WRITING (ON) BODIES: LYRIC DISCOURSE AND THE PRODUCTION OF GENDER IN HORACE *ODES* 1.13

ELIZABETH H. SUTHERLAND

[B]odily marking not only serves to recognize and identify, it also indicates the body's passage into the realm of the letter, into literature: the bodily mark is in some manner a "character," a hieroglyph, a sign that can eventually, at the right moment of the narrative, be read. Signing the body indicates its recovery for the realm of the semiotic.

—Peter Brooks, *Body Work*

Vos, quod milia multa basiorum
legistis, me male marem putatis?

—Catullus 16.12–13

In his *Odes* 1.13 (*Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi*), Horace combines aspects of reading, writing, and bodily production to explore not just the metaphorical possibilities of the body in literature but also its larger role within literary discourse. The ode's treatment of bodies ties in well with Peter Brooks' suggestion that the body alone is prelinguistic, even alien to language. To give a body meaning, as Brooks claims, one must somehow "bring [it] into the linguistic realm."[1] How, the poem seems to ask, does one talk about a body, let alone read it? Horace addresses the problem by not simply writing about bodies, but by writing *on* bodies, an act that turns these *corpora* into material for the poem's discourse. If one is to read a body, Horace implies, someone must write (on) it first.

For the elite Roman male, reading other men's bodies was an important skill and, to judge from our sources, a constant preoccupation. This pursuit, known as physiognomy, has received skillful and enthusiastic critical attention in recent years, especially with regard to bodily representations of gender. Scholars have found of particular interest the ways in which physiognomy reinforced, and was in turn driven by, the competitive masculinity endemic to elite Roman society. A man who could be read as effeminate stood a greater risk of losing political status than did one who was convincingly male.[2] Men's

1. Brooks 1993, 7–8.

2. As I discuss below, though, notable exceptions such as Maecenas and Julius Caesar prevent one from making a simple equation between masculinity and power.

Classical Philology 100 (2005): 52–82
 0009-837X/05/10001-0004$10.00

bodies, made up of such component behaviors as the movement of the eyes or the drape of a toga, are treated as texts that a reader can decipher. The reader of these corporeal texts operates from a position of strength: no one interprets another's masculinity to his own disadvantage.

Men also treat women's bodies as texts, under different circumstances and with different motivations. Representations of literal women's bodies are less immediately relevant to my discussion, however, than are texts that masquerade as women. Maria Wyke was the first to argue that the elegiac beloved was not a real woman but was rather embodied poetry.[3] As is true of reading men's bodies, writing a woman's body has profound implications for relations of gender and power. The writer presents himself as authoritative by virtue of having produced a text/woman; lower status, of necessity, accrues to the woman/text. Both writer and reader therefore hold more power than does the readable body-as-text or written text-as-body.

Three different bodies are both written upon and read in *Odes* 1.13: Telephus', Lydia's, and the poet's own. Having written on these bodies and thus made them accessible to literary discourse, Horace is then free to merge the writing of the body with such topics as the relationship between speech and masculinity in erotic verse. While emphasizing the idea that speech and writing are acts requiring an authoritative voice, the speaker of this ode represents himself as a voice lacking in authority and as a body that is compromised, inadequately male. At the same time, he implicitly claims literary ascendancy and ethical dominance. He thus lays bare a central irony of amatory poetry: if verbal authority both demands and is demanded by masculinity, how can a poem's traumatized and feminized lover be at the same time the speaking voice of that text?

EXAMINING THE *CORPUS*

I begin with a closer discussion of the reading of bodies. Catharine Edwards and Maud Gleason have shown that elite Roman males, especially those operating in the political sphere, were greatly interested in puzzling out the truth of other men's natures. Character was (so they thought) clearly expressed by the body, at least to those able to read the signs. Dress, comportment, or facial expression might convey data regarding a person's trustworthiness, his moral standing, or his potential as a leader; an orator had to use gesture, voice, and facial expression correctly if he were to seem authoritative.[4] The careful reader might also uncover indications of a man's gender status, which could overlap with or encompass other characteristics.

3. See especially Wyke 1987; 1989b, 131–41; Gold 1993a, 88–89; 1993b, 286–93; and Keith 1994, 28–40, on the *amata* of elegy as metaphor for her lover's poetry book; see also Wyke 1989a; McNamee 1993, 228–29; Keith 1994; Greene 1995b; 1998, 37–66; and Downing 1999, 246–47. Fear 2000 discusses the troping of literary texts as prostitutes.

4. See especially Edwards 1993, 68–81 and 92–97; and Corbeill 1995, 129–73, on detecting *mollitia* during the Republic and early Empire; Gleason 1995, 60–64, chaps. 5–6, and passim, treats physiognomy during the Second Sophistic; see also Richlin 1993, 545–48. Gunderson 2000 discusses oratorical gesture; Corbeill (1995, 99–127) discusses oratorical analysis of mouths. For a more general survey of the politician's body and gestures, see Corbeill 2002.

Nor were these readings a one-way process, for a man could tailor his self-presentation so as to proclaim that he was truly male. During the late Republic and early Empire, however, an increasing number of elite men seem to have adopted conduct or clothing, ornament or gesture that made them appear less than fully masculine. Julius Caesar, whose overloose toga made him appear deceptively effeminate and ineffective, was the original "ill-girt boy" (*puerum male praecinctum,* words attributed to Sulla at Macrobius 2.3.9).[5] Also notorious in this regard was Horace's patron Maecenas, of whom Seneca the Younger disapprovingly asked, *non oratio eius aeque soluta est quam ipse discinctus?* ("Isn't his style just as lax as he himself was badly girt?" *Ep.* 114.4).[6] Edwards, speaking of the Roman discourses of morality so closely integrated with physiognomy, proposes that "accusations and descriptions of immorality were implicated in defining what it meant to be a member of the Roman elite, in excluding outsiders from this powerful and privileged group and in controlling insiders."[7] Other scholars have raised additional possibilities, all defined by issues of power. Carlin Barton suggests, for example, that effeminate self-representation might have been the only option for self-expression that remained for those under autocratic rule—or, for a Maecenas, might have reminded observers that he was on the winning side.[8]

However we understand this deliberate effeminacy, playing with gender, whether in Roman life or Roman literature, involves negotiations of power that are immensely provocative. Most applicable to my study is elegy's use of the *servitium amoris,* the "servitude of love," in which the poet-lover claims to submit himself to the will of an *amata* (beloved) or *domina* (mistress). Recent scholarly treatments of the phenomenon analyze the *servitium amoris* as a reflection of or response to social changes during the Augustan era, hence as a literary manifestation of the effeminate *habitus* (bearing) to which I referred above.[9] Horace gives us a lyric version (often abbreviated) of the *servitium amoris,* treating in several of his erotic odes the lover who finds himself at a disadvantage to his beloved. Of these, most familiar to modern readers is *Odes* 1.5, in which the poet-lover allows us to glimpse his history with the archetypally destructive Pyrrha. In a similar vein, 1.19, 2.8, and 3.10 portray women whose beauty and intractability make them a danger to the men who love them.[10]

5. Edwards 1993, 63–64.

6. See Graver 1998 on Seneca's representations of Maecenas.

7. Edwards 1993, 12. See also Wyke 1995, 117–21.

8. Barton 1994. Skinner (1997, 142, and passim) reads Catull. 63 as "a contemporary narrative of political impotence"; cf. Nappa 2001; Miller 1994, 120–40, on Catullus' challenge to Roman morality. See Wyke 1995, 117, for accusations of immorality as political weapons. Skinner (1993, 64–66) touches on the possibility that effeminacy could have been explored as an opposite to "lack of culture" rather than to "lack of masculinity"; cf. Fitzgerald 1996, 51 and passim.

9. The dynamic was first identified by Frank Copley in 1947. McCarthy 1998 is the most recent discussion that focuses on the *servitium amoris*. Gutzwiller and Michelini (1991, 74–78) usefully summarize Callimachus' antiheroic self-presentation and its development among his Roman inheritors.

10. One might also consider *Carm.* 1.27, 1.33, 3.20, and 3.26. See among others Pöschl 1970, 23, 27–28, on risks to the lover in love; Lowrie 1994, 383–84, on the harshness of elegiac (and lyric) beloveds in *Carm.* 1.33; and Sutherland 2003 on erotic danger in 1.19. Ancona (1994, 19–20 and passim) treats the Horatian lover's chronic inability to gain control over the beloved.

As with the elegy type in which the *servitium amoris* was first identified, though, one must be cautious in how one approaches this set of odes. Recent scholarship on elegy has shown emphatically that the elegist's claim to be subordinate to his beloved is largely disingenuous. While lamenting his own dependence and his mistress's neglect, the elegist makes it clear that he has the power to create his *domina* in all her temperamental glory; he may even reveal delight in imagined or actual violence against her.[11] Not surprisingly, Horace's poet-lover displays much of this same complexity, differing from the elegiac voice primarily in his frequent claim to a philosophical detachment.[12] As we will see, the Horatian lyricist may express this detachment by actively denying any sexual attraction or feelings of violence.

When they are expressed, however, emotions in lyric and elegy tend to be powerful and overwhelming. Elegiac and lyric speakers violate Roman norms in this respect too. Lack of control over one's body might produce overindulgence in food or in sexual pleasures; physical and emotional lack of control (*incontinentia*) both belong more properly to women than to men. As a result, self-control in all areas of one's life is an essential part of elite masculinity.[13] We will see that both Telephus and the speaker of *Odes* 1.13 violate this principle.

CALLIMACHUS' IMPOTENCE

For *Odes* 1.13, the seemingly awkward collision of literary potency and erotic failure reflects the demands of literary program. The poet's self-presentation and rhetorical goals reveal distinctly Callimachean sentiments. In addition, the odes that precede *Odes* 1.13 show a strong Callimachean bias. *Nos convivia, nos proelia virginum . . . cantamus* (1.6.17–19): much as do the elegists, the *ego* of *Odes* 1.6 rejects heroic combat in favor of erotic quarrels. He thus states his commitment to small verse and simultaneously demonstrates his ability to incorporate the themes of grand verse into his lyric. One can also readily identify *Odes* 1.3 and 1.7 as overtly programmatic statements. These odes allow us to read *Odes* 1.13, once we reach it, as the product of a lyricist committed to Callimachean principles.[14]

In addition to stylistic features of the ode, its speaker's erotic self-presentation as well is profoundly affected by the Callimachean inheritance. Alison Sharrock has noted in her discussion of Ovid *Amores* 3.7 that "[t]he paradox of elegiac love is its effeminacy: to be an elegiac lover is to be

11. See Cahoon 1988, 296–97; Fredrick 1997, 185–86; Greene 1999b, 415–17; and James 2003 passim, on the elegist's feelings of violence toward the elegiac beloved.

12. See especially Davis 1991, 39–60, on the Horatian *amator*'s efforts to distance himself from elegy. On the speaker of *Carm.* 1.5, see Sutherland 2002, 43–50.

13. Foucault 1985, 35–93, lays the groundwork for this line of scholarship. More recently, see especially Edwards 1993, 81–87, 91–92, on the association of *incontinentia* with effeminacy, and cf. Oliensis 1991 on male self-control in the *Epodes*; see Skinner 1993, 65–66; Greene 1995a, 81–83, 88–89, 1999a, 5–7, 11–15, on the Catullan lover's loss of gender status; and Veyne 1988, 137–41 on "the encounter between a poetics of immobility and an ethics of autarky."

14. Ahern 1991, 301–2, 314, and Smith 1994 discuss *Carm.* 1.6 in terms of Callimachean allusion to Homer; Putnam 1995 reads the ode as a challenge to Homer. See Davis 1991, 28–39, on Horace's use of *recusatio*. Zumwalt 1970, 1–108, treats the Callimachean aspects of *Carm.* 1.3 in considerable depth.

mollis, and yet effective lovers need to be hard."[15] We will consider the same paradox in *Odes* 1.13, where the poet vacillates between a position of authority and a position of subjection. This process requires that he review every conceivable disparity in power that can occur in erotic lyric. Does Lydia dominate Telephus? Does Telephus dominate Lydia? Is the poet, since he is less successful in love than Telephus, subordinate to the younger man? Or, as author, does he surpass both the subjects of his poem? To write is to be potent; to be in love is, virtually by definition, to be impotent.

There are elements of the ode that undercut this speaker's efforts to be seen as a potent voice. Concerned solely with erotic matters, he does not even engage with the *rixae* that are elegy's usual substitute for epic battles, a mechanism through which he might recuperate a degree of masculine standing.[16] It is implicit here that, by indulging in the overblown emotions of amatory verse, the lyricist has withdrawn from the public obligations of the elite Roman male. Regardless of whether or not he represents himself in the ode as being dominant or being successful, the very fact that this speaker operates within the genre of lyric situates him outside mainstream social and political discourse.[17]

And yet, there is a sense in which Callimacheanism can be figured as a "masculine" genre in contrast with the (usually) masculine genres of epic and tragedy. Don Fowler posits that "the Callimachean figure hunched over his tablet rationally employing his *techne* suggests a masculine poetics of 'orderly, parsimonious, and obstinate' control."[18] This aspect of literary craft is certainly present in *Odes* 1.13. Literary as well as personal control will be a concern for our lyricist, as I discuss below. We can thus recognize divergent expressions of Callimacheanism that inform operations within this single poem. The speaker of *Odes* 1.13 is effeminate because he writes in a Callimachean mode (producing verses that are too small to be truly masculine), yet effeminate also because of his inability to stay firmly within the boundaries of his generic choices.

DIFFIDENCE AND DISCLAIMERS

Horace's amatory lyric has been criticized over the years for its speakers' apparent lack of emotional engagement in their own erotic scenarios. Ronnie Ancona notes that the passionate Catullan mode of love poetry has often been more compelling to the modern reader. The Horatian lover's detachment has, in contrast, made many of the erotic odes less successful for critics than the philosophical or political ones. In an effort to redeem the Horatian ama-

15. Sharrock 1995, 162.

16. *Carm.* 1.13 also contains traces of Horace's ongoing confrontation with elegy, which he frequently presents in the *Odes* as a less masculine genre than lyric. Davis 1991, 39–71, discusses Horace's "disavowal" of elegy; see especially 58–59 on the generic status of *mollis*. Wyke 1995, 117, 119–20, and Greene 2000, 246–48, discuss elegy's self-positioning as an effeminate genre.

17. See Wyke 1995, 116–17, James 1998, 11, Fredrick 1997, 189–90.

18. Fowler 2002, 148–49. Sharrock 2002a suggests that possession by an epic Muse can be perceived as emasculating.

tory ode, Ancona argues that "the lover's distance does not indicate an absence of erotic feeling, but rather indicates how fully the lover has responded to the beloved's threat to his own autonomy."[19] While there are poems in which the lover admits to his passion, we can indeed identify a significant number of the *Odes* in which he seems either to conceal erotic feeling or to make a point, convincingly or not, of disclaiming such feelings. *Odes* 2.4 (*Ne sit ancillae*) is a noteworthy ode of the former type, at the end of which the poet explicitly denies any attraction to the woman whose beauty he has just finished praising. We find even more distance in *Odes* 2.8 (the Barine ode, whose speaker holds himself apart from the men who cannot resist falling under Barine's spell), in *Odes* 1.17 (*Velox amoenum,* in which the poet acknowledges no sexual desire when he offers Tyndaris refuge), and *Odes* 1.25 (the hostile *Parcius iunctas,* which generically can be read as the response of a rejected lover).[20]

The lovers of the *Odes* frequently use anger or violence as well to maintain distance from the beloved. Unlike the elegists, though, who typically exult in their *rixae,* Horace's speakers do not acknowledge these feelings verbally.[21] Anger and violence simmer below the surface but are revealed only obliquely and indirectly. One might think in particular of *Odes* 1.23 (*Vitas inuleo*), which closes with a vivid, lingering rejection of violence, or of 1.19 (*Mater saeva Cupidinum*), in which the lyric lover strives to bring Glycera under control with images that betray his barely suppressed rage and fear.[22]

While the lyricist of *Odes* 1.13 does not conceal his abundance of erotic feeling, he does attempt to elide his feelings of anger and violence toward the inaccessible beloved. I argue that this poet-lover diverts the audience's attention from his violent inclinations by installing Telephus as a proxy who will perform abusive actions in his stead. Bodies in this poem become the pages on which our lyricist communicates, even if indirectly, his traumatic experience of desire and his ensuing fury at not being able to possess the woman he wants.

OPENING THE BOOK

Reshaping the familiar language and imagery of erotic pathology, the *ego* of *Odes* 1.13 begins by expressing his despair over Lydia's infatuation with another man, the apparently younger Telephus.[23] In his response to this situation, the poet describes for us a series of bodies that run the gamut from intact to damaged to pathologically compromised: Telephus' body, untouched

19. Ancona 1994, 9; cf. West 1995, 85, on Horace's use of irony in his erotic poems.

20. See Ancona 1994, 38–39; Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 68, 74; Gagliardi 1993, 95; and Sutherland 2002, 95–96, on the self-distancing of the poet in *Carm.* 2.4. Sutherland 2002, 108–13, discusses the poet's stance in *Carm.* 2.8. On *Carm.* 1.25, see Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 291.

21. See especially James 2003, passim, on the dynamics of the elegiac *rixa*.

22. See Ancona 1994, 73–74, on implied violence in *Carm.* 1.23. Sutherland 2003, 71, 72–76, examines the poet's efforts in *Carm.* 1.19 to control the beloved's dangerous body.

23. Telephus' coloring and his initial passivity imply youthfulness. Kenneth Quinn (1980, ad loc.) calls him "a mere *puer*."

but effeminate in coloring and presentation; the *puella* Lydia's, marked with love bites; and the poet's own, disintegrating under the force of his passion. In closing, the lyricist tries to persuade Lydia to leave Telephus and praises faithful, unending relationships of a type never actually attained in the scenarios of Roman love poetry.

In the course of describing these bodies and their relationships to one another, the speaker creates a network of questions about how gender is depicted and how it is received. His picture of Lydia's body is consonant with the Roman view of women as the appropriate recipients of sexual penetration, whether literal or metaphorical. He balances this portrayal by giving Lydia the possibility of domination over Telephus. At the same time, the poet's self-representation, in following the subversive conventions of erotic poetry, deviates from the cultural norm for men. The *amator,* abandoning his prescribed role as sexual dominator, chooses instead to reveal himself as debilitated and feminized by love.[24] In his portrayal of Telephus, however, the lyricist complicates these more usual treatments of gender. The Telephus whom we see in lines 1–3, pink, gleaming, and available for admiration, appears a rather different creature when, in lines 9–12, we readily identify him with the *puer furens* who marks Lydia.

Nor is the poet's self-representation lacking in complications. Despite his apparent willingness to align himself with the suffering and effeminate lover, he is ultimately responsible for representing these bodies. Telephus would not appear first clearly effeminate, then indecisively masculine, if the poet did not share with us Lydia's rhapsodies on Telephus' body, then continue by both narrating and interpreting Telephus' abuse of Lydia's body. Through text, gender becomes visible for an appreciative literary audience. The marking or absence of marking on the bodies in these lines writes a truth that would not otherwise be accessible to us. In the meantime, the poet chooses to narrate his own physical dissolution. We recognize his feminization, expressed as it is in damage perceptible only to himself, because he presents his findings to us after interpreting his own physical and emotional state. The poet, then, is himself text, interpreter, and (though he pretends to conceal the fact) composer.

TELEPHUS' BODY: THE *TABULA RASA*

The first body we meet is that of Telephus, who occupies lines 1–3 of the ode. Critical aspects of his *corpus* are filtered through two voices before reaching us. The voice that directly informs us belongs to the lyricist, who paraphrases Lydia even as he addresses her. Telephus is pink, white, and altogether girlish in appearance, initially the perfect Callimachean writing surface (*Carm.* 1.13.1–3):

> Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi
> cervicem roseam, cerea Telephi
> laudas bracchia . . .

24. See especially Greene 2000, Wyke 1995, and Gold 1993a, on the inversion of gender roles that occurs in Catullus and elegy.

When you, Lydia, praise
Telephus' rosy neck, Telephus'
waxen arms . . .

Commentators have noted that, by repeating *Telephi* (1, 2), the poet subtly reveals both his *amata*'s preoccupation with another man and his own distress over her obsession.[25] Lydia does not merely talk about Telephus, she talks about him a great deal, emphasizing what she finds most pleasing about him. She represents him as a body to be admired by praising him entirely in corporeal terms. Covering what are apparently a quite attractive neck and arms, Telephus' skin has an appealing flush (*cervicem roseam,* 2), a feature of his coloring that regularly identifies women as beautiful and men as effeminate.[26] Horace uses alliteration to heighten the contrast between pink and white: the repetition of the syllable *cer-* both links *cervicem* with *cerea* and emphasizes *roseam*. We pause for a moment to appreciate this effect, with the result that we, like Lydia, spend longer than the mere text requires thinking about the beauty of Telephus' neck and arms.[27]

Cereus, a color term that is more difficult to pin down, is used only rarely of a person's coloring. The fact that the adjective is so unusual in this context demands that we pay closer attention to its role in the description of Telephus. Its literal translation of "waxen" implies that Telephus' skin has a golden tone, though Nisbet and Hubbard argue for the possibility of fairer coloring.[28] Even if this adjective does not allow us to visualize Telephus' coloring as snowy white, though, the gleam often associated with *cereus* still identifies his body as drawing the gaze. *Cereus* perhaps also implies the perfectly smooth texture of Telephus' skin as well as his coloring. Lydia feminizes Telephus by offering his body for the visual admiration of both poet and external audience; her effusions further sexualize him by giving us a tactile impression of his body.[29]

In addition to being an eroticized body, Telephus also has a literary programmatic function, for *cereus* calls to mind the wax layer on a writing tablet. We can compare David Roessel's study of how the elegist Sulpicia treats her *amatus* Cerinthus. Arguing persuasively that "Sulpicia" identifies Cerinthus with the tablets on which she writes her poetry, Roessel concludes

25. West 1967, 67; Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, ad loc.; Connor 1987, 196; Ancona 1994, 122. As Kennedy (1993, 74) has suggested for elegy, the cruelty of the *domina* serves as an excuse for the *amator* to attempt to control her (cf. Wyke 1995, 111–12).

26. W. M. Owens (1992, p. 240 and n. 10) and Hans Peter Syndikus (2001, p. 155, n. 4) comment on the feminizing effect of pink coloration. Catullus uses *roseus* at 55.12 of a woman's breasts and applies the adjective at 63.74 and 80.1 to the lips of men whose masculinity has been severely compromised (Attis by castration, Gellius by passive oral sexuality that is too easily detected in public).

27. See also Sutherland 2003, 62–64, on this passage and on the heavily visual impact of terms for whiteness or gleam. I discuss the theorizing of vision in my treatment of Lydia's body, below.

28. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, ad loc. It is tempting to assume from *cereus* that we can also view Telephus as statuelike—hence with resonances of Pygmalion's beloved, for example, and of literary women made into statues; cf. Sutherland 2003, 65–66, and passim, on Hor. *Carm*. 1.19. Yet all Nisbet and Hubbard's citations prove only that *cereus* was considered an attractive color, not necessarily that it denoted the brilliant fairness characteristic of marble. In particular, the pairing with *candidus* at Plin. *HN* 37.33 to describe amber (*candidum et cerei coloris*) seems just as likely to describe the gleam or clarity of the *sucinum*.

29. Cf. Maurach 1992, p. 502, n. 4.

that Cerinthus derives his name from *cerinthus* (κήρινθος), or "bee-bread," a substance fed to bee larvae that often was equated with both wax and honey. The waxed tablet evokes bees and honey, associated since Homer with poetic composition. Cerinthus thus wins the dual status of beloved and literary medium that is shared by other elegiac beloveds.[30] Unlike the female beloveds of elegy, however, Cerinthus has very little physical presence in Sulpicia's elegies, appearing corporeally only as *tabellae* (writing tablets) at *Corpus Tibullianum* 3.13. Sulpicia, as Kristina Milnor shows, primarily represents her own body rather than that of her beloved.[31] Elegy is not flexible enough for a female lover to perform intensive sexualization of a male body.[32]

These well-established associations between wax and writing tablets, on the one hand, and bees and poetry on the other, make Telephus' body resemble Sulpicia's vision of the tabelliform Cerinthus. By calling Telephus' arms *cerea,* the lyricist asks that we think of him as a freshly prepared writing surface. Telephus is also a writing surface that remains notably clean: unmarked, he has not yet been written upon. Like newly coated *pinakes,* though, he invites such a transgression. The very purity of his surface both emphasizes his availability and makes the viewer imagine the pleasures of marking him. From Lydia's perspective, Telephus—already the effeminate object of desire—is a literary *amatus,* the passive source of literary production. He is, furthermore, *her* tablet, a waxed surface that she considers herself free to mark as she chooses. By praising Telephus in these terms, Lydia indicates also that she wishes to write *on* his body, in other words, to dominate him sexually and to identify him publicly as her property.[33] She envisions Telephus' skin as exposed wax, writing-tablets that have been opened to reveal their secrets.[34]

Telephus' assimilation to a writing surface identifies him as a Callimachean literary product. An artistic creation, as *cereus* implies, he appears to us initially as pure and unblemished.[35] Effeminate, *mollis,* he is also by im-

30. Roessel 1990. Space does not allow me to enter the debate concerning the authorship of the poems attributed to Sulpicia and to the *amicus Sulpiciae,* on which see especially Hinds 1987, Flaschenriem 1999, Holzberg 1999, and Milnor 2002, 268–69 and passim. I follow here the conventional practice of understanding *Corpus Tibull.* 3.13–18 as the compositions of a woman poet named Sulpicia. See Wyke 1987 and 1995, 112–15, and Gold 1993a, 87–88, on the elegiac beloved as text. Page duBois (1988, 130–66) treats the development from earlier Greek literature's "woman as field" to the literary era's metaphor of "woman as writing surface"; cf. Gamel 1989, 197, and Greene 1999b, 415, on the equivalent dynamic in Ovid.

31. Milnor 2002; see especially pp. 261, 272–73.

32. *Pace* Milnor (2002, 261), who considers it a "dramatic literary gesture" that Sulpicia uses her own body as the site of literary production.

33. Roessel 1990, 247–48, discusses the subordinate status that Cerinthus must hold if he is to be Sulpicia's writing medium. Lydia, like Sulpicia, strives to become a phallic woman by claiming to have both literary voice and the ability to write upon her lover's surface. One might compare the more hostile dynamic of Catull. 25, in which the poet (using the verb *conscribillo*) threatens to write on the body of the thief Thallus. Peter Brooks (1993, 20–25) treats more generally the dynamic by which the desiring subject tries to bring the desired body into narrative by marking it.

34. DuBois 1988, 137, 142–44, discusses the analogy frequent in Greek literature between the closed, unreadable tablet and a woman's hidden vaginal folds. Represented as an open tablet on which one can write, Telephus becomes all the more penetrable and sexually vulnerable.

35. Cf. Sharrock 1991 as well as Elsner and Sharrock 1991, 160–61, 169–73, on the beloved as an artistic construction of the lover.

plication *tenuis* (slender), as young men conventionally are in erotic poetry. Lydia brings Telephus into existence by praising/writing (about) him; she even offers him to the poet's gaze as a desirable body. The poet, of course, reacts not to Lydia herself but specifically to her narrative of Telephus (and ultimately to the corporeal narratives that he will be able to read).[36] Horace thus disrupts the usual Roman mode for writing a gendered Callimacheanism. Lydia is (however briefly) an actively *docta puella,* while Telephus is envisioned as a *scriptus puer.* If Lydia could produce Telephus' body by praising him to us, she would claim implicitly the verbal authority to write poetry about him and maintain control over him.

Telephus' complexion and his position as object of Lydia's desire tentatively invert the normative Roman dynamic in which men assert their power over women. Lines 1–4, in which he is a version of the *puer delicatus,* give us an oblique representation of female sexual interest in an effeminate male. The Greek name already makes it probable that Telephus is a freedman, with the result that he would be an acceptable sexual object according to Roman norms; on this basis alone, he occupies the uncertain social rank so common among literary *amatae*.[37] Mythological resonances also contribute to his status. As did Philoctetes, the Telephus of Greek mythology suffered from a wound that would not heal. Even though the myth includes his cure—by Achilles' spear, which had inflicted the original injury—he is above all a perpetually damaged body. In Euripides' lost *Telephus,* furthermore, the hero brought additional debasement upon himself by donning beggar's rags to approach Achilles; Mnesilochus, in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae,* parodies Telephus while dressed as a woman. It is not surprising, then, that the Telephus of *Odes* 1.13 is a body available for feminization and wounding.[38] Lydia, for these few lines the ode's desiring subject, has a mythological

36. Cf. Greene 1999a, 11, who notes that Catull. 51 includes a temporal element: *nam simul te, / Lesbia, aspexi* implies that the speaker does not find the encounter totally debilitating outside that temporal framework.

37. Edwards (1993, 92–97) discusses the Roman association of Hellenism with effeminacy (though see *contra* Williams 1999, 15–17, 64–72). Being sexually passive was, according to Roman ideology, an acceptable role for a beautiful, effeminate young man, so long as he was not a citizen. See Kennedy 1993, 30–31, Richlin 1993, 532–38, and Edwards 1993, 70–73, on Roman categorization of sexual behavior and sexual object choices; see also Gleason 1995, 58–64, on distinctions between masculinity and femininity. Verstraete 1980, Veyne 1985, 29, Richlin 1993, 538, Skinner 1997, 135–36, and Williams 1999, 10–11, 12–13, 19–28, and passim, treat further the Roman insistence that the adult citizen male be recognized as the penetrator in sexual encounters. For a cautionary note, see the observation of Karras 2000, 1256–57, that (because of, e.g., different behaviors within different social classes) "the ancients did not have a unitary view" of sexuality; cf. Oliensis 1997 and Fredrick 2002a, 10, and 2002b, 239–42 and 258–59.

38. As did the Telephus of Aeschylus' lost tragedy, Euripides' Telephus took the infant Orestes hostage and fled to an altar. Aristophanes imitates this scene in both *Acharnians* (where Dikaiopolis seizes a coal basket) and *Thesmophoriazusae*. (In the latter play Mnesilochus, while dressed as a woman, kidnaps a wineskin and threatens to sacrifice it.) See Webster 1967, 43–48, on reconstructing Euripides' *Telephus*; Foley 1988 treats the *Acharnians*' parodying of tragedy. The *Telephus*' hostage scene, as Foley notes (1988, p. 35, n. 12), was very popular; it appears frequently in vase paintings, as does the parodic version of the *Thesmophoriazusae*. Kossatz-Deissman (1980, 284–90) discusses the connection between the Telephus of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and his representation on the Apulian bell krater H5697; cf. Simon 1982, pp. 30–31 and pl. 15, Woodford 2003, 70, 108–12, and Bauchhenß-Thüriedl 1971. The ethnic identity and political allegiance of Euripides' Telephus appear to have been both unclear and unstable, perhaps making him additionally the precursor of Horace's ambiguously gendered Telephus. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.), noting that Telephus appears several times in the elegists, posit a Hellenistic forebear in which a lovelorn Telephus could only be healed (metaphorically speaking) by the spear that had wounded him. In light of his well-established dramatic antecedents, this hypothesis seems unnecessary.

predecessor as well: her name recalls the Lydian queen Omphale, in whose servitude Hercules dressed as a woman.[39] Humbled hero and exalted queen, Lydia and Telephus are paradigms for a woman who dominates men and a man who is available for domination.[40]

Horace's Telephus encapsulates the conundrum that is Roman masculinity during the Augustan period. In mythology Telephus is a hero and warrior; in *Odes* 1.13 too he is in some respects an effective male, possessing the woman whom our poet loses and inscribing erotic text upon her skin. His pronounced effeminate characteristics, however, continually undermine his associations with potent masculinity.[41] And, as subsequent lines of the ode will confirm, we must also question his integrity as an effective and dominant author-lover once we have glimpsed him in this subjugated position. Telephus is a profoundly destabilizing presence for any discussion of masculinity, gliding between points on the spectrum without resting in any one position.

Telephus' problematic masculinity also has ramifications for Lydia. While his metaphorical presentation as writing tablet reiterates his effeminacy and offers the possibility of a dominant role for Lydia, we never do see him actually written upon. Lydia's vision of writing on Telephus' body remains only her fantasy. We are faced, in other words, with the problem of how a female voice might make itself known within Horace's lyric. Milnor has proposed that "the terms which the [elegiac] genre offers to define 'woman' are not compatible with the position of poet, inasmuch as elegy's gender system is framed around the distinction between male lover and female mistress, male speaker and female spoken, male author and female textual object."[42] Sulpicia was somewhat able to work counter to the conventional terms of elegy; Lydia, the creation of a male poet, is unable to do so. In *Odes* 1.13, she runs afoul of generic parameters that (in Horace's version of lyric) simply cannot allow a woman to be an active speaker and lover. Fantasy aside, Lydia does not, in the end, have the option of an autonomous lyric voice but is restricted to being a foil for Telephus and a focal point for the lyricist's desire.[43]

PATHOLOGIES OF EROS

Despite the possibilities that Lydia and the poet reveal in their shared characterization of Telephus, the marked body that we see next is instead the

39. See Williams 1999, 77, on women's sexual interest in beardless young men. Richlin (1992, p. 139 and n. 47) and Edwards (1993, 84) treat literary invective against women who prefer *cinaedi* as sexual partners. I am grateful to Eleanor W. Leach for suggesting the link between Lydia and Omphale. Kampen 1996 discusses artistic representations of Heracles and Omphale in the second century C.E.; cf. Leach 1994, pp. 339–40, n. 19.

40. Or, in the succinct phrasing of Sharrock 2002b, 275, the story of Omphale "relates the 'demasculization' of the great hero by a woman, who thereby achieves pseudomasculine power."

41. It is, of course, part of Horace's version of Callimacheanism to adapt epic or martial figures and themes to his lyric; see, e.g., Leach 1994, Cairns 1977, 133–34, and Davis 1991, 11–22; cf. Telephus at *Carm.* 1.19.25–26, where he is also a feminized object of female desire.

42. Milnor 2002, 263.

43. Sharrock (2002a, 211) suggests that male poets share an "inability to see a woman poet as creative agent rather than created object."

poet's own. His emphasis on Telephus' effeminacy in lines 1–3 implied that the poet thought of himself as a different male type, a true *vir* in contrast to Telephus' *androgynos*.[44] We get a rather different impression, though, from lines 4–8. In striking contrast to the unmarked and beautifully colored Telephus, the ode's speaker is corporeally damaged and compromised. His self-representation builds on the motif of "eros-as-wound." This topos, of course, claims Sappho 31 as its *locus classicus* and finds resonance as well with Catullus 51, the archaic poem's most renowned descendant.[45] Because Horace so exaggeratedly tropes his models, some scholars have argued that this portion of *Odes* 1.13—along with its first and third stanzas—is ironic and is therefore not to be taken seriously.[46] There may well be some humor in Horace's reworking, since its blatancy highlights how little our speaker's *ego* resembles the voices of Sappho and Catullus; this does not, however, mean that we should not take these lines seriously. The passage reminds us of the fact that erotic lyric, despite its pretense of being authentic personal expression, is instead an artistic construct. Combined with Telephus' potential as an inscribed writing tablet, this modification of Sapphic and Catullan imagery asks that we consider more closely how to read a body that has been written upon.

Horace's allusions also have ramifications for his positioning in regard to both gender and genre. His speaker reveals himself as effeminate simply by virtue of being in love and speaking through a disintegrating body. By troping Sappho, and by casting Telephus as the successful lover of Sappho 31, the speaker of *Odes* 1.13 further adopts a feminine persona through which he portrays his response to amatory failure. This portion of the ode sharpens our focus on the generic problem of how a love poet can be a true *vir*. For to speak of one's abandonment by a lover, as Lawrence Lipking has argued, one must speak as a woman.[47] A master at producing both text and bodies, the lyricist places his own disintegrating body at the center of the ode's literary exchange. This *corpus,* which in our ode is placed between Telephus' writeable body and Lydia's written body, reifies the poet's models. He trumps Sappho by rewriting himself as the Sapphic body, the ultimate exemplar of passion made flesh.

There are manifest differences, though, among the Sapphic, Catullan, and Horatian versions of the lover's collapse. *Odes* 1.13 particularly responds to

44. *Pace* Quinn 1980, ad loc., the terms in which Telephus is described are not "mildly distasteful to another man." Nor do I agree with the position of Segal 1973, 42 (shared by Williams 1968, 164), that the poet is "[o]utclassed [by Telephus] in physique." We can perhaps compare Leach, who discusses the "anxieties of self-definition" (2001, 357) that drive Cicero to repeated attacks against Clodius' gender identity.

45. See Cyrino 1995, passim (especially 2–6 and 71–74), and Rubino 1975 on the destructive nature of eros in classical erotic poetry. Greene 1999a, 7–12, compares specifics of the lover's bodily disintegration in Sappho 31 and Catull. 51.

46. Segal (1973, 40–41) and Commager (1962, 152–55) consider this section a parody, as does Willett (1996), who believes Horace "shuts the door on comparisons with Sappho" by "suggest[ing] that Sappho may have shown part but not all of the truth about love." I disagree with the assessment of West (1967, 67) that Horace avoids self-pity by producing an "amusing mock-poetic kitchen metaphor"; Williams (1968, 564) is more cautious in his assessment.

47. Lipking 1988, xix–xx; cf. Greene 1995a on Catullus' feminizing of his poetic voice. In contrast, see Ancona 2002 on the lyricist's efforts in *Carm.* 1.22 to retain a masculine identity despite being in love (and see Greene 1999a, Ancona 2002, 169–70, on the imperviousness of the successful lover in Sappho).

and modifies Sappho 31, since her text reviews the body's disintegration in greater detail than does Catullus'.[48] Sappho's lyricist describes body parts that stay in their assigned locations despite the fact that they no longer function correctly; Horace's speaker, on the other hand, reveals that he is entirely unable to contain or control different aspects of his *corpus*. We read this body from the inside out, for he introduces his entrails to us first. Immediately beneath his surface (as if he had no skin at all, penetrable or otherwise) is a liver that threatens to exceed its own limits (*fervens . . . tumet,* 4). From the beginning of his self-description, our poet admits that he cannot restrain his emotions, or their physical manifestation, within prescribed boundaries.

The poet's uncontrollable liver has additional literary and symbolic value. Its swelling is perhaps a pathetic substitute for sexual display: compare, for example, the satirist of Juvenal 1, whose liver (in Fowler's treatment) blazes because he lacks the phallic strength to change the world around him.[49] Our lyricist's tumid liver may also encompass Callimachean allusion. Callimachus describes the Telchines (*Aet*. frag. 1.7–8) as φῦλον . . . τήκειν ἦπαρ ἐπιστάμενον, "a race that knows how to wear away its own liver." Subsequently identified as the "race of Jealousy" (*Aet*. frag. 1.17), they attack better poetry because of their own lack of competence.[50] The poet of *Odes* 1.13, in a glance ahead at the next stanza, acknowledges that he may be less successful at writing than is Telephus. Just as the speaker's liver cannot adequately contain his emotions, the generic borders of his poem are (he pretends) similarly hard-pressed to contain this response: the epic coloration of his feelings hints that he is not a perfect Callimachean. The jealousy in this ode is therefore founded upon literary as well as amatory performance. Ironically, of course, Horace here proves his own literary skill by testing the boundaries of Callimachean inclination and practice.

The distinction between Horace and Sappho holds true when we consider less vital bodily features than internal organs. Whereas Sappho's lover merely grows pale (χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας ἔμμι, "I am greener than grass," 31.10–11), both the mind and the complexion of Horace's poet depart from their *certa sede* (5–6), indicating a joint slippage of physical and psychological bonds. Sappho's cold sweat (31.9) also finds a counterpart in *Odes* 1.13, in the tear that slips out stealthily (*furtim labitur,* 7).[51] Insofar as we can recover Sappho's text, however, her sweat seems to be a condensate from outside that covers her body as would rain: μ' ἴδρως ψῦχρος κακχέεται ("a cold sweat pours down upon me," 9). While this moisture furthers the traditional conceit of eros as an attack that comes from outside, it does not jeopardize her boundaries as the Horatian lover's escaping tear violates his. His tear comes from within him; its production and its exit are beyond his control. *Furtim* (7), which frequently connotes deception, may even hint that this emission

48. Cf. Syndikus 2001, 155–56.
49. Juv. 1.45; Fowler 2002, 151–52.
50. Fredrick 1997, 174–76, discusses the impact of *phthonos* (jealousy) within Roman erotic poetry.
51. Cf. Keyser 1989, 78; Maurach 1992, 504.

is illicit as well as involuntary: the poet has tried unsuccessfully to restrain or conceal his tears.

In addition to being forms of corporeal damage, the series of collapses experienced by Horace's lyricist give the impression that his body's divisions have been transgressed and bodily matter has slipped out of place. Since this phenomenon is largely absent from both Sappho 31 and Catullus 51, it appears to be a conscious development by Horace and, as such, draws attention to itself when *Odes* 1.13 is contrasted with its models. This disturbing instability of the Horatian lyricist's *corpus* allows matter to flow in from the outside as well. His steeping in fire (*macerer ignibus,* 8) receives added force from *penitus* (8); the adverb implies a far more thorough permeation than what the Catullan *amator* experiences (*tenuis flamma demanat,* 51.9–10). *Macerare,* which primarily denotes "to steep" or "soak," indicates that the Horatian lyricist's body has become excessively infused with fluid. This hostile fiery liquid not only moves beneath the body's surface, as does the λέπτον πῦρ of Sappho, but it also permeates the body's interior, as Sappho's fire does not.

The systemic physical disintegration experienced by the poet-lover of *Odes* 1.13 is ultimately a form of gender inversion.[52] The disrupted physical condition of Horace's speaker, combined with his unmanly emotional response to Lydia, confirms that his passion has made him more female than male. His steeping in fire is doubly problematic: along with permeable boundaries, liquidity was thought more typical of women than of men.[53] The two conditions are closely linked. Anne Carson, discussing the symbolic ramifications of saturation by fluids, shows that women's tendency to be overly moist also carries with it the likelihood of inadequate boundaries and, hence, an immoderate level of permeability. Excessive libidinousness is an associated problem.[54] A surfeit of fluids, according to the ancient medical writers, makes women both physically and psychologically deficient. In contrast, it is both normative and preferable to have a dry body, as do men. Nothing about this poet's body or behavior is stable, bounded, or appropriately contained. His lack of bodily control assimilates his theoretically male body to the compromised female body; he becomes feminized far more pathologically than was Telephus, and in a less attractive manner. His literal vulnerability to the

52. The way in which the speaker of Catull. 51 is "robbed of his senses" is an inherently feminizing mode of victimization by desire (Greene 1999a, 7); cf. Wyke 1995, 116–17, Gold 1993a, 90–91, on the feminization of the *amator* in love elegy.

53. The status of fire is unclear. In the Hippocratic system, women might be either hot or cold; in the Aristotelian system, women were invariably cold. The concept of "liquid fire" is of course an oxymoron. It is therefore difficult to say conclusively whether Horace considered the lyricist's burning at 1.13.9 a male or female (feminizing) process. By analogy with *Carm.* 1.19, *Carm.* 1.13 more likely assumes that heat is generated by the female (see Sutherland 2003, 67, 70, on fire in *Carm.* 1.19, and Flemming 2000, 117–19, on medical conceptions of women's bodies).

54. Carson 1999, 78–85; see more generally Dean-Jones 1991, 114–22, and 1994, 183–88, King 1994, 106–8, and 1998, 28–30, and von Staden 1992, 9–10, on the Greek medical writers; Gleason 1995, 84–98, especially 94–98, Richlin 1995, 191, and Gold 1998, 374–75, treat the Roman material; see also Corbeill 1995, 144–45, Miller 1998, and Reckford 1998, 341–43.

beloved shows that he is unable to maintain the physical or emotional self-control expected of an elite Roman male.

THE INSCRIBED OBJECT OF DESIRE

The poet's juxtaposition with Telephus (the effeminate but unpenetrated) calls even further into question his own ability to be an older and more powerful male. He proposes that Telephus is truly masculine by visualizing an encounter between him and Lydia in the ode's third stanza. Here our lyricist reads Lydia's body as story by describing and commenting on the bruises that a lover (presumably Telephus) has left on her skin.[55] Without having witnessed the events that he narrates, the speaker gives us an account of how he imagines their violent lovemaking. The scene that he outlines bears a strong resemblance to elegy's amatory battles. Like Telephus' body, though, Lydia's body and the damage inflicted upon it are processed through the secondary filter of the lyricist's voice instead of being presented as a first-person confession from a violent elegiac *amator* (*Carm.* 1.13.9–12):[56]

uror, seu tibi candidos
turparunt umeros immodicae mero
rixae, sive puer furens
impressit memorem dente labris notam.

I burn, whether quarrels excessive
because of wine have stained your gleaming
shoulders, or a raging boy
has left a souvenir mark on your lips with his teeth.

Telephus has marked Lydia. Her gleaming skin and her lips display bruises and bite marks, producing a piquant combination of purity with damage. Word order allows the contrast between damaged and pristine bodies to resonate on the literal page as well as on Lydia's flesh. *Uror* (9), proclaims the lyricist, "I burn," continuing the claim to bodily disintegration that he had developed in the previous stanza. *Uror* is balanced by *candidos* (9), which the proximity of *tibi* marks as a part of Lydia's body; briefly, then, we discern a contrast between passion-ridden lover and untouched female. Not for long, though, since *turparunt* (10) immediately follows *candidos*. Finally, in line 11 we learn that *puer furens* is the subject who has been acting upon Lydia.

In these lines, Telephus' role as proxy for the lyricist becomes rapidly apparent. The poet's own passion (*uror,* 9) introduces the correlative pair *seu . . . sive* (9–11); because of the positioning of these clauses, his experience remains in the foreground during both ensuing pictures of amatory violence. In the absence of a specified perpetrator, lines 9–11 (which occupy

55. For greater ease in discussion, and because of the strong end-stopping that occurs every four lines, I treat the ode as composed of five stanzas; see, however, Halporn, Ostwald, and Rosenmeyer 1980, 103–4, and cf. Collinge 1961, p. 59, n. 2, on the question of how to divide the second Asclepiadean.

56. See James 2003 on the elegiac *rixa* as a "sanctioned outlet" for the lover's rage, and on the elegiac *amator*'s acknowledgement of his own fury; cf. Cahoon 1988, passim, Fredrick 1997, 185–87, and Greene 1999b, 412.

virtually the center of the ode) allow us briefly to imagine that the speaker himself has bruised Lydia's shoulders. The mania implied by *uror* is developed further by *furens*. Poet and Telephus, sharing one stanza, are both men out of control. (Telephus, moreover, is a *puer,* immature and hence additionally unmanly. This quality, and his rage, undermine his earlier potential to be Callimachean.) Since *uror,* though, is used in erotic verse primarily of frustrated desire, the stanza's opening line denies our poet any immediate part in this experience. Telephus remains Lydia's actual lover; the lyricist's concern to master Telephus with syntax makes him appear Telephus' shadowy double.

The stanza is intensely visual, bringing into play the mixture of sexuality, vision, and violence so common in Roman erotic poetry. Our tormented lyricist, dwelling with patent delight on his image of the marked Lydia, presents her damaged skin to us for our enjoyment.[57] I can most efficiently address his response to her body by referring to film theory's use of visual pleasure (scopophilia) and voyeurism. As formulated by the pioneering feminist scholar Laura Mulvey, scopophilia in film "arises from pleasure in using another person as an object of sexual stimulation through sight."[58] In Mulvey's use (which is essentially neo-Freudian), and in that of scholars following her, scopophilia elides the woman's sexual difference. She is fetishized by being presented as a series of body parts. Here "the gaze" substitutes for actual penetration; the woman's genitals are ignored and her body remains intact.

Voyeurism, in contrast to scopophilia, includes a sadistic element. Recognizing the woman's sexual difference calls up a violent response on the man's part, which (in Freudian thought) derives from the fear of castration that is triggered by his recognition of sexual difference.[59] While Freudianism does not invariably map well onto the social and familial dynamics of Augustan Rome, the language of film theory has proven extremely useful for feminist readings of elegy and lyric. The terms "scopophilia" and "voyeurism" in particular have had great applicability in discussions of violence in elegy. Lydia, loved and abused, proves an excellent example of the transition so frequently observed in elegiac *rixae* from scopophilia to voyeurism and violence.[60]

57. See Cahoon 1988, 296–97; and Greene 1999b, 415–17, on Ovid's aesthetic pleasure in violence against women.

58. Mulvey 1975, 9–10; cf. Kaplan 1983, 310–11. Mulvey 1975, 13–14, treats fetishization. See most recently Fredrick 2002a and Greene 1999b for discussions of scopophilia in classical literature.

59. For the purposes of this article, I am using one earlier form of film theory, which was concerned only with the male gaze directed at a female object. Other early approaches included the interest of Doane (1987) in the inadequacy of the female gaze. More recent film theory (and its literary or art-historical applications) has been concerned with, e.g., films that both are produced by women and speak to a female audience (de Lauretis 1987) or with identifying masochistic processes of viewing (Clover 1992); see especially Fredrick 2002a, 13–16, Benton 2002, 32–33, and Eldred 2002, 63–65, for recent evaluations of film theory in the context of classical literary scholarship.

60. Skinner (1997, 132–33) rightly cautions against mechanically projecting the structures of Freudianism onto Roman society. See in particular the work of Fredrick 1997 and 2002a, Greene 1999b, and Sharrock 2002b, on the applicability of film theory to elegiac violence. Sutherland 2003 applies film theory to *Carm.* 1.19, in which Horace's lyricist (with questionable success) attempts violence and visual control against a desired woman.

Before being bruised, Lydia is already (by implication) an outstanding source of visual pleasure. She is fair-skinned, with shoulders that are *candidos* (9). Her pale and gleaming shoulders tell us that she is a very beautiful woman. Because of her beauty and the simple fact that she is light in coloring, she draws the gaze just as does the fair-skinned Telephus. The brief delaying of *rixae* (11) makes us aware of a contrast in color between Lydia's fair shoulders and the wine (*mero,* 10) that triggered Telephus' violence, since the conventional darkness of *merum* evokes more dramatically the bruises that are merely implicit in *turparunt* (10). From the poet's meticulous use of language, from his lingering on these scenes of conflict and their results, we can conclude that he appreciates Lydia's staining for its aesthetic effects at the same time that the story behind her bruises distresses him.[61]

By reading the violence that is mapped out on Lydia's body, the lyricist also brings her emphatically into the realm of the sexual. Here Horace undermines yet another norm of erotic verse. As I mentioned in my opening section, Wyke introduced a thread of scholarship (now developed further by her and by other scholars) on the elegiac *puella*'s status as metaphorical elegiac text.[62] Callimacheanism, and Roman realizations of Callimacheanism, require that text and metaphorical *puella* be smooth and unblemished, fair and polished. Lydia in *Odes* 1.13 is flawless in line 9 (and presumably, though not explicitly, in lines 1–8), but her wounding by Telephus undermines her former status as the untouched source of scopophilia. She is now *candida* only insofar as her natural fairness provides a canvas for her bruises.[63] Both her name and the sexual adventuring advertised on her body identify her as publicly accessible. As a result, the lyricist appears pathetic in desiring an exclusive claim to her. The fact that he remains desperate for Lydia (*uror,* 9), despite being able to read her bruises correctly, continues the feminizing process that began with his disintegration in the second stanza.[64]

Uror brings into focus an additional collapse of the lyricist's potency. The verb has a range of possible meanings in this context. It is, of course, a cliché of Roman erotic poetry for an *amator* to claim that he is burned; we should nevertheless grant *uror* its full force here, since the speaker clearly intends it to evoke violence that is done to his body.[65] His use of the verb in this poem may derive from the devastating passion that he has already

61. Again, see Commager 1962, 154, on Horace's effective use of colors. Ancona (1994, 124) notes of Lydia's bruises that "it is this prior lovemaking that itself occasions the poet-lover's desire"; see also Yardley 1976, 125. Maurach (1992, 505) and Syndikus (2001, p. 157, n. 18) suggest that the poet is troubled by the damage to Lydia's beauty. Prop. 1.7.39–40 similarly emphasizes the contrast between white skin and bruises; cf. Greene 1999b, 413–15.

62. In addition to Wyke 1987, see especially Myerowitz 1985, 104–28, and cf. Gold 1993a, 87–88, and 1993b, 286–93, Keith 1994, Greene 1995b and 1998, 37–66, Richlin 1995, and Downing 1999.

63. See Wyke 1987, 60, and Fredrick 1997, 172–74, 179–86, on the elegiac *puella*'s shift from being the aesthetically perfect body to the degraded body.

64. See Skinner 1991, 6–11, on the *amator*'s desperation in Catull. 37, and 1991, p. 7, n. 25, on the contrast between the restricted sexuality of the *matrona* and the public sexuality of the prostitute.

65. West (1967, 71) makes the astute observation regarding *Carm.* 1.13 that "[w]e cannot fully understand any of this poetry if we do not bear in mind the literal force of the metaphors"; cf. Sutherland 2003, 66–67, on burning in *Carm.* 1.19; Pichon 1902, 150 and 301, lists numerous examples from elegy; and see West 1967, 68–70, for further discussion.

described, from his despair that Lydia belongs to another, even from his own sexual pleasure in the story that he extracts from her bruises—or from some combination of all three responses. In any event, the poet finds no useful target for either his arousal or his distress: *uror,* a middle use of the passive, locks him firmly into the solipsistic position that erotic poetry mandates for its lovers.

The lyricist seems capable only of this self-directed violence. Unlike the elegiac lovers, he cannot express directly his anger toward the *amata*. Violence does remain a normative part of love play for this ode; the speaker's impaired state requires, however, that Telephus serve as his proxy in Lydia's wounding. Telephus then manifests conventionally masculine capabilities by inflicting physical injury on Lydia. Symbolically penetrating her, he leaves bruises that claim a manliness his physical appearance denies.[66] Since Telephus has no voice in *Odes* 1.13, we can only guess at his concern with such testimony. Elegiac poets, however, speak frequently of love bites—imprinted by either lover or beloved—as proud proof that a relationship exists (Prop. 3.8.21–22):

in morso aequales videant mea vulnera collo:
me doceat livor mecum habuisse meam.

Let my comrades see my wounds, on my bitten neck:
let the bruising show that I had my girl with me.

The other side of the equation also holds true. Like the poet of *Odes* 1.13, other competitors in love refer to love bites when they express their distress over an *amata*'s flagrant infidelities (Ov. *Am.* 3.14.31–34):

cur totiens video mitti recipique tabellas?
cur pressus prior est interiorque torus?
cur plus quam somno turbatos esse capillos
collaque conspicio dentis habere notam?

Why do I see tablets being sent and received so often?
Why is the middle of the bed already pressed down?
Why do I notice that her hair is disturbed by more than sleep
and that her neck bears the mark of a tooth?

Even if Telephus does not deliberately advertise his success with Lydia, the lyricist finds the younger man's traces entirely unambiguous. Telephus lays claim to Lydia by displaying his prowess on her body, all the while maintaining his own physical integrity and proving his masculinity. This apparent *puer delicatus* writes on Lydia as she fantasized of writing on him. In wresting from her the power of which she dreamed, he moves the dynamic between male and female back toward its normative state.[67]

66. Fredrick (1997, 176, 179, 184–86) argues that the wounding of the elegiac *amata,* since it represents the lover's attempt to recoup a conventional masculinity, moves elegy back in the direction of epic. Corbeill (1995, 151–52) observes that it is risky for a speaker to make unsubstantiated charges of effeminacy against an opponent.

67. Cf. the suggestion of Greene (1999a, 5–6) that the rival (*ille*) of Catull. 51 proves his masculinity by his "imperviousness to Lesbia's charms." Telephus can leave his mark on Lydia's body, but he shares the lyricist's emotional collapse.

As I noted earlier, though, Telephus' masculinity may not be so easy to pin down. It is difficult to forget his prior status as the perpetually wounded male body. Even in the third stanza, where Telephus appears unquestionably male, specifics of his attack on Lydia are troubling. Horace describes the quarrels that these two share as *immodicae mero,* "immoderate from wine," indicating that Telephus does not practice the restraint usually prescribed for the elite male. Telephus, proxy for the lyricist, finds his status as male destabilized at the very moment that it should be most abiding.

What masculinity Telephus can claim has close associations with writing. While Lydia's bruised shoulders are the most visually dramatic element of these lines, the *memorem . . . notam* (12) that Telephus leaves on her mouth has greater thematic importance, thanks to the association of *nota* with writing and communication. A conventional term in Tibullus, Propertius, and especially Ovid for the marks left by lovers, *nota* can refer (among other applications) to writing in general, to a label that indicates a wine's grade, or to a brand or mark that identifies one's property.[68] The *nota*—along with synonyms for such marks—is deeply imbedded in Roman amatory verse as a means of communication between lovers, whether inscribed on a body or on another surface. The elegist of Propertius 3.8, for example, asks that his *puella* wiggle her eyebrows or trace *notae* with her fingers if she wants to communicate with him in public (3.8.23–24). This worry about the conjunction of public and private communication is also expressed in Tibullus 1.6. Here (11–14) the *amator* describes how he taught Delia to evade her husband:

fingere nunc didicit causas, ut sola cubaret,
  cardine nunc tacito vertere posse fores,
tum sucos herbasque dedi, quis livor abiret,
  quem facit impresso mutua dente venus.

She has now learned to feign reasons to sleep alone,
  learned how to turn the doors on silent hinge,
then I gave potions and herbs to send away the bruising
  which shared passion makes with a tooth's mark.

The poet's lessons have backfired, however, with the result that (in a twist on Roman elevation of the *univira*) he must now advise Delia's husband on how to restrict her sexuality to just the two of them (1.6.17–20):

neu iuvenes celebret multo sermone, caveto,
  neve cubet laxo pectus aperta sinu,
neu te decipiat nutu, digitoque liquorem
  ne trahat et mensae ducat in orbe notas.

Make sure she neither praises young men often in conversation,
  nor lets her garment droop to show her bosom when she reclines,
nor deceives you with a nod, nor moistens her finger with wine
  to draw marks on the tabletop.

If a lover wishes to hide an illicit affair, marks on the body must be concealed or erased and alternate modes of communication must be developed.

68. *OLD* ad *nota,* 1, 5, 6; *noto, notare* has similar applications and likewise appears in erotic contexts.

The husband, or an established lover who fears deception, must at the same time become skilled in detecting and reading the illicit lover's hidden languages.[69] For the lover eager to publicize his conquests, however, love's traces are cause for exultation. The *amator* of Propertius 3.8 interprets violence from the *puella* as evidence that her feelings for him are sincere, *nam sine amore gravi femina nulla dolet* (3.8.10). The bruises that she leaves on him therefore serve as a means by which he might claim her as his sole property in the eyes of his rivals (*aequales,* 3.8.21).[70] In short, we can identify in Augustan erotic poetry a system of transactions wherein bites and bruises can be read by those who are knowledgeable in their interpretation, and those who leave the marks must plan their strategies accordingly.[71] Telephus is a successful writer insofar as he is a successful lover.

This focus on text as body and body as text distracts from the lyricist's anger, which is easily detected if one ignores his smokescreen. The poet expresses his rage through Telephus' actions, while retreating from any first-hand display of hostility. He narrates his own corporeal devastation almost concurrently with his recounting of Lydia's ecstasies over Telephus. Horace may be varying here a device often mined by Propertius and Tibullus, whose lovers fantasize about inflicting violence on the beloved but do not follow through.[72] Telephus, the direct perpetrator of violence against Lydia, becomes an intermediary through whom the lyricist can express his own fury against the beloved while retaining deniability. Lydia's body is thus the site for damage whose fascination the poet can explore at a distance. Perhaps more importantly, he retains an ethical advantage over Telephus.[73]

FAILURES OF READING AND OF RHETORIC

The speaker of *Odes* 1.13 spends his first three stanzas describing verbal communication about the body (by Lydia) and communication through and on the body (his own disintegration and Telephus' inscriptions on Lydia's body). It is not until the fourth stanza that he makes a direct request of Lydia, which involves her ability to interpret the marks that are on her own body (*Carm.* 1.13.13–16):

> non, si me satis audias,
> speres perpetuum dulcia barbare
> laedentem oscula quae Venus
> quinta parte sui nectaris imbuit.

69. Compare Prop. 4.3.26 and Ov. *Am.* 1.8.98 for other examples of *notae* as evidence of the beloved's infidelity.

70. The public quality of this display is related to the beatings inflicted by a lover during a *rixa* (on which motif see Yardley 1976, 126–27).

71. Cf. Leigh 1995, 200–202, 205–6, on the use of battle scars as marks of authentication.

72. As James (2003, 188) has suggested of Propertius and Tibullus, their anger "is constantly submerged but subconsciously felt." The indirection of *Carm.* 1.13 is similar to what we find in *Carm.* 1.17 and 1.23. Pucci 1975 treats the drive toward violence that is implicit in the lyricist's representation of Cyrus in 1.17; see similarly Ancona 1994, 70–74, on 1.23. Violence is often channeled into chaotic sexual encounters rather than being expressed directly.

73. The poet's indirection and avoidance of violence also, not incidentally, allow him to retain his Callimachean principles.

Do not, if you heed me adequately,
hope that he who crudely bruises your sweet lips
will be steadfast, lips that Venus has drenched
in a fifth part of her own nectar.

If Lydia were able to read the bruises on her own mouth correctly, the poet implies, she would recognize that Telephus is not an appropriate choice as her lover. The marks that Telephus leaves identify him as an unruly cultural outsider (*barbare laedentem,* 14–15).[74] He does not understand that a lover should be a man of discriminating tastes, that he should do nothing to disrupt the atmosphere of elegance and eroticism associated with a beautiful woman.[75] The poet represents himself in contrast as a peaceful, urbane lover whose sensitivity and erudition allow him to comprehend and demonstrate appropriate behavior toward the beloved. Emphasizing the violence of love bites rather than their eroticism, he claims to base his disapproval of Lydia's relationship purely on ethics and aesthetics. As Charles Segal notes, however, the fourth stanza "keeps the speaker's jealousy of Telephus in the foreground."[76] The poet's judgment on Telephus is further compromised by his own enjoyment of Lydia's injuries and by his obvious appreciation of Telephus' physical charms.[77]

The poet's syntax ensures, however, that he will have little influence with Lydia. The tentativeness of *si me satis audias . . . speres* (13–14) makes him seem to draw back from his request almost before he has begun to make it. Horace thus deftly undercuts any likelihood that Lydia will listen or respond to the speaker; this construction may even indicate that the speaker himself does not expect to be heeded. Only under uncertain and hypothetical circumstances will Lydia listen to his words and choose him over Telephus. As Ancona sums up, the poet's voice proves ineffective.[78] In the value system proposed here, Lydia proves to be either an unwilling or an inadequate reader of her own body. This judgment, though, comes to us through the poet, and it is not clear how seriously we should take his voice. The opening stanza has already shown that Lydia is thoroughly infatuated with Telephus. We have only the lyricist's objections to convince us of his position—and this is of questionable merit, since his primary concern is to entice Lydia away from Telephus rather than to perform a serious critique of their relationship. Tele-

74. Quadlbauer 1975 (followed by Connor 1987, 197, and Owens 1992, 238–39) reads *oscula* in line 15 as meaning "kisses" rather than "lips," which seems to me a strained interpretation. Though Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, ad loc.) give parallels for describing kisses as steeped in nectar, it is more logical that the relative clause here (*quae . . . imbuit,* 15–16) be applied to Lydia's lips rather than to kisses that Telephus has just been said to impress *barbare* (14). The result is the same, though, whichever way one reads this noun.

75. Cf. Syndikus 2001, 158. The tone of lines 13–16 has much in common with Catullus' systemic celebration of *venustas* (on which see Seager 1974, 891–93). Commager (1962, 153–54) and Segal (1973, 41) note the ode's intensely literary quality. I find the medical interpretation of Keyser 1989 unconvincing.

76. Segal 1973, 42; cf. also Tib. 1.10.52–66, especially lines 63–64, for contemporary recognition of the acceptability of erotic violence.

77. Owens (1992, 240–42) argues that the lyricist of *Carm.* 1.13 is infatuated with Telephus as well as with Lydia.

78. Ancona 1994, 123–25.

phus has won the battle before the poem begins: the elegiac parallels treated above tell us that Lydia in all likelihood enjoys the bodily marks that the lyricist frames as violence.

The speaker's verbal deficiency, like his physical disintegration, raises questions about his position in Rome's hierarchy of genders. In the competitive world occupied by the elite Roman male, maintaining power over one's neighbor required that one trump him in both gender status and speech, which were closely linked.[79] The aggression and competitiveness that this system implies for speaking practices are less conspicuous in Horace than they are, for example, in Catullus; we must take into account also the lyric and elegiac pose that ironically represents oratory as "masculine" speech to be rejected by the smaller, more "effeminate" genres.[80] We do nevertheless find poetic voices in the *Odes* claiming the power of effective speech (1.22.9–12):

namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
terminum curis vagor expeditis,
fugit inermem.

For while I was singing my Lalage
in the Sabine wood and wandering
beyond the border, cares laid aside,
a wolf fled me, though I was unarmed.

As Ellen Oliensis has noted of 1.22, "[the poet's] bodily integrity is not violated but shielded by his amorous song."[81] That the speaker of 1.13 does not similarly assert his verbal authority implies a conscious omission on Horace's part. The effective voices of this ode belong to Lydia and Telephus, both of whom claim to be successful communicators in the sexual arena. The poet allows Lydia's words objectifying Telephus to dominate his first stanza; in the third stanza, he describes Telephus' sexual prowess in terms metaphorical for verbal skill. Compared to these two performances, the lyricist's own hesitation is particularly striking. We come away with the impression that he deliberately advertises his own failure in performing masculinity.[82]

The content of the speaker's request to Lydia raises further problems for his gender status, since he expresses emotional need for the beloved instead of an interest in dominating her sexually. In particular, by focusing on Lydia's mouth and appearing to reject Telephus' amatory violence, the poet creates a tone that is erotic but never aggressively sexual. We can compare Catullus' first "kiss poem" (Catull. 5.7–9):

79. Gleason 1995, passim, especially 103–58, and Gunderson 2000, 81–85; see Skinner 1991, 5, on this dynamic in Catullus.

80. See Fredrick 1997, 179–82, and Wyke 1987, 60, on this dynamic in elegy; on Horace see especially Ahern 1991 and Smith 1994 on *Carm.* 1.6.

81. Oliensis 1998, 110.

82. Cf. Skinner 1991, 4–5; Richlin 1992, 81–143. The transition from untouched Telephus to inscribed Lydia may, as Fredrick suggests of the transition from Callimachus to Catullus, come about because it is easier to mark the female body (Fredrick 1997, 176–78).

da mi basia mille, deinde centum,
dein mille altera, dein secunda centum,
deinde usque altera mille, deinde centum.

Give me a thousand kisses, then a hundred,
then another thousand, then a second hundred,
then still another thousand, then a hundred.

Recent commentators on Catullus believe that his Poem 5 and its companion piece, Poem 7, reflect a self-indulgent, "non-purposive" sexuality that identifies their speakers as effeminate. As a result, within the fiction of Catullus' collection this pair of poems is the likely motivation for the charges of effeminacy to which poem 16 (*pedicabo ego vos*) responds with phallic counterattack.[83] The fourth stanza of *Odes* 1.13 is similarly nonpurposive in its sexual dynamic, excluding Horace's lyricist from the phallic aggressiveness so central to constructions of Roman masculinity. Any further claim he might make to normative gender status is hereby called into question.

These same lines, though, should make us question how seriously we are to take the lyricist's pose, however overdetermined his effeminacy may be. Given his poorly concealed fascination with Lydia's bruises in lines 9–12, his prim censuring of Telephus' rough kisses seems entirely disingenuous. This carefully phrased disavowal of violence allows the poet to differentiate himself ethically from Telephus while setting before our eyes one last image of amatory damage. The picture of Lydia's lips, injured, juxtaposed with Lydia's lips, drenched in Venus' nectar, is—though subtle—the ode's clearest affirmation that this speaker finds Telephus' violence arousing.[84] In so continuing his voyeuristic representation of Lydia's body and the harm done to it, the poet shows himself enmeshed in the precise literary trope that he claims to reject, deriving tremendous enjoyment from others' sexual aggression and sexual wounds. As in the third stanza, though, his pleasure can be only secondhand: Telephus performs the actual wounding, while our lyricist enjoys the scene vicariously through a complex set of denials.[85]

EROTIC RETREAT AND LITERARY CONTAINMENT

The feigned ethical stance of the fourth stanza carries over into the ode's final lines. Here the lyricist appears to dream of the lasting and secure partnership that, to his mind, Lydia ought to choose over her volatile encounters with Telephus. There are, however, some difficulties with the language of this closing passage (*Carm.* 1.13.17–20):

83. See especially Fitzgerald 1996, 36–38, 49–55, and p. 251, n. 10, on Catull. 5 and 7. Marilyn Skinner (1991, 4–6) applies to Catullus the Foucauldian notion that romantic immoderation constitutes *mollitia,* particularly noting the phallic stance of Catull. 16. Wiseman (1976, 16–17), Janan (1994, p. 149, n. 5), and Nappa (2001, 49–57) discuss the relationship of Catull. 16 to the "kiss poems."

84. *Pace* Maurach (1992, 513), who believes that by the end of line 12 "die triebhafte Leidenschaft ist bezwungen," and Segal (1973, 41–42), who sees lines 13–16 as transitional in a movement from passion to calm.

85. Cf. Segal 1973, 44.

felices ter et amplius
quos irrupta tenet copula nec malis
divulsus querimoniis
suprema citius solvet amor die.

Thrice happy and more are they
whom an unbroken bond holds and whom
love, torn asunder by no evil complaints,
will set free no more quickly than their last day.

If one considers these lines solely with a focus on language and tone, they seem oddly out of sync with the ode's first three stanzas. Segal summarizes and critiques some readings of the stanza, noting that while scholars generally acknowledge the variance between the ode's two sections ("intense emotion" in the first three stanzas, "sanctimonious calm" in the last), they have not always thought it important to reconcile the disjunction.[86] The formulaic phrase *felices ter et amplius,* he proposes, "suggests that the speaker in fact stands in a situation far from what he is praising." Lines 17–20 do not represent true calm but instead comment ironically on the speaker's inability to control his emotions; he is overly involved in his passion for Lydia.[87] By Segal's reading, therefore, the ode's closing lines remind us not to take the poet seriously. We are well advised that he has self-consciously produced his earlier stance as distraught lover.

As was true of the speaker's production of his own disintegrating body earlier in the text, his deliberate construction and exaggerated awareness of his own emotions here should give us pause. Presenting himself as the perfect alternative to Telephus, he claims to offer—as do Catullus' *ego* and the lovers of elegy—a devoted fidelity. According to Roman norms, though, fidelity is expected only of women, not of men; according to the norms of lyric and elegy, such fidelity is doomed to disappointment. The poet-lover must inevitably experience loss, betrayal, and abandonment.[88] Our speaker's representation of his emotions here would seem to confirm the *mollitia* for which his compromised body has already given evidence. We are encouraged to associate his effeminacy with inability to win Lydia while identifying Telephus' apparent masculinity with his erotic success. Marked by desire, the poet is unable to mark others' bodies; debilitated by love, he humiliates himself still further before his public by revealing dreams of a union that will be happy until death.

86. Segal 1973, p. 39 and n. 1, p. 40.

87. Segal 1973, 42, 45, with reference to the formula's occurrence at Hom. *Od*. 5.306 and Verg. *Aen*. 1.94, actually states that the phrase *always* suggests a speaker's own less-than-happy state. Parallels at, e.g., Prop. 3.12.15 and *Corpus Tibull*. 3.3.26 do not, however, bear this out. See Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, ad loc., for other occurrences.

88. Cf. Hallett 1984, 249, on male fidelity in Catullus, and Wyke 1989a, 36, on the same in Propertius. As Segal (1973, 40) remarks, "in the love-affairs of the *Odes irruptae copulae* are by far the exception rather than the rule" (see *contra* Syndikus 2001, 159). Rubino 1975, 291, and Veyne 1988, 132, discuss the impermanence of elegiac relationships. On the nominal subservience of Catullus to Lesbia and of the male elegists to their respective beloveds, see Hallett 1984, 249–51; Wyke 1989a, 36–37; Gold 1993a, 91–93; Skinner 1997, 142–47; and Greene 2000, 241–42 and passim. Male infidelity is nevertheless a frequent theme in elegy; see, e.g., Prop. 1.3.35–40 and 1.18.9–12, and on Ovid see James 2003, 184, 203–4, and 208.

From one perspective, then, these closing lines offer an emotional version of the physical impotence we have observed in the previous four stanzas. The poet has (so he indicates) no emotional control, no verbal power, and no penetrative ability; neither his body nor his literary product is adequately bounded. How seriously, though, are we to take his assertions? We can identify a second layer to the close of *Odes* 1.13, in which a calmer voice—didactic and contemplative rather than distraught and self-absorbed—proposes that his lyric *can* explore extremes of emotion and still remain under control.[89] Having dwelt on processes of disintegration, the speaker fantasizes in lines 17–20 about containment, stability, and wholeness: *irrupta* and *tenet* (18), *nec . . . divulsus* (18–19), and *[nec] . . . solvet* (19–20) propose that extremes of love and devotion might ultimately counteract their own bodily damage. This speaker, in true Callimachean style, advertises his own literary virtuosity; he claims a profoundly effective masculinity by bringing before our gaze Telephus' body, Lydia's, and his own. In order to position these bodies within the ode's power dynamic, he describes the marks that appear on each, marks that we can interpret only after he has revealed or acknowledged them. When we encounter his poem, then, we are reading Lydia, Telephus, and the poet himself.

This attempt at recuperation does not address or resolve all the problems that the ode has raised. It does not succeed, first of all, at eliding our vision of the lyricist's dissolving body in lines 5–8; we are left with a tension between the poet's ability to write bodies (though not to write on them) and his inability to control his own body. Nor do we find a reconciliation between Telephus' effeminate body and uncontrolled rage, on the one hand, and his achievement of successful (if symbolic) penetration on the other. Lydia fails to write on the object of her desire and is herself written upon. The result is an ode populated by failed or flawed writers who may also be inadequate erotic performers. Horace thus throws into question the validity of lyric as a truly masculine genre.

A further and perhaps more serious unresolved problem is the status of Lydia's body. As I have discussed above, bodies used as writing surfaces and bruises used as text remind us that the elegiac *puella* serves repeatedly as a metaphor for her genre. In an ode that conspicuously acknowledges its literary models, Telephus—already depicted as a writing tablet—imprints his desire on Lydia's fair-skinned body. The metaphor should be internally reciprocal: poetry produces bodies, bodies generate poetry. Yet in our ode the metaphor collapses. Callimachean text and Callimachean body are supposed to be without fault. However, in making the transition from *candida puella* (object of scopophilia) to damaged and penetrated flesh (object of voyeurism), Lydia becomes a failed text. The lyricist has already explored the problem that the successful Callimachean poet must be an impotent lover. Now, it seems, sexual pleasure achieved may imply bad poetry.

The treatment of bodies in *Odes* 1.13 also raises a network of questions about the precise relationship between power and the corporeal writing that

89. See Lowrie 1994 on Horace's use of extremes to define a mean for his lyric.

I have identified. Do the bruises on Lydia's neck make her female and the disintegration of the lyricist's body make him effeminate, or do these signs merely articulate the essence of each individual? Does Telephus' lack of marks indicate that he is after all truly masculine, or does masculinity make it impossible to mark him? Does the body's inner nature take primacy, or the body's representation? As I proposed when I considered the relationship between bodies and poetry in this ode, one side of the equation may not have more weight than the other. Rome was a culture much preoccupied with the public production and reception of gender: if the lyricist represents a body as masculine or feminine/feminized, his representation becomes the truth of that body and that individual.[90] The difficulty with *Odes* 1.13 is that it seems to deny or overturn every position that it takes.

In particular, *Odes* 1.13 repeatedly offers the possibility that gender norms will be reestablished. Yet when we consider the merging of power and gender, the ode constantly destabilizes Roman expectations of how bodies are gendered and how texts are produced, while also challenging the Roman dependence on physiognomy. Telephus is able to act upon Lydia's body, yet never achieves a convincing masculinity; Lydia, who briefly attempts to be a desiring subject, is speedily relegated to the conventional mold of the literary *amata*. She is reinstated as *materia* for a lover's erotic writings instead of being authorized as her own producer of amatory texts. Disrupting Roman norms even more violently, the *ego* of *Odes* 1.13 presents himself as a suffering lover, an effeminate man with no power over himself or over his beloved. His compromised body—his surface—excludes him from the company of those *viri* who successfully project masculinity. At the same time, he claims mastery of the poetic representation and manipulation of gender.[91] Finally, from Lydia's damaged body-as-text we learn that the erotic poem may itself be unstable or fundamentally blighted. In the end, not only are there no readings that we can trust, but the very texts that we attempt to read may be inherently unstable and corrupt.[92]

University of Tennessee

90. See especially Edwards 1993, 68–97, on the Roman preoccupation with detecting *mollitia* in the male body; cf. Gleason 1995, 55–81, on the same process during the Second Sophistic.

91. Cf. Gold 1993a, 89, on Propertius' "crack[ing] open the traditional identification of 'male' and 'female' codes of behavior."

92. An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the Birmingham, Alabama, meeting of the Southern Section of CAMWS in 2002. I am grateful to Ellen Greene and other members of that audience for their responses and suggestions. Comments and criticism from Allen Dunn, Eleanor Winsor Leach, Christopher Nappa, Matthew B. Roller, and the anonymous readers for *CP* have much improved the final product. Any remaining errors or infelicities are my own responsibility.

LITERATURE CITED

Ahern, C. F. 1991. Horace's Rewriting of Homer in *Carmen* 1.6. *CP* 86:301–14.

Ancona, R. 1994. *Time and the Erotic in Horace's "Odes."* Durham, N.C.

_____. 2002. The Untouched Self: Sapphic and Catullan Muses in Horace, *Odes* 1.22. In Spentzou and Fowler 2002, 161–86.

Barton, C. A. 1994. All Things Beseem the Victor: Paradoxes of Masculinity in Early Imperial Rome. In *Gender Rhetorics: Postures of Dominance and Submission in History,* ed. R. C. Trexler, 83–92. Binghamton, N.Y.

Bauchhenß-Thüriedl, C. 1971. *Der Mythos von Telephos in der antiken Bildkunst*. Beiträge zur Archäologie, 3. Würzburg.

Benton, C. 2002. Split Vision: The Politics of the Gaze in Seneca's *Troades*. In Fredrick 2002c, 31–56.

Brooks, P. 1993. *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative*. Cambridge, Mass.

Cahoon, L. 1988. The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*. *TAPA* 118:293–307.

Cairns, F. 1977. Horace on Other People's Love Affairs (*Odes* I, 27; II, 4; I, 8; III, 12). *QUCC* 24:121–47.

Carson, A. 1999. Dirt and Desire: The Phenomenology of Female Pollution in Antiquity. In Porter 1999, 77–100.

Clover, C. 1992. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton, N.J.

Collinge, N. E. 1961. *The Structure of Horace's "Odes."* London.

Commager, S. 1962. *The "Odes" of Horace: A Critical Study.* New Haven, Conn.

Connor, P. J. 1987. *Horace's Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humour.* Victoria, Australia.

Copley, F. O. 1947. *Servitium Amoris* in the Roman Elegists. *TAPA* 78:285–300.

Corbeill, A. 1995. *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*. Princeton, N.J.

_____. 2002. Political Movement: Walking and Ideology in Republican Rome. In Fredrick 2002c, 182–215.

Cyrino, M. S. 1995. *In Pandora's Jar: Lovesickness in Early Greek Poetry.* Lanham, Md.

Davis, G. 1991. *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Dean-Jones, L. 1991. The Cultural Construct of the Female Body in Classical Greek Science. In *Women's History and Ancient History,* ed. S. B. Pomeroy, 111–37. Chapel Hill, N.C.

_____. 1994. Medicine: The "Proof" of Anatomy. In *Women in the Classical World,* ed. E. Fantham, H. P. Foley, N. B. Kampen, S. B. Pomeroy, and H. A. Shapiro, 183–205. Oxford.

DeForest, M., ed. 1993. *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King*. Wauconda, Ill.

De Lauretis, T. 1987. *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction*. Bloomington, Ind.

Doane, M. A. 1987. *The Desire to Desire: The Woman's Film of the 1940s*. Bloomington, Ind.

Downing, E. 1999. Anti-Pygmalion: The *Praeceptor* in *Ars Amatoria*, Book 3. In Porter 1999, 235–51.

duBois, P. 1988. *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*. Chicago.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.

Eldred, K. O. 2002. This Ship of Fools: Epic Vision in Lucan's Vulteius Episode. In Fredrick 2002c, 57–85.

Elsner, J., and A. R. Sharrock. 1991. Re-Viewing Pygmalion. *Ramus* 20:149–53.

Fear, T. 2000. The Poet as Pimp: Elegiac Seduction in the Time of Augustus. *Arethusa* 33:217–40.

Fitzgerald, W. 1996. *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Flaschenriem, B. L. 1999. Sulpicia and the Rhetoric of Disclosure. *CP* 94:36–54.

Flemming, R. 2000. *Medicine and the Making of Roman Women: Gender, Nature, and Authority from Celsus to Galen*. New York.
Foley, H. P. 1988. Tragedy and Politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*. *JHS* 108:33–47.
Foucault, M. 1985. *The Use of Pleasure*. Trans. R. Hurley. New York.
Fowler, D. 2002. Masculinity under Threat? The Poetics and Politics of Inspiration in Latin Poetry. In Spentzou and Fowler 2002, 141–59.
Fredrick, D. 1997. Reading Broken Skin: Violence in Roman Elegy. In Hallett and Skinner 1997, 172–93.
_____. 2002a. Introduction: Invisible Rome. In Fredrick 2002c, 1–30. Baltimore.
_____. 2002b. Mapping Penetrability in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome. In Fredrick 2002c, 236–64.
_____, ed. 2002c. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power and the Body in Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
Gagliardi, D. 1993. Orazio e gli amori ancillari: Per l'interpretazione di *Carm.* II, 4. In *Letture oraziane,* ed. G. Bruno, 91–97. Venosa.
Gamel, M.-K. 1989. *Non sine Caede:* Abortion Politics and Poetics in Ovid's *Amores*. *Helios* 16:183–206.
Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, N.J.
Gold, B. K. 1993a. "But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place": Finding the Female in Roman Poetry. In *Feminist Theory and the Classics,* ed. N. S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin, 75–101. New York and London.
_____. 1993b. The "Master Mistress" of My Passion: The Lady as Patron in Ancient and Renaissance Literature. In DeForest 1993, 279–304.
_____. 1998. "The House I Live in Is Not My Own": Women's Bodies in Juvenal's *Satires*. *Arethusa* 31:369–86.
Graver, M. 1998. The Manhandling of Maecenas: Senecan Abstractions of Masculinity. *AJP* 119:607–32.
Greene, E. 1995a. The Catullan Ego: Fragmentation and the Erotic Self. *AJP* 116:77–93.
_____. 1995b. Elegiac Woman: Fantasy, *Materia,* and Male Desire in Propertius 1.3 and 1.11. *AJP* 116:303–18.
_____. 1998. *The Erotics of Domination*. Baltimore.
_____. 1999a. Re-figuring the Feminine Voice: Catullus Translating Sappho. *Arethusa* 32:1–18.
_____. 1999b. Travesties of Love: Violence and Voyeurism in Ovid *Amores* 1.7. *CW* 92:409–18.
_____. 2000. Gender Identity and the Elegiac Hero in Propertius 2.1. *Arethusa* 33:241–61.
Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
Gutzwiller, K. J., and A. N. Michelini. 1991. Women and Other Strangers: Feminist Perspectives in Classical Literature. In *(En)Gendering Knowledge: Feminists in Academe,* ed. J. E. Hartman and E. Messerdow, 66–84. Knoxville, Tenn.
Hallett, J. P. 1984. The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism. In *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers,* ed. J. Peradotto and J. P. Sullivan, 241–62. SUNY Series in Classical Studies. Albany, N.Y.
Hallett, J. P., and M. Skinner, ed. 1997. *Roman Sexualities*. Princeton, N.J.
Halporn, J. W., M. Ostwald, and T. G. Rosenmeyer. 1980. *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry.* Indianapolis and Cambridge.
Hinds, S. 1987. The Poetess and the Reader: Further Steps towards Sulpicia. *Hermathena* 143:29–46.
Holzberg, N. 1999. Four Poets and a Poetess or a Portrait of the Poet as a Young Man? Thoughts on Book 3 of the *Corpus Tibullianum*. *CJ* 94:169–91.

James, S. L. 1998. Introduction: Constructions of Gender and Genre in Roman Comedy and Elegy. *Helios* 25:3–16.

_____. 2003. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy.* Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Janan, M. 1994. *"When the Lamp Is Shattered": Desire and Narrative in Catullus*. Carbondale, Ill.

Kampen, N. B. 1996. Omphale and the Instability of Gender. In *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Greece, Egypt, and Italy,* ed. N. B. Kampen, 233–46. Cambridge.

Kaplan, E. A. 1983. Is the Gaze Male? In *Powers of Desire,* ed. A. Snitow, C. Stansell, and S. Thompson, 309–27. New York.

Karras, R. M. 2000. Active/Passive, Acts/Passions: Greek and Roman Sexualities. *American Historical Review* 105:1250–65.

Keith, A. M. 1994. *Corpus Eroticum:* Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*. *CW* 88:27–40.

Kennedy, D. F. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy.* Cambridge.

Keyser, P. 1989. Horace *Odes* 1.13.3–8, 14–16: Humoural and Aetherial Love. *Philologus* 133:75–81.

King, H. 1994. Producing Woman: Hippocratic Gynaecology. In *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night,* ed. L. Archer, S. Fischler, and M. Wyke, 102–14. New York.

_____. 1998. *Hippocrates' Woman: Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece*. London and New York.

Kossatz-Deissman, A. 1980. *Telephus Travestitus*. In *Tainia: Roland Hampe zum 70. Geburtstag am 2. Dezember 1978,* ed. H. A. Cahn and E. Simon, 281–90. Mainz.

Leach, E. W. 1994. Horace *Carmen* 1.8: Achilles, the Campus Martius, and the Articulation of Gender Roles in Augustan Rome. *CP* 89:334–43.

_____. 2001. Gendering Clodius. *CW* 94:335–59.

Leigh, M. 1995. Wounding and Popular Rhetoric at Rome. *BICS* 40:195–212.

Lipking, L. 1988. *Abandoned Women and Poetic Tradition*. Chicago and London.

Lowrie, M. 1994. Lyric's *Elegos* and the Aristotelian Mean: Horace, *C*. 1.24, 1.33, and 2.9. *CW* 87:377–94.

Maurach, G. 1992. Hor. *c.* 1, 13: Einige Methodenprobleme. *Gymnasium* 99:501–17.

McCarthy, K. 1998. *Servitium Amoris: Amor Servitii*. In *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations,* ed. S. R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan, 174–92. London and New York.

McNamee, K. 1993. Propertius, Poetry, and Love. In DeForest 1993, 215–48.

Miller, P. A. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness*. London and New York.

_____. 1998. The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility. *Arethusa* 31:257–83.

Milnor, K. 2002. Sulpicia's (Corpo)reality: Elegy, Authorship, and the Body in [Tibullus] 3. 13. *CA* 21:259–82.

Mulvey, L. 1975. Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. *Screen* 16:8–18.

Myerowitz, M. 1985. *Ovid's Games of Love*. Detroit.

Nappa, C. 2001. *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction*. Frankfurt am Main.

Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: "Odes," Book I*. Oxford.

_____. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: "Odes," Book II*. Oxford.

Oliensis, E. 1991. Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*. *Arethusa* 24:107–38.

_____. 1997. The Erotics of *Amicitia:* Readings in Tibullus, Propertius, and Horace. In Hallett and Skinner 1997, 151–71.

_____. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority.* Cambridge.

Owens, W. M. 1992. Double Jealousy: An Interpretation of Horace *Odes* 1.13. In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History,* ed. C. Deroux, 237–44. Brussels.

Pichon, R. 1902. *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores.* Paris.
Porter, J. I., ed. 1999. *Constructions of the Classical Body.* Ann Arbor, Mich.
Pöschl, V. 1970. *Horazische Lyrik: Interpretationen.* Heidelberg.
Pucci, P. 1975. Horace's Banquet in *Odes* 1.17. *TAPA* 105:259–81.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1995. Design and Allusion in Horace, *Odes* 1.6. In *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration,* ed. S. J. Harrison, 50–64. New York.
Quadlbauer, F. 1975. *Laedentem Oscula:* Zu Hor. *carm.* I,13,15. In Monumentum Chiloniense: *Studien zur augusteischen Zeit: Kieler Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 70. Geburtstag,* ed. E. Lefèvre, 347–58. Amsterdam.
Quinn, K., ed. and comm. 1980. *Horace: The "Odes."* New York.
Reckford, K. J. 1998. Reading the Sick Body: Decomposition and Morality in Persius' Third *Satire*. *Arethusa* 31:337–54.
Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor.* New York.
_____. 1993. Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the *Cinaedus* and the Roman Law against Love between Men. *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3:523–73.
_____. 1995. Making Up a Woman: The Face of Roman Gender. In *Off with Her Head! The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture,* ed. H. Eilberg-Schwartz and W. Doniger, 185–213. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Roessel, D. 1990. The Significance of the Name *Cerinthus* in the Poems of Sulpicia. *TAPA* 120:243–50.
Rubino, C. A. 1975. The Erotic World of Catullus. *CW* 68:289–98.
Seager, R. 1974. *Venustus, Lepidus, Bellus, Salsus.* Notes on the Language of Catullus. *Latomus* 33:891–94.
Segal, C. 1973. *Felices Ter et Amplius:* Horace, *Odes* I,13. *Latomus* 32:39–46.
Sharrock, A. R. 1991. Womanufacture. *JRS* 81:36–49.
_____. 1995. The Drooping Rose: Elegiac Failure in *Amores* 3.7. *Ramus* 24:152–80.
_____. 2002a. An A-musing Tale: Gender, Genre, and Ovid's Battles with Inspiration in the *Metamorphoses*. In Spentzou and Fowler 2002, 207–27.
_____. 2002b. Looking at Looking: Can You Resist a Reading? In Fredrick 2002c, 265–95.
Simon, E. 1982. *The Ancient Theatre*. London and New York.
Skinner, M. B. 1991. The Dynamics of Catullan Obscenity: Cc. 37, 58 and 11. *Syllecta Classica* 3:1–11.
_____. 1993. Catullus in Performance. *CJ* 89:61–68.
_____. 1997. *Ego Mulier:* The Construction of Male Sexuality in Catullus. In Hallett and Skinner 1997, 129–50.
Smith, R. A. 1994. Horace *Odes* 1.6: *Mutatis Mutandis,* a Most Virgilian *Recusatio*. *Gymnasium* 101:502–5.
Spentzou, E., and D. Fowler, eds. 2002. *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Oxford.
Sutherland, E. H. 2002. *Horace's Well-Trained Reader: Toward a Methodology of Audience Participation in the "Odes."* Frankfurt am Main.
_____. 2003. How (Not) to Look at a Woman: Bodily Encounters and the Failure of the Gaze in Horace's *C*. 1.19. *AJP* 124:57–80.
Syndikus, H. P. 2001. *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der "Oden."* Vol. 1. Darmstadt.
Verstraete, B. C. 1980. Slavery and the Social Dynamics of Male Homosexual Relations in Ancient Rome. *Journal of Homosexuality* 5:227–36.
Veyne, P. 1985. Homosexuality in Ancient Rome. In *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times,* ed. P. Ariès and A. Béjin, trans. A. Forster, 26–35. Oxford. Originally published as *Sexualités occidentales* (Paris, 1982).
_____. 1988. *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*. Chicago.

Von Staden, H. 1992. Women and Dirt. *Helios* 19:7–30.
Webster, T. B. L. 1967. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London.
West, D. 1967. *Reading Horace*. Edinburgh.
_____, ed. and trans. 1995. *Horace "Odes" I: Carpe Diem*. Oxford.
Willett, S. J. 1996. Reticent about the Feeling, Precise about the Thing: Horace's Ironic Elegy. *Diotima: Materials for the Study of Women and Gender in the Ancient World,* http://www.stoa.org/diotima/essays/willett.shtml.
Williams, C. A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity.* New York.
Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry.* London.
Wiseman, T. P. 1976. Catullus 16. *LCM* 1:14–17.
Woodford, S. 2003. *Images of Myths in Classical Antiquity.* Cambridge and New York.
Wyke, M. 1987. Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*. *JRS* 77:47–61.
_____. 1989a. Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy. *Helios* 16:25–47.
_____. 1989b. Reading Female Flesh: *Amores* 3.1. In *History as Text,* ed. A. Cameron, 111–43. London.
_____. 1995. Taking the Woman's Part: Engendering Roman Love Elegy. In *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus Essays for J. P. Sullivan,* ed. A. J. Boyle, 110–28. Victoria, Australia.
Yardley, J. C. 1976. Lovers' Quarrels: Horace, *Odes* 1.13.11 and Propertius 4.5.40. *Hermes* 104:124–28.
Zumwalt, N. K. 1970. Horace's Evasion of Grand Poetry: *C.* I, 3 and *C.* I, 34. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley.