

“Occasional Moles”

The Establishment of an Ovidian Novelty

KEIRAN CARSON (Bury St Edmunds)

Abstract – An intriguing passage in Seneca the Elder contains an anecdote, which details the suggested removal of three lines from Ovid’s works; two lines are preserved (am. 2,11,10 & ars 2,24), the third omitted. When it has received attention, the anecdote tends to attract a provision of a line from the Ovidian corpus to solve the mystery. I propose to deal with the anecdote in a slightly different manner and focus instead upon the two known lines to seek to understand why these particular verses were selected. I shall provide the Senecan passage to contextualise the controversy and then fully survey how the two known lines have previously been interpreted. Thereafter, a methodology, based on common rhetorical peculiarities, will be outlined to test whether or not these lines are unique. Initially, I shall use the methodology as a gauge on the Ovidian lines previously suggested as a solution to the mystery, to establish whether the methodology can further corroborate any of these hypotheses. The range will then be broadened to include the entire Ovidian corpus. Finally, the investigation will be extended to a wide range of Greek and Latin pentametric lines. The primary purpose of this article is to gauge how singular the criticised rhetoric actually is within the entirety of classical elegiac poetry; as such, no attention will be paid to the dating of the verse: poetry prior to, contemporary with, and posterior to Ovid’s works will be investigated. My methodology will show that the two known lines are indeed rhetorically unique and support the reasoning for their isolation by Seneca; it will also demonstrate that if the third line shared the same rhetorical peculiarities (this, of course, need not be so), it is no longer extant in the Ovidian corpus.

Keywords – Ovid, Ovidian aesthetics, Seneca the Elder, lacunae, missing verses, literary mysteries, elegiac poetry, pentameter, rhetoric, compound adjectives, parallelism, mirrored syntax, Grecisms

0. *Testimonium: Seneca, Controversiae 2,2,12* *

Declamabat autem Naso raro controversias et non nisi ethicas; libentius dicebat suasorias: molesta illi erat omnis argumentatio. Verbis minime licenter usus est nisi in carminibus, in quibus non ignoravit vitia sua, sed amavit. Manifestum potest esse, quod rogatus aliquando ab amicis suis, ut tolleret tres versus, invicem petit, ut ipse tres exciperet, in quos nihil illisliceret. Aequa lex visa est; scripserunt illi quos tolli vellent secreto, hic quos tutos esse vellent: in utrisque codicillis idem versus erant, ex quibus primum fuisse narrabat Albinovanus Pedo, qui inter arbitros fuit:

Semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem;

Secundum:

Et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum.

Tertium:

.....

Ex quo adparet summi ingenii viro non iudicium defuisse ad compescendam licentiam carminum suorum, sed animum. Aiebat interim decentiorem faciem esse, in qua aliquis naevos esset.

But Naso used to declaim *controversiae* rarely, and none at all except ethical ones; he used to state *suasoriae* more enthusiastically. Every adducement of proof was irritating to him. He did not employ his words without restraint except in his poems, in which he did not ignore his faults, but loved (them). Evidence is able to be (supplied for this, by) the fact that, when once asked by his friends to remove three verses, he asks in turn that he himself make an exception of three (verses), against which no permission be granted to them. The condition seemed fair; the friends wrote in secret the verses which they wished to be removed, he, those which he wished to be safe(ly retained). In both notebooks the verses were the same. Albinovanus Pedo, who was among the judges, reported that the first verse was:

Semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem

* I should like to record my thanks to Professor Fögen, Professor Ingleheart and the anonymous reviewer arranged by the *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* for their careful readings of earlier drafts, their perceptive criticisms, and bibliographical recommendations.

The second:

Et gelidum Borean egelidumque Notum

The third:

.....

From this (anecdote) it appears that the man of the utmost talent did not lack the critical acumen to check the lack of restraint in his poems, but the intention. Sometimes he used to say that a face, on which someone had moles, was more attractive.¹

1. Introduction

The above anecdote has several problems, which should be addressed, before plunging into the investigation proper. Since only two lines are cited, there is an obvious textual difficulty.² Müller's (1887, 136) *apparatus criticus* shows that *tertium* has no corroboration from the manuscript tradition, but is added to indicate the suspected *lacuna*. Ramia (2014, 89-90), reliant on Winterbottom's (1974, 265) treatment of the Senecan narrative, suggests that the textual difficulty here is capable of two answers: either there is an omission and the third line

¹ All translations in the article are the author's own. It has been pointed out to me by Professor Fögen that the final line is capable of an alternative understanding by taking *interim* with the accusative and infinitive construction rather than *aiebat*; i.e. "He used to say that *sometimes* a face was more beautiful, etc.". Such an interpretation would naturally qualify the employment of rhetorical flourishes to occasional, rather than habitual, use. It should also be observed that the conclusion finds earlier echoes within erotic poetry and oratorical criticism. The lyricist Alcaeus was reportedly attracted by the flaw of a mole on a boy's finger, see Cic. N. D. 1,28,79. The example of a facial flaw aiding attractiveness is later found in Mart. 7,25,26. For further examples of the range of recycled biographical traits or transferred anecdotes for Graeco-Roman literary figures, see Fairweather 1974, 259-261. 266-268. Nevertheless, the trope of a lover's blindness is conventional, cf. Lucr. 4,1153-1169; Hor. sat. 1,3,38-40. Beyond the erotic topos, the use of *naevus* finds precedence: note the use of *maculosa*, when Encolpius details rhetorical flaws in Petron. 2,6,2.

² On the generally corrupt nature of Seneca's text, see most recently Winterbottom 2019, 16-43, where varied discussion of emendations, interpretations, and omissions are provided for the corpus.

cited by Seneca has been lost in the course of its manuscript transmission or the third line was unknown to, or forgotten by, Seneca himself when recording the anecdote.³ The upshot of these two options is profound for those who are in the pursuit of the missing line. If the first option is accepted, the whole Ovidian corpus is open for the search; if, however, the second option is believed, it becomes less likely that the famous Ovidian works contain the omission. Thus, it is more plausibly found among the poet's juvenilia or the first edition of the *Amores*. As these works are no longer available, the fragments of the poet's work are the only recourse left to us.⁴ Beyond the textual difficulties the setting of the anecdote raises further complications, the corollary of which would likewise delimit the range of Ovidian works that should be treated in the inquiry. Although no geographical setting is indicated, it is very hard to imagine the convivial party happening after Ovid's exile to Tomis. Therefore, a Roman, or at the very least an Italian, setting is to be imagined. If this is so, it would naturally exclude those works written in Ovid's exilic period.⁵ There

³ It is disputable whether or not Seneca referred to texts or relied solely on his own memory in his composition of the *Suasoriae* and the *Controversiae*. For the important literary and thematic use of memory in Seneca's work see Gunderson 2003, 29-58; Trinacty 2009, 260 similarly raises the problem without taking any definitive stance; Fairweather 1981, 37-42, after extended discussion, leans towards the conclusion that written aids were used by Seneca and the promotion of memory instead of written evidence should be grounded in the Platonic tradition, which was hostile to writing over memory.

⁴ As will be seen later, a number of scholars – including Scarcia 2000, Ballester 2013, and Ramia 2014 – have identified a line from the Ovidian fragments to answer the issue.

⁵ Among the scholars to make this point, Wheeler 1925, 11 is an early representative. His reasons are not particularly convincing, as he limits the anecdote to Ovid's early period on the basis that the amicable poetic challenge smacks of youthful bravado and playfulness in its tone. Recent scholars have likewise stressed the dating of the anecdote to support their conclusions, including Ballester 2013, 27 and Ramia 2014, 89. Initially, Ramia is somewhat hesitant, as he notes that Seneca's text is written after 37 AD and would theoretically permit any Ovidian verse being identified. Thereafter, however, he stresses that the poetic judgement must have happened prior to Ovid's exile and consequently excludes all the exilic poetry from the range of options. For those who subscribe to the minority view that Ovid's exile was merely a literary fiction, the problem

are also several doubts expressed about the authenticity of the anecdote. These criticisms never actually state a convincing reason for the doubt cast. The most explicit criticism is voiced by Frecault (1972, 53), who suggests that the anecdote seems too good to be true and that Ovid must have been endowed with incredible perspicacity to anticipate his friends' suggestions.⁶ Along this line of argumentation may be included criticisms which deem the style of the two known lines as so characteristically Ovidian as to exclude any clear identification for the third verse.⁷ An unequivocal assertion along these lines is

is removed. I do not share it myself; for the history of the thesis see van der Velden 2020, 336-342.

- ⁶ Further baseless undermining of the anecdote is found hinted at in Fraenkel 1945, 7, Sharrock 1994, 129 and Ramia 2014, 89. Professor Ingleheart has pointed out to me that the flavour of the piece, concentrating on Ovid's love of his own faults, "smacks of biographical invention". For the general role of anecdotes in Latin literature, see Haight 1940, for a rather uncritical overview, and Saller 1980, whose work on the problems accruing around anecdotal evidence for the principate is capable of, and invites, wider application. Fairweather 1974 provides abundant pabulum for the fictions that creep into ancient biography.
- ⁷ Ancient criticisms on Ovid's indulgence of rhetorical embellishments are found elsewhere: Seneca the Elder (contr. 9,5,17) notes that Scaurus dubbed Montanus "the Ovid among rhetoricians", due to his inability to leave well alone in his speeches. Quintilian (inst. 10,1,88) deems Ovid's epic poetry contaminated through his characteristic license; he reiterates the sentiment (inst. 10,1,98) by noting that, if Ovid regulated his tendencies, his poetry would be much improved, as his tragedy *Medea* demonstrated. Against these criticisms it should be recalled that Seneca the Elder (contr. 7,1,27) also records evidence of the pithiness and restraint that Ovid could exercise. When appraising the following hexameter by Varro of Atax (*omnia noctis erant placida composita quiete*), Ovid reportedly suggested the line would be improved, were the final hemistich deleted and the sentiment concluded at the caesura. Seneca's mixed appraisal of Ovid's work – contrasted to Quintilian's more negative assessment – can helpfully be compared to the appraisal concerning Ovid's friend Junius Gallio; see Pont. 4,11. Gallio had strong connections with the Senecan family and even adopted one of Seneca's sons – Lucius Iunius Gallio Annaeanus. Consequently, he is portrayed by Seneca (contr. 10, pr. 13) as a prominent and expert declaimer. Nevertheless, later writers on oratory tend to condemn Gallio's rhetorical baubles in a way reminiscent of Ovidian excess: he is explicitly criticised by Tacitus because of his *tinnitus* (jingling) and is linked with Maecenas' bombastic oratory; see Tac. dial. 26,1. Quintilian similarly disparages Gallio's oratorical style by comparison at inst. 9,2,91. Fashions naturally change over time, but it is interest-

made by Wheeler (1925, 10): “the third verse is not given, but any reader could easily find hundreds in Ovid that would serve”.⁸ Finally, for a later parallel to the Senecan anecdote recorded in the Ovidian tradition, see the following manuscripts: *Freiburg University Library* Ms. 380 and *British Library* Ms. Harley 219.⁹

The consequences of the above for my article are as follows. When trying to identify Ovid’s absent line, which is of secondary importance to my investigation, verses from the pre-exilic poetry will

ing to note that Seneca can unequivocally praise Gallio’s style, whilst displaying a more tempered judgement on Ovid’s. Both seem – the loss of Gallio’s work necessarily hampers any conclusiveness – to have broadly shared similar rhetorical traits.

⁸ In this light, consider also Foster 1909, 55 – who provides three alternatives for the missing line and adds that there are many pentameters in Ovid with similar repetitions – and Ramia 2014, 78.

⁹ These manuscripts record a story concerned with Ovid’s best and worst lines. The emphasis adjusts from one concerned with aesthetics to morality as the arbiter, and from a pagan to a Christian context. In the tale two 13th century clerics travelled to Ovid’s tomb in Tomis; they then considered among themselves which Ovidian verse should be deemed best, and which worst. Thereafter, Ovid’s ghost supposedly appeared and selected two verses from *Heroides* in answer. His best was from epist. 17,98 (*est virtus placitis abstinnisse bonis*; some editions prefer *licitis* for *placitis*), which outlines Helen’s assertion that virtue shuns even pleasurable (or permitted) joys; the worst is provided by Phaedra’s attempts to seduce Hippolytus through an appeal to the precedent of Jupiter’s banishment of moral scruples in epist. 4,133 (*Iuppiter esse pium statuit, quodcumque inuaret*). The text here is a little marred and the sentiment often reduced to a pentametric version (*omne iuvans statuit Iuppiter esse pium*); the *appendix criticus* to Palmer’s edition (1898, 22-23) for line 132 demonstrates that a number of verses were thought to be added by *pessimi poetae* immediately after the line. Without getting bogged down in textual critical matters concerning the authenticity or authorship of these two lines or rehashing whether the double letters – to which epist. 17,98 belongs – are Ovidian or not, the entirely bogus tale shows itself as a clear later parallel to Seneca’s anecdote and its concern with Ovidian criticism. For details on the anecdote see Rand 1925, 138 and Goldschmidt 2018, 101-102; Dimmick 2002, 274 offers a reading which unites the two anecdotes and amplifies the points treated here. Aside from comparable controversies within the Ovidian tradition, Seneca the Elder provides another similarly tantalising problem concerning a supposedly Virgilian quotation. As the present footnote is already quite lengthy, this controversy has been placed in an appendix for those interested.

carry more weight. However, for the primary focus of my article – which investigates a wide range of Latin and Greek elegiac poetry to gauge the frequency of such rhetorical features exhibited in the two known lines – the criticisms above carry no weight at all. Once the methodology is established to investigate the rhetoric in these works the veracity of the Senecan anecdote is immaterial and it will remain to be seen whether “hundreds” of similar verses can be found in Ovid and other poetry of the same metre.

As the anecdote itself has now been contextualised, it is a convenient place to present an overview of the various scholarly interpretations that coalesce around the two known lines, before detailing the methodology to be adopted. Five broad categories (structure, stylistic effects, intertextual antecedents, later imitations, and originality) will suffice to accommodate an appraisal of each line’s distinctiveness and demarcate their shared characteristics to inform the methodology.

2. Amores 2,11,10 (*et gelidum Borean egelidosque Notos*)

The line has marked structural and stylistic interest: the pentameter employs both parallelism and repetition. As McKeown (1998, 236-237) observes, these features are found elsewhere in Ovid even in the later exilic poetry and among hexametric works.¹⁰ The use of *-que* to coordinate the repetition in the second hemistich, further marks this line as an example of *versus echoici*.¹¹ Maltby (1999, 382-384) includes the Ovidian line (alongside epist. 4,112) as a later example of Tibullus’ innovative use of this device. Although Tibullus is not given to Ovid’s overly rhetorical iteration, Maltby makes several significant points for *versus echoici*: the feature was distinctively Tibullan and unemployed by Propertius; the style is markedly Hellenistic and frequently betrayed its origin by being heavily employed by Tibullus in poems noted for their Hellenistic background; it was frequently used by Tibullus as a

¹⁰ For later pentametric examples see Ov. trist. 4,7,16 & 18. Both lines will be treated later; line 16 (*tergeminumque virum tergeminumque canem*) with its parallelism and repetition comfortably meets both outlined requirements. For a hexametric comparison, see Ov. met. 1,325-326.

¹¹ I.e. either the repetition of a word at the beginning and end of the couplet or at the start of each hemiepes in the pentameter.

distinctive closure device. In the two Ovidian examples cited, Maltby stresses the use of Greek proper names (e.g. Boreas, Notus) seem calculated by Ovid to point to the Hellenistic aesthetic. Conflicting views have been advanced with reference to the originality of the line. In Wilkinson's (1955, 21-23) discussion of the largely formulaic features of the *propempticon* (am. 2,11), he singles this line out (alongside a few others) as being so distinctively Ovidian that it provides an individual stamp to a hackneyed theme. Boyd (1997, 25), by contrast, is at pains to show the imitative nature of am. 2,11,9-10. Her discussion focuses on the catalogue of winds provided by Homer.¹² Boyd notes that in Virgil's imitation of the line (Aen. 1.85-86), only the opening pair of winds are named; she deems Ovid's couplet, with the use of all four Homeric winds, as a poetic form of one-upmanship against Virgil's earlier Homeric allusion. The use of the rare compound *egeliðus* provokes varied commentary. McKeown (1998, 237-238) notes the prefix is ambiguous and deliberately selected to mark both comparison and distinction: it could be deemed privative ("not cold") or intensive ("very cold").¹³ Elsewhere Wills (1996, 451), when treating the stylistic effect of repetition through compounds, believes that the line has a Catullan echo. By noting that am. 2,10 thematically and linguistically recalls Catull. 64 and that the use of the rare compound *egeliðus* may similarly recall Catull. 46,1, Wills suggests that the repetition and the twinning of Greek proper nouns may be felt in Catull.

¹² Hom. Od. 5,295-296: σὺν δ' Εὖρος τε Νότος τ' ἔπεσον Ζέφυρός τε δυσαῖς / καὶ Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης, μέγα κῆμα κολίνδων.

¹³ A range of citations support either interpretation. The hot or cold temperature of the South wind is also furnished with examples. In passing, it may be noted that the identification of the South wind as warm (*tepidus* [...] *Notus*) in Ovid's work (Ib. 34) is used by Radford 1927, 360-361, among other instances of repeated phrases in the two poets, to argue for the Ovidian authorship of Lygdamus' poetry, see Tib. 3,4,96 (*tepidus* [...] *Notos*). Radford's reasoning is that Ovid and Lygdamus are the only Latin poets, who describe the South wind as warm rather than cold. Nevertheless, as McKeown's citations show, the later prose works of Pliny the Elder and Seneca the Younger also provide instances of *Notus* as a warm wind. Elsewhere, Lygdamus is identified as Ser. Sulpicius Rufus or Sulpicius Postumius, who is variously interpreted as the brother or father of the poetess Sulpicia, the nephew of Messalla, or the uncle of Ovid's third wife; see Syme 1978, 116; Butrica 1993; Lewis 2013, 167-173.

31,1-5 (*paene insularum, Sirmio, insularumque / [...] Thuniam atque Bithunos*). Later echoes of the line include: three lines from a choral ode, Phaedr. 1129-1131, by Seneca the Younger, an author similarly censured on stylistic grounds by Quintilian;¹⁴ and a hexametric line from Nonnos' *Dionysiaca* 39,112.¹⁵ Furthermore, Boreas and Notus are coupled in the same *sedes* of a pentametric line by Claudian *Carmina Graeca Epigramma* 5,2 (= A.G. 1,5,3);¹⁶ *et gelidus* elsewhere begins a pentametric line at A.L. 202,8 (= Shackleton Bailey A.L. 151,8).

3. Ars amatoria 2,24 (*semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem*)

This line, famed for its mannerism, is deemed so characteristically Ovidian that it is frequently employed to explain or excuse other suspect elements in Ovid's corpus. Wilkinson (1955, 84), for instance, uses it to portray Ovid as a "juggler of words", when defending the authenticity of epist. 3,3-10: the marked epanalepsis of these lines earlier led to their rejection by Lachman. Nagle's (1994, 193-194) review of Keith's work references the line to support a supposed bilingual pun at fast. 2,89: the phrase *sine lite* is rendered *alite*, as if the preposition functioned as a Greek privative alpha. Differing assessments of the line attribute various motives for the suitability of the rhetorical style to match the subject. In Fraenkel's (1945, 7-8. 183) verdict the line betrays a 'modernist' streak that opposed accepted critical standards. Nevertheless, Fraenkel counters any criticism of the line's rhetorical superfluity by noting that the parallelism perfectly captures the essence of the minotaur. He shows that Ovid elsewhere used comparable rhetorical techniques to capture the creature's dual form, cf. epist. 2,70. 10,102. 10,127. One may add here Coleman's (2010, 283-286) identification of Ovid's harnessing of stylistic flaws to artistic effect: she shows that the minotaur is elsewhere marked by pro-

¹⁴ *Euros excipiunt, excipiunt Notos, / insani Boreae minas / imbriferumque Corum*; see McKeown 1998, 237. On Seneca the Younger's use of Ovid see Maguiness 1956 and Coffey / Mayer 1990, 13-15.

¹⁵ Εὐρον ἀκοντίζοντα καὶ αἰχμαζόντα Βορῆα; see McKeown 1998, 237.

¹⁶ τίς πῆξεν; Βορέης ἢ τίς ἔλυσε Νότος. It should be noted that the linking of Boreas and Notus occurs in other positions in poetry: compare e.g. the hexametric opening of A.G. 1,5,3 (οὐ νότος, οὐ βορέης).

nounced jingling in the cacemphaton at epist. 10,71 (*moretere recurvo*). In Lateiner's (1990, 226) estimation, Ovid's style is distinctly avant-garde. Mathematically symmetrical arrangement, sound effects, repetition are each carefully delineated: the catalogued effects include the fact that each hemiepes is composed of seven syllables spread across two words with repeated prefix *semi-* to distinguish the minotaur's split nature; the chiasitic arrangement; the reiteration of every syllable in the second hemiepes; the pause at the diaeresis; the onomatopoeic alliteration of M and V sounds, suggestive of lowing cattle. By contrast, Sharrock (1994, 129-131) takes the couplet (ars 2,23-24) as her focus. She considers the hybrid composition of elegiac verse (hexameter + pentameter) ideally depicts the two hybrid characters: the half man / bird Daedalus and the half man / bull minotaur. Sharrock argues the stately hexameter line with its spondaic core and alliteration achieve an epic effect for Daedalus; the rapid rhythm and tonal change in the pentameter aid the change of focus to the minotaur.

The line's intertextual background is interesting. Rusten (1982, 332-333) observes that the phrasing, sentiment and central ideas depend upon a passage from Empedocles' poem *Περὶ φύσεως*.¹⁷ Of particular note is the use of comparable compounds to characterise monstrous forms. Rusten notes, however, that Ovid's innovation is to contract Empedocles' four lines and four compound adjectives into a single line using two compound adjectives. Beyond Greek scientific literature, Wills (1996, 416) sees the line as engaging with an iambic line from Catull. 4,27: *et gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris*.¹⁸ Ars 2,24 became symptomatic of Ovid's own rhetorical style and generated later imitations. The most ingenious of these is found in Milton *elegiae* 1,5,122 (*semicaperque Deus, semideusque caper*).¹⁹ As Godolphin (1940, 355) perceptively notes, Milton is not only aping Ovid's criticised

¹⁷ πολλὰ μὲν ἀμφιπρόσωπα καὶ ἀμφίστερνα φύεσθαι / βουγενὴ ἀνδρόπρωτρα, τὰ δ' ἔμπαλιν ἐξανατέλλειν / ἀνδροφυῇ βούκρανα, μεμειγμένα τῇ μὲν ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν / τῇ δὲ γοναικοφυῇ σκιεροῖς ἡσκημένα γυίοις.

¹⁸ The Catullan line was humorously adapted *verbatim* elsewhere in *Catalepton* 10,25.

¹⁹ Limitations of space have necessitated the avoidance of Neo-Latin poetry in the later overview of pentametric lines, but Milton's line demonstrates that such an extension may prove worthwhile.

technique, but also beating Ovid at his own game; the initial hemiepes is taken from fast. 4,752 and then, through parallelism and repetition, is made even more Ovidian than the original. Besides Milton's version, a later attempt to capture the nature of a half-man / half-bull may also be mentioned in this context cf. Drac. satisf. 38 (*et qui homo bos fuerat de bove factus homo est*).

The line has commanded a mass of comment on individual rhetorical features that mark its individuality. Wills (1996, 277-278. 414-416. 436) identifies three distinct methods of repetition in the line: 1) mirrored syntax through synonymous phrases; 2) parallel half lines divided at the caesura or diaeresis; 3) repetition involving simple and compound versions of the same word. The literary antecedents for these methods of repetition are illuminating and varied. The first method is prominent in Horace and Ovid; the second is favoured by Propertius and Ovid, rare in Tibullus and Martial;²⁰ the third betrays Alexandrian origins and is attested in earlier Latin poetry.²¹ The use of the compound *semibos* warrants further attention. Both Fairweather (1981, 199) and Ramia (2014, 91) consider it an Ovidian neologism. This may be so (the absence of so much classical literature makes all such pronouncements tentative); nevertheless, the adoption of Empedocles' poem within the line somewhat nullifies the originality. However, when we consider the literary tastes of Ovid's patron, Mesalla, and his rhetorical teacher, Arellius Fuscus, the aesthetic use of the compound gains significance. It may first be observed that the use of the compound transgresses Tibullan standards; Maltby (1999, 386-387. 396-397) demonstrates Tibullus' eschewal of compound adjectives and Ovid's more innovative employment of them. Contrariwise, by recalling the Greek model of the line, the use here accords with Mesalla's avoidance of Grecisms: Mesalla was famed for his *latinitas* and would habitually translate a Greek term for a Latin equiv-

²⁰ It should be noted that Propertius tends to employ the device for closural purposes.

²¹ For Hellenistic antecedents, Wills cites the chiasmic repetition of simple and compound verbs in a couplet by Bion 1,1-2 (αἰάω [...] ἀπόλετο / ὤλετο [...] ἐπαιάουσιν); for an earlier Latin example cf. Lucil. 1058 (*inberbi androgyni, barbati moechocinaedi*). The repetition of compounds is found elsewhere in Ovid, cf. e.g. epist. 3,73-74; met. 14,673.

alent.²² Maltby (1999, 379) demonstrates that both Tibullus and Ovid tended towards their patron's taste here; Propertius, by contrast, frequently deployed Grecisms.²³ Arellius Fuscus' influence on Ovid is contentious.²⁴ Nevertheless, it can be shown that a hallmark of Fuscus' style was the coining of striking compound adjectives.²⁵ More minor stylistic points include: (a) the reduplication of the enclitic *-que*

²² See Porphyron 1,10,28 for Mesalla's substitution of *funambulus* for *σχοινοβάτης*. Although Mesalla famously balked at the admission of Greek words in his oratory, it is nevertheless attested in the Virgilian *Appendix* that he was wont to compose bucolics and love elegies in Greek, see Knorr 2005, 398.

²³ The wider aesthetics of a 'Mesallan circle' are tantalising, but beyond the scope of this article. We may, however, quickly trace a few problems involved. In Cronin's (1970) investigation of sigmatism in Tibullus and Propertius it is shown that the former employed sigmatism much more than the latter. When we recall that Mesalla himself wrote a treatise on the letter S (Quint. inst. 1,7,35), it is tempting to ascribe it to wider Mesallan aesthetics; nevertheless, problems accrue as Lygdamus avoided sigmatism, see Cronin 1970, 180. In several ways Ovid seems to conform and expand characteristic Tibullan aesthetics; this is particularly felt in the adoption and uniform use (barring a few exceptions in the later works) of the disyllabic close to the couplet. Nevertheless, other stylistic elements, as has already been shown in the two surveys, are markedly alien to Tibullus' method. For a convenient elementary recipe of the Ovidian distich see Tate 1835; for an amusing attack on the dominance of Ovidian aesthetics informing verse composition, in preference to Catullus' freer style, see Harrison 1943. Howe 1916 argues that the rhetorical flourishes, so frequent in Ovid, are a necessary corollary to his standardisation of the disyllabic close: the rhetoric here is meant to disguise and mute the potential monotony the uniform cadence provides.

²⁴ Sen. contr. 2,2,8 details the formative influences of Arellius Fuscus and Porcius Latro on Ovid. Owing to textual difficulties, there is doubt as to which orator made the greater impact on Ovid; for Latro see Fairweather 1981, 264-270, for Fuscus see Huelsenbeck 2011. The distinction between the two is significant: Fuscus habitually declaimed in Greek (Sen. suas. 4,5) and his style is dubbed overwrought and luxuriant (Sen. contr. 2, pr.), Latro (like Mesalla) eschewed Greek in his oratory and cultivated a natural effortless style (Sen. contr. 1., pr.); for further on Fuscus' convoluted Asiatic style see Fairweather 1981, 246. 251. 270-276.

²⁵ See Lindner 1862, 14 on the use of *indenuntiatius* and other distinctive Fuscine vocabulary; more recently Huelsenbeck 2011, 190. With the exception of individual words an appraisal of Seneca's quotations to furnish individual orator's style is no simple matter, for the problems involved see Fairweather 1981, 42-49.

in each hemistich, cf. Luck (1961, 252). Luck, primarily concentrating on the exilic poetry, notes several arrangements for the construction, including those instances where the reiteration occurs – as here – after an intermediate word.²⁶ (b) The 'jingle' effect created by terminating each hemiepes with an iambic word, has received varied commentary.²⁷ Raven (1965, 107) consequently stresses elegiac poets' avoidance of terminating the first hemiepes in a disyllable.²⁸ The eschewal of the construction, particularly by Tibullus, is in contrast to the markedly Tibullan rhythm of the final hemiepes, concluding as it does in a rapid pentasyllable + disyllable;²⁹ see too Maltby's identification of Tibullan features in am. 2,11,10 above. (c) The line is distinguished by being of the 'reversible' pentameter type, whereby the two halves can be placed in either hemiepes, without any rhythmic or semantic disturbance, cf. Platnauer (1951, 14-15).³⁰

4. Further Points on the Two Lines

A few points, encompassing both lines, should be added. Both lines seem to have initiated a later echo in Ovid's exilic poetry: for ars 2,24

²⁶ In passing, it may be noted that Luck adds that Ovid provides no instances of rhyming phrases linked with *-que* without an intermediate word; once again trist. 4,7,16 & 18 (see above page 39) are focused on when comparing the effect. The use of the enclitic in Ovid's work is also treated by Lateiner 1990, 235 and Maltby's comments above on the role of *-que* in echoed verses should be recalled.

²⁷ See e.g. Postgate 1910, xxxi; Smith 1913, 98-99; Radford 1923c, 296; Siefert Jr. 1952, 24; Raven 1965, 107. Smith – after identifying the avoidance of an iambic clash as an evolution of Hellenistic standards begun by Callimachus – acknowledges that Ovid habitually avoided the iambic coincidence, but would occasionally admit it for stylistic effect. Radford, however, goes much too far in using Tibullus' eschewal of the construction as a cause for his ascription of those poems (2,2. 3. 5) that do betray the device to another poet: Lygdamus, whom Radford elsewhere identifies as Ovid.

²⁸ As Siefert Jr. 1952, 24 notes, the jingling repetition characteristic of Ovid is also achieved through his adoption of simple sentence structures.

²⁹ For the structural use Ovid made of a pentasyllable in the second hemiepes, see Nagle 1987, 87-88.

³⁰ He adds am. 2,11,36 (*Nereidesque deae Nereidumque pater*) as a further Ovidian example.

see trist. 4,7,18 (the second hemiepes *semibovemque virum* is repeated); for am. 2,11,10 see Pont. 4,12,35 (*tepidus Boreas et sit praeferigidus Auster*; here *Notus* is exchanged for *Auster* but the relative temperature of North and South winds persist). Thus the condemned style is reaffirmed in the mature period. Both lines are also syntactically inessential: ars 2,24 is linked by apposition to *conceptum crimine matris* in the preceding line; am. 2,11,10 is merely a continuation of the list of objects to the verb in the preceding line. Both lines could easily be deleted without any harm to the syntax as a whole.³¹ Both lines also engage in comparison and contrast in each half, through clever word-play of their adjectival complements; Fairweather (1981, 199) is far too narrow in interpreting the criticism of the two lines by Seneca as the pairing of contrasting words, rather than the diction itself. Essentially, Ovid's use of comparison and contrast here can be compared to how the rhythm of a standard pentameter line can be viewed. It could be viewed as a parallel arrangement of two dactyls and one *longum* in each half; alternatively, the structure could be understood as composed – mirror fashion – as two dactyls, a central spondee, and two anapaests.³² As the survey has demonstrated both lines commanded extensive comments on the use of the compounds in each line to achieve effect; the manipulation of compound forms to provide point is elsewhere criticised by Seneca as vulgar and facile; see suas. 7,11.³³ Another shared feature is the use of the enclitic *-que* at the antepenultimate position of the second hemiepes and the use of parallelism within each hemiepes; both are treated by Siefert Jr. (1952, 39. 62-63). Finally, the rhythm found in the final hemiepes, formed from a pentasyllable and a disyllable, adds a speed to the lines

³¹ Lyne 1984, 27-28 is explicit on this point, when he states with reference to the two lines: "content, even sense, is clearly subordinate to formal conceit". Fraenkel 1945, 172, however, is more supportive of the importance of the two lines; after noting that they appear "too loud and gaudy" for many, he stresses that they are both "expressive of a definite idea".

³² For the latter interpretation of the pentameter line see the *Fragmenta Sangallensia* in Keil 1874, 639.

³³ See further Wills 1996, 451 and Edward 1928, 112. 153-154 for the *cacozelia* involved here.

that is favoured by Tibullus and infrequent in Propertius; for relative statistics in elegiac poetry see Giarratano (1908, 32-33).

5. Methodology

Sufficient background has been provided for the anecdote and the two known lines; a formula can now be established, which links together as many points of commonality between the two known verses. The salient features are as follows: each verse is fashioned from two phrases, separated at the diaeresis, and joined by a coordinating conjunction; each of the two phrases retains the same order of complementary adjective preceding its substantive; the phrases follow a standard pattern, the adjectives are linked by some form of repetition and the substantives are at variance; the adjective in the second hemiepes is of compound formation; the first hemiepes to each line is dactylic and mimics the rhythm of the second half; the second half of each line contains a pentasyllable and a disyllable; the pentasyllable also includes an enclitic conjunction placed in the antepenultimate position.

This basic framework of the common features for the parallelism and repetition found in the two identified lines is adequate to gauge the frequency of the rhetoric in elegiac poetry as a whole. Nevertheless, the implications of the overview to the two known lines should not be forgotten. Further commonalities, which may be deemed just as important, included both the syntactic superfluity of each line and the ambiguous word play that both links and separates each phrase: in ars 2,24 the same three words are used in each half, but their varied placement notes the radical shift of emphasis in a description of the same creature; in am. 2,11,10 the compound adjective *egelim* can be seen as marking a similarity or contrast in the winds' temperature.

The methodology traced out above will be employed in the examination of elegiac poetry to establish how often such rhetoric occurs. When seeking to use the method for the peripheral focus of the inquiry, namely the identification of the missing verse, the following should be remembered. Given the nature of the anecdote, it is highly unlikely that the third line can be found in the post-exilic poetry. As both known lines seem to have generated a variant line in the exilic poetry, any line which exhibits the rhetorical features delineated

above and finds a later echo in the exilic poetry would prove an excellent candidate for the solution to the mystery. The motive for the extensive surveys above (besides furnishing a practical methodology of shared rhetorical traits), has been to note the difficulties involved in the employment of each line to solve the mystery. It will readily be seen that, although there are many points of comparison, there are equally distinctions. Ars 2,24 is the more perfectly balanced and interchangeable: each half contains the same syllables, ends with a disyllable and has antepenultimate enclitic *-que*. The broad rhetorical background of each line differs too: the arrangement of ars 2,24 seems decidedly more Propertian; am. 2,11,10 more Tibullan. It is to be recalled that both Propertius and Tibullus favoured the differing effects for purposes of closure. A cautionary note should thus be sounded. Both known lines provide ample scope to investigate the rhetorical peculiarities that inform the methodology here adopted and to note the aesthetic particularity of these rhetorical characteristics across ancient elegy. They do not, however, allow us to categorically identify the absent line: the third line may have contained a different set of rhetorical flaws. It will be sufficient here to see whether or not the method adopted lends any support to any lines previously selected as the missing verse or supplies another Ovidian line for consideration.

6. *Internal Evidence*

The ten lines that have been selected as possible candidates for the missing line by Ramia (2014) provide a convenient initial test of our methodology.³⁴ These lines are: 1) Ov. am. 3,4,40 (*Romulus Iliades*

³⁴ Ramia's article provides a sound background to the controversy; this has obviated the need to extensively detail many contextual concerns. Ramia's article can conveniently be divided into two points of focus: the first (79-87), presents a conspectus of certain proposed answers to the controversy and related matter from antiquity up to the early twenty first century; the second (88-94), offers Ramia's own assessments of the propositions and concludes with his support for one of the proposed lines to solve the problem. Ramia tries to provide the motives that guided each proposition, but, as he frequently acknowledges (80. 82. 85. 87. 88), these motives are often unexplained, since the controversy has mainly been treated in a peripheral manner in the form of a footnote in works

Iliadesque Remus); 2) Ov. ars 2,204 (*tu male iactato, tu male iacta dato*); 3) Ov. ars 2,300 (*gausapa si sumpsit, gausapa sumpta probat*); 4) Ov. ars 3,322 (*Tartareosque lacus tergeminumque canem*); 5) Ov. epist. 4,144 (*oscula aperta dabas, oscula aperta dabis*); 6) Ov. epist. 15,40 (*nulla futura tua est, nulla futura tua est*); 7) Ov. trist. 4,7,16 (*tergeminumque virum, tergeminumque canem*); 8) Ov. trist. 4,7,18 (*centimanumque Gygen, semibovemque virum*); 9) Sen. benef. 4,14,1 (*quae quia non licuit non dedit, illa dedit*); 10) Quint. inst. 9,3,70 (*cur ego non dicam, Furia, te furiam?*).³⁵

When applying our methodology to these hypotheses, a number of lines can be immediately discounted. Initially, we can discount every line that is not constructed solely from two noun and adjective phrases. This eliminates 2 (with its pronoun, adverb, participle construction), 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10 (for their use of finite verbs and, in the final two examples, lack of parallelism in each hemiepes).³⁶ Having

with an entirely different main focus. Indeed the only works that take the controversy as their primary concern are the recent articles of Ballester 2013 and Ramia 2014.

³⁵ As limitations of space militate against a wide review of each line, it is only fair to outline Ramia's own conclusion to the problem. Ramia ends up by restricting his own review to the fragments of Ovid's work, on the basis that, were the absent line from Ovid's famous transmitted works, it would have been recorded by Seneca. Consequently, he lends his support to Ballester's proposition (2013), recorded in Quintilian. Ramia deems the pun contained in *Furia* / *furiam* of a piece with the wordplay found in the two known lines. He adds that the trisyllabic ending of *furiam* betrays its early composition, thus meeting the timeframe restrictions of the anecdote. As will be obvious, different methodologies will necessarily yield different results; Ramia's article is to be recommended for an alternative approach to the problem.

³⁶ As the verb in the sixth example is *esse*, it may be considered an exception. The line could, however, also be discounted due to the fact that each hemiepes is repeated *verbatim*. It may be countered that, although each half is repeated *verbatim*, each half is still syntactically distinct as the first half forms the protasis of the preceding line, the second half the apodosis. In answer to this objection, I would assert that as the first half belongs syntactically to the preceding line, the two halves do not form an equal balance to each other in a comparable manner to the two known examples. Moreover, as each half is syntactically important, the line does not betray the same superfluity as the two given examples. Nevertheless, the line is striking and in the same year as Ramia's article, another proposal for this line as an answer to the riddle was supplied, see Thorsen 2014, 157.

excluded six propositions, four examples remain formed of two noun / adjective phrases. Applying further details of the outlined methodology on these lines, allows additional narrowing. Example 1, despite adhering to the rhythm of the known lines and providing an enclitic in the antepenultimate position, differs markedly in arrangement and formation. It is arranged in a chiasmic manner and its adjectival forms offer only repetition but not variation. Consequently, this example can be removed. Examples 7 and 8 are both from the *Tristia*, as such they are weak candidates for the missing verse, since they are outside the timeframe of the anecdote; the use of repetition without variation of the compounds in 7 and unrelated compounds in 8 distances them further from our methodology. Before passing these lines over, however, a significant fact should not be overlooked. The two pentametric lines are united within the same poem with only one hexameter line between them. Also *trist.* 4,7,18, in its final hemiepes, echoes *ars* 2,24 (*semibovemque virum*);³⁷ we earlier observed that both known lines supply echoes in Ovid's exilic poetry. These two observations dictate that example 7 be considered a little closer. In formation it approximates very nearly to the outlined formula; it contains the same rhythm, has an appropriately placed enclitic, and consists of two adjective / noun phrases with at least a compound adjective in the second half. The only way in which it deviates from the formula is by virtue of the fact that the compound adjectives offer only repetition and no variation. Nevertheless, the placement of the line so close to a line, which seems to purposely recast *ars* 2,24, should give pause. Might Ovid here have intentionally echoed two of the lines previously criticised in his earlier works? This naturally leads on to the final line we have to consider, example 4. This line was reported in Gibson's commentary (2003, 228) as the solution to the problem, on McKeown's suggestion. Rather frustratingly no reason is attributed. In the absence of any stated motive, it may be assumed that McKeown considered the formation of the line and its later echo in the exilic poetry sufficient. As will be seen, this line contains the echo in its final hemiepes, as is the case with *ars* 2,24 and *trist.* 4,7,18.

³⁷ It is to be further noted that the first hemiepes (*centimanumque Gyen*) finds its analogue in *am.* 2,1,12.

The line adheres to the rhythm and placement of the enclitic as already observed in the two known lines; its adjectives and substantives follow the same placement and there is a compound adjective in the second half. Nevertheless, the line does not seem to betray the same parallelism as the two known examples. There is no etymological link or audible repetition found in either the adjectives or nouns; clever wordplay is also absent. The example is certainly tempting, it fits the right time frame and meets many of the criteria demanded here, but not entirely.

After evaluating these ten lines, no manifestly obvious answer is found to the issue, despite the temptations of ars 3,322. It remains to examine the rest of the Ovidian corpus to see whether or not a better example, which meets the set criteria, may be identified. Beginning our overview, the first example to consider is am. 1,3,14 (*nudaque simplicitas purpureusque pudor*). This line is formed of two parallel phrases with the enclitic suitably placed, the lack of iteration or correspondence of adjectival forms, however, rules against it. An example from the same poem as one of the known lines may also be noted, am. 2,11,36 (*Nereidesque deae Nereidumque pater*).³⁸ Here the rhythm, word placement and use of the enclitic are sufficiently similar. Nevertheless, the adjectives, which in the second half is a substantive and in the first linked to *deae* by apposition, display no variation other than the fact that they show different case endings. This variation of case endings somewhat disrupts the harmony of the two parallel phrases. Am. 2,17,24 (*frigidus Eurotas populiferque Padus*) contains two parallel phrases, but no other link to the criteria. Am. 2,18,24 (*Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque legant*) offers initial repetition in each half, but the use of a finite verb and the lack of an adjective in the second half undermines it.³⁹ Epist. 1,98 (*Laertesque senex Telemachusque puer*) offers the same virtues and flaws as am. 1,3,14 above. Epist. 4,112 (*Pirithoum Phaedrae Pirithoumque tibi*) despite containing initial repetition in each half, offers little else sought for. Epist. 15,54 (*Nisiades matres Nisiadesque nurus*) by virtue of its spondee in the first hemiepes, it is a

³⁸ For the Ovidian nature of this type of repetition, when considered with other late Republican and Augustan poets, see Radford 1923d, 179-180.

³⁹ For a brief treatment of this type of repetition in Ovid see Radford 1923d, 180.

weaker example of am. 2,11,36 above. For fast. 4,342 (*perpetuam pacem, perpetuumque ducem*), see epist. 15,54 above. In fast. 5,142 (*pervigilantque lares, pervigilantque canes*) the repetition involves finite verbs, and the line does not contain two noun and complement phrases. Ib. 347 (*Tisamenique patri, Callirhoesque viro*) suffers the same faults as am. 1,3,14; it also belongs to the exilic period. In Ib. 632 (*inpiger Hyrtacides Hyrtacidaeque comes*), the chiasitic order and lack of adjectival variation, aside from the gender and number of its respective case endings, rule this example out. Epiced. Drusi 204 (*Ausoniae matres Ausoniaeque nurus*) is a weaker example, due to the spondee in the first half, of a line like am. 2,11,36 above. Elsewhere in Ovid's work weaker examples of parallelism or repetition betraying some similarities to the formula may be found at: am. 2,15,10. 3,3,22; ars 1,494. 1,622. 3,168. 3,182. 3,322; epist. 15,184. 16,62; fast. 1,140. 1,302. 1,384. 1,462. 2,236. 5,324. 6,60; trist. 1,5,60. 2,150. 3,9,30. 5,14,36; Pont. 4,2,40. 4,16,6; Ib. 360; Epiced. Drusi 438.⁴⁰

In sum, after testing the methodology on the extant Ovidian corpus, no true parallel can be identified. This demonstrates that if the missing line adhered to the methodology outlined, it is no longer extant. The investigation has, however, shown how distinctive the two known lines are. It remains to pursue the inquiry and gauge their uniqueness with reference to a broader range of data.

⁴⁰ Repeated effects that occur outside of the single pentametric line have been excluded; therefore examples such as trist. 12,20 & 22, where the opening hemiepes of each pentameter line is repeated (*iam iam tacturas*), or am. 1,9,1-2, where the same phrase forms the first hemistich of the hexameter and the final hemiepes of the pentamer (*militat omnis amans*), have been ignored. An example from Ovid's oratory may be given here too, see Sen. contr. 2,2,11. In a declamation concerning a wife, who attempts suicide on behalf of her husband, Ovid compares her to Evadne and Alcestis: *perit aliqua cum viro, perit aliqua pro viro*. Huelsenbeck 2011, 187-190 notes two points of interest: the comparison and phrasing owes its origin to Arellius Fuscus; Ovid used the comparison later in ars 3,15-22.

7. External Evidence

Having considered Ovid's own poetry and found no exact parallel for the two lines, despite quite a few very similar versions, it would now be appropriate to test our methodology on pentametric lines in other Greek and Latin elegiac poetry to see how rare the rhetoric actually is. Although the sample may not be comprehensive and excludes Neo-Latin poetry, the range selected is quite broad, encompassing as it does early Greek poetry up until Late Antiquity, and in the case of some epigrams from the *Anthologia Graeca* stretching well into the Byzantine period. The Greek works considered will be the *Anthologia Graeca*, the remains of Elegiac poetry found in the Greek papyri and Gerber's edition of Greek elegiac poetry, the Greek verse inscriptions, and the elegiac works of Callimachus. The Latin sample is equally broad in its timeframe and covers the poetry written in the Republican period up until late Antiquity (early 7th century), the writers or works examined will include: Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, the *Appendix Vergiliana*, Aulus Sabinus, the *Priapea*, Martial, Ausonius, Prudentius, Paulinus of Nola, Claudian, the *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, Sidonius, Dracontius, Ennodius, Fortunatus, along with the disparate Latin poetry contained in the *Anthologia Latina* (Riese's and Shackleton Bailey's editions) in Bachrens' *Poetae Latinae Minores* in Duff & Duff's *Minor Latin Poetry* and in the verse inscriptions collected by Buecheler and the fragments found in Bachrens' and Morel's editions. Consequently the range is broad and plentiful enough to gauge how singular the two criticised lines actually are.

8. Evidence from Greek Elegiac Poetry

Beginning our overview with Greek elegiac poetry, it will be seen that iterative rhetorical devices are in no short supply. We find the following types: (1) lines where each hemiepes contains its own internal repetition, e.g. Tyrt. 11,32 (Gerber, 56): ἐν δὲ λόφον τε λόφῳ καὶ κυνέην κυνέῃ, cf. Thgn. 954 (Gerber, 310), A.G. 9,122,4. 16,197,2. 16,251,6; (2) lines where only one hemiepes contains internal repetition, e.g. Call. Epigr. 52,4: ἄς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ ται χάριτες χάριτες, although the cacophony found at the end of the first hemiepes and continued at the start of the second brings this close to the first example, see too Call. Epigr. 53,2; (3) lines where each hemiepes repeats each other,

like two lines from a single Greek epigram, e.g. A.G. 7,548,2 & 4: ἐστὶ Δικαιοτέλους; ἐστὶ Δικαιοτέλους & κείνος ὅδ' ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ; κείνος ὅδ' ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ, cf. Ov. epist. 15,40 discussed above; (4) forms where an audible rather than an etymological link unites the repetition, e.g. A.G. 11,222,2: ΛΕΙΧΕΙ γὰρ ΧΕΙΛΩΝ, κὰν ἴσα, κὰν ἄνισα, cf. A.G. 11,339,2. 16,368,4; (5) versions where a complete line is repeated elsewhere in the same poem as a refrain, e.g. A.G. 1,116,2 & 4: δῶρ' ἀπὸ κρυστάλλων, δῶρ' ἀπὸ σαρδονύχων; (6) forms where partial repetition occurs over alternate lines of the same poem, e.g. A.G. 9,215,2: δς δ' οὐδὲ φθιμένοις, οὔ ποτ' ἂν οὐ φθιμένοις, (where the final hemiepes recurs to form the first hemiepes of the fourth line) or A.G. 11,388,2 & 4 where the phrase ἐν τῷ ζῆν εἶναι is employed as the opening hemiepes in each line; (7) versions which are echoed in a later line of the same poem, not *verbatim*, but with marked correspondence, e.g. A.G. 12,245,2 & 4: τῶν ἄλλων ζώων τοῦτ' ἔχομεν τὸ πλεόν & τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων οὐδὲν ἔχουσι πλεόν; (8) lines which are repeated in separate poems, e.g. the conclusion to each of the following lines A.G. 14,20,2 & 14,21,2: παρθένου εὐρήσεις υἷέα καὶ φονέα, also note the following inscriptions: *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae* 53,2 a & b where the following concludes each version: ἐξώλης εἴη Κυψελιδᾶν γενέα, and cf. *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae* 197 a & b, which open with the same initial hemiepes: (a) μνήμα τόδ' Ἰπάρχου· στεῖχε δίκαια φρονῶν & (b) μνήμα τόδ' Ἰπάρχου· μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα; (9) lines where two phrases are employed to form the pentameter, but displaying different oblique cases, e.g. A.G. 6,332,2: κοίρανος ἀνθρώπων κοιράνω ἀθανάτων, or Thgn. 1288 (Gerber, 370): Ἰασίου κούρην παρθένον Ἰασίν; (10) linked parallel phrases, whose rhythm, asyndetic nature and structure differs from Ovid's two lines, e.g. A.G. 9,823,6: Ὑδριάδες Νύμφαι, Νύμφαι Ἀμαδρυάδες, cf. also A.G. 16,278,4; (11) versions which display iteration between each hemiepes and mark a contrast, but whose rhythm and arrangement differs from Ovid's lines, e.g. Thgn. 1258 (Gerber, 366): ὀργὴν ἄλλοτε τοῖς ἄλλοτε τοῖσι φίλῃν, and, similar in arrangement with marked audible repetitions between each hemiepes, Thgn. 818 (Gerber, 290): ὅττι δὲ μοῖρα παθεῖν, οὔτι δέδοικα παθεῖν; (12) forms where each hemiepes has marked repetition, but whose structure or rhythm differs from Ovid's versions, e.g. Thgn. 520 (Gerber, 246): ὥς εὖ μὲν χαλεπῶς, ὥς χαλεπῶς δὲ μάλ' εὖ, or A.G. 9,394,2: καὶ τὸ ἔχειν σε, φόβος· καὶ μὴ ἔχειν σ', ὀδύνη; (13) lines formed of compound adjectives with repeated

prefixes, e.g. A.G. 5,76,2: εὔσφυρος, εὐμήκης, εὔοφρος, εὐπλόκαμος ; (14) lines whose effect is dependent upon the reiteration of verb forms, e.g. A.G. 6,84,6: σῶζετο Νικαγόρα, σῶξε δὲ Νικαγόραν, cf. A.G. 7,555,2. 7,560,6. 9,206,2. 9,427,6. 12,175,8; (15) lines whose iteration is governed by prepositions, e.g. A.G. 7,381,4: σύμπλοος εἰς ἄγρην, σύμπλοος εἰς Ἀἶδην, cf. A.G. 7,579,2. 7,606,4. 9,205,2. 9,787,2. 16,348,4; (16) versions which depend on the iteration of adverbs, e.g. A.G. 9,148,6: πῶς ἅμα σοὶ κλαύσω, πῶς ἅμα σοὶ γελάσω ; (17) lines where a single noun or adjective alone is repeated or audibly linked in each hemiepes, often twinned with a conjunction, e.g. A.G. 7,433,2: ἁ Λακεδαιμονία τὸν Λακεδαιμόνιον, A.G. 9,573,6: καὶ κλαιωμιλή, καὶ γελοωμιλή, A.G. 16,315,4 καὶ φιλαριστείδης καὶ φιλοθουκυδίδης, the compound forms of the last two examples are especially noteworthy. Finally, there are many examples where the pentameter line is split in two to mark a logical comparison or contrast between each half. Here, the repetition is not as marked as the lines already cited, and it may be noted that Greek epigrams often use the device to note a contrast between life and death, mortal and immortal, cf. A.G. 5,94,4. 7,42,4. 9,357,2. 10,122,2. 12,203,2. 14,41,2. 15,46,6. 16,364,4.

In sum, despite the frequency of repeated stylistic effects that Greek elegiac poetry supplies, there is not a single example that accords to the methodology selected to isolate the characteristics found in Ovid's two lines.

9. Evidence from Latin Elegiac Poetry

As Latin elegiac verse is more plentiful than the Greek poetry at our disposal, it will be convenient to present an overview by individual poets and collections of poetry, rather than collectively.

9.1. Catullus

Catullus offers little comparable to the Ovidian lines. The most noteworthy line, through its polysyndetic use of *atque* and iteration of *alia* in the second hemiepes, is provided by 68,152: *haec atque illa dies atque alia atque alia*. The absence of correspondence here is not surprising, despite the earlier echoes of Catullus noted in the surveys for ars 2,24 and am. 2,11,10. It is well known that Ovid was little influenced by

Catullus' epigrams, but heavily by his lyrics, see Ferguson (1960, 340).⁴¹

9.2. Tibullus

Despite Maltby's (1999, 382-384) claim that Tibullus' use of *versus echoici* were formative upon Ovid's later stylistics, there are few examples of such reiterative devices in the *corpus Tibullianum* as a whole. When they do occur, verbs often govern the reiteration.⁴² The most striking examples are 1,1,78: *dites despiciam despiciamque famem*, 1,4,82: *deficiunt artes; deficiuntque doli*, 1,7,64: *candidior semper candidiorque veni*, 2,5,100: *caespitibus mensas caespitibusque torum*. Less convincing examples are found at 2,1,90 and 2,3,58. Regarding the other poets in the corpus, see 3,3,16. 3,4,74; 3,5,24; 3,9,6.

9.3. Propertius

Although, as Foster (1909, 55-59) demonstrates, rhetorical iteration is markedly prevalent in Propertius (especially when contrasted with Tibullus) and may well have informed and guided Ovid's later practice, when applying the methodology we are using to isolate the two Ovidian lines, Propertius contains nothing comparable. In consequence, I cannot agree with Foster's comparison of the two Ovidian lines in relation to Propertius in anything other than a general way. For the closest examples in Propertius' work, see 1,12,20: *Cynthia*

⁴¹ It may be pointed out that the fragmentary line *cur ego non dicam, Furia, te furiam?* identified by Ballester and Ramia (see above page 49) as the missing line, is deemed by Ferguson to be influenced by the Catullan pentameter 81,6: *audes, et nescis quod facinus facias*.

⁴² Indeed, Tibullus' art tended to avoid such obvious effects of parallelism between the hemistichs. A comparable measure can be provided with another stylistic effect which Tibullus used very sparingly. Radford 1923c, 296 observes the infrequency with which Tibullus allowed the first hemiepes to conclude in a disyllable to avoid the consequent jingle created by his frequent adoption of a disyllable to conclude the second hemistich. Although the point Radford makes with the data, namely to reassign Tib. 2,2,3 & 5 and the Lygdamus poems to an Ovidian authorship, may be objected to, it is nevertheless clear through his citations and a perusal of Tibullus' poetry that such rhetorical repetitions and jingles as are to be found plentifully in Ovid's works are very seldom found in Tibullus.

prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit, 1,20,26: *hunc super et Zetes, hunc super et Calais*, 2,1,38: *hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden*, 2,3,38: *tu quia poscebas, tu quia lentus eras*, 2,3,44: *uret et Eoos, uret et Hesperios*, 2,9,36: *sive ea causa gravis sive ea causa levis*, 2,15,36: *huius ero vivus, mortuus huius ero* (cf. the often repeated formulas of life and death used in Greek epigram, noted above), 2,16,2: *maxima praeda tibi, maxima cura mihi*, 2,22a,34: *hic ego Pelides, hic ferus Hector ego*, 2,25,10: *sive ego Tithonus sive ego Nestor ero*, 2,26b,56: *parus et Orion, purus et Haedus erit*, 2,28b,42: *vivam, si vivet; si cadet illa, cadam*, 2,30b,24: *hoc si crimen erit, crimen Amoris erit*, 3,20,30: *semper amet, fructu semper amoris egens*. For weaker examples of the device see: 1,2,30. 1,10,22. 2,4,2. 2,5,28. 2,6,42. 2,8,6. 2,15,50. 2,16,46. 2,18b,22. 2,26a,16. 2,26b,28. 2,28a,14. 3,22,10. 4,9,18.

Two things may be noted in passing on the findings here. A brief glance of the citations will show that although Propertius used such rhetorical repetitions frequently, most of the instances contain main verbs. In contrast to Ovid's lines, the Propertian examples are a fundamental part of the syntax of the couplet and not merely a case of *ars gratia artis*. Secondly, it will be noted that the instances in Propertius' works are heavily confined to his earlier books and almost entirely absent from books 3 and 4. Thus, at the very stage where Propertius' metrical usage approximated more closely to the Tibullan standard (particularly the disyllabic close to the couplet), which became standardised by Ovid, was also the stage where marked repetition between the two halves of the couplet became noticeably infrequent in his work. This is, of course, demonstrably different from Ovid, who coupled metrical purity with a marked use of rhetorical iteration, parallelism, and a plethora of rhetorical devices, as has already been noted.

9.4. Sabinus

In his responses to Ovid's *Heroides*, Sabinus does not avail himself of echoing this particular characteristic of Ovid's poetry.⁴³ The nearest

⁴³ The author of the responses by Sabinus is, of course, a contentious issue. Purser in Palmer's posthumously published edition of the *Heroides* (1898, xxvii) ascribes the authorship to Angelus Quirinus Sabinus in circa 1467. Whether authentic or

line to consider is epist. 1,118: *Herculeam Sparten Nestoreamque Pylon*, where the structure is comparable, the rhythm different, and little audible correspondence between the initial adjectives. Other weaker examples include epist. 2,56: *non amor alterius, non amor ullus habet*, and epist. 3,92: *sive tuos ignes pellere, sive meos*.

9.5. Appendix Vergiliana

The *Appendix Vergiliana* affords few examples and nothing directly comparable to Ovid's two lines. The only examples deserving mention are *Copa* 20: *est hic munda Ceres, est Amor, est Bromius*, *Catalepton* 9,44: *tam procul haec gnato, tam procul haec patria*,⁴⁴ *Maecenas* 44: *tam non ille tener, tam gravis hostis erat*,⁴⁵ *Maecenas* 46: *fortis erat circa, fortis et ante ducem*. Weaker correspondences are found at *Catalepton* 9,60; *Maecenas* 98 & 156.

9.6. Priapea

The *Priapea* provides little for this investigation. The two examples afforded are 24,4: "*propter olus*" *dicas "hoc ego?" "Propter olus"*, and 38,4: *quod peto, si dederis, quod petis, accipies*.

9.7. Martial

Despite Martial's widespread imitation of Ovid, this particular rhetorical device is absent. The most noteworthy examples of rhetorical iteration are found at epigr. 30(26),4: *credidimus remum credidimusque ratem*, epigr. 31(27 prius 29),8: *pugnare pares, succubere pares*, 7,12,10: *per genium Famae Castaliumque gregem*, 9,68,10: *nam vigilare leve est, pervigilare grave est*, 9,68,12: *accipis ut clames, accipere ut taceas*. Also in the *Suppositicia* of Schneidewin's edition is the following, numbered 10,12: *nec redit unda fluens, nec redit hora ruens*. As will be noted, all the examples

not, the author did not choose to imitate the rhetorical quirk that is here investigated.

⁴⁴ In Baehrens (Vol. ii) the line is given as *tam procul hoc Latio, tam procul hac patria*.

⁴⁵ This line is reported elsewhere with weaker correspondence. In Duff & Duff's edition (Vol. 1, 1935, 125) the line is printed *quam nunc ille tener, tam gravis hostis erat*.

above involve verbs. Less convincing forms of correspondence are found at 1,57,2. 1,57,4. 3,76,4. 4,78,8. 9,97,12. 10,44,2. 10,48,16. 10,82,6. 11,5,2. 11,73,2. 12,4(5),4. 12,29,16. 12,48,10. 14,140(139),2. For further on Martial's use of rhetorical parallelism, with comparisons across ancient literature which will complement the present examination, see Siedschlag's section on the *Isokolische Pentameter* (1977, 111-114).

9.8. *Ausonius*

Ausonius, never shy to imitate the classical poets, is the author who comes closest to the investigated rhetoric. In his work there are eight pentametric lines formed of two parallel adjective / noun phrases. *Parentalia* 16,4 (Green, 34): *morigerae uxoris lanificaeque manus*, has two genitive phrases, the rhythm, however, differs and there is little repetition in the compound adjectives save homoeoteleuton; *Professores* 20,6 (Green, 55): *alter ut Ausonius, alter ut Arborius*, differs in rhythm and arrangement but does offer conjunctions in each half; *Epitaphia* 2,4 (Green, 60): *coniugii vindex, ultor adulterii*, offers a chiasitic arrangement with genitive nouns on the extremes and nominative adjectives within, the rhythm, asyndetic structure and case variation are markedly different from Ovid's lines; *Epitaphia* 7,2 (Green, 61): *carus et Atridis, carus et Aeacidis*, is exactly like *Professores* 20,6 (cited above); Epigr. 64,4 (Green, 82): *exteriore Myron, interiori deus*, has a parallel rhythmical structure, slight variation between the two adjectives, an asyndetic arrangement; Ep. 8,32 (Green, 201): ὀκτὼ Θουκυδίδου, ἐννέα Ἡροδότου, does not contain sufficient correspondence between the two halves, but should be included here too; from Green's Appendix A (Green, 673) is Epigr. 9,2: *ligneus ut Daphne, saxeus ut Niobe*, which is similar to *Professores* 20,6 and *Epitaphia* 7,2. Nevertheless, the best example, which comes very close to Ovid's versions, is Epigr. 80,2 (Green, 87): *caprigenumque pecus, lanificosque greges*. Here the rhythm, use of conjunctions in each half, and employment of compound adjectival forms in the order adjective – noun, and the accusative cases for each phrase mirror Ovid's. The only differences that weaken the correspondences are that the adjectives are not linked etymologically in any way and the phrases are syntactically much more important than Ovid's versions, as they are the object of the verb *assimulas* in line 3. Thus they are not included solely for the sake of artistic fancy. Elsewhere in his

work, Ausonius offers lines formed from four accusative nouns linked by conjunctions, see *praefationes variae* 1,20 (Green, 3): *Aemilium aut Scauram Berytiumque Probum* ; for lines with initial repetition in each half, with further logical correspondences in the remainder, see Epigr. 60,4 (Green, 81): *qualis sum nolo, qualis eram nequeo*, cf. Appendix A (Green, 674), Epigr. 15,2: *hoc pereunte fugis, hoc fugiente peris* ; lines with correspondences throughout each half that note a contrast, see Epigr. 84,2 (Green, 88): *nec male olere mihi nec bene olere placet* ; lines whose correspondence is reserved for the final half of each hemiepes, see Epigr. 84,2 (Green, 91): *Papia lex placuit, Iulia displicuit*, cf. *Caesares, Galba*, 4 (Green, 201) for the use of *placere* : *complacuisse debinc, displicuisse prius*. In sum, Ausonius comes very close to the type of line we are seeking to identify and, aside from a few quibbles, Epigr. 80,2 is the nearest in ancient literature we can now get to Ovid's lines, outside of Ovid's own work.

9.9. Prudentius

Prudentius offers little of value to this study, for the closest examples see *perist.* 11,32. 11,86. 11,112. 11,122.

9.10. Paulinus of Nola

Paulinus of Nola betrays some fondness for rhetorical iteration, but offers no true comparison. The most noteworthy repetition concerns the two examples of each hemiepes containing internal repetition found in the *Appendix*, see *carm. app.* 3,200: *de sancto sanctus, de pietate pius*, and *carm. app.* 3,202: *de vero verus deque deus est*. Other instances deserving citation include *carm.* 21,291: *et non ambo senes, sed tamen ambo patres* ; *carm.* 25,2: *virgo puer Christi, virgo puella dei* ; *carm.* 31,56: *virgine conceptus, virgine natus homo* ; *carm.* 31,592: *Celse, dolor patribus, gloria, Celse, patrum* ; *carm. app.* 1,54: *sperni non timeat, spernere non solet* ; *carm. app.* 1,76: *quaerere nil cupiunt, perdere nil metuunt* ; *carm. app.* 3,34: *quodve agimus cuncto tempore quove agimus* ; *carm. app.* 3,188: *nec nimium durus nec nimium facilis* ; *carm. app.* 3,224: *ante deus homo est, nunc deus ex homine*. Further examples include *carm.* 31,2. 100. 146. 432; *carm. app.* 3,58 & 140.

9.11. Claudian

Claudian is of little use for this examination. The most interesting line to cite is the treble use of the conjunction *et* and fourfold cacophony found in *Epistula ad Serenam* 31,44: *et pecus et Segetes et domus ampla fuit*. Other examples include *Epithalamium dictum Honorio Augusto et Mariae* 6,20: *iam Phrygias caedes, iam Simoenta canit*; *De consulatu Stilichonis* 3, *praefatio* 22: *Hannibal antiquo saevior Hannibale*; *De paupere amante* 15,2: *sed toleranda fames, non tolerandus amor*; *De mulabus Gallicis* 18,2: *imperio nexas imperioque vagas*; *De sene Veronensi qui Suburbium numquam egressus est* 20,22: *plus habet hic vitae, plus habet ille viae*.

9.12. Epigrammata Bobiensia

The *Epigrammata Bobiensia* has very little of note. The only lines worth mentioning are 22,2. 41,2. 55,2.

9.13. Sidonius Apollinaris

Sidonius likewise has little use for this study. The only lines worthy of note are epist. 4,18 (line 6 of the attached poem): *gloria magna viri, gratia parva loci*; carm. 3,2: *messibus et gregibus, vitibus atque apibus*; carm. 8,14: *contemptu tardo, iudicio celeri*; carm. 10,14: *Pallas tum cristis, Delia tum pharetris*.

9.14. Dracontius

Dracontius, despite a certain fondness for repeated effects, offers no example of the Ovidian type. For the best rhetorical repetitions see satisf. 58 (with its triple repetition arranged as a chiasmus): *et bona mixta malis et mala mixta bonis*; satisf. 66: *vipera saepe iuvat, vipera saepe nocet*; satisf. 82: *cuncta creanda parans cuncta creata fovens*; satisf. 88: *Lucifer hoc docuit, Sirius hoc monuit*; satisf. 166: *ut sibi regna daret ut daret et suboli*; satisf. 220: *tempora eunt vitae, tempora mortis eunt* (again the comparison with life and death is to be noted). Other lines to consider are satisf. 2. 10. 70. 112. 212. 240. 248. 252. 254 (with final hemiepes = *tempora temporibus*). 260.

9.15. *Ennodius*

Ennodius is of little value. The only lines worth citing all use verb forms for their repeated effects: *carm.* 1,6,24: *qui lapides soluit, qui solidavit aquas*; *carm.* 2,1,8: *funeribus iunxit funera multa suis*; *carm.* 2,76,6: *qui accusat ridens, qui perimit placidus*; *carm.* 2,122,2: *non potes esse Maro, sed potes esse moro*.

9.16. *Venantius Fortunatus*

Venantius Fortunatus delights in repeated stylistic effects. Nevertheless, despite the range of examples, none conforms to the formula sought. The most noteworthy example concerns the multiple reiterations, at its height approaching a fivefold repetition (or sixfold if concentrating on initial audible coincidence), found in the opening five pentameters (the hexameter lines also continue the iterations) of a poem from the Appendix, see *carm.* app. 5,2: *qui caput es capitum, vir capitale bonum*; *carm.* app. 5,4: *qui decus atque decens cuncta decenter agis*; *carm.* app. 5,6: *qui potes ipse potens, quem iuvat omnipotens*; *carm.* app. 5,8: *spes bona vel bonitas, de bonitate bonus*; *carm.* app. 5,10: *florum flos florens, florea flore fluens*. Such is the effectiveness here that the rhetoric bleeds into a line of the immediately following poem: *carm.* app. 6,10: *de genito et genita bis genitalis ava*. Other noteworthy examples from his work include *carm.* 5,5,148: *ut tu laus illi, laus sit et ille tibi*; *carm.* 6,1,20: *Mars habet ecce duces, pax habet ecce decus*; *carm.* 6,10,34: *clare decore tuo, care favore meo*; *carm.* 7,8,22: *hinc levat umbra diem, hinc fugat unda sitim*; *carm.* 7,25,26: *qui modo mitto apices, te rogo mitte pices*; *carm.* 8,1,14: *notus in urbe fuit, notus in orbe pater* (an obvious echo of *Mart.* 1,1,2, which is itself modelled on *Ov. trist.* 4,10,128-129); *carm.* 9,1,10: *tu genus ornasti, te genus ornat avi*; *carm.* 10,15,2: *nobilitas generis nobilior genitis*. Other examples to consult would include *carm.* 1,15,110. 2,16,32. 3,11,6. 5,5,68. 5,12,2. 6,3,34. 6,5,92. 6,5,118. 6,10,56. 7,8,50. 8,3,248. 9,2,96. 9,2,114. 9,8,2. 10,16,8. 11,23,2. 11,26,10; *carm.* app. 2,68. 2,100. 20,4; *sup. carm.* app. 1,42. 2,2 (whose line with its repetition of *crux* is comparable to *A.L.* 379,6 [Riese] and *Carmina epigraphica* [Buecheler] 906,10).

9.17. Anthologia Latina

The disparate poems that form the *Anthologia Latina* offer plentiful scope for rhetorical forms of repetition.⁴⁶ There are, however, no instances that conform to the pattern identified by our methodology. Of the various forms of repetition found, the following types may be noted: (1) a line where each hemiepes is repeated *verbatim*, see 658,26: *nolo tacere velis, nolo tacere velis!*;⁴⁷ (2) lines where each half is identical, except for the concluding word in each hemiepes, see 33,4: *carmine somnus adest, carmine somnus abest*, 275,4: *nec volo quod satiet nec volo quod cruciet* (cf. Mart. 1,57,4), 916,5 (note that a pentameter line begins the poem): *altera nonne oculis, altera nonne comis*, cf. also 907,2: *non nox absque gelu, non notus absque suo*; (3) lines that occur *verbatim* as refrains in the same poem, see 727,18 & 20: *candidus hinc unus carboneique duo* (it is to be noted that this is anticipated in line 16 also: *candiduli bini, unicus atque niger*), 875,2 & 4: *ut placeat domino, cogitat Ursidius*; (4) similar to the above, are lines in the same poem that reiterate substantial parts of each line, see the quadruple refrain in 907,4. 6. 8 & 10: *non sine carne pilus, non sine pelle caro / non sine pisce lacus, non sine sorde palus / non sine fraude forum, non sine mure penus / non sine voce sonus, non sine luce dies*; this sequence is initiated by 907,2 (see above) and itself seems to trigger a similar rhetorical form in the immediately following poem, see 908,4: *laus sine lite domus, laus sine fure locus*; (5) lines formed of two reiterated phrases, see the chiastically arranged shift of adjective and noun forms in 766,18: *triplicitas simplex, simplicitasque triplex*; (6) lines fashioned from two adjective + noun phrases without other coincidence between the two halves, see 605,2: *servator patriae, conditor eloquii*, 766,2: *gnara puerperii, nescia coniugii*, 867,2: *Gorgones vultus saxificumque nefas*; (7) lines where a cognate form is thrice reiterated, see 766,22 for the use of noun, adjective and verb form of *mori*: *et mortem iussit mortuus ipse*

⁴⁶ For purposes of citation Riese's edition has been selected; for the different numbering of poems in Shackleton Bailey's edition see his comparison table (1982, 378-382).

⁴⁷ This line is to be especially noted since, in arguing that the missing line from Ovid's trio is epist. 15,40 (*nulla futura tua est, nulla futura tua est*), Thorsen 2014, 157 declares, on a suggestion from Reeve, that it must be the missing line as it is "the only pentameter in extant Latin literature in which the first and second half are identical!"

mori ; (8) lines whose coincidence is solely audible and not etymological, see 897,62: *deposuisse deum non puduisset eum* ; (9) lines which repeat more than one word in each half, see 258,2: *esse potes liber, non potes esse pater*, 379,6: *crux mihi refugium, crux mihi certa salus*, 434,2: *quominus hoc videar, cur tamen hoc videor* (noticeable as the coincidence occurs at the end of each half), 451,4: *sive fuit fatum, seu fuit ille deus* (with slight variation in form, as with preceding example), 683,4: *hinc mihi larga domus, hinc mihi census erat*, 683,26: *sint tibi Vitalis, sint tibi laeta modo*, 898,2: *quid sensu? Ratio. Quid ratione? Deus* ; (10) lines which repeat the same initial word in each hemiepes, see 35,2: *sic coit ut perimat, sic parit ut pereat*, cf. 102,6. 242,8. 339,6. 395,10. 436,2. 462,24. 610,2. 766,20. 901,2. (11) lines where the concluding word of the first hemiepes, is echoed by the initial word of the second, see 415,14: *et quos decepit, decepit illa tamen*. Also to be included are the 42 poems (= 38-80, note poem 42 is absent) whose opening hemistich for the hexameter line forms the final hemiepes of the pentameter, see e.g. 38: *omnia casus agit. Fatum consulta sequuntur. / cedamus fatis: omnia casus agit* (cf. Ov. am. 1,9,1-2 *militat omnis amans [...] militat omnis amans*). The following poem after this sequence also uses the hexameter and pentameter lines to mark reiteration; poem 81 is arranged in quatrains and over its 32 verses, the first hexameter line is re-echoed by the fourth pentameter line, and the second pentametric line by the third hexametric, thus forming 16 reiterations across 8 stanzas.

9.18. Carmina Epigraphica

The verse inscriptions collected by Buecheler, which form the concluding volume of Riese's *Anthologia Latina*, have only minimal use for this investigation. There is one line remarkable for its use of monosyllables and reiteration, see 1095,2: *nec scio quit nunc sim nec scio quit fuerim* ; one line with triple polyptoton of *docere* and strong alliterative use of *-qui*, see 1251,2: *docta loqui doctus quique loqui docuit* ; and a pair of parallel phrases, varying their oblique cases in a repetitive unit arranged as a chiasmus, see 1412,8: *eloquio mores, moribus eloquium*. Other coincidences tend to be less strong and often restricted to echoing the word at the start of each hemiepes (sometimes another word in each hemiepes is repeated and placed in an alternative position in each half as well), see 906,10 (repetition of *crux*, see above). 1041,8. 1050,2. 1122,6 (here the repetition occurs at the end of each hemiepes).

1142,26 (differs, it contains a polyphton on *iungere* and audible coincidence in two nouns: *quos iungit tumulus, iunxerat ut thalamus*). 1163,2. 1164,10. 1189,8 (only noted due to the two parallel phrases arranged adjective – noun in each case. There is no other coincidence between the phrases). 1218,6. 1281,4. 1307,8 (one phrase, formed from three adjectives and a noun: *perfidus infelix horrificusque dies*). 1371,18. 1407,2.

9.19. *Fragmenta*

The Latin fragments offer only a little for the present study. Licinus line 2 (Morel, 46) has the following: *quaeritis ignem? Ite huc; quaeritis? Ignis homost*. A hexameter line formed of two accusative prepositional phrases is found in Cicero (Morel, 72): *in montes patrios et ad incunabula nostra*. An anonymous pasquinade against Augustus (Morel, 103) provides the following: *sexque deos vidit Mallia sexque deas*. Interestingly, this line was argued by Garlow (1936, 103-105) to be Ovidian and the *carmen* and *error* that caused his relegation; the idea is, however, rightly scoffed at by Thibault (1964, 83). Another attack (Morel, 132) on a different emperor, here Nero, has: *sustulit hic matrem, sustulit hic patrem*. Another popular verse against an emperor (Alexander Severus) provides reiterated initial half lines in its hexameter and pentameter verses: *te manet imperium*; see Baehrens (Vol. vi, 381). As an explanation for μετάθεσις (Morel, 181), the following occurs: *eripis ut perdas, perdis ut eripias*. The following quatrain (Morel, 185) directly reiterates each pentametric and hexametric line with a variance of word placement: *esse bonus si vis, cole divos, optime Pansa, / omine felici, Pansa, precare deos. / Pansa optime, divos cole, si vis bonus esse, / deos precare, Pansa, felici omine*. This is the first of a series of reciprocal verses (see poems 88-93 in Morel, 185-186), including a line which twins its repetition through an iambic and a pentametric line. In sum, the fragments, despite offering fertile ground for repeated rhetorical effects, do not contain a line comparable to Ovid's two.

10. *Conclusion*

In conclusion, two points have been established. First, the method chosen shows that the third line cannot be discovered in Ovid's works through a comparison of the shared rhetorical features of *ars* 2,24 and *am.* 2,11,10. Although *trist.* 4,7,16 may well contain the ech-

oed ghost of such a line, given Ovid's playful reworking of the criticised technique in his exilic period, strict observance of the formula prohibits support for this. A similar reservation is likewise found for ars 3,322 proposed by McKeown, which seems to be a forerunner to trist. 4,7,16 in its final hemiepes. In fact, no extant Ovidian line fully satisfies the method. Second, and far more significantly, the application of the formula to a wide range of Greek and Latin elegiac poetry has revealed how singular the two known lines are. With the exception, and that slightly debatable, of one line in Ausonius, no other pentametric line in this broad range satisfies the criteria, despite the frequent adoption of repeated rhetorical formulae and phraseology and the similarly frequent placement of phrases in the accusative case within the pentameter of the couplet. This is a striking conclusion, given the great tolerance and widespread use of repetition within Latin poetry; for the pervasiveness of repetition see Poteat (1912, 42), Raby (1934, 43-45) and Wills (1996, 473-477). Indeed it could be pointed out from the fragments of one of the named critics of the anecdote, Albinovanus Pedo, that ostentatious repetition *per se* was not of itself an issue.⁴⁸ It is not the repetition alone but the whole structure of the line and the compounded adjective in the second half, which when used collectively seemed a rhetorical step too far. This suggests, if nothing else, that Ovid certainly did not need to rely on clairvoyance to anticipate his friends' suggested deletions. This, of course, runs counter to the various glib assertions that any number of lines in Ovid could easily be found of a similar style. They cannot and cannot elsewhere in ancient literature. Although no answer can be provided for the elusive third line by this method, it has, nevertheless, made clear how striking and unparalleled the two known lines actually are.

⁴⁸ For the 22,5 lines of Pedo, see Sen. suas. 1,14. Note the conclusion for lines 1 (*diem solemque relictum*) and 16 (*dies orbemque relictum*); the refrain is emphasised by the use of the feminine caesura in each line (in contrast to the masculine in the intervening matter save line 8) and the use of *relinqui* at the end of line 10.

11. Appendix

As was noted in footnote 9, the missing Ovidian verse is by no means the only literary puzzle that Seneca the Elder has provided. One may compare the equally enigmatic use of *plena deo* (Sen. suas. 3,5-7). The phrase is purported to be a Virgilian imitation and became something of a literary *topos*. No record of the phrase is found in Virgil's text. Various explanations have been advanced to solve the mystery; a brief survey of the stances adopted is instructive in the present context. In Seneca's account there are three attributed imitations of *plena deo* all connected to Ovid's circle: the rhetor Arellius Fuscus recasts the phrase to characterise Calchas as *numine impleat*; Junius Gallio mocks Nicetes' exaggerated oratorical style, by dismissing him incongruously as *plena deo* to both Messala and Tiberius; Ovid himself uses *feror huc illuc, vae, plena deo* in a fragment from his tragedy (presumably with reference to Medea). Beyond Seneca's citations, scholars point out the following echoes: Horace (carm. 2,19,6) uses the phrase *plenoque Bacchi* to detail his prophetic rapture by Dionysus. Doubts are expressed as to whether Virgil influenced Horace, or *vice versa*. Ovid's *Fasti* (1,474) describes Carmentis' prophetic powers as *ore dabat vero carmina plena dei*. Finally, the later Latin epicists supply their own variants: Lucan. 9,564 (Cato): *deo plena*; Val. Fl. 1,230 (Idmon): *plenus fati Phoeboque quieto*; Stat. Theb. 10,164-166 (Thiodamas): *visu audituque tremendus / impatiensque dei, fragili quem mente receptum / non capit*; Sil. 3,673 (Zeus Ammon's shrine in Libya): *loca plena deo*; Sil 5,80 (Corvinus): *plenus et ipse deum*.

As is evident, all the above examples (excepting Sil. 3,673) are used with reference to a person; whatever tone is employed, the phrase denotes prophetic rapture. Given this association, all the scholars in this survey associate the phrase *plena deo* to a Virgilian context involving the Sibyl in Aen. 6,40-80.⁴⁹ The main controversy of

⁴⁹ The use of the phrase in Sil. 3,673 to qualify the neuter plural *loca*, has, nevertheless, prompted other interpretations. Scarcia 1996 uses the association to argue that the phrase originally stood in Virgil's text around Aen. 6,13 (qualifying *lecta*) to depict the Sibyl's shrine. As Feddern 2013, 284 notes, Scarcia's interpretation has attracted a few disciples; the Sibyl as referent, however, is far more appealing owing to the weight of the other evidence.

the phrase is easily summarised: does *plena deo* represent a phrase that originally stood in an earlier edition or recitation from Virgil's sixth book, or does it merely represent a paraphrase of a Virgilian scene coined by Ovid or his literary circle?

Proponents of the phrase being originally Virgilian are more numerous. Norden (1893, 506-511) tackled the issue extensively and identified two places from Aen. 6 that best mark the origin of the phrase: either lines 50-51, which describe the god's approach to the Sibyl (*adflata est numine quando / iam propiore dei*), or lines 78-79, which portray her possession by the god (*magnum si pectore possit / excussisse deum*). Norden argues strongly for the latter. This section is seen as an extended rewording of an original *plena deo*; a delineation of Virgil's manner of composition and revision follows to support the hypothesised emendation. Norden offers two motives for the alternative version. Firstly, Norden believes that the phrase *plena deo* too forcefully denotes a sexual union that takes place between the Sibyl and the god; the revised version therefore represents a softening of an episode deemed shocking or open to ridicule.⁵⁰ Although Austin (1977, 66-67) finds the idea fanciful, the notion that sexual congress with a divinity is necessary for effective prophecy is later restated by Skulsky (1987, 58-60). Secondly, Norden identifies a stylistic motive for the change, which involves the use of the perfect infinitive (*excussisse* – line 79) instead of the present infinitive, a Grecism that Tibullus had recently introduced *metri causa*. As this employment of the perfect infinitive is customarily avoided by Virgil, Norden believes the instance here disguises a later reworking of the episode, after the Tibullan innovation had received acceptance within literary circles.

The two places marked by Norden as the original location for *plena deo*, similarly attracted Edward (1928, 121-122). He suggests that simple emendation could restore the phrase: either Aen. 6,51 (*plena deo, iam to cessas in vota precesque, / Tros, ait, Aeneas*) or Aen. 6,71 (*plena deo nondum patiens*). After toying with the notion that the phrase would suit a Bacchic context (such as Amata's rapture in Book 7), Borthwick (1972, 411-412) observes that Servius glosses lines 6,50-51 with the

⁵⁰ This proposition is fleshed out at greater length in Norden's later commentary on Book 6 (1903, 143-145).

phrase *plena deo*; consequently, he is more definitive as to the original placement. Deeming Edward's emendations clunky, Borthwick suggests the first draft for lines 50-51 may have run as follows: [...] *maiorque videri, / nec mortale sonans, adflata est numine quando, / nondum plena deo*.

A different track is pursued by two Italian scholars. Della Corte (1971, 102-106) suggests, by reference to the earlier context of the third *Suasoria*, that the phrase should not be understood as a literal Virgilian quotation, but rather the summary of the Virgilian scene involving the Sibyl. Earlier in *suas.* 3,4-5, Seneca reports that Arellius Fuscus imitated a Virgilian description of the moon (*georg.* 1,427-429 & 432-433); it is clear that the declared allusion is merely thematic and not literal. Given the absence of *plena deo* from Virgil's text and the loose attribution of allusiveness elsewhere in Seneca's work, Della Corte concludes that the phrase may be a paraphrase, popularised by Ovid and his circle. Berti (2007, 282-290) follows Della Corte's reasoning and provides further support. Although he deems the allusion best fits the Sibyl episode in *Aen.* 6,49-51, he cautions against the reliance on Servius (like Borthwick above), as similar statements by Servius are found at *Aen.* 3,443 and *Aen.* 6,262. He adds that Macrobius' comment to *Aen.* 6,65 betrays similar sentiments. Berti adds three supplementary points to argue against a Virgilian origin to the phrase. Firstly, he notes that when Gallio uses the phrase to mock an overly dramatic orator before Tiberius, he needs to explain the allusion. Were it from Virgil's *Aeneid*, Berti believes this would be unnecessary. Secondly, Berti postulates that the phrase originated as a paraphrase in Ovid's tragedy *Medea* and that its original context (now lost) would have made clear the allusion to the Sibyl scene. This Ovidian usage then passed into the currency of the rhetors as a witty dismissal of exaggerated oratory and was deemed Virgilian owing to Ovid's inspiration for the scene *in toto*. Finally, Berti adduces a comparable problem at *Sen. contr.* 1,2,22. In this *controversia*, the term *inepta loci* is dubbed Ovidian (*Ovidianum illud "inepta loci"*), the phrase is absent from Ovid's own works and is only found at *Priap.* 3,8; the context concerns Scaurus' criticism of a rhetorical *faux pas* by Mureddius. Beck (2001, 95-105), instead of viewing the Priapic poem as Ovidian, would repunctuate the phrase and make the whole statement come from Scaurus: "*illud Ovidianum inepta loci*" meaning "that

Ovid like remark of yours is rhetorically inappropriate”.⁵¹ Beck’s thesis informs Berti’s understanding of the two phrases ascribed to Virgil and Ovid respectively; Berti sees the lack of a complete verse cited in each instance as a strong indication that neither the phrase *plena deo* is literally Virgilian, nor *inepta loci* Ovidian.

Supplementary points can be added to Berti’s interpretation. On the suspicion that Ovid’s *Medea* coined *plena deo*, Berti supplies three corresponding references in Seneca the Younger’s tragedy *Medea* that may betray Ovidian allusions. Engagement with the Ovidian fragment’s content or context is hypothesised at Sen. Med. 123-124. 382-386. 937-939. Hine’s commentary (2000, 131. 155) likewise observes the Ovidian reference to Sen. Med. 123-124 and notes to Sen. Med. 382 that the word “entheos” (Greek ἑνθεός, latinised earlier as *plena deo*) is first found in Seneca’s tragedies. Beyond the citations given by Berti, Trinacty (2009, 269-271) believes that line 86 (*huc fert pedes et illuc*) similarly betrays an allusion to the Ovidian fragment. The suitability of an Ovidian origin for the phrase finds further minor support within 44 pseudo-Ovidian lines interpolated in a manuscript (*Fondo Patetta* 314) of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* Book 8, see Anderson (1975). In line 3 we find: *namque Iovi sacrum cum plenus numine flamen*; in line 23 *plena deo iam totus habet praecordia flamen*. Although Anderson’s (1975, 10. 13) commentary acknowledges the two other Ovidian references, the usages here may well put the lie to Anderson’s appraisal of the general incompetence of the interpolator. Slight support may also be traced in Peirano’s (2013) use of the Senecan episode, as Seneca explicitly states that the Ovidian allusion was openly performed without any notion of plagiarism (*non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi*). Peirano’s article concerns the ethics of appropriate literary borrowings in the ancient world as distinct from plagiarism: in her view, for an allusion to be free of the charge of literary theft the borrowing must be used creatively. It is naturally hazardous – as creative literary usage is quite capacious – to place undue weight on Peirano’s notion here and claim that the Ovidian treatment must necessarily have recast the phrase.

⁵¹ I have had difficulty in sensibly rendering this proposed version and have relied upon Morgan’s (2003, 70) translated summary.

Finally, Feddern (2013, 307-311) offers the most recent extended treatment of the controversy and returns to champion the Virgilian origin of *plena deo*. Feddern notes that in the three attributed uses quoted by Seneca the Virgilian origin for the phrase is clearly expressed and he goes on to add that were the phrase not Virgilian it would be astonishing if nobody in Seneca's period noticed this. Concerning Berti's ascription of the phrase to Ovid and the later popularity of the phrase among orators, Feddern sensibly points out that it is not possible to verify whether Ovid influenced Gallio and Fuscus, or *vice versa*. Feddern thereafter stresses that alternative versions and revisions of Virgil's text should occasion no surprise, given the painstaking revisions that Virgil habitually practiced. The point is supplemented by a brief demonstration of the Virgilian quotations found in the texts of Seneca the Elder and the Younger. There are several lines quoted which deviate from the text as it is transmitted; whether they depend upon faulty memory or alternative versions that were circulating cannot be determined.⁵² By way of conclusion, Feddern suggests that Norden's earlier observation on the peculiar use of the perfect infinitive in line 79 appropriately conceals the original version. To Feddern's mind it represents the substitution of one Grecism for another: *plena deo*, a latinised form of the Greek *ἐνθρεος*, gave way to a line embracing the Greek employment of the perfect infinitive.

In sum, despite the wide popularity of *plena deo*, its exact origin and definition has been constantly contested.⁵³

kaydc1@gmail.com

⁵² For further 'misquotations' elsewhere in ancient literature including the frequent misquotation of Virgil by Seneca the Younger, see the brief overview by Owen 1931, 97.

⁵³ Although the survey has pointed out several important trends the controversy has generated, it may well be noted that the Horatian reference has largely been ignored. Would not this allusion, given the publication of Horace's *Odes* in 23 B.C., challenge the ascription of the phrase to Ovid? It should, at any rate, be explained by those who deem *plena deo* Ovidian, why the Horatian reference is to be sidelined.

Bibliography

Latin texts consulted (note that both the texts of Ausonius and Claudian contain some stray Greek epigrams):

- Baehrens, E. (ed.), *Poetae Latini Minores*. 6 Vol. [including *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*], Leipzig 1879-1886.
- Barber, E.A. (ed.), *Sexti Properti Carmina*, Oxford 1960.
- Buecheler, F. (ed.), *Anthologia Latina. Pars Posterior. Carmina Epigraphica*, Leipzig 1897.
- Canali, L. / Romana Nocchi, F. (edd.), *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, Soveria Mannelli 2011.
- Duff, J.W. / Duff, A.M. (edd., trans.), *Minor Latin Poets*. 2 Vol., Cambridge / Massachusetts 1935.
- de Duhn, F. (ed.), *Dracontii Carmina Minora, Plurima Inedita ex Codice Neapolitano*, Leipzig 1873.
- Ellis, R. (ed.), *Appendix Vergiliana*, Oxford 1907.
- Green, R.P.H. (ed.), *Ausonii Opera*, Oxford 1999.
- Hall, J.B. (ed.), *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, Leipzig 1985.
- Hallam, G.H. (ed.), *The Fasti of Ovid*, London 1920.
- Hartel, W. (ed.), *Magni Felicis Ennodii Opera Omnia*, Vienna 1882.
- (ed.), *Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina*, Vienna 1894.
- Kenney, E.J. (ed.), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*, Oxford 1965.
- Leo, F. (ed.), *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati Presbyteri Italici Opera Poetica*, Berlin 1881.
- Loers, V. (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini Epistolae*, Cologne 1829.
- Mohr, P. (ed.), *C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius*, Leipzig 1895.
- Morel, W. (ed.), *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*, Stuttgart 1927.
- Müller, H.J. (ed.), *L. Annaei Senecae Patris Scripta Quae Manserunt*, Leipzig 1887.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.), *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxford 1958.
- Owen, S.G. (ed.), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Libri Quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor, Halieutica, Fragmenta*, Oxford 1915.
- Peterson, W. (ed.), *Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber X*, Oxford 1903.
- Postgate, J.P. (ed.), *Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres*, Oxford 1914.
- Riese, A. (ed.), *Anthologia Latina*, Leipzig 1869.
- Schneidewin, F.W. (ed.), *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*, Grimae 1862.

- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Anthologia Latina*, Stuttgart 1982.
 — (ed.), *Marcus Valerius Martialis. Epigrammata*, Munich / Leipzig 1990.
 Showerman, G. (ed., trans.), *Ovid. Heroides & Amores*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1914.
 Smithers, L.C. / Burton, R. (edd.), *Invocation to Priapus. Priapeia sive diversorum poetarum in Priapum lusus*, London 1890.
 Thomson, H.J. (ed., trans.), *Prudentius. Vol. 2*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1953.

Greek texts consulted:

- Gerber, D.E. (ed., trans.), *Greek Elegiac Poetry from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1999.
 Mair, A.W. / Mair, G.R. (edd., trans.), *Callimachus. Hymns and Epigrams. Lycophron. Aratus*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1955.
 Page, D.L. (ed., trans.), *Select Papyri. Poetry*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1941.
 Paton, W.R. (ed., trans.), *The Greek Anthology. 5 Vol.*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1916.
 Preger, T. (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae*, Leipzig 1891.
 Trypanis, C.A. / Gelzer, T. / Whitman, C.H. (edd., trans.), *Callimachus. Aetia, Iambi, Hecale, and Other Fragments. Musaeus. Hero and Leander*, Cambridge / Massachusetts 1975.

Secondary Literature:

- Ballester, X., *Ovid's Lost Line*, in: *Anuari de Filologia Antiqua et Mediaevalia* 3 (2013) 25-29.
 Butrica, J.L., *Lygdamus, Nephew of Messalla*, in: *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 18 (1993) 51-53.
 Cameron, A., *The First Edition of Ovid's Amores*, in: *Classical Quarterly* 18 (1968) 320-333.
 Coffey, M. / Mayer, R., *Seneca. Phaedra*, Cambridge 1990.
 Coleman, K.M., *Cacemphaton in the Labyrinth. Ovid, Heroides 10.71*, in: *Mnemosyne* 63 (2010) 280-286.
 Cronin, P.A., *Sigmatism in Tibullus and Propertius*, in: *The Classical Quarterly* 20 (1970) 174-180.
 Dimmick, J., *Ovid in the Middle Ages. Authority and Poetry*, in: *Hardie, P. (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge 2002, 264-287.

- Fairweather, J., Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers, in: *Ancient Society* 5 (1974) 231-275.
- , *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge 1981.
- Ferguson, J., Catullus and Ovid, in: *American Journal of Philology* 81 (1960) 337-357.
- Foster, B.O., On Certain Euphonic Embellishments in the Verse of Propertius, in: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 40 (1909) 31-62.
- Fraenkel, H.F., *Ovid. A Poet Between Two Worlds*, Berkeley / Los Angeles 1945.
- Frecaut, J.M., *L'Esprit et L'Humour Chez Ovide*, Grenoble 1972.
- Garlow, L.W., A Guess as to Why Ovid Was Exiled, in: *Classical Journal* 32 (1936) 103-105.
- Godolphin, F.R.B., Notes on the Techniques of Milton's Latin Elegies, in: *Modern Philology* 37 (1940) 351-356.
- Goldschmidt, N., Ovid's Tombs. Afterlives of a Poetic Corpus, in: ead. / Graziosi, B. (edd.), *Tombs of the Ancient Poets. Between Literary Reception and Material Culture*, Oxford 2018, 101-122.
- Gunderson, E., *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity – Authority and the Rhetorical Self*, Cambridge 2003.
- Haight, E.H., *The Roman Use of Anecdotes*, New York 1940.
- Harrison, E., Latin Verse Composition and the Nasonian Code, in: *Classical Review* 57 (1943) 97-101.
- Howe, G., A Type of Verbal Repetition in Ovid's Elegy, in: *Studies in Philology* 13 (1916) 81-91.
- Huelsenbeck, B., Seneca *Contr.* 2.2.8 and 2.2.1. The Rhetor Arellius Fuscus and Latin Literary History, in: *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 66 (2011) 175-194.
- Keil, H. (ed.), *Grammatici Latini. Vol. VI. Scriptores Artis Metricae*, Leipzig 1874 [Cambridge 2009 reprint].
- Knorr, O., Three Orators and a Flawed Argument (Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.27-30), in: *Classical Journal* 100 (2005) 393-400.
- Lateiner, D., Mimetic Syntax. Metaphor from Word Order, Especially in Ovid, in: *American Journal of Philology* 111 (1990) 204-237.
- Lewis, A.M., The Family Relationships of Ovid's Third Wife. A Reconsideration, in: *Ancient Society* 43 (2013) 151-189.
- Lindner, F.G., *De Arellio Fusco Commentatio*, Breslau 1862.
- Luck, G., Notes on the Language and Text of Ovid's *Tristia*, in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 65 (1961) 243-261.
- Maguinness, W.S., Seneca and the Poets, in: *Hermathena* 88 (1956) 81-98.

- Maltby, R., Tibullus and the Language of Latin Elegy, in: Adams, J.N. / Mayer, R.G. (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1999, 377-398.
- McKeown, J.C., Ovid. *Amores*. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes. Vol. II. A Commentary on Book One, Prenton 1989.
- , Ovid. *Amores*. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes. Vol. III. A Commentary on Book Two, Prenton 1998.
- Nagle, B.R., Ovid "Facile" or "Formulaic"?, in: *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 25 (1987) 73-90.
- Nikolaidis, A.G., Some Observations on Ovid's Lost *Medea*, in: *Latomus* 44 (1985) 383-387.
- Ogle, M.B., The Lover's Blindness, in: *American Journal of Philology* 41 (1920) 240-252.
- Palmer, A. (ed.), P. Ovidi Nasonis *Heroides* with the Greek Translation of Planudes, Oxford 1898.
- Platnauer, M., *Latin Elegiac Verse. A Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid*, Cambridge 1951.
- Poteat, H.M., *Repetition in Latin Poetry. With Special reference to the Metrical Treatment of Repeated Words*, New York 1912.
- Raby, F.J.E., *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*. Vol. I, Oxford 1934.
- Radford, R.S., The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of his Metrical Art, in: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 51 (1920) 146-171.
- , The Priapea and the Vergilian Appendix, in: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 52 (1921) 148-177.
- , Tibullus and Ovid. The Authorship of the Sulpicia and Cornutus Elegies in the Tibullan Corpus, in: *American Journal of Philology* 44 (1923a) 1-26.
- , Tibullus and Ovid. Part II, in: *American Journal of Philology* 44 (1923b) 230-259.
- , Tibullus and Ovid. Part III, in: *American Journal of Philology* 44 (1923c) 293-318.
- , The Language of the Pseudo-Vergilian *Catalepton* with Especial Reference to its Ovidian Characteristics, in: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 54 (1923d) 168-186.
- , The Ovidian Authorship of the Lygdamus Elegies, in: *Classical Philology* 22 (1927) 356-371.
- Ramia, J., Hacia la Recuperación del Tercer Verso de Ovidio (Sen. *Contr.* 2.2.12), in: *Estudios Clásicos* 146 (2014) 75-96.
- Rand, E.K., *Ovid and His Influence*, London 1925.
- Raven, D.S., *Latin Metre*, London 1965.

- Rusten, J.S., Ovid, Empedocles and the Minotaur, in: *American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982) 332-333.
- Saller, R., Anecdotes As Historical Evidence for the Principate, in: *Greece and Rome* 27 (1980) 69-83.
- Sharrock, A., *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria II*, Oxford 1994.
- Siedschlag, E., *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen*, Berlin 1977.
- Siefert Jr., G.J., Meter and Case in the Latin Elegiac Pentameter, in: *Language* 28 (1952) 9-126.
- Smith, K.F., *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, Darmstadt 1913 [1971 reprint].
- Syme, R., *History in Ovid*, Oxford 1978.
- Tate, J., *Richmond Rules to Form the Ovidian Distich*, London 1835.
- Thibault, J.C., *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile*, Berkeley / Los Angeles 1964.
- Thorsen, T.S., *Ovid's Early Poetry. From His Single Heroides to His Remedia Amoris*, Cambridge 2014.
- Trinacty, C., Like Father, Like Son? Selected Examples of Intertextuality in Seneca the Younger and Seneca the Elder, in: *Phoenix* 63 (2009) 260-277.
- van der Velden, B., J.J. Hartman on Ovid's (Non-) Exile, in: *Mnemosyne* 73 (2020) 336-342.
- Weiden Boyd, B., *Ovid's Literary Loves. Influence and Innovation in the Amores*, Ann Arbor 1997.
- Wheeler, A.L., Topics from the Life of Ovid, in: *American Journal of Philology* 46 (1925) 1-28.
- Wilkinson, L.P., *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge 1955.
- Wills, J., *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion*, Oxford 1996.
- Winterbottom, M., Problems in the Elder Seneca, in: id. (ed.), *Papers on Quintilian and Ancient Declamation*, Oxford 2019, 16-43.

Bibliography for the Appendix:

- Anderson, W.S., A New Pseudo-Ovidian Passage, in: *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8 (1975) 7-16.
- Austin, R.G. (ed., comm.), *P. Vergilii Maronis. Aeneidos Liber Sextus with a Commentary*, Oxford 1977.
- Beck, M., *Inepta loci* (Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.22): ein Ovidianum?, in: *Hermes* 129 (2001) 95-105.
- Berti, E., *Scholasticorum studia. Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale*, Pisa 2007.
- Borthwick, E.K., Nicetes the Rhetorician and Vergil's *plena deo*, in: *Mnemosyne* 25 (1972) 408-412.

- Della Corte, F., *Plena Deo*, in: *Maia* 23 (1971) 102-106.
- Edward, W.A. (ed., trans., comm.), *Seneca the Elder. Suasoriae*, London 1928.
- Feddern, S. (ed., comm.), *Die Suasorien des älteren Seneca. Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Berlin 2013.
- Hine, H.M. (ed., trans., comm.), *Seneca. Medea*, Eastbourne 2000.
- Morgan, L., *Child's Play. Ovid and his Critics*, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003) 66-91.
- Norden, E., *Vergilstudien*, in: *Hermes* 28 (1893) 501-521.
- (ed., trans., comm.), *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig 1903.
- Owen, S.G., *Ovid's Use of the Simile*, in: *Classical Review* 45 (1931) 97-106.
- Peirano, I., *Non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi*. Intertextuality and Literary Deviancy Between Law, Rhetoric and Literature in Roman Imperial Culture, in: *American Journal of Philology* 134 (2013) 83-100.
- Scarcia, R., *Plena deo*. Vicende di una glossa virgiliana, in: *Euphrosyne* 24 (1996) 237-246.
- Skulsky, S., *The Sibyl's Rage and the Marpessan Rock*, in: *American Journal of Philology* 108 (1987) 56-80.