

AURORA NON GRATA: A CRITICAL APPRECIATION OF OVID, AMORES 1.13

AURORA NON GRATA: A CRITICAL APPRECIATION OF OVID, AMORES 1.13

By: VICTORIA J. HAYKIN, B.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts.

McMaster University MASTER OF ARTS (2014) Hamilton, Ontario (Classics)

TITLE: *Aurora non grata*: A Critical Appreciation of Ovid, *Amores* 1.13

AUTHOR: Victoria J. Haykin, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Paul Murgatroyd

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 101

ABSTRACT

Little scholarly work has been done on *Amores* 1.13 despite the fact that it is thematically unique in the extant corpus of Latin elegy and an altogether brilliant example of Ovidian ingenuity. The theme of the poem, Aurora's premature arrival and disruption of a lovers' union, is derived chiefly from Hellenistic love epigram. Scholars have often noted that two epigrams in particular, both composed by Meleager of Gadara, may have served as Ovid's literary models. In fact, there are three Meleagrian epigrams which appear to have influenced the composition of *Amores* 1.13: *A.P.* 5.172, 5.173, and 12.137. In the following chapters, I examine the Meleagrian dawn epigrams without reference to *Amores* 1.13. Once the constituent elements of the Meleagrian dawn epigram have been properly established, I then consider Meleager's influence on *Amores* 1.13 and the way in which Ovid adapts the Meleagrian model to suit his specific poetic needs. Finally, I provide a detailed literary-critical commentary on all elements of note.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS¹

I must first thank Dr. Paul Murgatroyd for his unfailing patience and support. I am deeply indebted to him for his guidance not only over the course of my graduate career, but also throughout my undergraduate years as the supervisor of both my B.A. Honours and M.A. theses. As well I would like to thank the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. Kathryn Mattison and Dr. Sean Corner, for their astute counsel and encouragement. Without the assistance of the department's administrative assistant, the indefatigable Carmen Camilleri, I would not have survived the thesis-writing process unscathed. Thank you to all of my friends in the department, in particular Jason Binder and Patricia White, who have helped maintain my sanity over these last few years. Last, but certainly not least, thank you to my parents for encouraging me to pursue my passion for Latin Literature.

¹ The author acknowledges the generous financial support of the School of Graduate Studies at McMaster University, the Department of Classics, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), the Edith Wightman Travel Scholarship, the E. Togo Salmon Travel Fund in Roman Studies, and the Tina and Paul Bellavia Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS).

*BUSY old fool, unruly Sun,
Why dost thou thus,
Through windows, and through curtains, call on us?
Must to thy motions lovers' seasons run?*

~ JOHN DONNE, *THE SUN RISING*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: <i>The Meleagrian Dawn Epigram</i> (A.P. 5.172, 5.173; A.P. 12.137)	
1.1 Constituent Elements of the Meleagrian Dawn Epigram	3
1.2 A Hypothetical Compositional Chronology	4
1.3 The Lover's Predicament (A.P. 5.172)	6
1.4 The Abandoned Lover's Lament (A.P. 5.173)	11
1.5 The Early-Morning Caller (A.P. 12.137)	17
APPENDIX A: <i>Extant (Non-Meleagrian) Dawn Epigrams</i> (A.P. 5.3; A.P. 12.136)	
Antipater of Thessalonica (A.P. 5.3)	24
Anonymous (A.P. 12.136)	26
CHAPTER II: <i>Meleagrian Echoes in Ovid, Amores 1.13</i>	
2.1 Establishing an Intertextual Link	29
2.2 Ovid's Literary Exploitation of the Meleagrian Model	32
CHAPTER III: <i>A Literary-Critical Analysis of Ovid, Amores 1.13</i>	
3.1 A Note on the General Arrangement of <i>Amores</i> 1.13	44
3.2 The Opening Couplet (<i>Am.</i> 1.13.1–2)	45
3.3 The First Section (<i>Am.</i> 1.13.3–8)	47
3.4 The Second Section (<i>Am.</i> 1.13.9–30)	53
3.5 The Third Section (<i>Am.</i> 1.13.31–46)	76
3.6 The Closing Couplet (<i>Am.</i> 1.13.47–48)	92
CONCLUSION	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	97

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>A.P.</i>	<i>Anthologia Palatina.</i>
<i>A.Pl.</i>	<i>Anthologia Planudea.</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.</i>
<i>G.-P.</i>	A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, <i>The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams.</i>
<i>H.-C.</i>	E. Hiller and O. Crusius, <i>Anthologia lyrica.</i>
<i>L.-P.</i>	E. Loibel and D. L. Page, <i>Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta.</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	H. G. Lidell and R. Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon.</i>
<i>OLD</i>	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary.</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.</i>
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.</i>

DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The author declares that the content of the research contained herein was carried out in full by Victoria J. Haykin with recognition of the contributions of the supervisory committee, comprised of Dr. Paul Murgatroyd, Dr. Kathryn Mattison, and Dr. Sean Corner, made during the writing and editing process.

INTRODUCTION

Although a comprehensive examination of the classical dawn motif is certainly not the primary aim of this work, I nevertheless think it useful to briefly consider the development of this theme in erotic poetry. This background information will afford the reader greater insight into the literary tradition out of which the Meleagrian dawn epigram emerges and, ultimately, Ovid's innovative treatment of the same theme in *Amores* 1.13.

Early examples of the classical dawn motif can be found in Homeric verse and Greek lyric poetry.¹ Libanius tells us that Sappho once wished for the length of the night to be doubled.² Although the actual poem cannot be identified in the extant corpus, echoes of Sappho's interest in this motif may be preserved in *fr.* 135 (L.-P.): “τί Πανδίονις, Ὠιρανα, χελίδω...;.” Presumably the swallow's singing heralds the break of day. Anacreon, a later lyric poet, also chides the chattering swallow for interrupting some sort of sex dream about his lover Bathyllus.³

The extant corpus of Hellenistic epigram contains the best examples of the so-called “Premature Dawn” motif. As I will discuss in the following chapter, Meleager of Gadara, no doubt with Sappho in mind, takes up this theme in several of his erotic epigrams. The three longest dawn epigrams, which must have influenced *Amores* 1.13,

¹ For a synopsis of the classical dawn poem, see HATTO 1965: 255ff.; MCKEOWN 1989: 337f. The earliest extant references to dawn in an erotic context can be found in Hom. *Od.* 23.241–26.; *H.H.* 5.218–38.

² Liban. *Orat.* 1.402 = Sappho *fr.* 197 (L.-P.).

³ Anac. 9 (12) (H.-C.).

will be discussed in the following chapter.⁴ A fourth example also authored by Meleager, but only two lines long, is preserved at *A.P.* 12.114. In this epigram Meleager hails the arrival of the Morning Star and begs it to quickly bring back the Evening Star, although there is no explicit mention of a lovers' union which unfortunately makes its inclusion in the following chapter impossible.

There are few Latin examples of the dawn motif prior to the Middle Ages when dawn songs (i.e. the *aubade*) became extremely popular.⁵ Thus, *Amores* 1.13 stands out as a particularly striking example of a classical Latin dawn poem. It should be noted, however, that several excerpts from the Propertian corpus do contain elements of the standard dawn motif, but can by no means be considered prime examples of this theme.⁶ Ovid then is the first and really only Latin elegist to examine the lover's appeal to dawn in any great detail, and his treatment of this motif merits greater scrutiny than it has thus far received.

⁴ Several other dawn epigrams are preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina* (*A.P.* 5.3, 5.118, 5.223, 5.283). I will discuss two of these in greater detail in the appendix to Chapter I.

⁵ For more on the medieval *aubade*, the *alba*, and the *tageliet* and later reception of *Amores* 1.13, see MÜLLER 1971: 451–80; PEACOCK 1975: 20–29; GRANSDEN 1979: 157–71, 235–37; SIGAL 1996;

⁶ See Prop. 2.18B.7ff., 3.20B.11ff.

CHAPTER I

THE MELEAGRIAN DAWN EPIGRAM (*A.P.* 5.172, 5.173; *A.P.* 12.137)

1.1 Constituent Elements of the Meleagrian Dawn Epigram

Three largely neglected dawn poems composed by Meleager, located at *A.P.* 5.172, 5.173 and *A.P.* 12.137, are prime examples of the Hellenistic interest in thematic progression and innovation.¹ *A.P.* 5.172 and 5.173 have received a small amount of scholarly interest, but when discussed at all, they are often employed only as examples of programmatic cycles; little of note has ever been said regarding their exploitation of the “Premature Dawn” motif.² Thus, it is important, prior to engaging further with the text, to lay out all of the constituent elements of the Meleagrian dawn epigram.

The Meleagrian dawn epigram can, in simplest terms, be defined as a Hellenistic-style *aubade*:

- (1) It takes place at daybreak, as the sun is just beginning or about to rise.
- (2) It is generally light-hearted in tone, never more than six lines in length, and erotic in nature.
- (3) The poem itself opens with a direct address by the lover to Dawn (Ὄρθρος) or the cock that heralds it (ὄρθροβόας).
- (4) The poet-lover is found lying in bed with his beloved lamenting Dawn’s untimely arrival or imagining a scenario in which his absent lover lies with another man.

¹ For more on the importance of these aspects in Hellenistic epigram, see GARRISON 1978: 33ff.; TARÁN 1979: *passim*; GUTZWILLER 1998: 227ff.; 2007: 169ff.; FANTUZZI-HUNTER 2004: 283ff. Two other non-Meleagrian dawn epigrams have been preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina* (*A.P.* 5.3; *A.P.* 12.136). I will discuss their relevance in Appendix A, located at the conclusion of this chapter.

² See GUTZWILLER 1998: 295; 2007: 330f.; YPSILANTI 2005: 86f.; BETTENWORTH 2007: 92.

(5) Dawn and its herald are subsequently criticized for the swiftness or tardiness of their arrival.

1.2 A Hypothetical Compositional Chronology

When investigating issues of theme and variation, it can be helpful to establish which of the poems in question may have been composed first, although this is ultimately an insoluble issue. If it can be argued that *A.P.* 5.172 and 5.173 form a programmatic pair, this would make establishing a working chronology slightly less challenging.³ Two lexical correlations confirm that both epigrams are meant to be read together: First, the vocative ὄρθρε in emphatic position, setting the scene for both epigrams; second, the contrasting τί μοι in 5.172 and τί νῦν in 5.173.⁴ The use of τί μοι fits the overarching theme of 5.172: The lover is focused solely on the personal ramifications of Dawn's ascent. At 5.173, the poet-lover bemoans the loss of his beloved to another man; τί νῦν draws immediate attention to the lover's current plight. He is bereft of hope as Demo lies warm beneath another's blanket, and the rising of Ὅρθρος now represents all that he has lost.

It is also most likely that 5.173 was composed after 5.172. The elevated diction of 5.173 adds credence to this theory; περὶ κόσμον ἐλίση echoes the περὶ κοῖτον ἐπέστης from 5.172, but the image of Ὅρθρος orbiting the kosmos elevates the tone of the line.

³ Literary or programmatic “cycles” were first defined by MÜLLER: The poems must form a thematic “whole”; they must be linked by a thematic *a priori*, that is “psychologisch gesprochen, das ‘Erlebnis’ das aber sofort im Dichten funktional wird, d.h. eine dichterische Verwirklichung, eine Formwerdung im Gedicht verlangt” (MÜLLER 1932: 6ff.). For the application of this definition to specific literary cycles, see YPSILANTI 2005: 83–110; GUTZWILLER 1997: 169–200; 1998: 276–301.

⁴ This theory, although never fully expounded upon, is loosely corroborated by GOW-PAGE, CLACK, and YPSILANTI (GOW-PAGE 1965: 623, vol. II; CLACK 1992: 67; YPSILANTI 2005: 86).

The best evidence, however, that 5.173 was composed later than 5.172 comes at the close of the epigram. 5.173.3–4 directly recall the events of 5.172.⁵ A final important point to note regarding chronology: Meleager himself, as an early compiler of the *Anthologia Palatina*, was responsible for the placement of 5.172 and 5.173, which suggests that their arrangement was purposeful.

A.P. 12.137 is the odd one out when it comes to establishing the literary progression of this motif. It is not part of a literary cycle nor is it even located within the same book of the *Anthology*. There are, however, several thematic and lexical considerations which may offer a solution to this dilemma. First, consider the use of ὀρθροβόας at 12.136.1. Instead of addressing Ὀρθρος directly, the lover now alludes to its ascent by berating those who foretell of its imminent arrival. This clever twist on the “Premature Dawn” motif suggests a compositional date later than 5.172 and 5.173. Ὀρθροβόας is an extremely rare word found only once prior to this in the *Anthology*, making it a fitting choice for an epigram consciously composed as a witty response to more conventional dawn poems.⁶ The ambitious phrasing and elevated style of this epigram may also be indicative of an attempt to top 5.172 and 5.173.⁷ Of course, one cannot affirm with certainty that 12.137 was composed last, but it does seem the most likely explanation.

⁵ “ἀλλ’ ὅτε τὰν ῥαδινὰν κόλποις ἔχον, ὠκὺς ἐπέστης | ὡς βάλλον ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ φῶς ἐπιχαιρέκακον” (G.-P. 27). GUTZWILLER draws attention to this as proof of a programmatic relationship between 5.172 and 5.173 (GUTZWILLER 2007: 331).

⁶ Ὀρθροβόας is employed also at *A.P.* 12.24.3.

⁷ For more on Meleager’s “elevated style,” see GOW-PAGE 1965: 669, vol. II and CLACK 1992: 97.

As I will chiefly be examining literary variations, the validity of my compositional chronology is not of paramount importance. I have made propositions here that I believe to be sound, but they will in no way affect the outcome of my discussion. For the sake of simplicity, however, I will be using them as a working order in the following sections.

1.3 The Lover's Predicament (A.P. 5.172)

On the whole, *A.P.* 5.172 is an extremely balanced composition. The first four lines of 5.172 form an ABAB structure. 5.172.1 opens with the address to dawn; 5.172.2 zooms into a bedroom scene. 5.172.3–4 are structured similarly: 5.172.3 zooms back out of the lover's bedroom and into an alternate reality wherein Ὀρθρος retreats and yields once more to Ἐσπερος. 5.172.4, however, returns again to the scene in the bedchamber as the early-morning rays fall upon the disgruntled lover's bed.

The epigram also follows a logical progression. In the first two lines, the lover openly rebukes Dawn and laments its early arrival. In the following two lines, the lover forsakes idle complaints in favour of a concrete entreaty, and in the final couplet, the poet supports the legitimacy of his plea by referencing mythological precedent. Moreover, there are verbal links between couplets strengthening their overall connectivity. The idea of the swiftness of Dawn's ascent links the first two couplets (ταχὺς/ταχινὸν δρόμον) and the repetition of words denoting retreat and retrograde motion connects the second couplet with the third (πάλιν στρέψας/παλινδρομίης).

5.172 opens with the vocative Ὀρθρε, setting the scene for what follows. As mentioned previously, the lover's use of τί μοι draws immediate attention to the personal

nature of the forthcoming predicament. Juxtaposed with this phrase is the odd epithet *δυσέραστε* found only in this epigram and at 5.173.⁸ The sense of the epithet seems to be “unfavourable to lovers.”⁹ Ὅρθρος and *δυσέραστε* surround *μοι* in the word order of the first line cleverly encapsulating the essence of the epigram; the lover (*μοι*) is oppressed by Dawn, unable to avoid its inevitable arrival.

Moreover, the metre of the first line is highly dactylic contributing to the vividness of tone and wittily underscoring the swiftness of Dawn’s ascent.¹⁰ The hard consonantal sounds in the middle of the line contribute to the forcefulness of the lover’s rebuke. The adjective *ταχὺς* and the main verb *ἐπέστης*, both of which are governed by Ὅρθρος, surround *περὶ κοῖτον* thereby creating a mirror image of the same effect noted in the first half of 5.172.1. Thus, the first line, in its totality, underscores the theme of the entire epigram in a concise and witty manner using an ABAABA formation.

5.172.2 presents a pleasing contrast. The scene zooms in from the speedy arrival of Ὅρθρος to a snapshot of the lover entwined in the embraces of his beloved. The diction becomes far more sentimental with *φίλας* setting the tone of the line and emphasizing the erotic tension of the scene. At the end of the line, the participle

⁸ “Unhappy in love” is a more common usage (GOW-PAGE 1965: 623, vol. II). It may also seem odd that Dawn is characterized as an enemy to lovers when Eos was well-known for her many love affairs. I would argue, however, that the lover is wholly self-absorbed and by calling Dawn “*δυσέραστε*,” he is providing the reader with deeper insight into his present state of mind. Moreover, there is flippancy in the idea that Dawn has it in for lovers, just as there is flippancy in the idea that the lover’s lament will persuade Dawn to retreat, since Dawn has no real interest in the plight of lovers and is simply performing a predetermined task.

⁹ GOW-PAGE 1965: 623, vol. II.

¹⁰ Dactyls are often associated with liveliness, vivacity, and/or speed. Spondees, on the other hand, are associated with despair, sluggishness, and/or solemnity. Reader response to the effect of metre is admittedly quite subjective, but nevertheless highly dactylic and spondaic lines do contribute to the overall tone of the poem in important ways and will require detailed comment.

γλαινομένῳ refers back to the μοι at the very beginning of the epigram thereby bringing the opening question full circle. By contrast, the metre of this line is highly spondaic, enhancing the erotic nature of the scene.

The following two lines constitute the lover's appeal to Dawn. 5.172.3 leads into an optative of wish presenting the reader with an alternate reality far removed from the lover's present predicament. The adverb πάλιν adds emphatic immediacy to the lover's plea. His one wish is Dawn's retreat. The phrase ταχινὸν δρόμον reinforces Dawn's swift and inevitable arrival. It is, however, surrounded on both sides by πάλιν στρέψας and Ἔσπερος two phrases underscoring the lover's desire that Dawn might reverse its course.

The phrasing in this line cleverly inverts the sentiments of 5.172.1 where swift Dawn encompassed the lover in the word order. Now, however, the lover's desires surround and oppress Dawn's arrival. Moreover, the true nature of the lover's request is not revealed until the very end of the line. Here it becomes clear that he is not only content with Dawn reversing course, but, even more than this, he wishes that Dawn might once more become Evening, thereby affording him and his beloved a second uninterrupted night of erotic revelry.

5.172.4 reverts from the optative mood back to the lover's present reality. The full focus is once again on Dawn as its rays enter through the lover's window. The superlative form of the adjective πικρός employed at the end of the line adds greater force to the lover's plight.¹¹ Indeed, the two adjectives γλυκὸν and πικρότατον bookend the line

¹¹ It is likely that this is a reference to Sappho *fr.* 130: “Ἔρος δηῖτέ μ' ὁ λυσιμέλης δόνει, | γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον” (L.-P.). Here Sappho describes Eros as γλυκύπικρον, “sweet-bitter,” a sentiment mimicked by the poet-lover of A.P. 5.172. For more on the concept of Eros as “bittersweet,” see MACLACHLAN 1989: 95–99; CARSON 1998: 3ff. and *passim*.

creating a clever contrast between the sweetness of Dawn's early-morning light and the enmity this engenders in the bitter lover whose beloved is soon to be wrenched from his embrace. The poet's choice of $\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\grave{\alpha}$ as a description of Dawn's rays may, at first glance, be surprising. From the lover's point of view Dawn's rays are intrusive, not sweet. Therefore, it seems likely that the implications of $\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\grave{\alpha}$ are meant to be ironic. That is, Dawn's $\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\grave{\alpha}$ $\phi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ are, in actual fact, a relief to most people since they dispel the blackness of night, but in this particular situation they are troublesome for the lover.

In what follows, the epigram adopts a mock-epic and rhetorical tone. In an effort to add credence to the plea that Dawn should reverse its course, the lover references an *exemplum* drawn from the world of myth. Zeus lies with the heroine Alcmene while her husband Amphitryon is away at war. In order to prolong the sexual pleasure, Zeus protracts the length of the night.¹² Thus, it seems that the lover is now asking not for a second night with his mistress but for one continuous night such as Zeus experienced with Alcmene.¹³ There is also a great deal of humour in this mythological reference. It was of course Zeus himself who stayed Dawn's course; Dawn had no control over the situation. Moreover, as a mortal lover, to equate one's personal situation with the king of the gods is laughable, and it is highly unlikely that Dawn would be swayed by such deluded reasoning.

¹² Meleager may also have in mind Athena's prolongation of Odysseus' and Penelope's pleasure in Hom. *Od.* 23.241–26.

¹³ CLACK 1992: 67.

On a textual level, the juxtaposition of ἐπ' Ἀλκμήνην Διὸς draws attention to the physical closeness experienced during the sexual act.¹⁴ The metre is also highly spondaic adding to the mock-epic solemnity. The incompleteness of the sense at 1.172.5 leaves the reader in suspense. The expression of the phrase ἤλθεσ ἀντίος, however, is odd and its proper meaning can only be inferred based on context. This has led to a great deal of contention regarding the soundness of the text which makes it impossible to draw concrete conclusions regarding literary significance.¹⁵ The remainder of the final line constitutes the lover's witty conclusion: If Dawn has turned back its course before, why not now? The noun παλινδρομίας closes off the epigram with an emphasis once again on Dawn's hoped-for, but unlikely, reversal.

Ultimately, 5.172 is a lighthearted and witty exploration of a common erotic predicament. The very fact that the lover finds it reasonable to address Dawn is comically ridiculous; it is obviously impossible for Dawn to hear or heed the lover's request, let alone reverse its course. Moreover, the image this epigram paints for the reader is intended to be highly amusing. We are no doubt meant to imagine the sleep-deprived lover, awoken at daybreak, addressing the rays of the sun shining through the window as his mistress still lies next to him, listening as her lover attempts to reason with an immutable force of nature. Essentially, the lover is hoping for an ἀδύνατον, and the humour of the poem depends upon the inevitable failure of the endeavour.

¹⁴ Some editors conjecture ἐπ' Ἀλκμήνην Διὸς (see DÜBNER 1864: 89; PATTON 1916: 211; WALTZ 1960: 79). As GOW-PAGE note, this is impossible if Διὸς is to be taken with ἀντίος ἤλθεσ (GOW-PAGE 1965: 623, vol. II).

¹⁵ GOW-PAGE argue that the manuscript tradition is sound and that the only possible translation is "you went backwards to Zeus' Alcmena" (GOW-PAGE 1965: 623, vol. II). It is not uncommon for epigrammatists to use telescopic language in their compositions due to the restraints of space.

1.4 The Abandoned Lover's Lament (A.P. 5.173)

A.P. 5.173 is laid out similarly to A.P. 5.172. The first two lines constitute a (slightly altered) repetition of the poet-lover's appeal to Dawn. In these lines, several words and phrases are reused thereby solidifying the poem's link with 5.172.¹⁶ The final two lines of the epigram comprise the lover's complaint and a summary of his present situation. In these lines the lover presents a dilemma strikingly dissimilar to 5.172.

In contrast to 5.172, 5.173 concludes in only four lines, without any attempt to persuade Dawn by means of mythological *exempla*. Furthermore, there is clever thematic reversal at play between the first and second set of couplets. In the first couplet, Dawn's arrival is delayed (5.173.1) while another man lies with Demo (5.173.2). In the first line of the second couplet, the poet-lover now lies with Demo and in the final line, Dawn's arrival is hurried.

Despite phraseological similarities, 5.173 entirely reverses the theme of 5.172. Instead of bemoaning Dawn's hasty arrival, the lover now berates Dawn's sluggishness as he lies in bed bereft of his beloved Demo. The first line is a direct echo of 5.172. Ὅρθρε once again opens the epigram in emphatic position followed by τί νῦν which draws a stark contrast between the lover's current plight and his former predicament in 5.172.

Dawn is once more referred to by the epithet δυσέραστε, and it is not until the adjective βραδύς that the reader is made aware of a surprising reversal. Dawn is no longer characterized as swift, but its ascent now seems delayed. Indeed, βραδύς occupies the

¹⁶ See section 1.2 for more on this.

same metrical *sedes* as the ταχὺς of 5.172.1 and both fall directly after the weak caesura which significantly strengthens the impact of the thematic *volte-face*. Moreover, the elevated description of Dawn orbiting around the world at 5.173.1 contrasts starkly with the mundane depiction of Dawn gazing down upon the lover’s bed at 5.172.1–2. The verb ἐλίσση, however, also conjures a particularly comic mental image of Dawn rolling about the kosmos almost haphazardly; the eagerness of Dawn’s unwanted ascent in 5.172 has now given way to a sort of amusing indifference.

The lover himself (μοι at 5.172.1) is conspicuously absent from these lines. He is no longer the one oppressed by Dawn’s hasty arrival, his role as Demo’s beloved has been usurped by another. At first one is struck by the lover’s flippant change in attitude toward Dawn’s arrival. The lover comically betrays his lack of perspicacity; previously, he chastised Dawn for its alacrity, and now he complains of its tardiness. (The real reason for the lover’s inconsistency, however, is eventually resolved in the following line.)

Metrically, 5.173.1 mimics 5.172.1, thereby heightening the ironic humour of the situation. At 5.172.1, the rushing dactyls were thematically appropriate, but at 5.173.1, spondees would have been more fitting. Moreover, the epithet δυσέραστε has rather ironic connotations. At 5.172, Dawn was rightly referred to as an “enemy of lovers.” In the context of 5.173, however, it seems odd that the lover, who is now bemoaning the delay of Dawn’s arrival and the likelihood that his mistress is presently engaged in some

form of infidelity, would still refer to Dawn as *δυσέραστε*. If anything, Dawn appears more sympathetic to lovers in 5.173.¹⁷

5.173.2 opens with *ἄλλος* forcefully placing an emphasis on the reason for the lover's second address to Dawn. Another man is somehow to blame. The reference to Demo, again in the genitive, follows the second word of the line, as it does at 5.172.2, and occupies the same metrical *sedes*. This link allows the reader to contrast the lover's formerly tender feelings for her at 5.172 with his current anguish. She is no longer described as *φύλας*, but as an unfaithful lover warming another man beneath her mantle. Indeed, the main verb *θαλπεθ'* and its subject *ἄλλος* encompass Demo in the word order mirroring the lovers' literal embraces. Furthermore, *Δημοῦς* and *χλανίδι*, the mantle belonging to Demo, surround *θαλπεθ'* creating an ABAB formation. Not only then is Demo being embraced by her lover, but she also is embracing him in return.

Moreover, the verb *θάλλω* appears, at first glance, to be similar in meaning to *χλαιίνω*, employed by Meleager at 5.172.2. There are, however, several latent senses of *θάλλω* which make it far more pregnant and pointed than *χλαιίνω*. Aside from meaning "to warm," *θάλλω* can also be used, in a metaphorical context, to mean "to deceive" or "to heat or inflame with desire" or "to cherish, foster."¹⁸ These three alternate translations of *θάλλω* are all equally poignant. The poet-lover is being deceived by his unfaithful mistress, making the first alternate sense of *θάλλω* particularly apt. The verb, which also has erotic connotations, complements the amorous nature of the scene. Finally, the sense

¹⁷ It could also be the case that Meleager employs *δυσέραστε* to imply that he is himself Demo's rightful lover and that her current paramour has simply usurped his rightful place by her side.

¹⁸ See LSJ s.v. I.1; III.1–2.

of “to cherish, foster” suggests a deeper element of sentimentality. Perhaps it is the case that Demo feels more fondly for this new lover, or perhaps the poet-lover’s word-choice betrays his own tender feelings for her.

In what follows, the scene shifts from the lover’s present dilemma to his former one. The substantive use of τὰν ῥαδινὰν clearly refers back to Demo. By leaving out her proper name, however, the lover suggests that he cannot bring himself to speak of her by name when recounting their past romantic exploits. Moreover, the active voice of the verb ἔχον, employed in this same line, presents a stark contrast to the passive nature of the lover’s actions at 5.172.2.¹⁹ As noted in my discussion of possible compositional chronologies, 5.173.3 must be meant to recall the events of 5.172.2, but clearly the lover is now casting his past exploits in a very different light. At 5.172.2, the poet-lover is warmed by his mistress’ embraces (χλαιομένῳ); the passive participle implies perhaps that Demo played the instigative role in the affair. Now, at 5.173.3, the lover, as the subject of the main verb ἔχον, suggests it was in fact he who initiated their embraces.

This subtle substitution on Meleager’s part may be meant to provide the reader with a glimpse into the lover’s psychological state. Loveless and forlorn, the lover chooses to rewrite his part in the former affair to his own advantage. This is yet another ineffective attempt to regain control of a hopeless situation. The take-away of these lines, however, is not meant to be heavy-handed sentimentalism. Meleager has cleverly played up the lover’s uselessness for comedic effect. The lover’s characterization, developed in

¹⁹ “ἄρτι φίλας Δημοῦς χρωτὶ χλαιομένῳ” (G.-P. 28).

5.172, is now further reinforced. He has not learned his lesson even after Dawn ignored his first plea, but instead he engages in an even more absurd exercise in futility.

The final line of the epigram mimics 5.172.4. Again, Dawn casts its rays over the lover, but the pointed substitution of the polysyllabic adjective ἐπιχαιρέκακον for γλυκὸν mirrors the lover's current emotional state; a wry final flourish in contrast to the end of 5.172 where the lover concludes his address to Dawn on a much higher note.²⁰

Ἐπιχαιρέκακον also dextrously responds to both πικρότατον, which modifies φῶς at 5.172.4, and παλινδρομίης, the last word of 5.172. Thus, Meleager simultaneously engages with and tops 5.172 by employing a longer, more complex compound adjective at the close of 5.173. In addition, the word order of this line has been slightly altered in comparison to 5.172.4.

The adjective ἐπιχαιρέκακον also has more subtle connotations. It can refer to a person who, standing afar off, rejoices in the grief of others.²¹ Thus, Dawn is imagined here as Demo and her new lovers' helpmate, rolling around the kosmos as they roll in bed, conspiring in their assignations, shedding a light that rejoices at the poet's predicament as if at a neighbour's disgrace

Several standard elements of the Meleagrian dawn epigram have been significantly modified. The lover does not attempt to convince Dawn to hasten its arrival. The poem's function is simply to contrast the lover's despair with his former happiness.

²⁰ Meleager's substitution of ἐπιχαιρέκακον for γλυκὸν may also be meant recall the "γλυκὸν...πικρότατον" image of 5.172.4 which, as mentioned above, is no doubt a reference to Sappho *fr.* 130. If this is the case, then perhaps ἐπιχαιρέκακον is meant both to recall the lover's "sweet-bitter" predicament at 5.172.4 and to draw a contrast with the thoroughly bitter nature of the lover's current situation.

²¹ See LSJ s.v. I.1–2.

As a result, this epigram is a full two lines shorter than 5.172. This second epigram, however, also serves a narratological function. Whereas 5.172 breaks off *in mediis rebus* with the lover's plea yet unanswered by Dawn, 5.173 reveals that Dawn was not swayed by the lover's faulty logic to stay its course.²²

Another humorous comparison lies in the differing lengths of the two epigrams. At 5.172, the lover laments Dawn's hasty arrival, but he nevertheless devotes a full six lines to his plea. Perhaps in a futile attempt to buy himself more time in bed with his beloved. At 5.173, on the other hand, Dawn's arrival is delayed and yet the lover concludes his lament in only four lines. Ironically, the dejected lover's earlier wish that Dawn might grant him a longer length of night has finally been fulfilled but only after his mistress has forsaken him for another man.

The underlying humour of 5.173 is, in some ways, quite similar to 5.172. Meleager re-explores the futility and stupidity of the lover's address to Dawn. This time, however, he examines it from an alternate angle, namely the lover's lament *sans* beloved. Although conceived as a droll alternative to the standard "Premature Dawn" scenario, 5.173 also downplays many of the elements of wit found throughout 5.172. The lover makes no great attempt to persuade Dawn to hasten its course. Thus, the humour here is much more subtle and ultimately meant to be found in the comparison of the lover's present predicament with his plight in 5.172, several examples of which have been discussed above.

²² As GUTZWILLER points out, these two epigrams work together to pair opposing viewpoints of a love affair thereby suggesting "the shape of love's whole" (GUTZWILLER 2007: 331).

1.5 The Early-Morning Caller (*A.P.* 12.137)

A.P. 12.137 can be broken down into two distinct stages. The first four lines of the poem are dedicated to the lover's violent denunciation of the rooster's clamoring. The final couplet constitutes the lover's threat of violence. Unlike 5.172 and 5.173, the couplets of 12.137 are far less distinct. In 12.137, the first four lines of the epigram cover the same amount of emotional territory covered in only two lines in 5.172 and 5.173; Meleager dwells twice as long on the personal harm caused by the Dawn's arrival (or, in this case, the crowing cock's declaration of Dawn's arrival). This may be because the poet-lover, now utterly fed up with Dawn's unending intrusions, is blinded by illogical rage.

12.137 returns to the theme of 5.172, namely a disgruntled lover bemoaning the celerity of Dawn's arrival. Instead of addressing Dawn directly, however, the lover verbally assaults Dawn's herald, the crowing rooster. Unlike 5.172, the lover of 12.137 does not seek to persuade the cock to cease his crowing. Again, as previously, the object of the lover's ire (ὄρθροβόας) opens the epigram in emphatic position.²³ As noted earlier, ὄρθροβόας is extremely rare. Indeed, in contrast to the other dawn epigrams, Meleager employs a myriad of rare words in 12.137, accentuating the elevated expression of the lines.²⁴ Moreover, all of the epithets in the first line modifying either the lover or the rooster contain the same number of syllables. This ingenious technique lays the groundwork for further lexical variation in the following lines.

²³ Cf. the position of ὄρθρε at 5.172.1 and 5.173.1.

²⁴ Altogether, Meleager employs one unique word (πλευροτυπῆ) and three rare words (ὄρθροβόας/κακάγγελε/τρισάλαστε) (GOW-PAGE 1965: 670).

A clear link back to 5.172 and 5.173 is the lover's use of *δυσέρωτι*. *Δύσερω* bears linguistic similarities to *δυσέραστος*, yet they differ greatly in meaning. *Δυσέραστος* was used previously to refer to Dawn's hatred toward lovers. At 12.137, *δύσερω* refers to lover himself and must be translated as "love-sick" or "passionate in love." Here, the innovation lies in the application of similar phraseology, clearly linking to previous dawn epigrams, but also creating a witty reversal. The intensity of 12.137 is brought out further by the rush of harsh consonants in lines 1 through 2 and the dactylic metre of the lines. The rush of dactyls complements the clattering consonants and adds an even deeper element of aggression to the lover's verbal abuses. Like 5.172, the metre aptly echoes the situation, namely the rooster's swift promulgation of Dawn's forthcoming arrival.

In what follows, the lover berates the rooster for a full four lines. As previously discussed, this is significantly different from other Meleagrian dawn epigrams. At 5.172 and 5.173, the lover directly reproaches Dawn for only one line. 12.137.1–4, however, are full of invective. The rooster is described as *κακάγγελε* and *τρισάλαστε*. Both of these compound epithets are extremely rare, and both add to the darkly humorous undertone of the epigram.²⁵ The lover applies these grandiose words to the crowing of a bothersome rooster. This is certainly not the sort of creature one would normally deem worthy of such lofty language.

²⁵ *Κακάγγελε* is first found in Aesch. *Ag.* 636 and, after that, very rarely seen. The only other extant use of *τρισάλαστε* is found at *A.Pl.* 265.1.

A similar tone persists throughout. At 12.137.2, the lover depicts the rooster as an arrogant creature, nightly beating its sides; the entirety of the line is devoted to the rooster's troublesome crowing, highlighting the overbearing nature of its actions. Πλευροτυπῆ is a unique epithet, and again, the mundane context of the angry lover's tirade makes the effect of these lines all the more amusing. In addition, the elevated tone of the phrase "κράζεις πλευροτυπῆ κέλαδον" mirrors the over-the-top arrogance of the cock's actions.

At 12.137.3, the rooster is comically depicted as standing over the lover's bed. This, of course, recalls 5.172.2. In contrast to 5.172, where Dawn's actions are of a more passive nature, the rooster's haughty wing-flapping creates a far more amusing image. Moreover, Meleager's use of βραχὺς references the "Premature Dawn" motif of 5.172 and line 3 of 5.173.

It is not until 12.137.4 that the reader is finally made aware of the reasons for the lover's hatred of the rooster. We learn that he is interrupting a lover's union. The verb παιδοφιλεῖν reveals that the lover is not lying with a female, as in 5.172, but with a boy.²⁶ Another surprising twist is the lover's anonymity. Unlike 5.172 and 5.173, the name of the beloved is noticeably absent. Thus, the introduction of an unnamed *eromenos* represents a significant variation, and the enjambment of 12.137.3 postpones the full effect of this clever reversal by leading the reader to believe that the lover will once again complain about how little time remains for him and his mistress.

²⁶ GOW-PAGE approve this textual emendation (GOW-PAGE 1965: 670). Other editors have preserved φιλεῖν instead of παιδοφιλεῖν.

The addition of a male lover also raises an interesting point regarding the cock. The cock was a common love gift given to an *eromenos* by the *erastes*.²⁷ It is ironic then that the very thing which was often used to initiate love affairs is now disrupting one already in progress. As the line continues, the rooster is berated for rejoicing at the lover's pains. This recalls the final line of 5.173 wherein the lover characterizes the rays' of Dawn's morning light as ἐπιχαίρεκακον. The image of a gloating rooster, however, adds a more humorous touch to the scene.

In the final two lines of the epigram, the lover, forsaking his tirade, now threatens the rooster's life, in an ill-conceived attempt to silence it once and for all. (Of course, carrying out the threat will do little to solve his problems; Dawn will inevitably arrive regardless.) First, the lover reproaches the rooster for treating its owner so callously. This is a humorous revelation. If the lover purchased the rooster then presumably he was aware that it would crow at daybreak. So it is in fact his own fault for purchasing the bird in the first place.

Next, the lover swears by the dim light of Dawn (ναὶ τὸν βαθὺν ὄρθρον). The modifier βαθὺν may, at first glance, be confusing. The reference to "dim Dawn," however, is particularly apt since the cock crows just prior to the dawning of the day, while it is yet relatively dark out. Thus, the lover swears by τὸν **βαθὺν** ὄρθρον because this is the hour at which the rooster's crowing has disturbed his sleep. GOW-PAGE suggest that he swears by τὸν ὄρθρον because it is the time at which he intends to kill the

²⁷ For more on this practice and its historical significance, see BARRINGER 2001: 70–72; CLARK 2008: 23.

rooster.²⁸ I would put forward a more detailed explanation. Roosters were well-known in the ancient world for their lecherous behaviour, and the early light of dawn is the time at which the rooster's mating would begin, but it also signifies the end of the lover's sexual enjoyment, thereby making it a fitting hour for the rooster's death, a *quid pro quo*.²⁹

12.137.6 is almost exclusively composed of words modifying τὰ μέλη, drawing attention to the damage caused by the rooster's crowing. Moreover, ἔσχατα and ταῦτα τὰ πικρὰ encompass the main verb of the line, emphasizing the fact that the rooster's bitter song will ultimately lead to its undoing. Τὰ πικρὰ recalls Meleager's use of πικρότατον at 5.172.4. This establishes a clever link with 5.172 but also introduces another variation on the theme. By placing τὰ πικρὰ in the final line of the epigram, Meleager implicitly draws a contrast between its placement at 5.172.4 and 12.137.6. 12.137, unlike 5.172, ends on a darkly comic note and ταῦτα τὰ πικρὰ strongly drives this home for the reader. Moreover, in 5.172 πικρότατον referenced the lover's emotional state whereas at 12.137.6 τὰ πικρὰ modifies the rooster's troublesome song. Ironically, the rooster's song is not inherently bitter. The rooster is simply a slave to animal instinct; it is the lover who finds the song so distasteful.

Overall, 12.137 is by far the most experimental of Meleager's dawn epigrams. Phraseology similar to 5.172 and 5.173 is employed, but the context is entirely reimagined and many of the more commonplace elements of this motif are eschewed. The tone of the epigram is by far the most forceful of the three. In contrast to 5.172 and

²⁸ GOW-PAGE 1965: 670, vol. II.

²⁹ Arist. *G.A.* 749b; *H.A.* 448b4.

5.173, the poet-lover chooses to berate the rooster, which is both more practical and more extreme.

In 5.172 and 5.173, I remarked that the comic elements of the epigrams were centred in the idiocy of the lover's appeal to Dawn. As was apparent, Dawn lacked the power to grant the lover's wishes. In the case of 12.137, the lover chooses to address something he has greater control over, namely the rooster's bothersome crowing. (Although the rooster, like Dawn, is unable to comprehend or heed the lover's request.) He can indeed easily put a stop to this by terminating its life. This will, however, prove equally ineffective when it comes to delaying Dawn's arrival. The lover fights another losing battle, but one which superficially appears easily attainable.

If all three epigrams were composed in the order proposed above, one can observe a distinct narrative progression. At 5.172, the lighthearted flippancy of tone highlights the lover's comically misguided hope that, if he can convince Dawn to stay its course, he will be granted more time in bed with his mistress. At 5.173, the lover once again addresses Dawn, but his enthusiasm for Dawn's support has diminished. It becomes clear that Dawn did not (and could not) grant the request of 5.172, and that the lover has now lost Demo to a rival. The humour in 5.173 lies in the poet-lover's wry reimagining of the standard elements of the "Premature Dawn" motif. In 12.137, on the other hand, it appears the lover has now realized the futility of addressing Dawn directly. This, however, contributes to the dark comedy of the situation. The lover, fed up with Dawn's inability to remedy his erotic dilemmas, lashes out illogically at the crowing rooster. As mentioned above, the lover has greater control over the rooster, but ultimately he is still

powerless to stay Dawn's course. The three epigrams effortlessly depict the lover's emotional evolution, from misguided optimism in 5.172, to bitter resignation in 5.173, and, finally, irrational indignation in 12.137.

APPENDIX A

EXTANT (NON-MELEAGRIAN) DAWN EPIGRAMS (*A.P.* 5.3; *A.P.* 12.136)

I have included the following two epigrams because they constitute the only other dawn poems preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina*. (Since the following two chapters are dedicated to a more lengthy critical analysis of Ovid's *Amores* 1.13, I could only include the dawn epigrams we can be certain Ovid used as a template in Chapter I.) Antipater of Thessalonica's *floruit* overlaps with Ovid's dates, which makes it impossible to tell whether *Amores* 1.13 influenced Antipater (*A.P.* 5.3) or vice versa.³⁰ The anonymity of the author of *A.P.* 12.136 also poses obvious problems when it comes to pinpointing who influenced whom. Nevertheless, where I believe there to be potential links between *Amores* 1.13 and *A.P.* 5.3 or *A.P.* 12.136, I will point them out in Chapter II, section 2.1–2.

Antipater of Thessalonica (*A.P.* 5.3)

Antipater of Thessalonica, about whom little is reliably known, lived sometime in the late first century BCE during the principate of Augustus.³¹ He also composed a Dawn epigram in the Meleagrian tradition. Like the two lengthier Meleagrian epigrams, Antipater's work is six lines in length and opens with Ὅρθρος in emphatic position. In marked opposition to its Meleagrian counterparts, however, Ὅρθρος is in the nominative not the vocative. In fact, the poet-lover of *A.P.* 5.3 nowhere directly addresses Dawn.

³⁰ For more on the potential links between Antipater and Ovid, see WILLIAMS 1978: 128f.

³¹ MCKEOWN hypothesizes that *A.P.* 5.3 was composed sometime between 10 BCE and 10 CE (MCKEOWN 1989: 338).

Instead, the lover addresses his mistress, the cock at 5.3.3f., and, in the penultimate line of the epigram, Dawn's consort Tithonus.

Like the Meleagrian epigrams, 5.3 can be broken down into thematic couplets. 5.3.1–2 outline the situation at hand: The early-morning cockcrow summons jealous Dawn; 5.3.3–4 recalls the last two lines of *A.P.* 12.137, wherein the lover imprecates the crowing cock. In the final couplet, 5.3.5–6, Antipater introduces Eos' aging lover Tithonus, an ingenious variation.

Returning to 5.3.1–2, one can observe several reused Meleagrian elements. The lover's girlfriend, whom the poet explicitly names (*Χρῦσιλλα*), recalls Meleager's reference to Demo at 5.172.2 and 5.173.2. In contrast to Meleager, Antipater gives his girlfriend prominence in the opening line of the poem. Indeed, as noted above, Antipater's epigram begins as a direct address to his mistress as opposed to a direct address to Dawn.

Antipater also reintroduces the rooster motif of *A.P.* 12.137. In these lines the cock is once again crowing at the break of day. Unlike 12.137, however, the rooster is not simply the herald of Dawn's arrival, but the one summoning it. The rooster is also described as ἠῶος which contrasts with Meleager's description at 12.137.2 in which the rooster is referred to as ἐννύχιος.

In the following two lines, the lover revisits a theme from *A.P.* 12.137. He curses the rooster calling it "the most jealous of birds," but unlike 12.137, Antipater forgoes threatening its life. Instead, the lover elaborates on the reason for his hatred of the bird,

namely it drives him out of doors and forces him to interact with other men. This is something implied in the Meleagrian dawn epigrams but never fully fleshed out as it is here. The lover bemoans leaving his beloved behind but never talks about leaving the bedroom at all. Thus, Antipater is filling in a gap in the narrative progression.

The final lines present an entirely unique scenario. Antipater references Eos' affair with the mortal Tithonus whom Zeus blessed with eternal life (but not eternal youth).³² The lover now directly addresses Eos' consort (Τιθωνέ) and jokingly accuses him of growing old as this would account for Dawn's untimely arrival. Moreover, the opening line's puzzling reference to envious Dawn (φθονερήν Ἠριγένειαν) becomes clear. Eos rises early to disrupt lovers' unions because she herself is being denied sex. Unlike Meleager's mythological reference at 5.172.5–6, which provides precedent for the protraction of the night in an erotic context, the reference at 5.3.5–6 accounts for Eos' sexual frustration, her envy of young lovers, and, as a result, her eagerness to rise early.

Anonymous (A.P. 12.136)

Due to the anonymity of A.P. 12.136's author, it is extremely difficult to ascertain whether this poet was influenced by the Meleagrian dawn epigram or vice versa. Thematically, 12.136 does, in some ways, resemble A.P. 12.137. Once again the poet-lover's beloved is a young boy and the lover's sleep is being disrupted by the chirping of nightingales. It is hard not to find at least a situational parallel with the Meleagrian dawn epigram. GOW-PAGE suggest that this epigram is set in evening just as the poet is

³² See *H.H.* 5.218–38.

readying himself for sleep (perhaps because he is already sexually sated and requires respite).³³ There is, however, no evidence that this is the case. Nightingales sing both at night and during the day, which leaves the setting of the poem ambiguous.³⁴

12.136, unlike the four other dawn epigrams discussed above, cannot be broken down into distinct couplets. Three quarters of the opening line of the epigram constitutes the direct address to the nightingales. In the following line and a half, the lover details his present situation and predicament, and in what remains, the lover requests that the nightingales cease their bothersome chattering.³⁵

The poet does not cite Dawn as the reason for the birds' morning clamouring but rather places all of the blame on the birds themselves by opening the epigram with ὄρνιθες in emphatic position. The marked lexical similarities of ὄρνιθες and Ὁρθρος may be the author's conscious attempt to engage with the Meleagrian dawn epigram.

In the following line and a half, the lover remarks that he and his *eromenos* are lying in bed together as he is being warmed by the boy's skin. This image is most certainly reminiscent of *A.P.* 5.172.2 and 5.173.2–3. In fact, the author of 12.136 employs the same verb, *χλαιίνω*, which Meleager himself uses at 5.172.2. It is also a passive participial form and situated at the very end of the line.

³³ GOW-PAGE compare this epigram to *A.P.* 5.165 which clearly takes place at dusk (GOW-PAGE 1965: 565). GUTZWILLER, on the other hand, seems to think that 12.137 takes place at dawn and that both *A.P.* 12.136 and 12.137 may once have stood beside *A.P.* 5.172 and 5.173 (GUTZWILLER 1998: 295).

³⁴ The poet never explicitly mentions Dawn, which adds to the situational uncertainty. Aristotle writes that in springtime, the nightingale sings for fifteen days and fifteen nights (Arist. *H.A.* 632b21). Of course, the nightingale is also a well-known poetic trope.

³⁵ As is no doubt evident by now, *A.P.* 12.13.6 is only four lines in length.

The final line and a half of the epigram contains elements which are not found in any of the other extant dawn epigrams. The lover, fed up with the bothersome nightingales, requests that they return to sleep and leave both him and his *eromenos* in peace. The lover's request is similar to the request of the Meleagrian lover at 5.172.3–4 who begs Dawn to withdraw and give way once more to Evening. In expression, however, these lines are unique. He refers to the nightingales as chattering women. The reference to women and nightingales brings to mind the metamorphosis of Philomela. This deeply embedded mythological allusion parallels the mythological references of 12.136 and 5.172, but unlike those examples, this allusion is descriptive as opposed to explanatory.

Despite the literary interest this epigram holds for the reader, it is impossible to elaborate further on its chronological place within the development of the Hellenistic dawn epigram. As is no doubt evident, there are indeed thematic correspondences between 12.136 and the Meleagrian dawn epigram, but this tells us nothing except that there appears to be a mutual interest in experimenting with similar themes.

CHAPTER II

MELEAGRIAN ECHOES IN OVID, *AMORES* 1.13

2.1 Establishing an Intertextual Link

For over a century, every influential scholarly publication that has either explicitly or tangentially examined *Amores* 1.13 has remarked upon its indebtedness to Meleager's treatment of the "Premature Dawn" motif.¹ Thus far, no one has set about establishing clear, unequivocal intertextual links. The aim of section 2.1 is to remedy this. Those who have noted resemblances between *Amores* 1.13 and *A.P.* 5.172, 5.173 and 12.137 are not mistaken, and it has been well documented that Catullus and the Neoterics as well as the more experimental of the Augustan love poets were fond of incorporating many of the literary leitmotifs of Hellenistic epigram into their own compositions.² It is insufficient, however, simply to state that such links exist; one ought also to examine them in greater detail in order to prove their veracity.

Amores 1.13 contains all but one of the standard elements of the Meleagrian dawn epigram:

- (1) It takes place as dawn arrives (1.13.1f.).
- (2) It is generally lighthearted in tone and erotic in nature.
- (3) The poem features a direct address to dawn at 1.13.3.

¹ In order of publication (from earliest to most recent), see NÉMETHY 1907: 145; DAY 1929: 136–37; FRÄNKEL 1945: 11ff.; ELLIOT 1973–74: 130–31; MCKEOWN 1989: 337–38.

² For more on this trend in Catullus and Latin love elegy more generally, see DAY 1929: 102ff.; BOOTH 2011: 51ff.; GUTZWILLER 2012: 79ff; PIAZZI 2013: 226–27. For detailed discussion of allusion in the works of Ovid, see HINDS 1998: 3ff.

(4) The poet-lover is found in bed lying in the arms of his beloved (1.13.5f.).

(5) Dawn is criticized at some length for her disruption of the sleeping lovers.

Aside from these general links, there are individual thematic parallels. The first is apparent at 1f. The adverb *iam*, located emphatically at the very start of the poem, draws the reader's attention to the swiftness of Aurora's arrival. The hastiness of Dawn's arrival is often noted by Meleager.³ At 3, Ovid directly addresses the goddess Aurora by name. Much like *A.P.* 5.172.1 and 5.173.1, where Meleager introduces Dawn by name, the line is highly dactylic.

The poet-lover then protests Aurora's hasty arrival, as we see also at *A.P.* 5.172.1 and 5.173.3, and begs her to stay her course, employing a forceful imperative. Following this, the lover details his current situation. He is being embraced by the tender arms of his beloved. This, of course, recalls *A.P.* 5.172.2 where the lover is being warmed by Demo's skin. There are also similarities to *A.P.* 5.173.2 where the lover's rival is now the one being kept warm beneath Demo's mantle.

At 8, Ovid makes reference to the early-morning songs of birds.⁴ Although no direct mention is made of the cockcrow, this may be a reference to *A.P.* 12.137. In particular, Ovid's use of *cantare* recalls the *πικρὰ μέλη* of *A.P.* 12.137.5. At 9, the lover repeats his earlier question (*quo properas...?*), but develops it further, accusing Aurora of being unwelcome to men and girls alike (*ingrata viris, ingrata puellis*).⁵ The

³ Cf. *A.P.* 5.172.1; 5.173.3.

⁴ There seems to be a stronger potential link here between *A.P.* 5.3.3–4 and *A.P.* 12.136.1ff.

⁵ I quote from MCKEOWN's text (MCKEOWN 1987: 157–58). At 31, the lover, for the third and final time, repeats the refrain "*quo properas...?*" This time, instead of addressing the goddess by name or

characterization of Dawn as disagreeable is found throughout the Meleagrian dawn epigram.⁶ More specifically, Ovid's use of *ingrata* may be a reference to the general tone of the Meleagrian dawn epigram. The Meleagrian lover consistently berates Dawn (or the cock) for its unwelcome disruption of a romantic liaison.

At 25, Ovid makes the claim that he can endure everything except being wrenched from the embraces of his *puella*. Indeed, he affirms that only the man who has no mistress can stand the thought of rising at daybreak. This is the very sentiment expounded by the poet-lover in *A.P.* 5.172 and *A.P.* 12.137. He is desperate to remain in bed with his beloved and will go to any lengths to secure a longer length of night.⁷

At 27f., the lover reveals how often he has hoped that Night would refuse to yield the sky to Aurora. Here there is an explicit parallel with *A.P.* 5.172.3. At *A.P.* 5.172.3, the lover begs Dawn to withdraw and surrender the heavens once more to Ἑσπερος. Thus, just as the lover of *A.P.* 5.172 was desperate for Dawn to protract the length of the night so that he could spend more time with Demo, the lover of *Amores* 1.13 longs for the very the same outcome.

referring to her as *ingrata*, the lover calls her *invida*. The multivalent connotations of *invida* add depth to the lover's sentiment. Not only does he accuse Aurora of bearing ill-will towards him (and all lovers), but he characterizes her as hostile, malevolent, and even jealous, a theme he elaborates on in greater detail nearer the end of the poem.⁵ There is a potential link here with *A.P.* 5.3. In *A.P.* 5.3, Dawn and the crowing rooster are routinely referred to as envious (φθονερή/φθονερώτατος) of the lover's situation. Again this is admittedly a hypothetical connection and should be considered tenuous at best, but the characterization of Dawn and its heralds as invidious pervades the entirety of *A.P.* 5.3 just as it pervades the third and final section of *Amores* 1.13.

⁶ Cf. *A.P.* 5.172.3ff., 5.173.3–4; *A.P.* 12.137.1ff.

⁷ The theme of *A.P.* 5.173 also bears some resemblance to these lines. The lover, now dejected and alone, laments the tardiness of Dawn's arrival. Unlike previously when he lay with his beloved Demo, loneliness and longing now drive the jilted lover to long for daybreak.

At 44f., Ovid employs the very same mythological reference found at *A.P.*

5.172.5f. This is the poem's second allusion to Jupiter's affair with Alcmena, but by far the most detailed.⁸ Like Meleager, Ovid mentions that Jupiter, tired of Aurora's interference in his love life, joined two days into one.

The presence of the overall format of the Meleagrian dawn epigram together with various probable and possible reminiscences suggests that Ovid is drawing heavily from the Meleagrian model.⁹ There are, of course, many ways in which Ovid adapts this model to suit his own poetic needs, and it is to this issue which I now turn my attention.

2.2 Ovid's Exploitation of the Meleagrian Model

In section 2.1, I established the intertextual link between the Meleagrian dawn epigram and *Amores* 1.13, but Ovid is not simply content to reference his literary predecessor. Instead, in true Ovidian fashion, he chooses to build on this model. The aim

⁸ The other can be found at 27–28 and is most likely a reference not to Meleager but to Plaut. *Amph.* 546 (BARSBY 1973: 145, n.18; MCKEOWN 1989: 353).

⁹ There are also several parallels with the dawn epigram of Antipater (*A.P.* 5.3), which are worth noting in brief. Of course we cannot be certain who influenced whom, but the links are nevertheless intriguing. At 11ff., Ovid makes note of all the men and women, from different walks of life, harmed by Aurora's arrival. There may be some similarity between these lines and *A.P.* 5.3. At *A.P.* 5.3.4, the poet-lover shrinks from entering back into the world and engaging in discourse with other men. This is the only dawn epigram where the poet suggests that other unpleasantness, aside from being separated from one's beloved, awaits the lover after Dawn has dragged him from his bed. Not only does the poet *qua* lover suffer, but the poet's identity as man who must daily engage in business also suffers since the rising of Dawn signifies the start of yet another work day. At 35ff., Ovid delves into Aurora's mythological background. The reference to her husband Tithonus at 35 is strikingly similar in sentiment to *A.P.* 5.3.5. Again, without affirming a direct connection between these two texts, it does seem as though Ovid is drawing on the work of Antipater or vice versa. At 37f., the similarities become even more pronounced. In these lines, it is implied that Aurora's early-rising is the result of her desire to escape the aging Tithonus. This same explanation for Eos' hasty arrival can be found in *A.P.* 5.3. At 39f., Ovid suggests that if Aurora were to be embraced by someone like Cephalus then she herself, now the object of true affection, would see the world from the perspective of a lover and demand that the horses of Night slow their course. Although not explicitly paralleled in *A.P.* 5.3, this line of reasoning is implied when the lover suggests that the reason for Dawn's early arrival is the lack of Tithonus' sexual vigour.

of the following section is to examine Ovid's exploitation of the Meleagrian dawn epigram in greater detail, discussing the elements Ovid chooses to play up, to downplay, or to exclude entirely.

i) Emphasized & Deemphasized Meleagrian Elements

Amores 1.13 is a total of forty-eight lines in length. This allows Ovid more space to experiment with sound, style, and structure. There is also more of an emphasis on *doctrina* (Ovid expands on the mythological elements found in Meleager and employs many literary allusions) and a more extensive use of wit and humour. These Ovidian developments are all intended to outdo the Meleagrian model.

At 1f., Ovid adds greater solemnity to Aurora's arrival. This is an epic introduction, and one which certainly tops *A.P.* 5.172.1 and 5.173.1.¹⁰ At *A.P.* 5.173.1, the language is more elaborate and elevated, but does not reference the lofty Homeric descriptions of Eos.¹¹ Nevertheless, Ovid subtly maintains the erotic tone of the Meleagrian dawn epigram by referring to Tithonus as Aurora's husband (*a seniore marito*).¹² This is another variation on the Meleagrian model. Rather than explicitly betraying the erotic nature of the setting, as the poet-lover of *A.P.* 5.172.1 does by immediately announcing to the reader that Dawn is an "enemy of lovers," Ovid cleverly implies it by drawing attention to Aurora's marital status. Moreover, *Amores* 1.13 is

¹⁰ Cf. Ovid's description of Aurora's arrival with Hom. *Il.* 11.1f.; 19.1f.; *Od.* 5.1f. MCKEOWN notes these parallels, among others (MCKEOWN 1989: 339).

¹¹ For more detail on the loftiness of expression at *A.P.* 5.173.1, see GOW-PAGE 1965: 623.

¹² MCKEOWN 1989: 339.

addressed to Aurora, a goddess, whereas the Meleagrian dawn epigram is addressed to dawn (or a cock). This adds greater irreverence and wit to Ovid's version.

The Homeric tone of the opening couplet is dispelled by the lover's flippant address to Aurora at 3, and in what follows Ovid reveals the true subject-matter of the poem. He is, in fact, lying in bed, enjoying the embraces of his mistress. These lines certainly mimic *A.P.* 5.172.2 and 5.173.3, as discussed above, but Ovid manages to outdo Meleager by contrasting the Homeric depiction of Aurora at 1f. with the prosaic description of a mortal love affair at 5ff.

The bedroom scene at 5ff. consists of three lines, which is three times the amount of space Meleager devotes to this same theme, except in *A.P.* 5.173 which essentially includes two bedroom scenes.¹³ By devoting more lines to this, Ovid is able to provide his readers with greater detail. Not only does he tell us that he is lying in his mistress' arms, but he also describes the closeness of her body and the crisp early-morning air.

At 8, the scene shifts from the bedroom to the birds chirping outside the lover's window. This is reminiscent of *A.P.* 12.137, as discussed above, but Ovid does not elaborate any further on this theme. Indeed, it seems almost as if the lover is enjoying the morning songs of the birds. The rhythm of the line, which is highly spondaic, enhances the soft, lethargic quality of the scene. The sense of *liquidum*, here used adverbially, must be "clearly" or "melodiously," a very pleasant description in contrast to the final line of

¹³ See *A.P.* 5.173.2 (Demo is lying in bed with another man) and 5.173.3 (the lover reminisces about his time spent in bed with Demo).

12.137: “ἔσχατα γηρύσει ταῦτα τὰ πικρὰ μέλι.”¹⁴ Thus, instead of blaming the singing birds for Dawn’s arrival, Ovid chooses to put a new spin on the Meleagrian motif. For the lover of *Amores* 1.13, songbirds enhance an early morning spent lying in bed with one’s beloved.

Next, Ovid addresses Aurora directly for a second time. He calls her *ingrata*, “unwelcome” or “unloved.” As discussed above, this sentiment pervades all three Meleagrian dawn epigrams. There may be a parallel between Ovid’s use of *ingrata* and Meleager’s use of *δυσέραστε*. Both words are unusual in context. This is the first time *ingrata* is applied to persons, and *δυσέραστε* is more commonly used to mean “unhappy in love.”¹⁵ Ovid’s “epithet,” in contrast to Meleager’s, is more roundabout. He tells us that Aurora is not simply unwelcome, but, in particular, she is unwelcome to both *viri* and *puellae* (i.e. she is *δυσέραστε* or “hostile to lovers”). The periphrasis of this expression adds to the mock-epic solemnity of the line.¹⁶

In the following line, Ovid commands Aurora to pull back on the reins of her chariot. The use of the imperative is an Ovidian innovation. Meleager eschews the imperative mood, even in *A.P.* 12.137, the most forceful of his dawn epigrams. The closest Meleager comes to issuing direct commands is at *A.P.* 5.127.3. Here, he uses the optative instead to express the lover’s wish that Dawn might become Evening. Thus,

¹⁴ See *OLD* s.v. 6. For the use of *liquidus* to describe sounds, see NISBET-HUBBARD 1970: 283, vol. I.

¹⁵ For Ovid’s odd use of *ingrata*, see *TLL* 7.1.1560.45ff.; MCKEOWN 1989: 344. For the more common meaning of *δυσέραστε*, see Chapter I, section 1.3.

¹⁶ I will say more about mock-epic solemnity in Chapter III and in my discussion of the κλητικὸς ὕμνος below.

Ovid outdoes Meleager by commanding Aurora not once, but twice at 3 and again at 10, to stay her course. The imperatives also add a sense of emphatic immediacy.

11ff. are an entirely Ovidian addition. As noted above, there are no parallels to this in the Meleagrian dawn epigram. (I will comment in greater detail on this section below and in Chapter III.) Suffice it to say that Ovid takes the basic Meleagrian concept (i.e. Dawn as disadvantageous to lovers) and expands on it by including several other ways in which Aurora's arrival disrupts the repose of both men and women.

At 25f., Ovid confesses that he would endure all these things, namely the sufferings imposed upon others by Aurora's arrival, as long as he can be with his girlfriend. Being separated from one's mistress at daybreak is, according to Ovid, the greatest misfortune of all. The preceding list of hardships brought about by Aurora adds cumulative impact to this statement. This is not something the Meleagrian lover ever addresses, although no doubt he would agree with the sentiment. In this way, the lover of *Amores* 1.13 expands upon the Meleagrian model.

The next two lines, in which Ovid relates how often he has hoped that Night might not yield the sky to Aurora, are reminiscent of *A.P.* 5.172.3. The verb *optare* serves a twofold purpose. It has several latent senses. On a basic level, it obviously means "to wish."¹⁷ This sense of the verb is particularly well suited since the Meleagrian line it is referencing employs the optative mood. On a secondary level, the verb can mean "to pray for something" when used in conjunction with an infinitive or, as is the case here,

¹⁷ See *OLD* s.v. 1a.

with a subjunctive.¹⁸ This liturgical usage of *optare* fits particularly well within the hymnic context of the poem, something which I will discuss in section 2.2.iii. The fact that Ovid also couches his desire in terms of a prayer frequently invoked adds greater legitimacy to his request. Meleager, by contrast, hopes against hope that Dawn will become Evening once again, but Ovid has supplicated the requisite deities, and he does so regularly.

Ovid has also added a line addressing the stars, something altogether absent from *A.P.* 5.172. There may be a couple of reasons for its inclusion here. First, it affords an easy opportunity to outdo Meleager by adding greater detail. Second, it brings another celestial personification into the picture. If both Night and the Stars would stand up to Aurora, the lover might finally achieve some peace.

Additionally, Ovid's request is more emphatic than Meleager's. In Ovid's prayer, Night would be the one who refuses to yield to Aurora, the one who takes a stand against her. At *A.P.* 5.172.3, the lover wishes only that it might become Evening again. He imbues the personification of Ἑσπερος with very little divine agency. Instead, he hopes that Dawn will make the first move by deciding, of its own volition, to reverse course.

At 29f., Ovid includes a second prayer. Although there is no Meleagrian precedent for the sentiments expressed in these lines, it certainly upstages Meleager's inadequate attempt to persuade Dawn to retreat at 5.172.3ff. There are, of course, other reasons for its inclusion, to be discussed in the following chapter.

¹⁸ See *OLD* s.v. 1b–c.

The final and most aggressive section of the poem begins at 31f. For the third time the lover addresses Aurora, this time referring to her as *invida*. Hostilities build in the following line and a half. For the first time, Ovid besmirches Aurora's character, comparing her heart to the blackness of her son Memnon's skin. Instead of attributing her son's skin colour to his ethnicity, the implication is that Memnon was born black-skinned on account of Aurora's envious disposition.¹⁹

Meleager likewise bad-mouths Dawn, but especially the rooster in *A.P.* 12.137. At 12.137.5, in particular, the lover reproaches the cock for mistreating its owner, the one who raised it from infancy. Undoubtedly, he hopes this guilt-trip will cow the rooster into submission. Etymologically the noun *θρεπτήρ*, which the lover uses in reference to the rearing of the rooster, has its roots in the verb *τρέφω*.²⁰ *Τρέφω* means both "to raise [children]" and "to rear [animals]."²¹ Thus, the lover of 12.137 considers himself a quasi-father-figure to the rooster. In *Amores* 1.13, Ovid reverses this situation. Instead, Aurora is the mother-figure and she is the abuser as opposed to abused. The relationship of mother to son is also far more meaningful than the relationship between man and beast, which may be a conscious attempt to overshadow Meleager.

Now Ovid properly introduces Aurora's consort Tithonus, who was alluded to in the poem's opening couplet. Tithonus' presence is certainly not a Meleagrian invention, or at least not that we can tell based on the extant Meleagrian corpus. At 39f., Ovid

¹⁹ See BARSBY 1973: 145.

²⁰ See LSJ s.v. I.

²¹ See LSJ s.v. II.1–2.

presents a potential solution to Aurora's problem: Take a younger, more virile lover. He has already hinted at previous extra-marital exploits and implied that she is sexually insatiable. It would make perfect sense for her to take a lover, and it would certainly solve Ovid's dilemma. This addition is entirely Ovidian.

One final Meleagrian element remains: the reference to Jupiter's liaison with Alcmena at 45f. The lover of 5.172 hoped that by providing Dawn with a mythological precedent for the prolongation of the night in an erotic context, he would convince Dawn to stay its course: “ἤδη γὰρ καὶ πρόσθεν ἐπ' Ἀλκμήνην Διὸς ἦλθες | ἀντίος· οὐκ ἀδαῆς ἔσσι παλινδρομίης.” Ovid's reference to Jupiter and Alcmena, however, when read in the context of what precedes it (i.e. Luna is as beautiful as Aurora and *she* managed to take a lover), is not meant to convince Aurora to retreat. Instead, it appears as though Ovid is suggesting, once again, that she take a lover. Although this time the implication is that he be mortal rather than divine.

The final lines of the poem are also of interest. Ovid reveals that, although Aurora heard his words and blushed, she nevertheless arrived on schedule as was her custom. Although Meleager never definitively states that Dawn ignored his request in *A.P.* 5.172, it is certainly implied in 5.173. Ovid, on the other hand, fills in a narratological gap in the Meleagrian model by explicitly informing the reader of his failure. He does appear to have had some effect on Aurora, however, since it seems that she did hear him. This also is a new addition to the Meleagrian model.

Ultimately, *Amores* 1.1.3 can be divided into three sections. In each section, Ovid raises the emotional pitch slightly. The first section, located at 2–8, is relatively calm.

Ovid is perturbed by Aurora's early arrival but is more interested in enjoying his last moments in bed with his mistress. In the second section, from 9–31, Ovid intensifies the tone by listing off all those inconvenienced by Aurora's arrival and stating that these annoyances are nothing in comparison to the lover's predicament. This section closes with Ovid's two prayers both of which involve Aurora delaying her arrival (or being delayed by force). The final section, from 32–44, is the most of aggressive of the three sections. Ovid now openly attacks Aurora's character and accuses her of marital infidelity.

In the course of one poem, Ovid has managed to capture the same thematic progression of the Meleagrian dawn epigram. As the lover becomes increasingly fed up with Aurora's interruption of his sleep, the intensity of the poem increases. Moreover, the anaphora of *quotiens* at 27 and 29 implies that Ovid laments Aurora's arrival on a regular basis. Yet his earlier complaints must have been disregarded. The Meleagrian lover is also frequently rebuffed, but unlike Ovid, who simply alludes to prior failed attempts, Meleager actually presents the reader with three individual, mounting instances of rejection.

Finally, Ovid's mistress is never named. This is similar to the unnamed *eromenos* of *A.P.* 12.137. Most likely she remains anonymous because she plays a subsidiary role.²² *Amores* 1.13 is meant to showcase Ovid's wit and poetic mastery of the subject matter.

²² The reader may be meant to imagine that Ovid's lover here is Corinna, as she is named throughout the *Amores*, but there is no proof of this making it impossible to be certain.

Moreover, there is another female who is meant to dominate the poem: Aurora. Thus, if Ovid's mistress were to play too prominent a role, the poem's impact would be reduced.

ii) Omitted Meleagrian Elements

Unlike Meleager, Ovid does not suggest that his mistress has ever engaged in an adulterous liaison, indeed we learn much less about Ovid's mistress than we do Meleager's. Instead, it is Aurora who engages in illicit affairs and whose sexual promiscuity has inadvertently resulted in the poet-lover's present dilemma. In effect, this is not so much the total omission of a Meleagrian element, but rather a cleverly disguised Ovidian adaptation.

Aurora never gloats over or laughs at the lover's misery. In fact, we are given little insight into Aurora's present state of mind. It is only in the final couplet that Aurora reacts and instead of mocking the lover, she blushes. This is strikingly dissimilar to the Meleagrian depiction of Ὀρθρος.

Ovid neither curses nor threatens Aurora. He comes close at times, especially in the final section of the poem, but the lover of *Amores* 1.13 is slightly more self-possessed than his Meleagrian counterpart. He criticizes Aurora freely, but offsets his censure by offering Aurora cogent advice which would be mutually beneficial to both parties.

iii) *Ovidian Additions* (κλητικὸς ὕμνος/suasoria)

Ovid parodies the κλητικὸς ὕμνος for comedic effect.²³ The opening lines constitute a reversal of standard kletic technique. Instead of asking a deity to arrive swiftly, which would be standard in a kletic hymn, Ovid asks Aurora to delay her coming. And rather than praising the deity's beneficence, the lover scorns Aurora for her untimely arrival. Two of the three sections of the poem feature more specific kletic inversions. At 9, Ovid refers to Aurora as *ingrata*, and at 31 she is *invida*. In a standard kletic hymn, the supplicant, instead of insulting the deity, would typically revere him/her. Ovid, however, is flippant and irreverent toward Aurora.

The lengthy list of people whose lives are disrupted by Aurora's arrival, located at 11–24, is another perversion of kletic technique. In a traditional κλητικὸς ὕμνος, the supplicant enumerates all those blessed by the deity's beneficence; he ought not to undermine the deity by accusing him/her of wrongdoing.

Ultimately, this an Ovidian addition to the Meleagrian model. Obviously, the inversion of the kletic hymn is meant to enhance the humour of the situation. Much like the Meleagrian lover, however, the poet-lover of *Amores* 1.13 is not helping his cause by purposely distorting liturgical technique. Aurora, as a goddess, will no doubt be aware of the perversion, and it is unlikely she will be sympathetic.

²³ For more on Ovid's use of the kletic hymn, see CAIRNS 1972: 137, 152f.; MCKEOWN 1989: 339, 344f., 346ff., 353.

Ovid is fond of adapting rhetorical technique to an erotic setting.²⁴ *Amores* 1.13 is no exception. Here Ovid indulges in a *suasoria* in an attempt to convince Aurora not to come. Just like the κλητικὸς ὕμνος, the *suasoria* is not found in the Meleagrian dawn epigram. The *suasoria* truly begins at 11ff. as Ovid trots out a list of persuasive real-life and mythological *exempla* in the hopes that Aurora might be swayed to stay her course.²⁵

Of course, as MCKEOWN points out, the humour of the situation lies in the unavoidable failure of this endeavour.²⁶ Ovid inverts the standard technique of the *suasoria*, which is traditionally employed to persuade an audience to adopt a certain course of action—his cheeky and offensive behaviour will undoubtedly put Aurora off rather than persuade her to follow the course recommended. Thus, there is a parallel here between the situational humour of *Amores* 1.13 and the Meleagrian dawn epigram. The Meleagrian dawn epigram can be considered comic chiefly due to the futility of the lover's ongoing attempts to stay Dawn's course. In the same way, Ovid knowingly indulges in rhetorical "flair" all the while aware that he will ultimately fail.

Essentially *Amores* 1.13 is a flippant poem. Ovid, as usual, is being competitive, actively seeking to outdo his literary predecessor whenever possible. He builds a whole (long) love elegy drawn from the genre of epigram and adds a brand new focus (i.e. the goddess Aurora). He ultimately succeeds in producing something far more learned, polished, and amusing and full of numerous individual innovations.

²⁴ See MCKEOWN 1987: 69.

²⁵ For more on Ovid's use of the *suasoria* in *Amores* 1.13, see ELLIOTT 1973–74: 129ff. I will comment on this technique in greater detail in Chapter III.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*: 339.

CHAPTER III

A LITERARY-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF *AMORES* 1.13

3.1 A Note on the General Arrangement of *Amores* 1.13

Amores 1.13 has been largely overlooked in scholarship. It is, of course, included in all commentaries on book one of the *Amores*, but little has ever been written on the poem's compositional technique and literary qualities, in particular Ovid's use of humour and wit.¹ In this chapter, I aim to remedy this scholarly oversight. In what follows, I undertake a highly detailed literary-critical analysis of 1.13. Special attention will be paid to all comic elements of note.

Amores 1.13 can be broken down into three distinct sections, each beginning with the refrain "*quo properas ...?*" The opening and close of the poem is framed by two couplets. The opening couplet precedes the first refrain and the concluding couplet follows after the section ushered in by the third refrain. The first of the three sections is by far the shortest at only six lines in length (3–8). The middle section is the longest at twenty-two lines in length (9–30). The final section is sixteen lines in length, not counting the poem's closing couplet (31–46).

All three sections are linked by the repetition of *mane* which highlights the reason for Ovid's appeal. Although, only the first appearance of *mane* at 3 is imperative, the two

¹ For commentary on *Amores* 1.13, see BARSBY 1973: 140–47; MCKEOWN 1989: 337–63; RYAN-PERKINS 2011: 122–28. ELLIOTT's article is the only other self-contained examination of *Amores* 1.13 (ELLIOTT 1973–74: 127–32). Other editions and commentaries worth noting include HEINSIUS 1661; BURMAN 1727; RIESE 1871; EDWARDS 1894; MARTINON 1897; NÉMETHY 1907; SHOWERMAN 1914; BORNECQUE 1930; MUNARI 1951.

adverbial forms of *mane*, found at 25 and again at 38, nevertheless allude to the imperative at the start of the poem. This connects each of the sections and is a clever verbal reminder that Ovid wants Aurora to stay her course.

There is an emotional gradation between each of the three sections. As the poem progresses, the lover becomes increasingly insolent and irreverent toward Aurora. There is also a pattern connecting each of the sections. Each section opens with two lines containing the *quo properas* refrain and a hasty attempt to slow Aurora's arrival. Following this couplet, Ovid's reasons for desiring Aurora's immediate withdrawal are set forth in greater detail.

3.2 The Opening Couplet (*Am.* 1.13.1–2)

The opening couplet of *Amores* 1.13 comprises Ovid's mock-epic introduction of the goddess Aurora. These two lines are striking in contrast to the highly erotic and comic nature of Ovid's impertinent address to Aurora which begins at 3ff.

***Am.* 1.13.1–2.** The poem opens with an epic-style introduction of dawn. Ovid borrows his description from the Homeric corpus and Vergil's *Aeneid*.² This opening couplet is naturally meant to distract readers from the true nature of the poem. By employing epic language, one is led to assume that a correspondingly epic plotline will follow. Generally in epic, references to Eos or Aurora are employed solely as poetic markers of a scene change. This idea would be well engrained in the minds of Ovid's contemporaries

² Cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.1f.; 19.1 f.; Verg. *Aen.* 4.129; 4.584.

making the sudden reversal of theme all the more surprising as Ovid instead presents his readers with a flippant *aubade*, erotic in nature and situationally mundane.

There are, however, several hints even in the opening couplet that this poem will not feature epic subject matter. The first can be found at the end of 1. Here the poet alludes to Aurora's husband (*a seniore marito*), which is a clever hint at the erotic nature of the poem.³ Moreover, Ovid develops this theme further at 35ff. when Tithonus' senility is credited as the impetus for Aurora's early-rising. Thus, the reference to Tithonus serves also to foreshadow his re-introduction later on.

At 2, the adjective *flava*, which alludes to Aurora's beauty in addition to the colour of her hair, may also hint at sexual promiscuity. As MCKEOWN notes, its substantive use may be suggestive of Aurora's "loose morality" and "amorous disposition."⁴ If this is the case, then the line break between *a seniore marito* at 1 and *flava* at 2 further emphasizes the sexual divide between husband and wife. The adjective *pruinusus*, which modifies the synecdochic *axe*, may be an incisive criticism of Aurora; it foreshadows the main theme of the poem, namely Aurora's frosty attitude toward the plight of lovers at daybreak (3ff.). The mock-solemnity of the second line is reinforced by the elegant balance of the word order. It is, in fact, almost a golden line.

The principle point of the opening couplet is to comically lead readers astray. In contrast to the Homeric and Vergilian examples alluded to above, Ovid never explicitly

³ See MCKEOWN 1989: 339. MCKEOWN also notes that the *senex maritus* or *senex amator* is a stock character in elegiac poetry (*op. cit.* 1989: 340).

⁴ *Op. cit.*: 341. See also FRÉCAUT 1972: 101.

names Aurora in the introductory couplet. This may be another deliberate hint that the poem does not contain epic subject matter. Moreover, the deference Ovid pays to the goddess is in fact insincere, and what at first glance appears to be an epic introduction turns out to be mock-epic in the context of the poet's subsequent address at 3ff. By setting up Aurora's arrival in this grand manner, Ovid thereby heightens the witty irreverence of his impertinent address. This couplet also adds to the overall shock value of the poem by encouraging the reader to compare Aurora's usual status in epic, alluded to/parodied in these lines, with Ovid's salacious portrayal of her at 35ff.

3.3 The First Section (*Am.* 1.13.3–8)

This section is comprised of three couplets and begins with Ovid's opening address to the goddess Aurora (3–4). In the second and third couplets, Ovid informs Aurora of the reason for his contempt of her arrival, namely the disruption of his love affair (5–8). Of all three sections, this is by far the least aggressive in tone. Ovid is certainly desperate to delay Aurora's arrival, but he is still intent on prolonging the perfection of the moment.

***Am.* 1.13.3–4.** The second couplet of the poem marks the beginning of Ovid's flippant address to Aurora. The epic elements of the poem's introductory couplet abruptly disappear. The tonal contrast between the first and second couplets is pronounced, and Ovid's clever reversal of theme reinforces the comedy of the following lines. In this couplet, Ovid blatantly disregards Aurora's divine status by brashly ordering her to halt her arrival.

At 3, the epic introduction is dispelled by the lively, dactylic question “*quo properas, Aurora?*” The metre of the line is highly unusual as it contains a strong stop after the caesura in the third foot and a second stop after the imperative *mane*.⁵ The oddity of the metre together with the strong stop following the imperative may suggest that the lover hopes to bring Aurora to a halt before she can advance any farther. The imperative mood serves to underscore the central theme of the poem and the urgency of the lover’s request.

This couplet performs a twofold function. It is both a *captatio benevolentiae*, aimed at placating the goddess, and the *exordium* of the poem’s *suasoria*. Ovid is simultaneously attempting to win Aurora over and subtly manipulating her by means of rhetoric. The purpose of an *exordium* is, according to Quintilian, to prepare the audience to accept what the speaker is about to say.⁶ This is achieved by keeping the audience well-disposed and attentive. The poet accomplishes this here by appealing to Aurora’s maternal instincts. Ovid’s conditional prayer that the annual sacrifice of birds in Memnon’s honour might continue uninhibited is meant to hold Aurora’s attention while he lists his personal requests in the following lines. As noted above, however, Ovid’s rhetorical technique is purposely and humorously flawed and will not result in the desired effect (i.e. Aurora’s delayed arrival).

The word order at 4 draws the reader’s attention to the line’s importance. As the *exordium* of the *suasoria*, this is the lover’s only chance to capture Aurora’s attention

⁵ For more on strong stops in the *Amores*, see MCKEOWN 1987: 121.

⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 4.5.

favourably before making his case. The two adjectives (*annua/sollemni*) open the line followed by the two nouns they modify, *caede* and *avis* respectively. This creates an AABB formation with the main verb falling in between the two nouns. Moreover, the repetition of “m” and “n” sounds in the second half of 3 and 4 contributes to the funereal tone.

There are several linguistic points of interest in these lines as well. The name Memnon is etymologically linked to the Greek verb μίμνειν and the singular imperative μίμνε, which mirrors *mane* both in form and meaning.⁷ This linguistic play seems to suggest that, since Memnon owes the etymon of his name to his ability to hold his ground in battle, Aurora should follow her son’s example and stay her course.

Ovid’s use of *umbris* at 3 in place of the more usual *Manibus* is also striking. MCKEOWN remarks that *umbrae* are antithetical to the daylight.⁸ If this antithesis was intended, then Ovid is foreshadowing the main thrust of his forthcoming argument, namely that he would prefer it if Aurora were to delay her arrival and abstain from dispelling night’s shadows. Ovid may also have used *umbra* in order to strengthen the connection between mother and son (i.e. Memnon is now a shade, but Aurora brings the daylight and shadows are created as a side effect of dawn).

⁷ See MCKEOWN 1989: 342; RYAN-PERKINS 2011: 124. At *Met.* 13.616ff., Ovid relates that the Memnonides were so named for their steadfastness in battle: “*se...viro forti meminere creatas. | praepetibus subitis nomen facit auctor: ab illo | Memnonides dictae.*”

⁸ MCKEOWN 1989: 342.

The verb *parentare*, employed at 4, which finds its linguistic root in the noun *parens*, is often used in reference to the rites performed at the Parentalia.⁹ This may be a pointed reinforcement of Memnon and Aurora's consanguinity, employed purposely to deepen Aurora's feelings of affection for her son.

The humour of this couplet lies in the ultimate futility of the request. Ovid is attempting to reason with a force of nature; all the literary flair he can muster will not keep Aurora from arriving. Thus, the contrast between Ovid's ingenuity and the hopeless comedy of the situation is meant to heighten the reader's response.

Am. 1.13.5–8. The following two couplets, although distinct, ought to be discussed together since they are inextricably linked by the rising anaphora of *nunc* at 5ff.¹⁰ Having concluded his *exordium*, Ovid now informs us of the reason why Aurora should delay her arrival: He is currently lying in bed with his mistress. This is also our first clear indication of the erotic nature of the poem. He describes at length the perfection of the moment, presumably in order that Aurora might feel shame for her voyeuristic intrusion and withdraw.

The impersonal verb *iuvare* at the start of 5 emphasizes the pleasure of lying in bed with one's mistress. The adjective *tener* is particularly pointed since it is a term closely associated with love elegy.¹¹ By employing this adjective, Ovid is now distinctly

⁹ See *OLD* s.v. 1. The Parentalia was held between the thirteenth and twenty-first of February (MCKEOWN 1989: 342).

¹⁰ I will discuss the importance of the anaphora in the final paragraph of this subsection.

¹¹ For more on the elegiac undertones of *tener* in Ovid's *Amores*, see RYAN-PERKINS 2011: 56, n.44.

setting the poem apart from the harshness (*durus*) of epic.¹² Even more importantly, Ovid seems to be suggesting that since he is both engaging in and writing about the elegiac life, Aurora, a goddess better suited to the grand epics, has no literary right to intrude.¹³ She belongs elsewhere, providing light for those engaged in martial, not erotic, activities.

In the final line of this couplet, the erotic tone continues. The word order once again mimics the scene. The main verb, *iuncta est*, surrounds the dative *meo*, mirroring the literal closeness of the lovers' bodies. Moreover, *lateri*, the noun with which *meo* agrees, precedes *iuncta* forming an ABAB pattern, insinuating, perhaps, that their limbs are intertwined.

There is also verbal play in *iuncta est*. The verb *iungere* can also be used in an erotic context to imply copulation or the joining of mouths (i.e. exchanging kisses).¹⁴ Thus, *iuncta est* suggests not only the physical closeness of the lovers' bodies but hints also at sexual intimacy. Aurora, who is depicted by Ovid as sexually frustrated at 35ff., may find this highly erotic scene particularly vexing. If she herself is being denied sex but desperate for it, it will not serve Ovid's case to remind her of her nonexistent sex life by detailing his own amatory adventures.

¹² See *op. cit.*: 125.

¹³ The goddess Aurora does appear (very rarely) in other elegiac works, most notably Prop. 1.18a.9ff.: “[*Tithonum*] *saepe suis decedens fovit in ulnis | quam prius adiunctos sedula lavit equos; | illum ad vicinos cum amplexa quiesceret Indos, | maturos iterum est questa redire dies; | illa deos currum conscendens dixit iniquos, | invitum et terris praestitit officium.*” I would argue, however, that the opening couplet of this poem, which is clearly meant to parody the dignified introductions of Aurora/Eos found in epic, indicates that Ovid is hinting here at the literary inappropriateness of Aurora's disruption of the elegiac lover.

¹⁴ See *TLL* 7.2.660.53ff.; *OLD* s.v. 3b–c.

Next, Ovid lists a second, but subsidiary, reason for his aversion to Aurora's early arrival: At this time in the morning, the birdsongs are at their sweetest.¹⁵ The juxtaposition of *somni* with its predicative adjective *pingues*, both of which are metrically identical (i.e. spondaic), is a rare occurrence in Ovid.¹⁶ MCKEOWN suggest that this deliberately contributes to the drowsy quality of the line.¹⁷ Furthermore, Ovid has achieved a tasteful balance by juxtaposing both nouns in the line, *somni* and *aer*, with their respective predicative adjectives, *pingues* and *frigidus*, thereby creating a chiasmic ABBA formation. The elegant arrangement of the line serves to highlight the perfection of the moment.

The anaphora of *nunc*, referred to briefly above, plays a vital role in these two couplets. With each *nunc*, the tension builds. This repetition accomplishes three things. First, it reinforces the importance of Ovid's reasons for resenting Aurora's arrival. She is about to intrude on his liaison at a moment when everything is perfect. Second, as the crescendo builds, it adds a heightened sense of urgency. If Aurora's advance continues unchecked, the perfection of the moment will be ruined. Third, it must also underscore

¹⁵ There is a clear allusion here to Tib. 1.3.60: "*dulce sonant tenui gutture carmen aves.*" These words are spoken by Tibullus as he lies ill in Phaecia, far away from his beloved Delia, hoping to see her once again. The poem ends with Tibullus longing for the arrival of Aurora as he runs to greet his beloved upon his hoped-for return: "*hoc precor, hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem | Luciferum roseis candida portet equis.*" Thus, Ovid is cleverly reversing a Tibullan theme by altering a line of 1.3 and transferring it to a situation where the lover is not longing for Aurora's swift arrival but the very opposite. It is a clever touch, and by using this line in *Amores* 1.13, which is inherently meant to be an amusing poem, Ovid is also flippantly poking fun at the seriousness of Tibullus' predicament in 1.3.

¹⁶ Other notable occurrences in the *Amores* can be found at 1.10.16; 1.15.17; 2.6.54; 2.11.10; 2.13.10; 3.4.38; 3.7.62; 3.8.26; 3.9.8; 3.9.17.

¹⁷ MCKEOWN 1989: 344.

the alacrity of Aurora's ascent. Since Ovid knows that Aurora is hastily approaching, he must drive his case home as emphatically as possible while he still has the time.

3.4 The Second Section (*Am.* 1.13.9–30)

The second section consists of an opening couplet again aimed at slowing Aurora's arrival. Following this, Ovid launches into a detailed list of all those who are harmed by Aurora (in addition to lovers like himself). Altogether, he lists ten different occupations over the course of fourteen lines. Six of the ten occupations are allotted a couplet each (*navita, colentes, boves, pueros, cultos, feminae*), four are allotted only a line or they share a joint couplet (*viator, miles, consultus/disertus*). The section then concludes with the declaration that lovers are harmed the most by Aurora's arrival, and an admission that Ovid has often hoped/prayed that she might be forcibly delayed by some competing force of nature.

Ovid's attitude toward Aurora in the second section is more irreverent than the first. He actively belittles and denigrates her. He argues against her arrival, whereas, in the first section, he was more focused on shaming Aurora for intruding on a special moment in the hopes that she might withdraw willingly.

***Am.* 1.13.9–10.** The first couplet of this section reiterates the “*quo properas...?*” refrain. This time, however, Aurora is referred to not by name but by the substantive adjective *ingrata*. The use of *ingrata* in this context is highly unusual.¹⁸ It draws attention to the comic blasphemy of the situation. Ovid is purposely distorting common hymnic

¹⁸ See section 2.2.i of Chapter II for more detailed discussion of the use of *ingrata*.

technique by describing the goddess' arrival as undesirable instead of welcoming it, as is common in traditional kletic hymns.¹⁹ Moreover, the anaphora of *ingrata* in this line serves to reinforce the distortion of the situation.²⁰

The anaphora also allows Ovid to point out that both men and girls are put out by Aurora's arrival. In the first section of the poem, Ovid's emphasis was on the displeasure Aurora's arrival affords male lovers. In this line, however, it is revealed that *puellae* also suffer. This adds greater legitimacy to the lover's accusation that Aurora is unwanted. It also foreshadows the main focus of the second section of the poem which details all the classes of people (including women) harmed by the approach of daybreak.

The second line of the couplet is elaborately structured. The two adjectives, *roscida* and *purpurea*, which open the line, agree with the two nouns, *lora* and *manu*, located at the close of the line. The main verb, *supprime*, separates the adjectives from their respective nouns, thereby creating a golden line (AAVBB). The elegant balance of the word order is another humorous twist on liturgical technique. A golden line most certainly befits an address to a deity, but in the context of *Amores* 1.13, it draws attention to the irreverence of the situation. Instead of employing elaborate diction in an attempt to hasten the goddess' arrival, Ovid is attempting to halt her approach by ordering her to pull back the reins of her chariot.

¹⁹ Cf. Sappho *fr.* 2.1ff. (L.-P.); Men. Rhet. 427.14. See also MCKEOWN 1989: 344.

²⁰ As MCKEOWN notes, the anaphora may also be drawn from liturgical technique (MCKEOWN 1989: 345).

The adjective *roscida* alludes to one of the many epithets applied to Aurora.²¹ Etymologically, the root of Aurora's name was believed to be derived from the noun *ros*, meaning moisture, which alludes to the dew that accompanies Aurora's arrival.²² At the same time, the adjective *roscida* (as well as *purpurea*) emphasizes the brightness that accompanies Aurora's arrival. Thus, Ovid incorporates a clever bit of *doctrina* while also drawing attention to Aurora's role as the "light-bringer." This is a role he particularly despises, especially since the morning light is currently disrupting his sleep. Generally in love elegy, the lover attempts to win the object of his affection by appealing to her intellectually. Here, Ovid instead displays his learning in a comic attempt to convince Aurora that her presence is unwelcome.

Moreover, by describing Aurora's *manus* as *purpurea*, he reminds us of the common Homeric description of dawn: ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως; elevated language in the context of a flippant and irreverent address to a deity is intended to be mock-solemn.²³ Thus, just as Ovid reminded Aurora that her presence was unwelcome by alluding to her status in epic at 1f., he calls her attention to this once more at the beginning of the poem's second refrain.

As in the first refrain at 3–4, Ovid employs the imperative mood a second time. The tone of this couplet, however, is altogether more forceful. Ovid now openly insults Aurora's arrival by calling her "unwelcome," and he not only asks her to halt, but even

²¹ Cf. Ov. *A.A.* 3.180. See MCKEOWN 1989: 345.

²² Cf. Varro *L.L.* 5.24. See CAIRNS 1979: 97f.

²³ See Hom. *Il.* 1.477, etc.; *Od.* 2.1, etc.

more emphatically he orders her to pull back the reins of her chariot. He does not attempt to placate her by appealing to her maternal instincts, as he does in the first refrain, and he blatantly exploits kletic technique for comedic effect, which would no doubt alienate Aurora and sabotage any chance of successfully delaying her.

Am. 1.13.11–12.²⁴ At this point, the *suasoria* resumes as Ovid launches into a lengthy list of *exempla* laid out similarly to the *probatio* of a panegyric.²⁵ As BARSBY notes, lists of this sort are one of Ovid's trademarks.²⁶ Although the list may, at first glance, appear overwrought, there are certainly important points to be made. Ovid manages to keep things interesting by employing elaborately worded phrases, sound effects, and *doctrina*. Ovid also frequently uses dignified archaisms. In the context of an irreverent address to a deity, however, Ovid turns the elevated language into a mock-solemn joke. On the surface, Ovid appears to be denouncing Aurora for the suffering she brings to hardworking men and woman. If you look beyond this, however, it becomes clear that the logic behind Ovid's argument is riddled with holes. This is, of course, purposeful on Ovid's part. It keeps the tone light and amusing and underscores the futility of the lover's undertaking.

The first couplet of the list proper details the effect Aurora's rising has on the sailor while at sea. Ovid contends that he is better able to carry out his duties by

²⁴ 11–14 are excluded in three of the main MSS, but both BARSBY and MCKEOWN have argued, I think successfully, that these lines are certainly in Ovid's style, and they fit in perfectly with the inversion of the kletic hymn (BARSBY 1973: 141, n.6; MCKEOWN 1987: 124f.; 1989: 345–46).

²⁵ See ELLIOT 1973–1974: 129.

²⁶ BARSBY 1973: 31.

observing the constellations at night than during the day. Furthermore, during the daytime, the sailor is easily led astray.

The juxtaposition of the pointed *ante tuos ortus* and the adverb *melius* at the start of line 11 puts immediate emphasis on the undesirableness of daybreak. The reference to *sua sidera* introduces a recurrent motif, revisited at 28, wherein Ovid notes that he would prefer it if Night and the stars refused to yield the heavens to Aurora.

The “s” alliteration of *sua sidera servat* may suggest that Ovid is seething with anger.²⁷ The substitution of a compound verb, in this case *observare* would be more appropriate, for a simple verb (*servare*), here in order to achieve alliteration is an archaic technique.²⁸ Furthermore, alliteration is particularly common in prayers, specifically panegyrics, addressed to deities.²⁹ Thus, Ovid is once again perverting hymnic convention by flippantly employing lofty archaisms in a mock-solemn context.

At 12 any ambiguity about the subject of the couplet is dispelled by the introduction of *navita* in emphatic position. The noun *navita* is another archaism; its appearance in this line is yet another example of elevated diction used in a mock-solemn context.³⁰

Typically in a κλητικὸς ὕμνος the poet enumerates the ways in which the deity brings blessings to humankind, not the opposite as we see here. The word order

²⁷ Cf. Verg. *Georg.* 1.335; *Aen.* 5.25; 6.338.

²⁸ See NORDEN on Verg. *Aen.* 6.338 (NORDEN 1957: 231).

²⁹ For the use of alliteration in prayers, see Ov. *Am.* 1.6.15f.; APPEL 1909: 160ff.; MCKEOWN 1989: 88. For proper technique in panegyrics, see Quint. *Inst. Or.* 3.7.7–9.

³⁰ For the metrical qualities of *navita* vs. *nauta*, see Isid. *Diff.* 1.390. For its use as an archaism in Ovid, see BÖMER 1969: 63–64; MCKEOWN 1989: 346.

underscores the harm caused by Aurora's arrival. The adjective *media* and its noun, *aqua*, surround *nescius errat* in the same way that the expansive ocean would literally encompass and overwhelm a sailor who has lost his way.

The sound at 12 is also significant. There is internal rhyme between *media* (which falls directly before the caesura) and *aqua* (at the end of the line). The rhyme draws attention to the fact that the sailor, if disrupted by the arrival of Aurora, will wander aimlessly over the sea.

The plurality of senses suggested by the verb *errare* strengthens Ovid's argument that Aurora's appearance causes significant distress for the sailor. In a literal sense, *errare* can mean both "to float, drift" and "to wander from course."³¹ More generally, it also means "to be in doubt, uncertainty."³² Hence, Ovid is implying not only that the sailor drifts aimlessly during the daytime and wanders from his desired course, but that he is also thrown into confusion when unable to refer to the stars for direction.

Ovid's logic in this couplet is ultimately flawed. It is not in fact the case that sailors navigate better during the night and that only the stars can guide their way. Nor do sailors become lost and wander off course every time that the sun rises. Thus, Ovid is humorously exaggerating.

Am. 1.13.13–14. This couplet addresses the response of travellers and soldiers to Aurora's unwelcome arrival. The traveller, at the first sign of daybreak, is forced to rise

³¹ *OLD* s.v. 2a; 3.

³² *OLD* s.v. 4a

and continue his journey although he may still be tired. The soldier, on the other hand, rises at dawn and equips himself with arms.

The juxtaposition of *te* plus *surgit quamvis lassus*, all of which are highly spondaic and unseparated by a sense-pause, is suggestive of the traveller's weariness.³³ The rhythm serves also to highlight the *viator's* slowness as he grudgingly awakens at the break of day.

To keep the protracted list of occupations interesting, Ovid has injected a touch of wry humour into this (and the following) line. The verb *surgere* has latent sexual connotations as does the adjective *lassus*, commonly employed in elegiac poetry to describe post-coital weariness associated with the sexual encounter.³⁴ The verb *surgere*, which literally means "to rise, stand erect," can be used with reference to the male sexual organ.³⁵ Thus, Ovid is making sexually-charged jokes by implying that Aurora rouses the traveller at a moment of sexual exhaustion but also manages to arouse him sexually. Moreover, the noun *arma*, which, in the *Amores*, is used as a metaphorical euphemism for the penis, may hint that the soldier, like the sailor before him, is in some way sexually aroused by Aurora's arrival.³⁶ Thus, the phrase *aptare manus ad arma* may suggest sexual self-gratification.³⁷

³³ See MCKEOWN 1987: 116; 1989: 347. The rhythm here is nearly unparalleled in the *Amores* and occurs only in this line and at 2.14.23 and 3.7.39. Cf. also Ov. *A.A.* 3.263; Tib. 1.8.75; Prop. 1.12.13, 3.10.13, 3.24.17.

³⁴ See ADAMS 1982: 196. Cf. *Amores* 1.5.25.

³⁵ See *OLD* s.v. 1d.

³⁶ Cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.9.26. Ovid often employs metaphorical double-entendres, but this is rare elsewhere in elegiac poetry (ADAMS 1982: 224).

³⁷ MCKEOWN notes that the *aptare ad* is a peculiar phrase (MCKEOWN 1989: 347). For other examples of this phrase, cf. Sen. *Ag.* 425; *Oed.* 935.

Interestingly, Ovid does not explicitly state that the soldier is inconvenienced by Aurora's arrival as he did in both earlier examples (the sailor is *nescius*, the traveller, *lassus*). The only adjective employed at 14 is *saevus* which emphasizes the warrior's savage ferocity. He may have included the soldier in this list because it is among one of the occupations frequently rejected by the elegiac poets. Ovid is indeed attempting to dissuade Aurora from arriving by insinuating that she is undesirable to men and women from all walks of life, but he is also, as will become clear at 25f., attempting to draw a contrast between the occupations listed here and the life of love.³⁸ Although Aurora may disrupt the repose of men and women who are compelled at daybreak to engage in sundry occupational tasks, it is the lover who is most inconvenienced by her arrival. This explanation may also account for the sexual innuendo in these lines. Ovid is suggesting that although forced to undertake onerous tasks, these men also find some pleasure in Aurora's arrival, whereas the lover is denied all (sexual) pleasure at daybreak and forced to leave his mistress.

By hinting that there are those aroused by Aurora's arrival, Ovid is spoiling his case. The traveller is not really forced to rise with the sun, and although the soldier may have to rise early, this is a consequence of the profession, not the fault of Aurora. Moreover, if the traveller and the soldier are in some sense sexually gratified by Aurora,

³⁸ In fact, the sailor and the traveller are also occupations traditionally shunned by the elegists. Cf. Prop. 1.6; Tib. 1.1.45–58, 1.10.29–32, 2.6.1–6. There is also most certainly tension in these lines between the life of *otium* and *negotium*. Certainly Ovid is championing the life of leisure over the life spent in the public sphere. This is worthy of greater comment but deeper social commentary is not the primary aim of this chapter.

then Ovid's argument here does not carry much weight. Again, Ovid's distorted logic is meant to be amusing.

Am. 1.13.15–16. In the next couplet, Ovid details the burden of the farmer and his oxen at daybreak. Aurora is the first to look down upon the farmer as he cultivates his fields. And she is the first one to summon the oxen and place them beneath the yoke.

The adjective *prima*, which begins both lines in this couplet, is another distortion of the κλητικὸς ὕμνος. In a kletic hymn, the supplicant would typically extol the deity as the πρῶτος εὐρετής of benefit to humankind.³⁹ The marked repetition of *prima* heightens the parody and likewise the effect of the joke. By applying liturgical technique to an undeniably commonplace scenario, Ovid is drawing attention to the shameless irreverence of his address.⁴⁰

In these lines, Ovid emphasizes the burdensome task of the farmer and his oxen. Instead of referring to farmers as *agricolae*, he employs the periphrastic phrase *colentes arva* in order to highlight the nature of the farmer's work.⁴¹ Moreover, the oxen are described as *tardi* which implies that, as essentially slow-moving creatures, the speed of

³⁹ See MCKEOWN 1989: 348.

⁴⁰ *Op cit.*: 348.

⁴¹ This may be a third example of sexual innuendo. The sowing of seeds and the tilling of fields are both commonly used erotic metaphors (see ADAMS 1982: 82ff.). It is worth pointing out that RYAN-PERKINS believe that the noun *bidens* is a euphemism for the penis (RYAN-PERKINS 2011: 125–26). They reference *Ov. Am.* 1.1.10 as support for this claim, and although sharp agricultural implements are often used to describe the *mentula*, I can find no other extant source that specifically uses *bidens* in this context (ADAMS 1982: 24f.). It is used, however, at *Priap.* 84.26 perhaps in reference to the anus (see also *OLD* s.v. 1).

Aurora's arrival will be all the more troublesome for them. The adjective *tardus* also suggests that they are deliberately late for their work and unwilling to rise with the sun.⁴²

There is also internal rhyme at 15 between the verb *vides* (which falls before the caesura and the substantive participle *colentes*). This draws attention once more to the negative repercussions of Aurora's arrival for farmers by placing added stress on the fact that Aurora is the first one to look down upon farmers languishing in their fields each day.

In addition, Aurora herself has now become the subject of the main verb. In all three of the preceding examples, the sailor, the traveller, and the soldier were each the subjects of their respective couplets. At 15f., however, it is implied that Aurora herself is the instigator of misfortune for the farmer and his oxen. This will be the case in all of the subsequent descriptions in this list.

Having dealt with three occupations typically considered antithetical to the elegist's life of love, Ovid has now moved on to the more traditional Roman professions. The shift in verbal agency may be a subtle suggestion that those occupations opposed to the life of the elegiac lover bring with them their own hardships, hardships for which Aurora alone cannot be blamed. Thus, Ovid is continuing to damage his case. The discerning reader will note the subtle humour of the situation and infer that Ovid's plea will ultimately go unanswered.

⁴² See *OLD* s.v. 4.

Am. 1.13.17–18. At 17f., Ovid explores the repercussions of Aurora's arrival for the schoolboy. Cheated of sleep, he is handed over to his school teachers. Once at school, he must endure cruel beatings.

With *tu* opening the couplet at 17, Ovid expressly emphasizes Aurora's instigative role in the schoolboy's suffering.⁴³ The two objects of the sentence, *pueros* and *magistris*, are located at opposite ends of the line wittily highlighting the schoolboy's desire to be as far away as possible from his teacher. Nevertheless, in the context of the line, he is forced into close association with him on account of Aurora's arrival. The clever juxtaposition of *pueros* and *somno* achieves a similar effect. The ablative of separation highlights the privation of the schoolboy's sleep, but the proximity of *pueros somno* in the word order implies that the schoolboy is desirous of more sleep.

Both of the main verbs at 17 (*fraudas tradisque*) suggest acts of deception and betrayal on Aurora's part. The juxtaposition of both verbs underscores the treachery of her act. MCKEOWN notes that we may be meant to imagine Aurora as a sort of *pedisequus*.⁴⁴ If this is the case, then the comedy of the situation is heightened. Aurora is not only the reason for the disruption of the schoolboy's sleep, but she is in league with the teachers themselves. Moreover, suggesting that Aurora's role in this affair is comparable to that of a manservant is highly degrading. This is certainly not how one addresses a deity if one hopes to receive their blessing.

⁴³ School often commenced even before daybreak (see Mart. 9.68.3f., 12.57.4f., 14.223; BONNER 1977: 137f.; COURTNEY 1980: 377–78; MCKEOWN 1989: 348).

⁴⁴ MCKEOWN 1989: 348.

At 18, the result of Aurora's deceit is revealed: By handing schoolboys over to their teachers Ovid is implying that she is, in effect, responsible for the corporal punishment inflicted upon them. The repetition of the sinister "s" sound may be meant to reinforce Aurora's duplicity.

The juxtaposition of *saeva* and *manus* recalls Ovid's description of the soldier at 14. By contrast, however, it is the lashes of the schoolmaster's whip that are now savage and the hands of the boys are *tenerae*. Ovid is purposely drawing attention to the harmlessness and the helplessness of the schoolboy's plight. This, in turn, raises the emotional pitch of the couplet and deepens the reader's animosity toward Aurora. (Of course, all of this will undoubtedly also estrange Aurora.)

Like Ovid's earlier examples, the logic of these lines is faulty. Although schoolboys were indeed forced to rise early, Aurora cannot be blamed for the infliction of corporal punishment. The boys may have brought punishment upon themselves by disobeying their *magister*.

Am. 1.13.19–20. Now Ovid turns to the suffering of well-dressed men forced, under oath, to enter the courtroom. Damning themselves with one word, they then must endure heavy financial losses.

The couplet begins at 19 with *eadem*, which is dependent upon *tu* at 17, in emphatic position. The intensive pronoun enhances the accusatory tone of the couplet by reemphasizing the fact that Aurora's arrival is once again bringing about personal misfortune. The verb with which *eadem* agrees (*mittis*) is located at the end of line. Thus,

Aurora surrounds and overwhelms the men forced before the court in the word order just as, Ovid claims, she does in reality.

The supine (of *spondere*, used at 19) is an archaism. It may perhaps be employed here on account of the legalistic subject-matter of the couplet.⁴⁵ There may, however, be another possible interpretation. This is not the first time Ovid has employed archaisms in the preceding examples for comedic effect. It is likely that once again, in the context of the flippancy of his address, Ovid is employing mock-solemn language in order to underscore the comic banality of the situation.⁴⁶

At 20, Ovid employs a second purpose clause. This draws attention to the negative consequences of Aurora's arrival by suggesting that Aurora herself sends men before the court for the express purpose of sustaining heavy losses. Unlike the purpose clause at 18, however, *ut* is relegated the second word in the line. The prominent placement of *unius* at the start of 20 stresses how easily clients can damn themselves in the courtroom.⁴⁷ This also reflects poorly on Aurora, who, Ovid suggests, is to blame for placing the defendant in this predicament.

⁴⁵ For the suitability of archaisms in a legal context, see MCKEOWN 1989: 349. Cf. the use of *sponsum* here with Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.67. For *mittere* plus the supine, see *TLL* 8.1185.23ff.; 8.1189.5ff.

⁴⁶ The substantive adjective *cultos*, referring, as BARBSY and MCKEOWN suggest, to the personal attire of the clients, cannot be properly commented upon due to the corruption of the text (BARSBY 1973: 143, n.10; MCKEOWN 1989: 349). Other conjectures include *consulti* (*ySo*); *stultum* (*Y*), which does not fit the metre and cannot agree with *ferant*; *stultos* (EHWALD); *multos* (WITHOFF 1798: 85ff.); *incautos* (MADVIG 1873: 68); *incultos* (CLAUSEN 1955: 53).

⁴⁷ The *unius...verbi* to which Ovid is referring here is the client's response to the question "*spondesne?*," namely *spondeo*, which resulted in a contract that could cause the client to incur serious personal losses (WATSON 1971: 117f.; BARSBY 1973: 143; MCKEOWN 1989: 350).

The hole in Ovid's logic is very similar to the preceding couplet. It is in fact the client's fault if he is forced to sustain losses, either because he rashly entered into a contract without considering the consequences of his oath, or because he is found guilty of perjury and the fine he is compelled to pay is justified. Ovid is purposely misrepresenting the facts for comedic effect.

Am. 1.13.21–22. Ovid continues the juristic theme of the previous couplet.⁴⁸ Now he examines the predicament of the *iurisconsultus* and *disertus*.⁴⁹ Aurora, Ovid claims, is pleasing to neither legal profession. She forces them to rise early every day to take on new lawsuits.

The epanalepsis of *nec tu...nec tu* at 21 simultaneously emphasizes the lawyer/forensic orator's aversion to Aurora's arrival and Aurora's active involvement in the disruption of the lawyer/forensic orator's sleep. This line is elegantly arranged, with the repetition of *nec tu*, separated by the main caesura, and the placement of the datives (*consulto/diserto*) each following their respective *nec tu*.

Nec iucunda recalls *ingrata* at 9 and reinforces the inversion of hymnic procedure. The epanalepsis is also a parody of the traditional κλητικὸς ὕμνος.⁵⁰ Thus, rather than praising Aurora for the benefit she brings to humankind, Ovid is once more

⁴⁸ The number of lines devoted to the unpleasantness associated with the legal occupation no doubt reflects Ovid's own opinions about a profession he himself once practiced (Ov. *Am.* 1.10.37–42).

⁴⁹ As MCKEOWN notes, the lawyer and the court pleader/orator were distinct professions (MCKEOWN 1989: 350). Cf. Ov. *A.A.* 1.83ff.; Cic. *Brut.* 148.

⁵⁰ See MCKEOWN 1989: 350. Cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.6.15f., 1.15.5f.

accusing her of disrupting pleasure. Ovid's persistent irreverence is cheeky and unlikely to impress Aurora.

The passive form of *cogere*, emphatically placed at the beginning of 21, suggests that both the lawyer and forensic orator are being dragged out of bed by Aurora against their will. *Uterque*, referring both to the *consultus* and the *disertus*, is hemmed in on all sides by the *lites...novas* they are forced to undertake (after Aurora has dragged them out of bed), mirroring the inescapability of their predicament.

The verb *surgere* can also refer to rising in the courtroom to deliver evidence.⁵¹ This implies that Aurora not only drags the *consultus* and *disertus* out of bed in the morning, but she also drags them to their feet in the courtroom. *Surgere*, as noted above, can also have sexual connotations. Perhaps Ovid is suggesting that lawyers and rhetors are also sexually aroused by Aurora's arrival, which would comically undermine his argument.

Aurora is also not to blame for dragging the lawyer and rhetor out of their beds. Like the soldier, these men chose their profession and as a result they must rise early for work. Moreover, it is not Aurora who forces them to take on new cases daily. Presumably, a lawyer/orator's legal success would lead to an influx of cases, and the clients themselves are also partly to blame for requiring legal services in the first place.

Am. 1.13.23–24. The final couplet of Ovid's lengthy list of *exempla* is the only one which deals with the effect of Aurora's arrival on the lives of working women. Women

⁵¹ See *OLD* s.v. 1b.

who spin wool work through most of the night, and for them, the early arrival of Aurora must be especially distressing. Aurora is the one, according to Ovid, who calls them back to the laborious task of wool-spinning after only a brief sleep.

It is noteworthy that, in a list detailing the deleterious effect of Aurora's arrival, Ovid leaves women until the end.⁵² As a sexually-frustrated goddess, it makes sense that she might want to disrupt the sleep of working men. But why distress working women, especially ones engaged in the virtuous task of weaving? Perhaps, Ovid uses this example to highlight the pervasiveness of Aurora's "attack" on humankind. Not only does she bring hardship to men, but she causes misfortune for men and women alike.

Once again *tu* opens the couplet in emphatic position; juxtaposed with this is a temporal *cum*-clause detailing the hardships of spinning-women. This line, nearly entirely devoted to the spinning-women's ceaseless toil, and broken up only by the pronoun *tu* at the start, effectively impresses upon the reader the extent to which Aurora's disruption of their rest, detailed in the following line, is so distasteful.

The location of *feminei* at the start of the *cum*-clause and *labores*, situated at the end of the line, underscores the women's desire to be far removed from their toil, despite the reality that they are allotted very little leisure time. Furthermore, the placement of the main verb, *possint*, and its complementary infinitive, *cessare*, between *feminei* and *labores* highlights the tantalizing possibility that the spinning-women may finally obtain

⁵² I will touch on two other reasons for the placement of spinning-women at the end of the list below.

a break from their work. The possibility of respite, however, is all but extinguished in the following line.

At 24, *lanificam* and *manum* frame the line. This achieves an effect similar to the one noted above, namely the separation of the adjective denoting the weaving of wool from the noun it modifies suggests the desired distancing of the hand from the task of wool-spinning. The compound verb *revocare* is suggestive of the regularity with which the spinning-women are called back to their work by Aurora.⁵³

Spinning-women did indeed work late into the night and rise before daybreak.⁵⁴ The task of spinning of wool is also symbolic of chastity.⁵⁵ In fact, working into the night hours was thought to guarantee that a woman had remained chaste.⁵⁶ Thus, the inclusion of weaving in this list is somewhat surprising given the erotic context of the poem.

It is especially comic then that Ovid should select this as a profession inconvenienced by Aurora's arrival. It also serves as a reminder that there are professions, opposed to the life of the elegiac mistress, purposely chosen by women who accept Aurora's coming as a reminder of the preservation of their modesty.⁵⁷ As a result, it is likely that this will do little to convince Aurora to delay her arrival, especially since

⁵³ This line is a parody of Tib. 2.1.9f.: "*omnia sint operata deo: non audeat ulla | lanificam pensis imposuisse manumit.*" Instead of being forced by a deity to perform their task, in these lines Tibullus bids the women to put aside their work in order to honour the god. By inverting the sentiment of these two lines, Ovid is slyly highlighting the comic perversion of traditional hymnic practice.

⁵⁴ See Ap. Rhod. 3.291ff.; Verg. *Aen.* 8.407ff.

⁵⁵ Cf. Liv. 1.57.9

⁵⁶ See MCKEOWN 1989: 351.

⁵⁷ Indeed the epigraphic record attests that this was a common profession among women (e.g. *CIL* I 1211, VI 11602).

this is yet another reminder that there are those who do not entirely despise her appearance at daybreak.

There are two other possibilities why Ovid concludes the list with a woman's vocation. First, the stark contrast between the spinning-women's life of chastity and the lover's predicament (i.e. not having enough time for sex before Aurora arrives), to which Ovid returns in the following couplet, is particularly amusing. Second, this final *exemplum* reintroduces *feminae* right before Ovid returns to plight of the lover and his *puella* at 25ff., thereby affording, as MCKEOWN describes it, "a particularly smooth transition to the following couplet."⁵⁸

Am. 1.13.25–26. Having concluded his list, Ovid now returns to the central theme of the poem. He avers that all hardships are endurable save for being separated from one's mistress at daybreak. The only person who would not agree with this sentiment, Ovid argues, is the man who has no mistress.

The phrase "*omnia perperer*" betrays the selfish nature of Ovid's request.⁵⁹ Ultimately, he is willing to let Aurora drag men and women out of their beds so long as she grants him and his beloved more time together. It is also implied that the love of the elegiac lover is preferable to all other livelihoods, but also the most troublesome because the pain of being separated from one's mistress is, in contrast to the hardship associated with other occupations, truly unbearable. The addition of the prefix *per-* to the verb

⁵⁸ MCKEOWN 1989: 351.

⁵⁹ The selfishness the Ovid's request is highlighted by the allusion to Prop. 2.26.35ff. At 2.26.35ff., Propertius states that he is willing to suffer anything so that he might be with his mistress. Ovid suggests the opposite; he is willing to let everyone else suffer so that he can be with his mistress.

perpeterere and the blustering repetition of “pe” and “r” comically drives home this point.

There is yet another interesting comparison between the life of love and the occupations listed at 11ff. In every previous example, Aurora’s arrival marks the commencement of each man/woman’s workday. For the lover, however, Aurora’s arrival signifies the end of the lover’s “work” (i.e. as soon as the day breaks, the sex ends).

The adverb *mane* plays an important role at 25. In all of the prior examples listed above, not one contains an explicit reference to rising at a specific time (i.e. at daybreak/in the early morning). Of course, it is implied, since Ovid is enumerating the ways in which Aurora’s arrival is disruptive, and Aurora is the goddess of the dawn. Nevertheless, the time of day is never stated. Ovid may be driving home the point that early morning is, unequivocally, the time at which lovers should not be disturbed. In addition, *mane* is reminiscent of the imperative of *manere* employed in the first refrain at 3. Thus, the adverb is a witty reminder that Ovid wants Aurora to stay her course.

At 26, the interrogative pronoun *quis* emphasizes the absurdity of Ovid’s question, implying that there is no one who would disagree with his stance on the diurnal separation of lovers. Certainly it is meant to be rhetorical, but there is humour in the question Ovid poses. If Aurora were to respond, would she affirm Ovid’s position? It is unlikely. She herself, as Ovid suggests at 35ff., is being deprived of sex and currently not engaged in an adulterous liaison. Thus, although Ovid specifically scorns men who do

not have girlfriends, Aurora will be reminded that she herself is currently no god's/man's girlfriend.

The first hemistich of 26 consists of five (very short) words, creating a staccato effect perhaps conveying contempt of the man who does not have a girlfriend.⁶⁰ This further reinforces the implication that the man without a mistress is the only person who could possibly disagree with Ovid. Since Aurora is currently sex-deprived and without a lover, Ovid may be humorously hinting that she is among those who will disagree with the importance of his request. Furthermore, Ovid's insistence that the life of love is preferable to all other lifestyles will serve only to make the (sexually-frustrated) goddess more jealous.

Am. 1.13.27–30. I will discuss the following four lines together since there are verbal correspondences between both couplets. Having returned to the central theme of the poem, Ovid begins to ramp up the emotional pitch of his complaint. He relates how often he has hoped that Aurora might delay her coming; he has prayed that Night would refuse to yield to her or that her approach might be impeded by the wind and the clouds.

Both couplets open with *optavi*. The verb *optare* suggests not only that Ovid has hoped for the postponement of Aurora's arrival, but that he has prayed for it.⁶¹ This an amusing little reminder that Ovid is currently distorting proper liturgical technique in his address to Aurora. The overall theme of these two couplets also fits more broadly into the

⁶⁰ See MCKEOWN 1989: 352.

⁶¹ See Chapter II, section 2.2.i above for more on the latent senses of *optare*.

traditional schema of the κλητικὸς ὕμνος and the *propemptikon*. In both poetic genres, the poet would commonly ask nature for assistance in granting a traveller safe passage.⁶² Of course, in these lines Ovid presents a perversion of this traditional technique by requesting that nature impede Aurora's arrival.

The elaborate balance of the couplets is striking: “*optavi quotiens ne Nox... | ne fugerent... / optavi quotiens aut ventus... | aut caderet.*” There is also a chiasmic assonance linking four of the main verbs: *cedere*, *fugerent*, *frangeret*, and *caderet*. The elegant structure of the lines is reminiscent of magical incantations and at 29f. Ovid employs verbs commonly used in charms against racehorses (*frangeret/caderet*).⁶³ The allusion to magic charms is for comedic effect, since, in the context of the second couplet, Ovid is praying for a thick cloud to trip up Aurora's horses. Moreover, by comparing the horses drawing Aurora's chariot to racehorses, Ovid is suggesting that Aurora's approach is unnecessarily hasty.

Following *optavi*, the opening lines of both couplets contain the adverb *quotiens*. The anaphora reveals that Ovid frequently prays for the delay of Aurora's arrival. This humorously foreshadows the inevitable failure of his attempt but also suggests that Aurora has had to endure abuse from him on previous occasions. Ovid is certainly not bolstering his case by pointing out prior unsuccessful attempts.

⁶² See MCKEOWN 1989: 353. Cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.11.37ff., 2.16.51f. For the inversion of this technique, see *Hor. Epod.* 10.

⁶³ See MCKEOWN 1989: 136, 353–54. For the elaborate structure of magical incantations, cf. *Varro Rust.* 1.2.27; *Verg. Ecl.* 8.80; *Marcell. Med.* 8.191. For examples of such charms composed against racehorses, see AUDOLLENT 1904: 378ff.

At 27f., Ovid adds Night and the stars to the equation. There are several latent senses of the verb *fugere*, used at 28 to describe the motion of the stars. It can mean “to flee (as from danger)”;⁶⁴ “to slip out of one’s grasp or control”; “to keep away from, avoid.”⁶⁴ Thus, the flight of the stars, aside from being a poetic image, suggests that the heavenly bodies themselves dislike Aurora’s arrival, but they are fortunate enough to be able to escape from her grasp whereas lovers must endure her arrival on a daily basis.⁶⁵

The use of *vultus* here may be another pointed dig at Aurora. Instead of referring to her *ortus*, as he did at 11, Ovid specifically refers to her visage. Since the noun *vultus* refers to the distinctive features of a person’s face, this suggests that the stars flee not only because they dislike Aurora, but perhaps also because her physical appearance disturbs them.⁶⁶ Of course, Ovid tells us at 44 that she is indeed beautiful, but the comic verbal play here will do little to secure Aurora’s favour. Moreover, the passive participle *mota*, the sense of which would be better conveyed by *remota*, suggests that Aurora bullies the stars out the sky by forcibly removing them from her path.

At 29f., the wind and clouds are attributed greater agency than Night and the stars. In this scenario, the wind actively rebuffs Aurora’s attempted arrival by breaking the wheel of her chariot (29); a thick cloud purposely trips up Aurora’s horses (30). Indeed it was believed that the winds could control the movement of heavenly bodies, so perhaps this explains why Ovid has imbued the wind and clouds with such an aggressive

⁶⁴ See *OLD* s.v. 1a; 6b; 10a.

⁶⁵ For other examples of the “flight of stars,” cf. *Ov. Met.* 2.114; *Eur. Phaeth.* 66; *Hes. Op.* 620; *TLL* 6.1482.45ff., 1493.14ff., 1501.15ff.

⁶⁶ *OLD* s.v. 4.

spirit.⁶⁷ On the other hand, it may be that, having prayed often (to no avail) that Night and the stars might finally take a stand against Aurora, Ovid decides to supplicate the winds as well, aware that they hold sway even over the celestial bodies.

The compositional balance between both couplets, invites the reader to compare the function of the passive participle *retentus* at 30 with *mota* 28. At 30, Aurora's horses are the ones now being held back, powerless, in contrast to the helpless plight of the stars at 28. This fits with the narrative progression suggested above. Once Ovid realizes that supplicating Night and the stars has made no difference, he calls upon forces whose powers are restricted neither to the daytime nor the nighttime.

The combination of astronomical theory and mythological imagery in this couplet is striking, and the effect is ingenious.⁶⁸ The lover, in his desperation, pulls out all of the stops. Since he cannot seem to convince Aurora to delay, instead he employs techniques drawn from magical incantation, racetrack curses, astrology, and liturgy. This delightful amalgam of contradictory elements comically undermines the (mock-)poignancy of the lover's lament.

Comically, by admitting that he has often before prayed that Aurora might be delayed by a celestial uprising or accident, Ovid is once again damaging his argument. Hoping for some sort of calamity to befall Aurora is even more likely to make her refuse his request. Indeed, although three-quarters of the second refrain was dedicated to Ovid's

⁶⁷ Cf. *Lucr.* 5.509–516, 637–49.

⁶⁸ See FRÄNKEL 1945: 176f.; MCKEOWN 1989: 354.

list of occupations harmed by Aurora's arrival, she herself is simply going about her daily business. Perhaps she enjoys waking up at daybreak no more than the lover, but as a force of nature she does not have much control over the situation.

Moreover, Ovid's prayers are inherently illogical. Praying to the personification of Night and the stars, both of which are immovable, implacable natural phenomena, will undoubtedly result in failure. The winds and clouds also have no divine agency in and of themselves which makes the prayer unlikely to be successful. Ultimately, the idea of praying to these inanimate forces is amusing and intended to humorously subvert Ovid's argument.

3.5 The Third Section (*Am.* 1.13.31–46)

The third section of the poem opens with the final "*quo properas...?*" refrain. The tone of this section is markedly different from the two preceding sections. It is by far the most irreverent and salacious. Ovid, inverting his appeal to Aurora's maternal instincts at 3f., accuses her of being a bad mother whose blackness of heart has permanently tainted her son's skin. Next he impudently offers Aurora sex advice, suggesting that she take a lover.

31–42 comprise the conclusion of Ovid's mock-*suasoria*. Having listed the benefits bestowed upon humankind, the orator is then to detail the subject's valiant exploits.⁶⁹ Instead, Ovid details Aurora's amatory exploits. The result is akin to a modern-day tabloid magazine. Instead of selecting Aurora's successful love affairs, he

⁶⁹ See Quint. *Inst.* 3.7–9.

chooses to document the outcome of her ultimately tragic marriage with Tithonus and allude to her abduction of Cephalus, who spurned her advances.

Am. 1.13.31–32. The first couplet of this section contains the third *quo properas* refrain. Ovid refers to Aurora as *invida*, which is far more forceful than the mild *ingrata* used at 9. He then accuses her of tainting the colour of her son Memnon’s skin because she herself is black-hearted.

31 opens with the vocative *invida* in emphatic position.⁷⁰ As the first word of the line, *invida* sets a tone far more aggressive in nature than previous sections.⁷¹ This also foreshadows the dramatic shift in tone noticeable throughout the final section. Ovid calls her “jealous” because, as will become clear in what follows, she has either rejected Tithonus’ advances or Tithonus himself is no longer able to perform sexually.

In the second half of 31, Ovid reintroduces Aurora’s son Memnon, although this time he is not named. Thematically, this is reminiscent of the first section in which Ovid mentioned Memnon in an attempt to provoke some sort of maternal feeling. Here, on the other hand, Ovid is suggesting that the blackness of Aurora’s heart caused Memnon to be born with dark skin. The sentiment here is antithetical to the sentiment evoked at 9f., but by reintroducing Memnon in the final refrain, Ovid is also bringing the poem full circle. Moreover, the moral connotations of the adjective *ater* are suggestive of Aurora’s jealous

⁷⁰ This another example of Ovid’s perversion of the kletic hymn. Traditionally, one would praise the deity for their benefaction (MCKEOWN 1989: 354). The adjective *invida* is often used in poetry to describe those in opposition to the lover’s affair: cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.2.27f., 3.6.21; *Epist.* 19.120; *Met.* 4.73, 234, 9.462, 486, 10.331, 641. Cf. also Nonn. *Dion.* 7.286.

⁷¹ Compare the force of *invida* with Ovid’s use of *ingrata* at 9 and the first refrain at 3 in which he refers to Aurora by name only.

disposition.⁷² By reminding Aurora that her inability to derive sexual satisfaction from her marriage has made her envious of lovers, Ovid is shaming her even further.

Ovid's accusation that Aurora's black heart caused Memnon to be born with black skin is also a cheeky joke. It would be common knowledge to Ovid's readers that, since Memnon was an Ethiopian king, he would have black skin.⁷³ In this couplet, however, Ovid comically suggests that he was not in fact born with dark skin because of his ethnicity but because Aurora herself is black at heart.

The adjective *ater* has several other latent senses which inform our reading of this line; it can also mean "deadly" and "terrible" as well as "spiteful, malevolent."⁷⁴ All of these senses attach to Aurora, implying, in this context, that her envious interference in other people's affairs is pointedly malicious. The repetition of hard consonantal "q" and "c" sounds at 31 and 32 also contribute to overall tone of reproach.

The rhythm of the couplet is worth noting. 31 is extremely dactylic, which underscores the haste of Aurora's unchecked approach. Her continued advance no doubt accounts for the aggressiveness of tone in the final section of the couplet. All of Ovid's earlier attempts have clearly failed. With *materni* at 32, however, the couplet takes a more sombre and spondaic turn which complements the line's accusatory tone.

⁷² Cf. Ovid's use of *ater* with Porph. *Hor. Sat.* 1.4.100: "*malos...homines atros ac venenatos dicere solemus.*"

⁷³ For an explanation of Memnon's skin colour, see Servius' note on Verg. *Aen.* 1.489: "*Eoas...acies et nigri Memnonis arma.*" In art, Memnon was depicted with African features from the Hellenistic period onward (MCKEOWN 1989: 355).

⁷⁴ See *OLD* s.v. 1a–b, 8a, 11. For the association of *ater* with envy, cf. *Ov. Met.* 2.760f.; *Hor. Epod.* 6.15; *Sen. Phaedr.* 492f.; *Sil.* 8.290f.; *Stat. Silv.* 4.8.16f.

The way in which Ovid refers to Memnon and Aurora in these two lines is also significant. At 31, instead of naming Memnon, Ovid refers to him as “*tibi filius*,” and Aurora is alluded to via *materni* at 32. By referring to both as “son” and “mother,” Ovid is drawing attention to their familial bond. In contrast to the conduct expected of mothers, Aurora’s bad behaviour stands out all the more. Furthermore, *materni* is an elevated alternative to *matris* which underlines the mock-solemnity of the couplet.⁷⁵

Am. 1.13.35–36.⁷⁶ In this couplet, Tithonus, alluded to in the opening couplet of the poem, is finally named. Ovid suggests that if Tithonus still possessed the power of coherent speech, the stories he would tell of Aurora’s liaisons would be shocking. Undoubtedly, he would affirm that there is no woman in heaven more shameful than she.

Ovid’s description of Tithonus at 35 is highly amusing.⁷⁷ He is alluding to the well-known detail that Tithonus, in extreme old age, eventually loses his ability to speak intelligibly.⁷⁸ After succumbing to senility, Aurora kept him in a bed-chamber (θάλαμος) where he would mumble incoherently to himself. Thus, Ovid seems to be suggesting here that Tithonus is held captive by Aurora, and that if he were able to escape from his “prison,” we would discover that the subject of his endless chatter is Aurora’s many adulteries.⁷⁹ This is not a particularly flattering depiction of the goddess. Furthermore, the

⁷⁵ See MCKEOWN 1989: 355.

⁷⁶ The intervening couplet (33–34) has been excised from most standard texts. The metre and poetic sense of the couplet suggests it is an interpolation (see BECKBY 1973: 145, n.15; MCKEOWN 1989: 355–56).

⁷⁷ Ovid is parodying a passage from Prop. 2.18A.7ff. in which Aurora is depicted as caring for her the aging Tithonus. By perverting the Propertian sentiment, Ovid is poking fun at Aurora’s devotion and the sentimentality of the situation.

⁷⁸ See *H.H.* 5.236ff.

⁷⁹ See MCKEOWN 1989: 356.

spondaic rhythm of this line may reflect Tithonus' laboured speech and his mobility hindered by extreme old age.

At 36, *femina* opens the line in emphatic position. This draws attention simultaneously to her sex, as MCKEOWN notes, and her role as the wife of Tithonus, which makes her shameful behaviour even more shocking.⁸⁰ Ovid's depiction of Aurora as heaven's biggest slut is meant to be amusing. Certainly, he is alluding to Aurora's many well-known love affairs, to which he turns his attention in the following couplet.⁸¹ This is extremely irreverent in the context of an address purportedly aimed at slowing Aurora's arrival. Also, by pointing out that Aurora has an infamous reputation to uphold, Ovid is highlighting the fact that she is currently not engaged in an affair which would explain her jealousy of lovers (and the unlikelihood of her granting Ovid's request).

Am. 1.13.37–38. This couplet provides us with greater insight into Aurora's love life or lack thereof. Ovid imagines her fleeing from Tithonus' side, repulsed by his extreme old age. From bed, she rises daily from her elderly husband to mount her chariot.

At 37, Ovid describes an amusing scene between Aurora and Tithonus. The beautiful goddess flees from her husband very much in the manner of a young, virginal maiden pursued by an impassioned lover who is desirous of making unwanted sexual advances. The verb *fugere*, or in this case its compound counterpart *refugere*, is frequently employed in the Ovidian rape narrative.⁸² Thus, Ovid has created a comic

⁸⁰ MCKEOWN 1989: 357.

⁸¹ Aurora has been described as the "most amorous of goddesses" (PINSENT 1969: 81).

⁸² Cf. *Ov. Met.* 1.502ff., 3.383f., 390, 477f., 8.108ff.

reversal. Instead of a chaste girl fleeing a sex-crazed suitor, Aurora, who is by all accounts a very sexual goddess, is now the one fleeing her husband, whose old age has made his advances intolerable.

The word order at 37 draws attention to the comedy of the situation. With *illum* placed at the start of the line, Ovid is highlighting Tithonus' role as the repulsed spouse whose sexual overtures are distasteful.⁸³ In the second clause, the extended separation of *longo* from its respective noun *aevo* draws attention to the length of Tithonus' life.

The comparative adjective *grandior* has several secondary meanings.⁸⁴ Obviously, in context, it refers to Tithonus' extreme old age, but can also mean "of considerable size, big, large, tall."⁸⁵ This is a comic play on the fact that Tithonus may have advanced in age but has probably shrunk in size.⁸⁶

At 38, the verb *surgere* is employed for the fourth time. In the context of this line the sexual connotations of the verb are especially amusing. It suggests that even though Aurora spurns Tithonus' advances, she is nevertheless sexually aroused and likely longing to engage in a romantic liaison with a younger, more attractive man. The verb *surgere* specifically implies the arousal of the male sex organ, which Aurora, of course, does not possess. This makes its appearance here all the more comical.

⁸³ Ovid is drawing a contrast between his depiction of Tithonus and Aurora and Propertius' depiction of the couple at 2.18A.9, 11, discussed above in footnote n.77.

⁸⁴ The phrase *grandis aevo* may have epic undertones, cf. *maximus aevo* at Verg. *Aen.* 11.237; Ov. *Met.* 7.310; Lucan 1.585. Thus, Ovid may be continuing the mock-epic tone of previous sections.

⁸⁵ See *OLD* s.v. 1b, 2a.

⁸⁶ See MCKEOWN 1989: 359.

Ovid describes the *rotae* of Aurora's chariot as *invisae*. Presumably the phrase "*invisas...rotas*" suggests that the chariot is hateful to Tithonus, not necessarily to Aurora. There are several explanations for this. Aurora's chariot is the means by which she escapes from him each morning, which explains his ill will. It may also suggest that Tithonus detests her chariot because he knows that she has often engaged in extramarital affairs and the chariot represents her primary mode of transportation.

The adjective *invisa* has other potential references more closely associated with the Ovid's attitude toward Aurora. It suggests not only that Tithonus detests Aurora's chariot, but that Ovid himself does as well. This is a subtle reminder that Aurora's arrival is unwanted. In light of the list of occupations enumerated at 11ff., Ovid may even be suggesting that all of humankind abhors her chariot.

The adverb *mane* employed at 38 is a subtle allusion to the imperative form of *manere* at 3. For the second time Ovid is employing an adverb that fits with the context of the line while simultaneously reminding Aurora that he wants her to halt her arrival. This is also the second time that Ovid has employed *mane* together with the verb *surgere* in a line about rising early from one's bed. Perhaps Ovid has purposely placed *mane* in lines such as these in order to draw greater attention to his dislike of Aurora's early-rising.

Am. 1.13.39–40. Having been reminded of Tithonus' advancing age, Ovid now suggests that Aurora look for sexual fulfillment elsewhere. If she were to embrace a man like her

former lover Cephalus, then she would identify with Ovid's current predicament. She herself would feel impelled to cry out: "Run slowly, horses of the Night."

At 39, the word order mirrors Aurora's embraces. Her hands (*manibus*) and the participle (*complexa*), of which she is the subject, surround *Cephalum* in the word order. Ovid has no doubt purposely arranged this line to drive home his point.⁸⁷ By mimicking Aurora's potential embraces with a lover, he hopes that she will feel compelled to follow his advice. Ovid's hypothetical depiction of Aurora being embraced by a lover such as Cephalus at 39 is also a return to the theme of embracing lovers found at the start of the poem.

There are several subsidiary senses to *complector* and *teneo*. Both have various sexual senses.⁸⁸ *Complector* can mean "to grip, cling to," "to fasten together, interlock," and "to unite."⁸⁹ *Teneo* is also a common euphemism for clinging together during intercourse.⁹⁰ Together these verbs suggest not only that Aurora and her lover would exchange embraces, but that they would also cling together during the sexual act; not a particularly tactful implication on Ovid's part, especially in an appeal addressed to a goddess.

Ovid's introduction of Cephalus, one of Aurora's many former conquests, is pointed. Instead of alluding to one of her other lovers which also include, aside from

⁸⁷ For the idiom from which the phrase "...someone like so-and-so..." is derived, cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.14.33; *Ov. Rem.* 589; *Verg. Aen.* 4.328f.; *Prop.* 4.11.19. For embracing one's lover using the hands, see KENNEY 1958: 57; MOORE-BLUNT 1976: 123f.

⁸⁸ Cf. *Catull.* 11.

⁸⁹ See *OLD* s.v. 3a-b, 7e. Cf. *Prop.* 2.15.25; *Petron.* 79.8.

⁹⁰ See ADAMS 1982: 181.

Tithonus, Ares, Cleitus, and Orion, Ovid chooses to mention Cephalus.⁹¹ This must be because Aurora's affair with him was far from successful. The young ruler of Phocis, who was married to Procris, was abducted by Aurora while out hunting. He rejected her advances but was unwillingly forced into a love affair and was held captive by Aurora for eight years. She bore him a son Phaethon, but ultimately Cephalus still longed for his former wife and Aurora was forced to let him go.⁹²

This reminder of an unreciprocated and largely unsuccessful love affair does in fact damage Ovid's case. It is a bright move to suggest that if Aurora can identify with his plight she will heed his request, but by reminding Aurora of a former failed romance, Ovid is in fact pointing out to Aurora that she has been largely unsuccessful in her romantic endeavors and that most of them have come to an unhappy conclusion.⁹³ This may cause Aurora to become more envious of Ovid and his successful, happy liaison.

Moreover, reminding Aurora of Cephalus and the fact she once held him captive will bring to mind Ovid's implicit suggestion that she is currently keeping Tithonus captive in her bedchamber. This underscores the hopelessness of both romantic plights and the great lengths she has gone to in order to secure undying affection. Yet all of these attempts have come to nothing, and she is still left sexually unfulfilled.

⁹¹ For the mythological accounts of Aurora's other love affairs, see Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.4.4 (Ares); Hom. *Od.* 15.250f. (Cleitus); Hom. *Od.* 5.121–24 (Orion). Her affair with Orion, incidentally, also ended rather badly. After incurring the wrath of Artemis, her beloved was slain. Hesiod suggests that Aurora was also the consort of the Titan Astraeus (Hes. *Theog.* 378ff.; *RE* 2.1796).

⁹² For the mythological account of Cephalus' abduction, see Hes. *Th.* 986–87; Hyg. *Fab.* 189; Ov. *Met.* 7.672–862.

⁹³ These affairs include Orion, Cephalus, and Tithonus (whom, according to Ovid, Aurora actually married).

At 40, Ovid remarks that if Aurora were to engage in a love affair she would appeal to Night in the hope that her love-making might be prolonged.⁹⁴ This is an appeal Ovid himself makes throughout the poem. Although, he is addressing Aurora, not Night, this line is highly reminiscent of the *quo properas* refrain. Of course, Ovid does relate that he has often supplicated Night at 27. He asks the personification of Night something very similar to Aurora's imagined appeal at 40, namely that Night might fend off Aurora's advances so that Ovid can lie longer with his mistress. The expression *lente currite* is, in itself, quite comical. Oxymora such as this are not entirely uncommon, but in the context of this address Ovid is most certainly being purposely flippant.⁹⁵

Am. 1.13.41–42. This couplet contains two cheeky rhetorical questions directed toward Aurora. In a mock-querulous fashion, Ovid asks why his love life is suffering because her husband is old and decrepit. Surely it is not because of Ovid that she was forced to marry Tithonus.

The verb Ovid employs at 41, *plectere*, is used of punishments inflicted undeservedly.⁹⁶ The humour in its usage here is that Ovid has in fact knowingly worsened the situation and any punishment he endures will be deserved. Of course, Aurora cannot stay her course even if she wanted to, which also adds to the comedy of the situation, but Ovid himself has done little to ingratiate himself with her.

⁹⁴ Cf. Prop. 3.20.14.

⁹⁵ Cf. Augustus' favourite expression "σπεῦδε βραδέως"; Ov. *Met.* 1.510f.

⁹⁶ See MCKEOWN 1989: 360. Cf. Ov. *Epist.* 11.110, 21.55ff.

The verb *marcere* employed in the second half of 40, has several latent senses. Obviously it implies that Tithonus has become enfeebled in his old age, but it can also mean “to be withered or flabby, to droop.”⁹⁷ This conjures a particularly distasteful image of Tithonus’ flaccid penis, one which would no doubt detract even more from any of the remaining sentimental feelings Aurora may still have for her husband. Indeed, it would likely elicit feelings of anger.

Moreover, the proximity of *amans* and *vir*, which fall before and after the main caesura at 40, heightens the disparity between Ovid and Aurora’s respective situations. Ovid is a successful lover, still young and clearly virile; Aurora’s *vir*, on the other hand, is withered and feeble. Thus, Ovid, hoping to point out that he is suffering unjustly, is in fact drawing attention to all of the reasons why Aurora might want to punish him.

At 41, Ovid once again undermines his case while attempting to convince Aurora that he is free from fault. The line opens with the interrogative particle *num* in emphatic position. This suggests that Ovid is anticipating a negative answer to the question he is about to propose. But once again, in true Ovidian fashion, he cannot help but impudently point out the bleakness of Aurora’s situation while trying to exonerate himself.

As I have just noted, Ovid’s rhetorical question implies that he is not in fact to blame for Aurora’s sexless marriage. If he is not at fault, however, then the question remains: Who is responsible? The obvious answer is Aurora herself. Her marriage was not forced upon her. Aurora developed a passion for Tithonus, and she was the one who

⁹⁷ See *OLD* s.v. 1, 2.

abducted him. At that time, their union was perfect; Tithonus was still young and handsome, and she was sexually sated.

Of course, Aurora is to blame for botching her appeal to Jupiter. It is entirely her fault that she forgot to ask for eternal youth together with eternal life. Her sexless marriage is a predicament of her own making. Thus, Ovid's question has tacitly turned the blame around on Aurora herself. He has cheekily reminded her of the foolishness of her request and its unfortunate consequences. This will not put Aurora in a particularly favourable mood.

Ovid's use of *seni* at 42 highlights the humour of his question. As discussed above, Tithonus was in fact a virile youth when Aurora married him, not yet an old man; *iuveni* would be more appropriate given the context.⁹⁸ Instead, Ovid employs *senex* because he wishes to highlight the fact that Aurora is ultimately to blame for her husband's (everlasting) senescence.

Both variable feet of the pentameter line are also spondaic which may be suggestive of (mock-)mournfulness since Ovid is claiming that Aurora holds some sort of personal grudge against him on account of her unfortunate marriage. The repetition of "m" and "n" sounds reinforces the sombreness of the rhythm. The spondees may also reflect Aurora's (imagined) unwillingness to marry Tithonus as Ovid, apparently playing match-maker, drives her into an unwanted union.

⁹⁸ See MCKEOWN 1989: 361.

Am. 1.13.43–46. The final two couplets of Ovid's appeal comprise the *suasoria*'s *refutatio*.⁹⁹ We are to imagine that, if Aurora were given an opportunity to respond to Ovid's request, she would point out that it is not even within her power to slow her arrival. To counter Aurora's implied response, Ovid employs two final *exempla* to further his case. He points out that there is a precedent for delaying dawn's arrival. First he remarks that Luna granted many hours of sleep to the youth she loved. And Jupiter himself, father of the gods, joined two nights together to extend his love-making.

At 43, Ovid employs an argument similar to the one found at 37ff. He is suggesting that if Luna could successfully secure a mortal lover, Aurora should be able to do the same and also that Aurora should grant Ovid and his mistress as many nights of sleep as Luna granted Endymion. There is a great deal of humour in this line. First, Ovid is equating his situation with Endymion's when in fact it is the opposite. Luna was securing Endymion's affection by granting him everlasting youth and sleep so that she could visit him nightly. Ovid is not Aurora's lover, and thus she has no incentive to grant his request. If, however, Aurora were to follow Ovid's advice and take a lover, he would certainly benefit from her delayed arrival each morning.

Moreover, it seems as though Ovid is suggesting that he would not mind if Aurora were to grant him everlasting sleep. This would, however, significantly detract from his ability to actively engage in love affairs. Thus, it is not a particularly apt or persuasive *exemplum*.

⁹⁹ See Quint. *Inst.* 5.1.2.

Ovid's use of *iuvenis* at 43 contrasts with *senex* employed in the line above. This draws attention to the youthful beauty of Luna's lover and the senectitude of Aurora's husband. By pointing out that Luna's lover is a young man, Ovid is alluding to the request she made of Jupiter, namely that Endymion might be granted everlasting sleep and youth.¹⁰⁰ He is impertinently implying that if Aurora had followed Luna's example earlier she might have avoided her present predicament.

The emphatic placement of *Luna* at 44 highlights the contrast between her successful affair with a mortal and Aurora's bungled attempt. Moreover, Luna is Aurora's sister which would make her inclusion here even more hurtful. Ovid is essentially pointing out that Aurora's sister has been a more successful lover than she despite the fact that Aurora has a reputation for being promiscuous.

The remainder of 44, in which Ovid notes that Luna is no more beautiful than Aurora, may be another pointed insult. MCKEOWN suggests that, in the context of Ovid's rebuke, this line is probably an example of *litotes*.¹⁰¹ If this is the case, then Ovid is implying that Aurora is in fact less beautiful than her sister. This may account for Luna's amatory success which will once again arouse feelings of envy in Aurora.

At 45, Ovid exploits what is perhaps the most persuasive precedent for a deity protracting the length of the night. The line opens with the solemn periphrasis *ipse deum genitor*. This is highly reminiscent of the Homeric phrase “πατήρ ἄνδρων τε θεῶν τε”

¹⁰⁰ Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.7.5.

¹⁰¹ MCKEOWN 1989: 361.

which adds a mock-epic element to the line.¹⁰² (It is also particularly apt since Ovid is referencing the sexual act that brings the great hero Hercules into being.)¹⁰³

The syncopated genitive form of *deorum* at 45 is an archaism as is the noun *genitor*, which appears first in Ennius.¹⁰⁴ The use of stylistically elevated language flippantly employed in the context of an inverted kletic hymn once again adds to the perverse humour of the situation. Such lofty language in the context of Jupiter's extramarital affair with Alcmene, which was clandestinely executed while Amphitryon was away at war, is also highly comic.

By describing Jupiter as the father of the gods, Ovid is highlighting his supreme power. And if Jupiter himself desired to lengthen the night for amatory reasons, then Aurora should not lightly dismiss Ovid's request. Furthermore, he is suggesting that if Jupiter engaged in an extramarital affair that led him to protract the length of the night, then Aurora should follow the king of the gods example, being so much his inferior.

Ovid plants one final dig at Aurora in the second half of 45. Instead of suggesting that Jupiter prolonged the night because he wanted to spend more time with Alcmene, Ovid suggests that it was specifically because he did not wish to see Aurora.¹⁰⁵ Ovid himself has expressed similar sentiments at 9, 11ff., and 31. Thus, Ovid is irreverently

¹⁰² See Hom. *Il.* 1.544, etc. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.91; *Fast.* 3.285; *Trist.* 2.37; *TLL* 6.1818.68ff.

¹⁰³ See ELLIOT 1973: 130; MCKEOWN 1989: 361.

¹⁰⁴ MCKEOWN 1989: 361. The archaic form of *deorum* occurs 28 times in the Ovidian corpus.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Prop. 2.22A.25.

aligning his request with Jupiter's own desires in an attempt to convince Aurora not only that the common people despise her appearance, but that Jupiter himself does so too.

In more traditional accounts of the myth referenced at 45f., Jupiter is said to have extended the night because more time was needed to conceive so mighty a superhero as Hercules.¹⁰⁶ Thus, Ovid is deliberately distorting Jupiter's true intent in order to convince Aurora that she should stay her course. In addition, it is amusing that Aurora, whose power is far more limited than Jupiter's, cannot grant his request regardless.

Ovid's use of *sua vota* at 46 is particularly multivalent.¹⁰⁷ The noun *votum* can be used to mean simply "a desire, hope," but more commonly it means "a vow made to a god to do or offer something in return for the granting of the favour" or "a prayer."¹⁰⁸ To whom would the king of the gods be making a vow or praying? The discrepancy can be resolved by reading the phrase as another comic, albeit irreverent, extension of Ovid's own desires. He is suggesting that the king of the gods, like Ovid, was desperate for more time with his mistress. This is once again highly irreverent. Comically, the noun *votum* is also drawing attention to the more common practice of vowing to offer a deity something in return for granting the supplicant a favour. Ovid's approach has been the very opposite. He has not promised Aurora a favour, but instead he has insulted her at every opportunity.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Ov. *Epist.* 9.9f.; Sen. *Ag.* 814.

¹⁰⁷ The fact that Ovid says Jupiter wanted only "*duas...noctes*" with Alcmena is somewhat odd considering that three nights is more common, see OWEN 1967: 221–21; *RE* 1.1572f. It may be that Ovid opted for two instead of three days due to metrical constraints.

¹⁰⁸ See *OLD* s.v. 1a, 2, 3a.

3.6 The Closing Couplet (*Am.* 1.13.47–48)

Ovid's appeal/rant has come to its end. In the concluding couplet, Ovid suggests that Aurora hears his request and blushes. Nevertheless, the day dawns, as is customary, no later than usual.

At 47, the noun *iurgia*, which opens the line, suggests Ovid was aware that the tone of his appeal to Aurora was impudent. Nevertheless, unable to admit total defeat, he comically suggests that Aurora seemed to hear him but chooses to ignore his request.

The verb *rubere* is a witty final touch.¹⁰⁹ Ovid is implying that the goddess blushes, perhaps shamed by Ovid's account of her behaviour. Perhaps even more likely, she turns red out of anger. I believe that this reading holds truer, at least to Ovid's depiction of Aurora in the preceding lines. There is a clever verbal play on Aurora's Homeric epithet ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως, and of course as the sun rises the sky itself takes on a rosy hue. Thus, Ovid comically suggests that Aurora's rosy colour was the side-effect of his appeal, not the rising of the sun, which would certainly be the more logical explanation.

There is also a tricolon diminuendo in this line. Each of the three phrases contains two fewer syllables than the previous one (seven, five, and three). This, in addition to the parataxis, helps to wind down the high-intensity of Ovid's appeal in a succinct and subtle

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *Stat. Theb.* 5.296.

fashion. Ovid's concision also enhances the humour of the line by suggesting the speed with which his request is rejected after he has concluded his address.

Furthermore, the cold detachment with which he relates the final outcome of his forty-four-line-long harangue is typically Ovidian.¹¹⁰ The humour lies in the tonal contrast of this couplet when compared with preceding couplets. In just two lines, the mood has shifted from aggressive impertinence to apathy.

There is one example of ring structure, but several elements contribute to it. These multiple correspondences also underscore the ineffectiveness of Ovid's lengthy appeal and the unimpeded swiftness of Aurora's approach. The first element of note is the thematic link between the opening and closing couplets. The poem both begins and ends at daybreak. Moreover, the second line of the first couplet ends with the noun *diem* just as the final line of poem ends with *dies*. This neatly links both couplets while emphasizing the fact that day is about to dawn.

In addition, both couplets are completely free-standing, separate from the main sections of the poem. They both contain words emphasizing colour. At 2, Ovid draws attention to the colour of Aurora's hair (*flava*) as she mounts her chariot; at 47, Ovid describes the colour of Aurora's blush (*rubebat*).

¹¹⁰ See BARSBY 1973: 17.

CONCLUSION

In the preceding chapters, I have established that Ovid drew chiefly from the Meleagrian model when composing *Amores* 1.13. I have also examined the poem line by line in a literary-critical fashion, demonstrating that Ovid's lengthier and more developed version of the Meleagrian dawn epigram is far more ingenious and, ultimately, humorous than its literary predecessor. Ovid has taken a little-known and rarely-emulated theme of Hellenistic love epigram and built it up into something uniquely Ovidian.

Amores 1.13 must also be considered within the larger context of book one. Situated between *Amores* 1.12 and 1.14, it plays a particularly important role in the overall narrative structure of the book. In *Amores* 1.12, Ovid, spurned by his beloved in a letter delivered second-hand by her maidservant, weeps for his misfortune. In *Amores* 1.14, Ovid, now very much involved in his mistress' private life, chides her for dyeing her hair against his wishes.

Although Ovid's mistress, Corinna, is never explicitly named in the poem, *Amores* 1.13 serves almost as the narratological bridge between *Amores* 1.12 and 1.14. At 1.13, Ovid is at the high point of his nascent affair, desperate to preserve the perfection of each moment even as Aurora threatens to intrude upon his privacy. Having achieved romantic success after the rebuff of 1.12, Ovid longs to revel in his sexual triumph. 1.14, on the other hand, is a snapshot of the affair in its more developed stages. Ovid, now comfortable in his role as Corinna's lover, feels the need to advise her on aesthetic matters, just as he advised Aurora at 1.13 on matters of the heart.

The affair with Corinna has not all been smooth sailing for Ovid. In 1.12, he struggled to arrange a clandestine meeting, and again in 1.13, even after achieving sexual success, Aurora threatens to interrupt his enjoyment, providing yet another obstacle to overcome. Aurora was a blonde, and Ovid cruelly spurned her in 1.13. In 1.14, after a comic turn of events, Ovid is now forced to part unwillingly with his girlfriend's flaxen hair.

In 1.12, the poem concludes with a curse uttered against the writing tablets that bore him the bad news of his mistress' inability to meet in secret. Ovid asks: "*quid precor iratus...?*" The theme of praying while angry carries over into 1.13. It is, of course, a theme developed in greater detail, but nonetheless alluded to at 1.12.29.

In the final couplets of 1.14, Ovid remarks that his hairless girlfriend will be forced to purchase a Gallic wig, which will cause her to blush (*rubebis*) whenever she receives compliments on it. At 1.14.52, Corinna's cheeks turn red (*picta rubore genas*) in response to Ovid's unfeeling monologue. This reminds the reader of Aurora who also blushed, angered by Ovid's impertinence. The comically impassioned diatribe of 1.14 is also highly reminiscent of Ovid's appeal in 1.13.

In the grand scheme of book one as a whole, *Amores* 1.13 affords the reader deeper insight into Ovid's poetic mindset. As BARSBY notes, the *Amores* is not simply aimed at following in the footsteps of Ovid's elegiac predecessors, it is about mocking standard poetic tropes and themes and creating new settings for tired, hackneyed ideas.¹

¹ BARSBY 1973: 16–18.

Amores 1.13 is a perfect example of this technique. Ovid has deftly integrated many stock motifs and routinely ridicules his poetic predecessors for taking the game of love so seriously.

Amores 1.13 advances our estimation of Ovid's poetic ingenuity. The combination of the inverted kletic hymn, mock-*suasoria*, the many allusions to Homer and Roman authors, and the exploitation of Hellenistic leitmotifs is certainly unparalleled in the elegiac corpus. This poem is a particularly perfect example of Ovid's poetic *raison d'être*—rife with cheeky humour and Ovidian innovation.

Ovid's role *qua* lover is more difficult to pin down. His mistress falls by the wayside relatively early on in the poem, and we learn little more about her. Ultimately, *Amores* 1.13 is meant to be a comical, ingenious, and largely controversial examination of (what must have been) a common erotic quandary: How exactly does one secure more time in bed with one's mistress at the break of day?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. N. (1982). *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London: Duckworth.
- Appel, G. (1975). *De Romanorum precationibus*. New York: Arno Press.
- Armstrong, R. (2005). *Ovid and His Love Poetry*. London: Duckworth.
- Audollent, A. (1904). *Defixionum tabellae*. Paris: Fontemoing.
- Barringer, J. M. (2001). *The Hunt in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Barsby, J. (1973). *Ovid: Amores Book I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beckby, H. (1963). *Anthologia graeca*. München: E. Heimeran.
- Berette, P. E. (1996). *A Critical Appreciation of the Amatory Epigrams of Dioscorides*. M.A. thesis, McMaster University.
- Bettenworth, A. (2007). "The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, edd. P. Bing and J. S. Bruss. Leiden: Brill.
- Bömer, F. (1969). *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen Buch I–III*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Bonner, S. F. (1977). *Education in Ancient Rome: From the elder Cato to the younger Pliny*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bornecque, H. (1930). *Ovide: les Amours*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les belles lettres."
- Burman, P. (1727) *P. Ovidii Nasonis opera omnia*. Amsterdam: Apud Waesbergios, Boom, Goethals.
- Carson, A. (1998). *Eros the Bittersweet*. London: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Cairns, F. (1989). *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1972). *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Clack, J. (1992). *Meleager: The Poems*. Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Clark, A. (2008). *Desire: A History of European Sexuality*. New York: Routledge.
- Clausen, W. V. (1955). "Silva coniecturarum." *AJPh* 76.47–62.
- Couat, A. H. (1882). *La poésie Alexandrine sous les trois premiers Ptolémées*. Paris: Hachette.

- Courtney, E. (1980). *A Commentary on the Satire of Juvenal*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Day, A. A. (1938). *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Depew, M. and D. Obbink, eds. (2000) *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Dübner, F. (1864–72). *Anthologia Palatina*. Paris: Firmin Didot & Co.
- Edwards, G. M. (1894). “P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores.” In *Corpus poetarum Latinorum*, ed. J. P. Postgate. London: G. Bell.
- Elliot, A. G. (1973–74). “‘Amores’ 1.13: Ovid’s Art.” *CJ* 69.127–32.
- Fränkel, H. F. (1945). *Ovid: A Poet Between Two Worlds*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gantz, T. (1996). *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources, vol. 1*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Garofeanu, D. (2008). *The Classical Spring Poem*. Ph.D. thesis, McMaster University.
- Garrison, D. H. (1978). *Mild Frenzy: A Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Gow, A. S. F. and D. L. Page. (1965). *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1966). “Antipater of Thessalonica: Notes and Queries.” *CR* 16.5–9.
- Gransden, K. W. (1979). “*Lente currite, Noctis equi*: Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde*, 3.1422–70, Done, *The Sun Rising* and Ovid, *Amores* 1.13.” In *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, edd. D. A. West and A. J. Woodman, 157–71, 235–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gutzwiller, K. (2012). “Catullus and the *Garland* of Meleager” In *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers*, ed. I. Du Quesnay and T. Woodman, 79–111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2007). “The Paradox of Amatory Epigram.” In *Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, edd. P. Bing and J. S. Bruss. Leiden: Brill.
- (1998). *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1997). “The Poetics of Editing in Meleager’s *Garland*.” *TAPhA* 127.169–200.
- Hall, J. B. (1982). “A Note on Ovid, *Amores* 1.13.19–20.” *LCM* 7.92.

- Hatto, A. T. (1965). *Eos: An Enquiry into the Theme of Lovers' Meetings and Partings at Dawn in Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Heinsius, N. (1661). *Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis edition nova*. Amsterdam: Apud Abrahamum Wolfgang.
- Hiller, E. and O. Crusius. (1907). *Anthologia lyrica*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Höschele, R. (2009). "Meleager and Heliodora: A Love Story in Bits and Pieces?" In *Plotting with Eros: Essays on the Poetics of Love and the Erotics of Reading*, ed. I. Nilsson, 99–134. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1988). *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keith, A., ed. (2011). *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kenney, E. J. (1961). *Amores; Medicamina faciei feminae; Ars amatoria; Remedia amoris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1958). "Notes on Ovid." *CQ* 8.54–66.
- Körte, A. (1929). *Hellenistic Poetry*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lee, G. (1968). *Ovid's Amores*. London: John Murray.
- Liveley, G. (2005). *Ovid: Love Songs*. London: Duckworth.
- Loibel, E. and D. L. Page. (1963). *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ludwig, W. (1967). "Kunst der Variation im Liebesepigramm." *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 14.299–334.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1980). *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mack, S. (1988). *Ovid*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mackail, J. W. (1906). *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. London: Longmans, Green.
- MacLachlan, B. (1989). "What's Crawling in Sappho Fr. 130?" *Phoenix* 43.95–99.
- Madvig, I. N. (1873). *Adversaria critica ad scriptores Graecos et Latinos*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Martinon, P. (1897). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores, Les Amours d'Ovides*. Paris: Fontemoing.

- McKeown, J. C. (1989). *Ovid: Amores. Volume II: A Commentary on Book One*. Leeds: ARCA.
- Moore-Blunt, J. (1978). "Two Epigrams by Meleager." *Emerita* 46.83–89.
- (1976). "Ovid, *Amores* 1.13: Three Textual Problems." *LCM* 1.121–24.
- Müller, J. (1932). "Das zyklische Prinzip in der Lyrik." *GMR* 20.1–20.
- Müller, U. (1971). "Ovid 'Amores'—*alba—tageliet*—. Typ und Gegentyp des 'Tagesliedes' in der Liebesdichtung der Antike und des Mittelalters." *DVJ* 45.451–80.
- Munari, F. (1951). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores*. Florence: Nuova Italia.
- Murgatroyd, P. (2005). *Mythical and Legendary Narratives in Ovid's Fasti*. Leiden: Brill.
- Némethy, G. (1907). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores*. Budapest: Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae.
- Norden, E. (1957). *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner.
- Ouvré, H. (1894). *Méléagre de Gadara*. Paris: Hachette.
- Owen, S. G. (1967). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium liber secundus*. Amsterdam: A. N. Hakkert.
- Patton, W. R. (1916–18). *The Greek Anthology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Peacock, A. J. (1975). "Donne's Elegies and Roman Love Elegy." *Hermathena* 119.20–29.
- Piazzi, L. (2013). "Latin love elegy and other genres." In *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, ed. T. S. Thorsen, 224–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pinsent, J. (1969). *Myths and Legends of Ancient Greece*. London: Hamlyn.
- Race, W. H. (1988). *Classical Genres and English Poetry*. London: Croom Helm.
- Riese, A. (1871). *P. Ovidius Naso*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Ryan, M. B. and C. A. Perkins. (2011). *Ovid's Amores, Book One: A Commentary*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press
- Sabot, A.-F. (1976). *Ovide, poète de l'amour dan ses oeuvres de jeunesse*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Showerman, G. (1914). *Ovid, Heroides and Amores*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sigal, G. (1996). *Erotic Dawn-Songs of the Middle Ages: Voicing the Lyric Lady*. Florida: University Press of Florida.

- Symonds, J. A. (1893). *Studies of the Greek Poets*. Lonon: A. and C. Black.
- Tarán, S. L. (1979). *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Love Epigram*. Leiden: Brill.
- Waltz, P. (1960). *Anthologie grecque: Anthologie palatine (Livre V)*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les belles lettres."
- Watson, A. (1971). *Roman Private Law Around 200 B.C.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1955). *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, G. W. (1978). *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Withof, J. H. (1798). *Conjecturen über verschiedene Lateinische Dichter und Prosaiker*. Düsseldorf: Dänzer.
- Ypsilanti, M. (2005). "Literary Loves as Cycles: From Meleager to Ovid." *AC* 74.83–110.