THE POET AND THE PROCURESS: THE *LENA* IN LATIN LOVE ELEGY*

By K. SARA MYERS

This paper investigates the figure of the *lena* in the elegies of Tibullus (1.5; 11.6), Propertius (IV.5), and Ovid (*Amores* 1.8).[1] While each poet treats the character of the *lena* in importantly different ways, each has in common a deep interest in contrasting his own position as both lover and poet with the activities of the *lena,* a bawd or procuress. All three poets curse the *lena*, denouncing primarily her malevolent magical powers, her *carmina*, which are directed against them and their *carmina*. The *lena* not only preaches an erotic code which in its emphasis on remuneration and the denigration of poetry directly opposes that of the poet-lover, she also usurps his role as instructor and constructor of the elegiac *puella*. It is the elegiac poet's prerogative to describe and construct the elegiac mistress. By usurping his role as *praeceptor,* the *lena* threatens the poet with both sexual and literary impotence. It is precisely because the *lena* challenges the male poet-lover's control over these terms that she is such a potent enemy; the woman with a pen, as Pollack writes in *The Poetics of Sexual Myth*, 'threatens to undermine a system of signification that defines her both as vulnerable and as victim'.[2] If the elegiac mistress can be said to play a more masterful role as *domina* in Roman love poetry than in conventional Roman ideology,[3] it must nevertheless be qualified with the reminder that she only plays a role constructed for her by elegy's first-person narrator who demands complete control over the discourse of their relationship, of the rules of the amatory game.[4] In Roman erotic elegy the subject matter may be female, but the narrative voice remains male and the ideological context remains androcentric. The poet's attack on her is an attempt to reassert his ultimate power over her as male and *auctor*, but her threat implicitly undermines his position as the sole interpreter and controller of his narrative. The *lena*'s shared status as erotic expert reveals her to be less an 'other', *altera*, than an alter-ego to elegy's first-person narrator. Her appropriation of the narrative voice is highlighted by her didactic posture, which closely imitates that of the elegiac poet as *praeceptor amoris*. Her precepts echo his and her speech articulates the rules of the erotic games which are the staple of Roman elegy.

As a female the *lena* represents the opposite of the amatory mistress, as old and ugly as she is young and beautiful.[5] As an ex-prostitute, however, the *lena* represents as well the future perhaps in store for the similarly classless elegiac *puella*.[6] Like the other 'written women' of elegy, as Wyke's work has emphasized, the *lena* can be read as a signifier of moral and political, as well as poetical, ideologies. The figure of the *lena* may be approached as a literary symbol with implications for the programmatic position of the poet. While the *puella* in elegy can be seen to function metaphorically as a model of the poet's poetic ideals, the *lena* serves as a model of anti-elegiac values. As a figured woman, the poet 'writes' her as an anti-Muse. Yet the poet's antipathy is more suggestive of identification. The *lena*'s gender and social status can also be read to express anxieties about the lack of social, sexual, and even poetic power central to the pose of the Latin

elegiac poet. As counter-ego the *lena* serves as foil for the elegiac lover-poet to define his own erotic, artistic, and social code. Her opposition is revealed to be central to the creation of the elegiac code of values. As alter-ego the *lena* is used to foreground both the self-delusions and seductions of the elegiac first-person persona and elegiac poetry itself. Through the figure of the *lena* the poets expose many of the tensions and contradictions of the elegiac code.

I. THE POEMS

The relative chronology of the *lena* elegies of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid is difficult. There are many interesting and significant parallels between the elegies and, even if priority cannot absolutely be determined, mutual influence in the treatment of the figure of the *lena* seems certain. For my own purposes, I will treat these poems as though Tibullus begins the tradition, with Propertius following, and Ovid providing the coda.[7] The portrait of the *lena* is not as fully developed in Tibullus, where she figures mainly as an oppositional figure, significantly, however, once in a Delia poem (1.5) and at the end of the collection in the final Nemesis poem (11.6). In both poems the *lena* bears the blame deflected from the elegiac *puella* and appears only to be cursed by the poet. These curses are a feature common to all three poets. Certain aspects of the characterization of the *lena* in Propertius and Ovid draw on other Tibullus poems, notably 1.4, where the erotodidaxis of Priapus resembles that of the *lena*.

Propertius iv.5 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8 are clearly closely related. There are numerous parallels between the two poems and the dramatic situation of each is similar.[8] In both poems the poet claims to report the erotodidactic speech of the *lena* which had been delivered to an unnamed and silent female auditor (iv.5.63, *amicae*) and each poet curses the *lena* for her interference in his affairs. While in Propertius the setting is probably deliberately vague,[9] Ovid's narrator provides the reader with stage directions explaining that he overheard the speech whilst hiding behind a set of doors — 'fors me sermoni testem dedit; illa monebat/ talia (me duplices occuluere fores)' (1.8.21–2) — and similarly explaining that her speech ended abruptly when his shadow betrayed his presence — 'vox erat in cursu, cum me mea prodidit umbra' (109). Ovid's greater dramatic detail perhaps suggests that he is elaborating Propertius' earlier version or making more explicit the links of the two elegies with similar situations in New and Roman Comedy. Both Ovid's and Propertius' poems are placed in positions which invite programmatic readings and their remarkable affinities to each other further suggest that they might function emblematically within the collections. *Amores* 1.8 is distinguished by its length and central position in Book One. Propertius iv.5 appears in a book filled with speaking females and needs to be understood in relation to these, while Ovid's *lena* is interestingly the lone female voice of his amatory collection.[10]

---

[7] For arguments supporting this order, see E. Courtney, 'Three poems of Propertius', *BICS* 16 (1969), 80–1; G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968), 545. P. Fedeli, *Properzio elegie libro IV. Testo critico e commento* (1965), xxvi, agrees with G. Luck's arguments in 'Das Acanthisgedicht des Properz', *Hermes* 83 (1955), 428–38, for an early composition date of Propertius iv.5. H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (1960), 140–1, argues on the basis of metrical and linguistic features for a late date, see also E. Lefèvre, *Propertius Ludibundus* (1966), 100–8. See also the discussion of *Am.* 1.8 by J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores Vol. II. A Commentary on Book One* (1989), 200–1. The situation is obviously made more difficult by the two editions of the *Amores*; on this see most recently McKeown, op. cit. (n. 1),

74–89. I will not be discussing the figure of the *lena* in Ovid, *Am.* iii.5.39–40.

[8] For parallels see the commentaries of Fedeli and McKeown, ad locc. See R. Neumann, *Qua ratione Ovidius in amoribus scribendis Properti elegiis usus sit* (1919), 106–22, Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 7), 105–8, Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), and M. Labate, 'Tradizione elegiaca e società galante negli *Amores*', *SCO* 27 (1977), 283–339, for comparisons of the two poems.

[9] The numerous textual difficulties of the poem have not made the construction of the dramatic situation any easier, see M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (1975), 137–42.

[10] McKeown, op. cit. (n. 1), 22, points out that Corinna speaks a total of only six words in the collection at *Am.* ii.18.8; another mistress speaks briefly at iii.7.77–80.

II. THE LITERARY BACKGROUND

When we first find the figure of the *lena* in Latin elegy in Tibullus 1.5.47–8 she enters obliquely as if already a familiar literary figure:

> quod adest huic dives amator,
> venit in exitium callida lena meum.

> Since a rich lover has appeared at her side,
> a crafty bawd has come for my destruction.

The very conventionality of the characterization of the *lena* has, I think, hindered the appreciation of the different use each poet makes of this figure.[11] The *lena* appears in a manner that declares her literariness in all three poets. As numerous critics have pointed out, the characterization of the *lena* in Latin love elegy is very close to that which may be found in New Comedy and Roman Comedy, such as Scapha in Plautus' *Mostellaria* and Cleareta in the *Asinaria*.[12] As Griffin has pointed out, however, the importance of the *lena* is emphasized in Augustan verse at the expense of the *leno*, a more common character in Comedy.[13] Rather than attribute the unimportance of the *leno* in elegy to the fact that this character 'would have shattered the delicate fabric of this poetic world',[14] we should consider that the *lena*'s gender is integral to her function in these poems. The didactic posture of the *lena* in Propertius IV.5 and Ovid *Amores* 1.8 is an essential feature of her characterization in Comedy. Wheeler suggested long ago that the figure of the poet as *praeceptor*, so central to the elegiac posture, has been usurped from the depiction of the *lena* in New Comedy as adapted in Roman Comedy, such as the didactic Scapha in the *Mostellaria*.[15] Cleareta in Plautus *Asinaria* 174–5 points out herself the conventionality and familiarity of the *lena*'s mercenary opposition to the lover: 'nam neque fictum usquamst neque pictum neque scriptum in poematis/ ubi lena bene agat cum quiquam amante, quae frugi esse volt?' The appearance of the procuress in the elegies of all three poets may indeed constitute a programmatic acknowledgement of the literary indebtedness of Latin erotic elegy to Comedy.

In Propertius IV.5.43–4 these literary origins are evoked when the *lena* suggests that the *puella* model her behaviour on a Menandrian role:

> sed potius mundi Thais pretiosa Menandri
> cum ferit astutos comica moecha Getas

> but rather let pricey Thais of urbane Menander's play [please you],
> where the whore of Comedy tricks the clever slaves.

Ovid in *Amores* 1.15.17–18 includes the bawd (*improba lena*, 17) in his list of typical Menandrian characters.[16] Other genres which depict such a figure include epigram (e.g. *A.P.* VII.455–6; XI.67; Mart. IX.29) and Hellenistic mime (Herodas, *Mim.* 1). Tibullus' depiction of Priapus in 1.4 is indebted to the Hellenistic tradition of *erotodidaxis*

[11] Ovid's and Propertius' poems have frequently been dismissed as generic set-pieces, e.g. W. A. Camps, *Propertius Elegies Book IV* (1965), 96, 'genre piece'; J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius: A Critical Introduction* (1976), 138, 'Alexandrian exercise'.
[12] cf. F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*² (1912), 146–8; A. A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy* (1938), 90–101. See on the figure of the *lena*, H. G. Oeri, *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie seine Nachwirkungen und seine Herkunft* (1948); Gutzwiller, op. cit. (n. 6), 106–7. J. C. Yardley, 'Propertius 4.5, Ovid *Amores* 1.6 and Roman Comedy', *PCPS* 33 (1987), 179–89, and H. MacL. Currie, 'Ovid and the Roman Stage', *ANRW* II.31.4 (1981), 2729–40, both argue for the importance of Roman Comedy as a direct source of inspiration for the elegists. J. Henderson, 'Older women in Attic Old Comedy', *TAPA* 117 (1987), 105–29, traces the bawd

type back to Archilochus 112. The *Dialog. meretr.* of Lucian also contain similar topics and types, esp. 3, 6, 7, 8.
[13] J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (1985), 114–15.
[14] ibid., 115.
[15] A. L. Wheeler, 'Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources, Part I', *CP* 5 (1910), 447–50; cf. 'Part II', *CP* 6 (1911), 56–77.
[16] Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), 82, takes Propertius' lines as a direct reference to the *Thais* of Menander as his source. At *Rem.* 385–6 the figure of Thais is used by Ovid to define the very nature of the subject of his erotic elegies: 'Thais in arte mea est'. For some background to the elegists' references to Menander, see E. Fantham, 'Roman experience of Menander in the late Republic and early Empire', *TAPA* 114 (1984), 299–309.

exemplified in Callimachus' *Iambus* IX (fr.199 Pf.).[17] It has also been suggested that the figure of the *lena* would be at home in contemporary Roman mime as well.[18] The dramatic scene of *Amores* I.8 has been likened to the erotodidactic scene of Herodas' first *Mimiamb* where the old nurse Gyllis tries to persuade Metriche, in the absence of her husband, to become the lover of Gryllus who has fallen in love with her. The setting in Plautus' *Mostellaria* 157ff. is even closer.[19] Here Philolaches, the lover of a young prostitute Philematium, eavesdrops on the erotodidaxis of her old maid Scapha and finally interrupts the conversation by his presence. Ovid's creation of this scenario suggests that he is making more explicit Propertius' hints that this elegiac motif has dramatic origins. Moreover, the closeness of his poem to that of Propertius effectively highlights by iteration the conventionality of the elegiac code and suggests that the *lena*'s function has a metaliterary component. By conjuring up the roles of lover, *lena,* and wealthy rival, all three elegiac poets self-consciously place themselves and their poetry in a fictive world of erotic discourse.

III. SOCIAL STATUS

        The clear literary genealogy and conventional characterization of the *lena* have by and large placed her outside of the consideration of her historicity.[20] While the search for the elegiac *puella* outside of elegy has long been debated and discussed, the *lena* has been received largely as a purely literary creation. The recent turning away from the search for the elegiac *puella* in 'real life' comes with the increasing realization of her essential literariness.[21] Nevertheless, a brief consideration of the social position of, or social prejudices about, the *lena* in Roman society is of interest insofar as it reflects on the variable socio-sexual status constructed for the 'elegiac women' in elegy and on the social anxieties of the elegiac poet himself in his identification with the *lena*. Although the *lena*'s role in literature is elided with that of the old nurse or maid (Plautus, *Most.*), or even mother (Lucian, *Dial. Meretr.* 3, 6, 7; Plautus, *Cist., Asin.*), and is not that of the brothel-keeper perhaps more typical of 'real life', she is most usually to be considered an aged prostitute. Recent work on prostitutes emphasizes that prostitutes and their pimps, male and female, in Roman society are lower-class, mostly slaves and freed-women.[22] While the profession was tolerated, the prostitutes and pimps themselves were the objects of moral contempt and legal and social restrictions as *infames*, and later under Augustan marriage legislation were subject to further restrictions. The *lena* is emphatically lower-class, socially marginalized by both her profession and gender.

        The *lena*'s status rehearses one of the possible social roles of the elegiac *puella*. As many others have recently suggested, we cannot easily assume the existence in Rome of a demi-monde of stylish 'loose ladies' or semi-professional courtesans on the model of

[17] C. M. Dawson, 'An Alexandrian prototype of Marathus?' *AJP* 67 (1945), 1–15; A. W. Bulloch, 'Tibullus and the Alexandrians', *PCPS* 19 (1973), 78–80.
[18] J. C. McKeown, 'Augustan elegy and mime', *PCPS* 25 (1979), 79. On the staging of elegy as mime or pantomime, see Ovid, *Tr.* II.519–20; E. Fantham, 'Mime: the missing link in Roman literary history', *CW* 82 (1989), 159.
[19] McKeown, Intro. to *Am.* I.8; Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), 82–3.
[20] As Wyke, op. cit. (n. 5), 165, observes.
[21] See especially the recent work of M. Wyke, 'Reading female flesh', in A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text* (1989), 113–43; 'Written woman: Propertius' *scripta puella*', *JRS* 77 (1987), 47–61, 'Mistress and metaphor in Augustan elegy', *Helios* 16 (1989b), 25–47, and P. Veyne, *Roman Erotic Elegy. Love,*

Poetry, and the West, trans. D. Pellauer (1988). Cf. Kennedy, op. cit. (n. 4), 83–100, on the historicism/textualism bind.
[22] T. A. J. McGinn, 'Prostitution and Julio-Claudian legislation: the formation of social policy in early imperial Rome', unpub. dissertation, University of Michigan (1986). See also, A. Hermann and H. Herter, s.v. 'Dirne', *RAC* III (1957), 1149–213; H. Herter, 'Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnisches und christlichen Schriftums', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 3 (1960), 70–111; J. F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (1986), 129–33, 250–3. On *infamia*, see A. J. H. Greenidge, *Infamia: Its Place in Roman Public and Private Law* (1894), 173ff.; on the *lena*, *Digest* XXIII.2.43.6: 'Lenocinium facere non minus est quam corpore quaestum exercere. Lenas autem eas dicimus, quae mulieres quaestuarias prostituunt'.

the Greek hetaira class.[23] Recent work on Roman elegy stresses precisely the convention-
ality of the elegiac code and the demands the genre, as a system with its own internal
necessities, makes of its players.[24] Most importantly, for the definition of *furtivus amor*
the elegiac mistress must be unmarriageable, an 'irregular', in the words of Veyne.[25]
Unlike the *virgo* or *matrona*, she must be sexually accessible (cf. Prop. 1.1.5, 'castas
odisse puellas'), but unlike the *meretrix*, she must not be easily purchasable. By situating
her differently at times between the traditional polarities of *matrona* and *meretrix*, the
elegiac poets deliberately play with a variety of possibilities for the social status of their
puella in order to explore different social and erotic configurations and ramifications. If
considered a married woman, the *puella*'s adulterous relationship with the poet flaunts
the contemporary moral climate. If she is a prostitute (Adams points out that *puella* and
amica are both words commonly used for whore),[26] then the *puella* is morally 'safe'.
Propertius Book IV seems to explore a number of different female social configurations,
ranging from the loyal *matronae* Arethusa and Cornelia of IV.3 and IV.11 to the
prostitutes of IV.5 and IV.8. Ovid also juxtaposes the figure of the *lena* with a *matrona* in
Amores III.1. Here the figure of Elegia is herself portrayed as a *lena* in contrast with the
matronly figure of Tragoedia.[27]

The *lena* represents, in one possible reading, what the *puella* may indeed become if
she listens to the self-centered elegiac poet. Whether or not the *puella* of these poems is
meant to be understood as Cynthia or Corinna, the role of the *meretrix* as the traditional
audience for such a speech suggests such a parallel. The *lena*'s speech advises the girl to
look to the economic reality of her future. Ovid's Dipsas at *Am.* 1.8.28 makes quite clear
her own financial needs: 'non ego, te facta divite, pauper ero' (as long as you become
wealthy, I will not be poor), cf. Syra in *Cist.* 41, 'causa pepuli ad meretricium quaestum,
nisi ut ne esurirem'. In the context of Propertius' revisionary fourth book, a book
notable for its proliferation of speaking female characters, it has been suggested that
Acanthis' pragmatic emphasis upon material concerns challenges and undercuts the
idealistic male fictions of the erotic discourse of the earlier elegies.[28] Whatever the poet's
professions of his loyalty to his mistress and his admiration of her numerous charms, it
is her beauty which holds the elegiac poet-lover enthralled: 'et pete, qua polles, ut sit
tibi forma perennis, / inque meum semper stent tua regna caput' (Prop. III.10.17–18).
Acanthis underlines the evanescent nature of this power:

> dum vernat sanguis, dum rugis integer annus,
>   utere, ne quid cras libet ab ore dies. (Prop. IV.5.59–60)[29]

> While you are in your flower, while your age lacks wrinkles,
>   make use of it, lest tomorrow subtract from your beauty.

[23] See Griffin, op. cit. (n. 13), 26–8; R. O. A. M.
Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace*
(1980), 8–18, for the picture of a 'demi-monde',
S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the
Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (1991), 302–7,
reviews and confirms the evidence for such a world in
Cicero's mentions of Volumnia Cytheris, in Sallust's
Sempronia, and in Augustus' legislation. For cautions
against the uncomplicated 'historicity' of such
women, see Wyke, op. cit. (n. 21, 1989b); G. M. Paul,
'Sallust's Sempronia: the portrait of a lady', *PLLS* 5
(1985), 9–22, on Sempronia as a rhetorical stereotype,
'an exemplum of social degeneracy'; cf. D. Delia,
'Fulvia reconsidered', in S. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's
History, Ancient History* (1991), 197–217. P. G. McC.
Brown, 'Plots and prostitutes in Greek New Comedy',
PLLS 6 (1990), 247–8, argues that frequently no
distinction can be made between the terms *hetaira*
and *porne*.
[24] D. Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in The
Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (1994), 151–9;
Veyne, op. cit. (n. 21); G. B. Conte, 'Love without
elegy: the *Remedia Amoris* and the logic of a genre',

Poetics Today 10.3 (1989), 441–69. See Sullivan,
op. cit. (n. 11), 91–106, for a psychological ('Dirnenli-
ebe') explanation of the elegiac situation.
[25] Veyne, op. cit. (n. 21), 85, *passim*.
[26] J. N. Adams, 'Words for prostitute in Latin',
RhM 126 (1983), 344–50. For the status of the
mistress of elegy as a married woman, see, e.g.,
Williams, op. cit. (n. 7), 528–54; as *meretrix*, see, e.g.,
W. A. Camps, *Propertius Elegies Book 1* (1961), 6.
[27] On III.1, see Wyke, op. cit. (n. 21, 1989), 119–34.
See also P. Grimal, *Les intentions de Properce et la
composition du livre IV des Élégies* (1953), 40–6.
[28] Gutzwiller, op. cit. (n. 6); Wyke, op. cit. (n. 5),
166.
[29] cf. Scapha's warnings of desertion at *Most.* 196ff.
She makes explicit the parallel between herself and
her daughter: 'tibi idem futurum credo' (202). The
motif of the old age of the 'courtesan' can be found in
much ancient poetry, see K. F. Smith, *Commentary
on Tibullus* (1913), *ad* Tib. 1.6.77f.; A. Sharrock,
Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria 2
(1994), 39–42.

We are perhaps even granted such a vision of Cynthia's future in the final lines of Book III, in Propertius' curse against Cynthia (III.24.31–8, cf. 37, 'cecinit mea pagina diras').[30] The dead Cynthia' s return in IV.7 and her revelation of the poet's romp with a pair of prostitutes in IV.8 further exposes the hypocrisy of the narrator's tone of moral condemnation in IV.5.[31]

IV. THE *LENA*

The characteristics of the *lena* are similar in all three poets and participate in the ancient Greek and Roman tradition of invective against old women and women in general; she is bibulous, mercenary, and dangerously magical, a witch. Parallels may be found in epigram, comedy, satire, and oratory.[32] In Roman society, marriage, mother-hood, and membership of a *familia* order the female in socially effective terms (daughter, sister, wife, mother). Richlin, in her investigation of invective against women in Roman satire, suggests that the figure of the old woman frequently becomes that of the 'uncanny other' because she does not fit within any of these established categories.[33] Behind these threats, as Winkler suggested, lies the tradition of abuse of old women created as 'part of a cultural habit on the part of men to deal with threats of eros by fictitious denial and transfer'.[34] As a powerful and socially undefined and hence uncontrolled woman the *lena* has the power to threaten the male with cuckoldry, sterility, and death.[35]

The terms of abuse of the *lena* in all three poets share marked similarities with each other and with other Latin poets. Horace's invectives against women were very likely important models for Propertius and Ovid.[36] Another powerful and threatening woman in Roman poetry, Cleopatra ('meretrix regina Canopi', Prop. III.11.39), shares many of these attributes.[37] A number of these qualities have a basis in ancient medical theory as well as moralizing rhetoric. Work on the ancient gynaecological medical corpus reveals that women as a whole, like the *lena*, are characterized as given to excesses of all kinds, especially those involving issues of self-control especially valued in ancient society, such as drink, sex, and emotion in general.[38]

Images of wolves (another word for prostitutes),[39] dogs, hunger, thirst, and death recur in all three poets, connecting the *lena* with stock terms of female abuse with bestial and sexual connotations.[40] The *lena*'s associations are predominantly deadly ones: she

[30] Gutzwiller, op. cit. (n. 6), 111; Lefèvre, op. cit. (n. 7), 101. Cf. Prop. II.18a.19–20, where the poet is trying to convince his mistress to love him in *his* old age!

[31] Veyne, op. cit. (n. 21), 63. For verbal echoes between IV.5 and IV.7, see E. Burck, 'Zur Komposition des vierten Buches des Properz', *WS* 79 (1966), 416–18; T. D. Papanghelis, *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (1987), 165–7; J. Warden, *Fallax Opus: Poet and Reader in the Elegies of Propertius* (1980), *passim*.

[32] See A. Richlin, 'Invective against women in Roman Satire', *Arethusa* 17 (1984), 67–80; eadem, *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (1992), 109–16; Gutzwiller, op. cit (n. 6), 113 n. 6; Oeri, op. cit. (n. 12); V. Grassman, *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz* (1966), 1–46.

[33] Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1984), 71; J. N. Bremmer, 'The Old Women of Ancient Greece', in J. Blok and P. Mason (eds), *Sexual Asymmetry* (1987), 204. Cf. T. M. Falkner and J. de Luce (eds), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (1989); V. Rosivach, '*Anus*: some older women in Latin literature', *CW* 88 (1994), 107–17.

[34] J. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire* (1990), 90.

[35] Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1984), 72.

[36] cf. esp. *Epodes* 5, 7, 12, *Sat.* 1.8. See Luck, op. cit. (n. 7), 435–7, on the similarities between Canidia and Acanthis. On Tibullus' curses, see D. E. Oppenheim,

'ΑΡΑΙ (zu Tibull 1.5)', *WS* 30 (1908), 146–64. Compare, unusually, Juvenal's abuse of old men at *Satires* 10.190–209.

[37] See M. Wyke, 'Augustan Cleopatras: Female Power and Poetic Authority', in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* (1992), 98–140.

[38] See A. E. Hanson, 'The Medical Writers' Woman', 333, and A. Carson, 'Putting Her in her Place: Women, Dirt, and Desire', 138, both in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds), *Before Sexuality* (1990). A. E. Hanson, 'The Restructuring of Female Physiology at Rome', in P. Mudry and J. Pigeaud (eds), *Les écoles médicales à Rome* (1991), 266, discusses the theory of female hyper-sexuality. See *Ars* 1.281–2, 341–42 and Propertius III.19 for the proverbial statement of the greater intensity of the female libido.

[39] Adams, op. cit. (n. 26), 333–5, cf. Isid., *Orig.*10.163: 'a rapacitate vocata'; Serv. *ad Aen.* III.647: 'dictae ab obscenitatis et odoris similitudine'.

[40] See Carson, op. cit. (n. 38), 144, on charges of bestiality in rhetoric against women, again connoting lack of control; E. Oliensis, 'Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*', *Arethusa* 24 (1991), 111, on the prominence of dogs in the classical misogynist tradition. See Plautus, *Curc.* 110[a-b], for the connection of old woman (Leaena), dogs, and drinking.

practises nekyomantia (*Am*. 1.8.17–18) and she is paired with the underworld imagery of dogs (Tib. 1.5.56; Prop. IV.5.3, 73), ghosts (Tib. 1.5.51), graves (Tib. 1.5.53–4; *Am*. 1.8.17), and owls.[41] Her association with the *strix violenta* (Tib. 1.5.52, cf. Prop. IV.5.17; *Am*. 1.8.13–14) conjures up notions of vampirism and cannibalism (cf. Tib. 1.5.49, 'sanguineas dapes'), and again emphasizes her threat to male potency.[42] Her squalor and decay are stressed ('animam . . . putrem', Prop. IV.5.69; 'immundo . . . situ', 72). Wolves and *hippomanes* also suggest madness (Tib. 1.5.53, 'furens') and lack of self-control (see the etymology of *anus* in Festus 5.25–27L: 'quod iam sit sine sensu, quod Graece dicitur ἄνους'). Her gluttony is also suggested in the curses involving food and drink.[43] The poets in their curses invoke upon the bawd the same punishments she threatens: thirst, hunger, poverty, and death:

> di tibi dent nullosque lares inopemque senectam
> et longas hiemes perpetuamque sitim! (*Am*. 1.8.113–14)[44]

> May the gods grant you a homeless and destitute old age
> and long winters and everlasting thirst!

The names of the bawds connote their malevolent powers and malicious natures. Propertius' *lena* is named Acanthis, a thorn (Plin., *Nat*. XXII.76; XXV.167). The names of many prostitutes in the ancient world, at least in literature, were derived from animals or plants.[45] Propertius plays on her name in the opening line of the poem in the conventional imprecation that thorns cover her tomb:[46]

> terra tuum spinis obducat, lena, sepulcrum
> et tua, quod non vis, sentiat umbra sitim. (Prop. IV.5.1–2)

> May the earth obstruct, bawd, your grave with thorns
> and, something you won't like, may your shade feel thirst.

In Ovid's *Amores* 1.8 Dipsas' name refers to a small snake with the same name. This snake's name derives from the fierce thirst from which it was thought to suffer and which it in turn inflicted on its victims (cf. the horrifying description of its effects at Lucan IX.737–60). As McKeown points out (ad loc.), Dipsas' name, therefore, suggests both her noxious nature and her alcoholism:

> ex re nomen habet: nigri non illa parentem
> Memnonis in roseis sobria vidit equis. (*Am*. 1.8.3–4)

> She has her name from the fact that she has never
> soberly seen the mother of black Memnon on her rosy steeds.

The connection of old women and drink, also suggested at Prop. IV.5.2, 75, is an old one. It connotes their lack of self-control and the overstepping of societal norms of

---

[41] cf. the graveyard imagery of Horace, *Epodes* 5. See Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1984), 71, on the theme of old women as corpses and see D. F. Bright's discussion of the parallels between the imagery of the curses against the *lena* in Tibullus 1.5 and his underworld in 1.3.67–82 (*Haec Mihi Fingebam: Tibullus in his World* (1978), 157). Artemidorus IV.24 records a dream in which old women signify death.

[42] See on the *strix*, Smith, *ad* Tib. 1.5.52; A.-M. Tupet, *La magie dans la poésie latine* (1976), 376. Cf. *Fasti* VI.141f. for old women as *striges* and Festus 414.25–7 : 'maleficis mulieribus nomen inditum est, quas volaticas etiam vocant'.

[43] See Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1992), 148–50, on the connection of gastric and sexual hunger.

[44] cf. Tib. 1.5.49–56; Prop. IV.5.2–4, 75–8. For similar curses against a *lena*, see Plautus, *Most.* 192f. For the question of whether or not Acanthis is meant to be understood as already dead at the end of Prop. IV.5, see Fedeli, op. cit. (n. 7), ad loc.; D. R.

Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (1967), 244; G. P. Goold, 'Noctes Propertianae', *HSCP* 71 (1966), 81–2; Williams, op. cit. (n. 7), 543–4.

[45] The Phryne of Tibullus II.6 is from the Greek word for frog, but was also the name of a famous Greek courtesan who modelled for Apelles. For other names of prostitutes which carry similar associations, see E. K. Borthwick, 'A "femme fatale" in Asclepiades', *CR* 17 (1967), 250–4, on *A.P.* V.162 (Asclepiades) where an hetaira is compared to a viper, and Theocritus, *Id.* 10.17–18 where Milon's mistress is compared to a mantis (which Gow, ad loc., warns may only refer to her thinness, as there is no evidence that the mantis' mate-killing habit was known).

[46] cf., e.g., *A.P.* VII.315, 320, 536; Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), 80. There may also be a verbal play with her name in Acanthis' mention of the withered roses of Paestum in ll. 61–2: 'vidi ego odorati victura rosaria Paesti/sub matutino cocta iacere Noto' (cf. *Ars* III.67–8).

proper female behaviour.[47] Within the context of Roman moralizing drink is also linked with sexual licence.[48] While the *lena* is represented in elegy as more interested herself in money than in sex, the description of her naked crotch in Tibullus' curse ('inguinibus nudis', 1.5.55, cf. 'triviis', 56) suggests sexual rapacity as well.[49]

Courtney suggests that Acanthis' name is also a punning allusion to the thorny shrub *dipsas acanthis* ('spina quae sitiens vocatur', Plin., *Nat.* XIII.139), suggested etymologically in Propertius' curse at IV.5.1–2, in *spinis* and *sitim*.[50] He conjectures that Ovid acknowledges his recognition of Propertius' pun by naming his *lena* Dipsas. We observe in the curses of both Ovid and Propertius quoted above the emphasis on thirst (note *sitim* at Prop. IV.5.2 and *Am.* 1.8.114), signifying not only the alcoholism of the procuresses, but also the threat of desiccation implied in the plant and animal associations of their names. The names of two of Horace's literary females share similar associations. The name of Cinara in *Odes* IV.1, IV.13, and *Epistles* 1.7.28 is also that of a thorny plant which induces thirst.[51] His Canidia has as well been etymologized with the drying heat of the dog star.[52] This nexus of heat and dryness connoted by all these names makes sense in Greco-Roman medical theory which posits females as threats to the male of desiccation and debility, of sexual impotence.[53] The dog star's heat ('stella proterva canis', *Am.* II.16.4) was seen as a time when female sexuality was at a peak, because of their wetter and colder nature, and male's at its lowest.[54] Acanthis' desiccating threat to Propertius' manliness suggested at IV.5.17, 'consuluitque striges nostro de sanguine' (she plotted with witches against my potency), may also be reiterated near the end of the poem in his reduction to skin and bones as he listens to her:[55]

> his animum nostrae dum versat Acanthis amicae,
>   per tenuem ossa <mihi> sunt numerata cutem. (IV.5.63–4)

> While Acanthis was in this way manipulating my mistress' mind,
>   the bones could be counted through my thin skin.

Ovid's *umbra* (shadow or ghost) which betrays him to the *lena* (109) contains a hint that the poet has been adversely affected by the *lena*'s power (cf. *umbra* in *Am.* III.7.16). In poetry, where so often inspiration is metaphorically figured in terms of drinking, thirst also has literary implications. In Propertius and Ovid the *lena* has quite literally taken away their voices and become primary narrator. Should the *puella* also be lured away by the *lena*, elegy's *materia* (*Am.* 1.3.19; Prop. II.1.1ff.) would disappear. Thirst, drink, old

[47] See Oeri, op. cit. (n. 12), 13ff., 39ff., on the literary topos. Cf., on the bibulousness of *lenae*, Plautus, *Cist.* 120f., 149 (on Syra), 'multiloqua et multibiba'. For other names of prostitutes suggesting alcoholism, see *A.P.* VII.353, 455 (Maronis), 457 (Ampelis), 456; XI.409 (Silenis); Lucian, *Dial. Meretr.* 4 (Bacchis), 8 (Ampelis). See also Bremmer, op. cit. (n. 33), 201–2; Carson, op. cit. (n. 38), 137, on wetness of mind connoted by drinking as an intellectually deficient condition. Cf. *Ars* III.765: 'turpe iacens mulier multo madefacta Lyaeo'; *Rem.* 805: 'vina parant animum Veneri, nisi plurima sumas'; *Prop.* II.33b.33–4: 'vino forma perit, vino corrumpitur aetas/ vino saepe suum nescit amica virum'.

[48] Dion. Hal. II.25.6; Pliny, *Nat.* XIV.89–90; Aulus Gellius X.23.1; Val. Max. VI.3.9 (Cato).

[49] See M. C. J. Putnam, *Tibullus: A Commentary* (1973), ad loc. Contrast the sexual imagery of Horace *Epodes* 8 and 12. On the connection between financial and sexual rapacity see M. Myerowitz, *Ovid's Games of Love* (1985), 119–20, who cites K. Millet, *Sexual Politics* (1971), 298. N. Zagagi, *Tradition and Originality in Plautus: Studies in the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy* (1980), 109ff., also interestingly sees in Plautus an analogy between love and legal or commercial transactions.

[50] Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), 80–1, cf. McKeown, ad loc.

[51] See J. P. Boucher, 'A propos de Cérinthus et de quelques autres pseudonymes dans la poésie augustéenne', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 511–13; Columella X.235f.; Plin., *Nat.* XX.263; *TLL* III.1059.81.

[52] Oliensis, op. cit. (n. 40), 110, 120–2.

[53] Carson, op. cit. (n. 38), 139–43. Old women's dryness of skin is a different matter (cf., e.g., Hor., *Odes* II.11.5–8, 'arida . . . canitie'; Juv., *Satires* 6.145, 'cutis arida'). *Siccus* is also a literary critical term connoting an unadorned style (*OLD* s.v. *siccus*) and is used occasionally of sexual frigidity, e.g. *Ars* II.686.

[54] Carson, op. cit. (n. 38), 137 (on women and wetness), 139–43; Oliensis, op. cit. (n. 40), 120–35; Hanson, op. cit. (n. 38, 1991), 263 (on women's colder nature). See C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (1992), 174–5, on the association of wetness and luxury.

[55] I follow the interpretation of l. 17 suggested by Shackleton Bailey, op. cit. (n. 44), 241; see also Tupet, op. cit. (n. 42), 376. The text is very corrupt in ll. 63–4 and it is difficult to know whether the lines refer to the poet or the *lena*. A parallel may be Horace's emaciation as a result of Canidia's power in *Epodes* 17, on which see Oliensis, op. cit. (n. 40), 120. Lucilius 282–3M similarly connects old women and male impotence.

women, and literary inspiration are all concepts which interestingly reappear program-matically in Propertius IV.9, in a book in which genre is a central preoccupation.[56]

Although it is the *lena's* pragmatic economical advice to the *puella* which directly harms the poet-lover's case, the elegiac poets ascribe her erotic power over themselves to her magical abilities.[57] She is a witch: 'illa magas artes Aeaeaque carmina novit' (she knows magic arts and incantations such as Circe (or Medea) had), *Am.* 1.8.5, cf. 'sagae praecepta rapacis', Tib. 1.5.59. Propertius' and Ovid's poems open similarly with descriptions of the procuress' magical powers (IV.5.9–18; *Am.* 1.8.5–18).[58] The *lenae* are charged with making use of the aphrodisiac *hippomanes* (Prop. IV.5.17–18; *Am.* 1.8.8), as well as potent herbs (Prop. IV.5.11; *Am.* 1.8.7).[59] Dipsas' double pupils ('oculis quoque pupula duplex/ fulminat et gemino lumen ab orbe venit', 15–16) are a sign of her dangerously unnatural nature.[60] The *lena* is in every way *contra naturam*, as her magical ability to pervert the natural forces of water (Prop. IV.5.12; *Am.* 1.8.6), the moon (Prop. IV.5.13; *Am.* 1.8.12), the sky (*Am.* 1.8.9–10), and magnets (Prop. IV.5.9) reveals. She even metamorphoses into either a wolf (Prop. IV.5.14) or an owl (*Am.* 1.8.13–14). As an unnatural social and sexual deviant she serves to verify the naturalness of female passivity.[61]

Female magic poses a threat to the erotic power and control of the elegiac lover. In Tibullus 1.5.41 the poet-lover's impotence is suspected to be due to a spell ('devotum femina dixit'). In *Amores* III.7 Ovid also seeks to blame his sexual impotence on the same powers ascribed to the *lena*: magic spells and Colchian poisons ('carmen et herba', 28): 'quid vetat et nervos magicas torpere per artes?' (35). Propertius seeks in magic an explanation for his lack of erotic success (Prop. 1.12.9–10; III.6.25–30). Yet the poets do not hesitate to appeal to magic at times for their own advantage (Tib. 1.2.41–64; Prop. 1.1.19–24; *Ars* II.327–30). Although the elegiac *puella's* charms make it unneces-sary that she use magic (Tib. 1.8.24, 'forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis'), her power over the poet is conventionally characterized as a type of enchantment (cf., e.g. Prop. 1.1.1, 'Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis'; Tib. 1.8.5–6, 'magico . . . nodo'). Magical powers and spells are traditionally contrasted with the power of poetry in the quest for erotic success (e.g. *Ars* II.99–122; *Med.* 35–42; Prop. II.4.7–8). At *Rem.* 249ff. Ovid contrasts his blameless Apolline poetry ('innocuam opem', 252) with venomous magic

[56] On water imagery and poetry, see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (1960), 222–33; A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (1965), 23–30, 66–8, 98ff., 183–8.

[57] The imputation of erotic magic to old women is again a conventional charge. J. G. Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (1992), 89, speaks of the 'systematic distortion' of literary texts in their emphasis on women as initiators of amatory spells. On the connection of erotic power and magic, see Sharrock, op. cit. (n. 29), 84. Old women proverbially need aphrodisiacs because of their sexual undesirability, e.g. Martial XIII.34. On the widespread stereotyping of women and old women as witches, see the remarks of G. Harris, 'Furies, Witches, Mothers', in J. Goody (ed.), *The Character of Kinship* (1973), 145–59.

[58] On these traditional magical powers, cf. Horace, *Ep.* 5.12; *Sat.* 1.8; Tib. 1.2.41–6; 1.8.17–23; Verg., *Ecl.* VIII.64f., Juv., *Satires* 6.133–5. On the connection between prostitutes and magic, cf. Lucian, *Dial. Meretr.* 1, 4, 8. For further parallels, see Smith, *ad* Tib 1.2.41ff; Tupet, op. cit. (n. 42), 337–417; G. Luck, *Hexen und Zauberei in der römischen Dichtung* (1962); E. Riess, 'Études sur le folklore et les superstitions VIII: Les poètes élégiaques romains', *Latomus* 2 (1938), 164–89. On the connection in Roman thought between poisoning and sexual misbe-haviour, see *Ad Her.* IV.16.23, 'mulieris ad omnia maleficia cupiditas una ducit'; Quint. V.11.39; Sen. *Contr.* 7.3 (18).6; F. Santoro L'Hoir, *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms. 'Man', 'Woman', and the Portrayal of*

Character in Latin Prose (1992), 41. See N. Purcell, 'Livia and the womanhood of Rome', *PCPS* 32 (1986), 95, on the charge of poisoning as an inversion of the *matrona's* role.

[59] Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), 83, believes that the *hippomanes* is a poison in Propertius, but an aphrodis-iac in Ovid. See Tupet, op. cit. (n. 42), 79–82, 377. For the topos of love as a poison, see Papanghelis, op. cit. (n. 31), 34. For the associations of the disease of eros and magic in Latin poetry, see W. Fauth, 'Venena Amoris: die Motive des Liebeszaubers und der erotischen Verzauberung in der augusteischen Dichtung', *Maia* 33 (1980), 265–82.

[60] cf. Plin., *Nat.* VII.18, 'feminas quidem omnes ubique visu nocere quae duplices pupillas habeant'. On double pupils as a possible sign of sexual voracity, as orgasms were said to be visible in the eyes, see J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982), 140, 143; J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire. A Study in Form and Imagery* (1974), 77 n. 3. On the *pupula duplex*, see Tupet, op. cit. (n. 42), 390–4; K. F. Smith, 'Pupula Duplex', in *Studies in Honour of B. L. Gildersleeve* (1902), 287–300; W. B. McDaniel, *CP* 13 (1918), 335–46.

[61] Pollack, op. cit. (n. 2), 3. See S. Dixon, 'The Enduring Theme: Domineering Dowagers and Scheming Concubines', B. Garlick, S. Dixon and P. Allen (eds), *Stereotypes of Women in Power* (1992), 210–11, on the male reaction to female power: 'defin-ing it as illegitimate, unnatural, ridiculous'; cf. J. Henderson, 'Satire writes "Woman": gendersong', *PCPS* 35 (1989), 61.

incantations ('veneficii vetus . . . via', 251).[62] Yet in this creation of an opposition, as Sharrock has seen, is the generation of an identification, 'poetry which speaks about magic *carmina* cannot help but reflect on itself'.[63] In rejecting the power of erotic magic as embodied in the figure of the *lena*, the elegists lay claim to such powers for their own poetry (cf. Prop. IV.4.51, 'magicae . . . catamina Musae'). The theme of poetic enchantment is traditional. The procuress' miraculous powers over nature resemble those traditionally associated with poets such as Orpheus. Ovid in *Amores* II.1.23f. claims for his poetry precisely these magical powers. Elegy's specific power, however, is its power to win over a mistress (Prop. II.13a.7, 'ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia versu') and to open doors ('carminibus cessere fores', *Am.* II.1.27, cf. Prop. I.10.15–18; Tib. I.2.9) The counter-ego is revealed as alter ego in the power of her *carmina* and *artes*, magic spells or poetry.

V. WRITING AND POTENCY

The *lena*'s threat of desiccation and debility, of sexual impotence, has both literary and social implications. Feminist and Gender studies have revealed that discussions of sex and gender are a means of articulating a variety of associated concerns, especially involving social and political hierarchies and power. At all times in ancient Greece and Rome this power is aligned with masculinity, not simply maleness. As many have shown, this masculinity, *virtus*, is not an inherent gender quality, but a moral practice, a mode of physical behaviour signified by self-control and aggressiveness, 'an achieved state'.[64] In this cultural view there is articulated a strong polarity between virility and the non-virile, with the female or effeminate signifying all that the masculine is not: uncontrolled, classless, powerless, vulnerable to domination, essentially unRoman.[65] Within the politically interested moral discourse at Rome women's behaviour is implicated and singled out as responsible for and emblematic of the general breakdown in morals and society. Their sexual licence constitutes a real threat to the well-being of the state.[66] Horace *Odes* III.6.17–32 constitutes but one example of such a view. It is increasingly recognized that 'poetic eroticism engages with a whole range of contemporary discourses and is itself shaped by them'.[67] Roman elegy is being read within this cultural context, the moral and sexual implications of its vocabulary listened to. The poet's anxieties in his poetry about sexual impotence are connected with his anxieties about his social status as a non-political male in Roman society and as a poet associated with a patron, as well as about his poetic composition.

The *lena* threatens to sap the male sexually, artistically, and economically. Style and writing are morally implicated at Rome. The Latin literary-critical vocabulary is frequently articulated in moralistic and sexual terms.[68] The composition of poetry itself

[62] cf. on the similar contrast between the *carmina* of Circe and Canens in *Met.* XIV, C. P. Segal, *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (1969), 65.

[63] Sharrock, op. cit. (n. 29), 64. See her excellent discussion of 'Love, Poetry, and Magic' at 53–86, to which this discussion is indebted.

[64] See especially the work of M. Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (1995), and 'The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century C.E.', in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (eds), *Before Sexuality* (1990), 389–415. Modern studies of gender, such as the work of Judith Butler, also emphasize the importance of gender performance.

[65] Edwards, op. cit. (n. 54), 63ff.

[66] ibid., 35–6, 43–7, 53; Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 23), 211.

[67] Wyke, op. cit. (n. 21, 1989b), 27, and eadem, 'In pursuit of love, the poetic self and a process of reading: Augustan poetry in the 1980s', *JRS* 79

(1989), 165–73; B. K. Gold, ' "But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place": Finding the Female in Roman Poetry', in N. Sorkin Rabinowitz, and A. Richlin (eds), *Feminist Theory and the Classics* (1993), 75–101; J. Henderson, 'Wrapping up the case: reading Ovid, *Amores* 2.7 (+ 8) I', *MD* 27 (1991), 39, 63.

[68] See esp. Bramble, op. cit. (n. 60), 16ff., 59–62; Kennedy, op. cit. (n. 4), 58–63; Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1992), 2–13. On the related use of cosmetic metaphors for rhetoric, see T. P. Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics* (1979), 3–8 and M. Wyke, 'Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World', in L. J. Archer, S. Fischler and M. Wyke (eds), *Women in Ancient Societies* (1994), 134–51. See also Gleason, op. cit. (n. 64, 1995), 75 n. 90, 'in antiquity judgements about speech were sexualized because speech was an essential variable in the social construction of masculinity'.

is often figured as a sexual act and poetic inspiration described in programmatic terms of sexual potency.[69] In *Amores* III.7 Ovid's complaints about his impotence make explicit much of the sexual connotation of his language describing the writing of poetry. His programmatic statement in *Amores* 1.1.27, 'sex mihi surgat opus numeris, in quinque residat', is recalled at III.7.75–6 where the *puella* sees that the poet is not responding to her ministrations: 'nullas consurgere posse per artes . . . /videt'. The terms he uses to describe his condition in III.7 are similar to those which he frequently uses to describe the qualities of elegy, such as *iners, languidus, inermis,* etc.[70] The irony of gendering one's genre as *mollis* or effeminate is here literalized. Alexandrian literary-critical vocabulary such as *mollis, tenuis,* and *tener* gains a new meaning when understood in terms of the moralistic critique of the effeminate.[71] Elegiac poets in the tradition traceable at least back to Catullus provocatively portray themselves through these terms as 'effeminate' as part of their challenge to traditional views of Roman *virtus*/maleness through the inversion of traditional gender and social roles. With her powers, the *lena* renders the poet *inermis*, empty-handed, unarmed and unmanned — and thus, paradoxically, suited to writing erotic poetry, which is gendered as *mollis* in opposition to *durus* epic (cf. Prop. IV.5.5, 'docta . . . mollire').[72] In the gender reversals of elegy, the female instead becomes a *dura puella*.

Yet at the same time that they 'play the other', — the effeminate (*mollis*), the servile (*servitium amoris*), the luxurious and socially irresponsible (*otium, nequitia*) — as part of their opposition to traditional definitions of Romaness and masculine power, the elegiac poets' invectives against such figures as the *lena* or, in Catullus, against *molliculi*, simultaneously attempt to reassert their virility through the phallic threat and the erotic triumph.[73] Under the pose of passivity and servility, the elegiac poet-lover preaches no counter-cultural revolution for the status of women, despite optimistic readings of the recent past, but seeks to affirm his maleness and potency by asserting his power over his discourse, especially over the terms of his erotic game and the *puella* (cf. Prop. II.26.21–2, 'nunc admirentur, quod tam mihi pulchra puella/ serviat et tota dicar in urbe potens').[74] In cursing the *lena*, the poet attempts to reassert his poetic and male potency over her opposition.[75] The threat of *vis* in Propertius IV.5.76, 'urgeat hunc supra vis, caprifice, tua' (may you, wild fig, exert your strength over her tomb), encodes the

[69] As much recent work has argued, see e.g. Kennedy, op. cit. (n. 4), 17–18; K. Freudenberg, 'Horace's satiric program and the language of contemporary theory in *Satires* 2.1', *AJP* 111 (1990), 187–203; M. Buchan, '*Ovidius Imperamator*: beginnings and endings of: love poems and empire in the *Amores*', *Arethusa* 28 (1995), 53–85. See W. Fitzgerald, 'Power and impotence in Horace's *Epodes*', *Ramus* 17 (1988), 176–91, on Horace's expression of his feelings of inadequacy in relation to a standard of masculinity.

[70] Note also the play on *numerus* in III.7.18, 26. A. M. Keith, '*Corpus Eroticum*: elegiac poetics and elegiac *puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*', *CW* 88 (1994), 38, reads III.7 as 'a metaphorical dramatization of disengagement from the elegiac project'.

[71] See esp. Edwards, op. cit. (n. 54), on '*Mollitia*', 63ff.

[72] Kennedy, op. cit. (no. 4), 32; Edwards, op. cit. (n. 54), 93. See Adams, op. cit. (n. 60), 21, on *arma* as penis.

[73] Konstan, op. cit. (n. 24), 182. See W. Fitzgerald, 'Catullus and the reader: the erotics of poetry', *Arethusa* 25 (1992), 419–43, on Catullus 16 and the power relations between poet and reader. A paradox

is already built into the *cinaedus* position: the effeminate man as highly sexed, cf., e.g., Juv., *Satires* 6.O 25, 'hic erit in lecto fortissimus'.

[74] See on this strategy of the elegiac pose, K. J. Gutzwiller and A. N. Michelini, 'Women and Other Strangers: Feminist Perspectives in Classical Literature', in J. E. Hartman and E. Messer-Davidow (eds), *(En)Gendering Knowledge* (1991), 66–84.

[75] On the masculinity manifested by the iambic *vis*, see Quint. x.1.60 on Archilochus: 'plurimum sanguinis atque nervorum'; cf. Fitzgerald, op. cit. (n. 73), 186; Oliensis, op. cit. (n. 40), 122; J. Henderson, 'Suck it and see (Horace, *Epode* 8)', in M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby (eds), *Homo Viator. Classical Essays for John Bramble* (1987), 105–18, esp. 109–10. On Priapus as the central figure through which to read Roman invective (i.e., the phallic threat) see Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1992), 58–9, 113, 118–21, 140–1. Even modern critics betray the persistence of the association of invective and virility; J. P. Elder, 'Tibullus: *Tersus atque Elegans*', in J. P. Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays in Roman Literature* (1962), 102, calls them 'robust, enjoyable'; Papanghelis, op. cit. (n. 31), 167, speaks instead of 'an unflinching realism applied to the anile condition'.

masculine threat of penetration as the reassertion of power.[76] Among the many paradoxes of the elegiac posturing, the pose of inferiority in the end is shown to be another strategy for amatory success and domination.[77] Similarly, the appropriation of the topos of the *militia amoris* humourously belies the poet's passive pose of *mollitia:* *Amores* 1.9.46, 'qui nolet fieri desidiosus, amet!'; Tib. II.6.10, 'et mihi sunt vires'. As has been observed, although the moral code the elegists propound is articulated in terms opposed to traditional *mores*, portraying their chosen lifestyle as one of dissipation, *nequitia* (*Am.* II.4.1, 'non ego mendosos ausim defendere mores'), they reappropriate these traditional virtues through such elements of the elegiac codes as *fides* and, as we shall see, *paupertas*.[78]

Thus both Propertius and Ovid cast themselves, however paradoxically, in their poems in a morally superior position to the *lena*. Propertius' accusations that the *lena* promotes adultery rhetorically place him on the side of the husband when, for example, he inveighs against her ability to corrupt even Penelope (IV.5.7–8) or condemns her ability to blind husbands (*maritos*, 15).[79] Yet at III.3.49–50 Calliope herself had decreed to Propertius that his poetic task was one with a similar didactic and deceptive aim: 'ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas,/ qui volet austeros arte ferire viros'. Ovid similarly charges Dipsas with violating *thalamos pudicos* (1.8.19, cf. Prop. IV.5.6, 'concordi toro'), yet Ovid *Amores* 1.2.32 had established *Pudor* as an obstacle to *Amor*. Although elegy's poet-lover in condemning the *lena* seeks moral high ground, the reader is invited to recognize the parallels between narrator and procuress and the self-contradictions of the elegiac pose.

VI. FOR LOVE OR MONEY

The *lena*'s appearance in Tibullus 1.5 establishes her position in erotic poetry as a rival and enemy of the poet-lover primarily because of her emphasis on the marketability of love or sexual favours (1.5.59, 'saga rapax'). Her influence over the *puella* competes and conflicts with the interests of the elegiac poet-lover who traditionally offers poetry instead of gold. The *lena* in Tibullus 1.5.47ff. appears in the company of, and is indeed credited with the presence of, another stock figure from New Comedy, the *dives amator* (cf. *Am.* 1.8.31) who threatens with his money to render the erotic and poetic power of the poverty-stricken poet ('pauper amator', *Am.* 1.8.66) ineffectual. She articulates the mercenary position, the 'sacrilegas meretricum artes' (*Ars* 1.435), the elegiac poets are always at pains to disavow.[80] Poets on the whole traditionally decry the venality of their times because of the devaluation of their art (Tib. 1.4.57–72; *Am.* III.8; *Ars* II.273–86; III.531–52; Prop. III.13). The elegists also inveigh against the power money has with their lovers. The topos of the poor poet/lover is one inherited from the Greek tradition, especially the Alexandrian poets such as Callimachus and New Comedy,[81] but it gains new force in the context of the Roman norms of usefulness and traditional *virtus*, against which the elegiac poet is always at pains to defend and define the value of his amatory

[76] On the sexual connotations of *caprificus*, see V. Buchheit, 'Feigensymbolik im antiken Epigramm', *RhM* 103 (1960), 218–23, on Martial *Ep.* IV.52, where he argues the term suggests the *membrum virile* and the lasciviousness of the *caper* (cf. Hor., *Epod.* 10.23: 'libidinosus . . . caper'). Note Priapus in Hor., *Sat.* 1.8.1 is made of fig (*ficulnus*). Bramble, op. cit. (n. 60), 90–4, points to the commonplace association of the wild fig with fissures in tombs as another form of penetration (e.g. Horace, *Epodes* 5; 17; Mart. x.2.9, and obviously relevant to Prop. IV.5), and to the fact that the word also connotes sterility (Plin., *Nat.* xv.79f.; Juv. 10.144–5). His image of the *caprificus* representing an impotent *paedicator* in Persius, *Sat.* 1.24–5 might also fit nicely with the context of Propertius IV.5. For more on the sexual imagery of the fig, see Adams, op. cit. (n. 47), 113–14.

[77] Kennedy, op. cit. (n. 4), 73.
[78] Conte, op. cit. (n. 24), 444–6, speaks of a 'trans-codification of values'; cf. M. Labate, *L'arte di farsi amare: modelli culturali e progetto didascaslico nell'elegia ovidiana* (1984), 30, 41f.
[79] For this argument, see Gutzwiller, op. cit. (n. 6), 108.
[80] W. Stroh, *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung* (1971), 215–16, traces the 'antimusische Hetärenphilosophie' back to New Comedy.
[81] See F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (1979), 8–9, 20–4; G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* (1959), 88–9; W. Wimmel, 'Apollo-Paupertas: zur Symbolik von Berufungsvorgängen bei Properz, Horaz und Calpurnius', in *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Karl Büchner* (1970), 291–7; McKeown, intro. *ad Am.* 1.10.

poetry. The *lena*, like the patron who demands an epic, provides a motivation for the defence of the elegiac choice. Her devaluation of his art enhances its intrinsic value by disassociation from her materialistic concerns.

The condemnation of wealth is a pervasive topos in the poetry of all three elegists and operates in a number of different and important ways.[82] Money figures within the 'oppositional' systems by which elegy constantly defines and constructs itself.[83] Wealth and poverty function within the elegiac contrasts of peace and war, soft and hard, poetry and gifts, young and old, *otium* and *negotium*. The poverty of the poet is, in the first place, a direct result of his choice of elegiac genre and 'life'. The rejection of wealth is a component of his revolt against the traditional mode of Roman life, his rejection of *negotium* for the *vita otiosa*.[84] Money is often associated with war and business (e.g. Tib. 1.2; 1.10; II.3; Prop. II.16; III.5; *Am.* III.8) and as such is rejected by the peace(*pax*)- and peacefulness(*otium*)-loving elegiac poet (cf. Prop. III.5.1, 'pacis amor deus est, pacem veneramur amantes').

Programmatically as well, it has often been remarked that the poet's profession of a humble status is connected with the adoption of Callimachean poetic values.[85] On a generic level, poverty expresses a Callimacheanism related to the rejection of the military themes of epic, as well as the rejection of the bombastic style in favour of refined technique and uncommon themes. It is a moral as well as literary pose suggesting that the poet puts his artistic standards before the temptation to seek easy popularity.[86] Although the pose of poverty is often most closely associated with Tibullus (e.g. 1.1; 1.5), Ovid and Propertius both adopt the posture of the *pauper amans* (e.g. *Am.* 1.10; II.17; III.8; *Ars* II.165–6; Prop. 1.8; 1.14; II.13b; II.24c; II.34; III.2). In Propertius and Ovid the *lena* directly attacks poetry and condemns poets for their inpecunity:

> versibus auditis quid nisi verba feres? (IV.5.54)

> Once you have listened to verses, what will you carry away but words?

> ecce, quid iste tuus praeter nova carmina vates
> donat? amatoris milia multa leges. (*Am.* 1.8.57–8)

> Look, what does that bard of yours give but new poems?
> from that lover you will get many thousands — of verses!

Propertius IV.5 is also significantly placed immediately after the poem about the death of Tarpeia in which her motive for betrayal has been changed by Propertius from that of desire for wealth to sexual desire in order to fit within the elegiac poetics of the book.[87] The *lena*'s role as the enemy of love poets is hyperbolically highlighted in Dipsas' denigration of Homer in *Amores* 1.8.61: 'qui dabit, ille tibi magno sit maior Homero' (may he who has something to give be greater to you than Homer the great). With this compare the claim by the elegists that elegy is more successful at winning love than the epics of Homer (Prop. 1.9.11; II.34.30; *Ars* II.279–80; Tib. II.4.15–20). Dipsas' claim that the mark of genius is to be able to give money ('crede mihi, res est ingeniosa dare', 62) conflicts with the poet's repeated claim that his *ingenium* is more useful in love than money.[88] Instead of gold, the love poet boasts that he offers poetry, fame, and *fides* (cf. *Am.* 1.10.59–62). In this way the poets convert an ostensible position of inferiority to one of superiority: 'regnem . . . ingenio' (Prop. II.34.55–8).

   The complaint of the poor poet-lover of the power of gold vs. poetry is a traditional
one, with Callimachus again providing an important model (fr.193 (*Iamb.* III), *Ep.* 32,
46Pf.).[89] The erotic poet's love object, whether male or female, is proverbially
mercenary, thus adding to the poet's misery and also providing him with the challenge
to make his art and his cleverness supersede the power of money.[90] The poverty of the
poet emphasizes the superiority of the power of poetry over wealth in winning erotic
success, thereby highlighting the functional nature of elegy as courtship poetry.[91] The
elegists frequently state that their purpose in writing elegy is to win the love of a girl or
boy: 'ad dominam faciles aditus per carmina quaero' (Tib. II.4.19), 'aliquid duram
quaerimus in dominam' (Prop. 1.7.6). For the elegist it is important that the illusion of a
relationship based on love alone is maintained and hence the persuasive power of his
poetry is confirmed. In all three poets the bawd bears the blame for influencing the
voiceless *amica* against the poet for reasons of financial gain. The true powerlessness of
the elegiac woman and the depth of the elegiac poet-lover's willingness to idealize her is
revealed through the transference of blame to the bawd (Tib. II.6.44, 'lena nocet nobis,
ipsa puella bona est' (it's the bawd who is harming me, my mistress is herself blameless),
cf. *Am.* 1.8.35: *erubuit*). Although gift-giving is a traditional feature of erotic courtship,
the elegists must constantly negotiate the implication that the relationship is a purely
mercenary one.[92] A concomitant suggestion is that what is purchasable is accessible to
all. Ovid sets it as a main task of the erotic quest to avoid payment: 'hoc opus, hic labor
est, primo sine munere iungi' (*Ars* 1.453). Propertius boasts that he has never had to pay
dearly for a night of pleasure: 'nec mihi muneribus nox ulla est empta beatis' (II.20.25,
cf. III.15.6). For the illusion of *mutuus amor* to be maintained, the *puella* must act from
her own desire (*sponte*) rather than for a price ('coacta', *Am.* 1.10.24). The poet's success
is thereby a direct result of the power of his verses: 'hanc ego non auro, non Indis
flectere conchis,/ sed potui blandi carminis obsequio' (Prop. 1.8.39–40). What poetry
has to offer the elegiac woman is more valuable than money, it is fame and immortality:
'carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae' (Prop. III.2.18).
   The imprecations against the *lena*'s greedy mercenary nature also need to be read
within Roman moralistic discourse condemning luxury as the cause of moral decline.
When the elegists complain of the decline of the present in its greed for gold, they are
not only repeating a poetic topos, but tapping directly into contemporary political and
moral discourse. Roman political and moral rhetoric is notable for its preoccupation
with accusations of sexual and financial immorality. Recent work has emphasized that
Roman moralizing discourse is deeply implicated in formulations of identity and in
anxieties about social and political status and power.[93] The pose of the poor poet in elegy
is played out against the background of the contemporary Roman moral discourse about
the corruption and decline of Roman *mores* through the influx of new wealth and avarice,
wherein women, as we have seen, are often singled out as signifiers of such corruption
and luxury through their lack of self-control. It is well known that the whole elegiac
posture plays upon and flies in the face of traditional denigration of amatory relationships
as dangerously harmful to the economic situation of the lover. However, by attacking
the venality and immorality of the *lena*, the poet, under the guise of a counter-ethos,
again aligns himself slyly with old Roman values.

[89] On the topos of poetry vs. gold in Greek and
Roman poetry, see Smith, *ad* Tibullus 1.4.57–72;
Cairns, op. cit. (n. 81), 37–8; P. Murgatroyd, *Tibullus
Elegies II* (1994), *ad* II.3.35–6; Stroh, op. cit. (n. 80),
214–15, *s.v. carmina-munera* Topik. See Pfeiffer's
comments *ad* Call. fr. 193.17, where he cites addition-
ally frr. 23.4, 695.
[90] For the rapacious mistress or *puer* see, e.g., Tib.
1.4; 1.9; II.3; II.4 (with Smith's parallels *ad* II.4.14);
Prop. II.16; III.13; *Am.* 1.10; III.8. See G. Garbarino,
'Properzio e la "domina": l'amore come dipendenza',
in R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti del convegno nazionale di studi
su la donna nel mondo antico* (1987), 181; S. Lilja, *The
Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women* (1978), 143ff. The

avaricious *meretrix* is a common figure in comedy; on
the economic realities behind the depiction of this
figure, see E. Fantham, 'Sex, status, and survival in
Hellenistic Athens: a study of women in New Com-
edy', *Phoenix* 29 (1975), 44–74; E. Schumann, 'Zur
sozialen Stellung der Frau in den Komödien des
Plautus', *Das Altertum* 24.2 (1978), 97–105.
[91] On this aspect of elegy, see Stroh, op. cit. (n. 80);
Conte, op. cit. (n. 24), 446 n. 10, 459.
[92] A. R. Sharrock, 'Womanufacture', *JRS* 81 (1991),
44.
[93] e.g. Richlin, op. cit. (n. 32, 1992), Edwards,
op. cit. (n. 54); A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Pliny the Elder
and man's unnatural history', *GR* 37 (1990), 80–96.

The speeches of the *lenae* in both Ovid and Propertius reflect precisely the anxieties expressed in Roman moralizing rhetoric about the dangerous effect of money on traditional social hierarchies. Both advocate seeking the favours of wealthy foreigners, soldiers, or ex-slaves:

> nec tu, si quis erit capitis mercede redemptus,
>   despice; gypsati crimen inane pedis.
> nec te decipiant veteres circum atria cerae. (*Am.* 1.8.63–5, cf. Prop. IV.5.49–53)

> Do not look down on anyone who has purchased his freedom from slavery,
>   there is no crime in the chalk-marked foot.
> Nor let ancient wax masks around lofty halls trick you.

Against this we can compare the complaints about the *recens dives* who has supplanted Ovid in the affections of his *domina* in *Amores* III.8.9f. (cf. *Am.* III.15.5–6) and Propertius' concerns about his new rivals, a praetor and a *barbarus* in II.16.[94] The elegiac poses of *servitium amoris* and *militia amoris* are here actualized by real figures and turned against the poet by the *lena*.[95]

Ovid's Dipsas also irreverently mocks the antiquarianism of Augustan propaganda in her denigration of the chastity of the Sabine women and her assertion of Venus' pre-eminence in Rome:

> forsitan immundae Tatio regnante Sabinae
>   noluerint habiles pluribus esse viris;
> nunc Mars externis animos exercet in armis
>   at Venus Aeneae regnat in urbe sui. (*Am.* 1.8.39–42)

> It might be that the sordid Sabine women under Tatius
>   weren't interested in being available to many men;
> but now Mars is in training in foreign wars
>   and Venus rules in the city of her son.

The tone is pure Ovidian irreverence (cf. *Ars* 1.60). Propertius takes a similar jab at Romulus in II.6.19–22, as does Ovid at *Ars* 1.101–34. McKeown also points out (ad loc.) that Dipsas' 'immorality' is further emphasized in her extremely unusual use of *matronae* as the butt of humour in ll. 45–6. For Ovid's bawd the past was no golden age but one of rusticity, *rusticitas* (44), (cf. *Ars* III.107–28; *Med.* 11ff.). Acanthis' list of luxuries in Propertius IV.5.21ff. is specifically linked by her with the dissolution of morals: 'frange et damnosae iura pudicitiae' (break all the laws of ruinous chastity, 28). Propertius himself recites this rhetorical commonplace in his diatribe against contemporary morals in III.13.47–60. These condemnations of wealth and moral diatribes in erotic elegy are clearly self-interested, hypocritical, and, of course, humourous. Elegiac *paupertas* is worlds apart from that espoused as the archaic ideal by Roman moralists.[96] The archaic golden age Tibullus describes in II.3.69–79 is far different from that promulgated and promised by Augustan propaganda.[97] In this version of early history the men of the past made love at will ('passim semper amarunt', 69), Venus guaranteed free and open love (71–2), and no women were guarded ('nullus erat custos, nulla exclusura dolentes/ ianua', 73–4).[98] Propertius' version in III.13 extols a time when gifts were cheap and goddesses were seen naked. Similarly self-interested is the elegists' frequent claim that they ask for no reward for their poetry other than the love of their chosen object (cf. *Am.* II.1.34, 'pretium carminis ipsa venit', cf. Prop. 1.14.23–4;

---

[94] McKeown, op. cit. (n. 1), 100, suggests convincingly that the contextual symmetry between *Amores* 1.8 and III.8 is intended.

[95] J. Debrohun, 'Redressing elegy's *puella*: Propertius IV and the rhetoric of fashion', *JRS* 84 (1994), 52 n. 53.

[96] cf. Lyne, op. cit. (n. 23), 155, on Tibullus' use of the *agricola* ideal as a 're-deployment against the Roman establishment's thinking of a figure of the establishment's own moral mythology'.

[97] See P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (1988), 167ff.; A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'The Golden Age and sin in Augustan ideology', *Past and Present* 95 (1982), 19–36. Cf. Murgatroyd *ad* Tib. II.3.67–8.

[98] cf. Saturn's rule in Tib 1.3.35–48: 'non domus ulla fores habuit' (43).

II.14.21–5). Behind this final claim, however, may also lie a further question about the economic conditions and artistic anxieties involved in textual production itself.

VII. PATRONAGE, PUBLICATION, AND PROSTITUTION

Allied with the pose of the poor poet is the suggestion that this poet does not, like a pimp — or perhaps the complying court poet — sell his poetry at a price and thus prostitute himself and his poetry. The elegiac poets 'protest too much'. Their attempts to disassociate themselves from the *lena* again are more suggestive of symmetry than antithesis. The poor love poet as we have seen, specifically rejects any greed for profit: 'nec nos ambitio, nec amor nos tangit habendi' (*Ars* III.541). Within the elegiac code, any profession which achieves financial gain can be tainted with the suggestion of prostitution (e.g. *Am.* 1.15.5–6; III.8.20, cf. Horace, *Epist.* 1.19.37–8). To claim poverty in both the Alexandrian and Augustan world is perhaps, like the *recusatio*, to claim economic independence from the demands of the patron for encomiastic poetry.[99] Clearly, however, the pose can function in the opposite way as a reminder of the need for remuneration (see Theocritus, *Id.* 16 below), although Horace specifically recommends that in the presence of a patron such a mention would be ill-advised: 'coram rege sua de paupertate tacentes/ plus poscente ferent' (*Epist.* 1.17.43–44). Horace then uses the image of the *meretrix* in this poem to signify such dependent behaviour: 'qui queritur . . ./. . . nota refert meretricis acumina' (53–5).[100]

The identification of the elegiac poet with figures such as the prostitute, slave, and female implies anxieties about disempowerment, a lack of voice, and a lack of control over one's own person and poetic production.[101] Ovid's protests that he is unlike the orator in that he does not perform on command or payment at 1.15.6, 'ingrato vocem prostituisse foro',[102] suggest an expression of his anxieties about his role as love poet in the traditional Roman social evaluation of power and Romanness. The very transactional nature of poetry entails concerns about power and public estimation.[103] Although our elegiac poets are all of the status and position which did not require the kinds of commissions and payments that such poets as the Greek Archias received, they are significantly concerned to distance themselves from such paid poets.[104] We have already seen that their imprecations against wealth echo contemporary élite concerns with social disruption through financial means.

The identification of poetry and prostitution and the denial of greed is a topos that can be traced back to early Greek lyric in the poetry of Pindar (*Isth.* II.6ff.), where he complains in familiar terms about current venality in contrast with the past by speaking

---

[99] Propertius IV.5 appears immediately before Propertius' most Augustan poem, IV.6, and there are a number of verbal parallels between the two poems which suggest that the juxtaposition of these poems might bear some significance.

[100] cf. *Epist.* 1.18.3 on the use of the same figure, and see J. Griffin's discussion of Horace and patronage in 'Augustus and the Poets: *Caesar qui cogere posset*', in F. Millar and E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (1984), 196–206. In *Sat.* 1.6 Horace disassociates himself from *prava ambitio* (51–2) and *avaritia* (68). In *Epist.* II.1.175–6 he seems to charge Plautus with venal motives: 'gestit enim nummum in loculos demittere, post hoc/securus cadat an recto stet fabula talo'.

[101] Wyke, op. cit. (n. 21, 1989b), 42; Fitzgerald, op. cit. (n. 73); M. A. Bernstein, ' "*O Totiens Servus*": Saturnalia and Servitude in Augustan Rome', in R. von Hallberg (ed.), *Politics and Poetic Value* (1987), 37–61, on Horace; M. B. Skinner, '*Ego mulier*: the construction of male sexuality in Catullus', *Helios* 20 (1993), 107–30, on Catullus. P. White, *Promised*

Verse. Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome (1993), 29, conversely argues that the vocabulary of *amicitia* in poetry is far more prevalent than that of servility, (but compare his remarks on the use of the slavery metaphor on pp. 89–90). For the use of *amicitia* as an expression of the patron/client relationship, see P. A. Brunt, '*Amicitia* in the Late Roman Republic', in *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (1988), 351–81.

[102] cf. *Am.* 1.10.39: 'turpe reos empta miseros defendere lingua'. Note Propertius' complaints in II.24a.5–7 about the charges of *nequitia* and *infamia* which he has incurred by associating with prostitutes.

[103] Fitzgerald, op. cit. (n. 73), 432.

[104] See D. Feeney's review of White in *BMCR* 5.4 (1994), 347, and P. White's observations, op. cit. (n. 101), 63, that the Latin poets rarely mention either Greeks or *grammatici*. Edwards, op. cit. (n. 54), 17, suggests that 'moralizing literature in general seems to have been produced by writers whose claims to being authentic elite were questioned'.

of the mercenary or 'working' Muse of the present.[105] Callimachus also distances himself from the profit-seeking Muse, with the suggestion of the rejection of popular poetry and a confirmation of artistic integrity (fr.222, *SH* 238–9, 253).[106] Theocritus, however, in his sixteenth *Idyll* complains of the lack of remuneration for poets in his day and sends his Graces out to collect payment.[107] Juvenal will later explicitly criticize Statius as the pimp of his own poetry, his poem as a prostitute: (7.87, 'intactam Paridi . . . vendit Agaven').[108]

The functional role of elegy as courtship poetry can also be transferred to its usefulness for the patron. The poet bruits the usefulness of love poetry for winning a *puella* and by implication allies his poetry with the solicitations of a pimp. White points out that the elegiac language of gifts, doorways and thresholds, inspiration, and servility serves equally to articulate the poet's relationship with a patron and with a *puella*. The elision between the solicitation of the elegiac *domina*'s favours and the patron's support is easy to make; the promise is in both cases literary immortality.[109] Although some of the most recent work on patronage in Roman society stresses the collegiality of patronage in Augustan Rome, others have seen in the Augustan poets a deep concern with their status and power, their integration in the Roman social order, and the reception of their poetry.[110] As Griffin has cogently argued, poets are very different from other clients, most importantly in that 'an ordinary client could not offer you immortal glory, nor would posterity have its eye on the nature of your relationship with him'.[111]

The poets' attack of the *lena*'s venality functions as an economic defence of his poetic choice, an elevation of the value of his elegiac poetry.[112] The triumph of poetry over money implies its victory over more traditional careers. In *Amores* 1.15 Ovid responds to the charge of neglecting the traditional Roman mode of life ('more patrum', 3) by proclaiming the triumph of poetry over wealth: 'cedant carminibus reges regumque triumphi' (33). Ultimately the poetic profession is shown to be more useful than any of the traditional Roman military or political careers in obtaining that which alone is recognized as worth more than money: immortality.

VIII. POETICS

We have seen that the *lena*'s mercenary code represents a threat to the rules of the male elegiac game; her form can similarly be read as a threat to his poetics. The description of the *lena*, like that of the *puella*, may also be read generically: she too is a scripted female, representing in many ways an anti-Muse of elegiac poetry.[113] She serves

---

[105] See A. Hardie, *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* (1983), 32–6, on the motif of the 'greedy poet', and idem, 'Juvenal and the condition of letters: the seventh *Satire*', *PLLS* 6 (1990), 201 n. 87; E. Thummer, *Pindar: die isthmischen Gedichte Band I* (1968), 82–3; L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (1991), 242–56.

[106] He is probably referring in fr. 222 to Simonides who had a bad reputation in Antiquity for being an avaricious poet, cf. Arist., *Pax* 697f.; see Hardie, op. cit. (n. 105, 1990), 166–7. I follow the interpretation of *SH* 239 proposed by A. W. Bulloch, 'A new interpretation of a fragment of Callimachus' *Aetia*: Antinoopolis Papyrus 113 Fr.1 (b)', *CQ* 20 (1970), 269–76.

[107] He will qualify this desire for a commission at 16.58f. See the discussion of F. T. Griffiths, *Theocritus at Court* (1979), 7–50.

[108] On this passage see Hardie, op. cit. (n. 105, 1990), 166, V. Tandoi, 'Il recordo di Stazio 'Dolce Poeta' nella Sat. VII di Giovenale', *Maia* 21 (1969), 103–22.

[109] White, op. cit. (n. 101), 4, 88–91. He points out that 'what Horace's Tiresias says about courting rich old men in *Satires* 2.5 needs surprisingly few adjustments to fit Ovid's purposes in the *Art of Love*' (89). See also B. Gold, 'The Master-Mistress of My Passion: The Lady as Patron in Ancient and Renaissance Literature', in M. De Forest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays in Honor of Joy K. King* (1993), 279–304.

[110] See most recently, White, op. cit. (n. 101) and F. Millar, 'Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome seen from Tomoi', *JRS* 83 (1993), 7. On the anxieties of publication and poetry writing in Roman society, see e.g. Fitzgerald, op. cit. (nn. 69, 73).

[111] Griffin, op. cit. (n. 100), 217 n. 43.

[112] See similarly J. E. G. Zetzel, 'The Poetics of Patronage in the Late First Century B.C.', in B. K. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (1982), 87–102, on the rejection of patronage in Latin verse as a literary vehicle for the elevation of the value of poetry.

[113] See M. M. Henry, *Menander's Courtesans and the Greek Comic Tradition* (1985), 29, on the role of the figure of the prostitute, often old, in Greek Old Comedy as the personification of 'cheap and decadent versifying'.

as foil to the definition of elegy through both her words and appearance. A number of critics have made a similar claim for Horace's depiction of another old woman, Canidia (*Satires* I.8; *Epodes* 5,17; also mentioned in *Satires* II.1; II.8; *Epodes* 3), suggesting that 'Canidia embodies an indecorous poetics against which Horace tries to define his own practice, particularly in the *Epodes*'.[114] Propertius and Ovid describe the bawd's physical qualities which mark her as undesirable and hence repulsive, emphasizing her wrinkles (IV.5.67; 1.8.112), decaying teeth (IV.5.68), scarce hair (IV.5.71; 1.8.111). She is un-elegiac in physical form in contrast with the depiction of the elegiac *puella* whose qualities can be read as an embodiment of the poet's artistic creed.[115] In the metaphoric terminology of ancient literary theory analogies between the human body and style were frequent.[116] In the literary vocabulary of sobriety and the programmatic debate between wine and water-drinkers, the *lena*'s drunkenness again signifies a lack of control and polish.[117]

In the Callimachean programmatic terms of elegiac poetry the *lena* and the prostitute are unrefined, public. Callimachus' *Epigram* 28 famously inscribes a sexual-textual poetics wherein in both the erotic and poetic world it is the elusive which is desirable and the public and accessible which is rejected.[118] The elegiac poets similarly demand from their mistresses a degree of sophistication necessary to the chase and an exclusivity which is contrasted to the availability of the prostitute. For Propertius Cynthia is necessarily *rara* (1.8.42), a literary critical term signifying refinement.[119] In *Amores* 1.10, a sort of rebuttal to Dipsas' mercenary precepts in 1.8, Ovid unfavourably contrasts his *puella*'s behaviour with that of a prostitute.[120] Like Callimachus' *periphoitos eromenos* (*Ep.* 28.3) the *lena* is insufficiently exclusive as an object for either erotic or poetic interest in elegiac/Alexandrian terms, but rather is accessible to all the public: *Amores* 1.10.21, 'stat meretrix certo cuivis mercabilis aere'. In II.23 Propertius equates associating with prostitutes with the rejection of Callimachean standards of selectivity and refinement: 'ipsa petita lacu nunc mihi dulcis aqua est' (2). Horace similarly in *Satires* I.2 in his recommendation of prostitutes denigrates the Callimachean code of exclusivity embodied in his famous *Epigram* 31, a poem whose sentiments will become practically the credo of love elegy (cf., e.g. *Am.* II.9.9–10; II.19.36).[121]

Ovid's Dipsas seems to threaten his genre with her epic-sounding *longo carmine* (18), and the thundering (*fulminat,* 16) of her twin pupils.[122] Her nekyomantia recalls epic scenes and epic subjects: 'evocat antiquis proavos atavosque sepulchris' (17). Her literary philistinism is revealed by her derogatory use of such important literary terms as *nova carmina* and *vates* (57).[123] McKeown (ad loc.) further suggests that Dipsas betrays her lack of understanding of the refinement of contemporary poetics by undervaluing Ovid's poetry in her reference to its prolixity: 'amatoris milia multa leges' (58).[124] The *lena*'s role as enemy of the elegiac poet-lover is emphasized in Propertius IV.5 in Acanthis' direct attack on the value of poetry:

[114] Oliensis, op. cit. (n. 40), 110; D. L. Clayman, 'Horace's *Epodes* VII and XII: more than clever obscenity?' *CW* (1975), 55–61; Henderson, op. cit. (n. 61), 60.

[115] On the elegiac mistress's form as a metaphor for the elegists' poetics, see especially Wyke, op. cit. (n. 21, 1989b). Cf. also Keith, op. cit. (n. 70); K. McNamee, 'Propertius, Poetry, and Love', and B. H. Fineberg, 'From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: The Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy', both in De Forest, op. cit. (n. 109), 215–48, 249–56.

[116] See Bramble, op. cit. (n. 60), 34–59.

[117] See Bramble, op. cit. (n. 60), 48–9, on the stylistic imagery of drink, and P. E. Knox, 'Wine, water, and Callimachean polemics', *HSCP* 89 (1985), 107–19.

[118] See Bramble, op. cit. (n. 60), 59–62.

[119] See Keith, op. cit. (n. 70), 30, *OLD* s.v. *rarus*.

[120] See K. Olstein, '*Amores* 1.9 and the structure of Book 1', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (1980), 286–300, on some interesting connections between 1.8 and the surrounding poems.

[121] For an interpretation of *Satires* I.2 as having literary as well as moral dimensions, see K. Freudenberg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (1993), 193–8. Cf. Horace, *Sat.* I.2.101 on the accessibility of prostitutes: 'nil obstat'.

[122] The image of thunder is Callimachean, *Aet.* I fr. 1.20. Cf. Prop. IV.8.55: 'fulminat illa oculis,' where this verb describes Cynthia's eyes in a poem of Homeric associations.

[123] McKeown, ad loc., points to *Ecl.* III.86: 'nova carmina'.

[124] cf. Call., *Aetia* fr.1.4. Ovid's curse against the *lena* involving winter and thirst is repeated in his curse of the swollen stream in *Am.* III.6.105–6, which is another literary Callimachean image, (on which see E. Courtney, 'Some literary jokes in Ovid's *Amores*', *BICS* 51 (1988), 20–3, and A. Suter, 'Ovid, from image to narrative: *Amores* 1.8 and 3.6', *CW* 83 (1989), 15–20). I would also compare the similar curses against the writing-tablets in *Am.* 1.12.7ff.

> Quid iuvat ornato procedere, vita, capillo
>> et tenuis Coa veste movere sinus?
> qui versus, Coae dederit nec munera vestis,
>> istius tibi sit surda sine aere[125] lyra. (IV.5.55–8)

> What's the point, my sweet, of going forth with hair arranged
>> and moving about fine folds of Coan silk?
> He who gives gifts of Coan verses, not dresses,
>> let his profitless lyre be mute to you.

Acanthis' damning direct quotation and perversion of Propertius I.2.1–2 at ll. 55–6, in her opposition of Coan garments with Coan verses (signifying the Hellenistic love poet Philetas), exposes her materialistic and anti-poetic code.[126] In Propertius I.2 the lover in praise of his mistress (and also with erotic and economic motives) claims that Cynthia has no need for adornments, while Acanthis argues the need for more acquisition. Finally, if the extremely corrupt text can be emended here dramatically with Goold, Propertius abuses the *lena* as a 'bookworm which bores through papyrus' (19–20).[127] The *lena*'s associations with popular mime, comedy, satire, and invective may also be part of the Alexandrian literary polemic; such a figure has no place in elegy.[128]

IX. ELEGY AND OPPOSITION

In the world of erotic elegy (related through Greek etymologizing to mourning or complaints, *querimonia* (Hor., *A.P.* 75))[129] opposition is in fact essential to the pose of the poet, and in Tibullus II.6 the *lena*'s dual role as obstructer of love and constructor of love elegy is made clear for the first time. By creating the necessary obstacles — 'lena vetat miserum' (II.6.45) — she creates the elegiac situations of deceit and frustration necessary for the elegiac poet. Like the *vir* she provides the rival essential to the games of love. She gives him scope for the exercise of his *ars amandi*. So Ovid begs and instructs a husband in *Amores* II.19 to put obstacles in the way of the lover: 'daque locum nostris materiamque dolis!' (44). The *lena*'s precepts articulate the elegiac game played out in the poems. Dipsas' lines stressing the importance of a rival could stand as a fitting definition of the elegiac game (cf. Prop. IV.5.37–40; *Ars* II.435–36; III.593–94):

> ne securus amet nullo rivale, caveto:
>> non bene, si tollas proelia, durat amor.   (*Am.* 1.8.95–6)

> Take care that he not love complacently without a rival:
>> if you take away all disagreements, love does not last long.

She practises the same art of 'womanufacture' that Ovid practises in the *Ars Amatoria* — written professedly for prostitutes (*Tr.* II.303: 'scripta solis meretricibus Arte').[130] The elegiac code demands that the elegiac woman be equally informed of the conventions of

---

[125] The MS reading *arte* is in many ways more appealing for my argument here, although it is usually rejected, see Fedeli ad loc.

[126] On the argument for the retention of the suspected distich of IV.5.55–6, see Shackleton Bailey, op. cit. (n. 44), 242; Luck, op. cit. (n. 7), 430–3; Burck, op. cit. (n. 31), 417; Camps ad loc.; Fedeli, ad loc. It is considered an interpolation by many others, e.g. Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 7). On the connection between Coan *versus* and *vestis*, see S. J. Heyworth, 'Notes on Propertius, Books III and IV', *CQ* 36 (1986), 209–10, who points also to Propertius II.1.5–6, III.9.44, and Call. fr. 532; Wyke, op. cit. (n. 21, 1989), 137, cf. D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (1975), 59 n. 2.

[127] Goold, op. cit. (n. 44), 83–4: 'exercebat opus tenebris, ceu blatta papyron/ suffosamque forat sedula talpa viam'. Labate, op. cit. (n. 8), 337–9, defends the reading of the MS tradition, also retained by Fedeli: 'exorabat opus verbis + ceu blanda perure +/ saxosamque forat sedula gutta viam'.

[128] The threats from which the lyric poet escapes in Horace, *Odes* 1.17, which are figured similarly as wolves, snakes, and the dog star, might also programmatically represent iambic verse; cf. G. Davis, *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse* (1991), 82f., on invective as a foil for lyric.

[129] cf. *Amores* III.9.3–4: 'flebilis indignos, Elegia, solve capillos:/ a nimis ex vero nunc tibi nomen erit!' See also C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: The 'Ars Poetica'* (1971), ad *A.P.* 75–8; R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book I* (1970), ad *Odes* 1.33.2; S. E. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (1987), 103.

[130] The term is Sharrock's, op. cit. (n. 92). Cf. *Ars* 1.435; III.615.

the elegiac game. Like Ovid in the third book of his *Ars Amatoria*, she provides women with the *ars* they require to participate in the amatory contest.[131] The artificial nature of this code is perhaps implied in Dipsas' suggestion that the requisite servant and maid be procured to 'play their parts' ('ad partes . . . parentur' (87)).

The elegiac situation demands suffering and resistance: 'unica nata meo pulcherrima cura dolori' (Prop. II.25.1; cf. 1.6.12; III.8; *Am.* II.9.27–8, 39–46; II.19.8; *Ars* III.598). In Tibullus II.6 the *lena* herself plays many of the traditional roles of the obstructers in the elegiac situation, such as the letter-carrier, *ianitor,* and *ancilla* (45–50). *Amores* I.8 occupies an important position as part of the long series of poems which open the *Amores* and form together in sequence a proem to the collection. Ovid's whole introductory sequence draws attention to his authorial construction of the fictional erotic discourse of elegy. *Amores* I.1–9 introduce us to the figures necessary to the equation of the elegiac *furtivus amor*: the *puella* and the rivals: the *vir*, the *ianitor*, the *lena*, and the soldier (cf. Ovid's triumph in *Am.* II.12.1–4 over the *hostes* of elegy: *vir, custos, ianua firma*). In Tibullus II.6 and Ovid *Am.* II.1 the programmatic importance of opposition to elegy is dramatized. In both poems the poet describes his attempt at turning away from love/writing elegy to grander genres. In Tibullus, epic poetry is suggested in the military imagery — 'castra peto, valeatque Venus valeantque puellae' (9)— while in Ovid's case it is Gigantomachy (11–16), and in each poem it is the closing of the door, the occasion of a paraclausithyron, which draws them back to elegy: Tib. II.6.11–12, 'magna loquor, sed magnifice mihi magno locuto/ excutiunt clausae fortia verba fores,' *Am.* II.1.17, 'clausit amica fores: ego cum Iove fulmina omisi'. Acanthis and Dipsas in their speeches both encourage the creation of this amatory situation:

> surda sit oranti tua ianua, laxa ferenti;
>   audiat exclusi verba receptus amans. (*Am.* 1.8.77–8, cf. Prop. IV.5.47–8)

> Let your door be deaf to the beseecher, open for the giver;
>   let the lover you have received overhear the words of the one shut out.

Ultimately, as counter-ego and alter-ego the *lena* by echoing the poet's precepts is complicit in his construction of the elegiac *puella* and in the creation of erotic discourse.

CONCLUSION

The *lena* shares more with the poet than she is contrasted with him; her *carmina* echo his *carmina,* her *artes* mirror those of the elegiac poet-lover. Like him, she knows the amatory rules and roles. Her precepts urge the very *artes* that make up the elegiac code, the same standards of sophistication, *cultus*.[132]   All three poets adopt the posture of erotic expert, of *praeceptor amoris*. The parallels between the *lena*'s speech and the poet's precepts are of course most obvious in the case of Ovid's Dipsas and his didactic *Ars Amatoria*.[133] Propertius and Tibullus, however, also claim the title of *magister amoris* (e.g. Tib. 1.6, 8; Prop. 1.7, 9, 10) and the *lena*'s code of deception and simulation (e.g. Prop. IV.5.27–9, 34, 45; *Am.* 1.8.35–6, 71, 83, 85–6), of delay and rivalry (e.g. Prop. IV.5.30–4, 39–40; *Am.* 1.8.73–6, 95–9) is replayed throughout their poems.[134] In Propertius Acanthis is *docta* (IV.5.5) and her frequently learned and lofty language

[131] See E. Downing, 'Anti-Pygmalion: the *praeceptor* in *Ars Amatoria*, Book 3', *Helios* 17 (1990), 237–49.
[132] Conte, op. cit. (n. 24), 454; Courtney, op. cit. (n. 7), 84–5; Labate, op. cit. (n. 8), 308.
[133] For lists of parallels and echoes, see McKeown, *ad Am.* 1.8, Sharrock, op. cit. (n. 29), 85–6.

[134] On the erotodidactic element in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid see Wheeler, op. cit. (n. 15), 447–8; idem, 'Propertius as *praeceptor amoris*', *CP* 5 (1910), 28–40; E. Romano, '*Amores* 1.8: l'elegia didattica e il genre dell' *Ars Amatoria*', *Orpheus* 1 (1980), 269–92.

humourously confirms this.[135] Ovid too grudgingly admits Dipsas' eloquence, 'nec tamen eloquio lingua nocente caret' (20). Although elegy's authorial first-person narrator attacks the *lena* as an enemy, she is revealed as an ally and an alter-ego.[136] The hypocritical nature of the ideal world of elegiac values is exposed 'from within'.[137] Through the figure of the *lena* the norms and prescriptions of elegy are self-reflexively unmasked. The elegiac poet-lover is revealed as seducer and deception is exposed as the 'central matrix' of the elegiac code (cf. Prop. IV.1.135, 'fallax opus').[138] The elegiac poet too lives off and profits from the creation and publication of his mistress's charms, as Cynthia complains angrily in Propertius IV.7.78: 'laudes desine habere meas'. In *Amores* III.12, an important poem on the nature of poetic interpretation, Ovid laments that his poems have made Corinna too famous and too accessible: 'vendibilis culpa facta puella mea est' (10) — a line that slyly glides the distinction between his mistress and his poems. He admits that he has himself through his poems impelled Corinna (and his poetry) into the public, 'ingenio prostitit illa meo' (8): the poet has become pander (*me lenone*, 11) and the *puella* a prostitute. The fame the poet offers his mistress is a dangerous one. In terms of Roman *mores* it is inherently bad for a woman to be known publicly, to be *notissima forma* (Prop. II.25.3).[139] The suggestion in Propertius II.32 and II.24a.2 ('tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro') is that Cynthia's bad reputation is the cost of Propertius' fame. Finally, in *Amores* III.1, an important programmatic poem, Ovid acknowledges the importance of the *lena*'s participation in the creation of the elegiac code, here the personification Elegia declares herself to be a *lena*, the teacher of Corinna (49–52), the procuress for Venus (43–4):

> rustica sit sine me lascivi mater Amoris:
>   huic ego proveni lena comesque deae.[140]

> Without me the mother of wanton Amor would be but a rustic:
>   I have come into being as the procuress and companion for this goddess.

Ultimately, for the poet to achieve fame his poetry must become the property of the many, the poet and patron become the *lena* or *leno* who promotes his wares. Publication involves the exposure of poetry to an always fickle audience, a public knowledgeable or ignorant and not under the poet's control. It involves the evaluation of the poet's art and the eventual judgement of posterity as to its eternity. The abandonment of Callimachean literary standards of exclusivity and authorial control is suggested when Horace, who in many ways most forcefully articulates the anxieties of patronage and publication, sends off his collection of *Epistles* in 1.20.1–2 to a life of prostitution in the disreputable Vicus Tuscus: 'Vertumnum Ianumque, liber, spectare videris,/ scilicet ut prostes Sosiorum pumice mundus'.[141]

The University of Michigan

---

[135] On the stylistic mixture of Acanthis' speech between the loftiness of her opening and closing lines and the vulgarity of the bulk of it, see Tränkle, op. cit. (n. 7), 175–7 ('In den gesamten Werken des Properz gibt es keine Stelle, die annähernd so tief in die Niederungen der Vulgärsprache hinabsteigt wie diese Verse'); Lefèvre, op. cit. (n. 7), 103–5; G. Puccioni, 'L'elegia IV.5 di Properzio', in *Studi di poesia latina in onore di Antonio Traglia II* (1979), 609–23; Gutzwiller, op. cit. (n. 6), 108–9; Luck, op. cit. (n. 7), 429–30.

[136] On the identification of Ovid and Dipsas, see Labate, op. cit. (n. 8), 285–309, Sharrock, op. cit. (n. 29), 86.

[137] See especially Conte, op. cit. (n. 24), 454–6, on irony.

[138] Henderson, op. cit. (n. 67), 66; cf. Kennedy, op. cit. (n. 4), 69; Sharrock, op. cit. (n. 29), 86, on the elegiac narrator as seducer; K. Olstein, '*Amores* 1.3 and duplicity as a way of love', *TAPA* 105 (1975), 241–58.

[139] See T. Hillard, 'On the Stage, Behind the Curtain: Images of Politically Active Women in the Late Republic', in Garlick *et al.*, op. cit. (n. 61), 53, on 'the high price paid for a public profile'. Note Apuleius' charge that Lucilius prostituted two Roman boys by publishing their real names instead of using pseudonyms in his poetry ('pueros directis nominibus carmine suo prostituerit', *Apologia* 10).

[140] For Venus as a *praeceptrix amoris* see Tib. 1.2.15–22; 1.8.5–6.

[141] On this poetic figure, see Bramble, op. cit. (n. 60), 59–62; P. J. Connor, 'Book despatch: Horace *Epistles* 1.20 and 1.13', *Ramus* 11 (1982), 145–52; Fitzgerald, op. cit. (n. 73), 423; S. J. Harrison, 'Deflating the *Odes*: Horace, *Epistles* 1.20', *CQ* 38 (1988), 473–6; M. Citroni, 'I destinatori contemporanei', in G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli, and A. Giardina (eds), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma Antica Vol. III* (1990), 70; L. T. Pearcy, 'The personification of the text and Augustan poetics in *Epistles* 1.20', *CW* 87 (1994), 457–64.