

ROY K. GIBSON, *Ovid. Ars amatoria book 3*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 446 pp., ISBN 0521813700.

Strange though it may seem, until very recently the only complete commentaries available for Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* were those of Paul Brandt (Leipzig 1902 = Hildesheim 1963) and the Italian scholars E. Pianezzola, G. Baldo and L. Cristante (Milano 1991). Apart from these we had the concise commentary of A. S. Hollis for book I (Oxford 1977). An extensive commentary on the second book by Janka was published recently (*cf. Emerita* 61, 2003, 357-9), and now we have this commentary on book III by R. K. Gibson of the University of Manchester, which originated as his doctoral thesis. We Ovidians have reason to celebrate.

The introduction (pp. 1-46) covers an analysis of the contents and structure of *Ars* 3, the didactic tradition (with emphasis on the frequent use of expressions in the imperative), the eroto-didactic tradition in *Ars* 3, the anti-cosmetic tradition and *Ars* 3, the *puellae* of *Ars* 3 and the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*, the dating of *Ars* 3 (G. places it between 2 BC and 2 AD, in contrast with Murgia [*AJPh* 107, 1986, 74-94], who dates it to around 8 AD) and a short summary of the text.

The Latin text (pp. 47-79) reproduces that established by E. J. Kenney in his second Oxford edition, with its many virtues and its no few errors (*cf.* G. P. Goold, "Amatoria critica", *HSCP* 69, 1965, 1-107 and J. B. Hall, *CR* 48, 1998, 194-5). G.'s divergences from Kenney are listed on pages 45 and 46.

The commentary (pp. 85-405) is preceded by a methodological note pointing out that the detailed introductions to the sections and subsections are important, that the unit of commentary is the distich and not the line, that great attention must be paid to cross-references, and that for the use of parallels it is important to bear in mind what the author has already stated (*cf.*, for example, "A typology of 'parallels' and the function of Commentaries on Latin Poetry", R. K. Gibson and Chr. Sh. Graus (edd.), *The Classical*

Commentary. Histories, Practices, Theory, Leiden 2002, 331-57). He also clarifies that the translations of the Latin text are either his own or based on H. T. Riley's prose translation of 1864.

I shall now present (citing by line) a few notes garnered from my reading of this commentary, which is very complete, for example, in the areas of metrics (l. 2: unparalleled elision of *dem et*; l. 119: *Palatia* in place of *Palatium* to avoid elision before a short vowel), morphology (l. 109: the middle-passive force of *induta*), syntax (l. 95: *tamen* with equivalent force to Greek δέ; ll. 263-4: use of the subjunctive in didactic poetry), style (l. 174: a 'golden' line; l. 261: on the *cacemphaton* or *kakozelia* of *tamen menda*, where a reference to the commentary by E. Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.88 [*Dorica castra*] would not have gone amiss), lexis (l. 133: on the term *munditiae*), history and *realia* (l. 116: on the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline; ll. 119-20: the temple of Apollo on the Palatine; ll. 135-68: on different hairstyles; l. 742 the funerary rite of "closing the eyes"), textual criticism and, above all, parallel passages, both Latin and Greek.

5 An apposite allusion to the double meaning, literal and erotic, of the whole line (*non erat armatis aequum concurrere nudas*).

15-22 Similar catalogues of loyal heroines appear in *trist.* 1.6.19-22, 5.5.51-8, 5.14.35-40 and *Pont.* 3.1.105-12.

18 On *ante annos occubuisse suos* there should have been a reference to the topos of *mors inmatura* or ἄωρος θάνατος; cf. A.-M Vêrilhac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΠΟΙ. *Poésie funéraire*. T. 1 Texte. T. 2, Commentaire, Athina 1978; A. Ramírez de Verger, "La *consolatio* en Frontón: en torno al *De nepote amisso*", *Faventia* 5, 1983, 69-70; cf. l. 739, *met.* 6.675; Verg. *Aen.* 4.620, 697.

24 There is no reference, either in the critical apparatus or the commentary, to the reading *favet* (*Turonensis* 879, Naugerius, Bersmannus, Ramírez de Verger 2003, cf. *art.* 1.46, 636, *am.* 2.5.11) in place of *placet*.

28 Repetition in any form upsets certain scholars, who do not hesitate systematically to cast doubts upon Ovid's perfectly correct writings. However, it is we 21st-century readers who must interpret Ovid, and not Ovid who has to adapt to our restricted knowledge, so far-removed from the 1st c. BC. I do not see why *femina* makes no sense in this line (the audience of *Ars* 3 was, as G. rightly states on p. 36, also

male), I do not see why we should go against the whole manuscript tradition (Powell's proposal, *praecepi*, is unnecessary) and I fail to see why the repetition of *femina* in lines which are consecutive or in close proximity deviates from Ovidian usage (*cf. am.* 2.12.19–24, *art.* 1.279–80, 3.163–5, *met.* 9.732–4, 790–4, 13.497–8, 14.385–6).

43 The phrase *ante oculos constitit ipsa meos*, echoing *am.* 3.5.10 (*constitit ante oculos ... meos*) and *Her.* 15.162 (*constitit ante oculos Naias una meos*) at most comes to reinforce the authorship of both poems and not to defend, as G. does, that “the phrasing of this line is borrowed by two *post-Ovidian* authors (emphasis mine), in similar contexts; *cf. [Am.]* 3.5.10; *Epist. Sapph.* 162”.

53-4 *Cf.* V. Buchheit, “Ovid und seine Muse im Myrtenkranz”, *Gymnasium* 93, 1986, 257–72.

59-100 I would have liked to see a more extensive study of the literary commonplace developed by Ovid, that of *tempus fugit*, which, along with that of *carpe diem* (*cf.* p. 118), was introduced into elegiac poetry as an invitation to enjoy love during the best years of one's life, when beauty is in full bloom; *cf. am.* 1.8.49–50; 2.9.41–2; *art.* 3.59–82; *fast.* 5.353; *Tib.* 1.1.69–74; 4.27–32; 8.47–8; *Prop.* 1.19.25–6, 2.15.23–4; *Hor. carm.* 1.11.7–8 (*cf.* the commentary by Nisbet-Hubbard, *Horace: Odes I*, 141–2); *Sen. Phaedr.* 446. See also W. H. Race, *Classical genres and English Poetry*, London 1988, 118–41 (“The Argument of *Carpe diem* Poems”).

61 At least a reference to the reading of both Heinsius and Housman, *vernos etiamnum educitis annos*, would not have gone amiss here.

82 For agrarian sexual metaphors, *cf.* E. Montero, *El latín erótico*, Sevilla 1991, 38–43.

89-90 An excellent introduction to the section (pp. 122–3) in which Ovid invites women to give men limitless sex, a common boon and one which causes no wear and tear.

101-34 Another excellent introduction to Ovid's defence of *cultus* against the anti-cosmetic tradition of antiquity.

113-4 Other arguments will have to be found besides the claim that the reading of Heinsius (*nunc aurea Roma/ edomiti magnas possidet orbis opes*) destroys the balance between the two parts of the hexameter, since imbalanced hexameters can be found elsewhere in this very book, e.g. in lines 121 and 127.

121-2 The formula “let others like such-and-such a thing: I prefer this other” is typical of a “programme” (*priamel* or *praeambulum*); *cf.*

E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford 1957, 230-2; W. A. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Leiden 1982, 145.

145-6 The indicative-subjunctive alternation (*decet/sit impedienda*) continues in the following distich (*placet/ sustineat*). There is no reason to read *illa est* instead of *illa sit*.

155 The reading *casum simulat* appears in the Parisinus, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 15155, s. XIII (p5), was rightly defended by G. P. Goold (*The Art of Love and other poems*, London 1979, 128) and H. Tränkle (*Hermes* 100, 1972, 399-400), and a similar *iunctura* appears below in l. 179 (*ille crocum simulat*).

172 I see no need to place an exclamation mark after *suos* (as proposed by A. Ker, in *Ovidiana*, Paris 1958, 225-6) in place of the question mark preferred by the vast majority of editors. Likewise in line 214.

199-208 An excellent introduction to Ovid's novel recommendation that women should use make-up, in opposition to the whole elegiac tradition.

214 It is preferable to keep the question mark, as it is parallel to the one in line 212.

231 G. rightly supports Burman's reading *splendent* against the *pendent* of the manuscripts.

240 On the mistreatment of *ornatrices*, add Martial, 2.66; Juvenal, 6.487-93.

251-90 A good comparison between Ovid and Alexis (*fr.* 103 K.A = Athen. 13.568a-d).

269 *Pingat* (Watt, *MH* 52, 1995, 96) fits in very well with the meaning of the line: "let the pale one add a touch of colour to her body with purple gowns" (*cf. met.* 15.89 and Mart. 2.29.8, cited by G.).

270 Politianus (*cf.* Cristante, p. 380) was thinking of a cosmetic made with crocodile excrement ("the fish of Pharos"), *cf.* Horace, *Epodes*, 12.11; J. Delz, "Zu lateinischen Dichtern: Ovid als Ratgeber in Kleiderfragen (*Ars* 3,269f.)", *MH* 55, 1998, 61-2.

325-6 The legend of Arion of Metimna (7th-6th c. BC) is also narrated by Herodotus (1.23) and Fronto; *cf.* M. P. J. van den Hout, *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*, Leiden 1999, 543-50.

343 I see no difficulty in accepting the reading *deue tribus libris* (*cf.* Woytek, *WS* 110, 1997, 283).

349-52 Ovid seems to be referring especially to the dancing of mimes, which provided sensual arousal; *cf. am.* 2.4.29-30, *art.* 1.595, *rem.* 334, 753-4.

353-92 To G.'s magnificent clarification of the games alluded to by Ovid should be added F. Socas, *Arte de amar*, Madrid 1995, 96, n. 72.

412-3 Ovid here falls back on the topos (not cited by G.) of *agrypnia* or remaining awake as a quality of hard-working, self-conscious poets; see R. F. Thomas, "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry", *HSCP* 83, 1979, 199-206.

433-8 Against Tarrant (*PCPS* 26, 1980, 85-8), it is salutary to read Gibson stating "I see no problem with the language or logic of 433-8".

433-6 In Spanish we use the term "donjuanes" for the type of men described by Ovid: conceited and fickle.

513-4 Indulgence forms part of the *obsequium amoris*, or courteousness towards the beloved of either sex. On the language of secret signs and gestures between lovers, cf. also the commentary by J. Booth on *am.* 2.5.15-18 (*Ovid, Amores* II, Warminster 1991, 119).

542 On *otium* among the elegiacs, cf. A. Ramírez de Verger, "El otium de los elegíacos: una forma heterodoxa de vida", in F. Gascó-J. Alvar (eds.), *Heterodoxos, reformadores y marginados en la Antigüedad Clásica*, Sevilla 1991, 59-70.

551 The avarice of courtesans or the elegiac beloved became a topos within the motif of the *puella avara*; cf. F. Navarro, "Amada codiciosa y edad de oro en los elegíacos latinos", *Habis* 22, 1991, 207-21.

554 The amatory motif of the "nets of love" or *retia amoris*; cf. 1.391-3, 2.3, 3.554; see B. Lier, *Ad topica carminum amatoriorum symbolae*, Stettin 1914 (reprint 1978), 18-20, and P. Murgatroyd, "Amatory hunting, fishing and fowling", *Latomus* 43, 1984, 362-8.

565 On *sapienter amare* or "loving wisely", see A. Ramírez de Verger, "La *puella sapiens* en Ovidio, *Amores* II 4, 45-46", *Emerita*, 69, 2001, 1-5.

567-70 The author does not cite the amatory motif of *rixae in amore*; cf. Prop. 3.8.9-10, 4.5.40-1, Tib. 1.6.69-72, 1.10.53-60, Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.9-12, Ov. *art.* 2.447-54 and 3.673-80; J. C. Yardley, "Lovers, quarrels: Horace *Odes* 1, 13, 11 and Propertius 4, 5, 40", *Hermes* 104, 1976, 124-8.

575 I think that G. is missing the point. Ovid meant that mature love is more secure and reliable, while that of young people is brief, and more powerful and fruitful, like young earth. The reading should therefore be *brevis et fecundior ille*.

627-8 Pliny the Elder (*nat.* 26.62) offers the following information, which may help to explain this passage: "Tithymallus is called 'milk plant' by us Romans, sometimes 'goat lettuce'. It is said that if its juice

is used to write on the body and then, when dry, sprinkled with ash, the letters will appear, and that some men prefer this means rather than billets-doux to communicate with their lovers"; cf. Ramírez de Verger-Socas 1995, p. 109, n. 103. The correct reading, along with Burman, is therefore *umiduli ... alumine limi*.

655 Merkel restored what Ovid must have written: *quid sapiens faciet, stultus cum munere gaudet?* When one is intent on not understanding a line, the easy option is to consider it spurious, as is the case with Goold ("Amatoria critica", *HSCP* 69, 1965, 49), Leary (*CQ* 41, 1991, 265-7) and Kenney (*Oxonii* 1995², 212), who does not cite Leary.

669 Cf. Pl. *Asin.* 220-1.

683-746 An excellent, condensed introduction on myth in elegy (pp. 359-60) apropos of the legend of Cephalus and Procris.

729 *Lucundus ... error* is an oxymoron, based on Virgil's *gratusque ... error* (*Aen.* 10.392).

755 Heinsius *ad loc.*: "Diu est quod vidi *quiddam* reponi debere. Quod prima editio confirmat, et unus Vatic." W. Stroh vigorously defended the manuscript reading *quidam* ("De crucibus quibusdam amatoriis", in *Acta conventus omnium gentium Ovidianis studiis fovendis*, Bucharest 1976, 565-6: "Hic quoque tradita lectio et potest servari et debet").

764 *ne ... vide* is preferable to Watt's *nec ... vides* ("Ovidiana", *MH* 52, 1995, 97). There are imperatives above in lines 755, 756, and 757, and *ne* plus imperative is a poetic construction; cf. Szantyr, 340.

776 Ovid undoubtedly wrote *accipienda*, not *aspicienda*, some copyist's prudish emendation following l. 780 (*conspicienda*), as Heinsius rightly pointed out. G. M. Edwards, who is scarcely cited by anyone, also read *accipienda*; cf. J. P. Postgate, *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, Londini 1905, 303.

787 It is strange that there should be no reference to the reading *modi*, which in my view is the correct one. I reproduce my own critical apparatus: *modi T, rec., Heinsius, Edwards, cf. am. 3.7.64; 3.14.24; art. 2.680; 3.771; Mart. 9.67.3 : ioci RYL, rec. aliquot, Scal. exc., edd. plerique.*

789-92 These lines should perhaps be placed after line 808.

795-6 A clear reference to the *irritamenta Veneris* or "incitements to love"; cf. *am. 3.7.12, 55-6; 3.14.21-6; art. 2.466, 689, 705 y 723-4; Iuv. 6.194-7; Apul. met. 5.6*; see also the extremely useful, if little-known, commentary by G. Némethy, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores*, Budapestini

1907, 245. See A. Ramírez de Verger and M. Librán, “*Irritamenta Veneris en Marcial*”, in F. J. Iso (ed.), *Hominem pagina nostra sapit. Marcial 1.900 años después*, Zaragoza 2004, 209-26.

The bibliography (pp. 406-27) is lengthy and comprehensive (and includes the contributions made by a number of Spanish researchers to the study of Ovid). I have only noticed the omission of the edition by M. von Albrecht (Stuttgart 1992), the monograph of E. Montero (*El latín erótico*, Sevilla 1991) and a couple of important reviews of Kenney’s Oxford second edition (J. B. Hall, *CR* 48, 1998, 194-5; E. Woytek, *WS* 110, 1997, 282-4).

Closing the volume are indexes of themes, passages and proper names. A select index of amatory terms (*cf.* Ramírez de Verger’s edition of Ovid’s *Carmina amatoria*, 342-54¹⁵) might not have been out of place here. I have detected very few errata (expostion, p. 16; subjuctive, p. 90). The format and paper are pleasing, but readers –especially those *aetate provecta*– might well have appreciated a more generous letter type¹⁶.

A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
 Universidad de Huelva
 ramirezdeverger@uhu.es

¹⁵ On page 352 of my edition (Index) the corrected terms ‘cognoscere’, ‘concupuisse’ and ‘iucundum furtum’ should be read. I apologize for these inexcusable *lapsus calami*.

¹⁶ I would like to express my thanks to Professor G. Laguna for his valuable corrections and suggestions and to J. Zoltowski for his comments and help with the English version. The present review is part of a research project (BFF 2002-02113) financed by the DGICYT of Spain.