and Ball 1994 pp. 409-414; on the identity of "Albius" in *Odes* 1.33, and *Epistles* 1.4, and for discussion of *Odes* 1.33: Ullman 1912 pp. 149-160, Commager 1962 pp. 240-241, Syndikus 1972 pp. 293-297, Davis 1991 pp. 39-43, and Ball 1994 pp. 409-414; cf. Fraenkel 1957 p. 323. Against identifying "Albius" with Tibullus: Postgate 1903b pp. 179-184. On *Odes* 1.5 programmatically defining Horace's amatory lyric against elegy: Santirocco 1986 pp. 32-34 and Davis 1991 p. 224; for Barine (*Odes* 2.8) as a parody of the elegiac *puella*: Syndikus 1972 pp. 388-392, Nisbet-Hubbard 1978 pp. 123-124 and Santirocco 1986 pp. 90-91.

of love-elegy.[50] Horace's narrator adopts the *persona* of the elegiac lover, lamenting that composing *versiculi* is of no use in his love for Lyciscus (1-4): he relates his former infatuation with Inachia, which made him a source of gossip throughout the city, and recalls his laments at her door, to which he was constantly carried back only to beat himself against it in vain (5-22). Now love for soft Lyciscus binds him, though passion for another boy or girl will one day release him from this, too (23-28). *Epode* 11 maintains an iambic meter, and the narrator's distinction between former and present affairs and his final assertion that future beloveds will replace the current object of his affections distinguishes his iambic perspective on love from the elegiac fixation on a single beloved, dramatising Horace's differentiation between iambic and contemporary elegiac poetics.[51] Horace's engagement with love-elegy in this poem also exemplifies the multiplicity of genres which he incorporates into his iambic.[52]

Commentators illustrate Horace's engagement with elegy using lexical and thematic parallels from Propertian and Tibullan works; nevertheless, they predominantly consider Horace to be reacting to Cornelius Gallus.[53] Lyne and Heslin propose, instead, that *Epode* 11 responds to Propertius Book 1. Lyne highlights correspondences between *Epode* 11.15-16 and 23-27 and Propertius 1.1.25-28, suggesting that *Epode* 11 is a "cynical and amusing" pastiche of Propertius' elegiac *servitium amoris* to a single beloved. Heslin begins from Propertius 1.4, in which the elegist warns an iambographer, Bassus, against praising women besides Cynthia to him: the elegiac narrator details the attractions of Cynthia's beauty and accomplishments, warns that she will slander Bassus to all the girls of Rome, and outlines the efforts she will make to retain her lover; he ends by reaffirming his attachment to Cynthia and commanding Bassus to leave them be. Heslin argues that "Bassus" is a pseudonym for Horace, mocking his "low" poetic genre as well as his equally low height and birth, and that part of the irony of 1.4 is that Bassus' praise of

[50] Leo 1960 pp. 146-152, Luck 1976 pp. 122-126, Watson 1983 pp. 229-238, and Watson 2003 pp. 358-381; cf. Harrison 2001 pp. 180-181. For elegy in *Epode* 15: Leo 1960 pp. 152-153, Babcock 1966 pp. 406-419 and Harrison 2001 pp. 184-185. For *Epodes* 11 and 15 developing from Alexandrian sources shared with Latin love-elegy rather than directly engaging with the contemporary Roman genre: Grassmann 1966 pp. 34-46, Fedeli 1978 pp. 117-118, and Ezquerra 1997 pp. 7-26, who notes that the possibility of Horace's interaction with Gallus' elegies is impossible to determine.

[51] Barchiesi 1994a pp. 127-133; cf. Heyworth 1993 pp. 88-89.

[52] For the generic variety of Horace's *Epodes*: Harrison 2001 pp. 165-186 and Harrison 2007a pp. 104-135; cf. Andrisano 2012 pp. 285-302.

[53] Leo 1960 pp. 146-152, Luck 1976 pp. 122-126, Watson 1983 pp. 229-238, and Watson 2003 pp. 358-381; cf. Harrison 2001 pp. 180-181.

female beauty picks up Horace's peculiarly intense invective against ugly women in *Epodes* 8, 12, 5 and 17. In *Epode* 11, Heslin suggests, Horace allows Bassus — "an iambic poet who has become the would-be victim of elegiac womanhood" — to respond, reflecting the iambic variety of sexual partners and deflating the threat that Cynthia's slander will prevent him from enjoying Rome's girls through his infatuation with Lyciscus (23) and by affirming his equal enjoyment of boys and girls (27-28), pointed responses to Propertius' programmatically heterosexual adaptation of Meleager *A.P.* 12.101 at 1.1.1-6. "Inachia" may also be a pseudonym which comments on the elegiac lover's devotion to a single mistress: Heslin suggests that "Inachia" evokes the Danaids, making Horace's beloved "one of fifty interchangeable" sisters rather than a special girl worthy of his unconditional, unswerving devotion.[54] We can build on these analyses and supply new evidence for Horace's engagement with early Propertian and Tibullan work by identifying elegiac elements in *Epodes* 5 and 17, beginning from the lovers' attachment of magic to the beauty of their *puellae* and their representation of this power as the cause of their irresistible attraction and self-proclaimed willing *servitium* to them. Canidia strips the elegiac *puellae* of their youth and beauty and replaces these with practical witchcraft, literalising the metaphor of magical enchantment as she employs love-magic to bind unwilling men to her; amplifying the elegiac subtext into a main narrative element exposes the lovers' double-edged association of magic with their mistresses to present a vision of how the lovers' amatory situation would be if their *puellae* really were witches rather than supernaturally lovely.[55]

My readings of magic and Canidia in *Epodes* 5 and 17 align with scholarship on the metapoetic roles of the witch and her spells in the *Epodes* and in *Satires* Books 1 and 2 which has been gaining increasing dominance over biographical readings of Canidia as Horace's lover — a Neapolitan perfume-maker named Gratidia — or as a real practitioner of magic whom he knew in

[54] Lyne 1979 pp. 121-122; Heslin 2011 pp. 51-66.
[55] Cf. Heslin 2011 p. 59: "the ugliness of Canidia has almost as prominent a rôle to play in Horace's early work as the beauty of Cynthia has in Propertius; they might even be considered mirror images."

Rome.[56] Oliensis and Barchiesi discuss Canidia's role as a "Muse" of Horace's iambic collection, highlighting her identity as a witch and her etymological associations with singing ("*canere*"), dogs ("*canis*") and advanced age ("*canities*") as elements of her character which associate her with the iambic poet and text. Oliensis suggests that Canidia's association with magic and song defines her as "a target and a producer of poetry" and a personification of "an indecorous poetics against which Horace tries to define his own practice" but with which he shares a deep affinity, making her an "anti-Muse" who stimulates his creative output.[57] Barchiesi adds that Canidia embodies iambic poetics: her use of snakes and poisons evokes the genre's etymological origins in "poisonous speech"; her age aligns her with its eponym, Iambe, the old woman whose lewd language and behaviour elicits laughter from her audience; her spells foreground the iambic characteristic of "*illocutionary*" speech which aims to achieve a direct result.[58] Barchiesi reads the *Epodes* as engaging with various models, predecessors and etymologies of iambic, and *Epode* 17 in particular as a literary "myth of origins", in which Canidia's magic makes the narrator into the image of an iambographer and a reflection of herself — white-haired, old, filled with bile and venom (17.21-23) — before the "reversal" at the end of the poem suggests that she is a costume for the poet whose verses incorporate elements of magical incantation and who, as her creator, supplies and controls her voice; Barchiesi cites Lesbia, Lycoris and Cynthia as parallel metaliterary constructions who can further our understanding of Canidia and her role.[59]

---

[56] For biographical readings of "Canidia": Tavenner 1930 pp. 14-21, Hahn 1935 pp. 213-230, Eitrem 1941 p. 67, Manning 1970 pp. 393-401, and Tupet 1976 pp. 294-296; cf. D'Arms 1967 pp. 141-145. Fraenkel 1957 pp. 62-63 stresses that the question of Canidia's basis in reality is secondary to her role as a poetic figure. Programmatic readings of *Satires* 1.8 interpret Canidia and Sagana as representing Horace's literary predecessors or opponents, or rivals who seek intimacy with Maecenas: Anderson 1972 pp. 7-12 and Habash 1999 pp. 285-297; cf. Plaza 2006 pp. 66-68 and 40-41. For the witches as analogous to Horace the poet: Hill 1993 pp. 257-263. Oliensis 1998 pp. 70-74 reads Canidia in *Satires* 1.8 as embodying a "poetics against which Horace tries to define his own poetic practice." For an alternative reading of *Satires* 1.8 and Horace's "theory of satire": Freudenburg 1993 pp. 228-231. These interpretations support reading literary self-definition and polemic in Canidia's appearances in *Epodes* 5 and 17. Horace also references Canidia in *Epode* 3 and *Satires* 2.1 and 2.8; I omit these poems as they do not incorporate dialogue with elegy. For Canidia's metapoetic role in *Satires* 2.1 and 2.8: Oliensis 1998 p 76; cf. Freudenburg 1995 pp. 207-219, esp. 218-219.

[57] Oliensis 1991 pp. 110-119.

[58] Barchiesi 2002 pp. 51-52 and 63-64 [Barchiesi's emphasis]; cf. Mankin 2010 p. 100 and Andrisano 2012 pp. 294-297.

[59] Barchiesi 1994b pp. 212-213 and 216-217 and Barchiesi 1995 pp. 339-342; for a similar reading of reversal and balance in *Epode* 17: Spina 1993 pp. 163-188.

Barchiesi suggests that we can use Propertius' Cynthia to support his reading of Canidia. I argue the opposite, beginning from the triangle of magic, poetry and the *puella* in elegy and the iambo-elegiac dialogue already underway between Horace and Propertius to propose that these textual women are not simply analogous literary constructions but that they are, instead, light and dark sides of the same coin. Canidia, like Cynthia, unites erotic enchantment and the poetic text in a female form; illuminating an anti-elegiac element in her construction complements Barchiesi's reading as well as extending Horace's iambic interaction with elegy and the intertextual potential of magic in Roman poetry. Reading an element of elegiac parody in *Epodes* 5 and 17 further supplements the interpretations of these poems which I reviewed above: Horace's iambic representation of the elegiac *puella* in Canidia, particularly one drawn in response to Propertius' equally tendentious treatment of iambic, introduces an extra level of humour in the poems which augments the "blame-narrative" of *Epode* 5, defining Horace's poetics from those of a contemporary genre whose praise-abuse ratio contrasts with that most immediately associated with iambic. This interaction between early Latin love-elegy and Horace's *Epodes* may be read from the opposite direction; it seems more probable, however, that Horace comically amplifies this subtextual element of early elegy.[60] Readers returning to the elegies in light of Horace's works would no doubt bring an extra awareness of the subtext and a new dimension to their view of the *puellae* and the elegists' treatment of them which is coloured by Canidia; I highlight Propertius 3.6 as acknowledging Horace's treatment of Cynthia at the end of this chapter. We begin with *Epode* 5.

Epode 5

Epode 5 relates Canidia's preparation of a love-philtre for her unfaithful beloved, Varus: the witch and her accomplices have kidnapped a Roman *puer* whom they will bury alive and starve before extracting his organs to use in the love-philtre. The poet narrates the scene, which includes direct speeches by the boy (1-10; 83-102) and Canidia (47-60). The epode opens with

[60] Commentators who maintain the predominantly accepted chronology of the *Epodes* and Tibullus Book 1 do suggest that the lover's curses at Tibullus 1.5.49-56 draw on *Epode* 5.83-102: Luck 1962 pp. 50-51 and Wimmel 1987 pp. 239-241. Perelli 2006 pp. 181-184 reads Tibullus 1.5 as responding to *Epode* 15. For *Epode* 5 as a "blame-narrative": Mankin 2010 pp. 96-97.

the boy praying by gods, children, and the emblems of his citizenship to know who his captors are and why one stares at him like a step-mother (1-10). The narrator reports that the sight of the child stripped of his clothes and insignia would soften the heart of an impious Thracian, but Canidia, her hair bound with vipers, ignores him and demands materials for her fire — grave-yard trees, eggs, toad's blood, the feathers of a *strix*, herbs from Iolchos and Hiberia, and bones ripped from the jaws of a dog (11-24). Sagana purifies the house; Veia digs the ditch for the boy, whose torture the narrator describes (25-40); Folia of Ariminum is also present, famous across Italy for enchanting the heavens with her voice (41-46). Canidia prays to Night and Diana for help against Varus, her elderly lover whom her powerful magic *nardum* failed to keep from the Subura (47-60): she demands to know why Medea's drugs have been unsuccessful for her — she obtained the remotest plants, and Varus slept on a bed imbued with her potion which should have made him forget all rivals; a more powerful witch must be working against her (61-72). Canidia vows to prepare a stronger potion to steal Varus' sanity and force him to return burning with love for her (73-82). Her prayer makes the boy realise that soft words will not influence her and he unleashes *Thyesteas preces* — after death his spirit will haunt the witches by night; the mob will chase them through the street with stones; wolves and birds will drag away their unburied corpses and his parents will witness the spectacle (83-102).

I suggest that Canidia's practical love-magic parodies the elegiac narrator's representation of his desire for, and *servitium* to, his *puella* as the result of enchantment, literalising the elegiac metaphor of magical beauty and presenting a vision of the *amator*'s situation as if his mistress really controlled his desire with witchcraft. The details of Canidia's ceremony draw on contemporary magic practice and popular superstitions attached to it, adapting these to construct a tendentious portrait of the elegiac relationship within the bounds of magical credibility; I highlight parallels from the *PGM* and *defixiones* to illustrate Horace's realistic treatment of literary material. In the following discussion, I focus on selected elements of *Epode* 5 which highlight Horace's interaction with love-elegy, particularly the boy's burial and starvation (32-40). This torturous death, I suggest, caricatures the elegiac lovers' subtextual representation of their *servitium* and fidelity as resulting from their mistresses' enchanting appearance, amplifying this as part of a magic ritual; the torture also represents the amatory

sufferings of the elegiac lover as the explicit result of erotic spells. We can identify additional points of dialogue with early Propertian elegy — particularly 1.1 and 1.4 — in the character of Folia (41-46), and in Canidia's monologue and her unsuccessful Colchian love-magic.

This reading also offers an alternative perspective on the contrasting descriptions of the *puer* and his words at either end of the epode: his pitiful appearance and soft words ("*mollire*", 14; "*mollibus | lenire verbis impias*", 83-84), and his vengeful curses ("*Thyesteas preces*", 86; "*humanum vicem*", 88).[61] The curses' stated aim of revenge and the emphasis on their active effect ("*diris agam vos*", 89) mark them as iambic.[62] Oliensis reads the child's speeches as illustrating the "origins of invective in impotence", with *Epode* 5 enacting the "symmetrical progression" between Canidia's *carmina* and those of the iambic poet as "one vengeful speech (Canidia's against Varus) begets another (the little boy's against Canidia)"; Johnson charts a similar progression, though he associates the rage and violence of the *puer*'s reaction to Canidia with the "Archilochean-Lykambid invective" which Horace later denies for his *Epodes* (*Epistles* 1.19.19-25).[63] I suggest that the clear definition of the child's curses invites a similar literary reading of his opening appeal, and that their repeated description in terms of "softening" the witch's heart ("*mollire*", 14; "*mollibus | lenire verbis impias*", 83-84) evokes love-elegy. "*mollis*" is already a key term in early elegiac self-definition, particularly Propertius': in 1.7, for example, the Propertian narrator contrasts his soft verse ("*mollem* [...] *versum*", 19) with Ponticus' epic.[64] By evoking elegy in the child, Horace incorporates an element of self-definition against this genre into the boy's words: rather than maintaining the futile appeals which will lead to a death through tantalisation and desire which tendentiously literalises the elegiac lover's

[61] For "*Thyesteas preces*" (*Epode* 5.86) and revenge: Mankin 1995 pp. 133-134, Watson 2003 p. 243, and Johnson 2012 pp. 108-109; on "*humanam vicem*" (88) and revenge: Mankin 1995 p. 134, and Watson 2003 pp. 243-244.
[62] For *agere* characterising Horatian iambic: Barchiesi 2001c pp. 145-146**,** Barchiesi 2002 pp. 44 and 64, and Lowrie 2009a pp. 104-105 and 108-110.
[63] Oliensis 1998 pp. 73-77 and 95-96, citing (p. 96 n. 79) Maurizio, L. (1989), "Engendering Invective", American Philological Association meeting, Boston, December 1989, for "the "educational" value" of *Epode* 5; for the "origins of invective in impotence" in *Epode* 5 and the mirroring of witch and poet: Oliensis 1998 pp. 73-77. Johnson 2012 pp. 101-109. For the *puer* as an iambic poet cf. Andrisano 2012 p. 298.
[64] On Propertius 1.7.19: Stroh 1971 pp. 18-21. Horace *Odes* 2.19.17-18 similarly characterises Valgius' elegies ("*mollium* [...] *querelarum*"), defining his lyric ethos against the genre's excessive love and grief; for Horace's lyric definition against elegiac emotional excess: Commager 1962 pp. 239-241, Putnam 1972 pp. 81-88**,** Davis 1991 pp. 39-60 and 184-186, and Lowrie 1997 pp. 77-93.

expression of his love in terms of death, the *puer* avenges himself with "active" curses. *Epode* 5 ends, however, with the suggestion that the *puer*'s revenge will take effect only after his death at the hands of his captors; the implicit failure of his curses to change his fate suggests that Horace's iambic may be as practically ineffective as any other poetry.[65] I begin by suggesting how Canidia, the *puer*, and Varus evoke the dynamic of the elegiac relationship in the explicit context of the witches' magic ceremony before discussing the boy's inhumation.

Canidia tortures the *puer*, arousing and manipulating his desire as part of her ritual, while she pursues Varus with her magic — this dynamic between the three characters evokes the elegiac "triangle" of the lover, his mistress, and his rival, and particularly the situation of Tibullus 1.8, where Pholoe, whose dazzling beauty needs no magic aids to bewitch suitors ("*forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis*", 1.8.24), torments the *puer delicatus* Marathus while she courts an older man ("*canus amator*", 29). Marathus' older, rather than richer, rival is unique in Tibullan and Propertian elegy; his youth and effeminacy resonate in the Horatian *puer*'s "*impube corpus*" (*Epode* 5.13), while Varus, the "*senex* […] *adulterus*" (57), balances Pholoe's elderly lover. Horace's parody of this Tibullan dynamic is reinforced by *Odes* 1.33, where the lyric narrator comforts the mourning elegist, Albius ("*Albi*", 1) — whom commentators predominantly identify with Tibullus — over losing Glycera to a younger rival ("*cur tibi iunior | laesa praeniteat fide*", 3-4), suggesting that Tibullus' idiosyncratic focus on age in the triangle of 1.8 was particularly

[65] For the *puer*'s curses suggesting the "pragmatic" ineffectiveness of iambic: Lowrie 2009a pp. 110-111. This impression is reinforced by the narrator of *Epode* 6, who undercuts the effectiveness of his own iambic tirade by asking if he will weep like a boy who remains unavenged ("*an si quis atro dente me petiverit, | inultus ut flebo puer?*", 15-16): Fitzgerald 1988 pp. 185-187, Oliensis 1998 pp. 76-77, Lowrie 2009a p. 110, Mankin 2010 pp. 99-100, and Johnson 2012 pp. 106-108. By contrast, Watson 2003 pp. 187-190 argues that the boy's words successfully disrupt the witches' spells and enable his escape.

noticeable to his friend and contemporary.[66] Other elements in the *puer*'s characterisation encourage reading him as evoking the elegiac lover. Canidia's seizure of the child's emblems of Roman citizenship ("*purpurae decus*", 7; "*insignibus*", 12) — symbolises, I suggest, his removal from society and demotion to a slave-status, dramatising the elegiac lover's social detachment through his emasculating *servitium* to his *puella*.[67] Propertius 1.1.1 programmatically combines magic with amatory *servitium* ("*Cynthia prima suis miserum cepit ocellis*"), and the narrator emphasises his innocence from physical desire before Cynthia's eyes captivated him: "*contactum nullis ante cupidinibus*" (2). In the overtly magical scene of *Epode* 5, the *puer*'s sexual purity may also evoke the Propertian lover's, with Cynthia's gaze resonating in Canidia's hostile stare: "*quid ut noverca me intueris* […]" (*Epode* 5.9).[68] The boy's extreme youth and sexual purity develops the documented use of young boys in magic — for example, the non-fatal use of sexually innocent boys as divinatory mediums — by combining it with popular Roman superstition regarding the victimisation of children by magic-workers. This is evident in Cicero's accusations in his invective *in Vatinium* that Vatinius honoured the gods with the entrails of young boys, and in a gravestone for a girl which records her abduction by witches; equally

[66] On Horace *Odes* 1.33 ridiculing Tibullus' exaggeration of ages: Cairns 1995 pp. 72-73 with n. 12. For debate over the problem which this focus on age creates for equating "Albius" with Tibullus: Postgate 1903b p. 183 and Ullman 1912 p. 153. Cf. Watson 2003 p. 186, comparing Tibullus 1.8.24, "an argument widely canvassed in love-poetry", with witchcraft as "Canidia's only hope of holding onto Varus". We may suggest that Varus — "bandy-legged", an insulting moniker for a homosexual man — anticipates the narrators of *Epodes* 11 and 17, who also evoke the elegiac lover in the iambic speaker. The narrator of 11 laments his present infatuation with Lyciscus; the poet's premature aging in 17 is the result of Canidia's nard ("*tuis capillus albus est odoribus*", 23), with which she had unsuccessfully anointed Varus' bed ("*indormit unctis omnium cubilibus | oblivione paelicum*", 69-70). This adds extra irony to Horace's self-presentation as the elegiac lover successfully subjected by Canidia's spells in *Epode* 17 which is in keeping with the ironic palinode of 17.1-52 and which continues to parody the elegiac lover's hollow and self-justificatory attachment of magic power to his mistress. On "Varus" as a pejorative term for a homosexual man: Mankin 1995 p. 131. This is not to read a sequential narrative between the poems or to suggest that "Varus" should be identified as the narrator in 11 and 17; rather, it reflects the thematic and lexical links which unify the *Epodes*.

[67] On "*purpurae decus*" (7) and "*insignibus*" (12) indicating the *toga praetexta* and the *bulla*: Ingallina 1977 pp. 109-1115 and 198, Mankin 1995 p. 112 and Watson 2003 p. 193.

[68] Watson 2003 p. 194 suggests that *Epode* 5.9 alludes to Medea as Theseus' murderous stepmother; this strengthens the Propertian echo if we recall the allusion to Medea at 1.1.4-6. As in 1.1, Medea's presence develops throughout *Epode* 5. Cf. Heslin 2011 pp. 63-65 for Horace *Epode* 11 engaging with Propertius' adaptation of Meleager *A.P.* 12.101 at 1.1.1-6; if Horace was aware of this programmatic element of Propertius' opening lines, it is likely that he was also alert to Propertius' magical subtext and interaction with Vergil *Eclogue* 8.47-50.

relevant for our passage is the belief that *striges* fed on the blood of male children.[69] By drawing on these superstitions, Horace exaggerates the elegiac lover's youth and *mollitia*, and the *puella*'s cruelty, within the bounds of magical credibility.

The *puer*'s torture develops the elegiac parody. After recounting the activities of Canidia, Sagana and Veia (15-31), the narrator outlines the purpose of the ditch Veia digs:

> *quo posset infossus puer*
> *longo die bis terque mutatae dapis*
> *inemori spectaculo,*
> *cum promineret ore, quantum exstant aqua*
> *suspensa mento corpora,*
> *exsecta uti medulla et aridum iecur*
> *amoris esset poculum,*
> *interminato cum semel fixae cibo*
> *intabuissent pupulae.*

(Horace *Epode* 5.32-40)

The boy's starvation and tantalisation prepare his liver and marrow for Canidia's aphrodisiac philtre: his craving for the close-yet-unobtainable food increases as his hunger grows, imbuing his organs with an intense desire which Canidia's *poculum* will transfer to Varus.[70] Scholarship investigating the influence of contemporary magic practice on *Epode* 5 notes correspondences between several aspects of Canidia's rite and realities and popular belief about everyday witchcraft: the boy's burial keeps his body in contact with chthonic forces throughout his death, increasing the power of the ritual and of his organs; blood and body-parts of birds and animals are common ingredients in philtres and other mixtures; the child's violent and premature death will make his spirit an *aōros*, or *biaiothanatos*, a restless soul invoked by magic practitioners to communicate with deities and accomplish spells.[71] Execution by live-burial and starvation also had a precedent in Roman history, as a punishment for Vestal Virgins' violation of their chastity

[69] Cicero *in Vatinium* 14: on Cicero's allegation as evidence of public attitudes towards magic rather than of real events: Tupet 1976 pp. 206-208 and Beard-North-Price 1998 pp. 155-156; cf. Apuleius *Apologia* 42; cf. Rives 1995 pp. 72-74 on Cicero's exploitation of human sacrifice in political invective. Ovid *Fasti* 6.101 testifies to the superstition regarding *striges* and young boys: cf. Ingallina 1977 pp. 116-119. For the use of young, chaste boys in Greco-Roman magic: Watson 2003 p. 197. On "boy-mediums" in necromancy: Ogden 2001 pp. 196-201; for analysis of male and female children as divinatory mediums: Johnston 2001 pp. 97-117. Sexually pure boys are most explicitly specified at *PDM* xiv.68 and *PDM* xiv.805-40: Johnson, H.J. (tr.), in Betz 1986 pp. 199 and 237.

[70] Ingallina 1977 pp. 132-134.

[71] For the interaction between practitioners, *aōroi* and *biaothanatoi*, and deities in magic: Johnston 1999 pp. 71-160.

and in the ritual burials of pairs of Gauls and Greeks in the Forum Boarium.[72] Eitrem highlights *PGM* XII.15-95 as a parallel for the length of the boy's tantalisation (*Epode* 5.33). *PGM* XII.15-95 is a ritual for producing an "Eros assistant" ("*Π[ά]ρεδρος Ἔρως*", 15), which can accomplish a variety of feats including causing dreams and insomnia, dispelling angry spirits, and, though it is not an erotic spell specifically, making targets love the practitioner and submit to his or her will.[73] We can carry this parallel further: as part of the rites at *PGM* XII.15-95, the practitioner is instructed to consecrate the waxen figurine of Eros — as Johnston clarifies, "perfecting" the statue "in the sense of preparing [it] for use in a ritual" — by placing before it offerings including fruit, birds, sweetmeats, and honey-wine, as well as inedible objects, over a three-day period (21-24). These meals parallel those which Canidia and her accomplices repeatedly place before their victim; Horace, I suggest, omits the inedible objects from his adaptation of this type of spell to enhance the similarity of the child's torture with Tantalus', an element which we pick up below. Canidia's treatment of her victim, which prepares his organs for use in her philtre, parallels that of the waxen figurine at *PGM* XII.15-95; strikingly, a live human replaces the inanimate statue here.[74]

These parallels illustrate Horace drawing on contemporary magic in *Epode* 5; nevertheless, the combination and exaggeration of these details does not correspond with extant evidence of magic practices, and points to the poet adapting contemporary magic ritual for a

[72] For debate over the origins and purpose of this ritual: Latte 1960 pp. 256-258, Eckstein 1982 pp. 69-95, Faraone 1991b pp. 191-193 and Ndiaye 2000 pp. 119-128**.** Perhaps notably for our passage, Faraone 1991b p. 192 interprets the victims of these burials as "living images", paralleling the substitution of small animals for figurines or inanimate objects in some extant binding spells. Rives 1995 pp. 65-85 discusses the social and cultural significance of human sacrifice narratives.

[73] Eitrem 1933 p. 37. Winkler 1991 p. 220 discusses the connection between the attraction desired in *PGM* XII.15-95 and the "more focussed" passion of *agōgai* spells which aims to force a victim to the practitioner. *PGM* IV.1716-1870 is an *agōgē* spell which includes a less elaborate ritual for obtaining an Eros assistant and which involves a burnt-offering, as at *Epode* 5.17-24, but no food.

[74] *PGM* XII.21-24: "*π[άντα ταῦτ]α ἀποτ[ε]λέσας ἀφιέρωσον | ἡμέρας γ′. παραθήσεις δὲ αὐ[τῷ] παντοῖα γένη καρ[πῶν νέω]ν πόπ[α]νά τε ζ′, στροβ[ί]λους ζ′, τραγημάτων πᾶν γ[έ]νος, λύχνους ἀμιλτώ[τους ζ′] καὶ [τρί]α μικρὰ δίπα[λ|τα, πινακίδας, τόξα, μῆλα φο[ι]νίκια, κρατῆρα κεκρ[α]μένον ο[ἰ]ν[ο]μέλιτι.*" On "supernatural assistants" (*parhedroi*) in the *PGM*: Ciraolo 1995 pp. 279-296, Scibilia 2002 pp. 71-86 and Collins 2008 pp. 97-101 (on *PGM* XII.14-95 and the analogous, erotic *PGM* IV.1840-1870). For the meals in *PGM* XII.14-95 "perfecting" the figurine: Johnston 2002 pp. 355-356 with n. 30; Johnston's discussion of "perfecting" through sacrifices focuses on *PGM* IV.26-51, in which the practitioner's body is "The "tool" that [he] must perfect." Mankin 1995 p. 120 compares the *puer*'s meals with those given to Greek scapegoats; *contra*, Watson 2003 pp. 212-213.

literary purpose. I suggest that we can read the boy's torture as encapsulating, in the context of an erotic magic ritual, the elegiac lover's amatory *servitium* — physically trapped in the ditch, and reduced to an implement for Canidia's spell — and his expression of his love and fidelity to his *puella* in terms of his death and burial, literalising and caricaturing the elegiac lover's connection of his enslavement to a single beloved with magical enchantment, and his eroticised visions of his death and burial; the same image, as we will see, also represents the torments of the elegiac lover explicitly as the results of erotic spells.[75] The manner of the child's burial indicates a literary significance behind his torture, and reinforces reading him as a tendentious portrait of the elegiac lover: Horace specifically likens him to one whose body is suspended in water with his head above the surface — "*cum promineret ore, quantum exstant aqua | suspensa mento corpora*" (35-36) — so that he can see the forbidden food as he dies. This description evokes Tantalus in the Underworld; Horace explicates this allusion at *Epode* 17.65-66, when Canidia explicitly likens her victim to the sinner ("*optat quietem Pelopis infidi pater | egens benignae Tantalus semper dapis*" 65-66).[76] Tantalus provides a mythological paradigm for the *amator*'s unattainable desires in the first Tibullan and Propertian collections; Tibullus 1.3 offers the clearest example:[77]

Tantalus est illic et circum stagna sed acrem
iam iam poturi desert unda sitim.

(Tibullus 1.3.77-78)

Tibullus depicts Tantalus in the pool, unable to drink the water he craves. Propertius 1.9 makes an oblique reference to the Titan's punishment in the context of literary polemic with the epicist Ponticus: "*nunc tu | insanus medio flumine quaeris aquam*" (14-15).[78] While Horace emphasises the starvation of Canidia's victim, the desiccation ("*aridum*", 37) of his organs recalls the thirst which the elegists foreground.[79] I develop this elegiac reading of the *puer*'s death in two sections: firstly, by considering the elegiac lover's concern with his death and burial; secondly,

[75] Cf. Horace *Odes* 2.8.19-20, where Barine's elegiac suitors are physically unable to leave her house despite their threats ("*impiae tectum dominae relinquunt | saepe minati*").
[76] For Tantalus at *Epode* 5.35-36: Mankin 1995 p. 120 and Watson 2003 p. 213; cf. Watson 1993 p. 270.
[77] On Tibullus 1.3.77-78: Houghton 2007 pp. 158-160; cf. Bright 1978 pp. 30-31. For Tantalus' applicability to elegiac poetics: Sharrock 1995 pp. 155-156; cf. Sharrock 1994 p. 60.
[78] Smyth 1949 p. 123; cf. Baker 1990 p. 100. Propertius' allusion to Ixion ("*et magis infernae vincula nosse rotae*", 1.9.20) underlines the evocation of Tantalus.
[79] Horace also uses Tantalus in the pool to illustrate misplaced or excessive desires in *Satires* 1.1.68-69 and 1.2.107-108: Cody 1976 p. 115 and Freudenburg 1993 pp. 195-196.

by exploring how the boy's torture represents the elegiac *amator*'s desire as the result of practical erotic magic.

The elegiac lovers repeatedly imagine their death and burial, anxious that they should occur during their love for their mistresses who faithfully attend to their funerary rites. The lovers use death as a metaphor for their amatory experiences and to illustrate the strength of their passion and fidelity to their beloveds; at the same time, the lover's narration of his funeral maintains the separation from his mistress which prevents the fulfilment of their relationship. I suggest that Canidia's live inhumation of her victim reworks these elegiac concerns in a representation of literal magic practice, dramatising the elegiac narrator's romanticised equation of love with death and his vision of dying in and through love; it will be useful to highlight some examples of the handling of death in Tibullus' and Propertius' early work before we look at Horace's adaptation of the motif more closely.

Tibullus 1.1 offers an extended vision of the narrator's death (57-68) in which he hopes to see Delia as he dies in her arms ("*te spectem suprema mihi cum venerit hora; | te teneam moriens deficiente manu*", 59-60) and imagines her tears and kisses as she places him on his funeral bier ("*flebis et arsuro positum me, Delia, lecto, | tristibus et lacrimis oscula mixta dabis*", 61-62); echoes of his earlier wish to hold Delia in his arms in bed by the fire (45-48) underline the narrator's eroticisation of his funeral.[80] The Tibullan lover's envisioned death provides the framework for 1.3: the elegy begins with the narrator lamenting the absence of his mother, his sister, and Delia at his funeral (5-10); the epitaph he recites (55-56) introduces his catabasis into an elegiacised Underworld (57-82). Tibullus 1.3 will become more relevant for our reading of *Epode* 17; for the present poem, I focus on the eroticisation of death which Tibullus 1.1 illustrates and which features more frequently in Propertius Book 1. The Propertian lover treats his death in 1.6, 1.14, 1.17, and 1.19. Notably for us, Propertius' earliest expression of his love for Cynthia as death occurs in 1.4: after Propertius stresses Cynthia's beauty, he asserts that she has many

[80] Bright 1978 pp. 129-130; cf. Papanghelis 1987 p. 53 and Bassi 1994 pp. 56-57. For Tibullus' "conflation" of love and death in 1.1: Bassi 1994 pp. 53-61. It is perhaps significant for our elegiac reading of Canidia that the Tibullan narrator's imagined funeral introduces his encouragement to Delia to love him before death comes or old age makes love and elegy unsuitable (1.1.69-74): "*iam subrepet iners aetas neque amare decebit, | dicere nec cano blanditias capite*" (71-72).

more attributes for which he would willingly perish: "*haec sed forma mei pars est extrema furoris;* | *sunt maiora, quibus, Basse, perire iuvat*" (1.4.11-12).[81] 1.4.11-12 may provide a jumping off point for Horace's literalisation of the elegiac lover's equation of love and death in the eroticised live-burial of Canidia's victim.

We can reinforce this suggestion by considering Propertius' subsequent handling of the lover's death. The Propertian narrator emphasises his burial in the earth after dying in love in 1.6 ("*multi longinquo periere in amore libenter,* | *in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat*", 27-28); he creates the same idea in 1.17 — firstly, separated from Cynthia after a shipwreck ("*haecine parva meum funus harena teget?*", 8); then concluding his vision of his mistress attending his funeral in Rome ("*illic si qua meum sepelissent fata dolorem* | […] | *ut mihi non ullo pondere terra foret*", 19-24).[82] The live-burial of Canidia's victim in *Epode* 5 — whose slow death is intertwined with his physical desire for the food he cannot reach — dramatises love-elegy's eroticisation of death and the continued separation of lover and beloved which the *amator*'s death and burial embodies; it also evokes the lover's liminal narrative presence in this theme, simultaneously dead and holding the position of poet and narrator.[83] The boy's incarceration illustrates the physical separation of lover and beloved through the latter's imagined death; Canidia's attendance at the *puer*'s burial distorts the elegiac lover's desire for his mistress' presence at his funeral as an indication of her fidelity and expands his fears on this score as Canidia plunders the child's remains in pursuit of another.

The *puer*'s murder will cause his desire to last physically in his remains, echoing the elegiac narrator's claims of his eternal love and fidelity to his *puella*; Propertius 1.19 is the most developed treatment of this theme in Book 1. The narrator declares that his love will cross over into the Underworld ("*traicit et fati litora magnus amor*", 12), and claims that his passion is so

[81] On *perire* (1.4.12) meaning "to die from love" and "to be in love": Fedeli 1980 p. 133 and Baker 1990 p. 54.
[82] Propertius again expresses his desire to remain in love while he dies, without reference to burial, at 1.14.14 ("*quae maneant, dum me fata perire volent*"). Baker 1990 p. 178 notes the equation of "*dolor*" with elegiac love in 1.17.19 and (p. 140) highlights the dual meanings of "*dum*" and "*perire*" in Propertius 1.14.14: "till the fates wish me to die" and "while the fates wish me to be in love". Cf. Baker 1970 p. 674 on Propertius 1.6.27-8.
[83] Flaschenreim 1997 p. 266 suggests that death metaphorically enables Propertius' narrator "to have it both ways: to be present in the poem's discourse and absent in its governing fiction".

strong that it will endure even in his ashes ("*non adeo leviter nostris puer haesit ocellis,* | *ut meus oblito pulvis amore vacet*", 5-6). Lines 5-6 evoke the physicality of the lover's desire which stems from his mistress' beauty, underlining this through the emphasis on his eyes.[84] Horace adapts this emphasis on desire lasting in physical remains to a magic context; the *puer*'s visual fixation on the meals before him replicates love's possession of the Propertian narrator's eyes (1.19.5), combining this with his literalisation of Cynthia's initial enchantment of the lover with her gaze (1.1.1).[85] The boy's starvation deflates the lover's eternal fidelity by substituting forbidden and desired food for the mistress, distorting the elegiac expression of fidelity into a magical practice and trivialising the lover's desire by indicating that it can ultimately be felt as strongly for frequently-changed plates of delicious food as for the woman the lover professes to hold above all others.

The *exemplum* of Protesilaus and Laodamia in 1.19 offers further correspondence with the Horatian image:

> *sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis*
> *Thessalus antiquam venerat umbra domum.*
>
> (Propertius 1.19.9-10)

Protesilaus' ghost, whose incorporeal form leaves him unable to touch Laodamia, provides a paradigm for the Propertian lover, illustrating his eternal passion for and separation from Cynthia;[86] "*falsis* […] *palmis*" (9) evokes the tradition in which Laodamia fashions a waxen effigy of her dead husband. "*falsis*" subverts the lover's successful reunion, introducing the deceitful hope elegy offers of uniting the lover with his mistress.[87] Canidia's victim is similarly stranded between life and death, unable to reach the object he desires ("*interminato* […] *cibo*", *Epode* 5.39); Horace's substitution of a live child for waxen effigies inverts the detail of the figurine of Protesilaus, de-romanticising the elegiac *exemplum* in his magical context. The continuation of the child's spirit after death as an *aōros* or *biaiothanatos* for Canidia to control

[84] Papanghelis 1987 pp. 12-13; Michels 1955 p. 175 cites 1.19.6 as exemplifying the physicality of Propertius' vision of death.
[85] For 1.19.5 recalling 1.1.1 cf. Boyle 1974 p. 900.
[86] On Protesilaus in Propertius 1.19.9: Papanghelis 1987 pp. 11-12; cf. Boyle 1974 pp. 901-908. Flaschenreim 1997 pp. 262 and 265-266, and Lyne 1998a pp. 209-212. Propertius' treatment of Protesilaus and Laodamia follows Catullus' use of this paradigm in c.68 (74-86 and 105-8), a work which initiates many of the themes developed by the later elegists; for Catullus' pre-elegiac treatment of the myth: Solmsen 1975 pp. 264-276 and Lyne 1998a pp. 204-209.
[87] On "*falsis* […] *palmis*" evoking the wax Protesilaus: Lyne 1998a pp. 211-212.

also echoes the returned Protesilaus; unlike the Propertian ghost, who remains desirous of the woman he cannot touch, the child's closing curses threaten that his spirit will return and assail the witches in their sleep: "*petamque voltus umbra curvis unguibus | quae vis deorum est Manium, | et inquietis assidens praecordiis | pavore somnos auferam*" (93-96). The boy's resistance to this fate in his closing curses highlight the difference between slavish elegiac devotion and iambic aggression.

The child's torture also represents the elegiac lovers' insinuations that their *puellae* arouse their devotion by magic rather than by their beauty. Physical emaciation and sleeplessness — illustrated by the *puer*'s wasted eyes and their fixation on the food — are generic characteristics of elegiac love; Propertius 1.5 lists both among the suffering which unrequited devotion to Cynthia entails: "*aut cur sim toto corpore nullus ego*" (22); "*non tibi iam somnos, non illa relinquet ocellos*" (11). As we highlighted above, 1.5 is the first elegy in Propertius Book 1 which explicitly develops his experience of loving Cynthia as magical enchantment ("*et bibere e tota toxica Thessalia*", 6), and, in its close relationship with 1.4, creates the impression that Propertius is warning Bassus against the magical consequences of loving Cynthia.[88] Horace, I suggest, expands Propertius' metaphorical comparison into a vivid representation of magic, exploiting the similarities between the elegiac symptoms and the effects demanded for the targets of erotic spells.[89] So far, we have viewed the treatment of Canidia's *puer* as adapting rituals for consecrating Eros assistants; by embodying the physical effects of elegiac love as though they were the result of magical enchantment, the child analogises figurines in erotic binding spells. In contrast to statuettes of Eros, which are created to perform the bidding of the practitioner, the figurines deposited bound, pierced, or arranged in pairs alongside written erotic spells represent the target and the effects intended for them — namely, the torturous symptoms of passionate

[88] At Propertius 1.13.15 the narrator similarly states that love conquers and enfeebles its victims ("*vinctum languescere*"): "*languescere*" is synonymous with "*intabescere*" (*TLL* VII, 1, 2066, 60 ff., s.v. *intabesco*), used of the child's eyeballs at *Epode* 5.40; the applicability of both verbs to the elegiac *amator* reinforces Horace's gory reworking of elegiac love in the child's murder — cf. below for the *puella* of Propertius 3.6 expressing her amatory despair with "*tabescere*" (23).
[89] For the similarities between general literary symptoms of love and the torments demanded in magic: Martinez 1995 pp. 353-354.

love.[90] Horace's literary adaptation of magic conflates these two distinct uses of figurines, enabling Canidia's victim to represent the physical disturbances suffered by the "enchanted" elegiac lovers while evoking rituals for consecrating Eros assistants.

Physical wasting and the denial of food, drink, and sleep are regularly wished for the targets of amatory spells: *PGM* IV.1496-1595 ("*εἰ πίνει, μὴ πινέτω, | εἰ ἐσθίει, μὴ ἐσθιέτω*", 1515-1516; "*εἰ κοιμᾶται, μὴ κοιμάσθω*", 1521), and *PGM* XXXVI.134-160 ("*πεινῶσαν, διψῶσαν, ὕπνου μὴ τυγχάνουσαν*", 149) are two examples of curses which deny victims both nourishment and rest. One second century AD erotic curse (Preisendanz Ostrakon 2 = Gager 35) specifies the victim's starvation ("*ἀσιτῳ*", 35); the spirit invoked at *PGM* XVI.1-75 is repeatedly commanded to make the target "pine and melt away" with passion ("*ποίησον | φθείνε*]*ιν καὶ κατατήκεσθαι* […] *ἐπὶ | τῷ ἔρωτι*", 11-12). In *Epode* 5, the wasting of the boy's eyeballs ("*intabuissent pupulae*", 40) and the dehydration of his organs ("*medulla et aridum iecur*", 37) provide vivid focal points for this starvation and thirst; his unrelenting gaze on the food ("*fixo cibo* | […] *pupullae*", 39-40) evokes the insomnia wished upon victims of erotic magic, as well as the elegiac lover's fixation on a single beloved. By highlighting the child's physical deterioration, Horace lingers upon the grim, visceral reality of witchcraft to create an unromantic adaptation of the elegiac metaphor of magical enchantment.

Erotic deprivation curses, as interpreted by Martinez, cause the target's "isolation from the land of the living".[91] This is particularly notable, as asserting his detachment from the normal course of society is central to the rhetoric of the elegiac lover, and illustrated by his willing enslavement to his beloved.[92] Both Tibullus and Propertius combine this domination with an undertone of magical enchantment both to increase the lover's detachment from normality, and to

[90] Gager 1992 p. 15 and Graf 1997a pp. 136-141; for the argument that the treatment of statues in amatory magic generated, by means of "persuasive analogy", the same effects in the targets they represented: Faraone 1999 pp. 41-42 and 51-53. Collins 2008 pp. 92-103 suggests an alternative interpretation of the function of figurines employed in amatory binding spells based on Greco-Roman attitudes towards statuary, and also discusses the differences between these figurines and those designed as magical assistants.

[91] Martinez 1995 p. 358.

[92] Wyke 1989a pp. 41-43 discusses the elegiac lover's presentation of his social isolation by emphasising his domination by his mistress; Allen 1950b pp. 264-270 examines the programmatic presentation of a universal experience as unique to the lover of Propertius 1.1.

justify his indiscretion in such a way as to restore his social position in the future. In *Epode* 5, the child's entrapment in the ditch, and loss of his emblems of citizenship, physically illustrate the lover's isolation and his domination by his beloved through magic. Horace exploits these similarities between the effects of deprivation curses and the elegiac self-presentation to expose the lover's self-serving rhetoric and to parody his condition in overtly magical terms.

The child's torture forms the focus for Horace's parody of the elegiac lover's presentation of his relationship in terms of magic enchantment. We can identify further elements of Horace's metapoetic engagement with the genre through magic, and a response to Propertius' iambic polemic in 1.4, in the following sections of *Epode* 5 — the introduction of Folia of Arimium and Canidia's monologue — and I offer some brief suggestions about these here.

Immediately after describing the boy's tantalisation, the narrator introduces the fourth witch, Folia:

> *non defuisse masculae libidinis*
> *Ariminensem Foliam*
> *et otiosa credidit Neapolis*
> *et omne vicinum oppidum,*
> *quae sidera excantata voce Thessala*
> *lunamque caelo deripit.*

(Horace *Epode* 5.41-46)

Folia is unique among her companions in the mention of her native town (42) and her country-wide fame (42-44), and in that she has no physical task — unlike Canidia who organises the burnt-offering (17-24), Sagana who purifies the house (25-28), and Veia who digs the ditch (29-32) — but is the only witch credited with the power to control the heavens with her incantations (45-46).[93] We have explored this last ability as a marker for a metapoetic aspect to magic in Vergil *Eclogue* 8 and in love-elegy; I suggest that the image in our poem invokes this contemporary motif to signal the same element in the Horatian witches and their magic, and demonstrates the inventive power of the poet's verses and their ability to inspire his audience's

[93] Cf. Mankin 1995 pp. 122-123 and Watson 2003 pp. 217-220.

imaginations.[94] Lowrie reads "*spectaculum*" — which introduces the image of the child's burial and concludes his Thyestean curses and the poem (34 and 102) — as raising iambic poetry's representational power, which the description of the *puer*'s torture demonstrates.[95] This corresponds well with the interpretation we have highlighted of *carmina* drawing down the moon and stars representing poetry's creative force, and underlines the suggestion that Folia's power performs the same function here. The position of our passage directly after the description of the inhumed child reinforces Lowrie's suggestions, and — as extant contemporary parallels for lines 45-46 all occur in love-poetry, predominantly elegy — encourages our interpretation of the boy's treatment as a comment on amatory elegy.

Canidia's monologue invokes Nox and Diana for aid with her love-magic (49-82): she details the spells she has tried (49-66) and her new plans, venting her anger and desire for revenge against Varus (67-82). The failure of Canidia's love-magic despite her care and diligence is a key concern (57-70); she concludes that a stronger witch's *carmen* must be influencing Varus' actions ("*a! a! solutus ambulat veneficae | scientioris carmine!*", 71-72). In the centre of her tirade, Canidia reveals that her previous spell had relied on the poisons which Medea employed against Jason's new wife, Creusa:

> *quid accidit? cur dira barbarae minus*
> *venena Medeae valent,*
> *quibus superbam fugit ulta paelicem,*
> *magni Creontis filiam,*
> *cum palla, tabo munus imbutum, novam*
> *incendio nuptam abstulit?*

(Horace *Epode* 5.61-66)

This emphasis on Medea picks up the herbs ("*herbasque Iolchos atque Hiberia*", 21) to be burned in Canidia's "Colchian" fire ("*flammis* [...] *Colchicis*", 24) at the beginning of the epode; these flames resonate in the conclusion of her speech ("*quam non amore sic meo flagres uti |*

[94] While *deripio* (46), unlike *deduco*, appears to have no independent literary connotations, it does reflect the speed and violence associated with the iambic metre and subject matter, modifying the motif to the context of the *Epodes.* Cf. *Epode* 17.78: "*deripere lunam vocibus possim meis*". For Horace's idiosyncratic use of *deripio* at *Epode* 5.46: Ingallina 1977 pp. 136-138 and Watson 2003 p. 220, who comments that the verb introduces "a violence […] normally absent from the procedure". Mankin 1995 p. 123 and Watson 2003 p. 219 note the correspondence between *Epode* 5.45-46 and passages of magic in contemporary Latin poetry but neither develop this nor remark on their metapoetic nature. Porter 1995 pp. 125-126 reads "*excantata*" (45) as the first direct mention of poetry as a theme in the *Epodes*.

[95] Lowrie 2009a p. 111: "Horace turns him [the *puer*] into a spectacle through poetry's mimetic power."

bitumen atris ignibus", 81-82). Medea's prominence in the context of failed love-magic links Canidia into the intertextual chain of literary witches who similarly invoke the Colchian princess; while her predecessors leave the association of Medea's magic with revenge implicit, Canidia amplifies this subtext.[96] I suggest that we can read this expansion of Medea's vengeful magic as a parody of contemporary elegy as well as defining Horace's iambic poetics — including his close dialogue with contemporary poets and genres. Canidia's emphasis on her use of Medea's spells to rekindle Varus' love highlights the failure of her attempts, as well as her unconsciousness of its cause. Given Medea's recurrence in love-magic from Theocritus *Idyll* 2 onwards, we may ask why Horace should direct his parody specifically at elegy? I suggest that the prominence which Tibullus, and particularly Propertius, give to Medea in characterising their poetry and their narrators through magic in their first collections make this a target for Horace's humour. By expanding Medea's inapplicability for love-magic to the point of ridiculousness, Horace caricatures the elegiac poetics of amatory failure; Canidia's amplification of Medea's revenge — which, in elegy, simmers below the lovers' failed seductions — simultaneously foregrounds a defining characteristic of iambic.

We can also highlight possible echoes between Canidia's speech and Propertius 1.4 which suggest that this monologue may give the Propertian lover a taste of a real iambic *puella*. In 1.4 the narrator threatens Bassus with unbridled defamation by Cynthia, who will adopt the role of the iambist, and his consequent exclusion from the girls of Rome (17-22); instead of offering Cynthia's speech the narrator outlines his mistress' extensive endeavours to retain his love before praying that she will never change and reaffirming his attachment (27-28). At lines 17-18, Propertius' narrator highlights the expansive range of Cynthia's potential abuse: "*haec insana puella* | […] *tibi non tacitis vocibus hostis erit*". I suggest that the Horatian narrator's introduction of Canidia's speech — "*quid dixit aut quid tacuit?* […]" (*Epode* 5.49) — picks up this verbal cue, introducing her monologue as simultaneously a response to his elegiac contemporary and a characterisation of his iambic; Canidia's demand that Night and Diana direct their divine wrath towards keeping Varus, her enemy, from the doors of other women shows her

[96] For Horace drawing on Theocritus *Idyll* 2 throughout *Epode* 5, though without mentioning the inapplicability of Medea to love-magic: Fedeli 1978 pp. 93-96.

attempting to carry out the slanderous actions of Cynthia only imagined in 1.4.[97] Canidia's incapability of barring doors to Varus responds to Propertius' characterisation of his poetic magic — Cynthia herself — as perennially ineffective in love, showing this failure in action; at the same time, her lack of success picks up the thread of Horace's iambic impotence which runs through the *Epodes*. All of these elements unite to make Canidia's speech a microcosm of the collections' poetics, including Horace's interaction with, and self-definition, against early Propertian love-elegy.

We can develop hints of similar iambo-elegiac interaction in *Epode* 17, where, as the concluding poem of the book, Horace recalls and concentrates the variety of themes and genres he incorporated throughout the preceding works. I summarise the poem before outlining my reading.

Epode 17

Epode 17 is a dialogue between a male poet and Canidia: the poet prays for release from Canidia's torture (1-52); his enemy replies, refusing to listen and promising further torments to avenge his insults to her character (53-81). The suppliant poet begs Canidia to reverse her spells (1-18). He has suffered enough punishments: Canidia's potions have aged him prematurely; there is no release from his labour, night and day follow on one another and breathing is difficult — Sabellan *carmina* and Marsian *nenia* physically assault him (19-29). He burns like Hercules or Etna; does Canidia, a laboratory of Colchian poisons, burn while the wind scatters his ashes (30-35)? He will appease the witch with hecatombs or by singing her praises on a false lyre, gaining pardon as Stesichorus did after he had slandered Helen (36-52). Canidia responds by asking why her victim pours prayers on her barred ears — she is deafer to his pleas than any rock which Neptune batters is to shipwrecked sailors. Did he believe that he could mock Canidia's rituals and slander her unpunished (53-59)? Paying Paelignian old women or concocting faster poisons will not help — more drawn out fates wait for him and he will lead a miserable life, ever

[97] Oliensis 1998 p. 97 notes that "*quid dixit aut quid tacuit?*" could equally apply to Horace's words in *Epodes* 8 and 12.

on hand for new labours: Tantalus, Prometheus and Sisyphus begged for peace; Jove's laws forbade it (60-70). Suicide will give no release; Canidia will ride the poet's shoulders and the world will shake before her insolence. She may be capable of incredible feats of magic — should she weep because her arts are ineffectual on their target (71-81)?

Scholarship proposes a range of metapoetic interpretations of *Epode* 17. Barchiesi argues that the poem treats the "principles of iambic poetry and its effects", among which magic is prominent: both the poet and Canidia employ iambic spells against one another, and both embody the genre — in the narrator's case, thanks to his adversary's magic. Through the symmetry of the poet and the witch, Horace demonstrates the tendency of iambic verse to be as harmful to the practitioner as to its victim; Barchiesi also suggests, in keeping with the theme of "reversability" which he traces through the poem, that the introduction of the Cotyia (*Epode* 17.56) — a festival which involved male transvestism — raises the possibility that Canidia, too, is "in drag", a masculine transvestite whose voice belongs to her poet but who has the power to lead "into crisis his poetics".[98] Barchiesi uses the concept of reversibility to explicate the close link between Horace and Canidia. I suggest that it also expresses Canidia's iambic inversion of the elegiac *puella*, and we will develop this further when we discuss the male narrator's false palinode at the end of our discussion. Spina's metaliterary interpretation of the poem, which draws out a similar "chiasmic" relationship between the poet and Canidia, suggests that the content and tight structural coordination of Horace's final epode emphasises the variety of genres, styles and traditions — Archilochean, Alexandrian, and Neoteric — which he experiments with in the collection.[99]

Johnson offers a similar reading to Spina's: the poet's speech tries to engage Canidia through epic, lyric, and elegy, reflecting the variety of genres which *Epodes* 11-16 incorporate and anticipating Horace's lyric work.[100] Johnson reads the narrator's symptoms at *Epode* 17.21-26 as characterising him as an elegiac lover, addressing Canidia as his beloved; though Johnson

[98] Barchiesi 1994b pp. 216-217 and Barchiesi 1995 p. 341 (quotations: Barchiesi 2009 p. 246); cf. Spina 1993 p. 181, who expresses reservations about a similar interpretation. For the link between Horace and Canidia ensuring their "mutual destruction" cf. Heyworth 1993 pp. 92-93.
[99] Spina 1993 pp. 163-188.
[100] Johnson 2012 pp. 163-179.

argues that Canidia has read and understood Horace's work, he does not comment on elegiac aspects in her reply. Bushala also suggests elegiac resonances in the poem: after arguing that the male narrator is Canidia's lover and the victim of her erotic magic, Bushala closes his article by quoting E.K. Rand's suggestion that *Epode* 11 "laughs prophetically forward at" Propertius and Tibullus before finally proposing that *Epode* 17 ridicules the "enclosed, absurd, and morbid world" of Roman love-elegy and the lover's anguished relationships with an "uncanny, voracious Charybdis-Cimaera".[101] My discussion extends beyond these comments, highlighting specific parallels with Tibullan and Propertian elegy which suggest that Horace engages with the attribution of love-magic to the *puella* in these poets' already-available early work, and which continue into Canidia's half of the epode.

I suggest that in *Epode* 17 Horace presents a vision of the elegiac lover's idealised future — expressed as a faithful love which will last until their old age — with a beloved who, in reality, seldom admits them to their company and who has at least one other lover. Tibullus 1.6 presents the most extreme example of this in early love-elegy: after lamenting Delia's deceitfulness and infidelity (1-36), promising to submit to punishments from his mistress if he mistreats her (43-74), and outlining an old age of loneliness, poverty, and mockery for those loyal to no one (75-84), the narrator concludes by declaring that others may have such reproaches — he and Delia may be a model of love in their old age ("[…] *nos, Delia, amoris | exemplum cana simus uterque coma*", 85-86). Propertius expresses a similar sentiment in the closing lines of 1.8B: rejoicing after Cynthia has responded to his *preces* and *blanditiae* and proven her fidelity (1-45) by refusing to accompany a rival to Illyria as she had previously threatened to do (1.8A.1-26), he declares that no man will steal his love and that claim will last into his old age: "*ista meam norit gloria canitiem*" (46).[102] The idea of poetic immortality also resonates in these

[101] Bushala 1968 pp. 9-10, citing Rand, E.K. (1937), "Horace and the spirit of comedy", *The Rice Institute pamphlet* 24, No. 2, pp. 51-52; Johnson 2012 pp. 167-168. Oliensis 1991 pp. 115-116 and Oliensis 1998 p. 71 describes Canidia as "a debased version of Catullus's Lesbia"; in the extant Catullan corpus, however, the narrator nowhere associates Lesbia, nor any female character, with magic power. Canidia's witchcraft suggests reading her as a comment on the early elegiac *puellae*. Horace's allusion to Catullus' patently insincere switch from abuse to praise in 42 can enhance his transposition of elegiac characteristics into iambic by inverting and exaggerating the lover's praise of a woman whose negative characteristics he admits; cf. Barchiesi 1994b pp. 209-210.

[102] On Propertius 1.8A and B: Stroh 1971 pp. 36-54, Pasoli 1977 pp. 101-111 and Zetzel 1996 pp. 97-99; on 1.8B.46: Pasoli 1977 p. 109 and Coutelle 2005 pp. 222-225.

sentiments. Commentators highlight Propertius 1.8A and B as meditations on the power of his elegiac *blanditiae*, and note that the thought of old age, alongside the poet walking in the stars ("*nunc mihi summa licet contingere sidera plantis*: | *sive dies seu nox venerit, illa mea est*", 1.8B.43-44), evokes the everlasting glory his work will bring. Tibullus 1.6 concludes the Delia elegies of Book 1, giving the lover's wish an undertone of literary achievement and longevity. The disjunction between the fame the extratextual poet and his work will enjoy through the ages and the immortal youth and beauty of the fictional lover and his beloved which it will preserve introduces an irony into the elegiac lovers' hopes for their future happiness; Horace, I will argue, exploits this to parody the contemporary genre in his concluding epode while asserting the enduring power of his own poetic text.

In *Epode* 17, Horace ironically distorts the elegiac lover's wish for a reciprocal union with his mistress in their dotage, beginning again from the lover's association of his *puella* with magic: in Canidia, he gives the elegiac lovers the faithful elderly mistress they envision, but one whose age and ugliness requires her to retain her suitors with witchcraft. As in *Epode* 5, Horace literalises the elegiac metaphor of magically enchanting beauty, now exploiting the desires of the practitioners of erotic magic that their victims should love them for the rest of their lives; one explicit example of this wish exists in a fourth-century AD curse-tablet from Pella, in which the *defigens* requests that she and her beloved "grow old together" ("*συνκαταγηρᾶσαι*", Voutiras 1998 line 5). The iambic narrator inverts elegiac conventions by reversing the pleas of the *exclusus amator* for admittance, begging instead for release from the spells which prolong his amatory torture. The power and effectiveness of poetry is central to *Epode* 17, which presents the poet's *carmina* as magic incantations — a "performative" category of verse which, like iambic, aims to have tangible influence on the world — before appearing to raise doubts about their capabilities.[103] The significance of Canidia closing the *Epodes* by questioning her magic and of her victim's ensuing silence continues to provoke discussion in scholarship; I hope to add to this debate based on our investigations of literary magic. As in our reading of *Epode* 5, I focus

[103] On *Epode* 17, magic and poetic power: Barchiesi 1994b pp. 205-217 and Lowrie 2009a pp. 108-110.

on specific points in 17 which highlight Horace's engagement with love-elegy. We begin with the poet's speech, then consider Canidia's reply.

The poet begins with a prayer to Canidia for release from her love-magic:

> *iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae*
> *supplex et oro regna per Proserpinae,*
> *per et Dianae non movenda numina,*
> *per atque libros carminum valentium*
> *refixa caelo devocare sidera.*
> *Canidia, parce vocibus tandem sacris*
> *citumque retro solve, solve turbinem.*

(Horace *Epode* 17.1-7)

We previously highlighted line 7 in relation to magical subtext at Tibullus 1.5.3-4; I here suggest that the Horatian verse alludes to the Tibullan couplet, giving an early indication that the epode will again engage with love-elegy through this motif. To explore this idea, it will be helpful to quote the Tibullan simile in context:

> *asper eram et bene discidium me ferre loquebar,*
> *at mihi nunc longe gloria fortis abest;*
> *namque agor ut per plana citus sola verbere turben*
> *quem celer assueta versat ab arte puer.*
> *ure ferum et torque, libeat ne dicere quicquam*
> *magnificum posthac: horrida verba doma*
> *parce tamen, per te furtivi foedera lecti*
> *per Venerem quaeso compositumque caput.*

(Tibullus 1.5.3-8)

The narrator recants his earlier ferocity and desire to break with his mistress; driven back to her, he re-submits himself to servile punishments and prays for mercy. Read alongside one another, our two passages display several points of contact: in addition to the lexical echoes in the description of the instruments — "*citus*" (Tibullus 1.5.3; *Epode* 17.7); Horace's "*turbinem*" echoes the unusual Tibullan form, "*turben*" — both narrators appeal for mercy ("*parce*", 1.5.7; *Epode* 17.6), evoking a hymnic-style with the anaphoric "*per*" (1.5.7-8; *Epode* 17.2-5).[104] The iambic narrator's self-characterisation as a "*supplex*" (17.2) condenses the Tibullan lover's servile posture (1.5.5-6), evoking the *exclusus amator* prostrate at his mistress' threshold; as we will see, the opening lines of Canidia's reply pick up this theme.[105] In the Tibullan passage, the simile of the top activates a magical subtext to the lover's expression of his *servitium amoris*

[104] On "*turben*": Murgatroyd 1980 p. 162 and Maltby 2002 p. 242.
[105] For the *exclusus amator* as *supplex* in the first collections of Propertius and Tibullus: Propertius 1.9.3 and 1.16.4; Tibullus 1.2.87, 1.4.72, and cf. 1.8.5-6.

which justifies his return and submission to Delia. Horace inverts the Tibullan lines, expanding this subtext into an explicit atmosphere of magic and having his narrator beg for release from the witch's spells rather than following the elegiac lover's demand for further punishment. *Epode* 17.1 ("*iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae*") echoes Canidia's declaration that a stronger witch must be controlling Varus at *Epode* 5.71-72 ("*a, a, solutus ambulat veneficae | scientoris carmine!*"); recalling the weakness of Canidia's love-magic undermines the seriousness of the narrator's surrender, balancing the Tibullan lover's flawed attempt to align Delia with Theocritus' Simaetha and bringing out the humour in the elegiac lover's submission to the magic power which he himself attributes and gives to his mistress.[106] Tibullus 1.5.1-6 also incorporates palinodic elements; evoking this elegiac passage in the opening lines of *Epode* 17 intertextually foreshadows Horace's ironic palinode to Canidia at lines 47-52 — we return to consider the significance of this for Canidia's anti-elegiac aspects in the conclusion to this section.[107]

The elegiac element recurs when the narrator details the effects of Canidia's punishments:

> *fugit iuventas et verecundus color,*
> *relinquor ossa pelle amicta lurida,*
> *tuis capillus albus est odoribus;*
> *nullum a labore me reclinat otium,*
> *urget diem nox et dies noctem neque est*
> *levare tenta spiritu praecordia.*
> *ergo negatum vincor ut credam miser.*

(Horace *Epode* 17.21-27)

The narrator's pallor (21-22), emaciation (22), insomnia (24-25), wretchedness (27), and light breathing (26) evoke the elegiac lover; his self-description as "*miser*" (27) — a term which is virtually programmatic of the anguished elegiac lover, and associated with magical enchantment at Propertius 1.1.1 and 1.5.5 and 29 — reinforces this association.[108] In Propertius 1.5, the

[106] For *Epode* 17.1 recalling 5.71-72: Johnson 2012 p. 165. At the same time, this echo, alongside the incantatory style of the poet's words, introduces the affinity between the poet and the witch which develops throughout the epode until the climactic final lines. For Horace's similarity to Canidia in *Epode* 17.1-7 and throughout the poem: Barchiesi 1994b pp. 205-217 and esp. 205-208, and Johnson 2012 pp. 165-166; cf. Spina 1993 p. 181.

[107] For palinodic elements in Tibullus 1.5.1-6, including comparison with *Epode* 17: Cairns 1978 pp. 546-552 and Cairns 1979 pp. 168-171.

[108] On *miser* indicating an amatory context at *Epode* 17.27: Bushala 1968 p. 8. "*miser*" appears in the *Epodes* elsewhere only of Maecenas' amatory sorrow at 14.13, underling the erotic association in our passage. For *miser* and the elegiac lover: Allen 1950b pp. 258-560; for its amatory significance at *Epode* 14.13: Mankin 1995 p. 232 and Watson 2003 p. 453.

narrator lists these symptoms — excepting the lightness of breath — among the sufferings of Cynthia's *exclusus amator* ("*discere et exclusum quid sit abire domum*", 20), an experience he initially likened to drinking all of the potions in Thessaly (6); the narrator of Tibullus 1.8 suggests that Marathus' infatuation may result from pallor-inducing herbs ("*num te pallentibus herbis | devovit*", 17-18). All of these symptoms parallel those demanded for the targets of erotic magic in the *PMG* and *defixiones*; in the explicitly magical context of *Epode* 17, Horace encourages these parallels to literalise the elegiac lovers' characterisation of their infatuation as the result of witchcraft.[109] We discussed the length and constancy of the torments in relation to the *puer*'s torture in *Epode* 5; here, we can add that amatory spells demand that their victims become pale, or suffer torments day and night.[110] Extant erotic spells target breathing only occasionally;[111] light breathing is, however, a characteristic of the elegiac lover which Horace parodied in *Epode* 11: "[…] *latere petitus imo spiritus*" (10). "*spiritus*" denotes breathing only in these two *Epodes*, reinforcing the parallel between our narrator's symptoms and those of the elegiac *exclusus amator*.[112]

The narrator's loss of his "*verecundus color*" provides another link with *Epode* 11, echoing "[…] *inverecundus deus*" (11.13). Directly applied to the god, *inverecundus* equally describes the effect of the undiluted wine on the narrator ("*fervidiore mero arcana promorat loco*", 11.14); the repetition of the positive form in our passage, the sole parallel in the *Epodes*, prompts the reader to recall the earlier elegiac parody in the present poem.[113] We can press these

[109] Barchiesi 1994b pp. 214-215 n. 31 quotes *PGM* 4.1496 and Audollent [*DT*] 270 as parallels for the narrator's torments, supporting the erotic nature of the magic in *Epode* 1.17; Watson 2003 pp. 534-584 argues, conversely, for a non-erotic reading of magic in *Epode* 17.

[110] *Suppl. Mag*. 42: "*βασανίσατε αὐ|τῆς τὸ σῶμα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμαίρας*" (16); *PGM* XVIIa.1-25: "*ἐν πάσαις | ὥραις ἡμεριναῖς καὶ νυκτερι|ναῖς*", (10-12).

[111] *PGM* IV.149 ("I will bewitch her breath […] until she comes to me); *PDM* xiv.655-65 includes the lungs of the victim among the places of her body to be burnt (Johnson, H.J. (tr.), in Betz 1986 p. 231). Breathing occurs in Jordan 1985 7 and 8, erotic *defixiones* for separation: Jordan 1985 pp. 223-227; Jordan 1985 pp. 251-255 Inv. No. 1737 is a possible curse for erotic attraction which targets the victim's lungs and complexion. For non-erotic *defixiones* desiring to "deprive a victim of breath": Watson 2003 p. 556.

[112] Propertius 1.9.32 ("*spiritus iste levis*") and Tibullus 1.8.57-58 ("*ut lenis agatur | spritus*"). Conversely: Watson 2003 p. 556. Mankin 1995 p. 198, citing Propertius 1.16.32 and Horace *Epode* 11.10, notes that Propertius and Horace are the earliest extant poets employing "*spiritus*" in this way.

[113] For *inverecundus* (*Epode* 11.13) as unusual: Mankin 1995 p. 200. For correspondences between *Epode* 17.30 and *Epodes* 11.4 and 11.27 underlining the amatory, though not elegiac, theme of the final epode: Schmidt 1990 p. 158 n. 116.

adjectives further. Each connotes moral as well as physical characteristics; the narrator's loss of his youth and "*verecundus color*" since coming into contact with Canidia evokes the effect which the narrator of Propertius 1.1 claims that Cynthia's enchanting beauty had on him: "*contactum nullis ante cupidinibus.* | *tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus*" (2-3).[114] In the more overtly magical context of *Epode* 17, the poet's loss of modesty echoes the demand of erotic spells that their victims come "without shame" to their lovers (*PGM* XVIIa.21), shifting the emphasis from the effect of the woman's beauty to her love-magic and amplifying the Propertian narrator's negative characterisation of his love.

Even as he describes the effectiveness of Canidia's spells, Horace ironically undercuts the power he claims that she holds over him. After listing the physical results of Canidia's love-magic, the narrator likens her to Deianaira — comparing himself to Hercules burned by his wife's false love-potion (30-33) — and to Medea ("*cales venenis officina Colchicis?*", 35). This triad of witches recalls *Epode* 3.7-18; in the amatory context of *Epode* 17, Deianaira and Medea exemplify women whose magic did not inspire love but instead had a toxic effect.[115] As in *Epode* 5, Horace highlights his awareness of the elegiac narrators' misapplication of Medea to the power of their own poetic love-spells and turns this around, associating Canidia with inappropriate witches to ridicule the hollowness of the elegiac lover's claims of magical enchantment whilst underlining Canidia's associations with iambic magic, poison and revenge.

Canidia's reply maintains the elegiac element. The witch begins by proclaiming her deafness to her victim in terms which evoke the elegiac *paraclausithyron* ("*quid obseratis auribus fundis preces*?", 53); here, in a witty inversion which echoes the reversal of Tibullus' *paraclausithyron* in lines 1-7, Canidia becomes the elegiac beloved who refuses to listen to her suitor's pleas for escape rather than for entry. Her self-comparison with a rock's unresponsiveness to sailors battered by Neptune (54-55) — which balances, as Spina notes, the

[114] *OLD* s.v. *constans* 1b and 4a. Cf. Stahl 1985 pp. 33-34 for Propertius' emphasis on the narrator's moral purity before encountering Cynthia (1.1.3-4).

[115] *Epode* 17.21-26 parallels Heracles' description of the effects of Deianaira's poison at *Trachiniae* 1053-1057: wasted flesh, attacked breathing, and bloodlessness. For parallels between *Trachiniae* 1053-1057 and erotic magic: Faraone 1994 pp. 115-135 and Versnel 1998 p. 250 n. 94. Barchiesi 1994b pp. 214-215 n. 31 highlights the correspondence between the narrator's self-comparison with Etna (*Epode* 17.32-33) and Catullus 68.53 to indicate the "underlying eroticization" in the epode (quotation: Barchiesi 2009 p. 243 n. 31).

evocation of the *Odyssey* at lines 15-17 — also draws out the hardness of Cynthia, Delia, and Pholoe implicit in their etymological links with mountains: Cynthus and Pholoe.[116]

After assuring her victim that magic will not help him (60-61), Canidia emphasises the ceaselessness of his punishments:

> *sed tardiora fata te votis manent:*
> *ingrata misero vita ducenda est in hoc,*
> *novis ut usque suppetas laboribus.*
> *optat quietem Pelopis infidi pater*
> *egens benignae Tantalus semper dapis,*
> *optat Prometheus obligatus aliti,*
> *optat supremo collocare Sisyphus*
> *in monte saxum: sed vetant leges Iovis.*

(Horace *Epode* 17.62-69)

Canidia's *exempla* prepare for her assurance that her victim will find no release through suicide (70-72), and their sins — the betrayal of Zeus' secrets — correspond to the poet's publication of Canidia's rites (56-59); we can also highlight an erotic dimension to the catalogue as, as Barchiesi notes, the sinners' punishments "are all traditional allegories of insatiable love".[117] Tantalus' prominence (65-66) explicates the description of the *puer* at *Epode* 5.35-36, connecting Canidia's victims; the birds which torment Prometheus (67) allude to their eternal devouring of his liver, reinforcing the connection between the poet's future punishment and Canidia's harvesting of the *puer*'s organ. The erotic purpose of the child's death alerts the reader to a similar element in our present passage, and *Epode* 17 internally reinforces this with "*laboribus*" (64) answering the poet's *exemplum* of "*laboriosi* […] *Ulixei*" (16).[118]

Lines 65-69 find an elegiac parallel in Tibullus 1.3, where Venus, guiding the narrator through Elysium to the gates of Tartarus, shows him Ixion (73-74), Tityos (75-76), Tantalus (77-78) and the Daniads (79-80) serving sentences for amatory sins:[119]

---

[116] Spina 1993 p. 176. For "Cynthia" and "Delia": Maltby 2002 p. 43; on "Pholoe": Nisbet and Hubbard 1970 p. 373.

[117] For the sins of Tantalus, Prometheus and Sisyphus: Mankin 1995 pp. 290-291 and Watson 2003 pp. 567-577. For Sisyphus' amatory crime cf. Henderson 1969 p. 649. Barchiesi 1994b pp. 214-215 n. 31 (quotation: Barchiesi 2009 p. 243 n. 31).

[118] For Tantalus (65-66) and *Epode* 5.35-36 cf. Mankin 1995 p. 291. For *Epode* 17.65-69 balancing 17.8-18, without focusing on "*laboribus*" and this amatory aspect: Spina 1993 pp. 177-179 and Barchiesi 1994b p. 206 n. 4.

[119] Schmidt 1990 p. 158 n. 116 cites the parallel *exempla* at Propertius 2.17.5-10 and 13f. to reinforce the amatory nature of *Epode* 17.62-69.

illic Iunonem temptare Ixionis ausi
versantur celeri noxia membra rota,
porrectusque novem Tityos per iugera terrae
assiduas atro viscere pascit aves.
Tantalus est illic et circum stagna sed acrem
iam iam poturi deserit unda sitim;
et Danai proles, Veneris quod numina laesit,
in cava Lethaeas dolia portat aquas.

(Tibullus 1.3.73-80)

Tantalus' fellow inmates similarly illustrate lovers' sufferings: Houghton reads Ixion as symbolising the lover's continually changing fortunes; Tityos, the chronic pain of infatuation; the Danaids, the *puella*'s insatiable demands.[120] In addition to the presence of Tantalus, Tibullus' catalogue resonates in the Horatian passage in two further ways. Birds denote Tityos' torture here ("*aves*", 76) as they do Prometheus' at *Epode* 17.67. In the elegiac passage, Tisiphone marshals the souls in the Underworld: "*Tisiphoneque impexa feros pro crinibus angues | saevit et huc illuc impia turba fugit*" (1.3.69-70). Bright notes the striking detail of the Fury's snaky hair, which distorts the beautiful tresses of the beloved which the *amator* — and especially Tibullus' narrator — singles out to illustrate her attractiveness and fidelity; Houghton extends this association, suggesting that Tisiphone is the *puella*'s Hadean avatar.[121] In *Epode* 17.62-69, I suggest, Canidia plays on the Tibullan Tisiphone's link with Delia. The close links between our poem and *Epode* 5 suggest the witch's implicit characterisation as an avenging deity here: the narrator of the earlier epode introduces Canidia with a description of her distinctive hairstyle ("*Canidia brevibus implicata viperis | crinis et incomptum caput*", 15-16), styling her as a Fury and characterising her as a wickedly comic inversion of the elegiac beloved and her ideally

[120] Houghton 2007 pp. 158-164; cf. Henderson 1969 pp. 649-653 and Bright 1978 pp. 30-31 for the elegiac focus of Tibullus' Underworld. Bassi 1994 p. 58 highlights Tibullus 1.1.55-56 as likening the *exclusus amator*'s existence to '"life" in Hades'. To Houghton's points we can add that Ixion's punishment, as well as anticipating Fortune's wheel in Tibullus 1.5 ("*versatur celeri levis orbe rotae*", 70), also picks up the lover's torment at Tibullus 1.5.3-4 — "*namque agor ut per plana citus sola verbere turben | quem celer assueta versat ab arte puer*"; Houghton 2007 p. 162 n. 49 quotes 1.5.70 as a parallel for 1.3.73-74. Horace's explication of the magic subtext of 1.5.3-4 at the beginning of *Epode* 17 highlights his awareness of Tibullus' work, and suggests that he is evoking the Underworld scene of 1.3.73-80 in Canidia's speech. Tibullus' description of Tantalus in the pool (1.3.78) resonates in *Epode* 17.1: "*iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae*". In the Tibullan lines, "*iam iam*" conveys just how close Tantalus is to finding relief before the water recedes, illustrating the intensity of the lover's disappointment and frustration; in *Epode* 17.1, the same expression conveys the narrator's desperation for release from Canidia's magic. Re-reading this opening line in light of Canidia's comparison of the poet's suffering with Tantalus', the structural and thematic balance between the halves of the epode encourages us to hear the poet's initial surrender echoing in this *exemplum*.

[121] Bright 1978 p. 30 n. 47 and Houghton 2007 pp. 160-161; cf. Smith 1978 p. 257. Bassi 1994 p. 58 suggests that Tibullus 1.1.55-56 aligns Delia with Persephone ruling Hades, presenting her as controlling her lover's existence in the Underworld.

disordered tresses; she also orchestrates the *puer*'s Tantalean sufferings which our passage balances (66). Evoking Tibullus 1.3 in *Epode* 17.62-69 recalls the witch as a Fury while maintaining her inversion of the elegiac mistress' beauty by co-opting the image already employed for this purpose by Tibullus.[122]

Tibullus' elegiacised Underworld, in which lovers' joys and misfortunes continue as they had in life, expands on the lover's assertion that his passion for his mistress will continue beyond the grave.[123] In *Epode* 17, in which magic is the dominant motif, Canidia's list at lines 62-69 evokes the repeated wishes of erotic spells that the practitioners may control their victims eternally ("*ποίησον τὴν δεῖνα | ἀγρυπνοῦσάν μοι διὰ παντὸς* [*αἰῶνος*]", *PGM* IV.2965-2966) or for the rest of their lives ("*ὑποτεταγμένην εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς μου*", *Suppl. Mag.* 47); *PGM* XVI.1-75 includes a formulation of this wish which is particularly pertinent for our passage, as the practitioner demands that their victim conform to their will and love them "until he reaches Hades" ("*ἕως ὅτ[αν εἰ]ς* [*Ἅδ*]*ην ἀφίκηται*", 16).[124] This literalisation of the elegiac lovers' declaration of passion and their eroticisation of death balances that which we traced in *Epode* 5, reinforcing the elegiac parody in both poems.

The iambic passage also picks up the thread of poetic immortality in *Epode* 17, playing on the paradox of this theme in love-elegy in terms suited to Horace's work. As we highlighted in the introduction to this section, the narrators of Tibullus 1.6 and Propertius 1.8B predict that their happy, faithful relationships with their mistresses will last into their old age; while the extratextual poets will enjoy their work's fame for many years, the lovers and their *puellae* will remain young and beautiful and this reciprocal union will remain out of reach forever. Canidia, by contrast, is already old and unattractive; she has accelerated her victim's age to match her own (*Epode* 17.21-27) and her spells will keep the aged poet alive forever in eternal torture. In keeping with his inversion of the elegiac lovers' representation of their relationships with their

[122] For Canidia as a Fury in *Epode* 5.15-16: Mankin 1995 p. 114 and Watson 2003 p. 198. For Canidia's serpentine hair embodying iambic "venom" in *Epode* 5: Barchiesi 1994b p. 213 and Barchiesi 1995 p. 340. For debate over reading *implicata* or *illigata* at *Epode* 5.15: Mankin 1995 pp. 114-115 and Watson 2003 p. 199.
[123] Houghton 2007 pp. 157-158 and 163-164.
[124] For a non-amatory reading of *Epode* 17.62-69: Watson 2003 pp. 536-537 and 578.

mistresses, Horace grants their wish of an enduring union with their white-haired *puellae* by providing an eternal torture like that supervised by the Tibullan Tisiphone. This reversal also allows Horace to use the same imagery of old age and immortality to illustrate the longevity of his iambic collection and its fame.

Poetic power and immortality come to the fore in the final lines of the epode with Canidia's climactic list of her abilities:

> *an quae movere cereas imagines,*
> *ut ipse nosti curiosus, et polo*
> *deripere lunam vocibus possim meis,*
> *possim crematos excitare mortuos*
> *desiderique temperare pocula,*
> *plorem artis in te nil agentis exitus?*

(Horace *Epode* 17.76-81)

The witch's last question and the repeated subjunctive "*possim*" (78-79) destabilise the credibility of her powers, which recall her actions in *Satires* 1.8 and *Epode* 5; the structural parallel with the opening line of the poem ("*iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae*", 1), in which the intratextual echo of *Epode* 5.71-72 undermines the narrator's acknowledgment of Canidia's abilities, intensifies this doubt.[125] This doubt parallels the recurrent scepticism of love-magic in contemporary poetry which, as we have seen, highlights the ineffectiveness of magic and poetry over its internal target whilst affirming its power to influence the belief and imagination of the extratextual audience. I suggest that these levels of poetic potency and fiction are active in our passage; this supplements current metapoetic readings of these lines, particularly Barchiesi's suggestion that Canidia in *Epode* 17 is Horace's feminine costume, a personification of his iambic text and his poetic voice.[126] The equation of poetry with magic *carmina* throughout *Epode* 17, as in *Satires* 1.8 and *Epode* 5, suggests that these final lines illustrate the images which Horace's poetry produces. Here, too, the introduction of doubt in the witch's abilities undermines their power and betrays their illusoriness, ending the collection on the theme of poetic impotence in contemporary political circumstances; at the same time, I suggest, concluding the book with Canidia's magic abilities draws attention to the creative power of

[125] For *Epode* 17.81 balancing *Epode* 17.1: Spina 1993 p. 191; cf. Watson 2003 p. 584.
[126] Barchiesi 1994b pp. 216-217.

Horace's verses.[127] The balanced and chiastic structure of the poem, alongside the magical language which runs through it, tightens the associations of the poet and witch; by the final lines, they speak as one voice, an impression which Horace's following silence reinforces. This same silence creates the impression that Canidia's combative question addresses the extratextual audience more than her victim — calling her powers into doubt while the audience is envisioning the feats jolts them mentally out of the illusion, increasing the impression of the power of the poet's verses as well as the fantasy which they create. Posing this doubt as a question strengthens this effect, creating a lingering doubt in the reader over whether Canidia is as powerless as she seems.[128]

To conclude this section, I would like to return to Horace's palinode to Canidia in lines 47-52. This closes the first half of the epode, balancing the idea of the longevity and enchanting power of the iambic collection illustrated through magic in lines 76-81 with the narrator's promise that his poetry will immortalise Canidia in the stars (39-40) and the extended invective with which he ends his speech (46-52).[129] As I hope to suggest, this passage also provides a device which neatly expresses the elegiac lovers' double-edged association of their beloveds with magic and articulates the relationship between these *puellae* and Canidia. It will be useful to begin by outlining the background of Stesichorus' palinode and Horace's evocation of this model before we explore how it relates to his elegiac polemic.

Stesichorus' palinode was framed as a retraction of an earlier work which had offended Helen by defaming her character. To appease her and to reverse the blindness with which he had been punished for his insults, Stesichorus' new lyric asserted that the "real" Helen had remained in Egypt, chaste and faithful, during the events at Troy while her wanton doppelgänger followed

[127] Lowrie 2009a pp. 108-109 notes that *Epode* 17.81 relates Canidia's abilities to "iambic effectiveness" but does not relate the witch's powers to Horace's poetry: "He may be incapable of pulling down the moon, or convincing the Roman populace to migrate to the Isles of the Blessed, but his poetry can blame and praise. Its pragmatic power is to circulate representations and affect reputations." Cf. Lowrie 2009a p. 111 for the "mimetic" power of Horace's iambic in *Epode* 5.

[128] For an alternative interpretation, which does not include the magic in the final lines, of the reader's response to the ending of *Epode* 17 demonstrating the "efficacy" of Horace's poetry: Johnson 2012 pp. 178-179.

[129] For Canidia's catasterism and poetic immortality: Watson 2003 pp. 562-563; for Canidia's catasterism and Callimachus *Iambus* 17: Barchiesi 1994b pp. 208-209.

Paris. A palinode, by its nature, is, however, double-edged: the supposed recantation necessitates the repetition, and reaffirmation, of the original view of her character. As a result, Stesichorus' poem expresses two images of Helen simultaneously: while the emphasis on the recantation appears to foreground the presentation of her character as virtuous, the original picture of her as a shameless wife remains visible alongside it and casts it in an ironic light; recalling that Stesichorus' poem was motivated by the desire to regain his sight rather than by altruism heightens this irony further.[130]

Horace's palinode amplifies these ironies. The narrator announces the insincerity of his poetic offering by declaring that he will sing of Canidia's chastity, and immortalise her among the stars, with a dishonest lyre ("[…] *sive mendaci lyra | voles sonari: 'tu pudica, tu proba | perambulis astra sidus aureum*", 39-41); the echo of Catullus 42.42 ("*pudica et proba, redde codicillos*") — the narrator's about-face from abuse to praise to persuade his female addressee to return his writing-tablets — at lines 40-41 also sets up for the hollowness of the present recantation.[131] Horace's narrator goes beyond the repetition of previous insults by adding new material to his earlier abuse of the witch (46-52). Evoking the model of Stesichorus reinforces the self-interested reason for the narrator offering his recantation to Canidia ("*infamis Helenae Castor offensus vice | fraterque magni Castoris victi prece | adempta vati reddidere lumina*", 42-44), and the witch's alignment with Helen intensifies its irony further through the extreme

[130] On Stesichorus' *Palinode*: Woodbury 1967 pp. 157-176, Bassi 1993 pp. 51-75 and Austin 1994 pp. 90-117. For the palinode as double-edged: Bassi 1993 p. 52. For the "doubleness" of Helen throughout her tradition and Stesichorus' specific innovations: Bergren 1983 pp. 81-82.

[131] The allusion to Catullus 42 also reinforces the notion of poetic power and immortality in this section; significantly for us, it also plays into Horace's dialogue with contemporary love-elegy by evoking a recent literary predecessor whose work straddled, and influenced the development of, both Roman traditions. For lost writing-tablets expressing the durability of the poetic voice in Catullus 42 and 50: Roman 2006 pp. 353-359; similarly on *Epode* 17.40-41 and Catullus 42: Lowrie 2009a p. 109. For alternative readings of the allusion to Catullus 42 at *Epode* 17.40-41: Oliensis 1991 pp. 115-116, Barchiesi 1994b pp. 209-210, Oliensis 1998 pp. 71-72 and Johnson 2012 pp. 168-170. Against *Epode* 17.40-41 alluding to Catullus 42: Lindo 1969 pp. 176-177.

contrast between her advanced age and ugliness and Helen's divinely bewitching beauty.[132]

The question now is: how does this relate to Horace's parody of the elegiac *puellae*? As we saw at the beginning of this chapter, the elegiac lovers' characterisation of these girls' physical attractiveness as magical enchantment is double-edged: while it initially appears to praise their beauty through the favourable comparison with magic, it covertly implies that their attractiveness stems from an artificial source of power with which they target and control their lovers. Introducing this ambivalence in the form of praise illustrates the unreliability and hypocrisy of the elegiac *ego* as a lover and as a narrator, as well as his willingness to modify his expressed attitude towards and representation of his mistress to the needs of his present situation. Horace's ironic palinode magnifies this hypocrisy to the point of ridicule. As an inversion of the elegiac *puellae*, Canidia replaces their attractiveness with literal love-magic, embodying the negative view of them which their lovers' flattery implies. The witch's ironic alignment with Helen — a woman of bewitching loveliness who, like both Canidia and the elegiac girls, is also associated with magic enchantment and the poetic text — parallels this inversion, and the device of the palinode emphasises the simultaneity of both views as well as the ease with which one can be brought to the fore according to the lover's self-serving demands; in keeping with his expression of his iambic poetics, Horace tips the emphasis towards the negative image through the narrator's continued slander of Canidia.[133] Helen and her phantom half hint that we can take this co-existence further and suggest that Canidia and the elegiac *puellae* are to be read as opposite sides of the same coin, making Canidia, as much as a positive embodiment of Horatian iambic, a pointedly "anti-elegiac woman".

---

[132] Helen also adds a literary dimension to the palinode which is in keeping with the association of Horace's iambic with magic throughout the epode. In *Odyssey* 4.219-234, the *pharmaka* which Helen adds to the wine before she begins her stories of Odysseus in Troy symbolises the enchanting effect of epic poetry on an audience: Clader 1976 pp. 32-33, Bergren 1981 pp. 206-210 and 213-214, and Bergren 1983 pp. 79-80. For Helen practising literal magic as well as seduction in Troy: Boyd 1998 pp. 7-14; cf. Clader 1976 p. 34. Gumpert 2001 pp. 40-42 highlights the erotic presentation of Helen's magical charms.

[133] Stesichorus' *Palinode* also incorporates an element of literary polemic, presenting two traditions — the narratives of Homeric epic and his lyric — alongside one another and apparently asserting the supremacy of the "new" work while reaffirming the legitimacy of the earlier text: Bassi 1993 pp. 53-59; cf. Bergren 1983 p. 82 and, with an alternative interpretation, Austin 1994 pp. 96-117. This model further underlines the element of elegiac polemic in *Epode* 17.39-56 before his extended invective of his target in the final lines of his narrator's speech exemplifies his iambic. Barchiesi 1994b pp. 208-210 reads Horace's palinode as contrasting iambic and lyric, genres which "define each other in turn as praise poetry and slander" (quotation: Barchiesi 2009 p. 238).

Spinning on a Dime: Propertius 3.6

Propertius 3.6, a poem which reopens the exchange between Horace's *Epodes* and earlier love-elegy from the other side, illustrates this affinity between Canidia and the elegiac beloved well, using allusions to Canidia's rites in *Epode* 5 to make the witch a part of the *puella*'s construction and to present a striking example of the lover's easy switch between romanticised and denigratory presentations of his mistress which Horace's evocation of Stesichorus' palinode brings out.[134] I summarise the elegy and address particular questions which relate to its interpretation before developing Propertius' answer to Horace's iambic *puella*.

3.6 is organised around a *puella*'s monologue, presented in direct speech; her lover's words frame this monologue, introducing and reacting to it. A slave, Lygdamus, is the estranged couple's mutual, silent addressee, and the narrative background emerges gradually as in a mime.[135] The lover demands that Lygdamus tell him the truth about his *puella* (1-8). Before the slave can reply, the narrator, through a series of rhetorical questions, constructs an image of his mistress as he imagines Lygdamus found her — beautiful, though she is in mourning and disarray; disregarding make-up or jewellery — (9-14) and describes her spinning wool with her handmaidens and lamenting their quarrel (15-18). This image introduces the *puella*'s speech (19-34): the girl stresses her lover's unjust neglect and her fidelity to him, and accuses another woman of stealing him with witchcraft; after detailing her rival's practices (25-30), she prophesises her lover's return and punishment (31-34). In the closing frame, the narrator declares that if the girl's words reveal her true character, Lygdamus should tell her that her lover was angry but not false — he reciprocates his mistress' passion and he will swear that he has

[134] Luck 1955 pp. 434-437 notes echoes of Horace *Epode* 5 in Propertius' description of and curses on Acanthis in 4.5; cf. O'Neill 1998 p. 59 n. 35. I interpret these echoes as evoking Canidia in the Propertian *lena*, enhancing the narrator's abuse and ostensibly legitimising his curses on his adversary, as well as underlining the *lena*'s metaliterary role and affinity with the poet and his *carmina* by recalling Canidia's relationship with the poetics of the *Epodes*; as Propertius' echoes of the Horatian witch do not relate to our primary focus on the association of magic with the *puella*'s beauty, I omit further discussion of Propertius 4.5 here.

[135] For the gradual revelation of detail in 3.6: Butrica 1983 pp. 17-18.

remained celibate for twelve days; if he reunites with his *puella*, the narrator will endeavour to ensure Lygdamus' freedom (35-42).

Scholarship primarily concentrates on whether 3.6 should be read as a monologue by the lover or whether it should be divided into three voices: the lover, Lygdamus, and the *puella*. The dominant view remains that the poem is a monologue in which the lover focalises his mistress' embedded speech; McCarthy's narratological analysis of 3.6 develops this reading by proposing that the extratextual poet narrates lines 15-18, rather than the fictional lover.[136] Discussions which focus on the elegy's magic content remain rare; commentators note that the magic rites which the girl lists (25-30) recall Horace *Epode* 5, though they do not expand on these observations.[137] Propertius' close engagement with Horace's lyric work in the programmatic opening sequence of Book 3 (1-5) invites closer investigation of the correspondences between 3.6.25-30 and *Epode* 5.[138] 3.6 is also the first elegy of Book 3 which presents the familiar relationship between the lover and *puella* of Propertius' previous collections — this position adds significance to the presence of magic in the poem, and we can suggest that the motif carries a metapoetic element here, as it does in the opening poems of Books 1 and 2, which reflects Propertius' literary developments in his third collection.[139]

---

[136] For 3.6 as a monologue by the lover, either incorporating rhetorical questions or repeating Lygdamus' testimony: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 273, Camps 1966 pp. 78-79, Hubbard 1974 p. 137, Lyne 1980 p. 137 and Yardley 1985 p. 362; McCarthy 2010 pp. 153-186. Cf. Warden 1980 p. 100. For dividing 3.6 into three voices: Butrica 1983 pp. 24-28; cf. Heyworth 2007b pp. 304-305.

[137] For discussion of 3.6.25-30: Tupet 1974 pp. 250-262 and Novara 2000 pp. 23-29; cf. Tupet 1976 pp. 360-368. For 3.6.25-30 and *Epode* 5.15-24: Wickham 1896 p. 366, Keissling-Heinze 1930 p. 507, Butler and Barber 1933 pp. 274-275, Plessis-Lejay-Galletier 1966 p. 342, Fedeli 1985 p. 219, Cavarzere 1992 pp. 149-150; Mankin 1995 p. 115 remarks that 3.6.25-30 is "imitating" *Epode* 5.19-24.

[138] Propertius 3.2.18 ("*carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae*") announces that his verses will immortalise the beauty of any *puella* they celebrate, echoing and adapting Horace's statement of his literary immortality at *Odes* 3.30.1 to emphasise the centrality of physical attractiveness to elegiac poetry; this anticipates the equation and contrast of the *puella* and Canidia in 3.6. On Propertius' programmatic engagement with literary predecessors, especially Horace, in 3.1-5: Nethercut 1970 pp. 385-407, Hubbard 1974 pp. 72 and 103-108, Miller 1983 pp. 289-299, Fedeli 1985 p. 90 on 3.2.18 and *Odes* 3.30.1 without mentioning beauty, and Mader 1993 pp. 321-340.

[139] McCarthy 2010 pp. 176-179 discusses how 3.6 demonstrates the place of the amatory relationship in the new elegiac program of Book 3, including its "shift toward metapoetic concerns"; McCarthy does not dwell on the magic content, nor does she approach 3.6 from the intertextual perspective I take.

Over the course of 3.6, the narrator draws two contrasting images of his beloved: the first, positive, portrait emerges through his rhetorical interrogation of Lygdamus in lines 9-18; the second, negative, picture develops through the girl's speech. The first image creates the *puella* as her lover claims that he wishes to see her — naturally beautiful and unadorned, and chastely working at home; his emphasis that her words reveal her true character indicates that the second picture conveys the picture of his mistress most suited to his present circumstances — and verbal echoes link the two portraits, reinforcing the narrator's construction of both and their existence side-by-side in the same girl. The lover's introduction of magic into his *puella*'s speech characterises her and her rival as witches, excusing himself for his unfaithfulness to the former and his hinted sexual impotence with the latter. The allusion to *Epode* 5 aligns the *puella* with Horace's Canidia; I suggest that Propertius recalls Horace's iambic inversion of the elegiac *puella* and re-appropriates it to construct one of two divergent views of the mistress. Following the focus on the mistress' natural beauty in the opening lines, the narrator leads his audience to associate Canidia's practical magic with a young and radiantly attractive girl rather than Horace's elderly, unattractive witch. Propertius thus turns the tables on Horace's reworking of Cynthia to show that he can have a beloved who is beautiful and a practising witch, offering an entertaining comment on his narrator's capacity for hypocrisy and self-delusion in his application of magic to his mistress, which the narrative of 3.6 illustrates.

This discussion is part of my wider reading of Propertius 3.6 as a reinterpretation of Theocritus *Idyll* 2 focalised through an elegiac "Delphis" who presents himself as the victim of Simaetha's love-magic, a work-in-progress paper which I presented at the Classical Association Annual Conference Durham, 2011 — "I Will Swear I Have Been Faithful for Twelve Days: Jilted Witches and Unfaithful Lovers in Propertius 3.6 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2".[140] In this paper, I argue that the Propertian narrator adapts Simaetha's narrative devices in her lament to Selene (*Idyll* 2.64-166) — most prominently, the use of an embedded, direct speech by her beloved, focalised from her perspective — to construct a portrait of his *puella* as a successful witch who controls him with her spells; the narrator's failure to appreciate that Simaetha's love-magic is unsuccessful and that Delphis is unfaithful to her during his twelve-day absence undermine his

[140] Chadha 2011; this reading offers fresh evidence for interpreting 3.6 as monologue by the narrator.

images of his beloved and his own claim of fidelity during their estrangement ("*iurabo bis sex integer esse dies*", 40). 3.6.26 and 30 evokes Simaetha's *rhombus* (26; *Idyll* 2.30-31) and wool (30; *Idyll* 2.2-3) in the first half of *Idyll* 2, aligning the *puella* with Theocritus' witch; the central lines of this passage allude to Horace *Epode* 5. The similarities between Simaetha's situation and Canidia's — two witches abandoned by unfaithful beloveds who unsuccessfully attempt to retrieve them by love-magic — enables the smooth integration of these models into 3.6.[141] In keeping with our present focus on Propertius' dialogue with Horace and the connection of magic with the *puella*'s beauty, I concentrate on the allusions to *Epode* 5 and reference my work-in-progress paper where necessary.

It will be useful to begin with the lover's vision of his mistress' appearance in the opening frame; we return to the girl's domestic activities (15-18) after examining the magic-content of her speech. After stressing the need for Lygdamus to be truthful (1-5), the narrator's questions build up a picture of his *puella*:[142]

> *sicin eam incomptis vidisti flere capillis?*
> *illius ex oculis multa cadebat aqua?*
> *nec speculum strato vidisti, Lygdame, lecto?*
> *ornabat niveas nullane gemma manus?*
> *ac maestam teneris vestem pendere lacertis,*
> *scriniaque ad lecti clausa iacere pedes?*
>
> (Propertius 3.6.9-14)

The lover concentrates on her lack of adornment (11-12, 14), her dishevelled hair and clothes (9 and 13) and her attractive physique ("*niveas* […] *manus*", 12; "*teneris* [...] *lacertis*", 13). Her neglect of her grooming and cosmetics are attractive as indicators of her fidelity and chastity; the narrator's specification of her hands and arms highlights her youth and beauty and introduces these as a key factor in his attraction to her.[143] His repeated demand to know what Lygdamus "saw" ("*vidisti*", 9 and 11) prompts the extratextual audience to visualise the *puella* with him,

[141] Cf. Fedeli 1978 pp. 95-97 for correspondences of structure and content between Theocritus *Idyll* 2 and Horace *Epode* 5.
[142] For 3.6.9-14 evoking Terence *Heautontimorumenos* 285-290 or its Menandrian model: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 273, Butrica 1983 pp. 28 and 34-36, and Yardley 1985 pp. 362-363. I follow the line order of Butler and Barber 1933 for Propertius 3.6.9-14.
[143] Warden 1980 p. 71 comments that 3.6.9-14 "indirectly" hint at the *puella*'s attractiveness.

intensifying their mental image of her.[144] This augments the details of the colour and delicacy of her hands and arms which add vividness to the girl, and which also, alongside "*scrinia*", evoke the concept of the beloved as a work of physical, as well as poetic, art — particularly in this case a marble or ivory statue, on which clothes have been haphazardly draped (13) — concretising her image for the audience and alerting us to read her embedded speech as the narrator's continuation of his artistic vision.[145] We return to the metapoetic element of the *puella* towards the end of our reading of 3.6; for now, it is important to note that the picture of the girl which emerges in these lines draw attention to her ideal, uncultivated charm so that as the lover leads into her speech this is the image the audience retains alongside the character portrait which unfolds.

Magic dominates the *puella*'s reported monologue. After bemoaning her undeserved neglect by her lover (19-24), she accuses a rival of controlling him with love-magic:

non me moribus illa, sed herbis improba vicit,
staminea rhombi ducitur ille rota;
illum tergentis ranae portenta rubetae
et lecta exsucis anguibus ossa trahunt,
et strigis inventae per busta iacentia plumae
cinctaque funesto lanea vitta toro.

(Propertius 3.6.25-30)

The central lines (27-29) recall Canidia's burnt-offering at the beginning of *Epode* 5:

iubet sepulcris caprificos erutas,
iubet cupressos funebris
et uncta turpis ova ranae sanguine
plumamque nocturnae strigis
herbasque quas Iolcos atque Hiberia
mittit venenorum ferax
et ossa ab ore rapta ieiunae canis
flammis aduri Colchicis.

(Horace *Epode* 5.17-24)

The Propertian witch echoes Canidia's herbs (21; 3.6.25), toad (19; 3.6.27), *strix* feathers (20; 3.6.29), and bones removed from the body of an animal (23; 3.6.28), as well as the graveyard

[144] Cf. McCarthy 2010 p. 157: 3.6.9-14 "shift the reader's attention" to the *puella*'s home, and "*vidisti* (9, 11) […] keeps front and center the context of the Ego accosting and questioning Lygdamus, while its semantic value points us toward Lygdamus' function as a witness and thus to the scene he saw." For the *puella*'s monologue positioning Lygdamus as a cipher for the extratextual audience: McCarthy 2010 p. 173.

[145] On *scrinia* (3.6.14) as a metapoetic marker: McCarthy 2010 p. 184 n. 24. For *niveus* evoking marble or ivory in elegy: Sharrock 1991 pp. 40 and 41-43 for Cynthia as a statue in Propertius 1.3.

provenance of these materials and their association with the dead (17-18; 3.6.29-30). The removal of the bones from the snakes (3.6.28) — notable in extant Latin poetry as an example of a witch handling snakes manually, rather than controlling them by song — suggests that Propertius' condensed allusion extends to the burial and starvation of Canidia's *puer* ("*exsecta uti medulla et aridum iecur | amoris esset poculum*", *Epode* 5.37-38):[146] "*ossa*" (3.6.28) parallels the bones snatched from dogs (*Epode* 5.23) and, alongside "*exsectis*", encompasses the *medulla* which are vital for Canidia's philtre (*Epode* 5.37).[147] Canidia's fire corresponds to an *epithuma*, a smoke-offering which initiated magical and religious practices. The materials are appropriate to the rite's erotic aim, as resonances later in the epode, including the child's burial, indicate: tearing the bones from dog's jaws (23) sympathetically imbues them with the creature's desire, anticipating the same desire in the *puer*'s marrow which is created by his longing for food (32-40); commentators suggest that the *strix* feathers (20) symbolise forgetfulness, foreshadowing Canidia's attempt to make Varus forget her rivals, and the bird's reputation for feeding on the blood of young boys looks forward to the witch's extraction of the *puer*'s organs.[148] Canidia's later declaration that Varus will burn for her like bitumen ("*quam non amore sic meo flagres uti | bitumen atris ignibus*", 81-82) also balances the erotic purpose of her *epithuma.*

Though the *puella* attributes love-magic to a rival with whom she contrasts herself ("*improba*", 25), her detailed knowledge of her rival's practices, however, signals her own expertise in the art and her particular affinity with Horace's Canidia, recalling Horace's iambic parody of the elegiac lovers' metaphorical application of magic power to their mistresses. Propertius' association of his *puella* with practical magic responds to Horace's iambic pastiche,

[146] For 3.6.28 as a rare literal treatment of snakes in Latin poetry: Tupet 1976 p. 364; cf. Heyworth 2007b p. 306 n. 35.

[147] A textual point common to 3.6.28 and *Epode* 5.37-38 is pertinent to our analysis: editors dispute the reading of the Propertian line, emending the transmitted "*exsectis*", with the connotation of dissection, to "*exsuctis*", "*exuctis*", or "*exsucis*", suggesting that the bones were collected after the snakes dried out; similar difficulty exists over "*exsecta*" at *Epode* 5.37, though this remains the dominant reading. The evocation of *Epode* 5.37 remains even accepting emendation at 3.6.28, the reptiles' desiccation corresponding with that of the child's organs ("*aridum*", 37). For 3.6.28: Butler and Barber 1933, Richardson 1977 p. 339 and Fedeli 1985 p. 219 adopt "*exsuctis*"; Camps 1966 adopts "*exuctis*"; Heyworth 2007a reads "*exsucis*"; Tupet 1974 p. 256 retains "*exsectis.*" For "*exsecta*" at *Epode* 5.37: Wickham 1896 p. 367, Tupet 1976 pp. 313-314, Mankin 1995 p. 121, who notes the parallel issue at Propertius 3.6.28, and Watson 2003 pp. 213-214; Bain 1986 p. 126 reads "*exsuca*".

[148] Mankin 2010 pp. 98-100. For cypress, fig, toads, and eggs in erotic magic: Tupet 1976 pp. 309-310 and 361-363, Ingallina 1977 pp. 200-201 and Watson 2003 pp. 199-203; on *epithumata*: Hopfner 1974 pp. 316-325 (esp. 319), Ingallina 1977 pp. 126-130 and Watson 2003 pp. 206-207.

literalising his beloved's association with magic and juxtaposing it with the picture of her beauty to show that he can have a beautiful woman who also controls him with powerful witchcraft; the final lines of the monologue develop this characterisation of his beloved.

The *puella* ends by prophesying her lover's punishment:

> *si non vana canunt mea somnia, Lygdame, testor,*
> *poena erit ante meos sera sed ampla pedes;*
> *putris et in vacuo texetur aranea lecto:*
> *noctibus illorum dormiet ipsa Venus.*

(Propertius 3.6.31-34)

Commentators interpret lines 33-34 as implying the lover's impotence; given the centrality of love-magic to the monologue, I suggest that we can read this section as a binding spell to cause the narrator's sexual failure elsewhere and his return to the *puella*.[149] Line 31 indicates the girl's utterance of a spell: "*cano*" can signify chanting an incantation as well as — with "*somnia*" — making a prophecy; the weaving of the spider's web over the bed (33) symbolises the binding as well as indicating, alongside the pentameter (34), that sexual impotence is the intended effect.[150] Verbal echoes connect this spell with the *puella*'s opening lament over her lover's neglect, providing the motivation for her use of magic: "*vacuo* […] *lecto*" (33) recalls her own empty bed ("*gaudet me vacuo solam tabescere lecto?*", 23); "*putris*" (33) echoes the connotation of disease in "*tabescere*" (23). The beds also parallel the funeral bier in the catalogue of magic ("*funesto* […] *toro*", 30) — the *vittae* from which, Tupet suggests, symbolise binding to cause impotence — underlining the girl's active performance of a poetic incantation in the final lines.[151]

[149] For 3.6.34 and the lover's impotence: Butrica 1983 p. 31; Warden 1980 p. 120 n. 5 notes that Venus metonymically signifies sexual intercourse here. I originally suggested this interpretation of 3.6.31-34 in my MA dissertation: Chadha 2008 pp. 30-32; for the function of these lines in relation to Theocritus *Idyll* 2: Chadha 2011. For an alternative reading of 3.6.31-34: Novara 2000 p. 26.

[150] *TLL* s.v. *cano* II B *i.q. divinare, vaticinari, praedicere* 2, p. 272, 5 citing Propertius 3.6.31; Fedeli 1985 pp. 221-222 highlights the applicability of "prophecy" here, though he suggests that the *puella*'s prophecies provided her with information about the rival in the preceding lines.

[151] Tupet 1974 p. 261. "*toro*" is the favoured emendation for the transmitted "*viro*". For discussion: Butler and Barber 1933 p. 275, Camps 1966 p. 81, Fedeli 1985 pp. 220-221, and Heyworth 2007b p. 307, who adopt "*toro*"'; in favour of "*viro*": Shackleton Bailey 1967 p. 149. Cf. Richardson 1977 p. 339. The lover's imagined position at the girl's feet ("*ante meos* […] *pedes*", 32) echoes that of the *scrinia* at the end of her bed ("*ad lecti* […] *pedes*", 14).

This image of the *puella* as a shameless witch contrasts with her lover's portrait of her domestic modesty, demonstrated by her spinning wool with her handmaidens:

> *tristis erat domus, et tristes sua pensa ministrae*
> *carpebant, medio nebat et ipsa loco,*
> *umidaque impressa siccabat lumina lana*

(Propertius 3.6.15-17)

These lines allude to Lucretia similarly engaged at Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.57.9 ("*Lucretiam* […] *nocte sera deditam lanae inter lucubrantes ancillas in medio aedium sedentem*"), as well as evoking Homer's Penelope.[152] Recalling these models reinforces the narrator's vision of his mistress as a chaste, domestic girl which he claims he wishes to see; following the monologue, his emphasis on the *puella*'s words revealing her "true spirit" ("*quae tibi si veris animis est questa puella*", 35) indicates that the second vision of her as a witch is meant to display her real nature. Despite their sharp division, similarities between the two images of the girl signal that the narrator constructs both. The whirling threads of the *rhombus* ("*staminea rhombi ducitur ille rota*", 26) distort the girl's domestic spinning (16), particularly as "*staminea*" derives from a specific term for threads drawn from the distaff or those on the warp of a loom; her spinning (16) anticipates the cobwebs she wishes to cover her lover's bed ("*texetur aranea*", 33). The wool with which she dries her tears (17) also resonates in the "*lanea vitta*" adorning the funeral bier (30). In the positive image, wool and spinning enhance the girl's virtuousness; in the opposite vision, they demonstrate her use of wanton love-magic.[153] These echoes link the contrasting images of the girl, alerting us to read her both as the product of the narrator's imagination and underlining his motivation for constructing her as a witch; the opposition between them also reveals the tension in the elegiac lover's desires — though he claims to want an ideal, domestic girl, he also longs for a mistress who is sexually available and eager, and violently possessive of him. Reading the *puella*'s speech as focalised through the elegiac lover, the claim that a rival lured him away exculpates his neglect of his mistress and his suspected infidelity; at the end of

[152] Fedeli 1985 p. 213, highlighting "*medio* […] *loco*" (3.6.16) and "*in medio aedium*" (*Ab Urbe Condita* 1.57.9).
[153] Chadha 2011 places these echoes in the context of Propertius' engagement with Theocritus *Idyll* 2. Cf. Warden 1980 pp. 71 and 100 on the "contrast" in 3.6 between the *puella*'s peaceful domesticity and natural beauty and the aggression in her "jealous" monologue, and between the pictures of the girl "spinning like a good housewife" and of the "usurper spinning her magic wheel". On wool-working and Roman feminine virtue: Milnor 2005 pp. 29-32; cf. Butrica 1983 pp. 29 and 36 n. 37 on our passage.

his beloved's monologue, the narrator develops her association with magic to suggest that she actively employed a love-spell against him, implying that this was the reason for his return to her and for his sexual failure with another woman. As these lines are the product of his own invention, he reveals his motive for constructing his beloved as a witch; aligning the *puella* with Canidia reinforces this characterisation.

The lover's reaction to his girl's speech continues to reinforce the veracity of her construction as a witch and illustrates his character as a narrator.[154] After he affirms the truth of her character, he gives Lygdamus a message to carry to his mistress: "*me quoque consimili impositum torrerier igni: | iurabo bis sex integer esse dies*" (39-40).[155] Line 39 maintains the narrator's suggestion that he is a victim of love-magic: his burning desire picks up the earlier allusion to Canidia's fires and her intention that Varus will burn for her (81-82).[156] The narrator includes the allusion to *Epode* 5 to reinforce his mistress' intimacy with love-magic by aligning her with Canidia; this, however, places himself in the position of Varus, who remained unaffected by Canidia's repeated attempts to control him with witchcraft. The recollection of Canidia's lack of success in love-magic undermines the narrator's claims to have been bewitched by his mistress; his inability to appreciate the ramifications of his association of his beloved with Horace's witch reveals his fallibility and untrustworthiness as a narrator, betraying his willingness to construct his mistress' character according to his own needs and circumstances — in our case, to justify his infidelity, sexual failure, and return to his *puella*, whose primary source of enchantment, despite her employment of practical magic, remains her beauty.

The *puella*'s association with love-magic in 3.6 differs from that in Propertius' earlier works — whereas the narrator previously attributed bewitching power to his mistress' looks, the presence of witchcraft in the *puella*'s monologue in 3.6 creates the impression that she employs

[154] Cf. Butrica 1983 pp. 32-33 for an alternative reading of the contrast between the girl's desire for punishment and the narrator's view of their relationship humorously illustrating the lover's "self-deception".
[155] "*torrerier*" (39) is an emendation of the transmitted "*torquerier*". For *torrerier*: Butrica 1983 p. 32 and Heyworth 2007a; Butler and Barber 1933, Camps 1966 and Fedeli 1985 retain *torquerier*. For discussion: Fedeli 1985 p. 224 and Heyworth 2007b p. 308
[156] Chadha 2011 argues that 3.6.40 aligns the narrator with Simaetha's unfaithful beloved, Delphis, who neglects her for twelve days ("*ὅς μοι δωδεκαταῖος ἀφ' ὥ τάλας οὐδέ ποθίκει*", *Idyll* 2.4; "*νῦν δέ τε δωδεκαταῖος ἀφ' ὥτέ νιν οὐδὲ ποτεῖδον*", 157).

practical magic and *carmina.* The narrator's description of his mistress (9-14) and his construction of the monologue signals that the girl and her words are an extension of the poet-lover and his elegy, the attributes of which she and magic represent. The girl's speech and her employment of love-spells dramatise the bewitching power of Propertius' elegy in a more detached fashion than previously, developing Calliope's exhortation at 3.3.49: "*ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas*"; the poem's narrative also enacts Propertius' return to the subject-matter familiar from his Books 1 and 2 following the programmatic opening group of 3.1-5.[157]

Propertius' engagement with Horace's iambic *puella* in 3.6 has ramifications for the elegiac lover and for his mistress. By offering the *puella* an embedded direct speech, the narrator vividly dramatises her association with love-magic; this heightens the contrast between the *puella* in the monologue and her previous construction in the shape of Lucretia, creating a striking example of how quickly the idealised *puella* can become a witch from another angle. This explicates the lover's double-edged association of the *puella*'s beauty and magic in Propertius' earlier elegies, which betrays the narrator's contradictory feelings towards his mistress and his inability to resist her charms. By recalling Horace's earlier amplification of this elegiac narrative use of magic in his *Epodes*, Propertius reclaims this parody on his own terms, humorously acknowledging and reaffirming the lover's hypocritical attitude towards his mistress and his need to justify his susceptibility to female loveliness as the result of something more than physical attraction.

Conclusion

The expression of the *puella*'s attractiveness in terms of magic enchantment in Propertian and Tibullan love-elegy functions metapoetically, as well as in the generic narrative. In the latter, the elegiac narrator's insinuation that his mistress has captivated him with witchcraft reveals the ambivalence in his feelings towards her, characterising him as a hypocritical lover and as a fallible and untrustworthy narrator. On a metaliterary level, the attribution of magic power

[157] Cf. Butrica 1983 pp. 36-37: "The experimentation with form should certainly be seen in the light of the emphatically declared adherence to Callimachus and Philitas that opens book 3."

to the girls who embody the elegiac text complements the construction of the genre as love-spells, giving a physical dimension to the enchanting effects of poetry and its influence over the lover and poet as well as the extratextual audience. This triangular relationship between magic, elegy, and the *puella* runs through the genre from its beginning, further indicating that magic was a key metaphor for Augustan love-elegy; Ovid's *Medicamina faciei femineae* explicates and responds to this connection, as we will see in the conclusion. Recognising the metapoetic level to the *puella*'s enchanting beauty in early love-elegy also opens an alternative avenue for reading magic as facilitating intergeneric communication — dramatising literary polemic through female personifications of the poetic text who are associated with witchcraft. Our new interpretations of Horace's *Epodes* 5 and 17 as responding to Propertius' and Tibullus' first collections illustrate this and testify to a contemporary awareness of the metaliterary dimension to the *puella*'s magical attractiveness.

I suggested in the introduction to this chapter that our elegiac readings of *Epodes* 5 and 17 can also offer a new perspective on Canidia's construction; I now return to this idea with the following question: why is Canidia a woman, rather than a male personification of genre or victim of iambic aggression in the vein of Lycambes and Bupalus, the targets of Horace's Greek predecessors Archilochus and Hipponax? Several answers to this question present themselves: misogyny is a prominent element of iambic; laughter provoked by the lewd behaviour of elderly women is associated with the roots of the genre; the contemporary political climate associated Rome's chaotic state with licentious, "masculine" women.[158] I believe that, based on the interaction between Augustan love-elegy and the *Epodes*, we can add a more specific, literary reason: that Canidia is composed as an "anti-elegiac *puella*" — particularly, though she also engages with Tibullus' early work, as an "anti-Cynthia". Instead of detracting from Canidia's independence and originality as a literary entity, reading her as constructed symbiotically with the female beloveds of Propertius and Tibullus adds a new dimension to Horace's witch and, by extension, to his *Epodes*. As well as symbolising Horace's poetry and highlighting its differences from Propertius' and Tibullus' already-published love-elegy, Canidia's inversion of the elegiac

[158] For old women as the targets of Roman satire: Richlin 1983. For the association between the health of the state and female conduct influencing witch-figures in Augustan literature, with reference to Horace *Epodes* 5 and 17: Stratton 2007 pp. 71-105; for Canidia as a personification of Rome: Mankin 1995 p. 301.

puellae necessarily incorporates the generic characteristics she reverses and rejects, uniting — as the palinode of *Epode* 17 expresses — both traditions alongside one another to embody the literary variety of Horace's iambic.

Conclusion

We end this study with a retrospective look at magic in love-elegy from the perspective of Ovid's erotodidactic poems. Ovid's erotodidactic elegy is a genre which emerges from love-elegy and which roots itself in this tradition. The narrator's didactic role provides a detached perspective on the elegiac genre, explicating its ironies and subtexts and presenting the lover and narrator in a more cynical light. The now-fragmentary *Medicamina faciei femineae* — in which female cosmetics metaphorically represent the construction of polished poetry — unites our main themes of love-magic, elegiac *carmina*, and the *puella*'s beauty, making it a fitting text to conclude our study. It provides further evidence that this triadic relationship in earlier love-elegy was recognisable to contemporary audiences to the extent that Ovid could promote it to the main subject of his work and use it to emblematise elegiac poetics. It also introduces Ovid's engagement with Vergil's *Georgics* through magic as he unites allusions to this didactic epic — a genre which we have not considered in relation to this motif so far — and to earlier love-elegy, fusing the two to create his new, hybridised work. Finally, we briefly return to *Remedia amoris* 249-290, this time to consider its relationship with its corresponding passage at *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108 rather than its dialogue with earlier love-elegy. We begin with the *Medicamina.*

Medicamina faciei femineae teaches women to blend cosmetics to create and maintain a beautiful complexion: the introduction, which promotes female *cultus* (1-50), leads into the recipes for facial treatments (51-100).[1] The *praeceptor* exhorts *puellae* to learn to enhance their beauty, detailing the positive results of *cultus* on nature and architecture (1-10) and contrasting the coarse Sabine women with contemporary Roman girls who prefer adornment and luxury (11-

[1] The text ends abruptly — this lack of formal closure suggests that the extant text is fragmentary: Toohey 1996 p. 162; for an estimated original length: Rosati 1985 p. 44, Toohey 1996 p. 162 and Watson 2001 p. 457, and cf. Gibson 2003 p. 179. On the text of *Medicamina* 1-50: Rosati 1985 p. 43, Korzeniewski 1964 pp. 182-213 and Heldmann 1981 pp. 165-173. The recommendation of the *Medicamina* to female students at *Ars amatoria* 3.205-208 suggests its brevity ("*parvus* […] *opus*", 206) and its completion before the latter work; for its short length and technical subject matter suggesting that it was Ovid's earliest didactic venture: Toohey 1996 p. 158. On dating the *Medicamina*: Rosati 1985 pp. 42-43; cf. Toohey 1996 pp. 157-158, Watson 2001 p. 457 n. 2 and Gibson 2003 p. 179. On the implied students of the *Medicamina* (*puellae* or *matronae*): Sabot 1976 pp. 402-403, Nikolaidis 1994 pp. 98-100, Watson 2001 p. 463 and Saiko 2005 pp. 197-198.

22). This preference is understandable: girls today must compete with the refined appearance of the men they wish to please (23-30); nevertheless, like the peacock, girls can take personal pride in their looks (31-34). Beauty arouses love more than magic can (35-42); an attractive character inspires affection which will last long after appearance fades (43-50). On this note, the narrator details his recipes for facial treatments which will make a girl's face smoother and brighter than her mirror (51-68), plump the cheeks (69-76), banish spots (77-90), and bring colour to the skin through cleansing and exfoliation (91-98 and 99-100).[2]

Scholarship on this work highlights its metaliterary elements: Wyke suggests that the *puella*'s body analogises poetic composition, celebrating the *ars* of the male text; Rimell reads the *Medicamina* as a "micro-manifesto of Ovidian poetics" — the metaphor of make-up highlights the poet's artfulness and versatility; the technical recipes dramatise poetic composition, equipping the female student to become a poet.[3] In the introduction, Ovid advises his students to trust *cultus* rather than magic to win love (35-42), listing products they should avoid and feats *cantus* will not accomplish. Commentators predominantly focus on the ostensible contrast between magical enchantment and beauty or cosmetics in these lines.[4] Rimell, by contrast, drawing on Sharrock's discussion of *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108, suggests that the passage aligns love, magic and poetry to undermine Ovid's claims that "the *Medicamina* are a miracle cure for fading beauty or that there is any such thing as snake-splitting sorcery" — instead, Ovid assumes "witch-like powers" as his recipes represent experimentation on his literary *puella* and his denigration of magic at 35-42 sets off his artistic expertise.[5]

While Rimell highlights Ovid's diversion from the elegiac narrator's usual desire for natural beauty through comparison with Propertius 1.2 and Tibullus 1.8, she does not comment further on the relationship between these texts, or on magic in the *Medicamina* in relation to

[2] For this division into five recipes: Rosati 1985 pp. 44-45 and 79-80 and Saiko 2005 pp. 213-215. For an alternative division: Green 1979 pp. 381-392.
[3] Wyke 1994 pp. 144-146; Rimell 2005 pp. 179-185. For "a complementary literary-critical aspect" to cosmetics in *Ars amatoria* 3.101-134: Gibson 2003 pp. 129-130, 148 and 183. Olson 2009 p. 309 adds to readings of elegiac *puellae* as artistic creations by noting that cosmetic substances were also used in paints.
[4] Korzeniewski 1964 p. 204, Rosati 1985 pp. 27-28, and Fauth 1999 pp. 157-159; cf. Watson 2001 pp. 465-466; Heldmann 1981 pp. 163-164 suggests that Ovid condemns magic to disassociate it from *cultus* and to promote the latter.
[5] Rimell 2005 pp. 195-197; cf. Cioccoloni 2006 p. 104 n. 31.

earlier love-elegy; similarly, Rimell does not note the presence of magic in Tibullus 1.8 or its metapoetic potential. We can build on Rimell's interpretation by considering the magic in relation with the motif's role in the earlier elegiac tradition. *Medicamina* 35-42 evokes the form and content of passages of metapoetic magic throughout the genre — especially Tibullus 1.8.17-26 — indicating that Ovid uses the motif to situate his work in this tradition despite its didactic form and style, as well as reflecting on the earlier elegiac connection of magic enchantment with "natural" beauty by expanding the associations of female charms, magic artifice and the poetic text. Just as this intertextual engagement with love-elegy grounds the *Medicamina* in this tradition, so allusions to Vergil's *Georgics* underline the poem's didactic form; as we will see, Ovid evokes Vergil's epic in the context of magic, integrating the didactic into love-elegy's emblematic metaphor to illustrate his new blended genre. Before we examine this section, it will be useful to consider the initial catalogue of the abilities of *cultus* (3-10): this passage resonates in 35-42 and introduces Ovid's interaction with the *Georgics*; we can also suggest an allusion to *Amores* 3.7 which underlines the *Medicamina*'s metapoetic focus and foreshadows its characterisation in terms of magic.

After his opening address, the *praeceptor* illustrates the benefits of *cultus*:

> *cultus humum sterilem Cerealia pendere iussit*
> *munera, mordaces interiere rubi;*
> *cultus et in pomis sucos emendat acerbos,*
> *fissaque adoptivas accipit arbor opes.*
> *culta placent: auro sublimia tecta linuntur;*
> *nigra sub imposito marmore terra latet.*
> *vellera saepe eadem Tyrio medicantur aeno;*
> *sectile deliciis India praebet ebur.*
>
> (Ovid *Medicamina faciei feminae* 3-10)

Commentators on these lines read nature as analogous with the female body;[6] they also note echoes of Vergil's *Georgics*, suggesting that these underline the didactic elements of the

[6] Richlin 1995 pp. 187-188, and Rimell 2005 pp. 194-195; cf. Rosati 1985 p. 64.

Medicamina and parody Vergil's work by giving Ovid's elegy equal epic status.[7] Alongside these Vergilian reminiscences, we can highlight an elegiac parallel for the catalogue of *cultus* (3-8) in the harmful effects of magic *carmina* on nature in *Amores* 3.7:

> *carmine laesa Ceres sterilem vanescit in herbam,*
> *deficiunt laesi carmine fontis aquae;*
> *ilicibus glandes cantataque vitibus uva*
> *dedicit et nullo poma movente fluunt.*

(Ovid *Amores* 3.7.31-34)

We suggested in Chapter 2 that these lines illustrate the detrimental effects of love-elegy — and of the "*culta*" *puella* (*Amores* 3.7.1) who embodies it — on Ovid's poetic creativity, as well as the genre's essential failure in love; *Medicamina* 3-8 inverts this list, asserting that cultivation rejuvenates the environment. The metapoetic element to *Amores* 3.7.31-34 prompts a similar reading of the opening of the *Medicamina*; the anaphoric "*cultus* […] *cultus* […] *culta*" (3-7) replaces "*carmine* […] *carmine* […] *cantataque*" (*Amores* 3.7.31-33) reinforcing the equation between the *cultus* Ovid now teaches, the *puellae* it will refresh and maintain, and poetry.

If the *puella* who previously decreased the poet's creativity and the lover's sexual potency was already *culta*, we may ask how the *Medicamina* will boost her inspiring effects? The clue to this lies, I suggest, in the allusions to the *Georgics* in lines 3-10, particularly the grafting ("*adoptivas*", 6) which evokes the personified trees marvelling at their metamorphosis at *Georgics* 2.82 ("*miratastque novas frondes et non sua poma*").[8] Grafting is prominent in *Georgics* 2: Vergil emphasises the wonder of the practice with splices of incompatible species (32-34, 69-82), the complete metamorphosis of one tree into another ("*et saepe alterius ramos impune videmus | vertere in alterius, mutatamque insita mala | ferre pirum* […]", 32-34), and the trees' astonishment at their transformations (82).[9] While some scholars interpret grafting in *Georgics* 2 as a bleak comment on man's abuse of nature, others view the combinations as

[7] For allusions to the *Georgics*: Watson 2001 pp. 461-462 and 467-468 and Cioccolini 2006 pp. 102-103; for allusions in *Ars amatoria* 1-3 and *Remedia amoris* to Vergil's *Georgics* to underline Ovid's role as *praeceptor* or to parody his predecessor: Kenney 1958 pp. 201-209, Leach 1964 pp. 149-154, Hollis 1973 pp. 91-92 and 99-100, and Dalzell 1996 p. 138. For an alternative reading of *Medicamina* 3-10: Cioccoloni 2006 pp. 104-106.
[8] For *Medicamina* 5-6 and *Georgics* 2.82: Watson 2001 p. 461.
[9] Gale 2000 pp. 212-213. On the impossibility of the grafts at *Georgics* 2.32-34 and 69-82: Ross 1987 pp. 105-108, Thomas 1987 p. 245 and Thomas 1988a p. 161.

exemplifying experimentation, creativity, and productivity.[10] In keeping with metaliterary readings of Ovid's didactic work and of *Amores* 3.7.31-34, I suggest that grafting at *Medicamina* 5-6 metaphorically signifies the process of combining genres to create new hybrid poetry.[11] Unlike *Georgics* 2.32-34 and 69-82, *Medicamina* 5-6 does not specify the varieties of trees but emphasises the benefits of the process; the transformation suggested in the Vergilian work becomes integration ("*adoptivas*", *Medicamina* 6), which our passage showcases as allusions to the *Georgics* intertwine with those to Ovid's *Amores* and produce fruitful new work — a didactic elegy in which the male *praeceptor* instructs and constructs *puellae* and texts without the *lena* as intermediary. Ovid underlines this last element in lines 7-8 by echoing Dipsas' advice at *Amores* 1.8.52-53 ("*canescunt turpi tecta relicta situ — | forma, nisi admittas, nullo exercente senescit*"), hinting that the *puellae*, and the text, which he will create will be as duplicitous as the *lena*'s pupil and raising the question of whether, as in the earlier poem, there is an elegiac lover and poet spying on the instructions in the *Medicamina*.[12] By evoking and inverting *Amores* 3.7.31-34, *Medicamina* 3-10 foregrounds the reawakening of love-elegy through its didactic graft; it also hints at an enchanting aspect to this *cultus*, which the later warning develops.

Ovid cautions against magic shortly before his recipes:

[10] For grafting symbolising human arrogance: Ross 1987 pp. 104-109, Thomas 1987 pp. 244-246 and 256-260 and Thomas 1988a pp. 20-21, 161-162 and 167-170. For human creativity and invention: Miles 1980 pp. 112-114 and 116-118, Gale 2000 pp. 208-214 and Lowe 2010 pp. 461-482.

[11] For a similar literary interpretation of grafting cf. Shea 1988 p. 66 n. 10: the *insitor* of Propertius 4.2.17-18 symbolises the "Callimachus Romanus […] grafting Greek forms and Latin language". Lowe 2010 pp. 474-475 notes that grafting is seldom employed metaphorically in Latin literature but cites Ovid *Metamorphoses* 4.373-379 as one example; Lowe 2010 p. 476 highlights *Medicamina* 5-7 as a "programmatic" expression of "Ovid's positive view of grafting", though he does not develop this comment.

[12] On *Medicamina* 1-50, *Amores* 1.8 and the didactic narrator's fusion of the lover-narrator of the *Amores* and the *lena*: Watson 2001 pp. 462-463 and 468-469, and Cioccoloni 2006 p. 100; for the *praeceptor* adapting the *lena*'s advice in *Ars amatoria* 3: Watson 1982 p. 239 and Gibson 2003 pp. 19-21. For *Ars amatoria* 3 hinting that male lovers are reading, too: Gibson 2003 pp. 19-21 and 35-36.

sic potius † vos urget † amor quam fortibus herbis,
quas maga terribili subsecat arte manus:
nec vos graminibus nec mixto credite suco,
nec temptate nocens virus amantis equae.
nec mediae Marsis finduntur cantibus angues,
nec redit in fontes unda supina suos;
et quamvis aliquis Temesaea removerit aera,
numquam Luna suis excutietur equis.

(Ovid *Medicamina faciei femineae* 35-42)

The feats which incantations cannot perform (39-42) replicate those used for the effects of poetry, constructing the *Medicamina* as an enchanting spell by evoking the imagery familiar from earlier love-elegy; the procedures for gathering and combining juices and herbs (35-38) anticipate the instructions for the facial treatments, equating the subject of the poem with witchcraft and destabilising the surface contrast between magic and *cultus*.[13] Lines 3-10 also resonate in our passage: the untrustworthy, bitter juices (37) recall those improved through cultivation ("*sucos* […] *acerbos*", 5); the burst snakes (39) balance the split tree trunk ("*fissa*", 6); the ineffective bronze (41) parallels that of the cauldron ("*aeno*", 9). These echoes reinforce the relationship between magic and the *cultus* Ovid's *Medicamina* offers, explicating the hints of poetic enchantment in the opening lines to tighten the link between magic, love-elegy, and beauty. Allusions to Tibullus 1.8.17-22, *Amores* 1.8 — both of which incorporate didactic elements — and *Georgics* 3 reinforce this suggestion. Our passage particularly recalls the Tibullan catalogue, echoing its anaphoric structure, the bronze influencing the moon's chariot (41-42; 1.8.21-22) and incantations controlling snakes (39; 1.8.20). Tibullus 1.8.17-22 is the most overt link between magic, beauty, and poetry in earlier love-elegy; evoking this passage underlines the same triadic relationship in the Ovidian lines, and also lays the foundation for Ovid's response to this

[13] Richlin 1995 pp. 196-197 notes that *Medicamina* 35-42 foreshadows the prescriptions though she reads these as evoking medicine, not magic; Fauth 1999 pp. 158-159 suggests that Ovid's recipes are linked with magic for creating beauty, but that they are differentiated from harmful magic. Alternatively: Cioccoloni 2006 p. 104 n. 31. The ancient association of cosmetics, magic, and poisons also destabilises the contrast between witchcraft and make-up: Richlin 1995 pp. 195-198; Olson 2009 pp. 305-308 discusses the poisonous qualities of cosmetic ingredients; cf. Cioccoloni 2006 p. 104 n. 31. For the ingredients of Ovid's recipes: Saiko 2005 pp. 203-215. *Medicamina* 35-36 underlines the relationship between magic and beauty treatments: "*subseco*" can denote trimming nails, as in the list of Marathus' self-adornments which are pointless for attracting Pholoe at Tibullus 1.8.9-14 ("*quid unges | artificis docta subsecuisse manu*?", 11-12).

combination in his predecessors' works which I will suggest below.[14] The periphrasis for the aphrodisiac *hippomanes* (38) duplicates *Amores* 1.8.8 ("[…] *valeat virus amantis equae*"), among the powers representing Dipsas' elegiac persuasions; both passages allude to *Georgics* 3.280-283: "*hic demum, hippomanes vero quod nomine dicunt | pastores lentum destillat ab inguine virus*" (280-281). Evoking Vergil's description of the nefarious use which stepmothers make of the substance (*"hippomanes, quod saepe malae legere novercae | miscueruntque herbas et non innoxia verba*", 282-283) links the *Medicamina* with their wicked words and love-philtres, distinguishing Ovid's erotodidactic from his predecessor's work by aligning it with the excessive passion and its destructive effects condemned in the *Georgics*; the allusion also highlights the mixed genre of the *Medicamina* and, by isolating a remarkable instance of erotic magic in Vergil's poem, validates Ovid's treatment of erotic magic in a didactic elegy by invoking the precedent of his illustrious contemporary.[15]

As we have noted, the narrator's didactic role offers a distanced perspective on love-elegy and its poetics, and a more cynical picture of the fictional lover and his association of his mistress' "natural" beauty with magic; I suggest that the evocation of Tibullus 1.8.17-22 in our passage draws attention to and facilitates this new angle, throwing Ovid's divergence from the earlier elegiac treatment of this relationship, on the narrative and metaliterary levels, into relief. Tibullus attributes magic power to Pholoe's uncultivated physical beauty ("*inculto* […] *ore*", 1.8.15), opposing this with the narrator's later warning that old age will lead the girl to create artificial attractiveness with makeup (41-44);[16] Ovid associates magic with the facial-treatments

[14] Fauth 1999 pp. 157-159, who notes Ovid's focus on cosmetics rather than on "natural" looks, and Watson 2001 p. 465 with n. 35 and 469 n. 49 highlight Tibullus 1.8.17-22 as a parallel for the elegiac promotion of beauty over magic. Alternatively, Rimell 2005 p. 180 comments on Ovid's divergence from his predecessors through his endorsement of make-up; cf. Heldmann 1981 pp. 151-158 for beauty and cosmetics in Propertius and Tibullus, including their association with witchcraft as deceptive means of seduction.

[15] For *Medicamina* 38 and Vergil *Georgics* 3.280-283: Rosati 1985 p. 70; for *Amores* 1.8.8: Barsby 1973 p. 93, McKeown 1989 pp. 206-207 — noting that *Amores* 1.8.8 parallels *Medicamina* 38 — and Bontyes 2008b p. 368 n. 8. On *hippomanes*: Tupet 1976 pp. 79-80. On *hippomanes* in *Georgics* 3.282-283 in relation to overwhelming lust and the madness it inspires: Miles 1975 p. 180, Hardie 1986 pp. 163-165, and Watson 1993 p. 847.

[16] Tibullus 1.8.41-44: "*heu sero revocatur amor seroque iuventas | cum vetus infecit cana senecta caput. | tum studium formae est; coma tum mutatur ut annos | dissimulet viridi cortice tincta nucis*".

which the *praeceptor* recommends that *puellae* use to refresh their complexions.[17] Within the elegiac narrative, this shift in the *Medicamina* foregrounds that the fictional *puella*'s "natural" beauty is the product of cosmetics after all. At this point, it will be useful to recall the hint that male lovers are an additional internal audience for the *Medicamina*: by revealing that the *puella*'s attractiveness results from artificial cosmetics, Ovid playfully implicates the elegiac *amator* in knowing that the "magical" beauty of his beloved is not natural but entirely created, deflating the romanticising of his *puella*'s uncultivated appearance and his self-justificatory presentation of it as magically captivating.[18] At the same time, by associating the *praeceptor*'s facial treatments with love-magic, Ovid literalises the magical enchantment which the lovers suggest as causing their infatuation, making their *puellae* into the witches they present them as being.

Metapoetically, Tibullus' association of Pholoe's attractive appearance with magic highlights her status as an embodiment of the elegiac text and its power to enchant; by transposing this power from the girl's natural charms to the cosmetics with which she acquires them, Ovid also displays the literary craftsmanship behind the beauty of the *puella*.[19] The connection of magic with the technical beauty treatments underlines that it is elegy's creative power which constructs, and inspires the audience to visualise, the *puella* and her magical charms, aligning her further with the poetic text and its effects on its readers. Ovid's *Medicamina* stands at the end of the amatory elegiac tradition: by this point, the audiences familiar with the genre are aware of its fictional nature and of the beloved as poetic construct and text. By persuading his extratextual readers to envision the *puellae* through minimal details and practical instructions without the narrative of a love-affair and after asserting the complete unreality of his world, Ovid good-naturedly demonstrates the persuasive powers of his new literary graft. *Medicamina* 35-42 thus explicates the subtextual union of magic, the elegiac text

[17] For this contrast between Ovid and Tibullus cf. Fauth 1999 p. 158, who gives a different interpretation from my own, and Watson 2001 p. 465 n. 3, who does not develop her observation.
[18] Cf. Rimell 2005 p. 181: "Authenticity in Ovid is *always* an act: hence the "bare" face of any woman treated with these *medicamina* will not glow naturally (*nitere in propriis bonis*, Prop. 1.2.6), but on account of the wondrous mask that has seeped into the skin and still clings, as if by magic, to the pores."; Rimell only applies this to the *Medicamina* and does not connect magic in the poem with the motif in earlier elegy and the ironic view this creates of the *puella*'s uncultivated appearance there.
[19] For Ovid displaying the literary artistry behind the *puella*'s construction, without reference to Ovid's divergence from the metapoetic connection of the *puellae* with the text in earlier love-elegy: Rimell 2005 pp. 180-188. Rimell's argument develops differently from the points I make here.

and the *puella* in early Tibullan and Propertian elegy, enacting the idea that girl's enchanting beauty and its effect on lovers and extratextual readers alike embodies this element of the poet's own verses. Ultimately, the lover and the poet — as much as their respective audiences — are enchanted and deceived by their poetry whose seductive powers lead them to create and be drawn into its world and the production of more elegy.[20]

This leads us to our last question — the relationship between *Remedia amoris* 249-290 and *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108. The close dialogue between these passages, as we noted in Chapter 2, has long been recognised by commentators on both poems and Sharrock demonstrates the metapoetic nature of Ovid's caution against love-magic in *Ars amatoria* 2, which characterises his poem as a deceitful and seductive spell. One element which Sharrock only footnotes, however, is that the equation of the *Ars* with magic belies the proclaimed capabilities of its instructions.[21] Our readings over the previous chapters have illustrated that calling attention to elegy's persistent failure to influence the beloved is a key function of magic in the genre — *Remedia amoris* 249-290 foregrounds this failure through its dialogue with earlier love-elegy; *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108, by contrast, only hints at this ineffectiveness, most particularly through the mention of Circe's futile *carmen* in the central couplet (103-104). I introduced my study with the aim of expanding on Sharrock's work on *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108; we now bring our discussion full-circle to develop Sharrock's acknowledgement of the ineffectiveness of the *Ars amatoria* by reading 2.99-108 alongside its pendant in the *Remedia*. By approaching the passages in this way, I hope to show that *Remedia amoris* 249-290 expands the hints of elegiac failure in *Ars amatoria* 2 — as Ovid's erotodidactic works explicate the themes of elegiac love-magic more generally — and reflects back onto the previous caution against trusting to magic in love, providing, at the same time, a further illustration of the benefits of reading elegiac magic intertextually. It will be helpful to begin by recalling the role of magic in the *Remedia* and how it communicates with earlier love-elegy before focusing on its relationship with *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108.

[20] For the Pygmalion-episode of Ovid *Metamorphoses* 10.243-297 explicating this relationship between the elegiac poet and lover and his artistic creation: Sharrock 1991 pp. 36-49.
[21] Sharrock 1994 p. 63 n. 65.

Remedia amoris claims to offer treatments for elegiac love caused by reading the *Ars amatoria*; in fact, the poem dupes its pupils into believing that they are being healed while it guides them back to the *Ars* for a new affair. The *Remedia* evokes elegiac love and poetry throughout its instructions, including its warning against trusting to the *infame carmen* of magic to cure love rather than to the *praeceptor*'s "safe" new work (249-290). As we saw in Chapter 2, the opening list of the magic feats which the *Remedia* will not accomplish (249-260) inverts those in earlier love-elegy, particularly *Amores* 1.8.5-18 and Tibullus 1.2.45-54, indicating that the motif symbolises elegiac verses which aim to win love but invariably fail. The evocation of *Amores* 1.8.5-18 and Tibullus 1.2.45-54 destabilises the narrator's opposition between the *Remedia*, magic, and earlier love-elegy, hinting that his new work is no different from the amatory agenda of the old. This identification suggests that the lack of effect which the narrator attributes to magic *carmina* also characterises his current instructions, signalling their uselessness for curing love; at the same time, by couching this indication of the *Remedia*'s true nature in terms of magic, Ovid illustrates the enchanting power of his verses which will lead his readers — internal and extratextual — through the poem and back to the *Ars*. The *exemplum* of Circe and her embedded speech to Ulysses (263-286) expands these indications, casting the mythological witch as an elegiac lover whose *Aeaea carmina* are ineffective for maintaining love and do not attempt to cure it. Alongside Ovid's close engagement with *Amores* 1.8 and Tibullus 1.2.45-54 in this section, allusions to *Ars amatoria* 2.99 in *Remedia amoris* 249 and 289 frame the warning against magic; Circe's monologue also expands the central statement at *Ars amatoria* 2.103-104 that she could have detained Ulysses if *carmina* could influence love. These allusions further undermine the *Remedia*'s apparent curative aim, signalling its affinity with the previous work.

The ostensible purpose of the *Remedia* can explain its close engagement with magic in earlier love-elegy. As a poem which advertises itself as advice for overcoming love, the poet and the *praeceptor* are naturally keen to differentiate this work from their previous amatory elegies which — particularly the *Ars amatoria* ("*discite sanari, per quem didicistis amare*", *Remedia amoris* 43; "*Naso legendus erat tum, cum didicistis amare: | idem nunc vobis Naso legendus erit*", 71-72) — led the students into love in the first place. Presenting the *Remedia* as the opposite of love-magic by evoking the characteristic elegiac form of the motif contrasts the work

with "harmful" erotic elegy; the instant subversion of this opposition through the same imagery, as we have seen, humorously indicates the poet's and instructor's deception of his readers and the *Remedia*'s allegiance to the cause of love.

Ars amatoria 2 concerns the pursuit, rather than the abandonment, of an elegiac affair. The poem employs magic, however, for the same reason as the *Remedia*: to persuade its students that witchcraft cannot be trusted to influence love but that the *praeceptor*'s instructions can. Earlier amatory elegy constructs itself as magic *carmina* to win love, but the imagery it uses for this foreshadows its lack of success. *Ars amatoria* 2.99-108 initially appears to sidestep this danger, creating, on the surface, a greater opposition between poetry and magic by focusing on practical elements of witchcraft rather than on *carmina* and their powers. The language of the warning, as Sharrock illustrates, still evokes incantations, equating the *Ars* with magic *carmina* after all; while this highlights the elegy's seductive power over its students and extratextual readers, the multivalence of *carmen* undermines the *praeceptor*'s claims for the success of his elegiac magic and hints at its ineffectiveness for maintaining love. This warning is most explicitly given in the central couplet on Circe and her unsuccessful *carmen* — precisely the couplet which *Remedia amoris* 263-286 expands. We have already seen how allusions to *Ars amatoria* 2.99 in *Remedia amoris* 249-290 undermine this elegy's attempt to distinguish itself from magic and from earlier love-elegy. The question we now need to pose is: how does the *Remedia*'s expansion of *Ars amatoria* 2.103-104 influence our reading of the earlier passage?

Remedia amoris 236-286 presents Circe as a characteristically unsuccessful elegiac lover whose *carmina* — equally magic and poetic — fail to detain Ulysses. By allusively signalling his students and extratextual audience to read this *exemplum* as a development of *Ars amatoria* 2.103-104 and by framing *Remedia amoris* 249-290 with allusions to *Ars amatoria* 2.99, Ovid indicates that this passage provides the illustration of elegiac failure downplayed in the earlier warning; the recognition that the *Remedia* belatedly supplies information which the *praeceptor* of the earlier poem had attempted to suppress intensifies the deception enacted upon the students through the *Ars*. The reciprocal relationship between these passages thus undermines the erotodidaxis of the *Ars* as much as of the *Remedia*, tying both texts further into

the elegiac tradition of magic illustrating deceit and failure in love, as well as the successful poetic enchantment of its extratextual audience. The *Remedia*'s caution against trusting magic should send its students back to the *Ars* equipped with new information with which to interpret the pendant warning as indicating the ineffectiveness of erotodidactic magic for love; the bewitching force of Ovid's poetry, however, continues to hold its readers for another round, and the cycle created by the passages on magic reinforces the doubly enchanting power of his erotodidactic elegy.

Ovid's erotodidactic works bring us to the end of our investigation into the origins and development of magic in Augustan love-elegy. We have followed the motif twice from the beginning of the genre, focusing on its metapoetic role as expressed through two themes: magic *carmina*, and the bewitching power of the *puella*'s beauty. The importance of magic to love-elegy is clear from its prominence in Tibullus' and Propertius' earliest poems; reading the motif intertextually by considering the recognised correspondences between magic in this genre and in contemporary and Hellenistic texts as active literary dialogues offers a new angle on the motif which provides fresh evidence for its metaliterary and narrative functions and of the extent of their presence in the genre. Resonances of Greco-Roman magic practice and discourse enhance these literary interrelationships, expanding our potential to grasp nuances of the theme and its use in individual elegies.

Propertius' and Tibullus' engagement with Vergil *Eclogue* 8 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2 — in which erotic magic ritual dramatises poetic composition and foregrounds themes of failed seduction, enchantment, and deceit — from the beginning of their first collections show that elegiac magic originates in the pastoral: the elegists co-opt the imagery and lexis of the motif in the Vergilian and Theocritean texts, promoting magic to the defining metaphor for their genre. Ovid's close interaction with his predecessors through magic and his continuation of the emblematic form and imagery to position his works in the amatory elegiac tradition — particularly in *Heroides* 6 and 12, *Medicamina faciei femineae* and *Remedia amoris*, which exemplify Ovid's expansion of the genre while amplifying the humour and ironies of the theme — testifies to the status which the motif achieves independent of its pastoral roots and to its

synonymity with love-elegy. Tracing these dialogues chronologically demonstrates the detail and the variety of the Augustan love-elegists' engagement with their contemporaries and predecessors through magic, illustrating that the apparently conventionalised motif is in fact a potent idiom for literary interaction; Hypsipyle and Medea in *Heroides* 6 and 12, two female poets who employ magic in the same way as the elegists and their fictional homonyms, also illustrate this interaction on a narrative level.

The triadic relationship between magic, *carmina*, and the *puella*'s beauty has the same effect. Returning to Augustan elegy's beginning in Propertius' and Tibullus' first collections enables us to highlight that the *puella*'s enchanting appearance gives physical representation to this quality of the elegists' *carmina* from the inception of the genre. The connection of magic with the embodiment of the poetic text makes it integral to elegiac passion, providing further evidence for its emblematic status; Ovid's *Medicamina* confirms this. Recognising that this metapoetic element to the beloved's association with enchantment is established at the start of love-elegy as we have it opens a new avenue for reading its intergeneric engagement with contemporary poetry, this time from the other side as Horace's *Epodes* 5 and 17 use the motif as a vehicle for defining his iambic poetics against his peers' already-published work. The elegiac *puellae* become fundamental to Canidia's construction and to her metaliterary role in the *Epodes*, enhancing the generic variety at the heart of Horatian iambic and providing new evidence that Horace's interaction with contemporary love-elegy was more extensive that scholarship has previously recognised.

It is worth emphasising that the interactions between texts through magic which we have outlined are truly dialogic. The elegists pick up Vergil's pastoral interaction with their own forerunner, Gallus, extending it from the opposite side and going one better — taking over the form and imagery of magic in *Eclogue* 8 and making it the distinctive marker of their own genre. Ovid's engagement with magic in his predecessors' works not only characterises his amatory epistles and didactic poetry as love-elegy, but by continually reinforcing the status of the theme and reflecting back on its position in the genre he also prompts new re-readings of their work, even, through *Heroides* 6 and 12, deepening the layers and pedigree of the motif by inscribing the

"earlier" experiences of his mythological witches into the Augustan elegiac tradition. Horace's parody of magic in Tibullus' and Propertius' first collections also illustrates this two-way dynamic, offering a view of the elegiac beloved which would no doubt resonate for readers returning to Propertius' and Tibullus' works and which Propertius' response in 3.6 explicates. Reading magic intertextually demonstrates that poets did not construct their work as spells in isolation; rather, the interaction between texts initiated and maintained through this theme makes it a fertile ground for dynamic literary dialogue and polemic throughout Augustan poetry, a natural vocabulary for poets to communicate and to define their work in relation to one another and to the wider literary tradition.

Bibliography

Abbaddo, A.M. (1991), "'Carmen' magico e 'carmen' religioso", *Civiltà classica e cristiana* XII, pp. 11-27.

Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae (ed.) (1893), *Corpus Inscriptiorum Latinarum Vol. 1, Part 1: Inscriptiones Latin Antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris Mortem*, Georg Reimer, Berlin.

Ahl, F.M. (1974), "Propertius 1, 1", *Wiener Studien*, N.F., 8 Bd., pp. 80-98.

Albis, R.V. (1996), *Poet and Audience in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham.

Alessi, P.T. (1985), "Propertius 2.28: Unity without Illness", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 81, No. 1, pp. 39-48.

Allen, A.W. (1950a), ""Sincerity" and the Roman Elegists", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 145-160.

Allen, A.W. (1950b), "Elegy and the Classical Attitude Toward Love: Propertius I, 1", *Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. 11, pp. 255-277

Allen, A.W. (1975), "The Moon's Horses", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 153-155.

Alpers, P. (1979), *The Singer of the Eclogues: A Study of Virgilian Pastoral*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Anderson, J.N. (1896), "On the Sources of Ovid's *Heroides* I, III, VII, X, XII. A Dissertation Presented to the Board of University Studies for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy", Calvary & Co., Berlin.

Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P.J., and Nisbet, R.G.M. (1979), "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 69, pp. 125-155.

Anderson, W.S. (1955), "'Poetic Fiction': Horace, Serm. 1.5", *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 49, No. 5, pp. 57-59.

Anderson, W.S. (1956), "Horace, the Unwilling Warrior: *Satire* I, 9", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 77, No. 2, pp. 148-166.

Anderson, W.S. (1972), "The Form, Purpose, and Position of Horace's *Satire* I, 8", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 93, No. 1, Studies in Honor of Henry T. Rowell, pp. 4-13.

Anderson, W.S. (1973), "The Heroides", in Binns, J.W. (ed.) (1973), *Ovid*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, pp. 49-83.

Andrews, N.E. (1996), "Narrative and Allusion in Theocritus, Idyll 2", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) (1996), *Theocritus*, Hellenistica Groningana II, Proceedings of the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry, Egbert Forsten, Groningen, pp. 21-53.

Andrisano, A.M. (2012), "Multiple Models and Horace: *Epodes* 1, 3 and 5", in Cairns, F. (ed.) (2012), *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar Fifteenth Volume*, ARCA 51, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., pp. 285-302.

Arena, A. (2002), "Per una interpretazione della Nemesi tibulliana", in Defosse, P. (ed.) (2002), *Hommages à Carl Deroux. I — Poésie*, Collection Latomus Volume 266, Latomus, Bruxelles, pp. 29-35.

Armstrong, R. (2004), "Retiring Apollo: Ovid on the Politics and Poetics of Self-Sufficiency", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 582-550.

Armstrong, R. (2005), *Ovid and His Love Poetry*, Classical Literature and Society, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London.

Audollent, A. (ed.) (1904), *Defixionum Tabellae Quotquot Innotuerunt Tam in Graecis Orientis Quam in Totius Occidentis Partibus Praeter Atticas*, Minerva GmbH, Frankfurt/Main.

Austin, J.L. (1975) (2nd ed.), *How to Do Things with Words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Austin, N. (1994), *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London.

Babcock, C.L. (1966), "*Si Certus Intrarit Dolor*. A Reconsideration of Horace's Fifteenth Epode", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 400-419.

Baca, A.R. (1968), "The Role of Delia and Nemesis in the Corpus Tibullanium", *Emerita* 36, pp. 49-56.

Bain, D. (1986), "Waiting for Varus?" (Horace, *Epodes*, 5, 49-72)", *Latomus*, T. 45, Fasc. 1, pp. 125-131.

Baker, R.J. (1970), "*Laus in amore mori*: Love and Death in Propertius", *Latomus*, T. 29, Fasc. 3, pp. 670-698.

Baker, R.J. (1973), "Duplices Tabellae: Propertius 3. 23 and Ovid Amores 1. 12", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 68, No. 2, pp. 109-113.

Baker, R.J. (1980), "Beauty and the Beast in Propertius I.3", in Deroux, C. (ed.) (1980), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* II, Collection Latomus Volume 168, Bruxelles, pp. 245-258.

Baker, R.J. (ed.) (tr.) (1990), *Propertius I*, The University of New England, Armindale, Australia.

Ball, R.J. (1983), *Tibullus the Elegist: A Critical Survey*, Hypomnemata: Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben, Heft 77, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Ball, R.J. (1994), "*Albi, Ne Doleas*: Horace and Tibullus", *The Classical World*, Vol. 87, No.5, pp. 409-414.

Barchiesi, A. (1993), "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 95, pp. 333-365.

Barchiesi, A. (1994a), "Alcune difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico. Giambo ed elegia nell' epodo XI", in Tovar, R.C. and Corte, J.C.F. (eds.) (1994), *Bimilenario de Horacio [ponencias del Congreso celebrado en Salamanca en 1992]*, Acta Salmanticensia Estudios Filológicos, Universidad Salamanca, pp. 127-138.

Barchiesi, A. (1994b), "Ultime difficoltà nella carriera di un poeta giambico: L'epodo XVII", in Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni del Bimillenario della Morte di Q. Orazio Flacco (ed.) (1994), *Atti dei convegni di Venosa Napoli Roma novembre 1993*, Edizioni Osanna, Venosa, pp. 205-217.

Barchiesi, A. (1995), "Poetica di un mito sessuale: la strega giambica", in Raffaelli, R. (ed.) (1995), *Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma: atti del convegno, Pesaro, 28-30 aprile 1994*, Commissione per la pari opportunità tra uomo e donna della Regione Marche, Ancona, pp. 335-342.

Barchiesi, A. (2001a), "Continuities", in Barchiesi, A. (2001), *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, pp. 9-28.

Barchiesi, A. (2001b), "Narrativity and Convention in the *Heroides*", in Barchiesi, A. (2001), *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, pp. 29-47.

Barchiesi, A. (2001c), "Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian", in Cavarzere, A., Aloni, A., and Barchiesi, A. (eds.) (2001), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, pp. 141-164.

Barchiesi, A. (2002), "Palingenre: Death, Rebirth and Horatian Iambos", in Paschalis, M. (ed.) (2002), *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, Rethymnon Classical Studies Volume 1, Department of Philology, University of Crete, pp. 47-69.

Barchiesi, A. (2009), "Final Difficulties in the Career of an Iambic Poet: *Epode* 17", in Lowrie, M. (ed.) (2009b), *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 232-246.

Barsby, J.A. (ed.) (tr.) (1973), *Ovid's* Amores *Book 1*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Barsby, J.A. (1974), "The Composition and Publication of the First Three Books of Propertius", *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 128-137.

Bassi, K. (1993), "Helen and the Discourse of Denial in Stesichorus' Palinode", *Arethusa*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 51-75.

Bassi, K. (1994), "Desired Silence: *Amor* and *Mors* in Tibullus 1.1", *Syllecta Classica*, Vol. 5, pp. 53-61.

Batstone, W.W. (1992), "Amor Improbus, Felix Qui, and Tardus Apollo: the 'Monobiblos' and the 'Georgics'", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 287-302.

Beard, M. (2007), *The Roman Triumph*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Beard, M., North, J., and Price, S., (1998), *Religions of Rome Volume 1: A History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Belling, H. (1889), "Ad Tibulli elegiam II 4", *Philologus* 47, pp. 378-382.

Berg, W. (1974), *Early Virgil*, The Athlone Press, London.

Bergren, A.L.T. (1981), "Helen's 'Good Drug'", in Kresic, S. (ed.) (1981), *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and the Interpretation of Classical Texts*, Ottawa, pp. 201-214.

Bergren, A.L.T. (1983), "Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought", *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 69-95.

Berkowitz, L. (1972), "Pollio and the Date of the Fourth 'Eclogue'", *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 5, pp. 21-38.

Bessone, F. (1995), "Medea's Response to Catullus: Ovid, *Heroides* 12.23-4 and Catullus 76.1-6", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 575-578.

Bessone, F. (ed.) (1997a), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula XII Medea Iasoni*, Felice Le Monnier, Firenze.

Bessone, F. (1997b), "Sapere, non sapere, dire, non dire. Ingoranza, reticenza ed ironia nelle *Heroides*", *Quaderni del dipartimento di filologia linguistica e tradizione classica*, 9, Università degli Studi di Torino, Bologna, pp. 207-223.

Betz, H.D. (ed.) (1986), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation: Including the Demotic Spells*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Beye, C.R. (1969), "Jason as Love-hero in Apollonios' *Argonautika*", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 31-55.

Beye, C.R. (1982), *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Edwardsville.

Bicknell, P.J. (1984), "The Dark Side of the Moon", in Moffat, A. (ed.) (1984) *Maistor: Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, Canberra, pp. 67-75.

Birt, T. (1877), "Animadversiones ad Ovidii heroidum epistulas", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 32. Bd., pp. 386-432.

Bloch, D.J. (2000), "Ovid's "Heroides 6": Preliminary Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 197-209.

Bontyes, S. (2008a), "*Erubuit!*: exclamation d'Ovide ou de Dipsas? (note sur Ov., *Amores* I, 8, 33-36)", *Latomus*, T. 67, Fasc. 1, pp. 167-168.

Bontyes, S. (2008b), "Ovide, *Amores* I, 8, 5-18 ou l'ambiguïté d'une magicienne", *Latomus*, T. 67, Fasc. 2, pp. 366-377.

Booth, J. (ed.) (tr.) (1991), *Ovid:* Amores *II*, Aris & Phillips Ltd., Warminster, England.

Booth, J. (1996), "Tibullus 1.8 and 9: A Tale in Two Poems?", *Museum Helveticum*, Vol. 53, Fasc. 3, pp. 232-247.

Booth, J. (2001), "Problems and Programmatics in Propertius 1.1", *Hermes*, 129 Bd., H. 1, pp. 63-74.

Booth, J. (2009), "The *Amores*: Ovid Making Love", in Knox, P.E. (ed.) (2009), *A Companion to Ovid*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England, pp. 61-77.

Booth, J., and Maltby, R. (2005), "Light and Dark: Play on *Candidus* and Related Concepts in the Elegies of Tibullus", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 58, Fasc. 1, pp. 124-132.

Bosworth, A.B. (1972), "Asinius Pollio and Augustus", *Historia*, Bd. 21, H. 3, pp. 441-473.

Bowditch, P.L. (2001), *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Bowersock, G.W. (1971), "A Date in the *Eighth Eclogue*", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 75, pp. 73-80.

Bowersock, G.W. (1978), "The Addressee of the Eighth Eclogue: A Response", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 82, pp. 201-202.

Boyd, B.W. (1997), *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the* Amores, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Boyd, B.W. (2002), "The *Amores*: The Invention of Ovid", in Boyd, B.W. (ed.) (2002), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 91-116.

Boyd, B.W. (2009), "*Remedia Amoris*", in Knox, P.E. (ed.) (2009), *A Companion to Ovid*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England, pp. 104-119.

Boyd, T.W. (1998), "Recognizing Helen", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 23, pp. 1-18.

Boyle, A.J. (1974), "Propertius I, 19: A Critical Study", *Latomus*, T. 33, Fasc. 4, pp. 895-911.

Bradshaw, A. (1989) "Horace *in Sabinis*", in Deroux, C. (ed.) (1989), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* V, Collection Latomus Volume 206, Bruxelles, pp. 160-186.

Brashear, W. (1992), "Magical Papyri: Magic in Book Form", in Ganz, P. (ed.) (1992), *Das Buch als magisches und als Repräsentationsobjekt*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 25-59.

Brashear, W. (1995), "The Greek Magical Papyri: an Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928-1994)", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.18.5, pp. 3380-3684.

Breed, B.W. (2000), "Silenus and the *Imago Vocis* in *Eclogue* 6", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 100, pp. 327-339.

Breed, B.W. (2003), "Portrait of a Lady: Propertius 1.3 and Ecphrasis", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 99, No.1, pp. 35-56.

Bremmer, J.N. (1999), "The Birth of the Term Magic", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 126, pp. 1-12.

Bright, D.F. (1978), *Haec Mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in his World*, Brill, Leiden.

Brown, P.M. (ed.) (tr.) (1993), *Horace:* Satires *I*, Aris & Phillips Ltd., Warminster, England.

Brunelle, C. (1997), "Gender and Genre in Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*", PhD Diss., The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Brunelle, C. (2000-2001), "Form vs. Function in Ovid's 'Remedia Amoris'", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 96, No. 2, pp. 123-140.

Brunelle, C. (2002), "Pleasure, Failure, and Danger: Reading Circe in the *Remedia*", *Helios*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 55-68.

Brunelle, C. (2005), "Ovid's Satirical Remedies", in Ancona, R. and Greene, E. (eds.) (2005), *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, pp. 141-158.

Bulloch, A.W. (1973), "Tibullus and the Alexandrians", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 19, pp. 71-89.

Burriss, E.E. (1929), "The Religious Life of Tibullus as Reflected in His Elegies", *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 22, No. 16, pp. 121-126.

Burton, J.B. (1995), *Theocritus' Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Bushala, E.W. (1968), "Laboriosus Ulixes", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 7-10.

Butler, H.E. and Barber, E.A. (eds.) (1933), *The Elegies of Propertius*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Butrica, J.L. (1983), "Propertius 3.6", *Échos du monde classique* XXVII, pp. 17-37.

Byre, C.S. (1991), "The Narrator's Addresses to the Narratee in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 121, pp. 215-227.

Cahoon, L. (1985), "A Program for Betrayal: Ovidian *Nequitia* in *Amores* 1.1, 2.1, and 3.1", *Helios*, New Series, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 29-39.

Cahoon, L. (1988), "The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 118, pp. 293-307.

Cairns, F. (1969), "Propertius i. 18 and Callimachus, Acontius and Cydippe", *The Classical Review*, New Series, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 131-134.

Cairns, F. (1974), "Some Observations on Propertius 1.1", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 94-110.

Cairns, F. (1975), "Horace, *Epode* 2, Tibullus 1, 1 and Rhetorical Praise of the Countryside", *Museum Philologum Londiniense*, Vol. 1, pp. 75-91.

Cairns, F. (1978), "The Genre Palinode and Three Horatian Examples: Epode, 17; Odes, 1.16; Odes, 1.34", *L'Antiquité Classique* 47.2, pp. 546-552.

Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cairns, F. (1983), "Propertius 1,4 and 1,5 and the 'Gallus' of the Monobiblos", in Cairns, F. (ed.) (1984), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Fourth Volume*, ARCA 11, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Liverpool, pp. 61-103.

Cairns, F. (1984), "Theocritus' First Idyll: The Literary Programme", *Wiener Studien*, N.F., 18 Bd., pp. 89-113.

Cairns, F. (1995), "Horace, *Odes* 3.7: Elegy, Lyric, Myth, Learning, and Interpretation", in Harrison, S. (ed.) (1995), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 65-99.

Cairns, F. (1999), "Tibullus, Messalla, and the *Spica*: I 1.16; I 5.28; I 10.22; II 1.4; II 5.84", *Emerita*, Vol. 67, No. 2, pp. 219-230.

Cairns, F. (2006), *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cairns, F. (2008), "C. Asinius Pollio and the *Eclogues*", *Cambridge Classical Journal: Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 54, pp. 49-75.

Califf, D.J. (1997), "*Amores* 2.1.7-8: A Programmatic Allusion by Anagram", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 604-605.

Campbell, D.A. (ed.) (tr.) (1982), *Greek Lyric in Four Volumes. I: Sappho and Alcaeus*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Campbell, M. (1983), *Studies in the Third Book of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica*, Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien Band IX, Georg Olms, Hildesheim.

Camps, W.A. (ed.) (1961), *Propertius: Elegies Book I*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Camps, W.A. (ed.) (1965), *Propertius: Elegies Book IV*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Camps, W.A. (ed.) (1966), *Propertius: Elegies Book III*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Camps, W.A. (ed.) (1967), *Propertius: Elegies Book II*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Carruba, R.W. (1969), *The Epodes of Horace: A Study in Poetic Arrangement*, Mouton and Co., The Hague.

Carter, J.M. (ed.) (1982), *Suetonius: Divus Augustus*, Bristol Classical Press, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London.

Cary, E. (ed.) (tr.) (1917), *Dio's Roman History in Nine Volumes: V*, William Heinemann, London, and G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

Casali, S. (1992), "Enone, Apollo pastore e l'amore immedicabile: giochi ovidiani su di un topos elegiaco", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 28, pp. 85-100.

Casali, S. (ed.) (1995a), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula IX: Deianira Herculi*, Felice Le Monnier, Firenze.

Casali, S. (1995b), "Tragic Irony in Ovid, *Heroides* 9 and 11", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 505-511.

Caston, R.R. (2006), "Love as Illness: Poets and Philosophers on Romantic Love", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 101, No. 3, pp. 271-298.

Cavarzere, A. (ed.) and Bandini, F. (tr.) (1992), *Orazio: il libro degli Epodi*, Marsilio Editori, Venezia.

Cecchin, S.A. (1997), "Medea in Ovidio fra elegia ed epos", in Uglione, R. (ed.) (1997), *Atti delle giornate di studio su Medea: Torino 23-24 ottobre 1995*, Celid, Torino, pp. 69-89.

Chadha, Z.K. (2008), "Spellbound: Magic in Latin Love Elegy", MA Diss., Durham University, Durham, England.

Chadha, Z.K. (2011), "I Will Swear I Have Been Faithful For Twelve Days: Jilted Witches and Unfaithful Lovers in Propertius 3.6 and Theocritus *Idyll* 2", Work-in-Progress Paper presented at the Classical Association Annual Conference Durham, 15th-18th April 2011.

Cholmeley, R.J. (ed.) (1919) (2nd ed.), *The Idylls of Theocritus*, G. Bell & Sons Ltd., London.

Cioccoloni, F. (2006), "Per un'interpretazione dei *Medicamina faciei femineae*: l'ironica polemica di Ovidio rispetto al motive propagandistico augusteo della *restitutio* dell'età dell'oro", *Latomus*, T. 65, Fasc. 1, pp. 97-107.

Cipolla, G. (1987), "Theocritus, *ID.* 2 – Vergil, *ECL.* 8. Observations on the *ΦΑΡΜΑΚΕΥΤΡΙΑΙ*", in *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerte a Francesco Della Corte I*, Edizione Quattro Venti, Urbino, pp. 353-365.

Ciraolo, L.J. (1995), "Supernatural Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri", in Meyer, M. and Mirecki, P. (eds.) (1995), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 129, Brill, Leiden, pp. 279-295.

Clack, J. (1977), "Non Ego Nunc (Propertius 1.6), A Study in Irony", *The Classical World*, Vol. 71, No. 3, pp. 187-190.

Clader, L.L. (1976), *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition*, Mnemosyne Supplement Vol. 42, Brill, Leiden.

Clare, R.J. (2002), *The Path of the* Argo*: Language, imagery, and narrative in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Clausen, W. (1964), "Callimachus and Latin Poetry", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 181-196.

Clausen, W. (1972), "On the Date of the First Eclogue", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 76, pp. 201-205.

Clausen, W. (1976), "Cynthivs", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 97, No. 3, pp. 245-247.

Clausen, W. (1977), "Cynthius: An Addendum", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 4, p. 362.

Clausen, W. (1994), *A Commentary on Virgil: Eclogues*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Clauss, J.J. (1993), *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book 1 of Apollonius'* Argonautica, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Cody, J.V. (1976), *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics*, Collection Latomus Volume 147, Bruxelles.

Coffey, M. (1976), *Roman Satire*, Methuen and Co. Ltd., London.

Coleman, R. (ed.) (1977), *Vergil: Eclogues*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Collins, D. (2008), *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*, Blackwell Ancient Religions, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England.

Commager, S. (1962), *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Commager, S. (1974), *A Prolegomenon to Propertius*, The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

Conington, J. (ed.) (1858), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera. The Works of Virgil with a Commentary: Vol. I: Containing the Eclogues and Georgics*, Whitaker and Co., and George Bell, London.

Conte, G.B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London.

Conte, G.B. (1994a), *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Conte, G.B. (1994b), Fowler, D. and Most, G.W. (rev.), *Latin Literature: A History*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Copley, F.O. (1947), "*Servitium amoris* in the Roman Elegists", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 78, pp. 285-300.

Copley, F.O. (1956), Exclusus Amator; *A Study in Latin Love Poetry*, American Philological Association Monograph Series, No. 17, Scholars Press, California.

Costanza, S. (2009), "La divisione di Prop. 2, 3 A-B-4 e la rilettura del mito di Melampo", *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, Vol. 4, pp. 200-213.

Courtney, E. (1969), "Three Poems of Propertius", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*, Vol. 16, pp. 70-87.

Coutelle, E. (2005), *Poésie et métapoésie chez Properce: de l'ars amandi à l'ars scribendi*, Bibliothèque d'Études Classiques 44, Éditions Peeters, Leuven.

Curran, L.C. (1966), "'Vision and Reality in Propertius I.3", *Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. 19, pp. 189-207.

Curran, L.C. (1975), "'Nature to Advantage Dressed': Propertius 1.2", *Ramus*, Vol. 4, No.1, pp. 1-16.

Dalzell, A. (1956), "Maecenas and the Poets", *Phoenix*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 151-162.

Dalzell, A. (1996), *The Criticism of Didactic Poetry: Essays on Lucretius, Virgil, and Ovid*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo, and London.

Daniel, R.W. and Maltomini, F. (eds.) (trs.) (1992), *Supplementum Magicum Vol. II (Suppl. Mag. II)*, Papyrologica Coloniensia Vol. XVI. 2, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen.

D'Anna, G. (1996), "Questioni cronologiche", in Mariotti, S. (ed.) (1996), *Enciclopedia Oraziana* 1, Instituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, *Orsa Maggiore*, Rome, pp. 259-264.

D'Arms, J.H. (1967), "Canidia and Campania", *Philologus*, 111.1/2, pp. 141-145.

Davies, C. (1973), "Poetry in the 'Circle' of Messalla", *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 25-35.

Davis, G. (1991), *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Davis, J.T. (1977), *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid*, Noctes Romanae, Forschungen über die Kultur der Antike 15, Paul Haupt, Bern and Stuttgart.

Davisson, M.H.T (1996), "The Search for an *alter orbis* in Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*", *Phoenix*, Vol. 50, No. 3/4, pp. 240-61.

Debrohun, J.B. (2003), *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Dee, J.H. (1974), "Propertius 4.2: Callimachus Romanus at Work", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 95, No. 1, pp. 43-55.

DeForest, M.M. (1994), *Apollonius'* Argonautica: *A Callimachean Epic*, Mnemosyne Supplement Vol. 142, Brill, Leiden.

Degrassi, A. (ed.) (1947), *Inscriptiones Italiae Volumen XIII – Fasti et Elogia: Fasiculus I – Fasti Consulares et Triumphales*, La Libreria dello Stato, Roma.

Deremetz, A. (1987), "Le *carmen deductum* ou le fil du poème: à propos de Virgile, *Buc.*, VI", *Latomus*, T. 46, Fasc. 4, pp. 762-777.

De Romilly, J. (1975), *Magic and Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Dickie, M.W. (1990), "Talos Bewitched. Magic, Atomic Theory and Paradoxography in Apollonius *Argonautica* 4.1638-88", in Cairns, F. and Heath, M. (eds.) (1990), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar Sixth Volume*, ARCA 29, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds, pp. 267-296.

Dickie, M.W. (1996), "What Is A *Kolossos* and How Were *Kolossoi* Made In The Hellenistic Period?", *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 237-257.

Dickie, M.W. (2000), "Who Practised Love-Magic in Classical Antiquity and in the Late Roman World?", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 563-583.

Dickie, M.W. (2001), *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*, Routledge, London and New York.

Dover, K.J. (ed.) (1971), *Theocritus: Select Poems*, MacMillan Education Ltd., Basingstoke and London.

Downing, E. (2002), "Anti-Pygmalion: The *Praeceptor* in *Ars Amatoria*, Book 3", in Porter, J.I. (ed.) (2002), *Constructions of the Classical Body*, The Body, in Theory, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 235-251.

Drinkwater, J.F. (1983), *Roman Gaul: The Three Provinces, 58 BC-AD 260*, Croom Helm, London and Canberra.

Drinkwater, M.O. (2007), "*Which* Letter? Text and Subtext in Ovid's *Heroides*", *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 128, No. 3, pp. 367-387.

Drinkwater, M.O. (2012), "'His Turn to Cry': Tibullus' Marathus Cycle (1.4, 1.8 and 1.9) and Roman Elegy", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 107, No. 4, pp. 423-450.

Duncan, A. (2001), "Spellbinding Performance: Poet as Witch in Theocritus' Second *Idyll* and Apollonius' *Argonautica*", *Helios*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 43-56.

Dupont, F. (1997), "*Recitatio* and the reorganization of the space of public discourse", in Habinek, T. and Schiesaro, A. (eds.) (1997), *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 44-59.

Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. (1979), "From Polyphemus to Corydon: Virgil, *Eclogue* 2 and the *Idylls* of Theocritus", in West, D. and Woodman, T. (eds.) (1979), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 35-69.

Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. (1984), "Horace and Maecenas: The propaganda value of *Sermones* I", in Woodman, T. and West, D. (eds.) (1984), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 19-58.

Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. (1992), "*In memoriam Galli*: Propertius 1.21", in Woodman, A.J. and Powell, J.G.F. (eds.) (1992), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Durling, R.M. (1958), "Ovid as *Praeceptor Amoris*", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 157-167.

Dyck, A.R. (1989), "On the Way from Colchis to Corinth: Medea in Book 4 of the 'Argonautica'", *Hermes*, Vol. 117, No. 4, pp. 455-470.

Eckstein, A.M. (1982), "Human Sacrifice and the Fear of Military Disaster in Republican Rome", *American Journal of Ancient History*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 69-95.

Edmunds, L. (2001), *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Ehrenberg, V. and Jones, A.H.M. (eds.) (1955), *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Eitrem, S. (1924), "Die Rituelle ΔΙΑΒΟΛΗ", *Symbolae Osloenses*, Vol. 2, pp. 43-58.

Eitrem, S. (1933), "Exkurs: Die 5. und 17. Epode des Horaz", *Symbolae Osloenses*, Vol. 12, pp. 30-38.

Eitrem, S. (1941), "La magie comme motif littéraire chez les Grecs et les Romains", *Symbolae Osloenses*, Vol. 21, pp. 39-83.

Elder, J.P. (1962), "Tibullus: *Tersus Atque Elegans*", in Sullivan, J.P. (ed.) (1962), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, pp. 65-105.

Elder, J.P. (1965), "Tibullus, Ennius, and the Blue Loire", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 96, pp. 97-105.

Enk, P.J. (ed.) (1946), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum: Liber I (Monobiblos). Pars Prior: Prolegomena et Textum Continens*, Brill, Leiden.

Enk, P.J. (ed.) (1962a), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum: Liber Secundus. Pars Prior: Prolegomena et Textum Continens*, A.W. Sythoff, Leiden.

Enk, P.J. (ed.) (1962b), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum: Liber Secundus. Pars Altera: Commentarium Continens*, A.W. Sythoff, Leiden.

Epstein, S. (1967), "A Sociological Analysis of Witch Beliefs in a Mysore Village", in Middleton, J. (ed.) (1967), *Magic, Witchcraft, and Curing*, American Museum Sourcebooks in Anthropology, The American Museum of Natural History, The Natural History Press, Garden City, New York, pp. 135-154.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1937), *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among The Azande*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ezquerra, A.A. (1997), "Los Epodos eróticos de Horacio y los inicios de la elegía Latina", *Estudios clásicos*, Vol. 111, pp. 7-26.

Fantazzi, C. (1966), "Virgilian Pastoral and Roman Love Poetry", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 87, No. 2, pp. 171-191.

Fantham, E. (1996), *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Fantuzzi, M. (1995), "Mythological Paradigms in the Bucolic Poetry of Theocritus", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 41, pp. 16-35.

Fantuzzi, M. (2003), "Pastoral love and 'elegiac' love, from Greece to Rome", *Leeds International Classical Studies* 2.3, pp. 1-11.

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R.L. (2004), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Faraone, C.A. (1989), "Clay Hardens and Wax Melts: Magical Role-Reversal in Vergil's Eighth *Eclogue*", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 84, No. 4, pp. 294-300.

Faraone, C.A. (1991a), "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells", in Faraone, C.A., and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 3-32.

Faraone, C.A. (1991b), "Binding and Burying the Forces of Evil: The Defensive Use of "Voodoo Dolls" in Ancient Greece", *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 165-205, 207-220.

Faraone, C.A. (1993), "The Wheel, the Whip and Other Implements of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar *Pythian* 4.213-19", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 89, No. 1, pp. 1-19.

Faraone, C.A. (1994), "Deianira's Mistake and the Demise of Heracles: Erotic Magic in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*", *Helios*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 115-135.

Faraone, C.A. (1995), "The 'Performative Future' in Three Hellenistic Incantations and Theocritus' Second Idyll", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 90, No. 1, pp. 1-15.

Faraone, C.A. (1999), *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Faraone, C.A. (2000), "Handbooks and Anthologies: The Collection of Greek and Egyptian Incantations in Late Hellenistic Egypt", *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 195-214.

Faraone, C.A. (2002), "The Ethnic Origins of a Roman-Era *Philtrokatadesmos* (*PGM* IV 296-434)", in Mirecki, P. and Meyer, M. (eds.) (2002), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 141, Brill, Leiden, pp. 319-343.

Faraone, C.A. (2004), "Orpheus' Final Performance: Necromancy and a Singing Head on Lesbos", *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 97, Fourth Series, Vol. 2, Fasc. 1, pp. 5-27.

Faraone, C.A. (2005), "Necromancy Goes Underground: The Disguise of Skull- and Corpse-Divination in the Paris Magical Papyri (*PGM* IV 1928-2144)", in Johnston, S.I. and Struck, P.T. (eds.) (2005), *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 155, Brill, Leiden, pp. 255-282.

Farrell, J. (1991), "Asinius Pollio in Vergil *Eclogue* 8", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 86, No. 3, pp. 204-211.

Farrell, J. (1998), "Reading and Writing the *Heroides*", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 98, pp. 307-338.

Fauth, W. (1980), "*Venena Amoris*: Die motive des Liebeszaubers und der Erotischen Verzauberung in der augustischen Dichtung", *Maia*, 32, pp. 265-282.

Fauth, W. (1999), *Carmen Magicum. Das Thema der Magie in der Dichtung der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Fedeli, P. (1978), "Il V epodo e i giambi d'Orazio come espressione d'arte Alessandrina", *Museum Philologum Londiniense*, Vol. 3, pp. 67-138.

Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1980), *Sesto Properzio: il primo libro delle elegie*, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Firenze.

Fedeli, P. (1981), "Elegy and Literary Polemic in Propertius' *Monobiblos*", in Cairns, F. (ed.) (1981), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Third Volume*, ARCA 7, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Liverpool, pp. 227-242.

Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1985), *Properzio: il libro terzo delle elegie*, Adriatica Editrice, Bari.

Fedeli, P. (1986), "Le elegie a Marato o dell'accumulazione dei *topoi*", in Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni del Bimillenario della Morte di Albio Tibullo (ed.), *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo (Roma-Palestrina, 10-13 maggio 1984)*, Centro di Studi Ciceroni, Roma, pp. 331-344.

Fedeli, P. (ed.) (2005), *Properzio elegie libro II: introduzione, testo e commento*, ARCA 45, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Cambridge.

Feeney, D. (1991), *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Feeney, D. (1998), *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*, Roman Literature and its Contexts, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fitzgerald, W. (1988), "Power and Impotence in Horace's Epodes", *Ramus*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 176-191.

Fitzgerald, W. (2000), *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*, Roman Literature and its Contexts, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Flaschenreim, B. (1997), "Loss, Desire, and Writing in Propertius 1.19 and 2.15", *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 259-277.

Fordyce, C.J. (ed.) (1966) (rev.), *Catullus: A Commentary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Fortuny Previ, F. (1985), "Presencia de la magia en Tibulo", in Universidad de Murcia, Sección de Filología Clásica (ed.) (1985), *Simposio Tibuliano: conmemoracíon del bimilenario de la muerte del Tibulo*, Murcia, pp. 243-253.

Foucault, M. (1978), *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*, Pantheon Books, New York.

Fowler, D. (1991), "Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 81, pp. 25-35.

Fowler, D. (1997), "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 39, Memoria, arte allusive, intertestualità (Memory, Allusion, Intertextuality), pp. 13-34.

Fowler, D. (2002), "Masculinity Under Threat? The Poetics and Politics of Inspiration in Latin Poetry", in Spentzou, E. and Fowler, D. (eds.) (2002), *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 141-159.

Fowler, R.L. (1995), "Greek Magic, Greek Religion", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 20, pp.1-22.

Fränkel, H. (ed.) (1961), *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Fraenkel, E. (1957), *Horace*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Frankfurter, D. (1994), "The Magic of Writing and the Writing of Magic: The Power of the Word in Egyptian and Greek Traditions", *Helios*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 189-221.

Frankfurter, D. (1995), "Narrating Power: The Theory and Practice of the Magical *Historiola* in Ritual Spells", in Meyer, M. and Mirecki, P. (eds.) (1995), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 129, Brill, Leiden, pp. 457-476.

Frazer, J.G. (ed.) (tr.) (1931), *Ovid in Six Volumes. V: Fasti*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and William Heinemann Ltd., London.

Freudenburg, K. (1990), "Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in *Satires* 2.1", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 111, No. 2, pp. 187-203.

Freudenburg, K. (1993), *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Freudenburg, K. (1995), "Canidia at the Feast of Nasidienus (Hor. *S*. 2.8.95)", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 125, pp. 207-219.

Fulkerson, L. (2002), "(Un)Sympathetic Magic: A Study of *Heroides* 13", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 123, No. 1, pp. 61-87.

Fulkerson, L. (2004), "*Omnia Vincit Amor*: Why the *Remedia* Fail", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 211-223.

Fulkerson, L. (2005), *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the Heroides*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fyler, J.M. (1971), "Omnia vincit amor: Incongruity and the Limitations of Structure in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 66, No. 3, pp. 196-203.

Gager, J.G. (ed.) (1992), *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gaisser, J.H. (1971), "Structure and Tone in Tibullus, 1, 6", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 92, No. 2, pp. 202-216.

Gale, M.R. (2000), *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The* Georgics, *Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gardner, R. (ed.) (tr.) (1958), *Cicero. The Speeches: Pro Sestio and In Vatinium*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and William Heinemann Ltd., London.

Garson, R.W. (1971), "Theocritean Elements in Virgil's Eclogues", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 188-203.

Garson, R.W. (1972), "Homeric Echoes in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 67, No. 1, pp. 1-9.

Geertz, C. (2000) (rev.), *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, New York.

Geisler, H.J. (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso: Remedia Amoris mit Kommentar zu Vers 1-396*, PhD Diss., Freie Universität, Berlin.

George, E.V. (1972), "Poet and Characters in Apollonius Rhodius' Lemnian Episode", *Hermes*, Vol. 100, No. 1, pp. 47-63.

George, R.P.H. (1996), "Octavian and Vergil's *Eclogues*", *Euphrosyne*, Vol. 24, pp. 225-236.

Gibson, R.K. (ed,) (2003), *Ovid:* Ars amatoria *Book 3*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gleason, M.W. (1995), *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Godolphin, F.R.B. (1934), "The Unity of Certain Elegies of Propertius", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 62-66.

Godwin, J. (ed.) (tr.) (1995), *Catullus: Poems 61-68*, Aris & Phillips Ltd., Warminster, England.

Goldberg, S.M. (2005), *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (1991), *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (2007), "What is Ekphrasis For?", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 102, No. 1, Special Issues on Ekphrasis, pp. 1-19.

Goold, G.P. (ed.) (tr.) (1990), *Propertius: Elegies*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Gordon, R. (1987), "Aelian's peony: the location of magic in Graeco-Roman tradition", *Comparative Criticism: An Annual Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 59-95.

Gordon, R. (1999), "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic", in Ankarloo, B. and Clark, S. (eds.) (1999), *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe Volume 2: Ancient Greece and Rome*, The Athlone Press, London, pp. 161-275.

Gordon, R. (2009), "Magic as a Topos in Augustan Poetry: Discourse, Reality and Distance", *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, Vol. 11, pp. 209-228.

Gordon, R. and Marco Simón, F. (eds.) (2010), *Magical Practice in the Latin West: Papers from the International Conference held at the University of Zaragoza. 30 Sept.- 1 Oct. 2005*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 168, Brill, Leiden.

Gow, A.S.F. (1934), "ΙΥΝΞ, ΡΟΜΒΟΣ, *Rhombus*, *Turbo*", *The Journal of Hellenistic Studies*, Vol. 54, Part 1, pp. 1-13.

Gow, A.S.F. (ed.) (1950a), *Theocritus Volume 1: Introduction, Text, and Translation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gow, A.S.F. (ed.) (1950b), *Theocritus Volume 2: Commentary, Appendix, Indexes, and Plates*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gowers, E. (1993a), *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gowers, E. (1993b), "Horace, *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 39, pp. 48-66.

Graf, F. (1997a), *Magic in the Ancient World*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Graf, F. (1997b), "How to Cope with a Difficult Life", in Schäfer, P. and Kippenburg, H.G. (eds.) (1997), *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 93-114.

Grassmann, V. (1966), *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz: Literarischer Hintergrund und sprachliche Tradition*, Zetemata, Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft Heft 39, C.H. Beck, München.

Green, P. (1979), "Ars Gratia Cultus: Ovid as Beautician", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 100, No. 3, pp. 381-392.

Greene, E. (1995), "Elegiac Woman: Fantasy, *Materia* and Male Desire in Propertius 1.3 and 1.11", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 116, No. 2, pp. 303-318.

Greene, E. (1998), *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Greene, E. (2000), "Gender Identity and the Elegiac Hero in Propertius 2.1", *Arethusa*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 241-261.

Griffiths, F.T. (1979), "Poetry as *Pharmakon* in Theocritus' *Idyll* 2", in Bowerstock, G.W., Burkert, W., and Putnam, M.C.J. (eds.) (1979), *Arktouros. Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M.W. Knox*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, pp. 81-88.

Griffiths, F.T. (1981), "Home before lunch: The emancipated woman in Theocritus", in Foley, H. (ed.) (1981), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, USA, pp. 247-273.

Gross, N.P. (1988), *Amatory Persuasion in Antiquity: Studies in Theory and Practice*, University of Delaware Press, Newark, and Associated University Press, London and Toronto.

Gross, N.P. (1996), "Ovid, *Amores* 1.8: Whose Amatory Rhetoric?", *The Classical World*, Vol. 89, No. 3, pp. 197-206.

Gumpert, M. (2001), *Grafting Helen: The Abduction of the Classical Past*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin.

Gurtzwiller, K.J. (1985), "The Lover and the *Lena*: Propertius 4.5", *Ramus*, Vol. 14, pp. 105-115.

Gurtzwiller, K.J. (1991), *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin.

Habash, M. (1999), "Priapus: Horace in Disguise?", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 94, No. 3, pp. 285-297.

Habinek, T.N. (2005), *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Hahn, E.A. (1939), "*Epodes* 5 and 17, *Carmina* 1.16 and 1.17", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 70, pp. 213-230.

Hallett, J.P. (1981), "*Pepedi / diffissa nate ficus*: Priapic revenge in Horace, *Satires* I. 8", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 124. Bd., H. 3/4, pp. 342-347.

Hallett, J.P. (2012), "Authorial Identity in Latin Love Elegy: Literary Fictions and Erotic Failings", in Gold, B.K. (ed.) (2012), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England, pp. 269-284.

Halperin, D.M. (1983), *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Hammer, J. (1925), *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Panegyricus Messalae: The Military and Political Career of M. Valerius Messala Corvinus*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Hanslik, R. (1955), "M. Valerius Messala Corvinus", *RE* 8A, Alfred Druckenmüller, Stuttgart, pp. 131-157.

Hardie, P. (1986), *Virgil's* Aeneid: Cosmos *and* Imperium, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hardie, P. (1988), "Lucretius and the Delusions of Narcissus", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici,* No. 20/21, pp. 71-89.

Hardie, P. (2002), *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hardie, P. (2006), "*Lethaeus Amor*: The Art of Forgetting", in Gibson, R., Green, S., and Sharrock, A. (eds.) (2006), *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's* Ars amatoria *and* Remedia amoris, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 166-190.

Harrison, S. (2001), "Some Generic Problems in Horace's *Epodes*: Or, On (Not) Being Archilochus", in Cavarzere, A., Aloni, A., and Barchiesi, A. (eds.) (2001), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, pp. 165-186.

Harrison, S. (2007a), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Harrison, S. (2007b), "Horace's self-representations", in Harrison, S. (ed.) (2007), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 22-35.

Harrison, S. (2007c), "Town and country", in Harrison, S. (ed.) (2007), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 235-247.

Heiden, B. (1988), "Learned Allusions and Political Expression in Propertius 2.1.51-70", *Latomus*, T. 47, Fasc. 2, pp. 358-364.

Heinze, T. (1991-1993), "The Authenticity of Ovid *Heroides* 12 Reconsidered", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*, Vol. 38, pp. 94-97.

Heinze, T. (ed.) (1997), *P. Ovidius Naso. Der XII. Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie Medea*, Brill, Leiden.

Heldmann, K. (1981), "Schönheitspflege und Charakterstärke in Ovids Liebeslehre", *Würzburger Jahrebücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, 7, pp. 153-176.

Henderson, A.A.R. (1969), "Tibullus, Elysium and Tartarus", *Latomus*, T. 28, Fasc. 3, pp. 649-653.

Henderson, A.A.R. (ed.) (1979), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Remdia Amoris,* Scottish Academic Press, Edinburgh.

Henderson, J. (1991), "Wrapping up the Case: Reading Ovid, Amores 2, 7 (+ 8) I", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici,* No. 27, pp. 37-88.

Henderson, W.J. (1973), "The Paraclausithyron Motif in Horace's *Odes*", *Acta Classica*, Vol. 16, pp. 51-67.

Hendrickson, G.L. (1925), "Verbal Injury, Magic, or Erotic Comus?", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 298-308.

Hendry, M. (1995), "Rouge and Crocodile Dung: Notes on Ovid, *Ars* 3.199-200 and 269-70", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 583-588.

Heslin, P. (2010), "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Dating of Propertius' First Book", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 100, pp. 54-68.

Heslin, P. (2011), "Metapoetic Pseudonyms in Horace, Propertius and Ovid", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 101, pp. 51-72.

Hewig, A. (1991), "Ariadne's Fears from Sea and Sky (Ovid, *Heroides* 10.88. [*sic*] and 95-8)", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 554-556.

Heyworth, S.J. (1984), "Notes on Propertius Books I and II", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 394-405.

Heyworth, S.J. (1992), "Propertius 2.13", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 45, Fasc. 1, pp. 45-59.

Heyworth, S.J. (1993), "Horace's *Ibis*: On the Titles, Unity, and Contents of the *Epodes*", in Cairns, F. and Heath, M. (eds.) (1993) *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar Seventh Volume*, ARCA 32, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds, pp. 85-96.

Heyworth, S.J. (1995), "Propertius: Division, Transmission, and the Editor's Task", in Brock, R. and Woodman, A.J. (eds.) (1995), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar Eighth Volume*, ARCA 33, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds, pp. 165-185.

Heyworth, S.J. (2001), "Catullian Iambics, Catullian *Iambi*", in Cavarzere, A., Aloni, A., and Barchiesi, A. (eds.) (2001), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, pp. 117-140.

Heyworth, S.J. (ed.) (2007a), *Sexti Properti: Elegos*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Heyworth, S.J. (2007b), *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Heyworth, S.J. and Morwood, J.H.W. (eds.) (2011), *A Commentary on Propertius: Book 3*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hill, B. (1993), "Horace, *Satire* 1.8: Whence the Witches? Thematic Unity within the Satire and within the Satires of Book 1", in DeForest, M. (ed.) (1993), *Women's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, Bolchazy-Carducci, Wauconda, Illinois, pp. 257-263.

Hill, D.E. (1973), "The Thessalian Trick", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 116. Bd., H. 3/4, pp. 221-238.

Hinds, S. (1993), "Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 30, pp. 9-47.

Hinds, S. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Holder, A. (ed.) (1897), *Pomponi Porfyrionis Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim.

Holleman, A.W.J. (1969), "Horace's Lalage (*Ode* 1,22) and Tibullus' Delia", *Latomus*, T. 28, Fasc. 3, pp. 575-582.

Hollis, A.S. (1973), "*Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris*", in Binns, J.W. (ed.) (1973), *Ovid*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, pp. 84-115.

Holmberg, I.E. (1998), "Μητις and Gender in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 128, pp. 135-159.

Holzberg, N. (2009), "Ovid, *Amores* 3, 7: a Poem between Two Genres", *Latomus*, T. 68, Fasc. 4, pp. 933-940.

Hopfner, T. (1974), *Griechisch-Äegytischer Offenbarungzauber Band 1*, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam.

Houghton, L.B.T. (2007), "Tibullus' Elegiac Underworld", *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 153-165.

Houghton, L.B.T. (2009), "Sexual Puns in Ovid's *Ars* and *Remedia*", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 280-285.

Housman, A.E. (1972), "Emendationes Propertianae", in Diggle, J., and Goodyear, F.R.D. (eds.) (1972), *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman Volume 1: 1882-1897*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 29-54.

Hubbard, M. (1974), *Propertius*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London.

Hunt, A. (2010), "Elegiac Grafting in Pomona's Orchard: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.623-771", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 65, pp. 43-58.

Hunter, R.L. (1987), "Medea's Flight: The Fourth Book of the Argonautica", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 129-139.

Hunter, R.L. (ed.) (1989), *Apollonius of Rhodes:* Argonautica *Book III*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hunter, R.L. (1993), *The* Argonautica *of Apollonius: Literary Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Huskey, S.J. (2004), "Strategies of Omission and Revelation in Ovid's Heroides 6, 12, and Tristia 3.9", *Philologus* 148.2, pp. 274-289.

Hutchinson, G. (1988), *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Hutchinson, G. (ed.) (2006), *Propertius Elegies Book IV*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ingallina, S.S. (1977), *Orazio e la magia: Sat. 1.8, Epodi 5 e 17*, Einuadi, Palermo.

Ingleheart, J. (2010), *A Commentary on Ovid*, Tristia, *Book 2*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Jacobson, H. (1974), *Ovid's Heroides*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

James, S.L. (2003), *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Janan, M. (2001), *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Janka, M. (1997), *Ovid* Ars Amatoria *Buch 2: Kommentar*, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg.

Janowitz, N. (2001), *Magic in the Roman World: Pagans, Jews and Christians*, Religion in the First Christian Centuries, Routledge, London and New York.

Johnston, S.I. (1995), "The Song of the Iynx: Magic and Rhetoric in Pythian 4", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 125, pp. 177-206.

Johnston, S.I. (1999), *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Johnston, S.I. (2001), "Charming Children: The Use of the Child in Ancient Divination", *Arethusa*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 97-117.

Johnston, S.I. (2002), "Sacrifice in the Greek Magical Papyri", in Mirecki, P. and Meyer, M. (eds.) (2002), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 141, Brill, Leiden, pp. 344-358.

Johnston, S.I. (2005), "Delphi and the Dead", in Johnston, S.I. and Struck, P.T. (eds.) (2005), *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 155, Brill, Leiden, pp. 283-306.

Johnson, T.S. (1997), "Sympotica Horatiana: Problems of Artistic Integrity", *Philologus* 141.2, pp. 321-337.

Johnson, T.S. (2012), *Horace's Iambic Criticism: Casting Blame (Iambikē Poiēsis)*, Mnemosyne Supplement Vol. 334, Brill, Leiden.

Jolivet, J-C. (2001), *Allusion et fiction épistolaire dans les Héroïdes : recherches sur l'intertextualité ovidienne*, Collection de l'École française de Rome, École française de Rome, Rome.

Jones, A.H.M. (1955), "L. Volcacius Tullus, Proconsul of Asia", *The Classical Review*, New Series, Vol. 5, No. 3/4, pp. 244-245.

Jones, D. (1997), *Enjoinder and Argument in Ovid's* Remedia Amoris, Franz Steiner, Stuttgart.

Jordan, D.R. (1985), "Defixiones from a Well Near the Southwest Corner of the Athenian Agora", *Hesperia*, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 205-255.

Jordan, D.R. (1994), "Inscribed Lead Tablets from the Games in the Sanctuary of Poseidon", *Hesperia*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 111-126.

Jordan, D.R. (2003), "*Remedium Amoris*, a Curse from Cumae", *Mnemosyne*, Fouth Series, Vol. 65, Fasc. 6, pp. 666-679.

Jouteur, I. (2009), "Une lettre dans les coulisses de la tragédie (*Hér.* XII)", in Jouteur, I. (ed.) (2009), *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne : 17-18 Novembre 2008, Poitiers*, de Boccard, Paris, pp. 67-88.

Katz, J.T. and Volk, K. (2006), "Erotic Hardening and Softening in Vergil's Eighth *Eclogue*", *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 169-174.

Keissling, A. (ed.), Heinze, R. (rev.) (7th ed.) (1930), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Erster Teil: Oden und Epoden*, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin.

Keith, A.M. (1994), "Corpus Eroticum: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac Puellae in Ovid's "Amores"", *The Classical World*, Vol. 88, No. 1, pp. 27-40.

Keith, A.M. (1999), "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 52, Fasc. 1, pp. 41-62.

Keith, A.M. (2008), *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*, Classical Literature and Society, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London.

Keller, O. (ed.) (1902), *Pseudacronis: Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora. Vol. I: Schol.* AV *in Carmina et Epodos*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.

Kennedy, D.F. (1984), "The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid's Heroides", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 413-422.

Kennedy, D.F. (1993), *The Arts of Love: Five studies in the discourse of Roman love elegy*, Roman literature and its contexts, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kennedy, D.F. (2002), "Epistolarity: the *Heroides*", in Hardie, P. (ed.) (2002), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 217-232.

Kenney, E.J. (1958), "Nequitiae Poeta", in Herescu, N.I. (ed.) (1958), *Ovidiana: recherches sur Ovide publiée sur l'occasion du bimilléniaire de la naissance du poète*, «Les Belles Lettres», Paris, pp. 201-209.

Kenney, E.J. (1983), "Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 44-59.

Kenney, E.J. (ed.) (1994) (2nd ed.), *Ovid: Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Kidd, D.A. (1979), "Propertius Consults His Astrologer", *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 169-180.

King, J.K. (1976), "Propertius' Programmatic Poetry and the Unity of the *Monobiblos*", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. 108-124.

King, J.K. (1980), "The Two Galluses of Propertius' Monobiblos", *Philologus*, 124.2, pp. 212-230.

Kirfel, E.-A. (1969), *Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroides Ovids*, Noctes Romanae, 11. Bd., Forschungen über die Kultur der Antike, Paul Haupt, Bern and Stuttgart.

Knight, V. (1991), "Apollonius, *Argonautica* 4.167-70 and Euripides' *Medea*", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 248-250.

Knoche, U. (1975), *Roman Satire*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and London.

Knox, P.E. (1986), "Ovid's *Medea* and the Authenticity of *Heroides* 12", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 90, pp. 207-223.

Knox, P.E. (ed.) (1995), *Ovid: Heroides Select Epistles*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Knox, P.E. (2005), "Milestones in the Career of Tibullus", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 204-216.

Koenen, L. (1976) "Egyptian Influence in Tibullus", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 1, pp. 127-159.

Korzeniewski, D. (1964), "Ovids elegisches Proömium", *Hermes*, 92 Bd., H. 2, pp. 182-213.

Kovacs, D. (1993), "Zeus in Euripides' *Medea*", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 114, No. 1, pp. 45-70.

Kovacs, D. (ed.) (tr.) (1994), *Euripides: Cyclops, Alcestis, Medea*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Kratins, O. (1963), "The Pretended Witch: A Reading of Ovid's *Amores*, I. vii", *Philological Quarterly* Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 151-158.

Küppers, E. (1981), "Ovids 'Ars amatoria' und 'Remedia amoris' als Lehrdichtungen", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.31.4, pp. 2507-2551.

Laigneau, S. (2000), "Ovide, *Amores* I,6: un *paraclausithyron* très ovidien", *Latomus*, T. 52, Fasc. 2, pp. 317-326.

Laird, A. (1993), "Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 83, pp. 18-30.

Lambert, M. (2003), "Tibullus 1.7: A Question of Tact?", in Basson, A.F. and Dominik, W.J. (eds.) (2003), *Literature, Art, History: Studies on Classical Antiquity and Tradition in Honour of W.J. Henderson*, Peter Lang, Berlin, pp. 47-60.

Landolfi, L. (2000), Scribentis imago: *eroine ovidiane e lamento epistolare*, Pàtron Editore, Bologna.

La Penna, A. (1977), *L'integrazione difficile: un profile di Properzio*, Giulio Einaudi, Torino.

Latte, K. (1960), *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, C.H. Beck, München.

Lawall, G. (1961), "Simaetha's Incantation: Structure and Imagery", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 92, pp. 283-294.

Lawall, G. (1967), *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book*, The Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington D.C., and Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Leach, E.W. (1964), "Georgic Imagery in the *Ars amatoria*", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 95, pp. 142-154.

Leach, E.W. (1966) "Propertius 1.17: The Experimental Voyage", *Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. 19, pp. 211-232.

Leach, E.W. (1978), "Vergil, Horace, Tibullus: Three Collections of Ten", *Ramus*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 79-105.

Leach, E.W. (1980), "Poetics and Poetic Design in Tibullus' First Elegiac Book", *Arethusa*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 79-96.

Leary, T.J. (1988), "Three observations on Ovid's *Medicamina* (13-14, 63-4, 87-8)", *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 25-26.

Leary, T.J. (1988), "*Medicamina* recalled", *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, Vol. 13, No. 9/10, pp. 140-142.

Leary, T.J (1990), "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, Vol. 15, No. 10, pp. 152-155.

Lee, G. (1990) (3rd ed.), *Tibullus: Elegies*, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds.

Lee-Stecum, P. (1998), *Powerplay in Tibullus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lee-Stecum, P. (2000), "Poet/Reader, Authority Deferred: Re-Reading Tibullan Elegy", *Arethusa*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 177-215.

Lefèvre, E. (1966), *Propertius Ludibundus*, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg.

Leigh, M. (1997), "Ovid, Heroides 6.1-2", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 605-607.

Leo, F. (1960), "De Horatio et Archilocho", in Fraenkel, E. (ed.) (1960), *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* II, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma, pp. 139-157.

Levi, P. (1966), "The Dedication to Pollio in Virgil's Eighth Eclogue", *Hermes*, Vol. 94, No. 1, pp. 73-79.

Levin, D.N. (1969), "Propertius, Catullus, and Three Kinds of Ambiguous Expression", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 100, pp. 221-235.

Levin, D.N. (1971), *Apollonius' Argonautica Re-Examined I: The Neglected First and Second Books*, Brill, Leiden.

Levin, D.N. (1975), "Hellenistic Echoes in Propertius' First Elegy", *Grazer Beiträge*, 8 Bd., pp. 215-221.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1967), "The Sorcerer and his Magic", in Middleton, J. (ed.) (1967), *Magic, Witchcraft, and Curing*, American Museum Sourcebooks in Anthropology, The American Museum of Natural History, The Natural History Press, Garden City, New York, pp. 23-41.

Liebescheutz, J.H.W.G. (1979), *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

LiDonnici, L.R. (2002), "Beans, Fleawort, and the Blood of a Hamadryas Baboon: Recipe Ingredients in Greco-Roman Magical Materials", in Mirecki, P. and Meyer, M. (eds.) (2002), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 141, Brill, Leiden, pp. 359-377.

Lilja, S. (1965), *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, Helsinki.

Lindheim, S.H. (2003), *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's* Heroides, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin.

Lindo, L.I. (1969), "Horace's Seventeenth Epode", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 176-177.

Lively, G. (2012), "Narratology in Roman Elegy", in Gold, B.K. (ed.) (2012), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England, pp. 410-425.

Livrea, E. (ed.) (1973), *Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon Liber Quartus: Introduzione, Testo Critico, Traduzione e Commento*, Biblioteca di Studi Superiori LX, «La Nuova Italia» Editrice, Firenze.

Lorch, L. (1982), "Human Time and the Magic of the *Carmen*: Metamorphosis as an Element of Rhetoric in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 262-273.

Lowe, D. (2010), "The Symbolic Value of Grafting in Ancient Rome", *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 140, No. 2, pp. 461-488.

Lowrie, M. (1997), *Horace's Narrative* Odes, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lowrie, M. (2009a), *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lowrie, M. (ed.) (2009b), *Horace:* Odes *and* Epodes, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Luck, G. (1955), "Das Acanthisgedicht des Properz", *Hermes*, Vol. 83, No. 4, pp. 428-438.

Luck, G. (1959), *The Latin Love Elegy*, Metheun & Co. Ltd., London.

Luck, G. (1962), *Hexen und Zauberei in der römischen Dichtung*, Artemis, Zürich.

Luck, G. (1976), "An Interpretation of Horace's Eleventh Epode", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol.1, pp. 122-126.

Luck, G. (1985), *Arcana Mundi: Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Luck, G. (1999), "Witches and Sorcerers in Classical Literature", in Ankarloo, B. and Clark, S. (eds.) (1999), *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe Volume 2: Ancient Greece and Rome*, The Athlone Press, London, pp. 91-158.

Luther, A. (2003), "Ein *Terminus ante quem* für die *Monobiblos*" des Properz", *Latomus*, T. 62, Fasc. 4, pp. 801-806.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1970), "Propertius and Cynthia: Elegy 1. 3", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 16, pp. 60-78.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1974), "Propertius I 5", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 27, Fasc. 3, pp. 262-269.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1979), "Servitium Amoris", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 117-130.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1980), *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1998a), "Love and Death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius, and Others", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 200-212.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1998b), "Propertius and Tibullus: Early Exchanges", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 519-544.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1998c), "Introductory Poems in Propertius: 1.1 and 2.12", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 44, pp. 158-181.

Lyons, D. (1998), "Witchcraft, Gender, Power and Intimate Relations in Mura Compounds in Dela, Northern Cameroon", *World Archaeology*, Vol. 29, No. 3, Intimate Relations, pp. 344-362.

MacBain, B. (1982), *Prodigy and expiation: a study in religion and politics in Republican Rome*, Collection Latomus Volume 177, Bruxelles.

MacDonald, J. (2005), "Structure and Allusion in *Idyll* 2 and *Eclogue* 8", *Vergilius (1959-)*, Vol. 51, pp. 12-31.

Macleod, C.W. (1976), "Propertius 4.1", in Cairns, F. (ed.) (1977), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar First Volume*, ARCA 2, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Liverpool, pp. 141-153.

Mader, G. (1993), "Architecture, *Aemulatio* and Elegiac Self-Definition in Propertius 3.2", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 88, No. 4, pp. 321-340.

Malinowski, B. (1954), *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays, with an Introduction by Robert Redfield*, Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company Inc., Garden City, New York.

Maltby, R. (ed.) (2002), *Tibullus: Elegies, Text, Introduction and Commentary*, ARCA 41 Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Cambridge.

Maltby, R. (2004), "The wheel of Fortune, Nemesis and the central Poems of Tibullus I and II", in Kyriakidis, S., and De Martino, F. (eds.) (2004), *Middles in Latin Poetry*, Levante, Bari, pp. 103-121.

Mankin, D. (1988), "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue: A Reconsideration", *Hermes*, Vol. 116, No. 1, pp. 63-76.

Mankin, D. (ed.) (1995), *Horace: Epodes*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mankin, D. (2010), "The *Epodes*: Genre, Themes, and Arrangement", in Davis, G. (ed.) (2010), *A Companion to Horace*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England, pp. 93-104.

Manning, C.E. (1970), "Canidia in the *Epodes* of Horace", *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 393-401.

Marcellino, R. (1955), "Propertius and Horace: *Quis multa gracilis*", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 7, pp. 321-325.

Marioni, G.D. (1981), "La potenza magica della poesia d'amore", *Atene e Roma*, 26, pp. 26-35.

Marr, J.L. (1970), "Notes on Propertius 4.1 and 4.4", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 160-173.

Marshall, A.J. (1976), "Library Resources and Creative Writing at Rome", *Phoenix*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 252-264.

Martinez, D. (1995), "'May She Neither Eat Nor Drink': Love Magic and Vows of Abstinence", in Meyer, M. and Mirecki, P. (eds.) (1995), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 129, Brill, Leiden, pp. 335-359.

Martirosova, Z. (1999), "Eclogue and Elegy: Intertextual and Intergeneric Dialogue between Vergil's *Eclogues* and Roman Love Elegy", PhD Diss., Columbia University, New York.

Marwick, M.G. (1967), "The Sociology of Sorcery in a Central African Tribe", in Middleton, J. (ed.) (1967), *Magic, Witchcraft, and Curing*, American Museum Sourcebooks in Anthropology, The American Museum of Natural History, The Natural History Press, Garden City, New York, pp. 101-126.

Mauss, M. (1972), *A General Theory of Magic*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

Mayer, R. (1983), "Missing Persons in the Eclogues", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*, Vol. 30, pp. 17-30.

McCarthy, K. (2010), "Lost and Found Voices: Propertius 3.6", *Helios*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 153-186.

McCracken, G. (1932), "Tibullus, Messalla, and the via Latina", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol, 53, No. 4, pp. 344-352.

McGann, M.J. (1983), "The Marathus Elegies of Tibullus", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.30.3, pp. 1976-1999.

McKeown, J.C. (1987), *Ovid. Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume 1: Text and Prolegomena*, ARCA 20, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Liverpool.

McKeown, J.C. (1989), *Ovid. Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume 2: A Commentary on Book One*, ARCA 22, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds.

McKeown, J.C. (1998), *Ovid. Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume 3: A Commentary on Book Two*, ARCA 36, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds.

McNamee, K. (1993), "Propertius, Poetry, and Love", in DeForest, M. (ed.) (1993), *Women's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*, Bolchazy-Carducci, Wauconda, Illinois, pp. 215-248.

Michalopoulos, A.N. (2004), "Fighting Against A Witch: The Importance Of Magic in Hypsipyle's Letter To Jason (Ov., *Her*. 6)", *MHNH*, No. 4, pp. 95-122.

Michels, A.K. (1955), "Death and Two Poets", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 86, pp. 160-179.

Middleton, J. and Winter, E.H. (1963), "Introduction", in Middleton, J. and Winter, E.H. (eds.) (1963), *Witchcraft and Sorcery in East Africa*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London, pp. 1-26.

Miles, G.B. (1975), "'Georgics' 3.209-294: 'Amor' and Civilization", *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 8, pp. 177-197.

Miles, G.B. (1980), *Virgil's* Georgics: *A New Interpretation*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Miller, J.F. (1983), "Propertius 3.2 and Horace", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 113, pp. 289-299.

Miller, J.F. (1997), "Lucretian Moments in Ovidian Elegy", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 92, No. 4, pp. 384-398.

Miller, P.A. (1999), "The Tibullan Dream Text", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 129, pp. 181-224.

Miller, P.A. (ed.) (2002), *Roman Erotic Elegy: An Anthology and Reader*, Routledge, London and New York.

Miller, P.A. (2004), *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Milnor, K. (2005), *Gender, Domesticity and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Moreau, A. (2000), "Petit guide à l'usage des apprentis sorciers", in Moreau, A. and Turpin, J.-C. (eds.) (2000), *La Magie: Actes du colloque international de Montpellier 25-27 mars 1999. Tome I: du monde babylonien au monde hellénistique*, Séminaire d'étude des mentalités antiques, Publications de la recherce Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier III, pp. 5-37.

Morgan, K. (1977), *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the Amores*, Mnemosyne Supplement Vol. 47, Brill, Leiden.

Mori, A. (2007), "Acts of Persuasion in Hellenistic Epic: Honey-Sweet Words in Apollonius", in Worthington, I. (ed.) (2007), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford, England, pp. 458-472.

Mosci Sassi, M.G. (2002), "Ipsipile e Medea: Due eroine fra elegia, dramma ed epica (Ovidio, Epist. 6 e 12)", *Res publica litterarum*, n.s. 5, pp. 116-124.

Muecke, F. (1993), *Horace:* Satires *II*, Aris & Phillips Ltd., Warminster, England.

Murgatroyd, P. (1975), "Horace, *Odes* II 9", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 28, Fasc. 1, pp. 69-71.

Murgatroyd, P. (1977), "Tibullus and the *Puer Delicatus*", *Acta Classica*, Vol. 20, pp. 105-119.

Murgatroyd, P. (ed.) (1980), *Tibullus I: A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, The University of Natal Press, Pietermaritzburg.

Murgatroyd, P. (1981), "*Seruitium amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus*, T. 40, Fasc. 3, pp. 589-606.

Murgatroyd, P. (ed.) (1994), *Tibullus:* Elegies *II*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Murgatroyd, P. (1995), "The Sea of Love", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 9-25.

Murgia, C.E. (1986), "Influence of Ovid's *Remedia amoris* on *Ars amatoria* 3 and *Amores* 3", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp. 203-220.

Murgia, C.E. (1989), "Propertius 4.1.87-88 and the Division of 4.1", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 92, pp. 257-272.

Murgia, C.E. (2000), "The Division of Propertius 2", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 45, pp. 147-242.

Murray, A.T. (ed.) (tr.) (1919a), *Homer: The Odyssey in Two Volumes, Vol. I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and William Heinemann Ltd., London.

Murray, A.T. (ed.) (tr.) (1919b), *Homer: The Odyssey in Two Volumes, Vol. 2*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and William Heinemann Ltd., London.

Murray, A.T. (ed.) (tr.) (1921), *Homer: The Iliad Volume I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and William Heinemann Ltd., London.

Murray, A.T. (ed.) (tr.) (1925), *Homer: The Iliad Volume II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and William Heinemann Ltd., London.

Musurillo, H. (1955), "Horace's Journey to Brundisium: Fact or Fiction?", *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 48, No. 12, pp. 159-162.

Musurillo, H. (1967), "The Theme of Time as a Poetic Device in the Elegies of Tibullus", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 98, pp. 253-268.

Musurillo, H. (1970), "*Furtivus Amor*: The Structure of Tibullus 1.5", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 101, pp. 387-399.

Mutschler, F.-H. (1985), *Die poetische Kunst Tibulls: Struktur und Bedeutung der Bücher 1 und 2 des Corpus Tibullianum*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie, Bd. 18, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Myerowitz, M. (1985), *Ovid's Games of Love*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, Michigan.

Myers, K.S. (1996), "The Poet and the Procuress: The *Lena* in Latin Love Elegy", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 86, pp. 1-21.

Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1990), *Virgil: Georgics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ndiaye, S. (2000), "Minime Romano sacro, à propos des sacrifices humains à Rome à l'époque républicaine", *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 119-128.

Nethercut, W.R. (1970), "The Ironic Priest", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 91, No. 4, pp. 385-407.

Nethercut, W.R. (1976), "Propertius' 'Fallax Opus' (4.1.135)", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 119 Bd., H. 1, pp. 30-38.

Newlands, C.E. (1997), "The Metamorphosis of Ovid's Medea", in Clauss, J.J. and Johnston, S.I. (eds.) (1997), *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 178-208.

Newman, J.K. (1967), *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*, Collection Latomus Volume 89, Bruxelles.

Niehaus, I. (2002), "Perversion of Power: Witchcraft and the Sexuality of Evil in the South African Lowveld", *Journal of Religion in Africa*, Vol. 32, Fasc. 3, Passions of Religion, Witchcraft and Sex, pp. 269-299.

Nikolaidis, A. (1994), "On a Supposed Contradiction in Ovid (*Medicamina Faciei* 818-22 vs. *Ars Amatoria* 3.129-32)", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 115, No. 1, pp. 97-103.

Nikoloutsos, K.P. (2007), "Beyond Sex: The Poetics and Politics of Pederasty in Tibullus 1.4", *Phoenix*, Vol. 61, No. 1/2, pp. 55-82.

Nikoloutsos, K.P. (2011), "The Boy as Metaphor: The Hermeneutics of Homoerotic Desire in Tibullus 1.9", *Helios*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 27-57.

Nisbet, R.G.M. (1984), "Horace's *Epodes* and History", in Woodman, T. and West, D. (eds.) (1984), *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1-18.

Nisbet, R.G.M. (2007), "Horace: Life and Chronology", in Harrison, S. (ed.) (2007), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 7-21.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes *Book 1*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1978), *A Commentary on Horace:* Odes *Book 2*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Nishimura-Jensen, J. (1998), "The Poetics of Aethalides: Silence and *Poikilia* in Apollonius' *Argonautica*", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 456-469.

Nock, A.D. (1972) "The Lizard in Magic and Religion", in Stewart, Z. (ed.) (1972), *A.D. Nock, Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, pp. 270-276.

Novara, A. (2000), "Magie, amour et humour chez Properce", in Moreau, A. and Turpin, J.-C. (eds.) (2000), *La Magie: Actes du colloque international de Montpellier 25-27 mars 1999. Tome III: du monde latin au monde contemporain*, Séminaire d'étude des mentalités antiques, Publications de la recherche Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier III, pp. 15-44.

Ogden, D. (1999), "Binding Spells: Curse Tablets and Voodoo Dolls in the Greek and Roman Worlds", in Ankarloo, B. and Clark, S. (eds.) (1999), *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe Volume 2: Ancient Greece and Rome*, The Athlone Press, London, pp. 1-90.

Ogden, D. (2001), *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Ogden, D. (2009) (2nd ed.), *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ogilvie, R.M. (1962), "The Song of Thyrsis", *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 82, pp. 106-110.

Ogilvie, R.M. (1965), *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1-5*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ogilvie, R.M. (ed.) (1974), *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita Vol. 1: Books 1-5*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ogle, M.B. (1910), "The Laurel in Ancient Religion and Folk-Lore", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 287-311.

Ogle, M.B. (1911), "The House-Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folk-Lore", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 251-271.

O'Hara, J.J. (1996), *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

O'Higgins, D.M. (1997), "Medea as Muse: Pindar's *Pythian* 4", in Clauss, J.J. and Johnston, S.I. (eds.) (1997), *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 103-126.

Oliensis, E. (1991), "Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's Epodes", *Arethusa*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 107-135.

Oliensis, E. (1998), *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Oliver, R.P. (1945), "The First Edition of the *Amores*", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 76, pp. 191-215.

Olson, K. (2009), "Cosmetics in Roman Antiquity: Substance, Remedy, Poison", *The Classical World*, Vol. 102, No. 3, pp. 291-310.

O'Neil, E. (1958), "Cynthia and the Moon", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 1-8.

O'Neill, K. (1998), "Symbolism and Sympathetic Magic in Propertius 4.5", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 94, No. 1, pp. 49-88.

O'Neill, K. (1999), "Ovid and Propertius: Reflexive Annotation in *Amores* 1.8", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 52, Fasc. 3, pp. 286-307.

O'Neill, K. (2000), "Propertius 4.2: Slumming with Vertumnus?", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 121, No. 2, pp. 259-277.

Otis, B. (1965), "Propertius' Single Book", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 70, pp. 1-44.

Page, T.E. (ed.) (1898), *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica*, MacMillan and Co. Ltd., London, and The MacMillan Company, New York.

Palmer, A. (ed.) (1898), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides, with the Greek Translation of Planudes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Papaioannou, S. (2006), "The Poetology of Hairstyling and the Excitement of Hair Loss in Ovid, *Amores* 1, 14", *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, Vol. 83, No. 2, pp. 45-69.

Papaioannou, S. (2008), "Self-Reflections on Elegy Writing, in Two Parts: The Metapoetics of Diptych Elegies in Ovid, *Amores* 1.11 + 12", in Liveley, G. and Salzman-Mitchell, P. (eds.) (2008), *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*, The Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio, pp. 105-122.

Papanghelis, T.D. (1987), *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Papanghelis, T.D. (1999), "Eros Pastoral and Profane: On Love in Virgil's Eclogues", in Morton Braund, S. and Mayer, R. (eds.) (1999), *Amor: Roma, Love and Latin Literature. Eleven Essays (and One Poem) by Former Research Students Presented to E.J. Kenney on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, The Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 44-59.

Parca, M. (1988), "*Tardus Amor* and *Tardus Apollo* in Propertius' Monobiblos", *Latomus*, T. 41, Fasc. 3, pp. 584-588.

Parker, R. (1983), *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Parry, H. (1987), "Circe and the Poets: Theocritus IX. 35-36", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 7-21.

Parry, H. (1988), "Magic and the songstress: Theocritus Idyll 2", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 43-55.

Parry, H. (1992), *Thelxis: Magic and Imagination in Greek Myth and Poetry*, University Press of America Inc., Lanham, New York, and London.

Pasoli, E. (1977), "Poesia d'amore e «metapoesia»: aspetti della modernità di Properzio", in Bigaroni, M. and Santucci, F. (eds.) (1977), *Colloquium Propertianum Assisi, 26-28 marzo 1976: Atti*, Academia Properziana del Subasio, Assisi, pp. 101-121.

Pavlock, B. (1990), *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London.

Payne, M.E. (2007), *Theocritus and the Invention of Fiction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Pease, A.S. (ed.) (1935), *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Perrelli, R. (2006), "*Quis excreat ante fores?* Tib. 1.5; Hor. *epod.* XV; Ov. *trist.* II", *Invigilata Lucernis*, 28, pp. 181-187.

Perutelli, A. (1995), "Chapter 2: *Bucolics*", in Horsfall, N. (ed.) (1995), *A Companion to the study of Virgil*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 27-62.

Petropoulos, J.C.B. (1988), "The Erotic Magical Papyri", in Mandilaras, B.G. (ed.) (1988), *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens, 25-31 May 1986*, Athens, pp. 215-222.

Petropoulos, J.C.B. (1993), "Sappho the Sorceress: Another Look at fr. 1 (LP)", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 97, pp. 43-56.

Petrović, I. (2007), *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olymp: Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*, Brill, Leiden.

Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949), *Callimachus Vol. I: Fragmenta*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Phillips, III, C.R. (1986), "The Sociology of Religious Knowledge in the Roman Empire to A.D. 284", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.16.3, pp. 2677-2773.

Phinney, Jr., E. (1967), "Narrative Unity in the *Argonautica*, the Medea-Jason Romance", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 98, pp. 327-341.

Pichon, R. (1991), *Index verborum amatriorum*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim.

Pincus, M. (2004), "Propertius's Gallus and the Erotics of Influence", *Arethusa*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 165-196.

Pinotti, P. (ed.) (1988), *Publio Ovidio Nasone Remedia Amoris*, Bologna.

Plaza, M. (2006), *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire: Laughing and Lying*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Plessis, F., Lejay, P. and Galletier, E. (eds.) (1966), *Œuvres d'Horace: Odes, Épodes et Chant Séculaire*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim.

Porter, D.H. (1995), "'Quo, Quo Scelesti Ruitis': The Downward Momentum of Horace's 'Epodes'", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 20, pp. 107-130.

Postgate, J.P. (1903a), "Messalla in Aquitania", *The Classical Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 112-117.

Postgate, J.P. (ed.) (1903b), *Selections from Tibullus and Others*, MacMillan and Co. Ltd., London.

Powers, N. (2002), "Magic, Wonder and Scientific Explanation in Apollonius, Argonautica 4.1638-93", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, N.S., Vol. 48, pp. 87-101.

Pralon, D. (2000), "Théocrite, *La magicienne*", in Moreau, A. and Turpin, J.-C. (eds.) (2000), *La Magie: Actes du colloque international de Montpellier 25-27 mars 1999. Tome I: du monde babylonien au monde hellénistique*, Séminaire d'étude des mentalités antiques, Publications de la recherche Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier III, pp. 307- 326.

Preisendanz, K. and Heinrichs, A. (eds.) (1973) (2nd ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri I*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.

Preisendanz, K. and Heinrichs, A. (eds.) (1974) (2nd ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri II*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.

Prince, M.D. (2002), "Magic Love and the Limits of Power: The Figure of Medea in Latin Love Elegy", PhD Diss., Duke University, North Carolina.

Prince, M.D. (2003), "Medea and the Inefficacy of Love Magic: Propertius 1.1 and Tibullus 1.2", *The Classical Bulletin*, Vol. 79, No. 2, pp. 205-218.

Prinz, K. (1914), "Untersuchungen zu Ovids *Remedia amoris*", *Wiener Studien*, 36 Bd., pp. 36-83.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1970), *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1972), "Horace and Tibullus", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 67, No. 2, pp. 81-88.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1973), *Tibullus: A Commentary*, The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

Putnam, M.C.J. (2005), "Virgil and Tibullus 1.1", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 100, No. 2, pp. 123-141.

Quinn, K. (1982), "The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.30.1, pp. 75-180.

Race, W.H. (ed.) (tr.) (1997), *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Race, W.H. (ed.) (tr.) (2008), *Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Reckford, K.J. (1999), "Only a Wet Dream? Hope and Skepticism in Horace, Satire 1.5", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 4, pp. 525-554.

Reeson, J. (2001), *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14: A Commentary*, Mnemosyne Supplement Vol. 221, Brill, Leiden.

Reeve, M.D. (1973), "Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 324-338.

Richardson, Jr., L. (ed.) (1977), *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*, The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

Richlin, A. (1983), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Richlin, A. (1995), "Making Up a Woman: The Face of Roman Gender", in Eilberg-Schwartz, H. and Doniger, W. (eds.) (1995), *Off With Her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, pp. 185-213.

Richlin, A. (2001), "Emotional Work: Lamenting the Roman Dead", in Tylawsky, E. and Weiss, C.G. (eds.) (2001), *Essays in Honor of Gordon Williams: Twenty-Five Years at Yale*, Henry R. Schwab, New Haven, Connecticut, pp. 229-248.

Richter, A. (1967), *Virgile: la huitième bucolique, texte établi, traduit et commenté*, «Les Belles Lettres», Paris.

Rimell, V. (2005), "Facing Facts: Ovid's *Medicamina* through the Looking Glass", in Ancona, R. and Greene, E. (eds.) (2005), *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, pp. 177-205.

Rist, A. (tr.) (1978), *The Poems of Theocritus*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Rives, J.B. (1995), "Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 85, pp. 65-85.

Rives, J.B. (2002), "Magic in the XII Tables Revisited", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 270-290.

Roberts, J.T. (1982), "The Power of Poetry and the Order of Vergil's *Eclogues*", *The Augustan Age*, Vol. 2, pp. 39-47.

Roberts, L. (1977), *A Concordance of Lucretius*, (The Garland Library of Latin Poetry), Garland Publishing Inc., New York and London.

Roman, L. (2006), "A History of Lost Tablets", *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 351-388.

Romano, E. (1980), "*Amores* 1, 8: L'elegia didattica e il genere dell'*Ars Amatoria*", *Orpheus*, Vol. 1, pp. 269-292.

Ronconi, A. (1968), "Malum carmen e malus poeta", in Ronconi, A. (ed.) (1968), *Filologia e linguistica*, Civilita del mondo antico, Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Roma, pp. 127-145.

Rosati, G. (1985), *Ovidio: I cosmetici delle donne*, Marsilio Editori, Venezia.

Rosati, G. (1988), "Il parto maledetto di Medea (Ovidio, Her. 6, 156 s.)", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 20/21, pp. 305-309.

Rosati, G. (1992), "L'elegia al femminile: le Heroides di Ovidio (e altre heroides)", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 29, pp. 71-94.

Rosati, G. (1998) (2nd ed.), *Publio Ovidio Nasone. Lettere di eroine: introduzione, traduzione e note di Gianpiero Rosati*, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, Milano.

Rosati, G. (2006), "The Art of Remedia Amoris: Unlearning to Love?", in Gibson, R., Green, S., and Sharrock, A. (eds.) (2006), *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's* Ars amatoria *and* Remedia amoris, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 143-165.

Rose, H.J. (1955), "On Propertius 2.28.35-38", in de Jonge, P. [et al.] (eds.) (1955), *Ut Pictura Poesis: Studia Latina P.J. Enk Septuagenario Oblata*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 167-173.

Rosen, R.M. and Farrell, J. (1986), "Acontius, Milanion, and Gallus: Vergil, *Ecl*. 10.52-61", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 116, pp. 241-254.

Rosner-Siegel, J.A. (1982), "*Amor*, Metamorphosis and Magic: Ovid's Medea (*MET.* 7.1-424)", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 231-243.

Ross, Jr., D.O. (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ross, Jr., D.O. (1987), *Virgil's Elements: Physics and Poetry in the* Georgics, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Rothstein, M. (ed.) (1966) (3rd ed.), *Propertius Sextus Elegien Erster Teil: Erstes und zweites Buch*, Weidmann, Dublin and Zürich.

Rotstein, A. (2010), *The Idea of Iambos*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Rudd, N. (1966), *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sabot, A.-F. (1976), *Ovide poète de l'amour dans ses œuvres de jeunesse: Amores, Heroïdes, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, De Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, Ophrys, Paris.

Saiko, M. (2005), *Cura dabit faciem. Kosmetik im Altertum. Literarische, kulturhistoriche und medizinishe Aspekte*, Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium Bd. 66, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, Trier.

Sallmann, K. (1995), "Poesie und Magie: Vergils 8. Eklogue", *Ziva Antika = Antiquité vivante*, Vol. 45, Parts 1-2, pp. 287-302.

Sandbach, F.H. (1962), "Some Problems in Propertius", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 263-276.

Santirocco, M.S. (1986), *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Scarborough, J. (1991), "The Pharmacology of Sacred Plants, Herbs, and Roots", in Faraone, C.A. and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 138-174.

Scheid, J. (1975), *Les frères arvales: recrutement et origine sociale sous les empereurs julio-claudiens*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Scheid, J. and Svenbro, J. (1996), *The Craft of Zeus: Myths of Weaving and Fabric*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Schiesaro, A. (2002), "Ovid and the professional discourses of scholarship, religion, rhetoric", in Hardie, P. (ed.) (2002), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 62-76.

Schmidt, E.A. (1990), *Notwehrdichtung: Moderne Jambik von Chénier bis Borchardt (mit einer Skizze zur antiken Jambik)*, Wilhelm Fink, München.

Schmitthenner, W. (1962), "Augustus' spanishcher Feldzug und der Kampf um den Prinzipat", *Historia*, Bd. 11, H. 1, pp. 29-85.

Scibilia, A. (2002), "Supernatural Assistance in the Greek Magical Papyri: The Figure of the *Parhedros*", in Bremmer, J.N. and Veenstra, J.R. (eds.) (2002), *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, Groningen Studies in Cultural Change Volume 1, Peeters, Leuven, pp. 71-86.

Scullard, H.H. (1981), *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, Thames & Hudson, London.

Sedley, D. (1998), *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Segal, C. (1968), "Circean Temptations: Homer, Vergil, Ovid", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 99, pp. 419-442.

Segal, C. (1981a), "'Since Daphnis Dies': The Meaning of Theocritus' First Idyll", in Segal, C. (1981), *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 25-46.

Segal, C. (1981b), "Adonis and Aphrodite: Theocritus Idyll III. 48", in Segal, C. (1981), *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 66-72.

Segal, C. (1981c), "Simaetha and the Iynx (Theocritus, Idyll II)", in Segal, C. (1981), *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 73-84.

Segal, C. (1984), "Underreading and Intertextuality: Sappho, Simaetha and Odysseus in Theocritus' Second *Idyll*", *Arethusa*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 201-209.

Segal, C. (1985), "Space, Time, and Imagination in Theocritus' Second 'Idyll'", *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 103-119.

Segal, C. (1987), "Alphseiboeus' Song and Simaetha's Magic: Virgil's Eighth Eclogue and Theocritus' Second Idyll", *Grazer Beiträge*, 14 Bd., pp. 167-185.

Segal, C. (1989), *Orpheus: The Myth of the Poet*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Segal, C. (2002), "Black and White Magic in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Passion, Love, and Art", *Arion*, Third Series, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 1-34.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1949), "Propertiana", *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 1/2, pp. 22-29.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1967), *Propertiana*, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam.

Sharrock, A. (1987), "*Ars Amatoria* 2.123-42: Another Homeric Scene in Ovid", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 40, Fasc. 3/4, pp. 406-412.

Sharrock, A. (1991), "Womanufacture", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 81, pp. 36-49.

Sharrock, A. (1994), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's* Ars Amatoria II, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Sharrock, A. (1995), "The Drooping Rose: Elegiac Failure in *Amores* 3.7", *Ramus*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 152-180.

Sharrock, A. (2000), "Constructing Characters in Propertius", *Arethusa*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 263-284.

Sharrock, A. (2002), "Ovid and the discourses of love: the amatory works", in Hardie, P. (ed.) (2002), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 150-162.

Sharrock, A. (2006), "Love in Parentheses: Digression and Narrative Hierarchy in Ovid's Erotodidactic Poems", in Gibson, R., Green, S., and Sharrock, A. (eds.) (2006), *The Art of Love:*

Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars amatoria *and* Remedia amoris, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 23-39.

Shea, C. (1988), "The Vertumnus Elegy and Propertius Book IV", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 63-71.

Shulman, J. (1981), "*Te Quoque Falle Tamen*: Ovid's Anti-Lucretian Didactics", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 76, No. 3, pp. 242-253.

Sidgwick, A. (ed.) (1890), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera with an introduction and English notes. Volume II: Notes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Slatkin, L.M. (1991), *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Smith, K.F. (ed.) (1978) (rev.), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus: The Corpus Tibullianum*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.

Smith, P.L. (1965), "*Lentus in Umbra*: A Symbolic Pattern in Vergil's *Eclogues*", *Phoenix*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 298-304.

Smyth, W.R. (1949), "Interpretationes Propertianae", *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3/4, pp. 118-125.

Snyder, J.M. (1981), "The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 76, No. 3, pp. 193-196.

Solmsen, F. (1962), "Tibullus as an Augustan Poet", *Hermes*, 90. Bd., H. 3, pp. 295-325.

Solmsen, F. (1975), "Catullus' Artistry in c. 68: A pre-Augustan „subjective" Love-Elegy", in Lefèvre, E. (ed.) (1975), *Monumentum Chiloniense: Studien zur augusteischen Zeit: Kieler Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 70. Geburtstag*, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam, pp. 260-276.

Solodow, J.B. (1977), "*Poeta Impotens*: The Last Three Eclogues", *Latomus*, T. 36, Fasc. 3, pp. 757-771.

Spelman, C.C. (1999), "Propertius 2.3: the chaos of desire", *Arethusa*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 123-144.

Spentzou, E. (2002), "Stealing Apollo's Lyre: Muses and Poetic *ἄλθα* in Apollonius' *Argonautica* 3", in Spentzou, E. and Fowler, D. (eds.) (2002), *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 93-116.

Spentzou, E. (2003), *Readers and Writers in Ovid's* Heroides: *Transgressions of Genre and Gender*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Spina, L. (1993), "Orazio nell'Ade (Lettura del'epodo XVII)", *Lexis*, 11, pp. 163-188.

Spoth, F. (1992), *Ovids Heroides als Elegien*, C.H. Beck, München.

Stafford, E. (2006), "Tibullus' Nemesis: Divine Retribution and the Poet", in Booth, J. and Maltby, R. (eds.) (2006), *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature*, The Classical Press of Wales, Swansea, pp. 33-48.

Stahl, H-P. (1985), *Propertius: "Love" and "War". Individual and State Under Augustus*, The University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Stapleton, M.L. (1996), *Harmful Eloquence: Ovid's* Amores *from Antiquity to Shakespeare*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Stratton, K.B. (2007), *Naming the Witch: Magic, Ideology, and Stereotype in the Ancient World*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Stroh, W. (1971), *Die Römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam.

Strubbe, J.H.M. (1991), "'Cursed be he that moves my bones'", in Faraone, C.A., and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 33-59.

Suits, T.A. (1969), "The Vertumnus Elegy of Propertius", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 100, pp. 475-486.

Suits, T.A. (1976), "The Iambic Character of Propertius 1.4", *Philologus*, 120.1, pp. 86-91.

Suter, A. (1989), "Ovid, from Image to Narrative: *Amores* 1.8 and 3.6", *The Classical World*, Vol. 83, No. 1, pp. 15-20.

Sutphen, M.C. (1902), "Magic in Theocritus and Vergil", in *Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve*, Baltimore, pp. 315-327.

Syme, R. (1937), "Pollio, Saloninus, and Salonae", *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 39-48.

Syme, R. (1939), *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Syme, R. (1962), "Missing Persons III", *Historia*, Bd. 11, H. 2, pp. 146-155.

Syme, R. (1978), *History in Ovid*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Syme, R. (1984), "History and Language at Rome", in Birley, A.R. (ed.) (1984), *Ronald Syme: Roman Papers III*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 953-961.

Syme, R. (1986), *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Syndikus, H.P. (1972), *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden. Band 1: Erstes und zweites Buch*, Impulse der Forschung 6 Bd., Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.

Syndikus, H.P. (1973), *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden. Band II: Drittes und viertes Buch*, Impulse der Forschung 7 Bd., Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.

Tambiah, S.J. (1985), *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

Tarrant, R.J. (1978), "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 82, pp. 197-199.

Tarrant, R.J. (1981), "The Authenticity of the Letter of Sappho to Phaon (*Heroides XV*)", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 85, pp. 133-153.

Tarrant, R.J. (1995), "Ovid and the Failure of Rhetoric", in Innes, D., Hine, H., and Pelling, C. (eds.) (1995), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 63-74.

Tavenner, E. (1930), "Canidia and Other Witches", in Shipley, F.W. (ed.) (1930), *Papers on Classical Subjects in Memory of John Max Wulfing*, Washington University, St. Louis, pp. 12-37.

Tavenner, E. (1933), "Iynx and Rhombus", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 64, pp. 109-127.

Tavenner, E. (1942), "The Use of Fire in Greek and Roman Love Magic", in *Studies in Honor of Fredrick W. Shipley*, Washington University, St. Louis, pp. 17-37.

Tennant, P.M.W. (1991), "Political or Personal Propaganda: Horace Sermones 1.5 in Perspective", *Acta Classica*, Vol. 34, pp. 51-64.

Thibodeau, P. (2006), "The Addressee of Vergil's Eighth *Eclogue*", *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 618-623.

Thill, A. (1979), *Alter ab illo: recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personnelle a l'époque augustéene*, «Les Belles Lettres», Paris.

Thomas, R.F. (1978), "Ovid's Attempt at Tragedy (*AM.* 3.1.63-64)", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 99, No. 4, pp. 447-450.

Thomas, R.F. (1986), "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 90, pp. 171-198.

Thomas, R.F. (1987), "Prose into Poetry: Tradition and Meaning in Virgil's *Georgics*", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 91, pp. 229-260.

Thomas, R.F. (ed.) (1988a), *Virgil:* Georgics. *Volume 1: Books 1-2*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Thomas, R.F. (ed.) (1988b), *Virgil:* Georgics. *Volume 2: Books 3-4*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Thomas, R.F. (1993), "Callimachus Back in Rome", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) (1993), *Callimachus*, Hellenistica Groningana I, Proceedings of the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry, Egbert Forsten, Groningen, pp. 197-215.

Thomas, R.F. (1996), "Genre Through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil to Propertius", in Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) (1996), *Theocritus*, Hellenistica Groningana II, Proceedings of the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry, Egbert Forsten, Groningen, pp. 227-246.

Thompson, M.W. (1970), "The Date of Horace's First Epode", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 328-334.

Töchterle, K. (1998), "Medea vor dem Drama: Ovid, Heroides 12", *Anregung*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 160-168.

Toohey, P. (1996), *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*, Routledge, London and New York.

Torlone, Z.M. (2002), "From Daphnis to Gallus: the Metamorphosis of Genre in the Eclogues", *New England Classical Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 204-221.

Tupet, A.-M. (1974), "Rites magiques chez Properce (III, 6, 25-30)", *Revue des Études Latine* LII, pp. 250-262.

Tupet, A.-M. (1976), *La Magie Dans La Poésie Latine. Vol. I: Des origines à la fin du règne d'Auguste*, «Les Belles Lettres», Paris.

Turner, V. (1967), *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London.

Ullman, B.L. (1912), "Horace and Tibullus", *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 149-167.

Vallette, P. (ed.) (tr.) (1960) (2nd ed.), *Apulée: Apologie. Florides*, «Les Belles Lettres», Paris.

Valvo, A. (1983), "M. Valerio Messalla Corvino negli studi più recenti", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.30.3, pp. 1663-1680.

Van Rooy, C.A. (1973), "'Imitatio' of Vergil, *Eclogues* in Horace, *Satires*, Book I", *Acta Classica*, Vol. 16, pp. 69-88.

Van Sickle, J. (1978), *The Design of Virgil's* Bucolics, Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri, Rome.

Van Sickle, J. (1981), "*Commentaria in Maronem Commenticia*: A Case History of *Bucolics* Misread", *Arethusa*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 17-34.

Verducci, F. (1985), *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart*: Epistulae Heroidum, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Veremans, J. (1989), "Tibulle II, 4: un paraclausithyron", *Euphrosyne*, Vol. 17, pp. 99-114.

Versnel, H.S. (1970), *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*, Brill, Leiden.

Versnel, H.S. (1991a), "Beyond Cursing: The Appeal to Justice in Judicial Prayers", in Faraone, C.A. and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 60-106.

Versnel, H.S. (1991b), "Some Reflections on the Relationship Magic-Religion", *Numen*, Vol. 38, Fasc. 2, pp. 177-197.

Versnel, H.S. (1998), "καὶ εἴ τι λ[οιπὸν] τῶν μερ[ῶ]ν [ἔσ]ται τοῦ σώματος ὅλ[ο]υ[... (...and any other part of the entire body there may be...): An Essay on Anatomical Curses", in Graf, F. (ed.) (1998), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstag-Symposium für W. Burkert, Castelen bei Basel 15. bis 18. März 1996*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart, pp. 217-267.

Versnel, H.S. (1999), "Κόλασαι τοὺς ἡμᾶς τοιούτους ἡδέως βλέποντες 'Punish those who rejoice in our misery': On curse texts and *Schadenfreude*", in Jordan, D.R., Montgomery, H. and Thomassen, E. (eds.) (1999), *The world of ancient magic: Papers from the first International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 4-8 May 1997*, Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 4, The Norwegian Institute at Athens, Bergen, Norway, pp. 125-162.

Versnel, H.S. (2002), "The Poetics of the Magic Charm: An Essay on the Power of Words", in Mirecki, P. and Meyer, M. (eds.) (2002), *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, Vol. 141, Brill, Leiden, pp. 105-158.

Versnel, H.S. (2003), "Magic", in Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. (eds.) (2003), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed.) (rev.), Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Verstraete, B.C. (2005), "The Originality of Tibullus' Marathus Elegies", in Verstraete, B.C. and Provencal, V. (eds.) (2005), *Same-Sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*, Harrington Park Press, an imprint of The Haworth Press, Inc., pp. 299-313, "Co-published simultaneously as Journal of Homosexuality, Volume 49, Numbers 3/4 2005".

Veyne, P. (1988), *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Vian, F. (ed.) (tr.) and Delage, É. (tr.) (1981), *Apollonios de Rhodes Argonautiques Tome III : Chant IV*, «Les Belles Lettres», Paris.

Vitucci, G. (1986), "Tibullo e Messalla: Un Problema di Cronologia", in Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni del Bimillenario della Morte di Albio Tibullo (ed.) (1986), *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo (Roma-Palestria, 10-13 maggio 1984)*, Centro di Studi Ciceroniani, Roma, pp. 267-273.

Volk, K. (2002), *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Volk, K. (2003), "*Timeo simulacra deorum* (Ovid, *Heroides* 10.95)", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 56, Fasc. 3, pp. 348-353.

Voutiras, E. (1998), ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΥΑΜΟΙ: *Marital Life and Magic in Fourth Century Pella*, J.C. Gieben, Amsterdam.

Walker, S.F. (1980), *Theocritus*, Twayne Publishers, Boston.

Walsh, G.B. (1984), *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Warden, J. (1980), *Fallax opus: Poet and Reader in the Elegies of Propertius*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo, and London.

Watson, L.C. (1991), *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity*, ARCA 26, Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd., Leeds.

Watson, L.C. (1982), "Ovid *Amores* I 6: A Parody of a Hymn?", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 35, Fasc. 1/2, pp. 92-102.

Watson, L.C. (1983), "Problems in Epode 11", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 229-238.

Watson, L.C. (1993), "Horace, *Epode* 5: Theme and Purpose", in Jocelyn, H.D. and Hurt, H. (eds.) (1993), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent, Founder and Editor of Liverpool Classical Monthly, by Some of its Contributors on the Occasion of its 150th Issue*, Issue 3 of Liverpool Classical Papers, Liverpool, pp. 269-282.

Watson, L.C. (ed.) (2003), *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Watson, L.C. (2007), "The Bogus Teacher and His Relevance for Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 150 Bd., H. 3/4, pp. 337-374.

Watson, P.A. (1983), "Ovid and *Cultus*: *Ars Amatoria* 3.113-28", *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)*, Vol. 112, pp. 237-244.

Watson, P.A. (1993), "Stepmothers and *Hippomanes*: *Georgics* 3.282f.", *Latomus*, T. 52, Fasc. 4, pp. 842-847.

Watson, P.A. (2001), "Parody and Subversion in Ovid's *Medicamina faciei feminae*", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 54, Fasc. 4, pp. 457-471.

Watson, P.A. (2002), "*Praeceptor amoris*: Ovid's Didactic Elegy", in Boyd, B.W. (2002), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Brill, Leiden, pp. 141-165.

Webb, R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Ashgate Publishing Ltd., Farnham, Surrey.

Welch, T. (2008), "Horace's Journey Through Arcadia", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 138, pp. 47-74.

Wendel, C. (ed.) (1967), *Scholia in Theocritum Vetera*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.

Whitaker, R. (1983), *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy: A Study in Poetic Technique*, Hypomnemata: Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben, Heft 76, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen.

White, H. (1979), *Studies in Theocritus and Other Hellenistic Poets*, J.C. Gieben, Amsterdam.

White, P. (1993), *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.

White, R.E. (1958), "The Structure of Propertius 2.28: Dramatic Unity", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 89, pp. 254-261.

Wickham, E.C. (ed.) (1896), *The Works of Horace Vol. I: The Odes, Carmen Saeculare, and Epodes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wiggers, N. (1977), "Reconsideration of Propertius II. 1", *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 334-341.

Wilkinson, L.P. (1955), *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Williams, F.J. (1969), "Theocritus, *Idyll* i 81-91", *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 89, pp. 121-123.

Williams, G. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Williams, G. (1972), *Horace, Greece & Rome*, New Surveys in the Classics No. 6, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Williams, G. (1980), *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Williams, M.F. (2000), "Propertius 2.26B, Theocritus' *Idyll* 11, and Epic Poetry", *Scholia*, Vol. 9, pp. 20-42.

Williams, R.D. (ed.) (1996), *Virgil: The Eclogues and Georgics*, Bristol Classical Press, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London.

Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wimmel, W. (1968), *Der frühe Tibull*, Wilhelm Fink, München.

Wimmel, W. (1983), *Tibull und Delia Zweiter Teil: Tibulls Elegie 1, 2*, Hermes Zeitschrift Für Klassische Philologie, Einzelschriften, Heft 47, Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden.

Wimmel, W. (1987), "Zur Rolle magischer Themen in Tibulls Elegie 1.5", *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 13, pp. 231-248.

Winkler, J.J. (1991), "The Constraints of Eros", in Faraone C.A. and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 214-243.

Winsor, E.J. (1963), "A Study in the Sources and Rhetoric of Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* and Ovid's *Heroides*", PhD Diss., Yale University, Connecticut.

Wise, V. (1982), "Ovid's Medea and the Magic of Language", *Ramus*, Vol. 11, pp. 16-25.

Wiseman, T.P. (1985), *Catullus and his World: A Reappraisal*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Woodbury, L. (1967), "Helen and the Palinode", *Phoenix*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 157-176.

Wray, D. (2001), *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wray, D. (2003), "What Poets Do: Tibullus on 'Easy' Hands", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 3, pp. 217-250.

Wright, E.F. (1984), "Profanum Sunt Genus: The Poets of the *Ars Amatoria*", *Philological Quarterly*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 1-15.

Wünsch, R. (ed.) (1897), *Inscriptiones Graecae* Vol. 3, Part 3, *Appendix inscriptionum Atticarum: defixionum tabellae in Attica regione repertae*, in Oikonomides, Al. N. (ed.) (1976), *Inscriptiones Graecae IG* I^2, II/III^2 *Paraleipomena et Addenda: Inscriptiones Atticae Supplementum Inscriptionum Atticarum* Vol. 1, The Scholar's Reference Edition, Ares Publishers Inc., Chicago, pp. 1-250.

Wyke, M. (1987), "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*", *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 77, pp. 47-61.

Wyke, M. (1989a), "Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy", *Helios*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 25-47.

Wyke, M. (1989b), "Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3.1", in Cameron, A. (ed.) (1989), *History as Text*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, pp. 113-143.

Wyke, M. (1994), "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World", in Archer, L.J., Fischler, S., and Wyke, M. (eds.) (1994), *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*, MacMillan, Basingstoke and London, pp. 134-151.

Yardley, J.C. (1972), "Comic Influences in Propertius", *Phoenix*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 134-139.

Yardley, J.C. (1973), "Sick-Visiting in Roman Elegy", *Phoenix*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 283-288.

Yardley, J.C. (1977), "The Roman Elegists, Sick Girls, and the *Soteria*", *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 394-401.

Yardley, J.C. (1978), "The Elegiac Paraclausithyron", *Eranos*, Vol. 76, pp. 19-34.

Yardley, J.C. (1979), "Horace and the Wolf", *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 32, Fasc. 3/4, pp. 333-337.

Yardley, J.C. (1985), "L'influence de la comédie sur Properce", *Annales de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Nice*, 50, pp. 359-366.

Yardley, J.C. (1986), "Propertius 3.6.9: A Weeping Mistress?", *Phoenix*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 198-200.

Zanker, G. (1981), "Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 124. Bd., H. 3/4, pp. 297-311.

Zetzel, J.E.G. (1977), "Review Article: Gallus, Elegy, and Ross", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 72, No. 3, pp. 249-260.

Zetzel, J.E.G. (1983), "Re-Creating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past", *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Canons, pp. 83-105.

Zetzel, J.E.G. (1984), "Servius and Triumviral History in the *Eclogues*", *Classical Philology*, Vol. 79, No. 2, pp. 139-142.

Zetzel, J.E.G. (1996), "Poetic Baldness and Its Cure", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 36, pp. 73-100.

Zetzel, J.E.G. (2002), "Dreaming About Quirinus: Horace's *Satires* and the development of Augustan poetry", in Woodman, T., and Feeney, D. (eds.) (2002), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 38-52.