THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO

OVID

EDITED BY

PHILIP HARDIE

University Reader in Latin Literature
in the University of Cambridge,
and Fellow of New Hall

CONTENTS

Contents

Contents

ILLUSTRATIONS

I

RICHARD TARRANT

Ovid and ancient literary history

Poets are fascinated by literary history, above all by their own place in it. In that respect Ovid is like his Roman predecessors and contemporaries, only more so: his references to other writers, and to his work in relation to theirs, are more numerous than those of any other Roman poet. To a degree this might be expected given the length of Ovid's poetic career – more than forty years, from roughly the mid-20s BC to the late teens of the first century AD – and the variety of poetic forms he cultivated, forms as diverse as love elegy and tragedy, mock-didactic and epic-scale narrative, epistles of mythological heroines and letters from exile.

But Ovid's literary-historical references do more than track the stages of his literary career, as is arguably the case with Horace, his nearest rival in longevity and generic versatility. By comparison Ovid's outlook is both more wide-ranging and more fluid. Whatever the form with which Ovid is engaged, his eye takes in the full sweep of Greco-Roman poetry, and the story he tells about his work is always being rewritten. If 'literary history' connotes a stable record of writers' careers and of their relations to one another, Ovid is an anti-historian, who delights in reshuffling the data and producing constantly new accounts. For Ovid literary history is a species of rhetoric, a way of showing how a thing can be made to look depending on the perspective adopted or the effect desired.

The exact chronology of Ovid's works is beyond recovery, but his career falls into three main periods.[1] The first (mid- to late 20s BC to AD 2) includes his literary debut, the *Amores*, originally published *seriatim* in five books and later[2] reissued in a unified three-book format, the single letters of the *Heroides*, the lost tragedy *Medea*, and the didactic cycle comprising

---

[1] Two lost works cannot be dated: a Latin version of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, which Ovid never mentions and which he may have dismissed as apprentice work, and the intriguing *Liber in malos poetas* referred to by Quintilian *Inst.* 6.3.96.

[2] One traditionally fixed point is that the revised edition of the *Amores* must precede Book 3 of the *Ars amatoria*, since line 343 of that work speaks of 'three books' of *Amores* (*deue tribus libris titulus quos signat AMORVM*, 'of the three books entitled AMORES'); the crucial word

the *Ars amatoria* (published in two stages, Books 1–2 addressed to men and Book 3 to women), the partially preserved work on cosmetics *Medicamina faciei femineae*, and the *Remedia amoris*. The brief second period (AD 2 or somewhat earlier to AD 8) was devoted to two large-scale compositions, the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, and ended abruptly with Augustus' sentence of banishment to Tomis on the Black Sea. The years of exile (AD 8–17 or 18) produced five books of *Tristia*, four books of *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the invective poem *Ibis*, and perhaps the double letters of the *Heroides*.[3]

Belatedness and canonicity

Ovid's political belatedness is well known: born in 43, the year following Julius Caesar's assassination, he was still on the threshold of adulthood in 27, when the title 'Augustus' was conferred on the victor of Actium. The literary consequences of Ovid's birthdate are no less significant. The thirty years preceding his first poetic efforts had been a period of creative energy without parallel in Latin literature. In the 50s Catullus and the other so-called *poetae noui* began an intense engagement with the traditional genres of Greek poetry seen through the filter of Hellenistic poetics, with their stress on erudite allusiveness and exquisite artistry.[4] The results set new standards of refinement in Latin poetry, and with the following generation (represented above all by Virgil and Horace), new levels of poetic ambition. The notion of Roman 'classics' that could stand beside the canonical Greek texts became not only thinkable but real, at least in the eyes of the Roman poets themselves. By the mid-20s distinguished Roman exemplars of Theocritean pastoral, Hesiodic didactic, Archilochean iambic, and Attic tragedy had appeared, and attempts on lyric and Homeric epic were in progress, in Horace's *Odes* and Virgil's *Aeneid*. The period was also marked by generic innovation and cross-fertilization, of which the most vigorous product was a subjective 'love elegy' that combined conventional elements from New Comedy and Hellenistic epigram with the emotional seriousness of Catullus; first given definition as a genre by Cornelius Gallus in the 40s, love elegy was soon taken up by two writers of genius, Tibullus and Propertius, each of whom published a first collection of elegies in the early 20s.

tribus, however, is a manuscript variant in a textually uncertain passage, and is rejected by Kenney (1994).

[3] Ovid's authorship of the double letters has been questioned, but see Kenney (1996) 20–6. Doubts have also been raised about the authorship of some of the single letters, most notably the letters of Sappho (*Her.* 15, see n. 78), Deianira (*Her.* 9), and Medea (*Her.* 12, see n. 21). For still more sweeping scepticism see n. 76.

[4] On this process see Clausen (1987) 1–14.

The excitement of these years for a young poet is vividly conveyed in the mini-autobiography of *Tristia* 4.10. Ovid claims to have revered the established poets of his youth as though they were gods,[5] but the ebullience of his early work suggests that he was exhilarated rather than abashed by the presence of so much poetic talent, and confident of earning a place of honour even in such distinguished company. At this time the concept of a poetic 'place of honour' had been given a newly tangible meaning by Augustus' Temple of Apollo Palatinus, with its twin libraries of Greek and Roman literature. When Horace speaks of Maecenas 'inserting' him among the canonical Greek lyric poets,[6] or when Ovid hopes that his name may 'mingle' with those of his predecessors,[7] the physical imagery operates at a literal as well as a metaphorical level.

I've got a little list

Ovid's characteristic literary-historical gesture is the list. Extended lists of authors appear at *Am.* 1.15.9–30, *Ars* 3.321–48, *Rem.* 361–96, 757–66, *Trist.* 2.359–468, 4.10.43–54, *Pont.* 4.16.5–44, and references to clusters of poets at *Am.* 3.9.21–6, 61–6, 3.15.7–8, *Ars* 3.535–8, *Trist.* 5.1.17–19. In addition, the catalogue of passionate women in *Ars* 1.283–340 and its inverted counterpart in *Rem.* 55–68 function as implicit lists of poets who have treated those legends.[8]

These catalogues of poets have been assimilated to other lists in Ovid's poetry (such as rivers in love or hunting dogs), or even cited to prove his alleged lack of self-restraint.[9] They are more revealing than such judgements suggest. Several appear in the last poem of a book, where a Roman poet usually defines his place within a genre or tradition (*Am.* 1.15, 3.15, *Trist.* 4.10, *Pont.* 4.16). But each of Ovid's concluding poems looks beyond a strictly elegiac framework, and each does so in a different way. *Amores* 1.15 surveys all major genres of Greek and Roman poetry, while 3.15 singles out Catullus and Virgil for bringing fame to Verona and Mantua, as Ovid will to Sulmo; *Tristia* 4.10 recalls the poetic Rome of Ovid's youth, *Ex Ponto* 4.16 that of the years before his exile. Ovid's other literary lists are similarly

---

[5] *Trist.* 4.10.41–2 *temporis illius colui fouique poetas, | quotque aderant uates, rebar adesse deos*, 'I cultivated and courted the poets of that time, and I thought that the bards were so many gods on earth'.

[6] *Odes* 1.1.35 *quod si me lyricis uatibus inseres.*

[7] *Ars* 3.339 *forsitan et nostrum nomen miscebitur istis.*

[8] Ovid is also given to listing his own works: *Am.* 2.18 is the most remarkable example, including a partial table of contents of the single *Heroides*, also *Ars* 3.341–8 (*Ars*, *Amores*, *Heroides*), *Trist.* 2.547–56 (*Fasti*, *Medea*, *Metamorphoses*).

[9] Wilkinson (1955) 73, 'Ovid could rarely refrain from sowing with the sack instead of the hand.'

diverse: the *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris* offer reading lists designed to induce or counteract erotic feelings, and the encyclopedic catalogue of *Tristia* 2 attempts to dilute the scandal of the *Ars* by reviewing all of Greek and Roman poetry *sub specie amoris*.[10]

A closer look at Ovid's earliest canon of poets, in *Amores* 1.15, illustrates the issues raised by these lists. To support the claim that poetry confers lasting fame, Ovid adduces a roll-call of Greek and Roman writers: Homer and Hesiod, Callimachus, Sophocles, Aratus, and Menander on the Greek side, and in Latin Ennius, Accius, Varro of Atax, Lucretius, Virgil, Tibullus, and Gallus. Only Tibullus and Gallus are exponents of love elegy, the genre of the *Amores* itself. The poem thus reflects the breadth of Ovid's poetic horizon rather than his claims for this particular collection.

The closest parallel in previous Latin poetry is the last elegy of Propertius' second book (2.34), a wide-ranging poem that refers to eminent Greek poets in various genres (Homer, Aeschylus, Antimachus, Callimachus and Philetas), pays tribute to Virgil and heralds the completion of the *Aeneid*, and concludes with a Roman poetic genealogy for love elegy (Varro of Atax, Catullus, Calvus, and Gallus), a precursor of the succession of Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid that Ovid himself would make canonical.[11] *Amores* 1.15 integrates the Greek and Roman dimensions of Propertius' poem while introducing a radically different perspective. Propertius evaluates all non-elegiac writers from the vantage point of the love poet, for whom genres such as epic and tragedy represent the poetic 'other'. For Ovid this distinction does not exist, probably because even in the *Amores* he does not fully identify himself as a love poet.

The panoramic scope and triumphal tone of *Amores* 1.15 are also remarkable given the poem's subordinate position. By contrast, 3.15, which concludes the whole collection, is a much slighter poem focusing on Ovid's abandonment of love elegy in favour of tragedy, a move foreshadowed in 2.18 and in the opening poem of Book 3. The choice of tragedy, rather than the usual epic, as the higher form that lures Ovid away from love elegy must be related to the fact that Ovid did compose a tragedy, a *Medea*.[12] The date of the play is not known, but it is plausible that it was written between the appearance of the books of *Amores* in their original form and their republication; if so, the progression toward tragedy seen in the extant *Amores* could be a product of Ovid's revision, designed to update the collection by making it 'predict' the turn taken by Ovid's career in the intervening years. The

---

[10] As nicely put by Conte (1994b) 357.
[11] *Ars* 3.535–8, *Rem.* 763–6, *Trist.* 4.10.53–4, 5.1.17–18, Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.93.
[12] The scepticism of Holzberg (1997b) 15–18 on this point is stimulating but not in my view persuasive.

references in *Amores* 2.18 to the *Heroides* and, perhaps, the *Ars amatoria*[13] would also be part of this process. To speculate further, if 1.15 originally concluded the fifth book of *Amores* by celebrating Ovid's achievement as a love elegist, its less prominent place in the three-book revision reflects the subsequent growth of Ovid's poetic ambitions.

Amores 1.15 thus exemplifies both inclusiveness and fluidity – useful co-ordinates for looking more generally at Ovid's literary-historical outlook.

In omnes ambitiosus

An inclusive approach to poetic composition informs Ovid's treatment of many literary-historical issues, of which the following will be singled out here: the range of traditional poetic forms, the potential of individual genres, and the Greco-Roman literary tradition as a whole.

The *Amores* opens with a version of the Callimachean primal scene, the poet embarking on an epic who is deflected into a less exalted genre by divine intervention. Ovid gives the motif two twists. The god is Amor rather than Apollo, which lightens the mood and foreshadows the erotic nature of the poetry Ovid will be forced to write. There is also no hint that Ovid is unsuited to epic or that epic is an inappropriate choice of genre; in turning Ovid's second hexameter into an elegiac pentameter Amor seems to be playing a mischievous joke rather than directing Ovid to his proper poetic vocation.

The same message is conveyed by Ovid's distinctive impersonation of the lover-poet. In Propertius and Tibullus the lover's professed fidelity to the mistress mirrors the poet's adherence to elegy. Ovid's vaunted susceptibility to other women is the erotic analogue to his generic ambitions; cf., e.g., *Am.* 2.4.47–8 *denique quas tota quisquam probat Vrbe puellas,* | *noster in has omnes <u>ambitiosus</u> amor*. ('there's beauty in Rome to please all tastes, | and mine are all-embracing.')[14] In *Amores* 1.1.14 *ambitiosus* is a reproach addressed by Ovid to Amor, who refuses to remain within his proper sphere; by later applying the word to himself Ovid suggests that he shares Amor's disregard for normal limits.

Sheer generic ambition is a possible motive (indeed perhaps the most credible one) for Ovid's venture into tragedy, the most confining of literary forms and the one most remote from his accustomed subject and mood. The *Medea* was apparently Ovid's only tragedy; one was enough to make

---

[13] The meaning of *artes . . . amoris* in line 19 is disputed; for even-handed discussion see McKeown (1998) 385–6.

[14] Translation from Lee (1968); 'all-embracing' for *ambitiosus* also in Humphries (1957).

the point. The work elicited even Quintilian's grudging admiration,[15] and it and Varius' *Thyestes* were conventionally regarded as the pre-eminent specimens of Roman tragedy.[16] Ovid often dealt with tragic plots and characters in his later work, but usually in ways that transmuted them into a distinctly non-tragic form and ethos.

It was customary, especially after Virgil, for a Roman poet to aspire to a *magnum opus*. In hindsight Ovid could lay claim to three, each generically distinct – *Fasti*, *Medea*, *Metamorphoses*.[17] Other writers, such as Virgil's friend Varius, had written both epic and tragedy, but this constellation of genres was unprecedented, and does not include the other forms of elegy that had established Ovid's reputation.[18]

Each of Ovid's works adopts a comprehensive approach to its subject, and several enlarge more limited treatments of their themes by other writers. The *Amores* depicts the full range of a lover's experience, from infatuation through attempts at disengagement to renunciation – a trajectory more orderly than anything in Propertius or Tibullus, and perhaps made more obviously so in the revised edition. The germ of the *Heroides* is present in an elegy of Propertius (4.3), a letter written by a Roman wife to her husband, a soldier on campaign. Ovid made the letter writers famous women of mythology and turned a single specimen into a multi-faceted collection.[19] The *Ars amatoria* elaborates motifs of erotic instruction found in single elegies of Propertius and Tibullus into an insanely systematic manual, then expands itself by a dialectic of opposition: advice to men in *Ars* 1–2 generates its counterpart addressed to women (*Ars* 3), and the entire *Ars* calls forth its antidote in the *Remedia amoris*. The *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* each projects its theme onto an all-inclusive temporal framework, the Roman sacred calendar and the history of the world. Each also represents a quantum leap in scale compared to earlier treatments, such as the various Hellenistic collections of metamorphosis-stories or the elegies of Propertius' fourth book dealing with Roman rituals. The desire to mine the full potential of a theme also marks the poetry of exile: the eventual total of nine books of *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* dwarfs the elegiac output of Propertius and Tibullus, and in sheer volume creates an exilic counterpart to Ovid's amatory corpus.

Inclusiveness of this kind is Ovid's particular form of novelty: innovation for him consisted less in free invention than in seeing richer possibilities in

[15] *Inst.* 10.1.98. [16] Tac. *Dial.* 12.6. [17] *Trist.* 2.547–62.
[18] Ennius' generic versatility may have been even greater than Ovid's, but by Ovid's time Ennius was known primarily as the epic poet of the *Annales* and secondarily as a writer of tragedy.
[19] Jacobson (1974) 319–48 usefully surveys the literary background to the *Heroides*, but underestimates the importance of Propertius 4.3.

existing material. In fact Ovid applies the rhetoric of invention to his poetry only once, about the *Heroides* (*Ars* 3.346 *ignotum hoc aliis ille nouauit opus* 'this kind of poem, unknown to others, he pioneered'), and even here his originality lay in relocation and elaboration rather than in creation *ex nihilo*.[20]

Ovid has often been seen as occupying a transitional place in Roman literary history, between a 'Golden' and a 'Silver' Age (concepts critically examined by Philip Hardie in the following chapter). This depiction in part arises from another aspect of Ovid's inclusiveness: he is the first and the last Roman poet to combine a broad knowledge of Greek literature with an intimate awareness of the new Latin 'classics'. For later writers such as Seneca and Lucan, Roman and specifically Augustan predecessors – notably Ovid himself – largely replace the Greeks as the models for emulation.

This all-encompassing perspective is visible as early as the *Heroides*: the collection begins with figures from Homer (Penelope (1), Briseis (3)) but also includes well-known characters of Greek tragedy (Phaedra (4), Hypsipyle (6), perhaps Medea (12)),[21] Hellenistic poetry (Phyllis (2)), and the most memorable heroines of Latin poetry to date, Catullus' Ariadne (10) and Virgil's Dido (7). The *Ars amatoria* presents a more complex interplay of genres. Its basic strategy draws the serious associations of didactic poetry into a clash with the situations of erotic elegy, evoking humour at the expense of both. But Homeric epic is also implicated through constant use of the Troy story as a source for erotic example, and Ovid's catalogues of exemplary figures (*Ars* 1.283–340 and *Rem.* 55–68) extend his frame of reference to tragedy, Hellenistic poetry, and its Latin successors, as in Ovid's hilarious treatment (*Ars* 1.289–326) of the Pasiphae of Virgil's sixth *Eclogue*.

The *Metamorphoses* most clearly embodies Ovid's global outlook, sub-suming all major forms of Greek and Latin literature into a unique and transforming synthesis. This range is advertised in the first book, which also shows that the incorporation of earlier literature will offer a counterpoint to the illusion of chronological progress. The poem opens with a Hesiodic theme (creation and the four ages), but defers its closest Homeric encounters to Books 12 and 13, while some of the most modern (i.e. neoteric and elegiac) episodes in their poetic colouring, such as the stories of Apollo and Daphne and Jupiter and Io, are placed immediately after the opening cosmological sequence. In addition, hardly any episode maintains a one-to-one relation

---

[20] Ovid more often highlights internal novelty, signalling a venture that is new or surprising for him, as at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses* (1.1–2) and *Fasti* (2.3–8).

[21] Against Ovid's authorship of *Heroides* 12, Knox (1986a); in favour, Hinds (1993) and Bessone (1997).

with a single poetic form; most fuse elements from several into a novel amalgam. For example, in recounting Polyphemus' courtship of Galatea Ovid engages in dialogue with Theocritean and Virgilian pastoral, love elegy, and Homeric and Virgilian epic.[22]

Ovid's inclusive outlook marks him as a quintessentially Augustan figure. His creative synthesis of diverse traditions has analogies in Augustan architecture, historiography, and political ideology.[23] More piquant are the parallels between Ovid's ambitions and those of Augustus himself. Ovid aspired to hold all available poetic distinctions just as the *princeps* prided himself on adding one civil, military, or religious office after another to his array of titles. Ovid's fondness for lists as a means of documenting his achievements is another trait he shares with the author of the *Res Gestae*.

The same, only different: revising and rewriting

To prove the value of *facundia* (fluency) in attracting women, the *praeceptor* of the *Ars* cites the example of Ulysses, who responded to Calypso's unending desire to hear the story of Troy by relating the same events in ever-changing form (*Ars* 2.128 *ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem*). Alison Sharrock remarks that 'Ovid's comment on Ulysses' rhetorical skills could almost be a programmatic statement of his own',[24] and it is indeed telling that Ovid links Ulysses' traditional mental agility to his skill as a narrator, and locates the narrator's challenge in giving new shape to familiar material.[25]

Rewriting permeates Ovid's poetry and supplies the controlling dynamic for several of his works. Many individual poems of the *Amores* contain ironizing rewritings of elegies of Propertius and Tibullus, and the originality of the collection as a whole consists in the novel slant it gives to well-worn themes.[26] The letters of the *Heroides* offer elegiac takes on canonical, usually non-elegiac, stories, now told from the heroine's perspective. In transforming Propertius 4.3 into the *Heroides*, Ovid characteristically turned pure fiction into retelling: Propertius' Arethusa and Lycotas have no history outside that poem, but each of Ovid's heroines does, and that history is an essential element of her Ovidian *persona*.[27]

---

[22] Farrell (1992).   [23] Galinsky (1999) 107–110.

[24] Sharrock (1994a) 2; Galinsky (1975) 4–5 applied the line to Ovid's procedure in the *Metamorphoses*.

[25] Homer's Odysseus had no fondness for repeating a tale once told, see *Od*. 12.452–3, cited by Sharrock (1987) 407. Sharrock also notes (411) that the scene in the *Ars* reworks material from the *Heroides* (1.31–6), thus exemplifying the Ulyssean technique it describes.

[26] See Morgan (1977), O'Neill (1999), most fully Boyd (1997).

[27] Barchiesi (1993), Hinds (1993); see below, p. 25, on the Dido of *Heroides* 7.

The concept of rewriting is fundamental to the *Metamorphoses*, where every story retells an earlier version or versions. Ovid follows no single pattern in these reworkings. Traditional epic material is in general subverted, usually by being subordinated to erotic motifs, as in Ovid's account of the Calydonian Boar Hunt.[28] But an inverse process of aggrandizing is also present, e.g., where Hellenistic authors had deflated Homeric or Hesiodic material, as with Callimachus' Erysicthon or Theocritus' Cyclops. Ovid's liberal use of internal narrators offers a more subtle means of reshaping earlier narratives, as familiar myths are filtered through the idiosyncratic or self-interested perspective of the storyteller in the poem. So, for example, Calliope's song of the Rape of Proserpina in the singing contest of Book 5 is coloured throughout by its dual function as a *Preislied* and a vindication of the gods.[29]

Three authors have a special place as objects of Ovid's revisionary efforts: Callimachus, Virgil, and himself.

Ingenio non ualet, arte ualet

Propertius had aspired to be the *Romanus Callimachus* (4.1.64). Ovid has a stronger claim to the title, but he would have found it too narrow, and regarded its explicit statement as lacking in sophistication. Ovid's Callimacheanism goes beyond specific imitations to a basic communality of temperament. Ovid shares Callimachus' erudite allusiveness, his fondness for oblique and ironic statement, his innovative treatment of myth, his stylistic versatility, and his acute sensitivity to his status as a poet – though the *persona* Ovid projects is more genial and, at least before his exile, less easily nettled by adverse criticism. Ovid's engagement with Callimachus spans his entire career, from the opening scene of the *Amores* to that bizarre product of exile, the curse-poem *Ibis*, Ovid's most overtly Callimachean (and least-read) work.[30] Even the 'facts' of Ovid's life can have a Callimachean origin: Ovid's statement that he began writing poetry 'when my beard had been cut once or twice' (*Trist*. 4.10.58) echoes a similar self-description in Callimachus.[31]

Callimachus' prominent position in Ovid's literary universe is evident from the canon of *Amores* 1.15, where he appears out of chronological order immediately after Homer and Hesiod. But the following descriptive tag – 'not strong in inspiration, he is strong in technical skill' – shows that Ovid's admiration ended far this side of idolatry. This discriminating view is partly

[28] Horsfall (1979).
[29] The episode is also a prime specimen of Ovid's self-rewriting; see below, p. 29.
[30] The re-evaluation by Williams (1996) may help remedy this long-standing neglect.
[31] McKeown (1987) 74.

the product of chronology. Callimachus' poetics had been bracingly novel for Catullus and his contemporaries, but by the 20s these writers were gone from the scene, along with the resident Greeks such as Parthenius who had initiated them in Alexandrian poetic ways. Callimachean literary values were now conventional, and Ovid's way of maintaining a Callimachean lightness of spirit is to treat them with irony. Consequently Ovid's references to Callimachean catchwords are either offhand[32] or wittily skewed. Callimachus praised the 'slender Muse'; Ovid accordingly shrinks the *Amores* from five to three books and promises that the pain of reading them will now at least be lightened (*leuior*).[33] The hackneyed motif of the poet's divine inspiration is toyed with in the *Amores* and jettisoned in the *Ars*, where the *praeceptor* breezily disavows any guidance from Apollo or the Muses (1.25–30). The claim to be guided by *usus*, experience, might seem provocatively anti-Callimachean but is in fact a ruse, since much of the wisdom dispensed by the *praeceptor* has been gathered from poetry, and even parts of his own erotic history turn out to be reminiscences of the *Amores*.[34]

At a more fundamental level, Ovid's understanding of Callimacheanism was shaped by developments of the previous generation. For Catullus (as apparently for the young Virgil) adherence to Callimachean ideals precluded poetry in larger forms, but the *Aeneid* had shown that a Callimachean poet could write at epic length.[35] The *Metamorphoses* also responds to this challenge, but reconciles the competing claims in an entirely different way, by weaving hundreds of discrete episodes into a thematically and chronologically ordered whole. Ovid's proem implies that the work will be both *perpetuum* ('continuous, unbroken') and *deductum* ('fine-spun'), thereby defining its distinctive quality in terms of Callimachean poetics and their Roman reception.[36]

Ovid's use of Callimachus is in fact most sustained in his longest poems. The *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* draw on the narrative technique of Callimachus' longer poems, the *Aitia* and the *Hecale*, in ways that suit their differing structures: in the *Fasti* the poet adopts the *persona* of a researcher questioning informants, as Callimachus had conversed with the Muses in

[32] For example, *Ars* 2.285 *uigilatum carmen*, evoking the sleeplessness expected of the diligent poet.

[33] *Epigr.* 4 *leuior demptis poena duobus erit*; see McKeown (1989) 2.

[34] See n. 61. Clauss (1989) finds a more complex instance of such irony in an episode of *Metamorphoses* 6 in which the goddess Latona attempts to drink from a pool and is thwarted by a crowd of farmers. The passage teasingly evokes the imagery of water as a symbol of poetic inspiration but refuses to resolve along Callimachean lines.

[35] An aspect of the *Aeneid* highlighted by Clausen (1987).

[36] *Met.* 1.4 *ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen*, 'spin a continuous song down to my own times'. On the Callimachean resonances of the proem see Kenney (1976), Heyworth (1994) 72–6, Wheeler (1999) 8–30.

the *Aitia*,[37] while some of the most intricately nested sections of narrative in the *Metamorphoses* develop Callimachus' procedure in the *Hecale*.[38]

In one respect Ovid is strikingly at odds with both Callimachus and his previous Roman followers: he shows no interest in restricting his work to the attention of a cultivated few. Instead, from the outset Ovid sought the favour of a large public. The frame poems of the *Amores* mention no individual addressee, and in *Amores* 2.1 he envisages his poems being read by lovers of both sexes. In the *Ars*, Ovid has the *praeceptor* address himself to the entire *populus*; similarly, the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses* predicts that Ovid will be ever 'on the lips of the people' (15.878 *ore legar populi*). Here too Ovid is heir to an evolution within Roman Callimacheanism: Roman poets first contracted the scope of their intended readership and then, with the *Aeneid* and Horace's *Odes*, expanded it outward to a potentially national audience.[39] Ovid adopts this post-Virgilian outlook – which might also be called the Augustan outlook in light of Augustus' projection of political-ideological messages to the *populus Romanus* – but applies it to conspicu-ously non-Augustan ends. Ovid's populist view of his audience takes on a new edge in his exile poetry, where he hopes for favour from 'the hands of commoners' (*plebeiae ... manus*, *Trist.* 3.1.82) to offset his official disgrace and exclusion.[40]

Vergilium uidi tantum

'Virgil I only saw.' Ovid's terse disclaimer of personal acquaintance in *Trist.* 4.10.51 belies his lifelong fascination with Virgil's poetry and his even greater fascination with Virgil's place in Roman literary history. Ovid clearly admired Virgil's work; 'il lungo studio e 'l grande amore' is as true of him as it is of Dante. But Virgil's standing also spurred Ovid to an intense form of *aemulatio*, and this rivalry will be the focus of attention here.

In hindsight Virgil's generic ascent from the *Eclogues* through the *Georgics* to the *Aeneid* would seem natural, a sort of literary *cursus honorum*, but to contemporaries like Horace, and to younger poets such as Propertius, the evolution was unpredictable and surprising.[41] By contrast, at the start of his career Ovid could contemplate Virgil's *oeuvre* as a whole – it is no accident that the first word of the *Amores* is *arma* – and could measure his progress against what Virgil had achieved.

Ovid's pre-exilic career can be interpreted as an attempt both to replicate and to surpass Virgil's. Ovid may at first have channelled his own generic

---

[37] Fantham (1998) 11–18.   [38] See Keith (1992a) on *Met.* 2.531–835.
[39] Citroni (1995) 31–56 and 207–69.
[40] Videau-Delibes (1991) 456–9, Citroni (1995) 440–2.   [41] See Thomas (1985).

ascent within an elegiac framework – from *Amores* to *Heroides* to *Ars* and *Remedia*[42] – but the inclusion of didactic surely points to the *Georgics*, and from there the further step to epic would appear natural. When that step was taken is not clear. In the *Remedia* Ovid claims to have done as much for elegy as Virgil had for epic (395–6), and speaks of the further growth of his reputation in elegiac terms;[43] but by then he was almost certainly contemplating what would become the *Metamorphoses*, and may even have begun drafting the poem. Ovid may have stressed his involvement with elegy to heighten the impact of his coming transformation into a writer of epic; also, once the *Metamorphoses* had given Ovid equal standing with Virgil in epic, his contributions to elegy would make him the more widely accomplished of the two. Ovid clearly meant the *Metamorphoses* to be his counterpart to the *Aeneid*, but he could not have foreseen that Augustus would abet his plan by banishing him, allowing Ovid the operatic gesture of burning his unrevised *magnum opus*.

Ovid specifically responds to Virgil's canonical status with a variety of self-assertive manoeuvres. One of these is shameless appropriation of Virgil's language. Virgil was said to have remarked that it is easier to steal Hercules' club than a line of Homer.[44] Ovid stages a series of daring daylight robberies, quoting signature lines of the *Aeneid* in shockingly discordant contexts. The Sibyl's warning to Aeneas about returning from the Underworld, *hoc opus, hic labor est* (*Aen.* 6.129), becomes a statement from the *praeceptor* of the difficulty of sleeping with a woman without giving her presents first (*Ars* 1.453). At least the Sibyl's words are allowed to retain their original meaning; when Ovid speaks of Virgil bringing Aeneas to Dido's bed (*Trist.* 2.534 *contulit in Tyrios arma uirumque toros*), he turns the opening words of the *Aeneid* into an obscene hendiadys.[45] The element of pure cheek in such transgressive quotations is undeniable, but they also show that Virgilian epic language can be redirected to Ovidian erotic ends and that all poetic language is open to reuse by a sufficiently strong reader/writer.[46]

Quotation of a more subtle sort belongs to the Hellenistic cult of learnedness. *Metamorphoses* 13.258 *Alcandrum Haliumque Noemonaque Prytanimque* is identical with *Aeneid* 9.767, which itself translates *Iliad*

[42] See Harrison below, pp. 80–4.
[43] Especially 390 *maius erit* [sc. *nostrum nomen*], *tantum, quo pede coepit, eat*, '[my name] will be greater, if only its feet continue on the path on which it began', with the common play on *pes* (= 'metre').
[44] *Vit. Donat.* 46, Macrob. *Sat.* 5.23.16.
[45] *Arma uirumque* ('arms and a man') = *uirum armatum* ('an armed (i.e., erect) man'); for *arma* in a sexual sense Adams (1982) 19–22, 224.
[46] On Ovid's 'consistent and calculated' adaptation of Virgil's language see Kenney (1973), especially 118–28.

5.678. Homer's line enumerates Lycians killed by Odysseus, transformed by Virgil into victims of Turnus; in Ovid the speaker is Ulysses, who is thus allowed to reclaim his Homeric triumphs.[47] Callimachean erudition and intertextual play are here applied to the Latin Homer.

In defending the *Ars amatoria* to Augustus, Ovid mischievously claimed that no part of the *Aeneid* was as widely read as the story of Dido and Aeneas' 'illicit affair'.[48] Certainly no other book of the *Aeneid* received as much attention from Ovid, and the variety of his responses encapsulates his treatment of Virgilian material.

Heroides 7 (Dido to Aeneas), a pre-suicide letter of some 200 lines, constitutes one of the earliest surviving reactions to the *Aeneid*, and one of the boldest. Ovid revises both Dido's character, making her more loving even at the end, but also more scathing about Aeneas, and also her language, transposing her Virgilian rhetoric into a relentlessly epigrammatic mode, as in her epitaph, *Praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et ensem*, 'Aeneas gave both cause and means of death' (197). The resulting loss of nuance is deliberate, since from the standpoint adopted by Ovid complexity is just a way of excusing Aeneas.

Ovid's Dido may not have read the *Aeneid,* but she displays a clarity about herself that results from her curious position, at once pre-Virgilian (in the fictive moment of her writing) and post-Virgilian (in the experience of Ovid's readers).[49] Recalling Aeneas' narrative of his past, she wryly observes that he had already shown his faithlessness by abandoning Creusa at Troy (83–5). When she reflects on her encounter with Aeneas in the cave, Ovid gives her an awareness of the event's meaning that in Virgil is reserved to the narrator (93–6, cf. *Aen.* 4.169–72), and even allows her to 'correct' the facts as related in the *Aeneid*, if only at the rhetorical level ('I thought it was the nymphs howling' – as Virgil says it was – 'rather the Eumenides were giving the signal for my doom'). Virgil's Dido lamented that she had no 'little Aeneas' to console her for the loss of her lover (*Aen.* 4.327–30); Ovid, ever the realist, knew that certainty on that score was not possible, and has his Dido warn Aeneas that her death could doom his unborn child (133–8). At least once, though, Ovid plays on his character's ignorance of Virgil to pathetic effect, when she predicts that Aeneas will yield 'unless you are more unbending than the oak-trees' (52); a famous simile (*Aen.* 4.441–9) comparing Aeneas to an oak that is battered but stays firm would have shown her the futility of that hope.

---

[47] Hardie (1994) on *Aen.* 9.767, Smith (1997) 47–9.
[48] *Trist.* 2.536 *non legitimo foedere iunctus amor.* Ovid affects a censorious tone that contrasts sharply with his slant in *Heroides* 7 and *Metamorphoses* 14, where Aeneas is depicted as an absconding husband.
[49] Desmond (1993).

In *Metamorphoses* 14, Dido's story is dispatched in a single loaded sentence (78–81): *excipit Aenean illic animoque domoque | non bene discidium Phrygii latura mariti | Sidonis, inque pyra sacri sub imagine facta | incubuit ferro deceptaque decipit omnes*. ('There the Sidonian queen welcomed Aeneas in heart and home, destined ill to bear the parting from her Phrygian husband: on a pyre, built under pretence of holy rites, she fell upon his sword and, herself deceived, deceived all.')[50] Radically abbreviating a story can show deference to an earlier version by implying that it has left nothing more to be said: examples are Medea's murder of her children (*Met.* 7.394–7) and Ariadne's abandonment by Theseus and rescue by Bacchus (*Met.* 8.174–9), which nod respectfully to Euripides and Catullus, and also to Ovid himself (*Medea* and *Heroides* 10). Cumulatively, however, Ovid's reduction of this and other major episodes from the *Aeneid* is hardly respectful, since it implies a set of values in which the public concerns of the *Aeneid* merit only passing mention.

Ovid also asserts his control over Virgil's most famous creation by redistributing language associated with Dido to other parts of his poem. Ovid's Medea fantasizes about Jason as her husband (*coniunx*, *Met.* 7.68), then rebukes herself for cloaking her offence (*culpa*) in fair-seeming terms (*speciosa nomina*); she seems to have learned from Dido's whitewashing of *culpa* as *coniugium* (*Aen.* 4.172) and can catch herself in the same misuse of language.[51] The dying Procris echoes Dido's appeal to Aeneas (*Aen.* 4.314–19) in pleading with her husband Cephalus not to bring his (in fact nonexistent) mistress into their home (*Met.* 7.852–6). Most surprisingly of all, in a transformation so thorough that it has gone unnoticed by commentators, Dido's agonizing death-throes (*Aen.* 4.688–92) are reimagined as Sleep's droll efforts to wake himself up (*Met.* 11.618–21).[52]

Finally, we must take note of Ovid's influence on Virgil, or in less paradoxical terms on our reading of Virgil.[53] Part of the effect of Ovidian rewriting is to alter our response to the work being rewritten. Stephen Hinds has shown how Ovid's handling of the Aeneas legend in the *Metamorphoses* makes us more aware of stories of metamorphosis present in the *Aeneid* but there kept in the background.[54] For me at least, Ovid's distanced account in *Metamorphoses* 10 of Orpheus' descent to the Underworld and his almost

[50] Translation from Hinds (1998) 105.

[51] Readers thus alerted to the Dido parallel may notice the much subtler reworking of the line endings of *Aen.* 4.54–6 (*amore – pudorem – aras*) in *Met.* 7.72–4 (*pudorque – Cupido – aras*); Smith (1997) 101–2.

[52] Dido unexpectedly appears outside the *Metamorphoses* as well: her wish to hear the story of Aeneas' travails again and again (*Aen.* 4.77–9) lies behind Calypso's repeated requests to Ulysses (*Ars* 2.127), on which see above, p. 20. Both passages contain a doubled *iterum*, which in Ovid becomes a way of marking repetition of a motif from an earlier text.

[53] On this aspect of intertextuality see Fowler (2000) 130.

[54] Hinds (1998) 104–22.

matter-of-fact description of the loss of Eurydice can make the emotively charged narrative in the *Georgics* seem overwrought and melodramatic. One might also ask whether by defining himself in opposition to Virgil in matters relating to Augustus Ovid did not help to create the image of Virgil the pure 'Augustan' that much recent criticism has been at pains to complicate.

Self-refashioning

> The friends who have it I do wrong
> When ever I remake a song
> Should know what issue is at stake:
> It is myself that I remake.
>
> (Yeats)

Even in his own lifetime Ovid was criticized for not knowing when to leave well enough alone.[55] This judgement targets the alleged overabundance of Ovid's style, but it can also draw attention to his extraordinary capacity for revising his work. Self-revision is not rare among Greek and Latin poets – Callimachus and Virgil are apposite examples[56] – but Ovid is unusual in the degree and variety of modes with which he pursued it. Ovid acts as his own strong reader, constantly seeing new possibilities in apparently finished work. Such an interest in revising suits a poet who repeatedly dramatized the transformation of his *persona*: elegist into tragedian, lover-poet into *praeceptor amoris*, writer of light elegy into writer of epic and aetiological poetry, and, finally, all of the above into the poet of exile.[57]

Several of Ovid's works are extant in a revised or expanded form: most clearly the *Amores* and the *Fasti,* probably the *Heroides*, possibly the *Ars amatoria*.[58] In his exile poetry Ovid describes the *Metamorphoses* as both unfinished and unrevised, even though the transmitted text, unlike that of the *Aeneid*, gives no clear sign of incompleteness or lack of polish. Ovid may have spoken in this way to heighten the parallel with Virgil, but another factor may have been his reluctance to see any of his works as 'closed'.

Some of this revision is the result of altered circumstances, such as the changes made in the *Fasti* to update the poem after the death of Augustus.[59] In other cases the character of the work itself prompted its extension. Thus the single *Heroides* led naturally to the double letters, and indeed a circumstantial argument for regarding the double letters as genuine is that the step

---

[55] Sen. *Contr.* 9.5.17 (quoting Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus) *nescit quod bene cessit relinquere.*
[56] Zetzel (1983) 101, 105 n. 34.   [57] Holzberg (1997b) 5.
[58] Syme (1978) 13–20 proposed (not to my mind convincingly) a date of 9–6 BC for a first edition of *Ars* 1–2.
[59] Fantham (1998) 1–4, also Feeney (1992) 15–19 on other possible post-exilic revisions.

from single to double letters is such a characteristic step for Ovid to have taken. In a similar way the elaboration of erotic advice from *Ars* 1–2 to *Ars* 3 and then to the *Remedia amoris* reflects the habit of arguing both sides of a case that Ovid absorbed from his training in declamatory rhetoric. Only with the *Amores* does dissatisfaction with the first form of the work seem to have been a cause for revision, and even here other motives may have been more compelling.

At a more specific level, Ovid often recasts his writing by incorporating it into a subsequent work. Recycling of this kind is not the result of flagging inspiration: part of its attraction surely lay in giving existing material a new meaning by placing it in a new context. So, for example, incidents presented in the *Amores* as the lover-poet's own experience become in the *Ars amatoria* the material for lessons in seduction.[60] In one case the *praeceptor* claims to remember (*memini*, *Ars* 2.169) tearing his mistress' hair, as his *Amores* self had done; the use of memory as a trope for literary allusion[61] links two stages in Ovid's evolving *persona*. The Ovid of the *Amores* is recalled in a more complex way in *Metamorphoses* 1.454–65, when Apollo mocks Amor's bowmanship and is punished by being made to fall in love with Daphne. By re-enacting his own earlier transformation by Amor from aspiring epic poet to elegist, Ovid implies that his actual epic will bear an elegiac and erotic rather than a martial stamp.[62]

More extensive self-reworking can be seen in episodes of the *Metamorphoses* (Daedalus and Icarus, Cephalus and Procris) that retell myths narrated in the *Ars Amatoria*. Even where the two versions are close in wording, the later account introduces a shift of focus and/or function. In the *Ars* Minos' failure to thwart Daedalus' winged escape ironically parallels the task of the *praeceptor*,[63] while in *Metamorphoses* 8 Ovid highlights the dynamic of father and son to link the story to other destructive parent-child relationships narrated in that book (Scylla–Nisus, Althaea–Meleager, Erysicthon–daughter).[64] The *Amores* offers the most thoroughgoing instance of reuse of earlier work. The details are necessarily speculative, since the nature and degree of revision will never be known, but it seems beyond doubt that the three-book collection in some way tells a different story from

---

[60] *Am.* 1.4 and *Ars* 565–606, *Am.* 1.7 and *Ars* 2.167–76, *Am.* 3.2 and *Ars* 1.135–62. The *Ars* reworkings are often criticized as inferior, but see Dalzell (1996) 140–44.

[61] See Miller (1993), also Conte (1986) 57–63 on Ovid's Ariadne remembering her Catullan self.

[62] Nicoll (1980).

[63] *Ars* 2.98–9 *non potuit Minos hominis compescere pennas,* | *ipse deum uolucrem detinuisse paro*, 'Minos could not restrain the wings of a man; | I try to hold down the winged god'; cf. Ahern (1989).

[64] The accounts can be distinguished in other ways; see the full discussion in Sharrock (1994a) 87–195.

the original five books, and highly likely that many individual poems, while remaining verbally unchanged, were given a new function in the masterplot by being relocated.[65]

The revision of the *Amores* is atypical in that it condenses and suppresses the earlier form of the work. Elsewhere Ovid proceeds by supplementation: the *Remedia* does not cancel the *Ars*, but sets up an ironic counterpoint to it, in which each work affects how the other is read. So also with the most complex case of intra-Ovidian revision, the reciprocal rewriting of the Rape of Proserpina effected by the different accounts in *Metamorphoses* 5 and *Fasti* 4: though each version is intelligible in isolation, when read against each other (as they were probably written), each makes the emphases and silences of the other more meaningful.[66]

For Ovid all writing entails rewriting; all reading, rereading. In contemporary critical parlance, Ovid recognized the inherently intertextual element of literary meaning.[67] The prominence of rewriting/rereading in Ovid's work also creates another dimension of multiple meaning, since connections between a text and its 'source' texts will be interpreted differently by individual readers. Ovid's poetry has proven so hospitable to postmodernist forms of criticism because Ovid himself was so sensitive to the ambiguities and slippages inherent in all communication between poet and reader.

The view from Tomis

Ovid's exile poetry was long regretted as a dreary epilogue to a brilliant career. Recent criticism has shown how – especially at the outset – Ovid embraced exile as a fresh poetic subject to which he applied all his gifts of invention. The notion that Ovid's years in Tomis are entirely a fiction of the poet, though it cannot be right, itself reveals how thoroughly Ovid transformed the facts of his situation into a new poetic *persona*.[68]

In this last phase all of Ovid's literary-historical preoccupations take on new definition. In particular, exile reactivates the process of self-revision, as Ovid recasts his whole earlier career from this new perspective. The refocusing is signalled by having the first collection of exile poems (*Tristia* 1)

---

[65] See above, pp. 16–17.
[66] The classic study by Heinze (1919) in terms of 'epic' and 'elegiac' narrative modes was given a more nuanced rereading by Hinds (1987).
[67] See Conte (1986) 29, Fowler (2000) ch. 5.
[68] For the idea see Fitton Brown (1985) and the comments of Williams (1994) 3–8. The many references to a vindictive Augustus would have been fatally offensive if Ovid were still in Rome.

meet its 'brothers' in Ovid's library back in Rome.[69] It proceeds with minor-key rewritings of earlier programmatic statements. For example, the *Ars amatoria* opens with an expansive address to the Roman people (*si quis in hoc artem populo non nouit amandi* 'if anyone in this populace does not know the art of loving'), which reappears at the start of the *Tristia* in a tentative and pathetic form (1.1.17–18 *si quis, ut in populo, nostri non immemor illic, si quis, qui, quid agam, forte requirat, erit* 'if anyone there, as can happen in a large populace, has not forgotten me, if anyone should chance to ask what I am doing'). At *Trist.* 5.1.17–19 Ovid reverses his usual claim to be one of the canonical *quadriga* of elegists (19 *utinam numero non nos essemus in isto* 'how I would wish not to be in that company'). The list of Ovid's 'serious' works at *Trist.* 2.547–56 (*Fasti, Medea, Metamorphoses*) replaces the erotic reading list in *Ars* 3.341–8 (*Ars, Amores, Heroides*).[70]

Ovid's most dramatic revision of previous work is directed at the *Metamorphoses*. Sending the opening poem of the *Tristia* to Rome in his stead, Ovid orders a place to be found for himself in the *Metamorphoses* as an instance of good fortune transformed to ill.[71] In *Tristia* 1.7 Ovid provides a new preface introducing the *Metamorphoses* as the work of the exiled poet and begging the reader's pardon for its flaws. But as with Ovidian self-revision in general, this reinterpretation of the *Metamorphoses* does not exclude others: in the same poem (*Trist.* 1.7.15–22) Ovid casts the epic in the role of his *Aeneid*, while at *Trist.* 2.557–62 he speaks of it as though it consisted largely of praise for Augustus and his house.

Ovid can now aspire to new, more rueful, forms of canonicity: he can boast that his misfortunes would fill a whole *Iliad*,[72] rank himself alongside Actaeon and Odysseus among the victims of angry divinities, and claim that his wife surpasses the heroines of legend in virtue and misfortune – thus deserving pride of place in the *Heroides*.[73]

Separation from Rome sharpened Ovid's concern for his place in literary history. 'Place' again functions literally as well as figuratively, since Ovid now fears that all his works, not just the condemned *Ars amatoria*, will be refused admission to Rome's public libraries.[74] It is therefore understandable that the poetry of exile contains Ovid's most extensive literary-historical statements:

---

[69] Hinds (1985) remains basic for this and other exilic reinterpretations of Ovid's earlier poetry.

[70] For other revisions of earlier themes see Galinsky (1969) 102–3 (triumph descriptions), Nagle (1980) 45–70 (erotic diction and motifs), 120–1 (*recusatio*), Claassen (1999) 32–5, 211–14. See also Williams, below, pp. 243–4.

[71] *Trist.* 1.1.117–22.

[72] *Pont.* 2.7.34 *Ilias est fati longa futura mei*. 'An *Iliad* of woes' is proverbial, but Ovid's phrasing dolefully echoes Propertius' boast that his erotic struggles with Cynthia create *longas . . . Iliadas* (2.1.14).

[73] Hinds (1999a) 124–8.   [74] *Trist.* 3.1.65–74, 3.14.1–10, *Pont.* 1.5.5–10.

the exculpatory survey of Greek and Latin poetry in *Tristia* 2, the poetic autobiography of *Tristia* 4.10, and the catalogue of contemporary poets in *Ex Ponto* 4.16. Each passage, in addition to its immediate function, reasserts Ovid's standing in the Roman literary world.

But even as Ovid repeats his claim to poetic recognition, the terms of the claim become significantly more modest. Whether as a form of *captatio misericordiae* or because of a genuinely chastened outlook, the poet who had asserted equality with Homer and Virgil now asks only to be accepted among the poets of his time. In *Trist.* 4.10.125–8 Ovid says that fame was 'not unkind' (*non ... maligna*) to his talent and that he is regarded as 'not inferior' (*non minor*) to many writers whom he ranked above himself, while in *Pont.* 4.16.45–6 he asks indulgence for stating only that 'my poetry was of good repute and worthy to be read in this company' (*claro mea nomine Musa | atque inter tantos quae legeretur erat*).[75] The minimalist rhetoric of these passages is painfully moving.

Ovid's final collection of poems ends with his most remarkable list of poets, a *tour d'horizon* of Roman literary life in the years preceding Ovid's banishment. A handful of the thirty writers mentioned qualify for footnotes in modern literary histories of Rome, but most are mere names, known only from their appearance in this poem. Is Ovid pretending to be impressed by this throng of nonentities? Or is he nostalgically recreating the literary scene from which he had been ejected? Perhaps Ovid could afford to be generous to his fellow-poets, leaving his readers to regret that the greatest poet of the time had been reduced to lamenting his exile. To the extent that *Ex Ponto* 4.16 recalls Ovid's account in *Tristia* 4.10 of his early years as a poet, the poem also maps in crushing detail the decline in poetic talent (except for Ovid himself) between the start of Augustus' principate and its final decade.

From Ovid rewriting to rewriting Ovid

Ovid's 'dialogic' engagement with earlier poetry (including his own) helps to define the type of imitation Ovid's work has inspired. With the possible exception of the *Heroides*, no work of Ovid was ever imitated as a whole; Ovid's talent for exhausting the possibilities of a theme may have rendered his poetry immune to straightforward replication. But many of his works were expanded and supplemented by others, both in his own lifetime and in later antiquity and the Middle Ages.[76] Ancient examples include

---

[75] Translation from Kenney (1982) 454.
[76] Zwierlein (1999) alleges that all of Ovid's works survive in a form extensively revised and expanded by Julius Montanus, a poet-rhetorician of the time of Tiberius. The evidence for this

Amores 3.5,[77] the *Letter of Sappho* (=*Heroides* 15),[78] the *Nux* (elegiac complaint of a walnut tree),[79] and a hexameter didactic poem on fish, the *Halieutica*.[80] The apparent ease of Ovid's style is usually cited as the main factor for such emulation, but Ovid's evident fondness for reopening already finished work was probably another stimulus. 'Adding to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*' is a motif that begins with Ovid himself and is then taken up in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, where the apotheosis of Claudius is regarded as incredible enough to merit inclusion;[81] at least one medieval reader of the poem was inspired to create an original transformation story that blends elements of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.[82] A form of rewriting that might have given Ovid wry pleasure is that which turns his work in a radically different direction. The medieval allegorizing interpretations of the *Metamorphoses* are the best-known case,[83] but an especially neat example is the fifth-century *Commonitorium* of Orientius, which deploys the language and rhetorical strategies of the *Ars amatoria* to enjoin chastity.[84]

More broadly, Ovid's demonstration that all stories can be retold – and that therein lies their vitality – has helped make his writing endlessly appealing to storytellers in all media. Like Ovid himself in his relation to other writers, Ovid's poetry thrives on retelling and reinvention.

FURTHER READING

Since one aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of Ovid's poetic career, it may in that respect be supplemented by several book-length treatments, such as Wilkinson (1955) in an older style or the more up-to-date Holzberg (1997a, soon to be available in English). Zingerle (1869–71) is still useful for documenting Ovid's verbal indebtedness to earlier and contemporary Roman poets, and also as an example of an earlier form of scholarship that defined literary influence almost exclusively in terms of verbal borrowings. More recent approaches to the issue of literary relatedness are illustrated by Hinds (1998). Fantham (1996) briefly discusses Ovid's place in the evolution of Roman literary culture (see also Quinn (1982)); a fuller treatment in Citroni (1995, in Italian). Cameron (1995) is an important (and avowedly controversial) re-examination of Callimachus' literary views and their Roman reception.

Discussions of individual works. Boyd (1997) treats the *Amores* with emphasis on Ovid's innovative treatments of elegiac motifs. On literary allusion in the *Heroides* see Barchiesi (1993); there is also useful material in Jacobson (1974). Dalzell (1996)

---

radical hypothesis, which among other claims would attribute all the *Heroides* to Montanus, has yet to be fully presented.

[77] Kenney (1969a).   [78] Tarrant (1981), but see Rosati (1996b).
[79] Lee (1958), Richmond (1981) 2759–67.   [80] Richmond (1981) 2746–59.
[81] *Apocol.* 9.5.   [82] Anderson (1976).
[83] See Allen (1970) 163–99, Hexter (1987), Coulson (1991); Dimmick in this volume, pp. 278–82.
[84] Vessey (1999) 165–71.

considers the *Ars* in relation to the traditions of didactic poetry. Fantham (1998) 4–25 conveniently reviews the varied generic background to the *Fasti*. On the exile poetry as a reinterpretation of Ovid's earlier work see Hinds (1985), Williams (1994), Claassen (1999).

Knox (1986b) is good on the learned and specifically Callimachean dimension of the *Metamorphoses*. See also O'Hara (1996) for a particular aspect of Ovid's learning, his use of etymological word-play. On the *Metamorphoses* as a response to the *Aeneid* see in general Hardie (1993) and Hinds (1998); Kenney (1973) considers Ovid's language in relation to Virgil's. For Ovid's reworking of earlier versions of individual stories in the *Metamorphoses* the Appendix in Otis (1970) is an accessible starting-point. Useful treatments of individual episodes from this perspective include Horsfall (1979), Keith (1992a), and Farrell (1992). Ovid's use of tragic material is studied by Gildenhard and Zissos (1999), who promise a monograph on this subject.

Finally, Myers (1999) helpfully surveys recent critical work on several of the topics discussed in this chapter.