

Lethaeus Amor: Love and Memory in Latin Elegy

by

Ellen M. Lee

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2016**

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Basil J. Dufallo, Chair

Associate Professor Ruth R. Caston

Professor Peggy S. McCracken

Professor David S. Potter

Professor Ruth S. Scodel

© Ellen M. Lee 2016

DEDICATION

in matris meae memoriam

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the following people for helping me achieve this great goal, as well as so many smaller ones along the way:

My committee, for your guidance and support, for all the time spent on drafts, meetings, emails, and the varied tasks of advising. Among many other things: Ruth Caston, for your kind advice and encouragement; Basil Dufallo, for always challenging me to exceed my own expectations; Peggy McCracken, for your inexhaustible enthusiasm; David Potter, for encouraging me to see the bigger picture beyond the poetry; and Ruth Scodel, for your enduring patience, even when I am at my most clueless.

My cohort, Clara Bosak-Schroeder, Harriet Fertik, and Matthew Newman, for being the constant buoys that have kept me afloat these many years. I would be sunk without you.

The UM Classical Studies community, whose warm and encouraging members have always offered me a soft place to land. Special thanks to Michelle Biggs, Sara Forsdyke, and Arthur Verhoogt, for listening to problems large and small with sympathy (and, often, a solution).

The Classical Studies Dissertators' Workshop and Support Groups, especially Kate Allen, Nick Geller, Tim Hart, Tiggy McLaughlin, Jacqui Pincus, and Amy Pistone, for letting me borrow your eyes over many drafts and bend your ears over many, many cups of coffee.

My family, for keeping the home fires burning, while I'm off pursuing my dream.

Evan, my partner in everything, for sustaining me through it all. Words aren't enough.

Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: <i>Memento Mori: Love, Death, and Memory in Love Elegy</i>	28
CHAPTER TWO: Out of Sight, Out of Mind? Forgetting <i>Roma</i> and <i>Amor</i> in the City and Abroad	71
CHAPTER THREE: Ugliness in the Eye of the Beholder: False Memories and the Female Body	108
CHAPTER FOUR: <i>Remedia (Re)members Heroides: Embodiment and Epistolarity</i>	141
CHAPTER FIVE: Receiving, Rescripting: Poetic Memory and Forgetting in <i>Remedia Amoris</i>	182
CONCLUSIONS	227
BIBLIOGRAPHY	230

ABSTRACT

This dissertation considers the connection between love and memory (or, as often, forgetting) in Roman elegiac poetry, through the lens of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* (*Cures for Love*). I argue that, by writing *Remedia*, the last poem in the *corpus* of Latin love elegy, as an 'art of forgetting' which purports to aid the unlucky lover by teaching him to forget love, Ovid underscores the significance of memory in the elegiac genre. By telling readers how to forget, Ovid reveals how previous poets, including himself, taught readers how to remember.

I investigate the connection between love and memory in elegy by pinpointing elegiac modes of amorous memory production. My method of analysis extracts certain pieces of advice (*praecepta*) given by the didactic narrator of *Remedia*, who guides the reader to rid himself of love. Even as his purportedly curative precepts inevitably fail, they point to elegiac strategies for memory production. My chapters treat these methods of creating memory thematically, each outlining a different piece of advice for forgetting, paired with a corresponding strategy for memory production in the elegiac genre: strategies for memorialization after death (Chapter 1); strategies for rescripting the localized memory of love (Chapter 2); strategies for creating false memories of the beloved (Chapter 3); women's strategies for epistolary memory production (Chapter 4); and strategies for scripting poetic memory through allusion and tropes (Chapter 5). I propose that *Remedia* offers a guide for the reader of elegy, underscoring the importance of these strategies of memory production for the program of the elegiac genre.

In addition to considering how the advice Ovid gives recalls his own previous works (the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Heroides*), I explore how Ovid's *Remedia* receives the works of his

poetic predecessors, including Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and even Homer. To investigate the broader cultural *milieu* of Roman memorialization and mnemotechnics, I utilize frameworks from social, poetic, and cognitive memory studies.

INTRODUCTION

Lethan Love: Forgetting Elegiac Love in *Remedia*

In *Remedia*, the Ovidian *praeceptor* purports to teach his student, a desperate lover, to fall out of love. In a passage about two-thirds of the way through the poem, he establishes his authority as a teacher by laying claim to a connection with the divine, as he imparts hope for a supernatural end to the student-lover's suffering:

*est prope Collinam templum venerabile Portam;
(inposuit templo nomina celsus Eryx);
est illic Lethaeus Amor, qui pectora sanat
inque suas gelidam lampadas addit aquam.
illic et iuvenes votis obliviam poscunt,
et si qua est duro capta puella viro.
is mihi sic dixit (dubito, verusne Cupido
an somnus fuerit: sed puto, somnus erat):
“o qui sollicitos modo das, modo demis amores,
adice praeceptis hoc quoque, Naso, tuis...” (Rem. 549-558)*

(Near the Colline Gate, there is a venerable temple (lofty Eryx has put a name to it); Lethan Love is there, who heals the heart and pours cool water upon his own flames. And there young men seek forgetfulness by their prayers, as well as any girl who has been taken in by a harsh lover. Thus he spoke to me (I am in doubt whether it was really Cupid or a dream, but I think it was a dream): “O you who who give and take away anxious love, add this, too, Naso, to your precepts...”)

Here, the *praeceptor* explicitly cites forgetfulness as the cure for love, tying his *remedia* to the effects of the river Lethe. As he invents a new cult of the god Amor and plays with the traditional topos of theophany, he recalls poetic conventions and religious traditions, bending these weighty themes to his own rhetorical purpose, the cure for love. Most significantly for the present study, this passage, by highlighting the role of forgetting, in fact demonstrates the importance of memory in elegy. In this dissertation, I read *Remedia* as an ‘art of forgetting,’¹ a handbook on how to forget the love affair. If, according to the Ovidian *praeceptor*’s argument, love can only be tempered by the cool waters of Lethe that bring on forgetfulness, then remembering must be the main source of fuel for the fires of elegiac love. The link between love and memory in *Remedia* recalls a similar thread connecting love and memory throughout love poetry of the late republic and early principate.

In this inquiry, I investigate the connection between love and memory in Latin elegy by pinpointing elegiac modes of amorous memory production. Within the fiction of the elegiac love affair, the memory of love is produced when a character (the poet-lover, for example) makes an effort to ensure that some aspect of the love affair (e.g., his undying devotion) will be remembered. The characters of elegy, as well as the elegist himself, produce memory through a variety of strategies, which I explore throughout this dissertation. I propose that *Remedia* offers a guide for the reader of elegy, underscoring the importance of these strategies of memory production for the program of elegy. By writing *Remedia* as an ‘art of forgetting’ in which his purportedly curative precepts inevitably fail, Ovid points at elegiac strategies for memory production. By instructing readers to forget, Ovid points out how previous poetry taught readers to remember.

¹ Following others, especially Hardie (2006).

Each of my chapters outlines a different strategy for the production of memory in elegy. My method of analysis extracts certain pieces of advice (*praecepta*) given by the narrator of *Remedia*, who guides the reader to rid himself of love; I compare this advice to previous love poetry, including that of Ovid himself, to determine how remembering and forgetting function within the values of Latin love elegy. Ovid's interaction with the mnemonic methods of individual characters, as well as those of the elegists themselves, complicate the role of memory in elegy and in Roman culture writ large. I consider how the advice Ovid gives recalls his own previous works (*Ars Amatoria*, *Amores*, and *Heroides*), the works of his poetic predecessors (including Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and even Homer), and the broader cultural *milieu* of Roman memorialization and mnemotechnics, utilizing frameworks from the studies of social, poetic, and cognitive memory.

What is memory?

Memory is a notoriously broad concept, both in the ancient world and today. In English, the word 'memory' can mark cognitive mental processes, individuals' remembrances of the past, the memorialization of the dead, public ceremonies celebrating the past, or textual reminiscences.² Appeals to memory can include calls to action ('Remember the Alamo!'), threats or warnings ('Remember what happened last time?'), and even greetings ('Remember me to Herald Square!'), and they elicit a variety of responses, from internal, passive mindfulness to external, active efforts. 'Memoria' in Latin has an equally wide range of connotations. Walter (2004) outlines *memoria*'s "semantische Facetten," noting that the term can indicate mental function, memory recall, historiography and history, written and non-written media that recalls the past, the traditions of the *mos maiorum*, burial and mourning practices, and the 'art of

² Cf. Fentress and Wickham (1992), x.

memory' of the rhetorical schools.³ Following Walter's (2004) analysis, the study of Roman memory has experienced a particular boom in the last decade. Gowing (2005), on the memory of the Roman republic in the imperial period, and Flower (2006), on the practices of memory sanctions in Roman politics, were among the first in a trend of investigating how Romans conceptualized their past. Rome's obsession with memory and memorialization is widely acknowledged; Galinsky's *Memoria Romana* project originates from the view that "memory defined Roman civilization."⁴ This dissertation, as an analysis of the ways in which elegy treats personal, poetic, and cultural memory, follows upon the scholarly discussions of memory in the burgeoning field of Roman memory studies.

In this study, I have attempted to stick to a limited vocabulary that I construe as 'memory terms.'⁵ Terms for memory and remembrance in elegy include words with *mem-* roots, including *memoria*, *meminisse*, *memor*, *memorabilis*. Etymologically related are *monimentum/monumentum*, which often refers to memorialization, and *admonitio*, which indicates a reminder. The act of mental and verbal recall is initiated by verbs like *referre* and *revocare*. Forgetting is signaled by *immemor*, *oblisci*, *oblivium*, and *Lethaeus*. This study is not, however, a lexicographical analysis of elegiac poetry. In certain circumstances, although no explicit memory terms may be used, concepts of memory are still at work, and I consider these instances throughout my analysis.

One of the most significant sources for Roman conceptions of memory can be found in Latin rhetorical treatises. The oratorical *ars memoriae* aided students of rhetoric in developing

³ Walter (2004), 26-35.

⁴ Galinsky (2014), 2. This collection of papers from the *Memoria Romana* conference held at the American Academy in Rome in 2011 represents a part of Galinsky's research project, begun in 2009 with the award of the Max-Planck Prize for International Cooperation. Several recent pieces of scholarship on Roman memory have been generated as part of this project; the most relevant for my project is Seider's (2013) monograph, discussed in more detail below.

⁵ For a more comprehensive list of Roman memory terms, see the list given on the *Memoria Romana* website (http://www.utexas.edu/research/memoria/latin_terms.htm).

techniques to retain and recall forensic details.⁶ Rhetorical manuals, like the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero's *De oratore*, and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, adopt the *loci* method, teaching students to situate memories mentally within particular locations in an imagined setting. This system of artificial memory enables the orator to access a memory by undertaking a mental journey through these imagined spaces (*loci*), viewing the objects (*imagines*) within them, each of which represents an item to be remembered. Looking at the *loci* and *imagines* in his mind's eye allows the orator to access stored memories efficiently. Yates (1966)'s exploration of the history of arts of memory, from the ancient through modern periods, points out that the *loci* method relies heavily on visual memory. According to Cicero's *De oratore*, the description of Simonides's invention of the art of memory emphasizes not only orderliness, but the significance of sight, claimed to be the strongest of the senses: *acerrimum autem ex omnibus nostris sensibus esse sensum videndi; quare facillime animo teneri posse, si ea quae perciperentur auribus aut cogitatione etiam commendatione oculorum animis traderentur* (*De orat.* 2.87.357; but the keenest out of all our senses is the sense of sight, and, because of this, anything that is perceived aurally or through thought can be most easily retained in the mind, if it is also relayed to the mind through the mediation of the eyes).⁷ Roman memory is most often constructed and understood visually, in the rhetorical manuals and elsewhere.⁸

The conception of memory in the rhetorical manuals is, of course, limited. The rhetorical *ars memoriae*, developed as an explicitly artificial system of memory, is intended as a memory

⁶ Ovid and his fellow elegists would have been quite familiar with these techniques of oratory. Cf. Berti's (2007) treatment of the relationship between Ovid's poetry and declamation, 290-308. I should point out here that a 'shorter note' (of only four pages), written by Patrick Beasom, published in *Classical Quarterly* in 2013, makes some of the connections between *Remedia* and the techniques of the *ars memoriae* that I point to throughout this dissertation. The two chapters that focus the most on rhetorical *comparanda* (chapters 2 and 3), indeed, were both drafted well before this short note was published. The observations I make in these discussions are not central to the argument of my dissertation, however.

⁷ Cf. Yates (1966), 4.

⁸ For a (now somewhat dated) perspective on the visual techniques of the *ars memoriae* from a cognitive perspective, see Small (1997), 95-116.

aid for details one has learned, rather than a way of preserving personal memories of the past. However, as Farrell (1997) has shown in his analysis of the phenomenology of memory in *De oratore*, even the rhetorical schools' conceptions of memory may be more dynamic than they seem on the surface. Although Cicero may appear to describe a static system of memory retrieval, Farrell argues, the story of Simonides actually shows a character making associations between personal memory and cultural memory, rather than a process of rote recall.⁹ Farrell concludes that "mnemonic behavior should be understood in terms not of storage but of enactment. The Romans in particular were to a very large extent in the habit not of storing memories but of performing them."¹⁰ In addition to visual memory, our understanding of Roman concepts of memory, then, should include dynamic memory manipulation.

Such an understanding of memory, in some ways, aligns well with modern conceptions of remembering and forgetting. In this analysis, I primarily focus on ideas of personal remembrance, that is, how individual characters remember their own pasts. Indeed, the genre of elegy, in which personal narratives are valued above social concerns, encourages such a study. However, I do also utilize other theories of memory, most notably the frameworks of social/collective memory, poetic memory, and cognitive memory.

Social or collective memory relies on cultural practices of remembrance, rather than individual reflection. The seminal works of Halbwachs (1925 and 1950) on the subject are a major source for the emergence of memory studies in the twentieth century. Halbwachs argues

⁹ On the distinction between 'static' and 'dynamic' conceptions of memory, see Whitehead's (2009) summary of the history of these concepts, *passim*. In particular, I find the definitions of Terdiman (1993) to be helpful; he divides ideas about memory into the systems of 'reproduction,' the "retention of the old" (59) that attempts to make an exact copy of the original, and 'representation,' a consciously constructed version of the past that, in a way, transforms the old into a new object. Although his theoretical framework does not recognize the possibility of these two concepts coexisting in the ancient world, his ideas about writing as memory production are relevant to my study of Ovid's treatment of memory: "The metaphorical substrate for inscription—memory—thus *rewrites* the text that it makes available for rereading. In inscribing, it simultaneously transforms. The point is crucial: the texts of memory are not *copies* but *representations*. They are always already overwritten *by the process of writing itself*" (109).

¹⁰ Farrell (1997), 383.

that memory is socially constructed and dependent upon cultural expectations and experiences. The shared nature of this group memory is so pervasive that, indeed, an individual memory is merely “a viewpoint on the collective memory.”¹¹ Halbwachs’s ‘collective memory’ has been criticized for eliding the individual’s role in remembering the past,¹² and the term ‘social memory’ has been introduced to designate a model of memory in which individual expressions of memories are understood to be influenced by the speaker’s social framework.¹³ In other words, ‘social memory’ describes how individuals’ reflections on the past are shaped by broader cultural ideas about the shared experience of that past. Gowing’s (2005) monograph applies the concept of social memory to Rome’s *memoria publica*, expressed through historiographical literature and material culture, to show how Romans’ concepts of a shared past provided the building blocks for Roman collective identity. Seider (2013) analyzes Vergil’s treatment of memory in the *Aeneid*, demonstrating that “there is a constant tension within the *Aeneid* between the memories that individuals voice and the mnemonic needs of the group to which they belong.”¹⁴ In my analysis, although I focus primarily on the personal memory of individual characters, intent on their own lives rather than a shared past, I consider Ovid’s interplay with cultural expectations based on memories of the Roman past, especially as he engages with Augustus’s assertion of control over social memory in the early principate.

Poetic memory refers, essentially, to the idea of the poetic tradition, a set of expectations and knowledge shared by poets, which can be thought of, perhaps, as a specialized form of social memory. Poets rely on a shared store of devices (tropes, figures, characters, myths, meters, turns of phrase, etc.) to indicate their remembrance of previous poetry and to claim participation in the

¹¹ Halbwachs (1980), 48.

¹² See Whitehead’s (2009) summary, 129-139.

¹³ Cf. Fentress and Wickham (1992).

¹⁴ Seider (2013), 22.

literary tradition. The intertextual discourse of Roman poets, as characterized by Conte's (1985) landmark study of poetic memory in Latin poetry, is markedly self-conscious in its (re)use of poetic language to allude to predecessors. In a manner particularly relevant for this study, Conte introduces the concept of 'reflective allusion,' and points out a case of such intertextual reference in Ovid's reuse of the figure of Ariadne. At *Fasti* 3.473-475, Ariadne, an archetypal abandoned woman, remembers her previous laments against Theseus. Her use of the language of memory (*memini*) signals a direct allusion to Ariadne's speech in Catullus 64, directed against Theseus himself. The character herself recalls her poetic past and explicitly identifies this process of memory in her words. Following from Conte's work, Hinds (1998) examines how memory words function in as signposts or footnotes to allusive dialogue through 'reflexive annotation,' by which poets consciously signal their allusion as such for the reader.¹⁵ As he argues, reflexive annotation tropes allusion as memory (i.e., the allusion is the primary signification, and the reference to memory is a metaphorical vehicle intended to convey the idea). However, in his analysis of the allusion-as-memory, Hinds leaves open the possibility of complicating this schema:

“But (to return to the example of Ovid's Ariadne, invoked earlier) why assume that in *Fast.* 3.471-6 *memory* is really a way of talking about *allusion*, rather than *allusion* really being a way of talking about *memory*? If the Ariadne correspondence had been cited in a book about memory, rather than in a book about allusion, it might have seemed more natural to read the trope the other way around—to reverse the direction of explanation. Why, in other words, should it be taken as read that, in the metaphorical relationship between Ovid's allusion and Ariadne's memory at *Fast.* 3.471-6, the former functions as

¹⁵ Hinds (1998) ties this 'reflexive allusion' to David Ross's observation of the 'Alexandrian footnote,' by which poets use specific language of report to signal their allusive participation in the literary tradition.

the primary field and the latter as the secondary field of signification—rather than *vice versa?*”¹⁶

In this dissertation, I follow Hinds’s suggestion, focusing on the role of memory as the primary signifier and approaching intertext with previous poetry from the point of view of memory and forgetting. Although I only concentrate on poetic memory in chapter 5, allusion and intertext appear as themes throughout my analysis.

In my examination of elegiac memory, I often make recourse to the terminology and methodologies of cognitive approaches to memory. In particular, I address the distinction between episodic and schematic memory in behavioral and cognitive psychology, as well as a few of the constituent components of these two types of memory. Episodic memory refers to the remembrance of specifics (i.e., episodes, details, or distinct sets of data), including personal, autobiographical memories. Most of what we would colloquially refer to as one’s ‘memories’ fit into this category. Schematic memory, on the other hand, is a system of generalized memory, that is, a set of cultural expectations, stereotypes, and conventional formulae that make up the basis of one’s knowledge of her/his environment. Part of this knowledge consists of a number of behavioral stereotypes, known as ‘scripts,’ which organizes a person’s general knowledge of a routine situation and the sequence of actions expected in such a situation. In a 1979 study, which expanded on the original script theory of Schank and Abelson (1977), Bower, Black, and Turner, exploring the role of text in the accessing of the behavioral scripts, devised so-called ‘script-texts,’ consisting of lists of sentences delineating the actions that comprise a particular script. In this case, the script-text told the story of an individual going to the doctor; reading the story cued the script for ‘Visiting a Health Professional’ in the mind of the reader. As the study showed, participants, when asked to recall as much as they could about the story they read, supplemented

¹⁶ Hinds (1998), 11.

the narrative contained in the script-text with tacit knowledge of the script, recalling common elements of the ‘Visiting a Health Professional’ script that were not actually present in the script-text they read. Bower, Black, and Turner’s study demonstrated that scripts of accustomed situations guide recall and recognition of past knowledge. In this dissertation, I treat the concept of scripts as part of generalized, schematic memory in chapters 2 and 5. As I argue, Ovid overwrites the accustomed scripts common to Roman society and literature, introducing his own schema of expectations, stereotypes, and conventions.

In a discussion of the connection between love and memory, of course, it is essential to consider the affective aspects of memory. Particularly, my focus on affective memory takes for granted the idea that emotional episodes are more memorable than events that do not trigger affective response.¹⁷ That this correspondence between emotion and memorability was assumed in the ancient world, as well, is clear from Cicero’s *De oratore*, which consistently declares that one of the main objectives of oratory is to move (*movere*) the audience to memory through impassioned rhetoric.¹⁸ In his analysis of Roman emotions, Kaster (2005) applies the framework of behavioral scripts to consider how emotions are culturally determined in the Roman world. As he demonstrates, scripts of emotion delineate the culturally expected reactions to affective stimuli, determining the sequence of perception, evaluation, and response an individual performs when (s)he experiences a certain emotion. The experience of emotion, then, is not entirely individual, but culturally constructed. When Ovid links *amor* with memory, he does not just

¹⁷ As, indeed, psychological studies have consistently shown. However, as Heuer and Reisberg (1992) point out, while emotional events are remembered in great detail, the detail is not always incredibly accurate (152-180). For the relationship between emotion and memory in cognitive studies, see, in addition to Heuer and Reisberg, the rest of the series of essays in Christianson (1992).

¹⁸ Cf. *De orat.* 2.115, 128, 310; 3.104. Vasaly (1993) details how ancient theories of rhetoric set out processes for creating an emotional response in one’s audience by deploying images meant to evoke memory: “the speaker first summons images from his memory, where they are stored; if the orator is skillful and imaginative, these stimulate the particular emotional response that he had hoped to create in himself; the orator then, through vivid description, stimulates corresponding *visiones* in the minds of his audience; and these, in turn, produce a seemingly inevitable emotional reaction in the listeners” (96-97).

implicate the personal, autobiographical remembrances of individual characters, but the schematic memory of scripted emotion in Roman culture.

In this dissertation, I base my analysis on engagement with elegy's use of personal, affective memory. My arguments begin from the observation that elegy, in response to the cultural dominance of public memorialization in Rome, privileges the private, personal remembrance of love over social memory of the public past.¹⁹ As discussed above, most scholars have centered their studies of memory in Latin poetry on social or poetic memory. Although, at various points, I address the significance of social, cognitive, and poetic memory systems in my interpretation of the elegiac memory, I center my study on personal memory in elegy, reading the characters (e.g., mythological figures, *puellae*, and narrators, including the lover-poet and the *praeceptor*) as individuals with the capacity for emotion and autobiographical memory. Following Conte (1985), Hinds (1998), and Armstrong (2006), I understand the personal memory of characters as inextricably linked to intertext with previous poetry. Personal remembrance is never purely individualized, but is always influenced by social memory. I argue that Ovid's play with memory in *Remedia* mixes personal with social and poetic memory, claiming all three as the domain of his elegiac remembrance.

What is love elegy?

Latin love elegy suffers from genre problems. Indeed, what we call 'elegy' may be too idiosyncratic to be truly considered a genre. As Farrell points out in his 2003 case study, elegy is both over- and under-determined. Elegy is "easy to define"²⁰ in terms of its boundaries: brief poems written in elegiac meter by a first-person authorial narrator, whose focus is his fraught love affair with a beautiful woman. But elegy is also not quite so simple. Although technically

¹⁹ See Ch. 1 for a fuller exploration of this assumption.

²⁰ Farrell (2003), 397.

limited to four poets (Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid),²¹ whose *floruits* are limited to a span of less than fifty years, the canon of elegiac poetry may be considered to incorporate certain poems of Catullus, the corpus of Sulpicia, and, indeed, Ovid's works outside of *Amores*. Ovid's contributions, especially *Heroides*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Remedia Amoris*, make clear that he construes the genre more broadly, viewing elegy as primarily defined by its meter and theme of love.²² Since my discussion follows from the point of view of *Remedia Amoris*, I will broadly define elegy here, as well, considering 'elegiac' any poetry that employs both elegiac meter and the theme of destructive love. Further, I will consider elegy-adjacent (and, therefore, relevant) any poetry that uses the themes and tropes of elegiac love, even if it may utilize a different meter.²³

Latin elegy's derivation from Hellenistic elegiac epigram (especially Callimachus) is unquestionable,²⁴ but the Roman form borrows themes, characters, and tropes from many genres: epic, comedy, pastoral, philosophy, tragedy, and others. Elegy is, indeed, "a hybrid genre if ever there was one."²⁵ As mentioned in the discussion of poetic memory above, the role of intertextual memory within elegy has been treated extensively by scholars.

In addition to meter and erotic subject matter, another defining characteristic of elegy is its self-reflexivity. Elegy, even as it addresses an external *puella*, focuses inward, on the experiences of the narrator and, metapoetically, the poet. As Barchiesi (1987) argues, elegy is

²¹ As Quintilian defines elegy (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.93).

²² See discussion of *Rem.* 359-396 in Ch. 5.

²³ The most fundamental overarching themes of elegy are *militia amoris* and *servitium amoris* (cf. Lyne (1980), 65-81; Kennedy (1993), 46-63). My analysis of elegy-adjacent poetry, however, does not particularly focus on these. In this dissertation, the only poem I extensively treat that does not use elegiac meter is Cat. 64, which, through its consideration of the tale of Ariadne and Theseus treats the *puella relicta* theme of elegy, the unifying motif of chapter 4. Because of the impact this theme (and indeed, this version of the story) has on later elegy, I view Cat. 64 as a particularly salient influence on the function of memory in elegy. (See Miller (2004), on treating Catullus as a Latin elegist.)

²⁴ See Cairns's (1979) discussion of Tibullus and Hellenistic poetry for an overview of the relationship between elegy and epigram.

²⁵ Farrell (2003), 397.

“non si tratta solo di materiali e tecniche narrative, e neppure solo di un tema unificante, l'amore, ma soprattutto di una prospettiva unificante.”²⁶ This ‘unifying perspective’ reduces everything to the language of elegy and the point of view of the poet-lover. Because the genre is consistently self-reflexive, elegy acts as a breeding ground for metapoetic dialogue. In elegy, the narrator stands in for the poet, his *puella* for his poetry. Wyke’s (1987) paper established the concept of the elegiac *scripta puella*, the elegiac woman who is more a literary construct than flesh-and-blood mistress. The body of Propertius’s Cynthia corresponds to the corpus of his poetry and his interactions with her reflect on his work as a poet. As Sharrock (1991), Keith (1994), and Boyd (1997), among others, have demonstrated, reading Ovid’s works through this metapoetic lens has been tremendously productive, especially for feminist scholars of Latin poetry, allowing Ovidian scholarship to move beyond biographical (or prosopographical) interpretations of Ovid’s characters, including the narrator and the *puella*.²⁷ Although I find such an approach fruitful and frequently gesture towards the possibility of metapoetic interpretation of elegy, my priority in discussing memory in elegy lies with surface, rather than metapoetic, readings of the texts.

Barchiesi’s idea of elegy’s ‘unifying perspective’ alludes to metapoetic currents, but also the programmatic privileging of the elegiac value system over all others. Elegy’s borders are hazily defined precisely because it attracts every subject into its purview. Elegy constructs a system of values in which private emotion takes precedence over public action, personal *otium* over patriotic *negotium*. As Conte (1989) has argued, elegy “constructs for itself an organic language which works by transcodification, inasmuch as it transvalues from one system to

²⁶ Barchiesi (1987), 68.

²⁷ When I refer to Ovid, I very rarely mean the historical figure. If I mean to refer to the poet in a metapoetic sense, I most frequently call him ‘poet’ or ‘Ovid,’ distinct from the characters of the ‘lover-poet’ or the *praeceptor*, who function as narrators within the world of the poetic narrative.

another.”²⁸ This process of ‘transvaluation of values’ enables elegy to ‘recuperate’ values from the dominant culture outside of its generic bounds into the new culture created within. Conte’s primary example is the Roman cultural value of war, which is recuperated into the elegiac paradigm through the trope of the *miles amoris*, which relates the values of the dominant cultural system (heroism, *gloria*, *patientia*) to its own system of signification, in which love, rather than war, becomes the signified.²⁹ Following Conte, I postulate that elegy also enacts a transvaluation of memory. The value placed on public *memoria* (primarily, the memorialization of great men and great deeds) is transferred to instead signify the individual characters’ personal memories of love. This privileging of personal memory over collective/social memory is characteristic of the treatment of the private/public dichotomy in elegy, which privileges the individual emotion (i.e., the pursuit of *amor*) over social responsibility (e.g., *negotia* like civic engagement, military exploits, business, and farming). In negotiating this transvaluation of personal and public, elegy both borrows from and challenges other genres and media; I will particularly focus on elegy’s interaction with Roman memorials and monuments (Chs. 1 and 2), the oratorical *ars memoriae* (Chs. 2 and 3), and Homeric epic (Ch. 5) in my analysis.

Ovid’s Role in Elegy

Ovid intercedes in this elegiac discourse by widening the parameters of elegy, borrowing rhetorical figures and tropes found in earlier elegy, but pursuing them further than his predecessors. In *Heroides*, rather than adopting the male lover-poet persona, Ovid writes from the perspective of *puellae relictæ*, an elegiac trope, to be sure, but markedly different from

²⁸ Conte (1989), 444.

²⁹ “In other words, those values which elegy recuperates from the universe of the culture (within which it has cut out its own autonomy) cease to be signifieds and become signifiers of different signifieds. But the creation of this new kind of signified is a process rather than a result; the act of reinterpretation retains a full consciousness of the substantial difference between text of provenance and text of arrival (and to synthesize new meanings is precisely an effect of rhetorical codification). This creates within elegy a tension which is never resolved and those contradictions which make it an unstable literary experience and an ephemeral one.” (446)

previous elegy in its feminine voice and epistolary form. In *Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*, and *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, Ovid takes on the persona of the *praeceptor amoris*, a teacher of love, a role previously assumed by Tibullus (1.4), Propertius (4.5), and, indeed, Ovid himself (*Am.* 1.8). But instead of short poems, he writes long didactic treatises, full of *praecepta* directed towards the characters of elegy, imagined as his readers and students.

The scholarship on Ovid's erotodidactic poetry has been dominated by questions of genre and intertext. Volk's recent contributions stand out among those interested in these texts' links to ancient didactic.³⁰ Exploring the didactic tradition, Volk (2002) works to both contextualize Ovid's didactic works and to define what makes these works unlike other didaxis: the authorial persona. As she notes, "the persona of the *Ars amatoria* is thus not only, like all other didactic speakers, both a teacher and poet, but at the same time also a lover, that is, a practitioner of the art he teaches."³¹ This tripartite persona—teacher, poet, lover—reflects the doubled personae of the two melded genres in Ovidian erotodidaxis: didactic (which requires the teacher-poet persona) and love elegy (which requires the poet-lover persona).³² Being a lover himself allows the Ovidian *praeceptor* to cull examples from his own amatory experiences, including those explored in *Amores*. Such exploits rhetorically provide the *praeceptor*'s qualifications for being considered an expert in love, even as they often show him as a failed lover. However, it is his struggles in love that purportedly inspire the poet to write. Love will yield to him (*mihi cedit Amor*, *Ars Am.* 1.21) because he has suffered its wounds.

But what exactly is 'love' in Ovidian erotodidaxis? As Myerowitz (1985) explains at the

³⁰ There are many. For Ovidian erotodidaxis: within the broader didactic tradition, see Hollis (1973: 89-93), Küppers (1981), Stuedel (1992), and Toohey (1996: 169-173); and Vergil's *Georgics*, see Leach (1964) and Woytek (2000); and Lucretius, see Sommariva (1980), Shulman (1981), Brunelle (2000-1), and Wildberger (2007); and Socratic traditions, see Kennedy (2000) and Gibson (2003: 13-19); and Roman philosophy, see Labate (1984: 121-74).

³¹ Volk (2002), 163.

³² Cf. Durling (1958), the seminal article on the Ovidian didactic persona.

opening of her monograph, “the *Ars Amatoria* is not a love poem, but a poem about love.”³³ Following a long discussion about what constitutes love in the Ovidian corpus,³⁴ scholars have generally come to agree that Ovid exploits a dual meaning of *amor*. Myerowitz, challenging previous scholarly interpretations of Ovid’s use of *amor*, distinguishes between being ‘in love’ (like the elegiac lover) and playing at love (like Ovid’s *praeceptor*). Ovid’s *cultus*, she argues, claims to tame the cruelty of elegiac *amor*, turning it into a cultural game that plays on both Augustan values and literary conventions. Typical elegiac *amor* is an all-consuming emotion, comprised of intense desire toward another. It is overtly sexual, directed at a member of the opposite sex, and is most often described as destructive and painful, likened to a wound, disease, or fire. Volk (2002) distinguishes between this type of love, *amor* as a strong emotion, and Ovid’s alternative use of the word, *amor* as a social behavior:

“What the poet treats is the *practice* of love in a specific cultural and social milieu.... From the instructions on where to find a mate to the advice on how to act during intercourse, the *Ars amatoria* teaches its students to master a string of types of behaviour, which, if performed correctly, will enable them to achieve their goal, a long-term male-female relationship based primarily on mutual sexual fruition.”³⁵

Ovid plays on the ambiguity between these two definitions of love in his erotodidactic works, alternately alluding to the uncontrollable *amor* of elegy and advising his students in the carefully controlled art of *amor*.³⁶ Ovid subverts the elegiac genre as he fluidly shifts between these two meanings of *amor*, showing his facility with both, while pretending they are the same. As Volk

³³ Myerowitz (1985), 17.

³⁴ Beginning with Fyler’s 1971 paper, which points out the paradox of *Ars*’s attempt to control irrational passion.

³⁵ Volk (2002), 169.

³⁶ Rosati (2006) enumerates these two different types of love as ‘Love 1’ (“an ‘active’ meaning of love in the sense of the art of courting and seducing”) and ‘Love 2’ (“a ‘passive’ meaning...referring to the passion and emotion experienced by the persons involved”) and observes that “‘Love 1’ serves to activate and control ‘Love 2’” (158).

(2002) comments, in Ovid's erotodidactic works, "what used to be an affliction has become a social skill, what used to be wholly irrational can be taught and learned."³⁷ The defining conflict of elegy, in the Ovidian *praeceptor*'s hands, is swiftly and irreversibly resolved.

This treatment of love not only acts as a comment on Ovid's poetic predecessors, but on the politics of the principate. Despite the tradition of construing the famous *carmen et error* that led to his exile as a reference to *Ars Amatoria*,³⁸ there is a dearth of scholarship discussing the relationship between Ovid's didactic works and Augustan politics before the 1980s.³⁹ Labate (1984) initiated a debate concerning the politics of Ovid's didactic with his contention that Ovid, the "perfezionatore dell'elegia,"⁴⁰ rejects elegy's prioritization of love over civic responsibility and contextualizes *amor* within the system of Roman social *mores*. Analyzing parallels between *Ars* and Cicero's *de Officiis*, Labate argues that the public and private spheres are brought into harmony by Ovid: "l'uno non è senza l'altro, sono anzi due lati della stessa realtà."⁴¹ Sharrock (1994) directly responds *contra* Labate, arguing that love and politics cannot occupy opposite sides of a coin because, in Augustan Rome, love is already political; the two must exist on the same plane. She reads *Ars* as a subversion of Augustus's moral legislation, as Ovid appropriates Augustan phrases and purports to reject adultery, even as he leaves open the possibility for such a reading of its *praecepta* and *exempla*. Habinek (1997) similarly situates Ovid's poetry in the Augustan context, arguing that the moral legislation of the principate appropriated concerns that had previously been managed by the family (i.e., marriage, divorce, and procreation) into the domain of the state. Habinek contends that concordant with this transformation from private to public is a change in the venue of the love affair, "the creation of a private space for performance

³⁷ Volk (2002), 172.

³⁸ cf. Syme (1978), who contextualizes Ovid and his poetry (as well as theories about his famous *error*).

³⁹ One notable exception is Holleman's (1971) anti-Augustan reading.

⁴⁰ Labate (1984), 48.

⁴¹ Labate (1984), 50.

of sexual acts.”⁴² Ovid, Habinek asserts, responds to this sudden change by ambivalently espousing either the old values of honor and shame, governed by priorities of the sexual *mos maiorum* (e.g., monogamy) or new legalistic language of sexual exchange (e.g., mutual orgasm), depending on which better privileges the *amator* in any given situation. Ovid takes advantage of this paradigm shift, relocating extramarital sex to the bedroom and emphasizing the import of discretion in public spaces; of course, even as he does so, he paradoxically takes sex into the public sphere through his poetry. Ovid’s playful and contradictory treatment of the lover’s sexual exploits in his didactic works reveals the cracks in the foundation of the *princeps*’s moral legislation.

***Remedia*, Memory, and the End of Elegy**

Remedia Amoris fits into the erotodidactic program established by *Ars Amatoria*; the same *praeceptor* who gave advice to student-readers about playing the game of love now counsels the desperate lover in falling out of love. *Remedia*’s strategy of reversing *praecepta* given in *Ars Amatoria*⁴³ has led many to characterize it as merely a palinode of the previous work.⁴⁴ Because of its perceived superiority, *Ars Amatoria* has received far more attention from scholars than *Remedia* (or *Medicamina Faciei Feminae*, for that matter), and most scholarship on *Remedia* has been dominated by the shorter poem’s relationship to the longer. However, after Conte’s (1989) article on generic consciousness in Ovidian elegy singled out *Remedia* as the key example of Ovid’s system of ‘transvaluation of values,’⁴⁵ scholarship on *Remedia* has been decidedly more nuanced. Conte contends that *Remedia* represents the ‘end of elegy,’ not just in

⁴² Habinek (1997), 38.

⁴³ Henderson (1979) shows that fourteen out of forty precepts are reversals of *Ars*; three precepts are borrowed unchanged, for a total of seventeen allusions to *Ars* (xvi). For the correspondences between *Ars* and *Remedia*, see also Hollis (1973), 101-104; Küppers (1981), 2530-41; and Wildberger (1998), 343-7.

⁴⁴ See Geisler’s (1969) commentary, 38ff., for a summary of this debate. He staunchly argues that *Remedia* is not a palinode: “Das Gedicht gibt dafür nicht den geringsten Anhaltspunkt” (39).

⁴⁵ On this phrase, see discussion of this article above. As Conte reads it, *Remedia* is key to Ovid’s interpretation of elegiac codes: “the *Remedia* is in fact the destination of Ovid’s work in ‘interpreting’ the code of elegy” (449).

terms of the *terminus ante quem* of the genre, but as the ultimate experiment in the limits of the elegiac code: having exaggerated every trope, motif, and convention of the genre, “Ovid seems aware that with the *Remedia* he is exhausting the ultimate possibilities of a literary form still to some degree recognizable as elegy.”⁴⁶

Following on Conte’s observations about *Remedia*’s role for the study of the genre of elegy, several scholars have explored Ovid’s treatment of poetic memory in *Remedia*, and we can broadly divide their interests into two categories: allusion and *exempla*. A number of studies treat *Remedia*’s allusion and intertext with other works, genres, and themes, including:

Remedia’s connection to didactic medical poems, such as Nicander’s *Alexipharmaca* and *Theriaca*,⁴⁷ its allusions to Vergil’s didactic *Georgics*,⁴⁸ its intertext with Lucretius’s *De rerum natura*,⁴⁹ and its relationship to comedy.⁵⁰ Treating Ovidian *exempla*, Davisson’s studies (1993, 1996) point out the incongruities between the argument that the *exemplum* is supposed to prove and the larger mythological context of the particular example. Throughout his career, but particularly in *Remedia*, Ovid makes use of *exempla* that are questionably relevant, half-heartedly applied, or blatantly contradictory to the purported goals of the work. As Davisson (1996) argues, these *exempla* undercut their own rhetorical efficacy and cause the reader to suspect that, far from representing a cure for love, *Remedia* actually shows that, according to the mythological tradition, any attempt to avoid love’s snares will result in even more suffering.

This ‘failure’ of *Remedia* as an effective cure for love has been a focal point for more recent studies of the connection between *Ars* and *Remedia*. Brunelle’s articles (2000-1, 2002) analyze the form and *exempla* of *Remedia*, pointing out that the very meter of *Remedia* serves to

⁴⁶ Conte (1989), 461.

⁴⁷ See Henderson (1979), xiii; Pinotti (1988), 15-23; Toohey (1996), 171; and Watson (2002), 162-163.

⁴⁸ See Woytek (2000).

⁴⁹ Sommariva (1980), Shulman (1981), Brunelle (2000-1), and Wildberger (2007).

⁵⁰ Pinotti (2006) and Gavaille (2009).

remind the reader of love: *Remedia* is “a poem whose elegiac form is diametrically opposed to its didactic goal.”⁵¹ His analysis (2002) of the *exemplum* of Circe, previously treated in *Ars*, demonstrates that *Remedia* forces a distinction between the student of the text and the reader, the internal and external audiences of the poem: “in the *Remedia* Ovid writes a didactic treatise that we may read but that his student should not.”⁵² Fulkerson (2004) argues that Ovid’s previous didactic work has created such a ‘totalitarian’ worldview that his reader-student cannot help but see his environment through the lens of elegiac discourse. Far from viewing *Remedia* as a reversal of *Ars*, she contends that “the two texts work in tandem, pulling their reader into an inescapable circle of elegiac love.”⁵³ Rosati’s (2006) view coincides, and he contends that *Remedia* is not a deconstruction or denial of *Ars Amatoria*, but merely an illusion of unlearning: “whilst the text stresses repeatedly the idea of unlearning (*dediscere*) on the part of the reader, it does not imply a parallel action of unteaching (*dedocere*) on the part of the *magister*. It is only the reader-pupil therefore who undergoes a negative process (and is *de-discens*), whilst the poet continues to be a *doctor*, even if of a different knowledge; he teaches a different *ars* (16, 233), bestowing *praecepta* (41) that do not involve unlearning those in his previous work but add to or even presuppose them.”⁵⁴ He concludes, like Fulkerson (2004), that *Remedia*, although it purports to represent a cure, actually reaffirms the power of elegiac love.

The role of memory within *Remedia* has been observed intermittently, but was never explicitly investigated until Hardie (2006). Hardie’s concern lies primarily with *Remedia*’s intertextual resonances, which turn poetic memory into a double-edged sword for the reader-student. On the one hand, the references to Catullus, Propertius, and Vergil evoke the tradition of

⁵¹ Brunelle (2000-1), 129.

⁵² Brunelle (2002), 67.

⁵³ Fulkerson (2004), 211.

⁵⁴ Rosati (2006), 154-155.

the *renuntatio amoris*, engaging the reader's intertextual memory to provide authority for the unlearning of love. However, recall of these texts reminds the student of the failures of these attempts to forget love in previous poetry. As Hardie argues, the figure of *Lethaeus Amor*, an oxymoron, "since love is by definition all-absorbing of attention," represents the paradoxical role of memory in *Remedia*: "as a poetic fiction the presiding god of forgetfulness manifests himself in a tissue of intertextual memories."⁵⁵ *Remedia*'s tension between remembering and forgetting is, for Hardie, expressed in terms of poetic memory: "to forget the admonitions of love would also be to learn to forget how to be a memorious intertextual reader."⁵⁶ Ovid's 'art of forgetting' necessitates remembering the poetic past, even as the *praecepta* urge the reader to forget it.

In this dissertation, I read elegy (like Roman culture as a whole) as obsessed with remembering and forgetting. I concur with Hardie (2006) that Ovid responds to the preoccupation with memory represented in previous elegy by creating an 'art of forgetting' in *Remedia*, which claims to aid the lover who wishes to fall out of love by teaching him how to forget the love affair, and that this 'art of forgetting' is continually undermined by the memory of previous elegy. When interpreted in an intertextual framework by a reader who remembers and recognizes elegiac allusions, *Remedia*'s *praecepta* are proved to be ineffective for forgetting. Instead, the 'art of forgetting' reinscribes the values of elegy in the memory of the reader. Ovid's play with creating an art of forgetting that reminds the reader both of previous elegy and of non-elegiac traditions, like oratory or visual culture, reveals the paradox that forgetting necessarily includes remembering and that the *amor* represented in elegiac poetry is impossible for the reader to forget. He ties personal and poetic memory together, conflating the two so that the reader remembers Ovid as a lover-poet, as the *praeceptor amoris*, and as a reader of previous

⁵⁵ Hardie (2006), 168.

⁵⁶ Hardie (2006), 169.

elegy, as well as remembering his predecessors and their characters. This connection of personal and poetic memory is a programmatic statement that elegy maintains memory in a circular system; no true erasure can occur because the system continuously fills in the gaps of memory loss. There can be no ‘end of elegy’ because the system of elegiac memory is always self-reflexive and self-repairing. Just as Ovid’s Ariadne cannot forget what happened to her in Catullus 64, so the reader of *Remedia* will recall what he learned in *Ars Amatoria*. The cycles of personal and poetic remembering and forgetting in elegy are never ending.

Just as personal and poetic memory are interconnected, *Remedia* juxtaposes personal and social memory. As discussed above, the tension between private emotion and social responsibility is a defining characteristic of Latin love elegy, and it finds expression through the privileging of amorous memory. In *Remedia*, Ovid responds to this elegiac movement by consistently complicating the relationship between public and private in his *praecepta*. He instructs the reader to forget love by avoiding elegiac behaviors (which privilege individual memorialization of the love affair) and demonstrating more culturally dominant *mores* (e.g., *negotia*, like fighting in battles, participating in civic affairs, traveling on business, farming, etc., which are thematically represented by other genres). However, rather than offering a treatise on how to perform these activities, Ovid’s focus remains on love throughout *Remedia*, indicating that, while the text interacts with non-elegiac genres like epic and oratory, it very much is still a product of the elegiac genre. Indeed, *Remedia* shows through constant reference to other types of behaviors and genres that there is no topic that elegy cannot incorporate within its generic bounds.

The mnemonic system created by elegy, consistently self-reflexive and all-encompassing, is located by *Remedia* in a very real, very Roman world, which sometimes intrudes on the

fantasy world created by the elegists. *Remedia* plays up this intrusion by blending together concepts of personal affect and public values (e.g., rhetorical strategies for memorization applied to forgetting the love affair; monuments as elite self-promotion as places to meet the *puella*) to comment upon both elegy and the Roman *milieu* in which it is situated. Ovid's claim with his 'end of elegy' is that there can be no end to elegy, since elegy is able to subsume every aspect of Roman culture.

Remedia, as Ovid's last work of love elegy, takes elegiac values, tropes, and metaphors to their furthest logical conclusions as a reaction to and commentary on his elegiac predecessors and his own elegiac works. As its *praecepta* inevitably fail, *Remedia* creates a series of paradoxes, reflecting and revealing contradictions that already existed in previous elegy. Ovid's paradoxical *praecepta* bring forward inconsistencies and complicate dichotomies in the elegiac value system. Ovid's 'art of forgetting' in *Remedia* allows readers of elegy to better identify elegiac strategies of producing memory. By telling readers how to forget, then, he reveals how previous poets, including himself, taught readers how to remember. Each of the following chapters explores a different strategy for the production of memory in elegy.

Outline of Chapters

My first chapter concerns the interaction between memory, love, and death. Death is the pretext for writing *Remedia*, as the Ovidian *praeceptor* claims his advice is necessary to keep the lover, desperate to the point of suicide, from expiring from love. In *Remedia*, to avoid death, one must forget love. This precept points to previous elegists' obsession with death and anxiety about being forgotten *post mortem*, and these preoccupations largely construct the program of elegiac memory. The centrality of memorialization in elegy corresponds to Romans' general anxiety about being remembered after death. Contrary to dominant Roman *mores*, however, the elegists

want to be remembered for personal affect, rather than public deeds, and, through their poetic development of elaborate death fantasies, they devise strategies for memorialization that prioritize *amor* over *honor*. In this chapter, I treat *Remedia* alongside the poetry of Tibullus and Propertius, as well as the epigraphic text of the *Laudatio Turiae*, contextualizing elegiac methods of memorialization within the anxieties of post-civil war Rome.

Chapter 2 explores how the memory of love is inscribed on the urban spaces of Rome. Throughout Ovid's didactic works, love is localized within the city of Rome, so the Ovidian *praeceptor* of *Remedia* advises the lover is to flee the city. Ovid's precepts within Rome, however, take precedence in the text, maintaining the focus on the city as the site of the memory of love. I argue that the intersection of memory and space in *Remedia* reflects on both personal and public strategies of memory production, as the spheres of elegy and the state merge in the city of Rome. Ovid's treatment of Rome's urban space overwrites scripts of social memory in the public spaces of Rome with the personal memory of love. Even spaces outside the city, but contained within the bounds of Roman empire, are tainted by Rome's association with love, demonstrating that there is no true escape from *amor*. Ovid's precepts in *Remedia* make clear that love's localization within the city roots elegy in a Roman context, blending private and public memory within the *loci* of Rome. Roman memory space, now associated with the *puella* because of *Ars*, always inspires elegiac memory-production and makes forgetting impossible, within or without the city. By considering the *praeceptor*'s advice within *Remedia*'s generic and cultural contexts, I show that Ovid creates his own methods for scripting the memory of public spaces in Rome.

My third chapter focuses on the memory of female beauty in elegy. *Remedia* advises the lover to misremember his *puella*'s body as ugly, manipulating his own memories to create a false

recollection of unsightliness. The *praeceptor*'s strategies for forgetting the female body in *Remedia* remind the reader that remembering flawless beauty is a pivotal part of elegiac memory production. However, as this advice in *Remedia* points out, the beauty described by elegy cannot exist in reality; elegy describes a beauty in the mind's eye of the lover that is distinct from her external beauty. By suggesting that the lover can remember his *puella* as ugly, the *praeceptor* intrudes on the fantasy world created by elegy, opening the genre up to the possibility that even bodily imperfection can have a place in elegy. Although 'natural' beauty is an elegiac value, Ovid treats the mistress' flaws (in body or character) as an equal impetus to poetic creation, as I demonstrate by taking a look back at beauty in *Amores*. Ovid's previous treatment of the *puella*'s physical imperfections, including blemishes instigated by *cultus*, points to the friction between truth and falsehood in the depiction of elegiac beauty.

Chapter 4 discusses the memory production strategies of another character of elegy, the abandoned woman. The *praeceptor* of *Remedia*, suggesting that the lover burn the letters of his *puella* to avoid thinking about her when she is absent, treats text as a stand-in for physical presence and, thus, as an impetus to memory. This precept recalls the trope of the abandoned woman and her strategies for remembering love and avoiding being forgotten, a particularly relevant *topos* for *Remedia*, since the lover who follows its counsel inevitably must become the archetypal villain of the trope, the lover who has left behind his *puella*. Equally salient is Ovid's earlier treatment of the *puella relicta* figure in the epistles of *Heroides*. The abandoned women of Latin love poetry are anxious about being forgotten and voiceless; this fear of voicelessness, however, gives them a voice in poetry. *Heroides* explores the ways in which written and oral memories engender near-corporeality by evoking intense remembrance. Its heroines devise strategies for memory production that reflect this focus on bodily

memorialization, sometimes adopting those of the lover-poets of elegy, and sometimes creating their own unique mnemonic methods of evoking physical remembrance.

My final chapter explores the role that elegiac tropes and topoi, as well as direct allusions to previous poetry, play in *Remedia*'s treatment of the poetic construction of memory. Ovid advises his students not to read poetry, but he constantly reminds the reader of the poetic tradition by frequently employing both specific allusions and generic tropes. Considering Ovid as a reader and rewriter of his predecessors, I view his reception of his Latin and Greek predecessors through the lens of cognitive theories of memory, considering both episodic memory, which I liken to allusion, and schematic memory (e.g., behavioral scripts), which I compare to generic convention. Ovid's reuse of tropes in *Remedia* enacts scripts that he alters to suit his own purposes, highlighting both his novel contribution to the genre and the original context of the hypotext. By exploring both specific cues to particular script-texts and more generalized cues to elegiac topoi, I show how Ovid reconstructs elegy even as he unravels it through his 'art of forgetting.' Finally, I examine the light this cognitive perspective sheds on the reader's reaction to Ovid's play with genre and memory, as *Remedia* complicates the memories of readers compelled by the Ovidian *praeceptor* to flout generic boundaries as they remember the poetic past.

Conclusions

Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* constructs an 'art of forgetting,' a cure to love that is based on amorous memory loss. By placing emphasis in this paradoxical text on how to forget love, Ovid underscores the importance of remembering to the program of elegiac production. His references to previous elegy, including his own, as well as to concepts from other genres and types of thought, work towards proving that elegy can truly incorporate all aspects of Roman life and

literature. Just as individual memory is both personal and social, elegy concerns both intimate memories of love, specific to individual characters, and the cultural constructs of love, poetry, and society. Ovid's last love elegy deftly unravels and reworks the massive discourse of elegy, singling out each of its signifiers for analysis one-by-one and reversing them, only to reconfirm and return them to order once again. Although the last work in the canon of Latin love elegy, *Remedia Amoris*, far from representing the 'end of elegy,' presents elegy as a genre with no boundaries, a song that never ends.

CHAPTER ONE:

Memento Mori: Love, Death, and Memory in Love Elegy

Introduction

Ovid's *praecepta* on how to forget love (and love elegy) in *Remedia* identify for the reader elegiac strategies for memory production. When he offers instruction in avoiding death, Ovid also teaches his readers how to impede production of the memory of love, which earlier elegy constructed through elaborate fantasies involving the death of the elegist or his beloved. By alleging that the imminent death of the lover is the critical reason a cure for love is urgently needed, Ovid points out that the elegiac lover's toxic obsession with his cruel mistress is an inescapable tenet of the genre, and he, thereby, demonstrates the centrality of death to the program of elegiac memory. The anxiety the elegists express about not being remembered after death manifests itself in the creation of fantasies that detail different strategies for the memorialization of the elegist and the love affair. To contextualize these strategies, I explore the changing role of memorialization as Roman cultural paradigms shift between republic and principate. As anxieties and opinions about honor adjust during the civil wars, the elegists exploit a new tendency towards memorializing private emotions, rather than public deeds, in remembrances of the dead.¹ In *Remedia*, Ovid reflects on this elegiac trend by pointing out the

¹ The dichotomy of private/public is, of course, fraught and always culturally determined. (See Arendt (1958) and Habermas (1962) for two seminal texts on the history of the public/private divide in the modern West.) Regarding

political dangers that have arisen since the post-civil war period, in a truly Augustan Rome. After Augustus's moral reforms, love poetry is no longer a private, safe place from which to escape the public sphere; writing elegy is gravely dangerous.

The tie between memory and death in Latin love poetry is complicated by the intricate bond between love and death in elegy. Elegy functions as a *memento mori*, a channel for the exploration of death even in the midst of the reflection on love. The coupled concepts of *mors* and *amor* are valued by elegists who aim at not only introspective and eloquent expression but also playful interaction with their sources and with their words.² Latin elegy's obsession with the interaction of love and death no doubt owes its existence, at least in part, to Hellenistic poetics.³ The traditional etymological derivation, ἐ ἐ λέγειν (to cry 'woe, woe'), indicates that Greek ἐλεγεία was fundamentally connected with death and mourning.⁴ The use of elegiac meter in Greek sepulchral epitaphs, as well as the Hellenistic poets' adoption of this form for their literary

ancient Rome, Milnor (2005) points out the Latin word *privatus* is essentially defined in political terms: "For the Romans, at least originally, to be private was to be 'apart from' the community, the affairs of the state, the spaces of civic life" (20). As she argues, the limits between private and public, individual and community, underwent particular change during the early principate, as the private citizen Octavian came to control the state as the emperor Augustus. In my view, it is no coincidence that elegists should explore the boundaries between private and public during this period of transition; their generic insistence on being apolitical, refusing to write about the business of the state and instead focusing on personal, individual affective experiences, rather than communal responsibilities (or even emotional experiences shared by the community), becomes a source of tension when their poetry veers into more political territory. In this chapter, I have no intention of flattening this tension into easily definable categories. Instead, I will define my terms here as the Latin language does, with all its attendant ambiguities: 'private' (*privatus*) is both 'individual' and 'politically disengaged,' as opposed to 'public' (*publicus*), meaning 'communal' or 'civic.'

² The major scholarship on death in elegy tends to focus on Propertius. Papanghelis (1987) traces the Hellenistic roots of the genre's connection to death through a detailed analysis of Propertius. Erasmo (2008) treats Propertius's use of Roman funerary ritual, especially its theatrical aspects, as self-representation. Marchese (2012) analyzes the "ruolo esistenziale" of the poet-lover, exploring the ways in which the *Amore/Morte* nexus contributes to an ethical system in Propertian elegy. Among those who treat death in elegy more generally: Müller (1995) is concerned with the elements of *Todesfantasie* in Tibullus and Propertius; Ramsby (2007) looks at the role of inscriptions in elegies of Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid; Houghton (2011) focuses on the role played by allusions to death and burial in the elegists' (primarily, Propertius and Tibullus) program of establishing their own set of values opposed to the traditional *mos maiorum*. None of the major treatments of death in elegy discuss Ovid's didactic works in detail.

³ For the relationship between Propertius (and other Latin elegists) and his Hellenistic models, especially as regards the topos of death, see Papanghelis (1987), *passim*. For the etymological play with the words *mors* and *amor*, 41-43.

⁴ For the etymology, see Maltby (1991), 201-202. The funerary origins of the meter are acknowledged by several Latin poets, including Ovid, as at *Am.* 3.9.3-4, when he comments that it will be befitting for *Elegia* to mourn the death of Tibullus.

epigrams on death, underscores the meter's association with death. Even as the Latin elegists adapt elegiac meter to fit the contexts of *amor* and *Roma*, they, like their Greek predecessors, exploit the reminder of death cued by the meter.⁵ The ideas of true and loyal love that can outlive death, painful and unrequited love that can cause death, and cruel death that can sever a love affair are tropes that persist throughout the genre. Poetry, as the medium through which this relationship between love and death is expressed, becomes a *locus* of memory for the love affair affected by the death of a lover. The verse itself codifies the memory of love and preserves it, serving as a memorial to the dead lover.

Death in *Remedia Amoris*

Death is built into the discourse of love and memory from the very beginning of *Remedia*. Ovid opens his *Remedia Amoris* with an exchange between the *praeceptor* and Amor, the purported first reader of the book. Since the god has taken offense at the book's title and aim, the *praeceptor* justifies his goal of curing love by characterizing love as a deadly disease. He must draft a treatment for the lovesick, he argues, to prevent the deaths of lovers unhappily in love:

*siquis amat quod amare iuvat, feliciter ardens
gaudeat, et vento naviget ille suo.
at siquis male fert indignae regna puellae,
ne pereat, nostrae sentiat artis opem.
cur aliquis laqueo collum nodatus amator
a trabe sublimi triste pependit onus?
cur aliquis rigido fodit sua pectora ferro?*

⁵ As scholarly interest in Hellenistic epigram has grown, so has the attention to Roman elegists' use of it. See especially Keith's edited volume (2011), which boasts seven scholars' treatments of the relationship between Hellenistic epigram and Latin elegy. Cf. also the commentaries of Fedeli (1980, 1985, and 2005) and Hutchinson (2006). For the connection between Roman elegy and the Latin funerary epigraphic tradition, see: Yardley (1996), who explores elegy's use of topoi and formulae from Latin epitaphs; and Ramsby (2007), whose monograph treats the convention of inventing inscriptions in elegy and the relationship of this 'epigraphic habit' to inscriptional evidence.

*invidiam caedis, pacis amator, habes.
qui, nisi desierit, misero periturus amore est,
desinat; et nulli funeris auctor eris. (Rem. 13-22)*

(If someone loves and is content to love, he should rejoice, happy and passionate, and sail on his favorable wind. But if he suffers the rule of a cruel mistress, lest he perish, he should undergo the care of my art. Why has some lover tied his neck with a noose and hanged himself, a gloomy burden, from a high beam? Why has another gouged his own chest with an obdurate sword? Lover of peace, you're held guilty for murder. Let him who, unless he ends it, will die from wretched love, end it; and then you will be the cause of no death.)

Distinguished carefully from requited love, which is unproblematic and needs no cure, the unhappy love addressed by *Remedia* inevitably results in the suicide of the lover. The fault for the lover's death is not laid on the suicidal lover himself, but on Amor; Love has become a murderer. In response to this crime, the *praeceptor* positions himself as a savior, not only of the lover, but also of Amor, whom he purports to safeguard against the charge of murder. His justifications for his writing, then, are twofold: to rescue the lover from death and to protect Love itself.

To keep Love from being polluted by bloodshed, the *praeceptor* attempts to convince Cupid that, since he is a boy, he should keep his play light, leaving the violence to his stepfather, Mars. Instead, he should follow in his mother's footsteps: *tu cole maternas, tuto quibus utimur, artes, / et quarum vitio nulla fit orba parens (Rem. 29-30; but you, attend to your mother's arts, which we enjoy safely and by whose fault no parent is made childless). Venus's arts are characterized by peace and safety, as opposed to the bloody wars of Mars, which kill young men and bereave their parents.*⁶ Rather than physical torment, the inner pains of love, caused by

⁶ Cf. Prop. 3.5.1: *Pacis Amor deus est*. However, as Henderson (1979) points out (*ad 20*), "Cupid is traditionally anything but peaceable." I will show later in this chapter that these lines in *Remedia*, as well as others that utilize bereaved mothers as *exempla*, are laced heavily with irony.

separation from the beloved and encapsulated by the tropes of elegy,⁷ should be the extent of the suffering caused by Cupid. The tears of the lover as he sings his woeful love songs should suffice for the god: *his lacrimis contentus eris sine crimine mortis; / non tua fax avidos digna subire rogos* (*Rem.* 37-38; you will be content with these tears, without the charge of death; your torch isn't appropriate for setting greedy funeral pyres). With this sententious statement,⁸ urging the god to be satisfied with the sorrows of the locked-out lover, rather than demanding tears of mourning, the narrator concludes his speech to Cupid, who, persuaded, gives permission for the poet to continue.

Although he has convinced the god, the *praeceptor* continues to justify his teachings as a therapy for a mortal disease. He employs *exempla* from mythology, contending that his advice could have saved Phyllis, *moriens* Dido, and Medea's children (*Rem.* 55-60) and that all the loss of the Trojan War could have been avoided (65-66) if he had been Paris's teacher. Indeed, if Paris had heeded the *praeceptor*'s advice, his brothers would not have died (*Rem.* 573-4). *Remedia*'s examples of unhappy love that results in death are drawn from myth, rather than the script of the love affair between poet-lover and *puella*, common to previous elegy.

Although the specter of death is constantly present throughout elegy, explicit references to the suicide of the elegist are not very common.⁹ However, implicit threats of suicide are often suggested whenever love itself is asserted as the cause of death in elegy.¹⁰ In 2.8, Propertius

⁷ See Ch. 5 for a fuller treatment of the tropes operating in lines 31-36.

⁸ The antithetical relationship of wedding and funeral torches is proverbial. Cf. Henderson (1979) *ad loc.*

⁹ The most straightforward reference to suicide comes from Tibullus 2.6, in which the poet-lover bemoans the hardships of *acer Amor* (2.6.15). The force of his threat, however, is tempered immediately by his hope for the future: *iam mala finissem leto, sed credula uitam / spes fouet et fore cras semper ait melius* (Tib. 2.6.19-20; I would have already brought an end to my misfortunes through death, but faithful hope abets life and always says that tomorrow will be better).

¹⁰ Exactly what it means 'to die in love' (*in amore mori*, Prop. 2.1.47) in elegy is unclear. Does one die from the painful misery love causes? Or does one end the agony by killing oneself? In certain poems, the lover wasting away from despair seems more likely than purposeful suicide (as in *Corp. Tib.* 3.2, in which the poet-lover Lygdamus's epitaph blames his death on his *dolor* and *cura* for his Neaera). Propertius's epitaph in 2.1 is more ambiguous; both

makes his implied threats more explicit,¹¹ first accusing his faithless *puella* of killing him and reveling in his death:

*sic igitur prima moriere aetate, Properti?
sed morere; interitu gaudeat illa tuo!
exagitet nostros Manis, sectetur et umbras,
insultetque rogis, calcet et ossa mea!* (Prop. 2.8.17-20)

(Will you die, Propertius, like this at such a young age? Well, die then. Let her celebrate your death! Let her stir up my ghost, hound my shade, let her jeer at my pyre and trample my bones!)

The hard-hearted mistress, not content with merely being responsible for the death of her lover, must continue to torment him after he has died. The cause of the poet-lover's imagined death is not stated, but the blame is securely placed on the *puella*. The poet-lover's fantasy of his *puella* dancing on his grave is interrupted by a new thought, which reveals his suicidal intentions:

*quid? non Antigona tumulo Boeotius Haemon
corruit ipse suo saucius ense latus,
et sua cum miserae permiscuit ossa puellae,
qua sine Thebanam noluit ire domum?* (Prop. 2.8.21-24)

(What? Didn't Boeotian Haemon die at Antigone's tomb, stabbed in the side by his own sword, and mix his bones together with that unfortunate girl's, since he did not wish to return to his Theban home without her?)

In the midst of a fantasy of death, the poet-lover conjures an image of the tragic Antigone, accompanied in death by her betrothed, Haemon. The poet-lover co-opts the myth for his own purposes, adding emphasis to the emotional, rather than moral, aspect of the story to turn the

his *fata* (71) and his *dura puella* (78) are incriminated as causes of his death, leaving the means of death completely opaque. Prop. 2.28, in which the poet-lover fears for his ill *puella*, leans towards an implied suicide when the narrator states, with the certainty of the future indicative in the protases: *vivam, si vivet; si cadet illa, cadam* (Prop. 2.28.42; I will live, if she lives; if she dies, I will die). Ovid, in *Am.* 2.10, picks up and plays on this ambiguity of previous elegy by highlighting its sexual undertones; for Ovid, to die in love means to die *la petite mort* of orgasm (29-30).

¹¹ Although the poet-lover's suicidal (and homicidal) purpose becomes clearer as the poem continues, some argue that the initial idea in lines 17-20 refer more to wasting away than suicide. Cf. Papanghelis (1987), 116 n. 20.

story into a “*crime passionnel*.”¹² This memory of mythological suicide is, in turn, replaced by another thought, as the poet-lover turns from a fantasy of killing himself to imagining a murder-suicide: *sed non effugies: mecum moriaris oportet; / hoc eodem ferro stillet uterque cruor*. (Prop. 2.8.25-26; But you won’t get away: it’s only right that you die with me. Both our blood should drip from the same sword.) In a span of less than ten lines, the poet-lover moves from considering his own (rather bloodless) death, to a mythological fantasy of suicide, to a bloody vision of murder. Elegy, then, can represent a violent end for the lover who dies in love, although such a portrayal is certainly not the standard for elegiac death.¹³

Ovid exploits this possibility for suicide within elegy to justify the need for a cure for elegiac love in *Remedia*. Following in Propertius’s elegiac footsteps, Ovid mixes together elements of two scripts, the suicides of mythological lovers, and the painful and traumatic love the poet-lover experiences in elegiac poetry. In doing so, he presents a portrait of the elegiac lover as a tortured soul, constantly on the verge of violence against himself and others.

In *Remedia*, then, death is set up as the pretext for writing: death is the reason love needs a cure in the first place. The course of treatment to prevent death is a program of forgetting love, only achievable through strict adherence to the *praeceptor*’s prescriptions. In his precepts, memory, forgetting, love, and death are implicated together in a complex knot of causal relationships. According to *Remedia*, to avoid death, one must forget love. With this argument, Ovid implies that remembering love, a great part of the project of elegy, results in death. In

¹² As Papanghelis (1987) argues, 112-144. See 117-126 for an interpretation of Propertius’s adaptation of the Antigone myth, including possible non-Sophoclean iterations.

¹³ However, when considering suicide and elegy, it is impossible not to think of the death of the genre’s founder, Gallus. Although the precise reasons for his downfall are unclear, he was publicly censured upon his return from Egypt, where he had earned the title of prefect after achieving military success, and he committed suicide thereafter. Augustus’s displeasure seems to have centered on Gallus’s self-promotion, deemed excessive by the *princeps*, who was, as Cairns (2006) argues, “hyper-sensitive to anything which might detract from his own image as the victor of the Civil Wars” (74). Although he was condemned for imprudent aristocratic display, rather than the licentiousness of his poetry, the suicide of the first Roman elegist may cast a shadow over Ovid’s interpretation of death and the elegiac lifestyle. See Cairns’s extensive treatment of Gallus (70-250) for an overview of the elegist’s life and poetry.

essence, he shows that love elegy is about death and, so, reversing its effects requires the elimination of death. By making it his pretext for writing a cure for love, Ovid identifies death as a principal basis for memorializing love in elegy. The elegists' fantasies of death and mourning (or, more often, being mourned) outline strategies for memorialization that reflect new anxieties and shifting standards for remembrance after death in the post-civil war period in Rome. In order to understand Ovid's contribution to and examination of dialogues of death and memory in elegy, we must first explore the context of memorialization in Rome in the period of transition between the republic and principate, in which remembering emotion comes to take precedence over remembering deeds in the memorialization of the dead.

Memorialization in Transition: Turia and Cornelia

I wish to address two modes of memorialization in Latin literature of the late republic and early principate: eulogy that addresses the honorable deeds of the deceased, and eulogy that remembers the dead person in emotional terms.¹⁴ Deed-memorialization preserves the honor of the dead person by remembering the actions that shaped his or her life, both controlling the memory of the deceased's life and memorializing his or her death as the necessary conclusion to the accomplishments of that life. Death appears not as an enemy to memorialization, but merely as a fact of life's conclusion. Affect-memorialization, on the other hand, preserves affection for the dead by remembering the emotional state of a living person at the time of the death of his or her loved one. The mournful remembrance focuses on emotion, rather than action, and the deceased's memorableness is entirely dependent on the extent to which his/her death is mourned. In texts with this focus on affect, memorialization represents control over death, equating preservation of emotion with the preservation of the deceased himself or herself. Death is the

¹⁴ The terms used here, deed-memorialization and affect-memorialization, are my own. To my knowledge, no one has explicitly addressed the differences between these two modes of remembering the dead in Roman literature.

enemy, a barrier between the lover and his beloved, which can only be breached by memorialization of sentiment. Forgetfulness of emotion strengthens this barrier and allows death to prevail. Although a text can incorporate both modes of memorialization, the love poetry of this period champions the latter: *amor* instead of *honor*, personal affect instead of communal admiration.

The period of transformation in the post-civil war era was marked by political, cultural, and social turbulence as Romans sought new ways to reconnect their links to the past, severed by civil war. The previous memorialization strategies of elite families, however, came under threat as the power to influence public memory became more and more firmly situated in the hands of the *princeps*.¹⁵ The boundaries between public and private shifted as elites became no longer both viewers and viewed on the public stage, but were subject to the gaze of the imperial eye, in both public and private spheres.¹⁶ As Bodel argues, the *funus publicum* of elites was co-opted by the *princeps*, as he and his family came to monopolize all forms of public memorialization.¹⁷ Elite public display, including funerals, steadily declined throughout the principate, as the new regime began to limit overt senatorial competition.¹⁸ Memorializing the dead remained important, of course, but methods of memorialization were modified as the political situation

¹⁵ The scholarship on elite funerary practices is, unsurprisingly, vast. For an overview of Roman funerary ritual, see especially Toynbee (1971); for comprehensive treatments of death in the Roman world, see Edwards (2007) and Hope (2009). On the funeral procession specifically, see Bodel (1999) and Favro and Johanson (2010). For the remembrance of ancestors among elites, see Dolansky (2011) on the *Parentalia* and Flower (1996) on the display of ancestor masks. Hope and Huskinson's (2011) volume contains an excellent selection of articles that focus on mourning ritual and memorialization in Rome. In particular, see, in this volume, Graham on the role of the dead body in funerary ritual and Erker on gender roles in mourning the dead.

¹⁶ On the shift in the 'scopic paradigms' from the republic to the principate, see Bartsch (2006). She argues that Seneca responds to this change by encouraging elites to focus their impulse for display inward, turning their view towards themselves rather than their senatorial peers: "Seneca's concern is not so much with the traditional sources of th[e] gaze at Rome: the censors, the officeholders, and the fellow elite; the *imagines* of one's noble house; the people who flocked to funerals, triumphs, and law cases. It is no longer they who will provide a mirror to the self, but the individual himself." Although Bartsch does not treat elegy specifically in her analysis, I view the focus on private affect in elegy as a reflection of this move towards interior introspection, rather than external display, in the early principate.

¹⁷ Bodel (1999), 271.

¹⁸ As Eck's (1984) analysis has conclusively demonstrated. Cf. also, more recently, Mouritsen (2005).

evolved. While Republican self-determinism and familial rivalries favored a system of deed-memorialization after death, the new politics of the principate encouraged more private remembrance of dead elites.

Most epitaphs on tomb monuments are of the former category, memorializing the deeds of the dead (usually, men) by commemorating their occupations or offices held, their genealogies (thus linking them to the deeds of their relatives), and their ages at death (thereby portraying death as merely another accomplishment of life).¹⁹ The longest surviving Latin funerary inscription, the so-called *Laudatio Turiae*, does not follow standard epigraphic conventions of brevity, but rather gives a rather detailed account of the life of a Roman woman²⁰ in the form of a *laudatio funebris*, a eulogy given by a relative of the deceased, either at the graveside (for funerals of women or more private funerals of men) or at the *rostra* (in the case of most elite males' funerals in the republican period).²¹ In this *laudatio*, Turia's husband is concerned primarily with deed-memorialization, although personal affect is certainly not lacking and, as I will show, in fact frames the memorialization of the deceased.²² The *LT* appears to show, then, a middle-ground between affect- and deed-memorialization, appropriate to the period of the transition between republic and principate.

The majority of the text of the *LT* centers on the wife's actions in service to her husband or her natal family, and it is primarily the praise of her deeds that he wishes to display as a public

¹⁹ Keppie (1991), 106-107.

²⁰ The subject of this text has often been associated with Turia, the wife of Q. Lucretius Vespillo (*cos.* 19 BCE), whose rescue of her husband during the proscriptions of 43 BCE is mentioned by both Valerius Maximus and Appian. Although Durry (2002, *LIVff.*) has conclusively argued against this identification, I follow other scholars (like Hemelrijk, 2004) in continuing to refer to the subject of the *LT* as Turia, for convenience's sake.

²¹ For an overview of the *laudatio funebris*, see Kierdorf (1980).

²² As Hemelrijk (2004) points out, much of the scholarship on the *LT* focuses on the text of the inscription (see especially Durry (2002), Wistrand (1976), and Horsfall (1983)) and its rhetorical, historical, and juridical elements (see especially Ramage (1994), Lindsay (2009)). Cutuolo (1983-4), instead, treats its "aspetti letterari poetici e culturali," making an argument for reading the *LT* as literature. For a more recent, more holistic view of the *LT*, the couple on whom it centers, and its historical context (especially in terms of late republican gender values), see Osgood (2014).

monument (*meritorum tuorum oc[ulis] omnium praeferam titulum*, II.24). The most memorable deed mentioned in the *LT* is undoubtedly Turia's effort to get her husband recalled from exile, as she persists in her supplication of Lepidus (whose cruelty is contrasted with the clemency of Augustus) despite suffering humiliating abuse (II.11). This act of bravery is brought into parallel with two other acts of preservation in the absence of her husband: first, Turia pursues justice after the murder of her parents and successfully upholds her father's will (to the advantage of her husband); and, second, she defends their household against plunder when it is attacked by a troop of men. In addition to these public deeds, the final act for which Turia is praised is her attempt to produce heirs for her husband. As he relates, Turia, in a shockingly selfless act of sacrifice, offers him a divorce as a response to the couple's childlessness. Significantly, it is in the context of the latter act, and not the previous ones, that Turia's husband states: *tibi vero quid memorabi[lius] quam inserviando mihi o[peram] dedisse te]...?* (II.48; But what could be more memorable in your life than the deeds you performed in serving my interests...?). Turia's husband wishes to publicly memorialize not only her political and legal endeavors but also her sacrifices in the domestic sphere, which, he emphasizes, were all performed for his sake.

For the conclusion of his commemoration of her life, Turia's husband turns away from politics and towards the household, while still emphasizing the public nature of his wife's memorialization. But, here, her public *fama* is framed in terms of personal affect. Near the end of the *laudatio*, Turia's husband describes his own distraught state as a result of her death: *naturalis dolor extorquet const[ant]iae vires: maerore mersor...* (II.63; natural sorrow wrenches away my strength of mind: I am consumed by grief...). However, he consoles himself with the fact that her deeds (*fructus vitae*, II.58) will not be forgotten, since he is committing them to immortal

memory (*immort[ali]tati ad memoriam consecrat[am]*, II.57).²³ Wistrand points out that this sort of consolation does not derive from a philosophical school but is more deeply rooted in the republican elite culture: “To value fame and glory as a compensation for the loss of a mortal life is rather a part of the views and the cast of mind we can expect to find in a society where an aristocratic spirit predominates.”²⁴ However, this traditional aristocratic idea is compellingly contrasted both with the husband’s admitted loss of control in his grief over his wife’s death, a dangerous prospect for any Roman attempting to conform to elite ideals of masculinity, as well as with his turn from more political honor-memorialization to more private affect-memorialization near the end of the *laudatio*. As Milnor suggests, this movement away from politics occurs just after Augustus becomes prominent, both in the private story (as he appears as the opponent of Lepidus, alongside Turia herself) and on the grander field of triumphal politics.²⁵ Milnor ascribes this change to the elites’ reaction to the civil wars, arguing that stories of the household “form the perfect backdrop for the delicate balancing act between public discourse and private life.... Domestic values such as kindness, loyalty, even love between the members of a household, have taken the place of civic ones as the declaimers seek a way of both remembering and forgetting the trials of civil war.”²⁶ Turia’s husband walks a line between political and domestic, as well as deed-memorialization and affect-memorialization. Although he endorses aristocratic values, like fame as a consolation for death, he also draws attention to his personal emotional reaction to the death of his wife in a manner unusual for elite men in the republican period.²⁷ Death appears here as both the conclusion of a life well-lived and an

²³ *CIL* reading, adopted by Durry (2002). Wistrand (1976) follows Vollmer here: *consecrat[um est semperiternam]*.

²⁴ Wistrand (1976), 71.

²⁵ Milnor (2005), 218.

²⁶ Milnor (2005), 236.

²⁷ Osgood (2014) particularly addresses the emotional language of the *laudatio*, analyzing how the husband eschews the traditional virtue of *constantia*, required even in times of bereavement (94) and comparing the *laudatio*’s treatment of male grief both to accounts of Augustus and his family and to Cicero’s Stoic philosophical works.

emotional hardship for the survivors. Even though Turia's husband expresses a level of affect that we will see in love poets of the period, his focus is still on the memorialization of his wife's deeds; he writes to commemorate her life, rather than her death.

Propertius 4.11 gives another example of the deed-memorialization of a Roman matron, Cornelia, daughter of Publius Cornelius Scipio (*cos.* 38 BCE) and Scribonia (the former wife of Octavian) and wife of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus. Like the *LT*, Prop. 4.11 depicts the life of a Roman woman with ties both to the aristocratic elite and to Augustus and focuses primarily on her actions, rather than her emotional relationships. Unlike the *laudatio* given by Turia's husband, however, the dead Cornelia herself presents her eulogy, addressing her surviving husband and children from beyond the grave. Her speech exemplifies elegy's connections to eulogy, a method for commemorating the deeds of great men, but its elegiac form inherently introduces elements of affect-memorialization as well. In 4.11, Propertius constructs an intermediate space between the two modes, portraying a Cornelia who recognizes affect, but discourages it, while she emphasizes the meritorious acts that make her worthy of commemoration.

Unlike Turia, whose catalog of courageous deeds are recited in her *laudatio*, Cornelia lists only two major achievements: marrying only one husband and giving birth to three children. In addressing her daughter, she sets herself up as an *exemplum* to which her daughter should aspire:

*fac teneas unum nos imitata virum
et serie fulcite genus; mihi cumba volenti
solvitur aucturis tot mea facta meis.
haec est feminei merces extrema triumpho,
laudat ubi emeritum libera fama torum.* (Prop. 4.11.68-72)

(Make sure that you, imitating me, hold onto one husband, and support the family with a line of descent; I am willing for the ferry to come for me, since so many of my children will augment my deeds. This is the final reward of a woman's triumph, when unbiased public opinion praises her veteran marriage bed.)

Cornelia advises her daughter that, in order to be an exemplary woman, she should only marry once, an act which will prove her virtue and allow her to be remembered well, and have many children, who will both remember her and act as extensions of her, thus perpetuating her good *fama*. Indeed, she uses economic terms to describe her children as her surety of public opinion (*famae pignora*, 12).²⁸ According to Cornelia, her marriage and children are her primary claims to fame, an image completely fitting within the Augustan moral program, explored in more detail later in this chapter, which encouraged marriage and the production of children. Here, Cornelia conforms—and encourages her daughter to conform—to the standard of the ideal Augustan woman, married but once, but a mother many times over.²⁹

Cornelia is not memorialized merely for her own merits, or, by extension, those of her children, but for her ancestors' as well. Her *fama* is derived from ancestral *tropaea* (29); she swears by her famous ancestors' ashes that she has done nothing to shame them or cause damage to the family's *exuviae*, the mementos of victories in battle (41-43). Indeed, her final argument in favor of her memorialization is framed, not in terms of her children or husband, but her ancestors: *sim digna merendo / cuius honoratis ossa vehantur avis* (4.11.101-102; may I be

²⁸ Cornelia uses *pignora* to refer to her children again at 4.11.73. Hallett (1973) observes: "Cornelia has no true emotions, just acquisitive impulses" (119).

²⁹ Especially in regard to its political implications, the scholarship on this poem, as Janan (2001) points out, has tended to divide itself into two categories: "either the poem sincerely praises the virtues of a Roman matron (and by implication, the conventional Augustan Roman standards of social and sexual decorum by which Cornelia has molded her existence), or it reveals the emptiness and futility of a woman's life lived by such standards" (147). Among the former, Luck (1959) and Reitzenstein (1969) read 4.11 as a paean to Cornelia's virtues. Hallett (1973), on the other hand, sees Cornelia's cold and unsympathetic speech as unflattering and, in comparison to Cynthia, an altogether negative portrayal of Roman womanhood. Janan walks the line between the two axes, arguing that Cornelia's characterization of matronal life is ambiguous, the open ending allowing her self-sacrifice to be read as both noble and futile simultaneously. See Janan 147 (and notes) for a review of the vast scholarship on Prop. 4.11.

considered worthy, deserving that my bones be borne to my honorable ancestors). Her merit for memorialization is entirely measured against her ancestors' examples; for, of course, any increase in her own *fama* entails a change in the reputation of her family.³⁰ This focus on ancestral memorialization, however, acts as a reminder of the elite funerary display no longer permitted to those outside the imperial family. Cornelia is indeed connected to Augustus's line, as his stepdaughter, and her contribution to her familial *fama* enhances not just her private *domus*, but that of the *princeps* himself. As such, she stands, as Lowrie puts it, "at the fulcrum of past and present," an *exemplum* that evokes traditional *mores* and a representation of the Augustan ideal for her daughter's emulation.³¹

In this context of deed-memorialization, then, Cornelia emphasizes her virtues, both individual and ancestral, rather than her feelings for her surviving family. She begins by discouraging her husband from mourning her publicly (*desine, Paulle, meum lacrimis urgere sepulcrum*, 4.11.1; cease, Paullus, from pressing my grave with your tears), thus implicitly claiming the dismissal of affect as a goal of her speech. Later, advising her husband to take care of their household, she encourages him to grieve secretly, not even allowing their children to see his tears. Instead, he should mourn only at night, when he is free to speak to her *simulacra* and remember her in his dreams; significantly, he is never encouraged to weep, even during this nighttime grieving period (79-84). In mentioning her funeral and her mourners, she focuses not on their grief, but on the confirmation of virtue that their attendance lends her life. Her mention of Augustus's presence and sorrow (*defensa et gemitu Caesaris ossa mea*, 4.11.58; my remains are endorsed even by the sigh of Caesar) does not primarily serve to lament her death, but legitimates her claims to having led an honorable life. Just before commending herself to the

³⁰ On the importance of the commemoration of one's deceased family through the display of ancestor masks during one's funeral, see especially Flower (1996).

³¹ Lowrie (2008), 177.

spirits of her ancestors, she closes her speech with a quelling (and, perhaps, comforting) command to the attendees of her funeral, which parallels her instruction to her husband at the beginning of the poem: *flentes me surgite, testes, / dum pretium vitae grata rependit humus* (4.11.99-100; arise, witnesses who weep for me, as the grateful earth repays my life's worth). As in other deed-memorialization, at the end of her speech, the deeds of Cornelia's life take precedence over her survivors' sorrow. Affect is acknowledged, only to be ultimately dismissed, by the dead Cornelia.

These two examples of eulogy, even though they display traits of both modes of remembrance, show the importance of one's actions in deed-memorialization: the memorableness of a person is primarily dependent on the events of his or her life, not only on the emotional turmoil surrounding his or her death. Death itself is not the theme, but merely the conclusion of one's life's accomplishments. In the love poetry I will examine next, however, this paradigm is reversed: death becomes the focus of the lover's lament, and the deceased's memorableness is entirely dependent on the extent to which his/her death is mourned. The details of the deceased's life (except, of course, those that illustrate love) are largely disregarded, and the mournful remembrance focuses on emotion, rather than action.³²

Elegiac Mourning and Affect-Memorialization in Propertius and Tibullus

Elegy's promotion of affect-memorialization over deed-memorialization reflects the genre's emphasis on private emotion over public responsibility. The feeling of alienation from society characteristically expressed by the elegists necessarily privileges an introverted perspective that cultivates individual, rather than collective, memory. The remembrance of the dead in elegy similarly concentrates on personal affect rather than communal respect. Death,

³² A distinction may be made here between the internal emotion of grief and mourning, its external and inherently social expression. However, in Latin elegy, the reaction to death is almost always depicted as an external display, rather than internal turmoil. Therefore, I address only mourning as an emotional response to death.

rather than representing the last action of one's life, acts as an impetus for remembering the love affair and ensuring its permanent memorialization. Death, then, is an integral part of the program of elegiac memory. In elegy's affect-memorialization scheme, to ensure emotional mourning after one's death is to control death itself, maintaining a lifeline between the lovers that death itself cannot sever. Forgetfulness, characterized by a lack of lacrimose mourning, allows death to cut off both life and love. Elegy's fantasies of death, as well as expressions of anxiety at not being remembered after death, illustrate strategies for the memorialization of the poet-lover, the *puella*, and the elegiac love affair. According to this program of elegiac memorialization, the poet-lover must be memorialized by his *puella*, who, in a reversal of usual elegiac power dynamics, must attend her dead lover loyally, taking over the roles that his female family members would play in a traditional Roman funeral. The funeral itself should be eroticized and focus on the remembrance of poetry and, subsequently, love above all else. Even the poet-lover's tomb and sepulchral inscription should act as memory prompts for his poetry and the love affair. Indeed, if this memorialization plan is properly carried out, the memory of love can even conjure the dead, bringing love back from the brink of oblivion. Through elegy's strategies for the memorialization of the love affair, the poet-lover takes control over his own memory (and that of his poetry), through a scheme of private affect-memorialization.

In elegy, love alone can ensure that the lover will be mourned and remembered after death. The beloved is the primary performer of mourning and memorialization in elegy, supplanting the elegist's ancestral family as his primary memory-bearer. Elegists argue not only for a change in who carries on these memories, but also a transformation of the very content of the memorialization, promoting the idea that the elegiac affair is the only aspect of one's life worth remembering. The reader is assured that deeds (and the benefits they confer during life)

are worthless after death, a reaction against the type of honor memorialization discussed above, in favor of the memorialization of *amor* instead. As Propertius argues in 3.5, wealth and military power have no effect in the Underworld; poor and rich, victor and vanquished are equal in death (14-15). Instead, Propertius promotes love as the only worthwhile pursuit. In 2.1, he asserts that the only proper way to earn praise for one's life is to die in love: *laus in amore mori* (2.1.47). The *laus* love provides after death both constitutes and perpetuates the memory of the lover after death. Tibullus asserts a similar opinion about the value of love for memorialization. In 2.4, he asserts that the girl who forces her lover to seek out wealth and power in order to win her with gifts will have no one to mourn her, while the girl who has been ungreedy and kind to her lover will be mourned by him until he is an old man (43-50). Securing the devotion of a lover is, then, the only proper way to spend one's life and the only effective strategy to assure oneself of being mourned and remembered after death.

In elegy, the memory and mourning of a poet after his death is inextricably linked not only to his mistress but also to his poetry itself. As the poet's *puella*, the muse for his poetry, laments over his corpse, she contributes to his poetic *corpus*, either through her mournful actions, which comprise the narrative of the poem, or through her literal words, which serve as verses themselves. The *puella*, as often in Latin elegy, is thus conflated with poetry. The poetry, embodied in the person of the *puella*,³³ constitutes the memory and memorialization of the dead poet, providing a prompt to memory for the reader, in the same way that a funeral, a *laudatio*, or a funerary monument might preserve the memory of the dead for the survivors. The surest guarantee of poetic immortality, then, is remembrance of the dead poet prompted by a narrative of his hypothetical death and the mourning of his beloved.

³³ As often in Latin elegy, although that is not the main focus of my analysis here. See discussion of Wyke (1987) in Introduction.

The lover's desire to be extensively, and often violently, mourned by his beloved after death is an integral theme of Latin elegy. Depictions of mourning pervade elegy, and images of mythological mourners often appear as *exempla*, demonstrating strategies for impactful memorialization. Propertius laments that, while loyal Briseis grieved properly for Achilles after his death in Troy,³⁴ Cynthia was unable to remain faithful for even a single day:

*nec non exanimem amplectens Briseis Achillem
candida uesana uerberat ora manu,
et dominum lauit maerens captiua cruentum,
propositum flauis in Simoente uadis,
foedauitque comas, et tanti corpus Achilli
maximaeque in parua sustulit ossa manu;
cum tibi nec Peleus aderat nec caerulea mater,
Scyria nec uiduo Deidamia toro. (Prop. 2.9.9-16)*

(Briseis, too, embracing lifeless Achilles, beats her white face with her frenzied hand, and, his prisoner, mourns and bathes her blood-soaked master, laid out on the yellow shoals of Simois. She dirties her hair, and she lifts the corpse and mighty bones of great Achilles in her small hand; for neither Peleus, nor your sea-blue mother were there for you, nor Scyrian Deidamia, her marriage bed widowed.)

Here Briseis acts as the exemplar of the loyal survivor by performing specific actions of mourning: she embraces the dead Achilles (9), she beats her cheeks in a frenzy (10), she washes Achilles's body (11), she soils her hair (13), and she places her hands on the corpse (14). Briseis first displays her fidelity by despoiling her own beauty. She marks herself as the beloved of Achilles after his death, disfiguring her features as an outward manifestation of her grief, and, concomitantly, making herself undesirable to other suitors. She is singularly devoted to her lover, unlike the inconstant Cynthia, who, it is implied, could stand to learn a thing or two from

³⁴ See Wiggers (1976) for an exploration of Propertius's experimentation with epic themes in this poem. Papanghelis (1987) briefly treats 2.9, as well, drawing attention to its Hellenistic epigrammatic tone and "the forceful interpenetration between the concepts of *fides* and *mors*" (135).

Briseis's example. Further, Briseis shows her loyalty to her dead lover by performing funerary rituals over his corpse. In addition to her displays of anguished lamentation, she bathes and lays out his corpse, tasks normally undertaken by the female relatives of the deceased.³⁵ Briseis alone is present to perform the proper rituals; his mother Thetis and wife Deidamia are absent when Achilles dies.³⁶ It is, then, Briseis's love and loyalty towards Achilles that ensure that he will be properly mourned after his death. Her love allows her to stand in for the legitimate relatives of Achilles and usurp their position as the primary mourners and memory-bearers of Achilles. Finally, the idea of display is significant here. Briseis's grief is not internalized, but actively and publicly displayed. Although no spectators are mentioned, we must infer that the corpse of Achilles has been laid out (*propositum*) by Briseis on the shore for the purpose of a funeral, which, given the hero's celebrity among the Greek forces, we must imagine to have been well-attended.³⁷ Therefore, Briseis's performance in mourning Achilles not only affects her own personal memory of her beloved, but also affects the memory of Achilles constructed by viewing the hero's funeral or, perhaps, by reading Propertius's account of it. In performing these ritualized actions, which debase herself but glorify Achilles, Briseis displays the appropriate amount of affect after the death of a lover, devoting herself completely to her dead beloved and preserving his memory through her mourning.

But Briseis's love is not introduced merely as the means by which Achilles's memory is preserved through funerary ritual; the funeral itself is eroticized, thus extending the love affair itself beyond the death of the lover. The passage focuses on the tactile interaction between the lovers: Briseis embraces Achilles, touching his enormous body with her small hands. Such

³⁵ See Erker (2011), 41-48.

³⁶ Heyworth (2007a), following Carutti, deletes lines 15-16, which directly refer to Thetis and Deidamia. However, even if this emendation is correct, Briseis still stands alone as the sole mourner of Achilles in this poem.

³⁷ Heyworth (2007a) prefers *appositum* (from the Δ MSS), but this reading hardly changes the idea of display necessary here.

caresses evoke an erotic context, in addition to the funerary one. Similarly, the description of Briseis's beauty, with references to her *candida ora* (10) and her hair (which, in being soiled, must be unbound, 13), recall descriptions of the female beloved throughout elegy.³⁸ Briseis, then, appears, at first glance, to fit the mold of the elegiac *puella*. However, in this scene, the elegiac relationship has been reversed: Achilles acts as the *dominus*; Briseis is his *captiva* (11). This play on words functions as a metatextual comment on the nature of elegy and its role in the memorialization of the poet. In elegiac convention, the female *puella* is portrayed as the dominant partner, on whom the male lover depends for her favors. He, as in the larger context of this poem of Propertius, is depicted as the devoted lover, paired with a mistress (here, Cynthia) whose loyalty is often faulty. Propertius's *exemplum* of correct behavior for the beloved, then, reflects her loyalty, which, due to the inconstant nature of the elegiac *domina*, can only concretely be shown after the lover's death. Death is the truest test of fidelity and memory in Propertius. The surviving beloved must become the loyal partner, as her dead lover becomes her *dominus*. She must take on the task of *servitium amoris*, mourning her lover in ways that recall the erotic nature of their relationship, preserving the memory of their love through funerary rituals that are both sensual and sorrowful.

Elsewhere in elegy, elegists call on their beloveds to mourn and memorialize them with similar exemplary actions. Tibullus imagines that Delia will bestow kisses wet with tears on his corpse, laid out upon the pyre (Tib. 1.1.61-62). Like Briseis, she must mourn her beloved completely and publicly, demonstrating her grief and devotion as Tibullus's body is displayed.³⁹

³⁸ See Chapter 3, on the elegiac *puella*'s beauty (and ugliness).

³⁹ Bassi (1994), analyzing the connection between *mors* and *amor* in Tib. 1.1, draws a correspondence between the narrator's longing for pastoral *otium* and the fantasy of death, which both represent the desire for a loyal and loving *puella*. She argues that the silence which characterizes both the dead lover and the inarticulate mourning of the *puella* demonstrates the failure of elegiac poetry to achieve its purported goal of erotic fulfillment: "both rural bliss and a chaste *puella* are beyond the reach of the living elegiac *ego*" (60).

The interaction between Delia and the corpse is similarly eroticized. Delia's kisses are anticipated by Tibullus's placement on the bed, about to be consumed with fire (*arsuro positum me, Delia, lecto*, 1.1.61), a double entendre that refers not only to the funeral pyre for his dead body, but also to the bed on which, alive, Tibullus pursued his ardor for Delia.⁴⁰ References to the *puella*'s beauty, especially her unbound hair, also signal a confusion of funerary and erotic contexts in this poem. Tibullus, demonstrating his own care for his beloved, pleads that Delia spare her unbound hair and tender cheeks (67-68) in her grief. Whether we accept as sincere Tibullus's claim that such behavior would wound his shade (67), or we understand this request as disingenuous, a form of *recusatio* to encourage Delia in this exemplary display of lamentation, the ultimate effect is the same: such a display of mourning contributes to the eroticized memory of the love affair.

Later in Book 1, Delia, like Briseis, is juxtaposed with the other female members of her lover's family, who are imagined to mourn him after his death. In 1.3, Tibullus associates Delia with his mother and sister, lamenting that none of them will be present to perform his funeral rites if he dies abroad (1.3.5-10).⁴¹ However, while his sister and mother are depicted as executing (or, rather, being prevented from executing) funerary rituals, such as gathering his bones and weeping before his grave, Delia is absent from this imagined scene. Her loyalty is, instead, displayed before her lover's death, as she acts to prevent his death through prayer and divination. Nonetheless, the love affair between the elegist and his *puella* is evoked in the erotic description of the funerary rites performed by Tibullus's sister and mother:

⁴⁰ On a similar theme in Propertius, see Papanghelis (1987), 58-63.

⁴¹ The major scholarship on this poem tends to overlook these lines, focusing instead on the poem's Homeric allusion and connection to the Greek tradition; cf. Bright (1978), 16-37; Cairns (1979), 44-60. Ramsby (2007) treats the references to war and Messalla, Tibullus's general and patron, concentrating on the epitaph at the center of 1.3, which she interprets as "a general (even gentle) protest to warfare that does not entirely exclude Augustus from implication in the agency of troubled times" (82).

*abstineas, Mors atra, precor: non hic mihi mater
quae legat in maestos ossa perusta sinus,
non soror, Assyrios cineri quae dedat odores
et fleat effusis ante sepulcra comis,
Delia non usquam, quae, me cum mitteret urbe,
dicitur ante omnes consuluisse deos.* (Tib. 1.3.5-10)

(Keep away, black death, I beg you: I have no mother here to gather my bones, consumed by fire, into her sorrowful bosom, nor sister to devote Assyrian perfumes to my ashes, and weep before my grave with her hair unbound, nor is Delia anywhere, who, before she would send me out of the city, they say, consulted every god.)

As in Propertius's portrayal of Briseis's lamentations over the body of Achilles, Tibullus's female family members here interact with his body in ways that evoke erotic themes. Tibullus's *perusta ossa* have been consumed by the fire of the pyre, but also by desire for his beloved, as above in poem 1.1. His mother embraces Tibullus's *ossa*, holding him close to her *sinus*, which can be understood as representing two erogenous zones of her body: her bosom or, as elsewhere in Tibullus, her vagina.⁴² The erotic resonances of this play on words are compounded by the sexualization of Tibullus's sister, who laments with her hair unbound, like Delia and Briseis, as she pours perfume on her brother's ashes.⁴³ After such an eroticized portrayal of his mother's and sister's actions, the lack of a portrayal of Delia's role in the rites, far from alienating her from his funeral, implicates her further in his memorialization. The eroticization of death allows Delia, as the elegiac mistress, to become insinuated into the roles of both mother and sister, with the *puella* supplanting all other females in the lover's life. This reversal of roles is an expression of the common elegiac conceit that the elegist, completely and singularly devoted to his mistress, cares not about social *mores*, wealth, or the legacy of his ancestors, but only for love. For the

⁴² Cf. Adams (1982), 90.

⁴³ The reference to Assyrian perfume (*Assyrios odores*, 1.3.7) evokes the *Assyrio odore* of Catullus 68.144, which refers to the scent filling a house celebrating a marriage rite. Maltby (2002) gives a few other *comparanda* for this phrase *ad loc.*

elegist who wishes to sever his ties to his ancestral line, then, memorialization normally undertaken by his family must be assigned to the focus of his devotion, his beloved and his poetry. By using the erotic vocabulary of elegy, Tibullus presents a picture of death that confounds the categories of familial and erotic memorialization and presents elegy as an alternative way of not only life, but also death.

Propertius's depictions of his own death also transgress Roman elite *mores* because of his preference for memorialization through elegiac devotion over familial remembrance. In 2.13,⁴⁴ he gives very specific instructions for every aspect of his funeral, including Cynthia's actions in mourning. He requests a simple, plebeian funeral; there should be no funeral procession of ancestral *imagines* and trumpets, no elaborate couch for his corpse, no sumptuous banquet with many attendants. Instead, the most important aspects of his funeral, just like his elegy, should be his verse and his beloved:

*sat mea sat magna est si tres sint pompa libelli
quos ego Persephonaе maxima dona feram.
tu vero nudum pectus lacerata sequeris,
nec fueris nomen lassa vocare meum,
osculaque in gelidis pones suprema labellis
cum dabitur Syrio munere plenus onyx.* (Prop. 2.13.25-30)

(My funeral procession will be great enough if it is comprised of three little books, which I will give as my greatest gifts to Persephone. And you will follow, your breast bared and torn, and you will you not tire of calling out my name, and you will place your last kisses on my cold lips, as the onyx-box filled with its Syrian tribute is offered.)

⁴⁴ On the scholarly debate about the unity of 2.13, see: Heyworth (1992), 46-47, and (2007), 163, who does not think a division is justified, but accedes that there is a disjunction in thought between lines 16 and 17, possibly caused by a lacuna, following Hemsterhusius and Schrader; and Fedeli (2005), 361-365, who divides the text into 13a (1-16) and 13b (17-58), following Broekhuysen's 1702 edition, since he finds the "brusco cambio di argomento" too jarring to accept it as a mere change in topic in a singular poem. I consider Wyke's (1987) argument, that there is no disjunct in the poem, which works as a unit to associate Cynthia with Callimachean imagery (57-60), compelling, and so I present 2.13 as a singular poem. However, since I am only concerned with lines 17-58, this controversy has little effect on my argument.

In mourning the poet-lover, Cynthia must bare and lacerate her breasts, kiss his dead lips, and repeatedly call out his name. Like both Briseis and Delia, she must display the intensity of her love and her loyalty through her mourning, creating an erotic display as she, partially nude, debases and disfigures herself, clinging to her lover's dead body. Only she and his poetry comprise his funeral procession, replacing the elegist's blood relatives as mourners. The poet's *libelli* stand in for his ancestral *imagines*, flouting the traditional representation of the deceased's life as a celebration and continuation of his ancestors' deeds. The affect embodied by his *puella* and poetry memorializes the dead poet-lover more effectively than his familial pedigree.

Propertius's focus on words, both written and oral, in addition to the images of mourning, is critical to the strategy of memorialization outlined in this poem.⁴⁵ Not just his own verses, envisioned as gifts to Persephone (26), are associated with his death and memory, but also the words of his beloved as she continuously calls out his name (28). Just as his books of poetry, dedicated to an immortal goddess in the Underworld, will preserve his memory in text, Cynthia will not tire of repeating his name, invoking Propertius perpetually through verbal memorialization. In addition to these forms of memory preservation, the importance of words to memory is epitomized in the two-line epitaph the poet imagines for himself. Upon the spot where his *ardor* (31) has consumed him, indicating the confluence of erotic and funerary contexts, his grave should be located beneath a laurel tree and display these two verses: QVI NVNC IACET HORRIDA PVLVIS, / VNIVS HIC QVONDAM SERVVS AMORIS ERAT (2.13.35-36; The

⁴⁵ Papanghelis's (1987) analysis of 2.13 focuses primarily on Propertius's lush imagery, which he reads as an adaptation of Bion's *Lament for Adonis*. His reading interprets the poem's *Todesphantasie* as a Romantic *tour de force*, rather than an expression of anxiety: "Far from being overpowered by death, Propertius is deftly manipulating its pictorial equivalents to orchestrate a luscious ritual impregnated with eros; death affords him an erotic triumph" (78-79). I do not disagree with his observations, but my analysis, which centers on Propertius's use of the written and spoken word, draws a different conclusion. While the erotic, tactile experience of love and death explored by Papanghelis may indicate that 2.13 is a sensual success for the poet-lover, the poem's emphasis on words lends itself towards an impression of anxiety about the consequences of death and the power of words to relieve that anxiety.

wretched dust which now lies here was once a man, the slave of a single love).⁴⁶ Propertius's self-composed epitaph sums up his life and death in two lines: he is now dust; he was once devoted to elegiac love. But these two lines (in addition, presumably, to the text of his poetry and the words of his beloved) will preserve his memory so that his tomb will come to be as famous as that of the hero of Pthia, Achilles himself (37-38). And just like Achilles, whose beloved (as we have seen in 2.9) safeguards his memory after his death, the poet-lover will be remembered by Cynthia:

*tu quoque si quando venies ad fata, memento,
huc iter ad lapides cana veni memores.
interea cave sis nos aspernata sepultos:
non nihil ad verum conscia terra sapit.* (Prop. 2.13.39-42)

(And whenever you too will meet your fate, remember, come here, as a gray-haired old woman, by this path to the memorial stones. Meanwhile, take care that you do not avoid my tomb: my conscious dust knows the truth.)

Cynthia's mourning, then, is not presumed to cease with the poet-lover's funeral, but to continue until her own death. His tombstone (*lapides memores*, 40) serves as a prompt to memory for her, a cue that the reader can understand to be verbal, since we have seen the text that ought to be inscribed there. In these lines, the anxiety of death does not appear to be necessarily connected to the deceased's lack of physical presence.⁴⁷ Indeed, at the end of the poem, the poet-lover is not worried that he will not be able to touch his *puella*, but that he will not be able to speak to her:

⁴⁶ As Ramsby (2007) notes, this is the first epitaph explicitly written for the poet-lover's tomb in Propertius's elegies. She reads these lines, in conjunction with the rest of the poem, as well as the epitaphic lines in 2.1, 2.5, and 2.11, as explorations of the elegist's identity and his program of elegy: "the appearance of epitaphic, inscriptional text within these poems amounts to a codification of this elegist's aims. The slave of love is not a man of politics, war, land, or family—he is a new man fashioned by artifice and ingenuity who must, by necessity, seek to provide an alternative to the existing categories of Roman manhood" (61).

⁴⁷ Here, I disagree with Papanghelis (1987): "What the poet despairs of in 19-24 is not Cynthia's loyalty after his death, but the posthumous function of his senses.... And what engenders this despair is the fact that he is projecting himself beyond the grave as something bodiless and non-sentient, be it dust or bones" (77). If we look at the poem through the lens of memorialization, we see that this anxiety over the loss of sense perception does not supersede his anxiety over Cynthia's loyalty and memory; the fact that the poet-lover cannot physically connect with his *puella* after his death does not mean that he cannot perceive her through her words and her presence at his tomb.

sed frustra mutos revocabis, Cynthia, Manes: / nam mea quid poterunt ossa minuta loqui?

(2.13.57-58; But you will recall my silent shade in vain, Cynthia; for what will my shrinking bones be able to say?). It is the loss of voice, rather than the loss of a physical body, that appears to upset the poet-lover most, just as the preservation of their love in the *puella*'s memory proves to be more important to the poet-lover than her simple performance of the funerary rites following his death. Her words cannot fully ameliorate that anxiety, since he himself will not have recourse to words. But, as long as Cynthia recalls him verbally, he will be able to perceive that she remembers him, keeping his memory alive. As in Tibullus 1.1, the extent to which the lover is mourned after his death affects his shade. Mourning through words, then, including the act of recalling the dead aloud, is shown to be essential for, and even equivalent to, preserving the memory of the dead in the mind of the beloved.

The poet-lover's anxiety surrounding death is inextricable from the fear that these affective strategies for memorialization will not be executed. A lack of grief on behalf of the *puella* implies infidelity and the absence of true emotion.⁴⁸ Indeed, the poet-lover of Prop. 1.19 claims that he does not fear death, but that Cynthia will not mourn him:

*non ego nunc tristis vereor, mea Cynthia, manes,
nec moror extremo debita fata rogo;
sed ne forte tuo careat mihi funus amore:
hic timor est ipsis durior exsequiis.* (Prop. 1.19.1-4)

(I no longer fear the gloomy shades, my Cynthia, nor do I care about my death, come due on that final pyre; but that my funeral should be without your love, this fear is more unendurable than those rites.)

The fear that Cynthia will not grieve for him surpasses the poet-lover's fear of death itself. Here, he equates Cynthia's presence at his funeral with her love for him. Her failure to perform his

⁴⁸ As we have seen, Cornelia's insistence that she not be mourned emotionally in Prop. 4.11 stands in stark contrast to this affective memorialization more common to elegy.

funerary rites demonstrates faithlessness and lack of love, which he fears above all. He contrasts her potential infidelity with his sure assertion of eternal loyalty:

*non adeo leviter nostris puer haesit ocellis,
ut meus oblito pulvis amore vacet.
illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros
non potuit caecis immemor esse locis,
sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis
Thessalus antiquam venerat umbra domum.
illic quidquid ero, semper tua dicar imago:
traicit et fati litora magnus amor.* (Prop. 1.19.5-12)

(The boy Love has not so lightly clung to my eyes that my dust can be free of you, our love forgotten. Even there in those dark places, the hero son of Phylacus was not able to forget his sweet wife, but desiring to touch his beloved with illusive hands, the Thessalian returned to his ancestral home as a shade. Even there, whatever I will be, my shade will always be called yours. For a great love traverses even the shores of death.)

The poet-lover claims that, even after his death, he will not be able to forget his love of Cynthia (*oblito amore*, 6). As usual, he presents himself as the loyal *servus*, even in death, and his concern is with Cynthia's loyalty, measured against his own devotion. He compares himself, as an *exemplum* of fidelity, to Protesilaus, returned from the Underworld to spend a few hours with his bride Laodamia.⁴⁹ The poet-lover claims his love is so strong that it will survive even his own death. He only fears that he, although still devoted to his beloved, will be forgotten after his death. His anxiety becomes more explicit as he imagines that Cynthia will replace him with a new love, which will keep her from his tomb and dry her tears (1.19.21-24). To Propertius, Cynthia's ability to move on to another lover means that she will cease to love him and, therefore, cease to mourn him. Therefore, his memorialization is contingent upon Cynthia's

⁴⁹ Lyne (1998) treats the tradition of the Laodamia myth, with particular attention to Propertius's engagement in 1.19 with Catullus 68. Other important studies of Prop. 1.19 include Boyle (1974), Papanghelis (1987), 10-19, and Flaschenriem (1997).

perpetual fidelity and love. If she does not remember him properly after death, his unceasing loyalty from beyond the grave is as ineffectual as the grasping hands of Protesilaus's shade.

In 4.7, however, Cynthia's ghost turns the tables on Propertius. Accosting him in a dream after her death, she accuses Propertius of improperly mourning *her*, claiming that he has forgotten her entirely. Here, Cynthia, rather than Propertius, appears as Protesilaus, returned from the dead, but she is motivated not by the desire to merely see her beloved, but by the need to be memorialized and mourned. Unlike the hero, loved and remembered by his beloved Laodamia, Cynthia has been neglected, a fact reflected in her shade's state of decay.⁵⁰ Both the funeral pyre and the Underworld have taken their toll. Her garments are charred (8), her ring has been warped (9), and Lethe's waters have eroded her beauty (*summaque Lethaus triverat ora liquor*, 10). But, in this case, it is not Cynthia who is made forgetful by death, but Propertius himself. In contrast to the incorporeal (but otherwise untarnished) shade of the well-mourned Protesilaus, her ghost's gruesome physical decomposition is caused by the neglect of her lover, who has failed to mourn her. She upbraids him for not providing for her funeral (25-26), observing her funeral rites publicly (27-28), or performing rituals to honor her death (29-34). She contrasts with Propertius with her two loyal slaves, Petale and Lalage, who have taken pains to mourn her, even with the threat (and enactment) of punishment from Propertius's new mistress, Chloris. As in 1.19, the replacement of a lover after his (or, in this case, her) death is yet another indication of forgetfulness and infidelity. As Cynthia argues, mourning after death is a reflection of the love experienced in one's life (*mortis lacrimis vitae sancimus amores*, 4.7.69; with the

⁵⁰ The parallel between Cynthia in 4.7 and Protesilaus in 1.19 is addressed briefly by Janan (2001), 109. More generally, her analysis of this poem (100-113) treats Cynthia's speech as a critique of both the Roman *mos maiorum* and its reflection in the elegists' masculine fantasy of the *puella*. The seminal scholarship on 4.7 includes Yardley (1977), Warden (1980), and Papanghelis (1987), 145-198.

tears of death, we confirm the loves of our lives). She claims, as Propertius himself did in 1.19, that if there is no mourning, there was no love.

If these strategies of memorialization are carried out, however, the memory of love reproduced in lamenting or anticipating the loss of a lover is so powerful that it can actually recall the dead or stave off death. As we have seen, Propertius introduces the idea of a lover returning from the dead in 1.19, when he compares himself to Protesilaus, whose love for his bride Laodamia recalls him briefly from the Underworld. Protesilaus's love for Laodamia is so potent that he is able to bring to fruition his desire to spend a few final hours in her embrace even after his death. Establishing himself as a similar paragon of devotion, Propertius asserts that, because he truly loves Cynthia, his prayers saved her from death when she was very ill (2.9.25-28). The intensity of his fidelity here, contrasted with the absence of her other lover, verges on the miraculous, seemingly enacted by Propertius himself (rather than the god(s) to whom Propertius made his vows). Later, in 4.7, Cynthia takes this claim one step further, asserting that she might have lived longer if Propertius had only recalled her at her death: *at mihi non oculos quisquam inclamavit euntis: unum impetrassem te revocante diem* (4.7.23-24; But no one called upon my eyes as they closed: if you had recalled me, I might have been granted one more day). It is now Cynthia who wishes to take on the role of Protesilaus and defy death to return to her lover. However, she is thwarted not because of her own lack of devotion, but that of Propertius, who fails to show his love by playing the part of Laodamia and calling Cynthia back from the dead. Propertius uses similar language in 2.27,⁵¹ when he describes a successful recall of the lover from death:

⁵¹ As Fedeli (2005) points out *ad loc.* He identifies the verb *revocare* as a word common to love poetry: "nel linguaggio amoroso è un verbo tecnico che esprime la richiesta del ritorno dopo una dolorosa separazione." Although he does not mention its mnemonic connotation specifically, he does list its use at *Rem.* 239 as a *comparandum*.

*iam licet et Stygia sedeat sub harundine remex,
cernat et infernae tristia vela ratis:
si modo clamantis revocaverit aura puellae,
concessum nulla lege redibit iter.* (Prop. 2.27.13-16)

(Even though he sits as an oarsman among the Stygian reeds and sees the gloomy sails of hell's boat: if the whisper of his beloved only calls out and recalls him, he will turn back on a journey, which no law permits.)

Propertius here claims that, even if a man has already set sail upon the Styx, if his beloved recalls (*revocaverit*, 15) him, he may return from the Underworld. The use of the verb *revocare* here, as in 4.7 above (*te revocante*, 24) underlines the importance of the spoken word in the restorative power of the memory of the dead. As in 2.13 discussed above, in which Propertius calls on Cynthia to verbally mourn him forever (*nec fueris nomen lassa vocare meum*, 2.13.28), the focus on words as the means by which memory is preserved is an important part of funerary ritual. Papanghelis notes that, in 4.7, Propertius references the rites of *conclamatio*, the calling out of the name of the deceased.⁵² This method of calling up the dead also recalls the oratorical practice of *mortuos ab inferis excitare*. As Dufallo points out, the dead Cynthia in 4.7 adopts the stance of an orator pursuing a case in court, recalling Cicero's *prosopopoeia* of Appius Claudius Caecus in *Pro Caelio*.⁵³ The verbal emphasis inherent in this oratorical posture displays the importance of the spoken memorialization of the dead. But when we consider the correspondence with the practice of *prosopopoeia* in oratory and the presence of the *imagines maiorum* in funeral processions, a further resonance of memorialization and mourning becomes clear. Just as the only mourner in the elegiac funeral is the *puella*, the only dead *exemplum* worthy to be recalled is the dead lover or his dead *puella*. The verbal mourning of the lover is necessary to any bid for immortality, whether through the actual prevention of corporeal death or through the

⁵² Papanghelis (1987), 160-161.

⁵³ Dufallo (2007), 77-84.

deathlessness engendered by memorialization in the mind of the beloved and in the poetry of the elegist.

But how effective for the elegist *are* these strategies of affect-memorialization? How can a reader who understands the conventions of the elegiac relationship take seriously a program of memorialization that requires the loyalty of the notoriously fickle *puella*? Does the elegist not remember his own elegy? In some ways, the relationship between death and love in elegy is heavily ironized, disrupting the purported priorities of elegiac love and breaking down the narrative fiction of the elegiac love affair. In essence, the fantasy of death brings into focus the unlikely inversions elegy usually presents: the dominant woman, the submissive elite male, poetry more permanent than stone. These elegiac conventions resist the Roman *mos maiorum* even as they reflect it and confirm its dominance. In her analysis of Tib. 1.1, Bassi (1994) points out that linguistic play with *mors* and *amor* does not necessarily propose a simile between, but rather a juxtaposition of, the two concepts.⁵⁴ She points out that the silence imposed by death shows the impotence of the elegists' fantasies of both death and love:

Moreover, this elegiac death wish, marked by the lover's desire to divest himself of the ineffectual burden of speech, is embodied in the poetic enterprise which requires (at least in principle) that face-to-face dialogue...give way to the solitary written word. The conceit of erotic fulfillment is finally and most convincingly undone by the absence of intimate contact and by the silence which the poem itself necessarily signifies. In the final analysis, Tibullus' first elegy, purportedly based on the aim of the reciprocal love of the *puella*, finally subverts its own credibility. And it is this subversion, commensurate with the necessary absence and silence of the *puella*, which underlies its conflation of *mors* and *amor*.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ *Contra* Ahl (1985): "there is death in love because there is MOR in aMOR" (40; quoted by Bassi, 53).

⁵⁵ Bassi (1994), 60.

Elegiac death and love are not equivalent, in other words, but two sides of a coin, and necessarily so, since their power structures are both one-sided. The poet-lover represents himself as a loyal and powerless *servus amoris*, while his *dura puella* dominates the relationship, demanding love without giving any in return. In death, however, the tables are turned. The elegist must be served by his mistress, or else his memory—and, consequently, hers, since she is also memorialized in his verses⁵⁶—will fall into jeopardy. The poet-lover controls his memory more effectively through the affect-memorialization constructed within his death fantasy than he ever could within the dominant narrative of elegy. It is this ironic and paradoxical dimension of the relationship between death and love, subtly inherent in Propertian and Tibullan elegy, that becomes a key component of Ovid’s play with memory and memorialization in his didactic elegy.

Remembering and Forgetting in Post-Civil Wars Poetics

In the period during or after the civil wars, this focus on emotional memorialization, rather than preserving the accounts of past deeds, indicates a growing discomfort in Rome with the poetic memorialization of honor. The civil wars had taken their toll, and, as a response to the social trauma of war, poets who had seen a surfeit of death for glory seem to have developed a distaste for honor memorialization, preferring to focus on the emotions stirred by the deaths of so many in civil war. As Propertius claims, if everyone were to devote themselves to love (as he has done), there would be no (civil) war, and Rome would have no need to mourn her citizens (2.15.41-46). Memorialization itself remained important, but the methods of memorialization diversified in this period to include the remembrance of *amor*, alongside the growth of elegiac love poetry. As Ramsby notes in her analysis of the epigraphic consciousness of elegy, “in a period of such broad political and geographical transformation, the infiltration of epigraph into

⁵⁶ As I explore further in Ch. 3.

poetry could be a sign that monuments of words, as opposed to monuments of stone, were perceived more likely to outlast the ravages of time.”⁵⁷ However, the love poetry of the period shows a clear anxiety about this new affective method of memorialization. Poets writing about love are not certain that their memory will be preserved, and they display this unease by complicating their poetry’s exploration of the themes of love and death. As we have seen throughout the love elegy of Propertius and Tibullus, the memory of love represents control over death, whether literal or figurative, and forgetfulness symbolizes the loss of that control.

It is in this context that Ovid issues his advice about avoiding death by curing love. Like the other elegists, *Remedia*’s strategies of memory show that power over death can be achieved by control of the remembrance of love. However, to Ovid, forgetting love, rather than memorializing it, is the only way to attain this goal and avoid death. He inverts the elegiac values of death and love; rather than viewing death as the inevitable end of a love affair and a necessary part of the path of its (and the poet’s) memorialization, he instead chooses for his student-reader a life lived in control of the emotional torture of love and the fear of death. The anxiety expressed by the elegists, that they would be forgotten after death and lose control over their legacies, is turned on its head as Ovid asserts that forgetting itself can be an art as controlled as his *ars amatoria*. Remembering love, on the other hand, is as dangerous as that bloodier cause of death the elegists sought to avoid: war.

The elegists’ choice to privilege memorialization through personal affect, rather than public honor, was relatively safe in the post-civil war period, when celebrating the deeds of one’s elite relatives could mean political (and literal) suicide. Indeed, as we have seen, the elegists reflect a greater trend in the culture of the principate of downplaying public in favor of private memorialization. Alienating themselves from the public sphere, elegists could concern

⁵⁷ Ramsby (2007), 31-32.

themselves with issues of private, personal memory without the need to reflect explicitly on the *memoria publica* of the Republic, the civil wars, or Augustus himself.⁵⁸

After Augustus's moral reforms of 18-17 BCE, however, love could be more a more dangerous topic than honor. The *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* and the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* mandated marriage (and regulated marriages across social classes), provided incentives for having multiple legitimate children (the *ius trium liberorum*), and made adultery a public, rather than private, crime. Cases of adultery that had previously been dealt with privately by a woman's husband or a *iudicium domesticum*, would now be subject to the new public *quaestio perpetua de adulteriis*. The penalties for criminal fornication (*stuprum*) and adultery, which included illicit sex with all women of the upper classes, were severe.⁵⁹ Although the intent behind this law has been heavily contested by scholars,⁶⁰ it is clear that Augustus's new legislation brought the private sphere of sex into the business of the *res publica*. Elegy, which, in its very essence, constituted a flouting of traditional sexual *mores*, now fell under the purview of the state, despite its generic disavowal of politics. If adultery was now illegal, elegy was certainly guilty, and Ovid and his predecessors, and perhaps even his readers, were implicated.

⁵⁸ This is not to say, of course, that elegists did not subtly (or, at times, not so subtly) reflect on public political matters. However, the generic stance of elegy held that the public sphere was the domain of epic and maintained the convention that the elegist was suited to be neither a soldier nor a poet of war (as at *Am.* 1.1). See especially Sullivan (1972) for an analysis of the political realities that affected and are reflected in elegy; see Kennedy (1993) for an analysis of the word 'political' and how politics can be understood to be an implicit, if not explicit, part of elegy (34-39).

⁵⁹ McGinn (1998) points out that it was the status of the woman involved, not the man, that determined the legality or illegality of the sexual act. As he argues, these restrictions reinforced the categorization of women into polar categories: marriageable and unmarried, sexually available and unavailable (144-145).

⁶⁰ Wallace-Hadrill (1981) argues convincingly that the main purpose behind the marital laws was to stabilize inheritance of property and status, rather than to specifically outlaw adultery. However, he does acknowledge that, given the "unprecedented severity" (71) of the laws against adultery, attitudes surrounding adultery (including the fear over children's legitimacy) played a role in the enactment of the legislation. Galinsky (1981) similarly contradicts previous scholars' assertions that the Augustan moral legislation was enacted merely for reasons of practical population control, on the one hand, or moralistic posturing, on the other. Instead, he advocates for an interpretation of the legislation as a "balance between pragmatism and idealism" (142) that was complex in both intent and execution. For more recent scholarship on the legislation, which has tended to focus on how the laws reflect Augustan ideology, see especially Edwards (1993), 34-62, and Milnor (2005), 140-154.

So, when he claims to write *Remedia* to keep the lover (or, perhaps, the poet) from death, Ovid then comments on the principate's incursion into the previously private sphere of love elegy. Unlike the prior generation of elegists,⁶¹ love poets must now not only avoid disagreement with the *princeps* in discussing public matters, but in writing about love, as well. In an era of moral reforms that could spell harsh punishment for the adulterer at the hands of the state, elegy was no longer a private, safe place to explore the interconnections between love and memory.⁶²

Ovid's Mourning Mothers

Ovid's threats of death for the lover, and the implied danger to the love elegist himself, are largely limited to the beginning of *Remedia*. The spectre of death, however, continues to surface occasionally throughout the poem. Most often, this *memento mori* appears in the figure of the mourning mother, grieving over the death of her son. *Remedia*'s inclusion of this trope, common to the more serious genres of epic and philosophy, has puzzled scholars, such as Henderson: "The image of the sorrowing or anxious mother seems to have had a powerful, and not very readily understandable, appeal for Ovid in this poem..."⁶³ In order to understand why these somber, pious, and decidedly un-elegiac women pop up throughout *Remedia*, I suggest that we must contextualize the *exempla* of the mourning mother within Ovid's commentary on the dangers of writing elegy. As we have seen, death is omnipresent in the elegiac world, a constant threat to the lover, infected by lethal passion, as well as to the poet, who risks the displeasure of

⁶¹ The bulk of whose poetry was published before the reforms of 18-17 BCE. Tibullus died in 19 BCE; probably only Propertius's fourth book of elegies can be dated to after the moral legislation (cf. the discussion of Cornelia in Prop. 4.11 earlier in this chapter.)

⁶² Of course, it is not necessarily the case that the elegist who wrote erotic poetry might fear the death penalty for his verses. However, incurring the wrath of the *princeps* certainly was a dangerous proposition, a fact that must have been made clear early in the history of the elegiac genre with the death of the poet Gallus. (See n. 13 above.) Even if a poet did not fear literal execution, imperial disdain of his poetry might expose him to social death through exile, as Ovid, of course, eventually discovered.

⁶³ Henderson (1979) goes on to postulate an autobiographical reason for these out-of-place *exempla*: "While one may describe it as an emotional commonplace, part of the *supellex* of the *doctus poeta* or *declamator*, it is permissible to wonder if some recent personal experience did not prompt him, subconsciously, to select it in preference to other available illustrations" (108).

the *princeps* for the violation of his moral reforms. Ovid further flouts the Augustan laws promoting marriage and legitimate childbearing by using images of grieving mothers as *exempla* for his lover-student, parodying the positive image of womanly virtue that the figure represents in early imperial *mores*. He sullies the *materfamilias* at the center of Augustan moral program by associating her with the illicit sex advocated by the poet-lover in elegy. The mourning mother, reverently remembering her dead son, is equated with the suffering lover, recalling his love affair, a bathetic comparison that underscores the slippage between the categories of erotic and maternal love in the era of Augustan moral reforms.

The figure of the mourning mother, paired with the image of Venus-as-mother, appears near the very beginning of *Remedia*. As we have already seen, the *praeceptor* invokes Amor's parentage when he asks him to consent to a cure for love. Entreating the god to resemble his mother Venus more than his stepfather Mars, the *praeceptor* juxtaposes love and war, the former characterized as benign and playful, the latter by blood and cruelty. Amor should behave like the boy he is, his mother's young son, rather than his stepfather's soldier: *tu cole maternas, tuto quibus utimur, artes, / et quarum vitio nulla fit orba parens* (*Rem.* 29-30; but you, attend to your mother's arts, which we enjoy safely and by whose fault no parent is made childless). In addition to their divine associations, the safety of love and the consequences of war are characterized further in terms of human parental relationships: Venus does not cause any parents to mourn their sons lost in battle. This portrayal of Venus as a mother herself, sympathetic to the concerns of mortal mothers, evokes the Augustan image of Venus Genetrix.

Producing legitimate offspring was a major aspect of the moral legislation of 18-17 BCE, which, to this end, not only forbade adultery, but also offered inducements to married women

who bore three or more children.⁶⁴ The image of the Augustan ideal mother, virtuous, faithful, and fertile, was promoted in art, in literature, and even through the *exempla* of the women of the imperial family.⁶⁵ Augustan representations of Venus underscored the goddess's role as Venus Genetrix, the foremother of the Julian clan, and deemphasized her association with love and sex.⁶⁶ However, as Lively (2012) points out in her analysis of 'good' and 'bad' mothers in the Augustan period, the boundaries between mother and lover can easily become confused. As she shows, the laws on childbearing and adultery seem to have even encouraged slippage between the categories of motherhood and eroticism: "ironically...one of the effects of this approach toward the legislation of private behaviors seems to have been the explicit association in Augustan literature and art of the illicit sexual *mores* with *matres*—albeit through determined official efforts to draw a clear line between legitimate and illegitimate sexual relations and the reproduction of children and heirs, between recreational and procreational sex."⁶⁷ In Augustan Rome, then, the image of the ideal mother is never far distant from that of the philandering wife. Ovid, acknowledging the fragility of these categories, plays on the overlap between the Augustan mother-goddess and the divine figure who represents his elegiac code of love. In the lines above, Venus Genetrix, Venus in her role as mother, and, more specifically, as matriarch of the imperial family, is tied not only to the tropic figure of the mourning mother, but also to her role as mother of Amor, herself a patroness of elegy. From *Remedia*'s opening, then, Venus's divine presence begins to break down the boundary between the Augustan ideal of the virtuous mother and the

⁶⁴ The most significant of these rewards for women was a certain degree of economic and legal freedom from their husbands and/or fathers. See Dixon (1988) for an analysis of the Roman state's role in encouraging motherhood (71-98).

⁶⁵ See Treggiari (2005).

⁶⁶ On the solemnity of Venus in Augustan art (especially in the context of her appearance in the Temple of Mars Ultor), see Zanker (1988), 195-201.

⁶⁷ Lively (2012), 199-200. Lively draws much of her literary evidence from Ovid, especially in *Heroides* and *Fasti*, where she argues that "Ovid reminds his audience that the mother of Aeneas and Augustus is not only Venus Genetrix but also Mater Amoris" (196).

alluring seductress of elegy.

The association between the mourning mother and the elegiac love affair does not always involve the character of Venus, however. Mourning mothers are used as *exempla* again at three more points during the *praeceptor*'s argument, all in aid of specific advice he gives in his cure for love. The first example is employed when the *praeceptor*, in defining his ideal audience, states that it is best to follow his advice either at the beginning or end of a relationship. If a lover tries to cure love at its peak, he will fail. Medicine is the art of timeliness (*temporis ars medicina fere est*, 131), and a cure must be given at the appropriate moment if it is to be effective. To prove his point, the *praeceptor* gives an example of consoling a mourning mother:

*quis matrem, nisi mentis inops, in funere nati
flere vetet? non hoc illa monenda loco est.
cum dederit lacrimas animumque impleverit aegrum,
ille dolor verbis emoderandus erit. (Rem. 127-130)*

(Who, unless lacking in wits, would forbid a mother to weep at her son's funeral? She ought not be admonished there. But when she has spilled her tears and satisfied her grief-filled heart, her pain then should be soothed by words.)

The *praeceptor* employs the figure of the mourning mother to argue that advice must be given in a timely manner. A cure for love, like a consolation for the bereaved, should not be applied if the time is not appropriate. In this *exemplum*, Ovid compares two emotions: the grief at the loss of a child and the pain of unrequited love. The conflation of erotic and maternal love here reflects a breakdown of categories separating the mourning mother at the funeral of her son from the lover weeping over the cruelty of his mistress, who denies him sex. This bathetic comparison caricatures the figure of the virtuous mother who grieves for her son, a commonplace in

philosophical consolations, among other genres.⁶⁸ But this association between sex and death recalls a trope of elegy, as well. As we have already seen, in scenes of mourning in elegy, the *puella* plays the funerary role that traditionally would belong to the dead elegist's female family, her grief exaggerated and blatantly sexualized.⁶⁹ The image of the loving mother, then, is not only juxtaposed with the pained lover, but with the mourning mistress of elegy. This implied parallel between the pious mother and the elegiac woman further exacerbates the violation of Augustan *mores*, doubly inculcating this model of maternal morality through association with both the elegiac lover and his sexy *puella*.

The next maternal *exemplum* the *praeceptor* adapts to his purpose demonstrates his advice that the lover should take a second mistress in order to fall out of love with the first. After all, he asserts, all love is conquered by a new successor (*successore novo vincitur omnis amor*, *Rem.* 462), even, it seems, motherly love: *fortius e multis mater desiderat unum, / quam quem flens clamat 'tu mihi solus eras.'* (*Rem.* 463-464; more steadily does a mother bear the loss of one son among many than of him for whom she weeps and cries out 'you were my only one'). The comparison here is, again, satirically absurd: just as a mother is consoled for the loss of one son by her other sons' health, so a lover, having given up his mistress, is consoled by sex with a new *puella*. Adversely, a man who loves only one woman is likened to a woman with only one son to lose. Ovid equates the positive *exemplum* of Augustan *mores*, the mother with multiple sons, with his own positive *exemplum*: the lover with multiple *puellae*. This mocking comparison between the mourning mother and the suffering lover parodies the Augustan ideal of motherhood, as well as the general program of the moral legislation, by destabilizing the

⁶⁸ Cf. Cicero's comments on the timeliness of mourning at *Fam.* 5.16.6: *etenim si nulla fuit umquam liberis amissis tam imbecillo mulier animo quae non aliquando lugendi modum fecerit* (Indeed, there was never a woman who, having lost her children, was so feeble-minded that she did not eventually put an end to her mourning).

⁶⁹ Cf. above, especially *Prop.* 2.9, 2.13; *Tib.* 1.1, 1.3.

categories of maternal and erotic love.

The final image of the lamenting mother in *Remedia* appears when the *praeceptor* urges the lover to eliminate his fear of rivals. The lover who is afraid that, if he leaves his *puella*, she will end up in another man's bed, will never be able to separate himself from her. Instead, he should set aside his fear, lest he become like a mother who thinks only of her endangered son: *plus amat e natis mater plerumque duobus, pro cuius reditu, quod gerit arma, timet.* (*Rem.* 547-548; Most of the time, a mother loves more, out of her two sons, the one for whose return she fears, because he bears arms in war.) A mother with two sons loves the soldier more, since he is in danger of being taken from her. A lover who risks losing his ex-*puella* to another man may fall into a similar trap, sinking deeper into love with her because he fears being left behind. As in the *exempla* above, the image of the distressed mother is compared to the lover's trials, in a way that evokes *bathos* rather than *pathos*. The lover vanquished by a sexual rival is a comic (and, of course, elegiac) commonplace, rather than a tragic one. Likening the mother with two sons—only one away from the *ius trium liberorum* of the Augustan ideal—to the promiscuous lover again disrupts the conventions created by the moral reforms, thinning the line between legally mandated motherhood and illicit, immoral fornication.

In addition, this final case addresses a topic the two previous examples did not: the son's cause of death. Here, the reason for the mother's mourning is, explicitly, war. This martial death (or, rather, the anticipated death) of the mother's son contrasts with the death of the lover, the purported reason for *Remedia*'s composition. The *miles amoris* of elegy is at risk of dying from love, not war. The comparison here, then, does not just conflate the fertile *materfamilias* with the elegiac lover, the legal production of children with illegal sex; it also couples the private death of the lover, obsessed with his personal relationship with the *puella*, with the public death of the

soldier, who serves the state and the *princeps*. Ovid's use of the *exemplum* of the mourning mother obscures the boundary between public and private to the same degree as Augustus' moral legislation had done. Previous elegists, who insisted that their private realm of elegy was separate from politics, might fear only death caused by the pain of love; but, in the new context of the *leges Iuliae*, writing love elegy could become as dangerous as any state-sanctioned war.

In a similar vein, these bathetic comparisons equate the memory of the dead son, killed in battle, with elegiac memorialization. On both sides of the parallel, it is the emotional response of the mourner that is emphasized, pointing to an affective memorialization for both the son and the lover. Ovid's maternal *exempla* memorialize their sons through their grief, in the same way that the *puella* remembers the dead lover. This conflation of erotic and motherly love represents a response to the elision of the boundaries between private and public in the moral reforms of the principate, which endanger elegy's stance of separation from the sphere of politics. *Remedia*'s frequent reminders of death inextricably tie elegy's memorialization of the love affair to the threat of death posed to the genre by Augustan moral reform, reinforcing the association between elegy and mourning.

Conclusion

Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*, even as it instructs the reader to forget love, points out how love is remembered in previous elegy. By claiming death as his pretext for writing his cure, he signals that death and mourning are central to the program of memory production in elegy. Elegy's anxiety about memorialization after death is part of a larger context of shifting patterns of remembering the dead in the transition from the republic to principate. Elegists pick up on the larger cultural trend towards memorialization through affect, rather than recalling the public deeds of the deceased, and devise strategies for uniquely elegiac affect-memorialization. In

Remedia, Ovid plays on previous elegy's posture of separation from the political sphere, manipulating his predecessors' focus on private, rather than public, death and mourning by alluding to the dangers of writing elegy in his own time. The elegist no longer only risks a death caused by love, but the grave displeasure of the *princeps*. Ovid's play with elegiac death and mourning in *Remedia*, then, does not just demonstrate his memory of the poetic past, but also indicates the danger Augustus's moral reforms pose to the memorialization of the love affair, the aim of elegy's program of memory production. Ovid's threats of death to the lover toll elegy's death knell.

As we have seen, however, Ovid reacts to the somber prospect of the death of elegy through humor, parodying traditional ideals and flouting Augustan *mores*. The satirical comparisons and absurd paradoxes constructed by the *praecepta* amplify this tenor of ironic wit, which is applied equally to politics and culture and to the elegiac tradition. Even as Ovid evokes the affect-memorialization of his poetic predecessors, his *praeceptor* persona emphasizes the importance of forgetting the private spheres of love and elegy. In *Remedia*, Ovid's treatment of Roman public memory, concentrated in the hands of the *princeps*, will reflect a similar play with the boundaries between private and public, elegy and encomium, and remembering and forgetting.

CHAPTER TWO:

Out of Sight, Out of Mind? Forgetting *Roma* and *Amor* in the City and Abroad

Introduction

Through his paradoxical instructions on how to forget in *Remedia*, Ovid calls attention to the ways Romans remember. In Roman cultural discourse, manipulation of space is the dominant strategy for memory production, and Ovid's treatise on forgetting is no exception. In this chapter, I argue that *Remedia*'s intersection of memory and space reflects the memory production strategies of both elegy and the state, as the spheres of private and public merge in the city of Rome, the *locus* of love in Ovidian amatory poetry. Ovid's treatment of Rome's urban space, his focus even as he purports to advise the lover-reader to evacuate the city, overwrites scripts of social memory in the public spaces of Rome with the personal memory of love, altering memory production in two ways. First, by instructing the lover-reader to abandon both the city of Rome and the values of elegy, Ovid recalls the elegiac topos of the lover-poet attempting to forget love through travel. This intertextual suggestion serves an ironic purpose, pointing out the failure inherent in the strategy of forgetting *amor* by leaving *Roma*. Indeed, the *praeceptor* spends most of *Remedia* within the city, a reflection of the impossibility of escaping Rome's intertwined public and private spheres. Second, I will explore how Ovid treats the juxtaposition of public and private memory spaces in Rome and contextualize *Remedia* within the broader milieu of Roman rhetorical and cultural mnemotechnics, which explicitly connect

spaces (*loci*) to memory production and retention. Ovid reappropriates these techniques of formal oratory and elite memorialization for his topic of love in *Remedia*, intentionally misusing socially-sanctioned *ars memoriae* and state-sanctioned monuments in an ironic effort to forget personal love and the public and private spaces in which it is encoded within the city. Even as he overwrites the scripts of public memory with the remembrance of love, he refers back to his previous work, *Ars Amatoria*, remembering and rewriting his own text for a new purpose. Further, Ovid's treatment of the city as a microcosm of the world proves that there can be no escape from either love or Rome; for wherever *Roma* goes, so *amor* will follow, the world over.

In this chapter, I will approach Ovid's play with literary and cultural memory through behavioral scripts. As discussed in the introduction, a psychological 'script' denotes a behavioral stereotype, a memory structure that organizes general knowledge of a common situation and its requisite sequence of actions. Although scripts are universally a core component of basic memory, their details are culturally constructed. Entering a place (like a colleague's home) or encountering another type of auditory or visual prompt (like hearing a phone ring) cues a person to perform particular actions according to a culturally-specific script. Scripts are taught not only through participation in commonplace situations, but through consumption of cultural media, including literature. For example, anyone familiar with the tale of Hansel and Gretel knows that, upon entering a house made of candy, one must take certain actions to avoid being eaten by a hungry witch. In the Roman context, certain cues, like entering the *forum* or a theater, prompt scripted behaviors, or, indeed, a list of possible scripts one could follow in a given situation, according either to one's preference or to the dominant cultural script. One dominant script for an elite male entering the *forum*, for example, involves giving a speech in a court case. Ovid

plays with the idea of dominant scripts by assigning his own scripted behaviors to sites in Rome, prompting his readers to countercultural scripts that emphasize elegiac love over male sociality.

Rome in the Rear-View

In *Remedia Amoris*, the *praeceptor* advises the lover-reader, who wishes to forget love, to avoid the places that remind him of his love affair. He begins his advice in *Remedia* by stating that the lover-reader should, first and foremost, avoid leisure (*fugias otia prima*, 136)¹ and suggests a number of alternative activities: participating in civic discourse in the *forum* (151-152), traveling abroad to fight the Parthians (153ff), tending to a farm (169ff) or going hunting (199ff) in the country. He advises that one pursue activities that will engage the mind and exhaust the body, leaving no room for desire in either. By participating in these behaviors, scripted in Roman society for the elite male, one can unlearn how to love: *aut his aut aliis, donec dediscis amare, / ipse tibi furtim decipiendus eris* (211-212; Either here or there, until you forget how to love, you should surreptitiously fool yourself). This turn away from amorous pursuits towards weightier (or, at least, manlier) endeavors indicates an abandonment of elegiac values, the memory and memorialization of the love affair being foremost among them. In doing so, the *praeceptor* purports to value social responsibility over personal affect, a programmatically anti-elegiac move. However, even as he cues this specific set of dominant cultural scripts his *praecepta* advocate a separation from the beloved that, in many ways, evokes elegiac scripts, reminding the reader of the memorability of elegiac love.

¹ Rejecting *otium*, of course, is synonymous with rejecting the elegiac lifestyle. As J.-M. André's classic study (*L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne*, 1966) shows, the term *otium* originally indicates a laying down of military arms, though it comes to mean a withdrawal from civic responsibilities (and from the city to the country) in the late Republican and Augustan periods. Ovid's succeeding examples clearly indicate both connotations, although his subsequent suggestions that the reader take up farm life contradict this precept. To Ovid, then, avoiding leisure (*fugias otia*) means avoiding elegy while participating in activities deemed more appropriate for a Roman man. For a general discussion of *otium* in Roman culture, see Toner (1995). For leisure in Tibullus, see Bright (1978); for leisure in Propertius, see Keith (2008).

Forgetting love is specifically tied in *Remedia* to a change in the lover's physical location, as the *praeceptor* stresses in the passage immediately following:

*tu tantum quamvis firmis retinebere vinclis
i procul, et longas carpere perge vias;
flebis, et occurret desertae nomen amicae,
stabit et in media pes tibi saepe via:
sed quanto minus ire voles, magis ire memento;
perfer, et invitos currere coge pedes.
nec pluvias opta, nec te peregrina morentur
sabbata, nec damnis Allia nota suis.
nec quot transieris et quot tibi, quaere, supersint
milia; nec, maneat ut prope, finge moras:
tempora nec numera, nec crebro respice Romam,
sed fuge: tutus adhuc Parthus ab hoste fuga est. (Rem. 213-224)*

(Although you will be held back by strong chains, just go far away, and go pursue a long journey; you will weep, and the name of your abandoned woman will come to mind, and your foot will often halt in mid-step: but the less you wish to go, the more you should remember to go. Carry on, and force your unwilling feet to run. Do not hope for rain; do not let foreign sabbaths delay you, nor the Allia known for its disasters. Do not ask how many miles you have gone or how many remain; do not manufacture delays so that you may remain nearby: do not count the hours; do not look back frequently at Rome, but flee: through flight the Parthian is still safe from his enemy.)

In this passage, persistent movement is the only mechanism for avoiding the memory of love.

The mere memory of his *puella*'s name recalls the lover to Rome, and he must redouble his efforts to forget (*magis ire memento*, 217). Controlling and overcoming the memory of the *puella* is a necessary step to leaving Rome and love behind. Indeed, the mere sight of the city over his shoulder is dangerous to the lover's resolve, and Ovid exhorts him not to look back frequently towards Rome (*nec crebro respice Romam*, 223). Even far outside of the memory spaces of

Rome, just a view of the city broadly may call to mind the memory of the *puella* and tempt the lover to turn around. Rome itself is a primary prompt to memory for the lover; indeed, the city is such an effective memory trigger that even a faraway view of its cityscape threatens to cue the script of elegiac love for the fugitive lover.

Since, then, the city of Rome gives space to the memory of love within its urban landscape, the safest solution for the lover wishing to avoid *amor* should be to leave the city. Travel provides an opportunity to escape Rome, the principal prompt to scripts of love, to the periphery, where the lover will conquer his desires, as surely as a Roman soldier defeats the enemy abroad, gaining power over the memory of love. The ideal option, then, is for the lover to abandon the dense memory space of Rome altogether, leaving the *puella* behind, along with the city, to be forgotten.

But is out-of-sight really out-of-mind for elegiac lovers? Some lovers in the poetry of Ovid's predecessors do seem to achieve forgetfulness through travel; the Theseus of Catullus 64 takes a journey and forgets Ariadne, after all. However, his forgetfulness, far from causing their love to descend into oblivion, gives space to the laments of Ariadne, the *puella relictā*, whose own memory of the love affair then comes to supersede that of her lover.² *Remedia*'s advice to leave the beloved in order to forget love calls to mind the trope of the abandoned woman and the elegiac script of her lament, as Ovid points out in this *praeceptum*. This passage subtly warns that, even if the lover-reader does succeed in leaving his *deserta amica* (215), the memory of the love affair may not be completely eradicated, as it may cue an entirely different elegiac script, in which the abandoned woman controls the construction of the memory of the love affair instead.

But it is not just this method of elegiac memory production that the *praeceptor*'s advice on travel brings to mind. Indeed, the desire to forget and the anxiety of being forgotten are

² See Ch. 4 for a fuller analysis of Cat. 64 and the *puella relictā*'s strategies for memory production.

expressed in the context of travel not only by Catullus, but also by Sulpicia, Tibullus, and Propertius.³ *Remedia*'s advice to leave the city as a cure for love finds its closest precedents in Catullus 11 and Propertius 1.1.⁴ However, contrary to the Ovidian *praeceptor*'s promises, these missions of forgetting end rather unhappily for the lover. Like Ovid, Catullus and Propertius locate love and its remembrance securely within the city, but they also demonstrate that even traveling outside the central *locus* of love does not necessarily keep amorous memory at bay. *Remedia*'s advice that the lover should pursue *negotium* abroad and abandon elegiac values becomes another paradoxical *praeceptum*, as this counsel itself reflects the failure of travel as a cure for love in the scripts of previous love poetry.

In poem 11, Catullus addresses Furius and Aurelius, his 'friends' and traveling companions,⁵ whom he exhorts to send a nasty goodbye note to his mistress, condemning her to a life without true love. As indicated by his lengthy list of possible destinations, which stretch from India in the East to Britain in the West, Catullus must seek the most remote climes to

³ Travel as a remedy for love is a Hellenistic topos (cf. Theocritus 14.52-55), which, though acknowledged by the commentators below, has received no extensive analysis. In Latin, the idea of travel as a way to escape love, often accompanied, as Geisler (1969) notes, "mit der Ablenkung durch negotia" (254), is expressed in Cicero (*Tusc.* 4.77), Plautus (*Merc.* 643-660, *Asin.* 157-8), Terence (*Ad.* 274-275, *Heaut.* 109-117, *Eun.* 135-248), Lucretius (*De rerum natura*, 4.1061-2), and Vergil (*Ecl.* 10.64-8). As we will see, this topos makes its way into Latin love poetry in Catullus 11 and Prop. 1.1 (see notes below), as well as Prop. 2.30 (see Fedeli (2005), *ad loc.*) and 3.21 (Fedeli (1985), *ad loc.*; see Clarke (2004) on this poem for the journey as an erotic topos). As Fedeli (1985) points out, this trope most commonly incorporates a "viaggio per mare allo scopo di evitare le pene d'amore" (609), a sea voyage being particularly effective for putting the most distance between the lover and *puella*. For journeys in elegy generally, see Clarke (2004), Lindheim (2011); on imperial geography and traveling in elegy, see Myers (2008), Keith (2014a and 2014b); on gender and travel in elegy, see Parker (2009), Vitale (2009-10); on the dangers of sea travel as an elegiac trope, see Houghton (2007).

⁴ Catullus 11 is written in sapphics and, thus, does not precisely fit into the elegiac genre. However, I consider the poem here as an obvious predecessor to the theme of travel as a remedy for love in elegy proper. Although I do not pursue the argument so far, Miller (2004) contends that Catullus ought to be treated as a true Latin elegist.

⁵ A great amount of the scholarly discussion on this poem has been dedicated to the debate over whether Furius and Aurelius should be read as friends or enemies of Catullus and, therefore, whether the poem should be read as sincere or sarcastic. See especially Sweet's (1987) summary of the discussion, which argues for a parodic reading; and Fredricksmeyer (1993), who reads the poem as a sincere reconciliation. Beyond this issue, most scholarship focuses on the poem's geographical catalogue and its engagement with the political and military context of the period; see especially Bright (1976), McKie (1984), Greene (2006), and Woodman (2012), 17-23. For the poem as part of Catullus's reception of Archilochus, see Wray (2001), 167-186. For the theme of travel as a cure for love in this poem, see Syndikus (1984), *ad loc.*

abandon the city and his *puella*. In particular, he says that he wishes to look upon the monuments of great Caesar (*Caesaris visens monimenta magni*, 10), emphatically quitting the *mollis* world of love poetry for the rigors of foreign travel and conquest.⁶ With his eyes on Caesar's *monimenta*, Catullus takes memory into his own hands, indicating a move from the personal, erotic memory of poetry to the public, martial memorialization of monuments.⁷ Significantly, this space of public memory is located outside of the city, a representation of imperial conquest over non-Romans, rather than a reflection of Caesar's power within the city itself. The city is reserved as a space for love, not war, colored by the private sphere of affect, which the poet-lover must escape in order to forget his *puella*.

But the poet-lover's eye towards the might of the Roman state is quickly turned back to the city itself. Catullus paints a picture of the woman he leaves behind, caught up in the embrace of three hundred lovers (*simul complexa tenet trecentos*, 11.18); he imagines her in an orgy with every man in Rome. In his view, she has clearly moved on, metaphorically, rather than literally. His message to her, indeed, characterizes Catullus as the one left behind, as it is the *puella*, not the poet, who is told not to look back. Furius and Aurelius are to tell the *puella*:

*nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem,
qui illius culpa cecidit uelut prati
ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam
tactus aratro est.* (11.21-24)

(She ought not look back on my love, as before, which, because of her wrongdoing, has died like the flower at the edge of the meadow, after it was touched by the passing plow.)
Catullus's bravado fails here at the end of the poem; he is no longer the adventurous traveler, but the vulnerable flower, cut down by a passing plow. The mobility of the scene is reversed, as the

⁶ For the prominent role of Caesar in Catullan invective, see Tatum (2007). Despite the pervasive critique of Caesar throughout Catullus's poetry, Tatum sees the reference to Caesar's conquests here as "without obvious irony" (341).

⁷ See Fordyce (1961) for the significance of the term *monimenta* and its connection to memory and memorialization (127).

flower is unable to escape the moving plow; Catullus, though a traveler in the beginning of the poem, is actually immobilized by love. For her part, the *puella* does not play the role of the abandoned woman, although Catullus has left her in the city. Instead, Catullus himself is located on the margins of the scene, at the edge of the field, struck down by Lesbia's carelessness. Although he demands that she not look back (*respectet*, 21), that she not remember him, it is he who is in danger of being forgotten⁸ and she who maintains power.⁹ The reversals in the poem lead the reader to the same conclusion as Ovid: the lover should not spare the city a backwards glance or think about what his beloved is doing in his absence. Catullus's failure comes when he ceases to look forward to the distant lands where he will travel. In his mind's eye, he looks back on Lesbia in the city with her many lovers and, thus, he loses control over his own mobility; it is as though he never left Rome's memory space. Looking back towards the city steals away the power over memory gained by travel. Catullus is left vulnerable, on the periphery of the world, but with only Rome and its memory space in his view.

Propertius also suggests travel as both a metaphor and a *remedia* for love. In 1.1,¹⁰ lamenting the difficulty of love, he claims that love has forgotten him: *in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artes, / nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire vias.* (1.1.17-18; Slow Amor is not thinking up any strategies for me and has forgotten how to walk the familiar paths, as before.) Slow-moving love has strayed from his accustomed path, leaving Propertius to travel unaccompanied.

⁸ Fordyce (1961) denies the force of the *re-* in *respectet* here: "there is no implication of looking back" (128). I, however, see no reason to ignore the prefix.

⁹ Fitzgerald (1995) compares Lesbia's power to the might of Roman empire: "Through her association with the plough, Lesbia, who deflowers the innocent love of Catullus, is aligned with the often violent forces of civilization. However, the problem of communication with Lesbia is put in the context of empire building by the lengthy citation of Furius' and Aurelius' protestations that they would accompany Catullus to the remotest parts of the world, some of which had been the object of the farflung military campaigns of 55 B.C.E. In this context, Lesbia is seen as a threatening monster on the edge of the empire, that is, beyond the pale of civilization, and also, by association with the plough, as a manifestation of the ruthless indifference that characterizes Roman imperial might" (180-181).

¹⁰ Most scholarship on 1.1 focuses on first 16 lines and their intertext with Gallus and Meleager (cf. Miller's (2004) interaction with this scholarly debate at 85-90). On the theme of travel within the poem, see Enk (1946); Fedeli (1980), *ad loc.*; Ross (1975), 66-68 (on the presence of this trope as an allusion to Gallus); and Kennedy (1993), 47-50.

Forgetful *Amor* does not provide him with any means to produce new memories of love. Unlike Milanion, whose story is told in the preceding lines, he is not able to catch up to Atalanta, the *velox puella* (1.1.8-16) and achieve the happy ending to his love story. Disheartened, Propertius exhorts his friends to seek a remedy for love for him, since he is too far gone to do so himself: *et vos, qui sero lapsum revocatis, amici, / quaerite non sani pectoris auxilia.* (1.1.25-26; And you, my friends, who too late recall me, having slipped, seek aid for an unwell heart.) Forgotten and neglected by both *amor*, which keeps contented love away, and his friends, who should be able to provide distraction from his misery through the conventional activities of male sociality, he seeks the only cure for love left to him: leaving the memory space of the city.

Continuing his travel metaphor, Propertius insists that he be removed to the farthest climes, since his best chance to forget love is to stay away from women altogether: *ferite per extremas gentes et ferite per undas / qua non ulla meum femina norit iter* (1.1.29-30; Take me through the farthest lands and across the seas, where no woman will know my path). According to Propertius here, the risk of encountering a woman is highest in the city of Rome; in some remote rural areas, love and its objects are entirely absent. Escaping the city is, then, the only way for the lover to avoid finding a woman in his way. Travel abroad, then, provides the path towards freedom from love's caprices, as well as the bonds of male sociality. Alternately, the city is fit only for those who have already found safety in love (*in tuto semper amore pares*, 1.1.32), who are equal partners in a relationship with a balance of power, a decidedly un-elegiac love. For him, and elegiac lovers like him, the city instead prompts the dangerous script of the lopsided elegiac relationship, with its controlling *domina* and its submissive *servus amoris*. If such love has already taken hold, then, it seems that the Ovidian *praeceptor* and Propertius here

agree that only way for the lover to regain power is abandon the city altogether, leaving it to be the domain of women and the memory of love.

However, as the poem continues, it becomes clear that the lover can never escape love through flight. Venus herself harries him, and Amor is never idle or absent (*nam me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras, / et nullo vacuus tempore defit Amor*, Prop. 1.1.33-34). Propertius reminds his friends not to become complacent in love at home within the city, warning them not to remember too late that love is more likely to become an unbalanced elegiac torment than remain a safe relationship between equals: *quod si quis monitis tardas adverterit aures, / heu, referet quanto verba dolore mea!* (1.1.35-38; But if anyone should turn a reluctant ear to my warning, alas, with what great pain will he remember my words!).¹¹ At the end of the poem, then, the promise of travel abroad as a cure for love is given up as futile, and the warning of Propertius to his male comrades falls on deaf ears. Propertius reaches out to his group of friends, and they to him, to no avail, demonstrating the failure of male sociality to interrupt elegiac scripts.¹² As in Cat. 11, travel and the concomitant script of military service represent the sanctioned behavioral options open to elite males, as opposed to the scripts of love poetry. Even as Catullus and Propertius attempt to cue these dominant cultural scripts by abandoning the city, the primary memory prompt to love, they find love's path unavoidable, having taken the place of the dominant scripts in their memories and poetry.

In *Remedia*, Ovid recalls this tradition of previous love poetry, securely locating the memory of love within the city and recommending flight abroad as the best method of forgetting

¹¹ This advice recalls Ovid's advice at the beginning of *Remedia* that the best cure is abstinence from love. Ovid's counsel here, indeed, is made in reference to space: *dum licet et modici tangunt praecordia motus, / si piget, in primo limine siste pedem.* (*Rem. Am.* 79-80; While you can, when yet moderate emotions touch your heart, if it grieves you, halt your step on the first threshold.)

¹² Cf. Keith's (2008) observation, on 1.1.25-40: "The dedicatee of 1.1 [i.e., Tullus] is thus naturally included in the group of friends the poet-lover addresses at the conclusion of the elegy, who endeavor in vain to help him by summoning him back to the masculine world of military service and political conquest" (127).

love. Ovid advises the lover-reader to follow in the footsteps of Catullus and Propertius, abandoning Rome, the personal memory space of love, to pursue *negotium* in the public sphere. However, in doing so, he reminds the reader of the failure of such programs of forgetting in previous love poetry. He cues the script of elegiac travel, which, despite its circuitous route, always delivers the lover back to the memory space of love. One cannot forget *amor* simply by leaving *Roma*.

Indeed, Ovid, even as he foregrounds the topos of travel as a remedy for love in amorous poetry, spends very little time on the idea in his *Remedia*. His initial *praeceptum* advising flight, which emphasizes the difficulty of the journey rather than the successful state of forgetfulness, suggests that distance itself is not a foolproof remedy for love. Indeed, though this advice is explicitly given as part of Ovid's *praecepta prima* (since it is concomitant with avoiding *otium*), he devotes much more space in the poem to guiding the lover-reader through the city, rife with the dangers of remembering love. His first advice, then, belies the true *locus* of memory and forgetting in *Remedia*: the city of Rome.

Memory, Space, and Emotion in Roman Rhetoric

The association between spaces (*loci*) and memory is a common one in Latin mnemotechnics. Rhetorical treatises, like the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero's *De oratore*, and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, teach pupils the *loci* method, in which memories are mentally situated in particular locations in an imagined setting, as part of the rhetorical *ars memoriae*.¹³ When the young orator wishes to access a memory (a detail of his argument, perhaps), he undertakes a mental journey, walking through these imagined spaces (*loci*) and

¹³ For general bibliography on *ars memoriae*, see the Introduction above. For discussions of the *loci* technique and its reflection on conceptions of space in Roman thought, see Vasaly (1993), 89-104, on Cicero's use of *loci*; Jaeger (1997), 19-25, on Livy's use of *loci*; and Leach (1998), 75-79, on how the spatial patterning inherent in the *loci* system corresponds to the diagrammatic topography seen in Roman painting.

viewing the objects (*imagines*) within them, each of which represents an item to be remembered. The spatial relationships between items within the *loci* and between the *loci* themselves efficiently organize and allow access to stored memories.

The *loci* should be spaces which can be easily visualized and committed to memory, neither too large nor too small, nor dark nor too bright, deserted rather than crowded. These spaces should be architectural: a house (*aedes*), an intercolumnar space (*intercolumnium*), a corner (*angulus*), an arch (*fornix*).¹⁴ An orator should have a large number and variety of spaces at his disposal, arranged in a series to aid the memory. The text even goes so far as to stipulate how close together one should imagine these *loci* in their series; around 30 (Roman) feet of space should keep the *loci* distinct but not too distant: *nam ut aspectus item cogitatio minus valet, sive nimis procul removeris sive vehementer prope admoveris id, quod oportet videri* (*Rhet. ad Her.* 3.19; for just like vision, reflection is less powerful if you have moved the object to be seen either too far or too near). Although such a rule is not explicitly stated, these requirements make it clear that these memory spaces are most likely to be drawn from an urban context. The focus on architectural structures as a necessary feature of *loci* and the concern that these imagined *loci* may appear too crowded (like their real-life counterparts) indicate that the city of Rome itself is imagined as a possible space to be utilized in the creation of this memory system.

Romans' experience in the city both informed and reflected this mnemonic method. Memory of the past was marked everywhere within the city, from the grandest monuments and memorials to the smallest graffito. As Edwards states, "Particular places in the city, especially public places, might serve as a stimulus to memories of particular events and individuals from earlier times.... The city was a storehouse of Roman memories, an archive which ordered them

¹⁴ *Rhet. ad Her.* 3.16. The anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a rhetorical handbook written c. 86-82 BCE, gives the most detailed description of how the *loci* should be chosen and organized within the memory.

and made them accessible.”¹⁵ A walk through the streets of Rome was in itself a mnemonic exercise; at every corner, the viewer was visually reminded of a different historic event in Rome’s past. As we see in Cicero’s *De finibus*, a philosophical dialogue set in Athens, viewing urban landmarks reminds Romans of Roman history, even when they are not present in Rome. In the fifth book,¹⁶ a group of friends, including Marcus Piso, accompanies Cicero to the Academy, whereupon Piso remarks:

*Naturane nobis hoc, inquit, datum dicam an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis **moveamur**, quam si quando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus aut scriptum aliquod legamus? Velut ego nunc **moveor**. Venit enim mihi Platonis in mentem, quem accepimus primum hic disputare solitum.... Equidem etiam curiam nostram—Hostiliam dico, non hanc novam, quae minor mihi esse videtur, posteaquam est maior—solebam intuens Scipionem, Catonem, Laelium, nostrum vero in primis avum cogitare; tanta vis admonitionis inest in **locis**; ut non sine causa ex iis memoriae ducta sit disciplina. (Cic. Fin. 5.2)*

(‘I wonder, is it by nature or by some accident that, when we see these places in which we are often reminded that great men once lived, **we are more moved** than if we were to hear their deeds told or read some account of them? Just so **am I now moved**. For an image of Plato now comes into my mind, since we have heard that he used to debate primarily here.... Even when seeing our own curia—I mean the Curia Hostilia, not the new one, which seems to be lesser even though it is larger—I would always think that I was seeing Scipio, Cato, Laelius, and especially my own grandfather; **places (loci)** have such a power to remind that it is not without reason that they are the basis for the teaching of memory.’)

Piso explains his feelings of awe at the sight of the Academy with his statement that places and memory are intricately connected. When a site of memory is viewed, it recalls the events that

¹⁵ Edwards (1996), 18.

¹⁶ On this passage, see Edwards (1996), 17-18, 28-29 and Vasaly (1993), 28-30, 100. For a focused look at Cicero’s treatment of topography in creating his own version of political landscape, see Vial-Logeay (2014).

occurred there, the people who walked there.¹⁷ Piso compares the site of the Academy to the site of the curia, the senate house, in Rome, which calls to mind images of great generals and statesmen, including members of Piso's own family. Connecting the historical significance of the curia to his own ancestors, Piso's statement exemplifies how elites might utilize the space of the city in order to tie their families to the cultural memory of Roman history, inscribing the space with the names of their progenitors (sometimes literally).¹⁸ But, here, Piso makes clear with his doubled use of the verb *movere* (*moveamur*, *moveor*) that this memorability is not only an effect of rational and orderly memorization of historical data, but also an emotional response to the place.

The power of place to evoke emotion is a common trope in discussions of rhetoric; rhetorical manuals often recommend making use of the emotional and symbolic potency of places to evoke *pathos* among the audience.¹⁹ The emotional content of memory, however, is reserved in Cicero for proper, masculine emotions, such as admiration of ancestors or loyalty to friends, which stir men to emulate the virtues of others.²⁰ The emotions prompted by visiting certain spaces in the Roman cityscape, then, are limited to those that conform to traditional, culturally-sanctioned values, like civic pride or respect for one's elders. In his analysis of Roman emotions, Kaster (2005) considers how emotions, like *verecundia* (loosely, respect for one's

¹⁷ Although he does not explore in detail the mnemonic implications of walking in this dialogue, O'Sullivan (2011) points out, in his discussion of the cultural practice of *ambulatio*, that "Cicero and friends add their own footprints to those of their departed heroes, and by walking the same ground they connect with them on both a metaphorical and metonymic level" (105).

¹⁸ For a brief overview of the use of monumental building as a method of self-promotion for elite families in the Republican period, see Zanker (1988), 18-25. For a narrative of the monuments constructed during this time period, see Stambaugh (1988), chs. 2 & 3 (on the Republic) and ch. 4 (on the early principate).

¹⁹ e.g., in *De oratore*, Cicero states that one of the main objectives of oratory is *movere*, to move the audience (2.115, 128, 310; 3.104). See the discussion of emotion and memory in the Introduction.

²⁰ That this emotion is strictly about friendship is stressed elsewhere in Cicero's works. In *De legibus*, Cicero debates legal issues with his brother Quintus and his friend Atticus. As they walk through Cicero's familial estate at Arpinum, Atticus states that he loves the place because Cicero was born there. For, as he says: *movemur enim nescio quo pacto locis ipsis, in quibus eorum, quos diligimus aut admiramur, adsunt vestigia.* (2.4; For, in some way, we are moved by those places in which appear the traces of those whom we love and admire.)

place in the world), are determined by cultural scripts that outline the appropriate responses to affective stimuli, as well as the appropriate settings to display those responses. In other words, cognitive scripts of emotion outline what behaviors one is expected to perform and experience when one experiences a certain emotion, and even what emotions should be cued by specific stimuli. Ingrained in an individual's memory, scripts "exert a normative pressure, encouraging certain styles of self-expression and certain modes of dealing with others—whether other individuals or the community at large—and at the same time discouraging other styles and modes."²¹ Public spaces in Rome cue not only behavioral scripts for particular actions, but also for particular emotions. For Piso, entering the *curia* in Rome not only cues the behavioral script for participating in a senate meeting, but it also prompts an emotional script for respecting and admiring his elders.

Monumental Memory in Material and Elegiac Tradition

This emphasis on memory as an impetus to imitate exemplary men is reflected in Roman visual culture. The porticos surrounding the Forum of Augustus, for example, housed statues of famous Romans in their *intercolumnia*, including Aeneas, Romulus, and members of the Julian line.²² Augustus utilized the elite technique of monument building in order to manipulate the cultural memory of the city, placing his family not only in its metaphorical but also its material center. In the early principate, the city center of Rome saw the construction and refurbishment of many grandiose public structures, detailed in the monument lists of Augustus's *Res Gestae* (19-

²¹ Kaster (2005), 133.

²² On the visual program of the Forum of Augustus, see Galinsky (1996), 197-213; Zanker (1988), 210-15; and Zanker (1968). As Davis (1995) has argued (as well as others subsequently, including Boyle (2003), 22-23), Ovid implicates the Forum of Augustus in his recounting of the rape of the Sabine women at *Ars* 1.101-134, which plays up Romulus's role as the first to use Roman theaters as venues for sexual conquest (190-193). This irreverent treatment of Romulus, who was closely associated with Augustus and featured prominently in the Forum of Augustus, refigures the memory of the Roman hero in Ovid's elegiac terms, overwriting Augustus's more solemn manipulation of the character for his own mnemonic purposes.

21). These structures functioned as *lieux de mémoire*²³ of both the Republican past and the present of the principate, manipulated in the transformations wrought by Augustus into reminders of the power of the *princeps* and his family's integral role in Rome's history. Augustus established these monuments as spaces of memory in the physical city, which helped him shape the collective imaginary of Rome's citizens to conform to his narrative of the past.²⁴

Ovid is not the first of the Latin poets of the early principate to acknowledge and engage with the Augustan strategy of memory production through manipulation of monuments.²⁵

Welch's (2005) monograph considers the 'topographical poems' of the fourth book of Propertius and their treatment of the monuments of the Augustan building program. She argues that Propertius's readings of these monuments call into question the official Augustan view of the city's past by revealing the multivalence of meanings constructed by each monument:

"Propertius engages with that meaning—sometimes challenging it, sometimes endorsing it, always changing it.... His reconstructions of Rome's past are designed to indicate that monuments have no fixed, real, or zero-grade meaning, but rather that their meaning is always open to (re)interpretation."²⁶ For example, she argues that Propertius's treatment of the temple of

²³ Here I use the terminology of Nora (1989), originating from his foundational text of memory studies, in which he describes *lieux de mémoire* as places "where memory crystallizes and secretes itself" which become particularly salient when there is "a turning point where consciousness of a break with the past is bound up with the sense that memory has been torn—but torn in such a way as to pose the problem of the embodiment of memory in certain sites where a sense of historical continuity persists. There are *lieux de mémoire*, sites of memory, because there are no longer *milieux de mémoire*, real environments of memory" (7). As others, including Gowing (2005) have noted, the rupture of the civil wars certainly represents a unique opportunity in the early principate to "glimpse memory being contested and remade" in these memory spaces (5).

²⁴ Following Edwards's (1996) discussion of the manipulation of memory in literary and material culture in Augustan Rome, the scholarly treatment of Augustus's use of the memory space of the city has experienced a boom, especially in the last decade. See especially Gowing (2005), 132-145, on the use of the memory of the Republic in the Forum of Augustus; Rea (2007), especially chs. 2 & 3, which focus on Augustus's (re)construction on the Capitoline and Palatine; Orlin (2007) on Augustus's restoration of temples; Sumi (2009; 2011) on the roles of the Aedes Castoris and the Aedes Divi Iulii, respectively, in the shaping on Augustan ideology and the preservation of the social memory of the Republic. Additionally, Flower (2006) often hits on the uses of monuments in effecting memory sanctions in the Augustan period in chs. 6 & 7.

²⁵ For an analysis of the ways in which Latin poets use topography to treat history, creating a "paysage historique," see Royo (2014).

²⁶ Welch (2005), 13.

Palatine Apollo in 4.6 and 2.31 transforms the temple from a public celebration of a military victory to a monument to Propertius's own poetic skill. As she argues, Propertius points out the gaps between the narrative of the actual battle at Actium and the somewhat rosier depiction of the story on the monument itself. By stressing his own fidelity to his art, his poems show that "Propertius' construction in poetry outshines Augustus' in marble."²⁷

Although Welch does not particularly mention memory in her analysis, my arguments about Ovid's treatment of Augustan monumental culture coincide with Welch's observations about Propertius. What Welch terms Propertius's manipulation of 'meaning,' I read as a manipulation of memory, a response to the Augustan program of controlling public memory spaces in Rome. In discussing the temple of Palatine Apollo in 2.31, Propertius overwrites the official, public memory associated with the temple, the Augustan victory at Actium, with his own private, erotic memory: he is late to meet with his *puella* because he was distracted by the opening of the temple (*quaeris, cur veniam tibi tardior?* Prop. 2.31.1). Propertius, in a typically elegiac move, privileges the private love affair of elegy over the public space of the city.

In *Remedia*, Ovid performs a similar manipulation of the public memory spaces in Rome,²⁸ completely overwriting the public memory of monuments with the memory of the love affair. Public spaces in all of Ovid's didactic works, in fact, are always described in terms of individual affect, rather than social obligation. However, Ovid's manipulation of memory plays on this tendency in elegy towards amorous appropriation of monuments, making the strategy of elegiac memory production even more blatant than his predecessors. In *Remedia*, Ovid takes this precept to its furthest logical conclusion, pointing out that the dichotomy between the public space of social memory and the private space of the memory of love is not (nor had it ever been)

²⁷ Welch (2005), 109.

²⁸ In her discussion of 2.31, Welch (2005) gestures towards Ovid's use of the trope of elegy that characterizes the cityscape as the setting for love (90).

clear-cut. Just as forgetting love is not as simple as stepping outside the city walls, writing elegy does not comprise a straightforward disregard of political maneuvering and imperial intrigue.

Remedia's strategy of centering the discussion of forgetting love within the city is, instead, a reflection of the inextricability of memory and space in Rome and the impossibility of escaping Rome's intertwined public and private spheres. Ovid's use of space in his didactic poetry constitutes a commentary on his predecessors' privileging of private over public as part of the program of love elegy. According to Ovid, elegy is fundamentally urban, centered in the capital of the world, and, as such, has access to the political tool of social memory. As Ovid demonstrates, elegists can just as easily manipulate the memory space of the city as the men who build grand monuments. Elegy indeed privileges the personal memory of love over the public memory of the *res gestae* of great men, but it does so by exploiting social, rather than individual, methods of memory production. Ovid appropriates not only the mnemonic strategies of his elegiac predecessors, but also the traditional methods of both the rhetorical schools and the monumental manipulation practiced by the *princeps* himself.

Love's Urban Localization in *Remedia Amoris* and *Ars Amatoria*

Ovid follows in a long tradition of viewing Rome as a *locus* of memory; but rather than the public memory of momentous events, Ovid sets Rome up as the seat of the personal memory of love. The city and its memory space are imbued with the remembrance of love to a degree unprecedented in earlier elegy.²⁹ Ovid goes beyond his predecessors in his strategies of memory manipulation by playing on the culturally dominant scripts associated with certain spaces: one doesn't necessarily go to the theater to see a play, but to be seen by the opposite sex; one may go

²⁹ Monella (2008)'s study on urban space in elegy distinguishes Ovid from his predecessors, arguing that the internal/external, static/dynamic opposition that is a central tension of pre-Ovidian elegy is reconciled in Ovid's *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*. As Monella contends, the anxiety about *urbanitas* that Propertius exhibits in his treatment of Rome and travel beyond it is entirely lacking in Ovid's elegy, in which "la riconciliazione dell'elegia con lo spazio dell'*Urbs* non potrebbe essere piu completa" (1126).

to the *forum* to argue a case, or to find a woman; one may go to the temple's portico to see the deeds of the great *princeps*, and to covertly begin a love affair, as well. For Ovid, private and public are not different spheres; the lover-poet cannot merely inhabit the former and avoid the latter. Instead, the personal and the political are inextricably bound, and memory spaces are polysemous, populated simultaneously with culturally-dominant and countercultural scripts, all of which represent open options for behavior within a certain space. The memory of love is always present in these public spaces, and, for this reason, it is as inescapable as the power of the Roman state.

Although, as discussed above, his primary advice counsels the lover to pursue activities abroad, Ovid does not base his *praecepta* on the lover-reader departing the city. Instead, he concedes that leaving Rome is not possible for everyone, and he offers alternative advice: *si te causa potens domina retinebit in Urbe, accipe, consilium quod sit in Urbe meum* (291-292; If a powerful reason keeps you in Mistress Rome, listen to what my advice is within the City). The city of Rome is figured here as the powerful *domina* of the elegiac relationship.³⁰ Like the *domina*, Rome maintains an undeniable hold over the elegist, who, powerless to escape, must devote himself to her praise in poetry.³¹ The city itself, then, is figured as the source of elegiac production: the *scripta puella* becomes the *scripta urbs*.³² The city is not merely the scene of love, a passive landscape on which the affair takes place, but is an essential part of love itself.

³⁰ As Henderson (1979) notes *ad loc.*, this phrase plays with the notion of Rome as 'mistress of the world,' a concept found also in Livy (38.51), Horace (*Odes* 4.14.44), elsewhere in Ovid (especially *Am.* 2.14.16), etc.

³¹ In his discussion of *Remedia's* "semiotic of space" (159), Rosati (2006) focuses on the opposing movements of the lover-student and Love, relayed in the text through a series of metaphorical exits and entrances executed in competition for control. He argues that the lover-student's internal reflection on love creates "a closed circle in which the lover is imprisoned and at the centre of which the ghost of the loved one continues to dominate unchallenged" (162). Rosati's focus on space primarily concentrates on the metaphor of movement through mental space, rather than the physical space of Rome, on which I center my analysis here. However, his observation that Ovid "detains the patient within precisely the space that the patient seeking a cure for love should avoid" (152) is completely consistent with my conclusions here. Ovid's advice, in only nominally advising the lover to leave the city, focuses on what to do within Rome, forcing the lover-reader to remain in both the physical and mental space of the city.

³² On the concept of the *scripta puella*, more fully addressed in the Introduction above, see Wyke (1987).

Roma and its reverse, *amor*, are so inextricably entwined that the lover who remains in Rome can never truly be cured, but must always work to avoid the city's constant threat of love.

The inevitability of failure implied by the omnipresence of love within Rome does not deter Ovid from dispensing his advice on behavior in the city, however. Ovid, rather appropriately, often directly reverses the advice he gave in *Ars Amatoria*, a didactic work which purports to help those looking for love, for the reader of *Remedia Amoris*, who wishes to forget love.³³ This borrowing creates an additional paradox for the not-yet-forgetful lover. Each place Ovid mentions not only reminds the lover of the experiential memories tied with that particular *locus*, but also reminds the student that he has read this *praeceptor*'s work before, under opposite circumstances. By forcing the lover to recall his previous search for love in *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid insinuates constant reminders of love into his discussion of how to forget it. In this way, Ovid rescripts not only the public monuments of Rome, but also his own text, manipulating the memory of the reader for a new purpose. Indeed, *Remedia*'s focus on the memory space within Rome confirms Ovid's previous appropriation of the tools of the social imaginary in his *Ars Amatoria*, which, as we will see, began the poet's project of rewriting the culturally dominant scripts of Rome's public structures. When the reader-lover encounters his teacher again in *Remedia*, he is unable to forget the effect that the *praeceptor amoris* has had on the city of Rome.

In *Remedia Amoris*, *loci* of memory are tied to the emotional backdrop of the love affair. The memory of love is inextricably tied to spaces in which the *puella* and the lover have interacted in the past or may encounter one another in the future. In either case, it is sight of the space which calls the memory to mind. Thus, the lover is exhorted to avoid her neighborhood altogether, if possible. Ovid urges the lover to keep away from his *puella*'s haunts at all costs:

³³ For the scholarly debate on the nature of 'reversals' in *Remedia*, see the Introduction above.

*proximus a tectis ignis defenditur aegre;
utile finitimis abstinuisse locis.
nec quae ferre solet spatiantem porticus illam,
te ferat, officium neve colatur idem.
quid iuvat admonitu tepidam recalescere mentem?
alter, si possis, orbis habendus erit. (Rem. 625-630)*

(A fire next door is difficult to fend off; it is best to keep clear of places in her neighborhood. Don't go to that portico where she usually takes her walk, nor should you inhabit the same circles in society. What good does it do to reheat a lukewarm mind with a reminder? If you could, you ought to inhabit another world.)

Here, love is figured as a burning passion, evoking the metaphor of fire within the city. In the close quarters of Rome's center, fires were an ever-present danger, and Ovid makes use of this essentially urban fear to characterize the beloved's neighborhood as too hazardous to enter. Love is placed squarely in the varied sites of the city, and the danger inherent in visiting these sites presents a constant threat to the lover, just as fire does to Rome's structures. Urban architectural density proves a serious obstacle for the lover hoping to avoid old habits and habitats.

However, it is not just the *puella*'s home or its environs that pose a risk to the lover; many spaces in the city are hotspots for the remembrance of love. The compact nature of Rome is particularly dangerous to the lover, as he must very carefully navigate the crowded city to avoid locales that might call his *puella* to mind. The city, like the series of *loci* in the mind of the orator, is dotted with sites of memory for the lover. In addition to private spaces specific to the lover, like the home of his *puella*, these sites include public spaces of general significance, like porticos, theaters, and fora, where one was likely to find a lover in *Ars Amatoria*. Although these public spaces are inscribed with the names of the *virī magni* who built them, the memory that Ovid assigns to them is that of the love affair, rather than the great deeds of great men.

During Ovid's lifetime, the *princeps* sponsored a remodeling of the city center of Rome, constructing and refurbishing many public monuments. In doing so, Augustus renovated not only the physical spaces, but their memory spaces as well, overwriting memorials of the republican past in Rome with reminders of the power of the principate. Ovid, in turn, subjects these monuments to yet another change in mnemonic meaning, so that they no longer recall republican or imperial political values, but instead inscribe his own elegiac values on the monument's face. Ovid's task of transforming the topography of Rome is primarily accomplished through the *praecepta* detailing where to find a lover in *Ars Amatoria*. In *Remedia*, Ovid takes the opportunity to reinscribe these spaces as sites of *amor*; however, his stated purpose here is opposite, and the structures become sites of forgetting, rather than remembering, love. In the following sections, I explore three types of public monument which Ovid designates specifically as spaces important to amorous memory and forgetting: porticos, theaters, and fora.

Porticos

The specific localization of the love affair within the city is first signaled in *Remedia* by a directive to keep away from the *porticus* the *puella* frequents. This proscription against porticos recalls the discussion of the portico as a place to meet members of the opposite sex in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*. Throughout both these works, the script of the elegiac love affair is cued by the porticos of Rome; however, other, primarily Augustan, scripts are implicated as well.

The portico represents an essential feature of the urban cityscape, a shady colonnade, usually connected to some larger structure, such as a theater or temple, that provided both men and women with a social opportunity to see and be seen. The portico was, of course, a place to spot fellow Romans, but it was also a key venue for viewing art, as the *intercolumnia* provided

space to spotlight sculpture and other objects of interest.³⁴ *Imagines* placed between the columns, just as those in the mnemonic *loci* created by orators, prompted cues to memory for the viewer, recalling episodes from history or mythology. One of the most prominent examples has already been mentioned above; the porticos in the Forum of Augustus housed statues of exemplary Roman men to remind citizens of their illustrious past. Ovid's porticos, on the other hand, are not populated with virtuous heroes, but by women looking for love. Indeed, two of the porticos mentioned by name displayed sculptural decoration in the forms of women. In *Ars Amatoria*, both of Ovid's lists of ideal places to find lovers (for men, in book 1; for women, in book 3) begin with the *Porticus Pompei*.³⁵ This shady spaces surrounding the massive Theater of Pompey, with its culminating temple to Venus Victrix, may have been decorated with statues of famous *hetairai*.³⁶ Ovid's appropriation of this space as a site of erotic assignations, then, is not entirely surprising. More unorthodox is Ovid's mention of the Portico of the Danaids, which surrounded Augustus's Temple of Apollo Palatinus (*Ars Am.* 1.73-74, 3.389-390).³⁷ The Danaids were represented in sculpture in the *intercolumnia* of the portico, along with the architect of their

³⁴ See Favro (1996) for the importance of porticos to the artistic display in Augustan Rome: "Isolated from visual contamination by other urban buildings, porticoed enclosures conveyed unadulterated propagandistic messages. Furthermore, their colonnades were ideal backdrops for sculptural display and plantings.... Some of the most important political art in the Augustan city occurred in these environments" (174). For a detailed exploration of the contents and resonances of Pompey's 'garden-museum,' see Kuttner (1999).

³⁵ The similarities between the language of these lines (1.67 and 3.387) are well-noted, as are the connections of these lines to Catullus 55 and Propertius 2.32 and 4.8. As Gibson (2003) points out, "It appears first in Ovid's list of places to be seen, as also at 1.67f...since it is the classic arena, from Catullus onwards, for viewing and meeting the opposite sex..." (259).

³⁶ Gibson (2003) reiterates the scholarly consensus that the statues in the *ambulationes* were (or at least may have represented) prostitutes (259). However, Evans (2009) contends that the portico's decoration instead consisted of a large group of various female figures, ranging from the abstract (conquered nations) to the particular (female poets, like Sappho, or mythological figures from drama). In either case, the *Porticus Pompei* was certainly a space for viewing females (both living and sculptural), rather than masculine heroes.

³⁷ This monument appears frequently in elegy, in Tibullus (1.3), Propertius (2.17, 2.28, 2.31, 2.33), and Ovid (*Am.* 2.13, 2.2.3ff, 3.9; *Ars Am.* 1.73-74, 3.119, 3.389-90). Most scholarship on the role of the portico in elegy focuses on Propertius's interaction with the monument: cf. especially Fantham (1997); Welch (2005), 79-111; Bowditch (2009); Dufallo (2013), 125-135. Miller (2009), 185-252 analyzes the use of the monument in Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid's *Tristia*. For Ovid's treatment of the Portico of the Danaids in *Amores*, see Shea (2011), 151-219. Ovid's treatment of the Portico in *Ars Amatoria* remains relatively unexplored by scholars; see the overview of the monument in Boyle (2003), 222-225.

crime, their father Danaus, who ordered his fifty daughters to murder their husbands (the fifty sons of Danaus's brother Aegyptus) on the night of their wedding. The figures stand in between the columns of the portico, reminding the viewer of their crime and punishment.³⁸ Some scholars have suggested that this monument, associated with Augustus's victory over Antony at Actium, and its statues of the African daughters of Danaus represent the subjugation of Egypt and Cleopatra.³⁹ But Ovid introduces another option, a more elegiac topos: wives who wish to rid themselves of their husbands. In referencing this monument, Ovid reduces a debate on the imperial politics of foreign affairs to the exploration of a much more intimate type of affair, irreverently emphasizing the sexual elements of the Danaid myth for his own, rather than Augustus's, purposes.⁴⁰

Ars Amatoria also alludes to other porticos built by members of the imperial household, explicitly mentioning the porticos of Octavia (1.69-70, 3.391) and Livia (1.71-71, 3.391) and probably also those of Agrippa (the *porticus Argonautarum*, 3.392) and L. Marcius Philippus (surrounding the Temple of Hercules Musarum, 3.167-168).⁴¹ Most of these places to find prospective lovers are in the southern Campus Martius, Augustus's prime building-ground, with

³⁸ The Danaids are usually portrayed with a distinguishing portrait feature, their perforated jars acting as reminders of their eternal Sisyphean punishment. While Zanker (1983) argues that the Danaids were depicted thus as water-carriers in the portico (27-31), Kellum (1997) argues that they were shown holding knives, poised for the kill (161). For a reconstruction of the monument, along with bibliography of the scholarly debate on previous reconstructions, see Quenemoen (2006).

³⁹ Cf. Kellum (1993), 80-81. Zanker (1983) argues for a more generalized resonance of civil strife. For a brief summary of interpretations of the portico, see Welch (2005), 85-87, who stresses that the monument "resists a stable interpretation."

⁴⁰ Miller (2007) points out, in his discussion of *Ars Am.* 1.61-228, that the image of the Danaids contributes to a carnivalesque sublimation of violence into erotic discourse: "In the blink of an eye, wifely devotion is deftly transformed into homicide, even as the violence and death implicit in the mythic subtext is itself subverted by the ongoing erotodidaxis that constitutes the poem's explicit narrative frame.... It is not, then, that there is no violence in the world of the *Ars*, but it is instantly sublimated into a moment of erotic playfulness that ironically is dependent in the last analysis on the very ephemeral structures of power it seems to subvert." (154).

⁴¹ For the identifications of these porticos with Ovid's references, see Gibson's (2003) notes *ad loc.*

the exception of the *Porticus Liviae*⁴² in the Subura. Ovid reappropriates the imperial messages of these monuments by designating these areas as sites of love within the city, as well.

For Ovid, the living women of Rome are the most prominent objects on display in the portico. In *Ars*, Ovid instructs the lover how to use the shady colonnades to best advantage when interacting with the *puella*:

*et modo praecedas facito, modo terga sequaris,
et modo festines, et modo lentus eas.
nec tibi de mediis aliquot transire columnas
sit pudor, aut lateri continuasse latus (Ars Am. 1.493-496)*

(Sometimes make sure you walk ahead of her, and sometimes follow behind, and sometimes hurry, and sometimes go slowly; and do not be too modest to cross over sometimes between the columns or to let your side connect with hers.)

In this passage, a promenade through the portico becomes a covert dance between the prospective partners. Ovid's advice shows the lover how to move through the intercolumnar space in order to gain the best vantage point on his object, while obfuscating his intentions to any onlookers. The woman, then, becomes the rhetorical *imago* located in the *intercolumnia*, viewed from many angles as though she were a living sculpture. Like the woman herself, memory of the love affair is inscribed within the columned space of the portico. It is, therefore, no surprise that Ovid suggests that the reader of *Remedia* avoid the portico altogether.

Theaters

Ovid also reappropriates the language of *loci* from the rhetorical tradition in his description of the memory spaces of theaters. *Remedia's* *praeceptor* urges the lover to keep out of the theater (*non indulgere theatris, 751*) both because the music and dance performed there can stir up passion (*enervant animos, 753*) and because the stories depicted on stage are usually

⁴² The inclusion of the *Porticus Liviae* carries an obvious irony in Ovid's elegiac guide to extramarital affairs, since inside the portico was a temple to Concordia, the representative of marital harmony (Gibson (2003), 261).

about love: *quod caveas, actor, quam iuuet, arte docet* (756; the actor teaches with his art how delightful is that thing which you should avoid).⁴³ Once again, Ovid here carries out a *volte-face* away from his attitude towards theaters in *Ars Amatoria*, in which a long passage directs the lover towards the theater as the best hunting ground for an affair. Unlike *Remedia*, *Ars Amatoria* does not argue that the love stories depicted onstage set the mood for love, but that the features of the physical theater provide good sightlines for beginning the hunt for love. In other words, the theater does not cue an emotional script for love because of the story being depicted on stage, but because of the physical space of the theater itself. Ovid stresses the shape of the curved structure of the theater (*curvis theatris*, 1.89) and the way that its *vomitoria* direct crowds of women, just like a long line of ants (*longum formica per agmen*, 1.93), past the lover-spectator.⁴⁴ To Ovid, the gender and class segregation within the Roman theater is not an obstacle to be overcome, but provides an opportunity for the lover to survey the female audience. As Ovid says, the women attend spectacles to be viewed: *spectatum veniunt, veniunt spectentur ut ipsae* (1.99; They come to see; they come to be seen themselves). For a man, then, having a good seat does not mean having an unobstructed view of the performance, but of the women.⁴⁵ Alternately, for a woman, it means sitting where you can be shown to best advantage. In *Ars* 3, Ovid tells the women of Rome: *visite conspicuis terna theatra locis* (3.394; visit the three theaters in eye-

⁴³ As Henderson (1979) notes, these lines refer specifically to the performance of pantomime, dance which portrayed (often erotic) scenes from mythology (131).

⁴⁴ It is notable here that Ovid elides the differences between the different types of spectacle, except inasmuch as some structures (like the theater) have segregated seating, whereas others (like the circus) allow a man and woman to sit together. This ambiguity indicates that the type of performance is unimportant relative to its location. The locale, rather than the story being performed, sets the stage for the love affair in *Ars Amatoria*.

⁴⁵ As Henderson (2002), in his discussion of the Circus Maximus in *Amores*, puts it: “The line between audience and players blurs, and the circle of the arena is broken, once viewing is recognized as active performance—not voyeurism, but itself exhibitionism, looped onto exhibitionist voyeurism, and, round the turn, voyeurist exhibitionism.... Spectators come into view as the *locus* of the spectacle, seeing, seeing seeing, seeing being seen, being seen seeing, and seeing that, getting into all that” (46). Several scholars have recently viewed Ovid’s works through the lens of the gendered gaze. In particular, Rimell (2006) discusses *Ars Amatoria* specifically, noting that the theater is “an exemplary arena for the vaunting of spectacular erotics” (63). (I engage with her argument about *Medicamina* in Chapter 3 below.) Salzman-Mitchell (2005) discusses the role of the male gaze in *Metamorphoses*.

catching seats).⁴⁶ The *loci* of the theater recall the mnemonic *loci* of rhetoric; an individual seat provides a space in which an *imago* can be placed and viewed. Once again, as in the case of the porticos, the *imago* in question is the woman herself.

Immediately following the passage on how to behave in the portico, Ovid includes similar guidelines for conduct in the theater: *nec sine te curvo sedeat speciosa teatro: quod spectes, umeris adferet illa suis* (1.497-498; And do not let her sit to-be-seen in the curved theater without you nearby; she'll take up on her shoulders the show you watch.) In these lines, densely packed with references and innuendo, Ovid tells the lover to be sure that he is in the theater, not to watch the actors, but to watch the *puella* perform. Here, the *puella* appears as an object to be viewed. Her physical form, stressed both by references to her beauty (*speciosa*) and her shoulders (*umeris*), is connected to the structure of the theater (*curvo teatro*). Like the *intercolumnia* of the portico, the curved shape of the theater provides a space in which the *puella* can be best viewed. The *puella* takes on the burden of putting on a show for the spectator (*quod spectes*). The phrase 'take up on one's shoulders' (*umeris adferet suis*) is a proverbial phrase meaning 'to take on responsibility,'⁴⁷ but here Ovid puns on the phrase, allowing the reference to the physical body of the woman as a sexual object to add an extra layer of meaning. The *puella*, like the *imago*, is an object to be viewed; her physical form is a conduit for the viewer's remembrance and allows for the preservation, performance, and recollection of memory. The theater provides a distinct and uncluttered space to allow the *puella-imago* to be seen to best advantage in the densely-packed urban setting and, thus, effectively remembered as part of the landscape of Rome. When the *praeceptor* of *Remedia* advises the lover-reader to avoid the

⁴⁶ Ovid refers here to the permanent theater structures of Pompey, Marcellus, and Balbus, all located in the southern Campus Martius. The former two adjoin porticos that have been discussed above (the *Porticus Pompei* and the *Porticus Octaviae*, respectively), accentuating the relevance of the theater in this discussion.

⁴⁷ See Hollis (1977), 115.

theater, then, he does not simply prohibit seeing amorous drama. He also counsels against viewing the spectacle of the *puella*, on exhibit in the theater just as much as are the actors on the stage.

Fora

If every public site in the city is a *locus* for the memory of love, where, then, can the lover actually go in Rome? As mentioned above, among a list of other distracting activities recommended near the beginning of *Remedia*, Ovid suggests that the lover wishing to forget love visit the law courts: *sunt fora, sunt leges, sunt, quos tuearis, amici: / vade per urbanae splendida castra togae.* (151-152; There are the *fora*, there are the laws, and there are friends whom you can protect: go to the camps shining with city *togae*.) The law courts are the domain of men and provide not only an intellectual distraction but also a physical refuge from *puellae*. In the *fora* imagined in these lines, there are only *togae*, a quintessential symbol of Roman masculine power; there are no *stolae* present.⁴⁸ The culturally dominant scripts cued by this space are open only to men and include the stereotypical activities of the Roman male, including speaking in court.⁴⁹

However, Ovid presents a different script for the *forum* in *Remedia*, once again recalling a corresponding passage in *Ars Amatoria*. Included in the opening section on where to find a lover in Rome, Ovid makes a bold claim about looking for love in the law courts:

*et fora conveniunt (quis credere possit?) amori,
flammaque in arguto saepe reperta foro.
subdita qua Veneris facto de marmore templo
Appias expressis aera pulsat aquis,
illo saepe loco capitur consultus Amori,*

⁴⁸ However, the specter of an amorous affair perhaps remains, since female prostitutes wore *togae*.

⁴⁹ For the fundamental (and, indeed, etymological) association between forensic oratory and the physical space of the *forum* and forensic oratory, see Klodt (2014).

*quique aliis cavet, non cavet ipse sibi;
illo saepe loco desunt sua verba diserto,
resque novae veniunt, causaque agenda sua est.
hunc Venus e templis, quae sunt confinia, ridet;
qui modo patronus, nunc cupit esse cliens.* (*Ars Am.* 1.79-88)

(Even the law courts (who could believe it?) are suitable for love, and passion is often rediscovered in the blustery *forum*. There, beneath the marble temple of Venus, where the Appiades spurt gushing water into the air, often is the counsel conned by Amor, and he who bails out others doesn't make bail himself. There, often claims abandon their declaimer; the cases lack precedents, and a new plea must be read. There, Venus laughs from her adjoining temple; he who was just an attorney, now wishes to be a client.)

In this passage, even the law courts are read as sites of love. Indeed, Ovid designates a particular *forum* as a *locus* of love, the Forum Iulium, built by Julius Caesar specifically as a legal, rather than business, hub.⁵⁰ The *forum*'s central temple to Venus Genetrix signified Caesar's familial connection to the goddess, and, for Ovid, exemplifies the impossibility of eluding *amor* within the city of *Roma*. Even the orator, surrounded by legal-minded men, will succumb to the debilitating effects of love, overseen by the laughing goddess. This assertion of the inescapability of love in *Ars Amatoria* lurks behind Ovid's advice in *Remedia* that the lovesick reader should seek out distraction in the *fora*. Indeed, this tension between the legal and amorous issues comes to the fore later in *Remedia*, when Ovid warns against taking legal action against an ex-lover. He relates a tale of a young man who demanded that his estranged wife respond to the charges he brought against her; upon seeing her in court, he fell madly in love with her again (663-668). It is best, Ovid contends, to let relationships end amicably and cut off all contact, since love requires only a small reminder to be inflamed again: *saepe reas faciunt, et amant; ubi nulla simultas / incidit, admonitu liber aberrat amor* (661-662; Often men bring up charges, and they love again;

⁵⁰ See Favro (1996), 69. For a brief description of the *Forum Iulium* and its accompanying temple to Venus Genetrix, see Boyle (2003), 202-205.

when no animosity intervenes, love, without a reminder, dissipates). Especially after a breakup, the *fora* are unsafe for lovers, since viewing the beloved, even in the masculine power center of the law court, will remind the lover of his passion. Under the watchful eye of Venus Genetrix,⁵¹ then, no man is safe from love in the *forum*.

Inside-Out, Outside-In: Rome as Microcosm

If, indeed, even the masculine refuge of the *forum* presents a danger, then there is no place within the city for the lover to find a safe haven. Love is inescapably located within the city of Rome, and each urban site is encoded as a *locus* of memory for the lover. As we have seen, the *praeceptor* of both *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris* imbues public sites in the city with personal memory, prompting the affective scripts of elegy alongside the political scripts of Augustan ideology. More personalized spaces, like individual homes or nameless streets and neighborhoods, important to the lover but not steeped in Augustan grandeur, are, however, also implicated in Ovid's rescripting of love in Rome. When, in *Remedia*, Ovid advises against visiting memory spaces specific to the individual lover-reader, rather than the public places mentioned as locales of love, he tends to compare these personal sites of memory to hazardous and exotic locations outside the city. The topography of Rome, particularly its private spaces, is transformed into a world of dangers and threats, as perilous as a sea voyage. The location of these savage perils within the city presents Rome as a microcosm, displaying all the dangers of the world writ large. This, in turn, reflects a similar message in *Ars Amatoria*, which contends that Rome is not just the cultural and political center of the world, but also the *omphalos* of love.

⁵¹ There is some debate over the correct interpretation of the word '*Appias*' in line 660: *non illas lites Appias ipsa probat*. Mozley (1929) translates: "the Appian herself approves not such strife as that," with an explanatory note that the 'Appian' refers to "Venus, because she had a temple near the fountain called Aqua Appia" (222-223). Henderson (1979) disagrees: "Mozley's identification of *Appias* here with Venus misses the point. Ovid's meaning is: not even those whose business is litigation (*Appias* = *forum* = *advocati*) approve of, or willingly take sides in, the quarrels of husband and wife" (120). However, the setting here is clear; the *forum* in question is clearly the *Forum Iulium*, over which Venus presides.

Ovid exhorts the lover to avoid any specific places he and his *puella* personally visited together. In a simile in which the lover is compared to a sailor navigating the treacherous sea, Ovid advises: *tu loca, quae nimium grata fuere, cave. / haec tibi sint Syrtes: haec Acroceraunia vita: / hic vomit epotas dira Charybdis aquas.* (738-740; Beware the places which once were all too pleasant. Let these be your Syrtes; avoid this Acroceraunia; here terrible Charybdis spews the water she has swallowed.) The lovers' once-pleasant meeting places in the city should now be viewed as mythical, deadly obstacles; the rocky and stormy gulfs of Syrtis, off the North African coast, the waters near Acroceraunia, a mountain range in Epirus, and the whirlpool of Charybdis, in the Straits of Messina between Sicily and Italy, are commonly troped in poetry as perils of seafaring.⁵² Figuring these urban *loci* of love as faraway dangers of epic proportions brings the distant locales into the city itself. The sophisticated city, as the site of love, contains wild and untamed perils within its spaces of memory. But it is particularly those spaces which the lover finds individually stimulating that are the most dangerous, the most outlandish. Unspecified *loca*, not inscribed with the names of famous men, are instead marked as memory spaces in the individual mind of the lover. These nameless spaces are as perilous as rocky shallows, undetectable until the ship has already been wrecked upon them. These places must be carefully avoided lest they unsuspectingly trigger the script of elegy in the lover's memory and cast him into the stormy sea of love once again.

The beloved's home and the surrounding area also represent threats to the lover's ability to forget. The door to her home is particularly perilous, and he should hurry past it as quickly as possible to avoid falling into the trap of once again becoming an *exclusus amator*.⁵³ Ovid again uses mythological *exempla* to incite fear in the lover's heart: *illo Lotophagos, illo Sirenas in*

⁵² See Henderson (1979), 129.

⁵³ Ovid's advice to the lover-reader to avoid the tropes of elegy, including the script of the *exclusus amator*, is discussed at length in Chapter 5 below.

antro / esse puta; remis adice vela tuis. (789-790; Pretend that in that cave there are Lotus-Eaters or Sirens; augment your rowing with sails.) Once again, far-off fantastical dangers are relocated within the city, as the beloved's door is imagined as a mysterious cave full of mythological creatures. The comparison of the beloved's home to the land of the Lotus-Eaters or the haunts of the Sirens is particularly apt, since both myths evoke the catastrophic loss of one's memory and purpose. Since the beloved's door is a space for the memory of the affair, especially the all-encompassing devotion felt by an *exclusus amator*, viewing it will cause the lover to remember his passion, and he will be able to recall nothing else.

The city, then, is just as dangerous as the fringes of the known world for the lover seeking a remedy for love. For, as *Ars Amatoria* teaches the reader, Rome not only provides sites of love, but is indeed the center of the amorous world. In book 1, Ovid tells the lover that he, unlike Perseus and Paris of myth, need not tarry far from Rome to find a *puella*; no long journey (*longa via*, 52) is required:

*tot tibi tamque dabit formosas Roma puellas,
'haec habet' ut dicas 'quicquid in orbe fuit.'
Gargara quot segetes, quot habet Methymna racemos,
aequore quot pisces, fronde teguntur aves,
quot caelum stellas, tot habet tua Roma puellas:
mater in Aeneae constitit urbe sui. (Ars Am. 1.55-60)*

(Rome gives you so many girls that are so pretty, you would say: 'This place has everything in the world.' As many fields are in Gargara, as many grape clusters are in Methymna, as many fish are in the sea, as many birds hide in the leaves, as many stars are in the sky, so many girls live in your Rome; the mother of Aeneas has made her home in the city of her son.)

To Ovid, the most impressive feature of Rome is its women, whose abundance and variety are compared successively to agricultural yield, fish and fowl populations, and celestial

boundlessness. As Hollis notes, this passage is “a most ingenious and amusing parody of a stock patriotic theme of the day - panegyric of Rome and Italy,”⁵⁴ praise that extols the quality and diversity of Italian goods. Ovid plays on this theme to show that the true product of *Roma* is *amor*. Everything can be found within Rome, but women (and the amorous feelings they spur) are the primary commodity. The panegyric passage is completed by a statement of divine approval, as Venus has taken up residence in the city, giving her nod to the amorous production of Rome.

Indeed, one of the reasons for such abundance of women is Rome’s political position as the capital of the empire. Ovid relates that people came from all over the world to view the *naumachia* staged by Augustus: *nempe ab utroque mari iuvenes, ab utroque puellae / venere, atque ingens orbis in Urbe fuit.* (*Ars Am.* 1.173-174; Truly young men and women came over from this sea and that, and the whole world was in the City.) Young people are drawn in from the other areas of the empire to view the spectacles of city, so that the entire world appears to be in Rome. To Ovid, of course, the principal function of this *microcosmos* to provide more opportunities for love: *quis non invenit turba, quod amaret, in illa? eheu, quam multos advena torsit amor!* (*Ars Am.* 1.175-176; Who didn’t find somebody to love in that crowd? Alas! How many men foreign love sent reeling!). Even *advena amor* takes place within the city of Rome, which becomes not only the political and social hub of the empire, but the *locus* of love as well. The *naumachia*, choreographed by Augustus to display Rome’s military and cultural power, is upstaged by the city’s paramount strength: *amor*. Rome has become the greatest imperial power in the world, dominating not only the military and political spheres of the *orbis terrarum*, but also, according to Ovid, the domain of love as well.

⁵⁴ Hollis (1977), 42.

Ovid represents foreign dangers and foreign lovers inside the city, establishing it as a microcosm of the world, which has been subsumed by the domination of Rome.⁵⁵ According to Ovid, even the wilds of mythological geography can now be found in the urban capital of the world. But, while the *Res Gestae* demonstrates the conquests that have ushered the whole world into the *pax Augusta*, Ovid's Rome is marked by constant danger for the lover fighting a losing battle as a *miles amoris*. Ovid confirms Rome's global dominance, and he takes the campaign a step further; not only has *Roma* conquered the world, but so has *amor*.

By representing Rome as a microcosm of the world, Ovid implicates the personal memory spaces of Rome's lovers in Augustan imperial geography. Rome is the political, military, and cultural capital of the world, and Ovid renders it as the center of love as well. Just as Ovid reencoded public monuments to accommodate the memory of the love affair, he entangles personal memory spaces, particular to the individual lover-reader, with the dangerous locales and amorous peoples of the wider world. Bringing the outside in makes Rome even less safe for the lover-reader of *Remedia*, as Rome's dominion over the world only enhances the city's power to evoke the memory of love.

Conclusions

As we have seen, Ovid encodes the sites of Rome with amorous memory, so that the entire city teems with personal memorials of love in addition to the public memorials of empire. Although he advises the lover trying to forget love to abandon the city, his *praecepta* center on the city of Rome. This gesture towards the poetic topos of travel as a cure for love comments on his predecessors' claims to separate private from public. Ovid reminds his readers that previous

⁵⁵ For the concept of worldwide empire in the Augustan period, see especially Nicolet's (1991) landmark analysis. The first chapter argues, through an exploration of the language and structure of the *Res Gestae*, that Augustus works to situate his accomplishments in a real geographic context and methodically prove to his readers that he has, indeed, conquered the whole world.

love poetry could not distinguish the memory spaces of elegiac love and political engagement. Ovid reappropriates the techniques of oratory to evoke affective representations of elegiac love in material places and objects, like the *loci* and *imagines* of the rhetorical *ars memoriae*. In doing so, he reencodes Augustan monuments with elegiac memories and meanings, prompting the scripts of the love affair in the porticos, theaters, and *fora* of Rome. At the same time, he reminds the reader of Rome's position as the capital of the *orbis terrarum*, depicting the city as a microcosm of the world, especially its dangerous peoples and places.

Although he advises the lover-reader to leave the city altogether, Ovid focuses his *praecepta* on what to do inside Rome itself, foregrounding the memory spaces of Rome in the mind of the reader. He enacts memorialization of his own poetry as he compels the reader of *Remedia Amoris* to recall his *Ars Amatoria* and its locales of love. In *Remedia*, he reverses his advice of the earlier poem, counseling the lover wishing to forget love to avoid the places *Ars* set out as love-charged. This self-reference is no mere palinode, however, but an intertextual prompt for the reader to recall the previous work. Just as locations within the city might provide an impetus to memory, *Remedia*, just by mentioning the spaces to be avoided, itself draws the lover-reader further into the depths of the memory of love and its memorialization in elegy. As so often in *Remedia*, Ovid's advice on how to forget love is ironically useless. The *ars memoriae* of *Ars Amatoria* works too well to make the *remedia* of forgetting plausible.

The true inefficacy of *Remedia* within the city is signaled by Ovid, in his advice on avoiding the door, neighborhood, and companions of his *puella* (quoted in full above): If he were able, the lover ought to inhabit a different world (*alter, si possis, orbis habendus erit*, 630). But can the lover-reader trust that an *alter orbis* outside the city will truly prove a respite from love? Even if he has been able to avoid the metaphorical Scylla and Charybdis located within Rome

(*Rem.* 739, above), what will become of him when he faces the literal Scylla and Charybdis on the sea when fleeing the city? Indeed, even as Ovid stresses that Rome is a microcosm of the world, he emphasizes that the city is also a powerful global force. Can Rome and the dangers of *amor* be avoided abroad?

The answer, unfortunately for the lover-reader lost in love, is likely ‘no.’ As Cicero and his friends have shown us, in *De finibus* 5.2 (quoted above), the memory space of Rome certainly exceeds the *pomerium* of the city. For Cicero, the monuments of Rome overshadow even the older structures of Athens, as a visit to Plato’s Academy prompts a remembrance of the *curia* in Rome and the (Roman) men who once frequented it. Ovid, in depicting the city as the center both of the wide world of imperial conquest and of the memorialization of love, implies that even those who leave the city cannot escape its amorous memory space. Only the bounds of Roman empire delimit love and its memorialization in elegy. It is because of Rome’s omnipresence in the world that elegiac *amor* is inescapably everywhere in the *orbis terrarum*.⁵⁶

Augustus deftly manipulates social memory in the use of space exhibited in his building program and imperial expansion. Ovid, then, appears to learn from the master, following the example of the *princeps* in maneuvering these tools of the social imaginary, subsuming them into his localization of love in the city of Rome. He overwrites Augustus’s monuments, already *exempla* of mnemonic manipulation meant to benefit a particular ideology, with memories of elegiac love, as he makes elegiac scripts equivalent to the culturally dominant scripts of these public spaces. He implicitly agrees with Augustus’s claim that Rome has conquered the world, only to assert that a significant consequence of Rome’s global domination is not political or economic, but personal, amorous, and fundamentally elegiac. Ovid’s stance plays with the

⁵⁶ Davisson (1996) points out another paradox inherent in Ovid’s advice to find an *alter orbis*: “if we are trying obediently to find a world which on the one hand contains no lovers yet on the other hand is not deserted, the *orbis* we seek may be elusive indeed” (254).

princeps's politics in a way which makes the reader suspect that Augustus would not be amused.

CHAPTER THREE:

Ugliness in the Eye of the Beholder: False Memories and the Female Body

Introduction

Remedia's instructions on how to forget love reveal the ways in which elegy memorializes the love affair and the mistress. Ovid's method of forgetting the female body in *Remedia* reminds the reader of the elegiac strategy of remembering the love affair through memorialization of the flawless female body. By advising his student-readers to invent false flaws for his *puella*, purposefully remembering her actually beautiful body with fabricated blemishes, the *praeceptor* shows how previous elegists, including Ovid himself, constructed the *puella* and her beauty as inherently deceptive and flawed. As Ovid's paradoxical advice in *Remedia* shows, the anti-cosmetic critique of female *cultus*,¹ coupled with praise of the 'natural' female body, results in a reflection of the female self as a fictional construct, an *imago* carefully constructed to produce a false memory of perfect beauty. Reflecting on the ways in which *Remedia*'s advice calls attention to this false elegiac construction of beauty, I argue that, already

¹ *Cultus* refers broadly to the care and adornment of one's body, often with a resonance of elegant style. For the semantic range of *cultus* and other terms for adornment, see Olson (2008), 7-9; for the particular range in the Ovidian corpus, cf. Scivoletto (1976), 85 n.45, on Ovid's "modesta trasformazione semantica del vocabolo." Most of the discussion of *cultus* in Roman literature has, indeed, focused on Ovid's corpus. (For a broader, although brief, overview of *cultus* outside of Ovid, see Wyke (1994)). Ramage (1973) contextualizes Ovidian *cultus* (87-100), which he reads as a rejection of the *rusticitas* of the past, within his exploration of *urbanitas* in the ancient world. However, more recently, Gibson (2007) has argued that, for Ovid, "*cultus* is figured as an 'intermediate' between modern *luxuria* and archaic *simplicitas* or *rusticitas*" (84). Specifically, in this chapter, I explore the *culta puella* of elegy, and, consequently, I treat *cultus* as it particularly pertains to the physical appearance and adornment (dress, hairstyle, cosmetics, etc.), often as opposed to the 'natural' beauty (*forma*) of the elegiac *puella*. For the specifics of female *cultus* and its role in Roman socio-cultural history, see Olson (2008).

in *Amores*, Ovid demonstrates a strategy for memory production that accepts flaws, rather than bodily perfection, as the basis for elegiac memory. His treatment of the *puella*'s physical imperfections, including flaws caused by *cultus*, as well as other visible blemishes, reveals the tension between truth and falsehood in the depiction of elegiac beauty.

Poetic Memorialization of the Female Body and the Anti-Cosmetic Tradition

In *Amores* 2.1, Ovid asserts that, according to his experience as a poet and a lover, the *puella*'s beauty represents both his inspiration for writing and, indeed, the very *materia* that makes up the poem: *at facie tenerae laudata saepe puellae, / ad vatem, pretium carminis, ipsa venit. / magna datur merces!* (*Am.* 2.1.33-35; But because I often praised the beauty of a young lady, she has come to this poet as recompense for poetry. What a great reward!). As beauty constitutes both poetic content and writerly motivation, the inescapable cycle set off by a woman's beauty leads to the memorialization of that beauty (and, therefore, the elegiac love affair) in poetry. Indeed, feminine beauty is portrayed as a source of poetic creation throughout elegy. Propertius, for example, views his poetry as an everlasting monument to Cynthia's beauty: *carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae* (3.2.18). The *materia* of this elegiac monument is the body of the *puella*, praised for her flawless beauty.² The poet-lover's experience of his *puella*'s pulchritude prompts him to the memorialization of that beauty (and, therefore, of the elegiac love affair). The exploration of female beauty in elegy entails the objectification of the elegiac *puella*, as her corporeal beauty is conflated with the character herself.³ Her true nature and its flaws are

² For the female body as the *materia* of artistic creation in *Ars Amatoria*, see Myerowitz (1985), 104-49. For praise of the beloved as *materia* of elegy, see McKeown's (1998) list of comparanda (ad *Am.* 2.1.33-34). Bretzigheimer's (2001) analysis of the topos of *laudatio puellae* in *Amores* (183-221) traces the tradition of this praise to the panegyric of Greek literature: "Die Elegiker stilisieren ihre niedere Gattung hoch, wenn sie sich in die (mit Homer beginnende) Tradition rühmender Dichter stellen, eines Pindar oder Bakchylides, oder auch eines Lobredners wie Isokrates, für die Ruhm durch Rühmen programmatisch ist" (183).

³ This treatment of female beauty as the basis of elegy reflects the inscription of women as poetry. See, among others, Wyke (1987) for the *scripta puella* as a metaphor for poetic production. As I clarified in the Introduction, metapoetic analysis is not the focus of my project. Instead, I concentrate on the poetic memorialization of beauty *as*

reflected, either directly or indirectly, on her body. The praise of the *puella*'s beauty, then, is circumscribed by blame.

The discourse on beauty in elegy primarily focuses on the dichotomy of 'natural' beauty versus 'artificial' beauty. The anti-cosmetic tradition in Hellenistic and Latin literature privileges unadorned simplicity over embellished enhancements to beauty.⁴ Beautifying adornments, such as make-up, expensive clothing and jewelry, and elaborate hairstyles, signify dissolute *luxuria* and moral decay. In addition to their inherent extravagance, cosmetic enhancements are viewed as inherently deceitful, since they are meant to conceal the truth that lies beneath. Ovid's Latin elegiac predecessors endorse this anti-cosmetic view, encouraging their mistresses to avoid make-up, perfumes, and silks.⁵ Such artifices lead to vanity and pride, which may lead a mistress to stray from her poor poet-lover in search of expensive fineries. Instead, the elegists recommend preserving one's natural beauty, rather than covering it up. In 1.2, his anti-cosmetic diatribe, Propertius castigates his *puella* for wearing make-up (like a woad-covered Briton) and asserts that her beauty is perfect just as nature made it (*ut natura dedit, sic omnis recta figura est*, 1.2.3).⁶ In attempting to appear more tempting, he contends, the mistress is hiding her true perfection. After all, as Propertius points out, the business of love occurs in the nude and leaves

such in Ovid's poetry, taking descriptions of the female body at face value, rather than reading them for metaphor. However, my observations, that Ovid points out the artificiality of elegy's praise of the female body, are consistent with such a metapoetic interpretation (for such a reading, see Bretzigheimer (2001), who argues that Ovid downplays his praise of the *puella* in acknowledgement of her nature as a fictional construct).

⁴ See Knecht (1972), 39-55 for the development of the anti-cosmetic tradition in Greek and Latin literature. Wyke's (1994) article is a concise survey of the rhetoric surrounding the regulation of both male and female adornment in Rome. For the anti-cosmetic tradition in elegy, see Heldmann (1981), 153-159; Rosati (1985), 9-19; Gibson (2003), 21-25; and Gibson (2006), 123-127.

⁵ Cf. Tibullus 1.8 discourages rouge, manicures, tight shoes, and constantly changing one's hairstyle and clothes; Propertius 1.2 advises against elaborate hairstyles, Coan silks, foreign perfumes, and jewelry; 2.18b denounces make-up and hair dye.

⁶ Much of the scholarship on Prop. 1.2 treats, in particular, the metapoetic resonances of *cultus*. Cf. Wyke (2002): "The Propertian *puella* is charged with an excessive use of ornament in a poem whose style is paradoxically ornate and whose central theme has been identified as artifice itself" (124). For metapoetic readings of the tension between *cultus* and Propertius's own *ars*, see Curran (1975), Gaisser (1977), and Zetzel (1996), as well as, more recently, Sharrock (2000), 273, and Keith (2008), 93-96.

little room for disguise: *nudus Amor formae non amat artificem* (1.2.12, naked Love does not love the artifice of beauty). The anti-cosmetic tradition in elegy prioritizes the naked unmodified female body above all other displays of beauty and deems the ‘natural’ body worthy of memorialization in poetry.

Propertius’s anti-cosmetic views are, indeed, framed in terms of memory in 1.15. He ties his accusations of infidelity to a critique of Cynthia’s adornment, claiming that her attentions to her toilette represent an attempt to cover up her interlude with another lover (1.15.5-8)⁷. Instead, she should follow the examples of Calypso, Hypsipyle, and Evadne, extolled as mythological heroines who remained faithful to their lovers, forever mourning their losses with hair undressed (*incomptis...capillis*, 11).⁸ However, Cynthia, hair duly coiffed (*manibus componere crines*, 5), is too far gone down the path of vice for these virtuous *exempla* to guide her:

*quarum nulla tuos potuit convertere mores,
tu quoque uti fieres nobilis historia.
desine iam revocare tuis periuria verbis,
Cynthia, et oblitos parce movere deos.* (Prop. 1.15.23-26)

(But none of these women could reform your morality, so that you, too, might become an honorable legend. Stop now recalling your false oaths with your words, Cynthia, and refrain from agitating the gods, who have already forgotten.)

Propertius claims that Cynthia’s deceitful behavior, evidenced through her beautifying efforts, will keep her from being remembered as a celebrated heroine like the mythological *exempla* he recalls. Indeed, even the gods have already forgotten about her. The antithesis of remembering and forgetting in lines 25-26, encapsulated in his command that she should cease to remind him of her infidelity, which the gods have already forgotten, serves to emphasize that neither she nor

⁷ Accusation of sexual promiscuity is a conventional topos in invective against women. See Wyke (1989), 38-41, and Greene (1998), 59-66. Related is the trope of the greedy *puella*, who pursues lovers mercenarily. See especially Myerowitz (1985), 118-124 (on Ovid specifically), and James (2003), 71-107 (on elegy generally).

⁸ For the use of mythological *exempla* in Prop. 1.15, see Whitaker (1983), as well as Keith’s (2008) response (171 n.17) and discussion of the passage (23-25).

the even the gods, but the poet-lover himself, is responsible for her memorialization. She will remember; the gods will forget. But how will the poet-lover preserve her memory in his verses? His poetry alone will ensure that, because of her artificial adornment, she will never be remembered as a *nobilis historia*, but as a treacherous beauty.

Propertius's reaction to Cynthia's *cultus* in 1.15 indicates another element of the *laudatio puellae* in elegy, the benefit poetry can confer on the *fama* of the *puella*. The poet-lover promises the *puella* fame, rather than fortune, in his poetry, which, he argues, will last forever.⁹ The *puella* who pleases him will be rewarded with a permanent memorial to her beauty. Indeed, Ovid claims in *Amores* 1.10 that his poetry is the only thing of value to a *puella*, since it will make her name eternal:

*est quoque carminibus meritas celebrare puellas
dos mea; quam volui, nota fit arte mea.
scindentur vestes, gemmae frangentur et aurum;
carmina quam tribuent, fama perennis erit. (Am. 1.10.59-62)*

(It is also my gift to glorify deserving girls in my poems; she whom I have chosen is made famous by my art. Clothes will tear, jewels and gold will break; but the fame that poetry bestows will last forever.)

Unlike the material, but ephemeral, largesse she may receive from other lovers, the poet-lover's gift of fame in poetry is permanent and, thereby, more worthwhile. If a gold bracelet breaks (*frangentur*, 61), it is, of course, still worth its weight in gold; but, in the economy of elegy, it is no longer as valuable, since it cannot be worn as a symbol of the *domina*'s position of power

⁹ It is a topos of elegy that the poet bestows his poetry (and its concomitant fame) as a gift upon the greedy *puella*, who insists on payment for her favors; see James (2003), 71-107, and Greco (2006), 52-54. In her analysis of Prop. 1.11, Greene (1998) explains the implications of this exchange: "The speaker's manipulative strategies toward his mistress are all but transparent; he implies that her *fama* (good or bad) depends on the continuation of her position as his mistress. The speaker's offer (or threat) to confer *fama* functions as a very persuasive argument for Cynthia's continued faithfulness, but it also suggests a reversal of the elegiac balance of power in which the male lover is subservient to his mistress" (63). Regarding *Am.* 1.10 specifically, De Caro (2003) points out that the poet's offer constitutes "un'accettazione della legge dello scambio," and adapts this economy of exchange "a favore della condizione propriamente elegiaca" (151). Hardie (2012), 357-371, contextualizes elegiac *fama* by comparison with other genres in his compendium of *fama* in Western literary tradition.

over her *servus amoris* in the elegiac relationship.¹⁰ Poetry, on the other hand, represents the poet-lover's mastery over the power of memory. Despite his claims of weakness, he exerts control over the memorialization of the *puella*'s beauty and has the power to paint her in an unflattering light, as he, indeed, has chosen to do in *Amores* 1.10. Indignant at her request for monetary compensation, he claims to have been cured of his attraction to the *puella*'s now irreparably-marred beauty:

*nunc timor omnis abest, animique resanuit error,
nec facies oculos iam capit ista meos.
cur sim mutatus, quaeris? quia munera poscis.
haec te non patitur causa placere mihi.
donec eras simplex, animum cum corpore amavi;
nunc mentis vitio laesa figura tua est. (1.10.9-14)*

(Now all fear is gone; the error of my mind has been cured; now that beauty of yours no longer captures my eyes. Why should I be changed, you ask? Because you demand gifts. This reason keeps you from pleasing me. When you were guileless, I loved your mind along with your body; now your beauty is marred by the flaw of your mind.)

The poet-lover claims to have fallen out of love, identified as an error of the mind (9), with his grasping and deceitful *puella*. Now that she has revealed her greed, he is no longer blinded by her captivating beauty (*nec facies oculos iam capit ista meos*, 10) and has finally seen her true nature.¹¹ Her beauty, which attracted him along with her *simplex* personality, has now been absolutely marred since she has given up on her *simplicitas* in order to cheat her lover out of

¹⁰ See Bretzigheimer (2001), 159-160, on the "Preis-Leistungs-Kalkulation" of the *puella* in *Am.* 1.10.

¹¹ In her analysis of Ovid's "visual memory" in the extended similes of *Amores*, Boyd (1997) considers the opening similes of 1.10, which compare the *puella* to three mythological heroines, Helen, Leda, and Amymone, whose beauty resulted in their rape. As she argues, the similes emphasize the tension between the reality and falsehood of visual imagery in poetry: "the simile serves to emphasize the deceptiveness of Corinna's appearance; it heightens the contrast between illusion and reality.... As a vehicle for imagery, the simile can be both visually realistic and intellectually deceptive: the extended simile, by virtue of its ability to bring every detail into painstaking focus while offering a multiplicity of alternative visions, is a means to both emphasize and undermine visual realism. The simile we have just considered, for example, while suggesting a visual effect, is in fact not directly visual at all. Ovid seems to want to compare the beauty of three mythological heroines to that of his beloved; but the terms of his comparison emphasize not physical appearances but the circumstances of rape." (108).

gifts.¹² The loss of her beauty in the lover-poet's eyes endangers the love affair and, therefore, its memorialization in poetry. As the lover-poet makes clear at the end of the poem, his poetry only confers fame on *meritas puellas* (59), who accept his poetry as their only compensation. The threat of anonymity hangs over the head of the *puella* who loses the poet-lover's esteem of her beauty, marred by infidelity, forfeiting permanent memorialization for monetary gain. Significantly, the *puella's animus* and *corpus* are shown to be completely interdependent; either they must both be perfect, or both will be completely ruined. She, who once was beautiful inside and out, has now revealed her inner flaws, marring her outer beauty in the poet-lover's eyes and, thereby, spoiling their love. If she is unable to restore her beauty in the sight of the poet-lover, she may destroy her chance at lasting memorialization in poetry.

The threat of such ignominy is impotent, however. The *puella* has been, of course, already preserved for posterity in 1.10, as well as elsewhere in *Amores*. Although the poet may threaten to curtail the *fama* of the *puella*, he cannot truly do without her, since she and her beauty are the *materia* of his poetry. The tension between the power of the poet, over the memory of love, and the power of the *puella*, the focus of his remembrance, underscores the fact of elegy that it requires elite men, members of the privileged class, figured as servile, to remember abject women, figured as dominant. However, within the fiction of the elegiac love affair, the poet-lover's true power lies not with his social class or gender, but with the fact that he is in control of memory. But how firm is his grasp on the memory of the *puella*? *Amores* 1.10 introduces a complicating strand in the thread binding beauty and elegiac love. The poet-lover claims that recognizing his *puella's* faults allowed him to look beyond her beauty, curing him (*animique resanuit error*, 9) of his debilitating desire. If beauty indeed causes the lover to devote himself to

¹² See Dimundo (2000), 215, and McKeown's (1989) note ad *Am.* 1.13.14 for the various valences of *simplicitas* as a traditional virtue and as a valued quality for a lover.

his *puella*, can the identification of flaws in his *puella*'s appearance truly cause the lover to fall out of love? Can he forget her beauty by remembering her faults?

Constructing an Anti-Cultus: False Memories in *Remedia Amoris*

Despite the more traditional attitudes of *Am.* 1.10, which tend to concur with Propertius's objections to 'artificial' beautification, Ovid is generally regarded as a vehement opponent of the anti-cosmetic tradition, a champion of *cultus* for women. In Book 3 of *Ars Amatoria* and *Medicamina*, Ovid explicitly advises women on hairstyle, clothing, make-up, and beauty treatments, recommending the best course of action to attract a man.¹³ Ovid makes no contrast between 'natural' and 'artificial' beauty in these texts. Instead, beauty in all its forms serves one purpose, allowing a woman to ensnare her lover, a necessarily deceptive cause. Indeed, the competitive nature of the cat-and-mouse game displayed in these texts makes deceit an indispensable strategy for winning. As in previous elegy, then, beauty in *Ars Amatoria* and *Medicamina* is shown to be fraudulent, but it is not censured. The primary difference between these texts, which praise and facilitate the *cultus* of women, and more anti-cosmetic texts is the addressee. *Ars Amatoria* 3 and *Medicamina* ostensibly give advice to women, written from the point of view of a man lending a helping hand to women living in a male world. *Cultus* is just as deceptive as it was in previous elegy, but the Ovidian *praeceptor* suggests that his female students use its deceptive capabilities to their advantage in the struggle between the sexes.¹⁴ In

¹³ On the treatment of female *cultus* in *Ars Amatoria*, see especially Gibson's (2003) commentary, as well as his (2006) article on Ovid's "moderate" *cultus*. On *Medicamina*, see Green (1979), which details the findings of his experiments testing out Ovid's recipes; Rosati (1985), who interprets *Med.* as a manifesto for *cultus* as an anti-naturalistic aesthetic and against the artificiality of Augustan society; and Watson (2001), who explores Ovid's etymological play with *cultus* (cf. 'cultivation'), looking at both general agricultural allusions and connections to Vergil's *Georgics*. Greco (2006) devotes a third of her brief monograph on Ovidian *cultus* to *Medicamina*.

¹⁴ Bourdieu's (1977) concept of the 'mnemonic' body is particularly relevant here. Societies, in valuing "the seemingly most insignificant details of *dress, bearing, physical and verbal manners*" (emphasis original), "[treat]the body as a memory" and "entrust to it in abbreviated and practical, i.e., mnemonic, form the fundamental principles of the arbitrary content of the culture" (94). Individuals' physical forms, then, embody the values of the culture writ large and perpetuate those values through the "hidden persuasion of an implicit pedagogy" (94). Ovid, here, brings

non-didactic elegy, however, the focus lies with the elegist as the manipulated victim of the powerful *domina*. Feminine deception is an abuse of the power of beauty and characterizes the *puella* as cold and manipulative against the sympathetic, vulnerable character of the poet-lover.

In contrast to his pro-*cultus* texts, Ovid's *Remedia* prioritizes the experience of the victimized lover. As in his previous didactic works, beauty is a tool used by women to enthrall and entrap the lover, and the cosmetic beautification of *cultus* provides a helpful aid towards that purpose. However, Ovid's goal in *Remedia Amoris* is to free the lover from the snare of a beautiful *puella*. The beloved's beauty is, consequently, characterized as treacherous. Indeed, female beauty is shown to be particularly harmful because it is memorable, as evidenced by elegy's treatment of the female body as the impetus for writing poetry, prompting the poet-lover to forever memorialize her beauty in verse. But, as the unlucky lover has so tragically discovered, the *puella*'s adorned face merely masks her true, cruel nature. Indeed, the *praeceptor* regards beauty as so inherently deceptive that its only counter is the creation of a new system of illusions. Towards this end, he devises a new sort of deception, as an equal and opposite response to the illusion of beauty, for the lover to perpetrate. The lover must believe that his *puella* is, indeed, unattractive, forgetting his mental image of her beauty, and replacing it with a false image of ugliness. To do so, he must perform a sort of anti-*cultus*, a purposeful uglification of the female form, making it unworthy to be remembered according to the standards of elegy.

In *Remedia*, the *praeceptor* advises dwelling on the *puella*'s faults (*profuit adsidue vitiis insistere amicae*, 315) as a healthy (*salubre*, 316) measure for the reader wishing to forget love.¹⁵

into tension the values of elegy and the values of Roman society, embodied by the female *corpus*, as he juxtaposes the dominant cultural pedagogy of the body with his own countercultural didactic message, manifested in the body of the elegiac *puella*.

¹⁵ Geisler's (1969) commentary boasts a fold-out page of *comparanda* for the *Vorschriften* of *Rem.* 311-356, including Lucretius (*De rerum natura* 4.1149-1169), Horace (*Sat.* 1.3), and Ovid's own *Am.* 2.4, as well as various citations through *Ars Amatoria*.

He goes into great detail to supply *exempla* of proper behavior for his student:

'quam mala' dicebam 'nostrae sunt crura puellae!'

nec tamen, ut vere confiteamur, erant.

'brachia quam non sunt nostrae formosa puellae!'

et tamen, ut vere confiteamur, erant.

quam brevis est!' nec erat; 'quam multum poscit amantem!'

haec odio venit maxima causa meo. (Rem. 317-322)

('How ugly,' I used to say, 'are my girl's legs!' And yet they weren't, to tell the truth.

'How pretty my girl's arms are not!' And yet they were, to tell the truth. 'How short she is!' But she wasn't. 'How much she demands of her lover!' This came to be the greatest source of my hate.)

Here, the *praeceptor* models the methods which his student should follow, namely, lying to himself about his *puella's* faults. He advises the student to misremember his *puella's* physical characteristics, exaggerating or, perhaps, wholly inventing bodily flaws. He claims that this mnemonic strategy was indeed successful for himself, as it resulted in stimulating the *odium* towards his *puella* which, ostensibly, resulted in the end of a love affair. As a teacher, he instructs his student to lie to himself, recalling flaws in his *puella* that do not, in fact, exist, as he twice confesses (*ut vere confiteamur*). Significantly, however, this attention to the tension between truth and artifice focuses on the unadorned body of the *puella*. It is not her *cultus* that the lover ought to find repellent, but her 'natural' beauty. The *praeceptor* advertises this creation of false memories as a method of forgetting the source of one's love, the unadorned beauty of the beloved, by replacing it with a source of hatred.

However, the *praeceptor* quickly alters his advice, arguing that, rather than entirely fabricating flaws, his student should strategically choose physical features to remember that could be construed as flaws with only a little embellishment.¹⁶ Once again, the *praeceptor* gives

¹⁶ For a brief, but well-cited, overview of the ideals of female beauty in Roman culture, see Olson (2008), 68-70.

specific examples to help his student understand and apply his advice:

*et mala sunt vicina bonis; errore sub illo
pro vitio virtus crimina saepe tulit.
qua potes, in peius dotes deflecte puellae,
iudiciumque brevi limite falle tuum.
'turgida,' si plena est, si fusca est, 'nigra' vocetur;
in gracili 'macies' crimen habere potest.
et poterit dici 'petulans,' quae rustica non est,
et poterit dici 'rustica,' si qua proba est. (Rem. 324-330)*

(And also faults stick close to charms; by that mistake virtues often have borne the blame for flaws. Where you can, downplay your girl's endowments, and deceive your own judgment, crossing that fine line. She should be called 'fat' if she is full-figured, if she is dark, 'swarthy'; in a slender woman, 'skinniness' can be a flaw. Those who are not rusticated can be called 'brash,' and anyone who is guileless can be called 'rusticated.')

The *praeceptor* alters his original claim, arguing that the best way to remember the *puella* as flawed is not to invent faults whole-cloth, but to choose strategically those features which can easily be exaggerated into flaws. Again, here, he stresses the tension between truth and lies, calling on the student to willfully deceive himself, blurring or, perhaps even inverting, the fine line between truth and falsehood, virtue and vice, flaw and charm. The lover is essentially instructed to adorn his *puella* with a false face, which makes ugly her 'natural' beauty, a process parallel, but antithetical to the deceptive and alluring *cultus* of women. Distinguishing features that the lover might previously have seen as charms or, at the very least, inoffensive, should now

¹⁷ Scholars have often commented upon the extreme similarity between these verses and Lucretius's famous lines at *De rerum natura* 4.1160ff. (which can themselves be traced back to Greek sources; see Brown (1987), p. 128, n. 72). The *praeceptor*'s strategy for curing love here echoes the criticisms against love offered by Lucretius, namely, that men in love are blind (*cupidine caeci*, *De rerum natura* 4.1153) to their beloved's faults. To Lucretius, the flaws men ignore are both innately physical (skin and eye color, height, weight, body type, and size of facial features) and presentational (tidy/untidy appearance, lispiness, talkativeness); Ovid's list conforms to this standard as well. As Brown (1987) emphasizes, the lover's transformation of a woman's flaws into beautiful features "correspond[s] to the physical enhancement of clothing and jewels" (78) that Lucretius had railed against previously in *De rerum natura*. Ovid picks up on Lucretius's criticism of *cultus* in this passage by teaching the lover an anti-*cultus* of his own, as I argue here.

be remembered as repellent. The image of the *puella* in the mind of the lover should be altered to reflect a body with exaggerated flaws, rather than pleasing charms. To Ovid, it seems, ugliness is in the eye of the beholder.

The *praeceptor* goes on to advise the lover to cement these false memories of the *puella*'s bodily flaws by having the *puella* show her body to its greatest disadvantage. The creation of false memories is no longer a merely mental assignment of the lover, but the *puella* herself must become an active participant in the inscription of her own flaws in the mind of her lover. The *praeceptor* tells the lover to encourage his *puella* to employ charms she lacks: make her dance, if she is not graceful (334); make sure she leaves her chest unbound, if she is large-breasted (337-338); make her smile, if she has ugly teeth (339). He advises the lover to take advantage of his *puella*'s imperfections, no matter how slight, and make her enact them to establish them as major flaws in his imagination.¹⁸ In this way, the *praeceptor* transitions from static visual prompts to false memory, the inanimate body of the *puella*, to dynamic visual cues; he thus encourages the lover to (mis)remember a narrative of encountering his mistress's flaws in action, rather than merely recalling false facts about her appearance.

The *praeceptor* continues this trend of the creation of dynamic false memories, as he advises his student to surprise his *puella* before she has performed her morning toilette (*cum se non finxerit ulli*, *Rem.* 341; when she has not fixed herself up for anyone). By approaching his *puella* before she is fully adorned, the lover is able to see her flaws, which she conceals through *cultus*. He can thus see the true *puella*, rather than the false face she shows to the world:

*auferimur cultu; gemmis auroque teguntur
omnia; pars minima est ipsa puella sui.*

¹⁸ On the importance of movement and gesture to perceptions of proper bodily comportment in Roman culture, see Edwards (1993), 63-97; Wyke (1994); Aldrete (1999); Corbeill (2004). See also Gibson's (2003) notes on *Ars Am.* 3.299ff. for the importance of gesture and carriage in the Ovidian *praeceptor*'s advice to women.

*saepe, ubi sit quod ames inter tam multa, requiras;
decipit hac oculos aegide dives Amor.*

*improvisus ades, deprendes tutus inermem:
infelix vitiis excidet illa suis. (Rem. 343-348)*

(We are taken in by adornment; everything is hidden by jewels and gold. The smallest part of the woman is the woman herself. You often ask: where is there something I can love amidst so much extra stuff? Lavish Love tricks the eyes with this aegis. Show up unexpected, and you will safely catch her with her defenses down. The unlucky woman will be done in by her own flaws.)

Here, the female beauty that inspires love is actually manufactured through *cultus* and is, therefore, false and deceptive. Indeed, the *praeceptor* claims that the woman you see is only part-woman! The *puella* is so heavily adorned with flashy jewelry, opulent clothes, caked-on makeup, and fancy hairstyles that her actual body can only be seen in part. These elements of *cultus* form an impenetrable barrier between the *puella* and her viewer, so that he is unable to see her true self. However, unlike Minerva's aegis, which displays an image of the hideous Gorgon's face in order to frighten its viewers, the *puella*'s aegis shows her as beautiful, protecting her from exposing her own flaws.¹⁹ Ovid continues the military metaphor of *cultus* as a warrior's *aegis* by advising his student to be a soldier, not *for* love (as in previous elegy), but against it. By attacking the enemy *puella* before her defenses are ready, he ensures his victory over both her and deceptive Love. Her flaws (*vitiis*, 348), now visible to the lover, will prove her downfall, since his disgust at seeing her true self unadorned will enable him to abandon their relationship.

It is significant here that the female body, unable to be discerned through the thick aegis of *cultus*, is conflated with the woman herself. If the lover cannot see the *puella*'s body as it truly is, he cannot possibly know her fully. The *praeceptor* bases his argument on the expectation that

¹⁹ Henderson (1979), *ad loc.*, points out that Minerva's aegis is specifically made of metal and, therefore, shiny, like her jewelry (and, indeed, her mirror).

seeing the *puella's* bodily flaws will cause the lover to see her as a liar.²⁰ Revealing her hidden imperfections indicates a defect in her character, namely, hiding her bodily flaws through deceptive means.²¹ In keeping with the anti-cosmetic tradition, *Remedia* shows female adornment to be necessarily false, a physical manifestation of the *puella's* underlying guile, even as it advises the creation of an equally false system of illusions to protect the apparently guileless lover.

After advising such a morning visit, however, the *praeceptor* gives an immediate caveat that the lover cannot rely on this method alone, since all feminine beauty can be deceptive: *non tamen huic nimium praecepto credere tutum est: / fallit enim multos forma sine arte decens* (*Rem.* 349-350; Nevertheless it is not safe to trust in this precept too much: for even artless beauty has deceived many). This remark appears to fly in the face of the anti-cosmetic tradition of elegy, which contends that ‘artificial,’ but not ‘natural,’ beauty is deceptive. The *praeceptor*, instead, asserts that even natural beauty can deceive the lover into continuing his love affair. This warning recalls *Amores* 1.14,²² in which the lover-poet extols the virtues of seeing his *puella* in the wee morning hours: *tum quoque erat neglecta decens* (*Am.* 1.14.21; even then she was comely in her carelessness). For the lover who truly sees his *puella* as beautiful, going to her before her morning toilette would prove counter-productive, only enflaming his passion, as the experience did for the narrator of 1.14. Instead, the two-edged sword of beauty underscores the *praeceptor's* contention that all beauty, whether consciously performed or unwittingly displayed, is deceptive, a trap that can ensnare the lover.

²⁰ Although, significantly, when he visits the *puella*, (351ff), it is not seeing her unadorned that disgust him, but the smells of her beauty products: *illa tuas redolent, Phineu, medicamina mensas: / non semel hinc stomacho nausea facta meo est.* (355-356; These drugs smell like your tables, Phineus; they have made my stomach nauseated more than once.)

²¹ As Currie (1998) puts it, “Ovid's cosmetics have an oxymoronic quality as genuinely beautifying but also confirming women's underlying ugliness” (166).

²² Discussed in more detail below.

Next, after a preamble addressing his critics and justifying his decision to include such material, the *praeceptor* gives advice on having sex with one's *puella*. A reader might expect that he would forbid such intimate contact, but *Remedia* includes it within the prescriptions for misremembering the *puella*'s body. First, the *praeceptor* advises that the lover should sate himself with other women first so that he is not driven mad by desire when he encounters his beloved (398-406). When he does engage in intercourse with the *puella*, he should choose the least effective position for viewing the her as beautiful, making sure she appears in unflattering light (411-412).²³ Most importantly, he should study her bodily flaws after he has satisfied himself sexually:

*dum piget, et malis nullam tetigisse puellam,
tactusque tibi non videare diu,
tunc animo signa, quaecumque in corpore menda est,
luminaque in vitiis illius usque tene.
forsitan haec aliquis (nam sunt quoque) parva vocabit,
sed, quae non prosunt singula, multa iuvant. (Rem. 415-420)*

(When you're bored and you wish that you had not touched the woman at all, and it feels like you won't touch another for a long time, then make a mental note, wherever there is a blemish on her body, and keep your eyes on all of her flaws. Perhaps somebody will say that they are small (and they are) but things that are not useful in and of themselves will help when they are many.)

Sex presents a rare opportunity to catch the *puella* off her guard and put the lover on defense.

Not only is the lover able to see all of his *puella*'s flaws bared, but he is also then uniquely able

²³ This passage, of course, recalls Ovid's advice in *Ars Amatoria* 3, in which he instructs women on how to appear most attractive during intercourse. Myerowitz (1992) notes that: "In the *Ars Amatoria*, *figurae* are primarily a female concern because they offer women a means to manipulate their own bodies in order to make themselves attractive to men.... That women are assumed to be more concerned with how they appear than how they feel, and are better at this self-objectification than men are, is consistent with Ovid's view of women throughout the *Ars* as being better artists since they are able to work on their own bodies as *materia*, in addition to the *materia* of their men" (136). Ovid only advises men to take the lead in determining sexual *figurae* when they are trying to control, not their own bodies, but the bodies of their female partners. See also Clarke (1998), for the ways in which this Ovidian characterization of sexual positions (which feature "the woman as aesthetic object," 218) corresponds to images of lovemaking in Roman visual art.

to take advantage of the post-coital abatement of his desire to convince himself that he will not want her again. He must use this time to create a litany of flaws that he can recall at a later date when his lust threatens to overwhelm him again. As with the *praeceptor*'s earlier advice above, no flaw is too small to be worthy of consideration; a number of small flaws should aggregate sufficiently to keep the lover away.

The *praeceptor* goes on to acknowledge that different flaws will deter different individuals and, therefore, he advises the lover to try out different positions and strategies to see what offends him the most:

*quo tua non possunt offendi pectora facto,
forsitan hoc alio iudice crimen erit.
ille quod obscenas in aperto corpore partes
viderat in cursu qui fuit, haesit amor:
ille quod a Veneris rebus surgente puella
vidit in inmundo signa pudenda toro.* (427-432)

(That act which is not able to offend your feelings, perhaps will be a crime for another judge. One love affair got into a sticky situation because the lover, in the course of what he was doing, saw his girl's naughty parts when her body was exposed; another because he saw the shameful marks on the soiled couch when his girl was getting up from their venereal activities.)

The *praeceptor* suggests here that both a woman's body and the traces it leaves behind may provide sufficient defects to dissuade the lover.²⁴ Like seeing the *puella* before she puts on her makeup, catching sight of realities usually hidden may serve as impetus to unfavorable memories of the *puella*'s body. However, the *praeceptor* immediately negates this comment by stating that

²⁴ Brunelle (2005)'s discussion of *Rem.* 399-440 notes the passage's intertext with satirical invective; satire's misogyny and focus on bodily emissions combine in this Ovidian take on the satirical genre: "A woman who is so unpleasantly and uncontrollably wet looks less like the typical elegiac *puella* and more like the typical target of Roman satire, a genre that derives much of its invective from a focus on the leaky and imperfect body and a condemnation of female bodily fluidity.... Both man and woman will have contributed to the *signa pudenda* that defile the bed, but the shame and revulsion operate on the man through the woman" (152).

anyone who might find such things to be a deterrent was not serious about his love in the first place: *luditis, o siquos potuerunt ista movere; adflarant tepidae pectora vestra faces* (*Rem.* 433-434; you are just playing around, if you can be moved by such things; tepid fires inflamed your hearts). Of course, only true lovers, those gravely endangered by love's deadly perils, are recommended readers of *Remedia*.²⁵ But this rebuke creates a paradox within *Remedia*: any lover who might be repelled by a recitation of his *puella*'s bodily flaws is not a serious enough lover to be a true student of the precepts against love. Conversely, any true lover would not find the *praeceptor*'s advice on remembering the *puella*'s flaws to be effective. *Remedia*'s advice on how to forget love, is, then, shown to be inadequate to the futile task of ridding the lover of love.

Rich False Memories and Rhetorical *Imagines*

Though ultimately paradoxical, *Remedia*'s strategy of encouraging the lover to construct a fictional memory does have a basis in cognitive reality. Through a process of misinformation, individuals can construct detailed false memories of events that never occurred. Loftus's 1993 study showed conclusively that false memories could be planted in the minds of subjects. Subjects in this study, in which a relative of the subject told her/him a (fictional) story about the subject having been lost in a shopping mall at the age of 6, began to recall details of the episode, as though they had actually experienced it.²⁶ These 'rich false memories' are completely artificial, manufactured memories that the subjects believe themselves to have recalled naturally. Over a period of time, the narrative of the memory may become more dynamic, as the subject 'remembers' details of the story, falsely, but unconsciously, constructing a fuller memory, based on cultural expectations and plausibilities, and even by coopting actual memories into the false narrative. A later series of studies, which planted the memory of meeting Bugs Bunny at a

²⁵ See Ch. 1.

²⁶ Loftus (1993). For an overview of cognitive studies on misinformation and false memories, see especially Loftus (2005).

Disney theme park,—of course, impossible, since Bugs Bunny is a Warner Bros., rather than Disney, character—demonstrated that visual cues to memory (in this case, seeing Bugs Bunny on a fake ad for Disneyland) caused more subjects to develop false memories than merely verbal signals.²⁷ Rich false memories can, then, be prompted by visual cues that plant misinformation in individuals' memories.

The *praeceptor's* advice that the lover should construct specifically visual false memories of the *puella's* physical appearance could be, then, quite possibly effective. If the *praeceptor*, a trusted advisor, plants the idea in the mind of the lover that his *puella* is ugly under her false veneer of *cultus*, then the lover may indeed construct a detailed, dynamic, false memory of his mistress with splotchy skin and fat thighs. The lover's memory may conform to the *praeceptor's* misinformation by creating a rich false memory of the *puella's* ugliness. The difficulty with his advice, then, does not lie with its plausibility. Instead, the contradiction inherent in these *praecepta* that form false memories is prompted by their creation of another strategy for memory production (albeit false memory production), rather than a strategy for forgetting, within a text that purports to help the reader forget.

The paradox of encouraging remembrance, even false remembrance, of visual images in order to facilitate forgetting becomes even more distinct when considered in the context of the *ars memoriae* of the rhetorical manuals. In these texts, *imagines*, representing specific objects to be remembered, are organized within the *loci* of memory. Like the *loci* themselves,²⁸ these *imagines* should be carefully constructed to best serve the purposes of memory:

Imagines igitur nos in eo genere constituere oportebit, quod genus in memoria diutissime potest haerere. Id accidet, si quam maxime notatas similitudines constituemus; si non multas nec vagas, sed aliquid agentes imagines ponemus; si egregiam pulcritudinem aut

²⁷ Braun et al. (2002); Braun-LaTour et al. (2004).

²⁸ See Ch. 2 above.

unicam turpitudinem eis adtribuemus; si aliquas exornabimus, ut si coronis aut veste purpurea, quo nobis notatior sit similitudo; aut si qua re deformabimus, ut si cruentam aut caeno oblitam aut rubrica delibutam inducamus, quo magis insignita sit forma, aut ridiculas res aliquas imaginibus adtribuamus: nam ea res quoque faciet, ut facilius meminisse valeamus. (Rhet. ad Her. III.xxii.37)

(We ought, then, to set up images of a kind that can adhere longest in the memory. And we shall do so if we establish likenesses as striking as possible; if we set up images that are not many or vague, but doing something; if we assign to them exceptional beauty or singular ugliness; if we dress some of them with crowns or purple cloaks, for example, so that the likeness may be more distinct to us; or if we somehow disfigure them, as by introducing one stained with blood or soiled with mud or smeared with red paint, so that its form is more striking, or by assigning certain comic effects to our images, for that, too, will ensure our remembering them more readily.)²⁹

To be most memorable, *imagines* ought to be to be either especially splendid or especially ugly.

They might be dressed up or disfigured in the imagination of the young rhetorician to make recall easier. The rhetorical *ars memoriae* stipulates, then, that *imagines* will be best remembered when they are out of the ordinary. Ovid's parallel *ars* sets up female bodies as these rhetorical *imagines*. In Ovid's poetry, they may either be dressed up with the trappings of *cultus* or they may be marred by physical or moral flaws. The art of forgetting in *Remedia* stipulates that the lover wishing to forget love should pay particular attention to the latter. However, if the reader considers both beautiful and ugly *imagines* as equally memorable, the *praeceptor's* strategy of remembering the *puella* as flawed fails. As with other *imagines*, making women appear ugly can only positively affect their memorability. If the purpose is forgetting, the goal should be to make the *puella* ordinary. In encouraging the lover to remember his *puella's* worst flaws, he actually ensures that the *puella* will be stored as a powerful *imago* in his memory.

By creating a paradox in which forgetting love entails remembering the *puella's* flaws,

²⁹ Translation from Caplan's Loeb (1954).

Ovid, as usual, undermines his own advice in *Remedia*. However, this contradiction further serves to underscore the deceptive and illusory power inherent in beauty, which, as we have seen, is as much a feature of *Remedia* as it was in previous elegy. Memory and its medium, poetry, are meticulously and consciously constructed, and the *materia* of elegy, feminine beauty, is molded to suit the purposes of the poet. Beauty, as Ovid shows in *Remedia*, can be easily substituted with ugliness with only a slight shift in paradigm. The fluidity of these opposites emphasizes that even ‘natural’ beauty, the purported basis of elegy, is an illusion, malleable by both the *puella* and the poet. Ovid’s paradoxical *praecepta*, then, critique elegy’s anti-cosmetic stance, questioning the value placed on the memorialization of the naturally flawless female body and suggesting that the elegiac *puella*’s flaws are more worthy of memorialization than her perfection.

Looking back at *Amores* from this perspective, we can more easily see that Ovid’s memorialization of the female beauty tends to focus more on a *puella*’s flaws than on her perfect body. The treatment of the female body in *Amores*, then, memorializes the *puella*’s shortcomings, both physical and temperamental, rather than her idealized beauty. Ovid makes clear throughout *Amores* that the *materia* of elegy is not just flawless female beauty, but also its blemishes: grotesque physical displays of vanity or pride, the disfiguring effects of greed and infidelity, the eroding toll of aging. Beauty is shown to be illusory, deceptive, and easily tarnished; the perfect beauty touted by Ovid’s elegiac predecessors is but a false memory. Instead, its flaws and fluctuations more frequently provide the fodder for poetic creation, and Ovid’s treatment of beauty in *Amores* makes clear this irony of elegiac values. Throughout *Amores*, flaws are more memorable than perfection in beauty.

Deceptive Beauty in *Amores*

Like Propertius's *nudus Amor* (above, 1.2.12), Ovid's *Amores* reflects the tradition of elegiac praise of the bare female form. *Am.* 1.5 extols the beauty of the elegiac *puella*, disrobing during a mid-day rendezvous. Ovid's view of Corinna's naked body brings into focus her flawless beauty:

*ut stetit ante oculos posito velamine nostros,
in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit.
quos umeros, quales vidi tetigique lacertos!
forma papillarum quam fuit apta premi!
quam castigato planus sub pectore venter!
quantum et quale latus! quam iuvenale femur!
singula quid referam? nil non laudabile vidi
et nudam pressi corpus ad usque meum. (Am. 1.5.17-24)*

(As she stood before my eyes, her clothes thrown aside, there was not a blemish to be found on her whole body. What shoulders, what arms I saw and touched! How squeezable were the shapes of her breasts! How smooth was her stomach beneath her slender chest! How long and excellent her side! How youthful her thigh! Why should I remember each thing in turn? I saw nothing that was not praiseworthy, and I pressed her naked wholly against my body.)

Corinna's beauty is perfect, betraying no flaw. The poet-lover catalogues her body's faultless parts, following his gaze downward,³⁰ until the climax of the poem, when he suddenly leaves off to assert that there is no need to give such a list, since there was no flaw on *any* part of her body. His *paraleipsis* here underscores the fact that the elegiac *puella* is perfectly beautiful, with no physical flaws. As Keith (1994) notes: "Corinna's body also displays a perfection realizable only in a work of art such as a marble statue, an ivory carving, or a finely-crafted book of poetry."³¹ Her beauty is, perhaps, too perfect to exist outside of a poetic text. Greene (1998), in observing

³⁰ It is common for descriptions of the body to progress downward. See McKeown (1989), *ad* 1.5.19-22, for a list of comparanda in Greek and Latin literature.

³¹ Keith (1994), 31.

the role of the male gaze in this poem, takes this observation even further, arguing that the *amator* both objectifies and subsumes his object within his poetry: “As possessor of the gaze, the male speaker gathers up the scattered parts of Corinna’s body; they are enfolded within his text and collected as *singula* for his remembering. ...Corinna’s body becomes whole (a *corpus* at all) when it is imprinted in the text or *corpus* of the speaker.”³² This “process of dismembering and remembering the female body”³³ allows the male speaker to remain a fully unified subject, a whole *corpus* himself (as line 24 makes clear), while his female companion has been carved up into her flawless parts. Metapoetically, Corinna’s parts add up to the whole of his poetic *corpus*, as her body is incorporated within the text.³⁴ I would, however, take this argument a step further than Greene, to acknowledge the underlying irony inherent in Ovid’s statement about memory and beauty here. With his question, *singula quid referam?* (23; Why should I remember each thing in turn?), the poet-lover implies that the *puella*’s perfection transcends the capabilities of poetry. The poem memorializes Corinna’s perfection, creating a whole so complete that the parts need not be recalled and described in turn to ensure the reader that they are flawless. Ovid thus seems to imply that memory, and, therefore, poetry is not up to the task of adequately describing the female form in its perfection. According to *Amores* 1.5, then, flawless beauty cannot be actually remembered in poetic memorialization, and, thus, its manifestation in elegy must be merely a false memory.

Ovid, then, very early on in *Amores*, breaks from the elegiac tradition of using only the ideal female form as the *materia* of his elegy. Beauty, perfectly praiseworthy in the elegy of his predecessors, is characterized by its flaws in Ovid’s works. In keeping with the anti-cosmetic

³² Greene (1998), 83.

³³ Greene (1998), 83.

³⁴ For the description of Corinna’s perfection and its implications for the metapoetic value of the *puella*, see both Keith (1994), 30-31, and Greene (1998), 77-84, as well as Hinds (1988), 11.

tradition, Ovid shows that the artificial beauty of female *cultus* deceives the lover through its misrepresentation of reality. Even unfeigned flawless beauty can be marred by character defects, which are often cyclically triggered by the arrogance beauty brings. However, the anti-cosmetic topos of his predecessors is taken even further in Ovid's poetry, as he memorializes the *puella*'s flaws, showing that the *materia* of elegy is not perfect beauty itself, but rather the illusion that beauty creates. Memory is not simply sparked by female bodily perfection; it is the flaws, physical or essential, in perfect elegiac beauty that are, to Ovid, truly worthy of memorialization.

Amores 1.14 describes, in harrowing detail, the *puella*'s physical flaws, which are shown to be a direct consequence of cosmetic modification. Ovid reproaches his *puella* for dyeing her once-beautiful hair, which is now falling out because of the harsh treatment. As opposed to Propertius's diatribe against *cultus*, which contends that there is no improving his mistress's beauty (1.2, above), Ovid's criticism focuses on the sad loss of the *puella*'s beauty and her appalling physical appearance. He claims that he has always told her not to dye (*medicare*, 1) or heat-curl (*urere*, 27) her hair, since it was already perfect: long and full (3), easily managed and free of tangles (13-15), and neither black nor golden, but the color of Idan cedar bark (9-12). Ovid recounts viewing the *puella* previously at her toilette with her maid, who was never punished for causing her mistress pain while dressing her perfect hair (16-17).³⁵ Indeed, Ovid claims, his *puella* appeared particularly attractive in the early morning before her hair was even dressed. The first 35 lines of the poem are dedicated to creating a memorial to the lost beauty of her hair, a representation of elegiac perfection. However, by immortalizing the loveliness of the *puella*'s hair in the first 35 lines of the poem, Ovid has, paradoxically, made forgetting the

³⁵ However, in *Remedia*, Ovid advises seeing your *puella* before her toilette as a method of falling out of love. See below.

destruction of her beauty impossible. Now, she must look in the mirror and mourn her appearance:

*quid male dispositos quereris periisse capillos?
quid speculum maesta ponis, inepta, manu?
non bene consuetis a te spectaris ocellis;
ut placeas, debes inmemor esse tui. (Am. 1.14.35-39)*

(Why do you lament that your hair, which you thought a mess, has been destroyed? Why do you put down your mirror with mournful hand, foolish girl? You look upon yourself with eyes unaccustomed to the sight; you ought to forget yourself if you want to be satisfied with your reflection.)

Here, Ovid focuses on the *puella*'s memory of her own past beauty, which she previously took for granted and has only come to value now that it is gone. She must now, as the poet-lover emphasizes, get used to her new less-beautiful appearance, forgetting her previous long, luxurious locks. She, who once could undergo her toilette with remarkable ease, now cannot even bear to look at herself in the mirror. Such a disaster is the consequence of her own actions, since she herself applied the poison (*venena*, 44) that cosmetically destroyed her natural beauty. Her willful self-destruction is represented in the poem as both a physical fracturing (she has been, after all, actually bodily separated from her hair) and a metaphorical fracturing, with the *puella* and her hair alternately conflated as a singular object and set apart as enemies.³⁶ As Kennedy (1993) has pointed out, even as her hair is personified, imagined to feel the pain of her mistreatment, the *puella* herself is depersonalized, objectified by the poet's fetishization of her hair.³⁷ In this fracturing, it is not just her beauty, but her very self that is at stake. Ovid, ignoring all other parts of her personality, makes clear that the *puella*'s past beauty represents her

³⁶ As Papaioannou (2006) notes, Ovid here works "to set the hair and the hairdresser/Corinna in opposite corners, and to portray the former as a defenseless and innocent victim to the 'attack' of the latter," only to later seamlessly "fuse [the two] back into a single entity" (62).

³⁷ Kennedy (1993), 72-3.

essential self, distinguished from her present reflection: *ut placeas, debes inmemor esse tui* (1.14.39; you ought to forget yourself if you want to be satisfied with your reflection). With her beauty gone, she is no longer herself; she must purposefully forget her old identity and forge a new one altogether, asking herself the question posed by Kennedy: “What if ‘you’ are not an essence, but the possessor of attractive ‘features’?”³⁸ According to Ovid, the *puella*’s self was essentially composed of her beauty, now destroyed. Since her reflection in the mirror no longer conforms to this bygone beauty, she must forget her past, the set of memories that add up to one’s self-identity, in order to accommodate a new self-view that reflects the mirror’s image.³⁹ Her beauty is not worth remembering, since it is not an adequate reflection of this new self; instead, her mistake and its devastating aftermath are the focus of remembrance in *Am.* 1.14.

Female beauty, even when unmarred by cosmetics, can incur other blemishes that change the way it is perceived and remembered. The beauty that spurs the poet-lover’s desire (and his writing) also causes his pain when withheld. As Ovid complains in *Amores* 2.17, the power that beauty confers causes a *domina* to become haughty and harsh:

*atque utinam dominae miti quoque praeda fuissem
 formosae quoniam praeda futurus eram!
 dat facies animos. facie violenta Corinna est—
 me miserum! cur est tam bene nota sibi?
 scilicet a speculi sumuntur imagine fastus,
 nec nisi conpositam se prius illa videt!* (*Am.* 2.17.5-10)

(And I wish that I would have been prey to a gentle mistress, as well, since I am going to be prey to a beautiful one! Beauty gives airs. Corinna is brutal because of her beauty—wretched me! Why does she know herself so well? Surely her pride is put on by her image in the mirror, but she never sees herself before she has been made up!)

³⁸ Kennedy (1993), 68.

³⁹ See Rimell (2006) for a discussion of the ways in which looking in the mirror “threatens as well as bolsters self-identity” (69) in *Medicamina*.

The elegiac mistress is castigated for the arrogance of beauty, which gives her power over the poet, the *servus amoris*. The true problem for Ovid, however, is not that Corinna *is* beautiful, but that she *knows* that she is beautiful (*est tam bene nota sibi*, 8).⁴⁰ Flawless beauty becomes a flaw itself when the beautiful woman recognizes the power it gives her over the elegist. It is significant that Corinna is imagined in front of her mirror, admiring herself after she has been *composita*, like the *puella* of 1.14 who mourns the loss of her beautiful reflection. As in 1.14, Ovid participates here both in the anti-cosmetic discourse that characterizes beauty enhancements as corrupting and deceitful and in the elegiac tradition that conflates a woman's self with her physical appearance. Ovid does not imply here that Corinna's beauty is false, however; she, after all, knows herself and her beauty (as with 1.14, conflated with her 'self') too well for his liking.⁴¹ Instead, it is her affectation of arrogance that is a sham. As McKeown notes, "Corinna's arrogance is presented as part of her toilette."⁴² She puts on her pride along with her make-up and only sees herself in the self-confident image she has assumed. Corinna's flaw is not to be found on her physical body, but is displayed on her face all the same.

Ironically, Corinna is castigated here for following the advice that Ovid has given in *Amores* 1.14. Just as the *puella* was encouraged to forget her old reflection and focus on the new, now that her hair has been cosmetically altered, the Corinna of 2.17 has forgotten her 'natural,' unadulterated image and bases her self-identity solely on her post-*cultus* reflection. The theme and language of self-knowledge and self-forgetting is also markedly similar in these poems,⁴³ underscoring the close relationship shown in 1.14 between self-identity and memory, both of

⁴⁰ As McKeown (1998) points out (*ad Am.* 2.17.7-8), there is parodic play here with the maxim γνῶθι σεαυτόν, which Ovid also performs at *Ars Am.* 2.498ff.

⁴¹ Her self-knowledge stands in contrast to the 'unaccustomed eyes' of the *puella* of 1.14: *non bene consuetis a te spectaris ocellis* (1.14.38). 2.17 is more usually compared to 1.3, since both poems promise the *puella* fame in poetry (cf. McKeown (1998), 367; Baar (2006), 222-226).

⁴² McKeown (1998), *ad Am.* 2.17.9-10.

⁴³ For example, note the repeated use of the reflexive pronoun in these lines: *debes inmemor esse tui* (1.14.39); *cur est tam bene nota sibi?* (2.17.8).

which are here based entirely on visual stimuli.⁴⁴ If a woman's essential self is based on her image in the mirror, then *cultus* provides her with the opportunity to modify that image and, consequently, her self. Before it reaches the reader, however, that image must necessarily be filtered through the perspective of the poet-lover. In her discussion of specularity in Ovid's amatory works, Rimell (2006) argues: "Mirrors lend women the power to know and control appearances, yet in so doing, we are reminded, they expose the limits of female individuation: they are the snare she has set herself."⁴⁵ In other words, a woman may change her appearance to amend her self-identity, but that identity, then, must always be fundamentally constructed through visibility; she can only control her identity as long as she is viewing herself in the mirror, rather than being viewed by the poet-lover. Unfortunately for the *puella* of 2.17, the poet-lover is in charge of the memorialization of her beauty, and the reader's perception of it is entirely constructed through his remembrance, filtered through his gaze. *Cultus* is, therefore, deemed unacceptable when it changes how the *puella* perceives and remembers herself to the detriment of the poet-lover. He paints a picture of Corinna, deep in reflection, which shows her arrogance as a physical flaw in her beauty, and it is this blemish, brought on by *cultus*, that he chooses to memorialize in 2.17.

The treatment of female beauty in *Amores* emphasizes the flaws of the *puella*, even as it calls into question elegy's memory of the *puella* as perfectly beautiful. Indeed, Ovid's adoption of his predecessors' anti-cosmetic attitudes serves a different purpose than in previous elegy. Instead of extolling female bodily perfection, he consistently focuses on the flaws of the *puella*, deeming them more memorable than her 'natural' beauty. The *puella* is characterized in terms of these imperfections, as she is denied any agency in her own remembrance. She functions as a

⁴⁴ See Introduction above for Romans' understanding of memory as primarily visual.

⁴⁵ Rimell (2006), 57.

static *imago*, not a viewer herself, but rather a visual prompt to memory for the lover-poet, whose poetry remembers her from the perspective of the male gaze. However, the poet's mnemonic power is not always so potent in *Amores*. In some instances, blemishes on the *puella*'s body can expose the falsehood of elegy's treatment of female beauty, laying bare the limitations in the poet's control over memory.

Revealing and Concealing: The Failure of False Memories in *Amores*

Despite the constant contention in Ovid's poetry, as well as other elegy, that feminine beauty is inherently deceptive, the female body is sometimes shown to reveal, rather than deceive. In *Amores*, revelatory marks on the body, primarily blushing and bite marks, can demonstrate a woman's character: blushing indicates modesty and good morals,⁴⁶ whereas bite marks are often proof to the elegist of his *puella*'s infidelity.⁴⁷ Unlike the beautification effects of *cultus*, these marks are involuntary and, thus, show the genuine, rather than feigned, face of the *puella*. Although they are free from the stigma of the anti-cosmetic rhetoric, which characterizes modifications to the female body as deceptive, these revelatory marks often occur in contexts in which pretense might be preferred, at least from the poet-lover's perspective.

In *Am.* 1.7, Ovid strikes his *puella* and regrets it. He describes the scene in detail, the *puella*'s body taking center stage. She is in tears (4, 22, 57-58), her hair has fallen down (12, 49), her cheeks bear his nail-marks (40, 50), her dress has been torn (47-48), her face is white with shock (51-52), her limbs tremble (53-56). Her entire body displays the proof of his rage, just as Venus was wounded by Diomedes's fury: *pessima Tydides scelerum monimenta reliquit. / ille deam primus perculit—alter ego!* (*Am.* 1.7.31-32; The son of Tydeus left behind terrible

⁴⁶ Or, if not good behavior, then shame at bad behavior: e.g., Cypassis blushes and reveals her affair with the poet-lover to her mistress in *Am.* 2.8. See also *Am.* 2.5, for the connection between blushing and shame (*purpureus pudor*, 34); cf. Boyd's (1997) analysis of the intertextual resonances of the similes in 2.5.33-42 (110-116).

⁴⁷ Cf. Horace *C.* 1.13; Prop. 4.3.26; *Am.* 1.8.98, 3.14.31-34 (see below). For bite marks in the context of other wounds of love in elegy, see Raucci (2011), 35-58.

reminders of his misdeeds. He was the first to strike a goddess—I am the second!). Unlike the bodily flaws we have seen above, the marks on the *puella*'s body reveal not her own faults but the poet-lover's. These marks are physical memorials (*monimenta*), inscribed on her skin, to his error, just as the poem memorializes the scene itself. Having lost control of both his temper and his power over memorialization, the poet-lover is unable to erase the memory of what he has done. Ovid describes his assault as violence against a divine being, the most heinous of crimes, made worse by the fact that he struck the woman he professed to love, rather than an enemy in battle (*mihi, quam profitebar amare laesa est; Tydides saevus in hoste fuit*, 34-35).⁴⁸ Instead of fighting against love, he wishes that he had marked her with signs of his affection: *aptius impressis fuerat livere labellis / et collum blandi dentis habere notam* (*Am.* 1.7.41-42; it would have been better for her to be bruised by the press of my lips and her lovely neck to bear the marks of my teeth). From Ovid's perspective, kisses and bite marks are more suitable wounds for the elegiac lover to dole out, marking the *puella* as beloved, rather than vanquished.⁴⁹

The attack on her body, however, has not diminished the *puella*'s beauty. In keeping with the anti-cosmetic ethos, the *puella* appears beautiful even with her hair in disarray: *nec dominam motae dedecere comae. / sic formosa fuit.* (*Am.* 1.7.12-13; but her discomposed hair was not unbecoming; she was still beautiful). Nonetheless, the narrator implores his *puella* to fix her hair again at the end of the poem, so that the marks he has made on her beauty will be removed: *neve mei sceleris tam tristia signa supersint / pone recompositas in statione comas* (*Am.* 1.7.67-68;

⁴⁸ McKeown (1989) argues that Ovid may “be drawing on declamatory exercises on the subjects *qui patrem pulsaverit, manus ei praecidantur* (Sen. *Contr.* 9.4, [Quint.] *Decl.* 358, 362, 372, also Theon 2.130.30f. Spengel) and *sacrilego manus praecidantur* (Sen. *Contr.* 8.2)” (164, *ad loc.*.” As he notes elsewhere (1987), many of the poems of *Amores* “are, in fact eroticised versions of *declamationes*” (69).

⁴⁹ Although, as Greene (1999) points out: “The scars of love, bruised lips and bites on the neck, sound curiously similar to the scratches on the *puella*'s cheeks. The link between the two also undercuts the speaker's claims of guilt, since demonstrations of affection appear to be so close to physical abuse” (415). On erotic violence in *Am.* 1.7, see especially Fredrick (1997), Greene (1999), and James (2003), 184-197.

lest the terrible signs of my crime remain, put your hair back into its arrangement again).⁵⁰ It is significant that his attempts to erase the *monimenta* of his misdeeds from her body must be enacted through *cultus*. The art of adornment restores the illusion of perfect elegiac beauty; the *puella*'s hair, restored to its pristine condition, will mask the violence perpetrated against her and the precarious situation of the love affair. However, while *Am.* 1.7 employs *cultus* as a means of deception, hiding the true nature of the event, it is the memory of violence that is ephemeral. The *monimenta* of the deed are inscribed on flesh, rather than stone; the *puella*'s beauty will be repaired, leaving the poem as the only lasting memorial to the event.

Despite this return to the status quo, the poet-lover portrays himself as lacking control over the process of memory production. In *Am.* 1.10, the poet-lover claims to have complete control over the poetic memorialization of the *puella*, whom he threatens with anonymity as punishment for her infidelity. His sway over her *fama* gives him leverage in a relationship that he, as all elegists, represents as precipitously imbalanced, in favor of the *domina*. Here, such a skewed perception the power dynamics of the elegiac relationship is shown to be merely a poetic fiction. The poet-lover's physical dominance over his *puella*, the hapless victim of his cruelty, reveals a crack in the veneer of the elegiac narrative, displaying a reality much closer to the truth of Roman gender politics than the false memories elegy presents. The tension between the blemished body of the beloved, marked by a memorial to his crime, and his own desperation to erase the memory of this mark, casts into doubt the elegiac poet's mastery over memory. If he is incapable of controlling the memorialization of the *puella*, she may not be subject to his threats to her *fama*. Perhaps, instead, she has the power to affect memory, as well.

Amores 3.14, indeed, suggests that the *puella* can wield memory, as well, at least within the narrative of the elegiac love affair. In this poem, the narrator addresses his *puella*, who has

⁵⁰ For the significance of the language of hair and hair-dressing to Ovid's elegiac poetics, see Papaioannou (2006).

been conducting affairs with his rivals. He does not beg her to be faithful, but merely to conceal her dalliances: *non ego, ne pecces, cum sis formosa, recuso, / sed ne sit misero scire necesse mihi* (*Am.* 3.14.1-2; I do not ask that you not sin, since you are beautiful, but that I, wretched, should not have to know about it). In these first lines, beauty and deception are inextricably tied. He knows that she will engage in love affairs because she is beautiful, and he knows better than to ask a beautiful woman to be monogamous.⁵¹ Instead, he relies on her ability to deceive, the primary characteristic of a beautiful elegiac woman. Indeed, he advises that she incorporate this extra layer of deception into her toilette: *indue cum tunicis metuentem crimina vultum* (*Am.* 3.14.27; put on with your gown a face that shies away from misdeeds). Ovid asks the *puella* to put on an honest face as part of the trappings of *cultus*, although her actions are far from virtuous. At present, he laments, she neglects her appearance, displaying her affairs openly: *cur plus quam somno turbatos esse capillos / collaque conspicio dentis habere notam?* (*Am.* 3.14.33-34; why do I see that your hair has been disarrayed by more than sleep and that your neck bears teeth marks?) The *puella*'s body reveals her misdeeds, facilitated by her lack of deceptive *cultus*. Far from the jealous lover of 1.7 who only wished to mark his *puella* as his own, the narrator here only wishes to experience the false memory that flawless beauty entails. He contends that he will be convinced if she merely puts on a verbal, rather than physical, show; she, like a rhetorician, may convince him through her swift denial that he does not see what he has seen (*quae bene visa mihi fuerint, bene visa negato*, 45). She must only make sure that she remembers to deny it: *sit modo 'non feci!' dicere lingua memor* (*Am.* 3.14.48; may your tongue remember to say, 'I didn't do it!'). Where her physical appearance fails, the narrator contends that words will succeed, if only she remembers the correct ones. Not just the poet, but the *puella*, has the power to create false memories.

⁵¹ On *Am.* 3.14 as a deconstruction of elegiac *fides*, see Hardie (2002), 38, 240.

It is particularly salient here that the *puella* is asked to make her case in words, rather than by using her physical appearance. This reliance on verbal communication, in some ways, aligns her with the poet, whose poetry, of course, relies on the word.⁵² However, unlike the poet, she is incapable of using visual prompts to memory; instead, she must convince him only using words that he has not seen what he has, in fact, seen. As *Remedia* shows, visual images are the most powerful prompts to false memory, a fact that lowers the *puella*'s odds of success for altering visual true memories by creating verbal false memories. *Amores*, as well, consistently demonstrates that blemishes are far more memorable than perfect beauty, ensuring that the *puella*'s physical faults will be better remembered by the poet than her coaxing words. Rhetorical argumentation, even in poetic form, cannot be as powerful a tool for persuasion as the female body. Despite the poet-lover's willingness to misremember, the *puella*'s bodily imperfections will hamper her ability to take control of her own poetic memorialization and to create false memories in the mind of the poet-lover.

Conclusion

In his amatory works, Ovid plays with the relationship between feminine beauty and poetic memorialization introduced by his elegiac predecessors. Taking their anti-cosmetic topos even further, Ovid shows beauty to be always deceptive; in his poetry, the perfect beauty of previous elegy does not exist. Instead, he chooses as his subject flawed beauty, revealing the *puella* as marred physically and, often, morally. *Amores* shows, again and again, that flaws are more memorable than perfect beauty. Adding to the paradox of Ovid's earlier elegy, *Remedia*

⁵² Metapoetic readings of this poem abound; Ovid's penultimate poem in *Amores* is interpreted as an attempt to close the gap between *puella* and poetry. Hardie's (2002) discussion of Ovid's "absent presences" emphasizes the acknowledgement in '*non feci*' that the *puella* (and the elegiac narrative) is a fictional construct: "The *puella* did nothing. *fecit Publius Ovidius Naso*" (240). Even as, within the narrative of the poem, the lover becomes more subservient to his *puella*, the poet takes control of the metapoetic message of his text. As Holzberg (1997) puts it, "Doch als *poeta* ist er durchaus Herr seiner Entscheidungen" (73). See also Bretzigheimer (2001), 38-41.

advises the lover to remember his beloved as flawed in order to forget her. But this strategy is, of course, flawed in and of itself, since preserving her faults makes the *puella* even more unforgettable. Revealing, rather than deceiving, marks on the body also call into question the control the poet-lover has over the production of false memories. The deceptive powers of *cultus* cannot truly overwrite the memory of misdeeds preserved in elegiac poetry and inscribed on the female body. As Ovid shows, just as perfect beauty is impossible to achieve, its imperfection is impossible to forget.

CHAPTER FOUR:

Remedia (Re)members *Heroides*: Embodiment and Epistolarity

Introduction

We have seen how Ovid's *praecepta* in *Remedia*, for the lover who wishes to forget love, show elegiac strategies for memory production employed by male lover-poets. In this chapter, I consider how the Ovidian *praeceptor*'s advice reflects the ways in which *puellae* create their own memory in elegy. In *Remedia*, text acts as a stand-in for physical presence, as well as an impetus to memory. Ovid, therefore, suggests that the lover should burn the letters of his *puella* to avoid thinking about her when she is absent. This precept recalls the figure of the abandoned woman,¹ along with her strategies for remembering love and avoiding being forgotten. If the lover were to follow *Remedia*'s advice, he would inevitably leave behind his *puella*, resulting in the creation of a new abandoned woman. In elegy, the *puella relicta* is anxious about being forgotten, about becoming voiceless; this fear of voicelessness, however, gives her a voice in

¹ The trope of the abandoned woman, as Lipking's (1988) comparative study makes clear, is represented across cultures, languages, and time periods. As he puts it, "abandoned women *are* poetic tradition, or at least so all-encompassing that no one could overlook them" (28-29). However, as he immediately goes on to point out: "Yet they *have* been overlooked. However ubiquitous, however important, the figure of the abandoned woman continues to be ignored by critics and other authorities. Her role in tradition may even depend on this peculiar status, her capacity for being at once always present and always outcast" (29). Lipking's observation holds today; although there have been a few in other fields of study, there have been no other major (or, indeed, minor) studies explicitly concerned with the trope of abandoned women in ancient literature. However, Spoth (1992), although he does not exactly establish a link to the topos of the *puella relicta*, demonstrates an important connection between the poetic mode of lament adopted by the heroines of myth and the lover-poets of elegy. He compares the *querela* of the heroines to the elegiac trope of the *paraklausithyron*: "Damit stehen die Heroides in der Grundsituation elegischer Liebe, der Situation des *exclusus amator*, sie sind gleichsam mythologische Paraklausithyra.... Die Heroinnen sind von ihren Geliebten meist nicht durch Türschwellen, sondern durch Länder und Meere getrennt; sie sind ‚ausgeschlossen‘ aus dem Leben ihrer Partner, die die werbende Klage erweichen soll" (34). See Ch. 5 for the trope of the *exclusus amator* in *Remedia*.

poetry.² Since the laments of abandoned women are a significant driving force behind elegiac production, Ovid's counsel, then, appears to augment elegiac memory production, adding yet more voices demanding to be remembered, rather than to signal its obliteration through a program of forgetting.

The admonition to burn the letters of the *puella* in *Remedia* also recalls the epistles of Ovid's earlier *Heroides*, a collection of poetic letters written in the voices of abandoned mythological heroines. The letters of *Heroides* elucidate the memory production strategies of the *puellae relictæ* of elegy. Their modes of memory production often echo the mnemonic methods of the poet-lovers of elegy. Like their male counterparts, the heroines implore their lovers to remember them and the love affair and to remain faithful. They prioritize the memorialization of affect over familial duty, privileging *amor* over *honor*. They eroticize the female body, situating the memory of the love affair on her corporeal form, as well as connecting it to the written text. However, these female writer-heroines differ from the male lover-poets in the ways in which they evoke bodily remembrance. Although both groups use their writing to take control of their own *remembrance*, the *puellae relictæ* experience an additional layer of anxiety about being

² The *puella relicta*, of course, is a female character written by a male poet, not a flesh-and-blood woman who can voice (or write) her own story. Feminist scholarship on *Heroides* in particular has been divided as to whether the epistles represent an overtly male assumption of the female voice (cf. Harvey (1989), Lindheim (2003)) or a legitimate attempt by Ovid to take on a woman's perspective (cf. Smith (1994), Fulkerson (2005)). Essentially, these two camps disagree about the perspective of the external reader: is the reader, constructed as male, encouraged to view himself as superior to the vulnerable heroine? Or is the reader (male or female) prompted to empathize with the female characters? My perspective, although it falls somewhat in between the two poles, tends to lean towards the latter. I read *Heroides* as neither explicitly male- or female-centered; the voice of a male author is always present, but the text itself is indeed focalized through the sympathetic voices of the heroines, as internal narrators. (For other recent contributions relevant to this discussion, see also Davis (2005) and Rimell (2006), 123-155.) I take as a particular model Fulkerson's approach in her 2005 study of *Heroides*, which explores the literary consciousness of the heroines as writers in an epistolary community. As she argues, "The *Heroides* present a *fiction* of the female voice that cannot but be provocative in light of the women's distinguished history as characters in (male-authored) master narratives. I return to the women's own voices, mediated as they inevitably are by Ovid, precisely because his 'female voice' has seemed so authentic to so many of his readers" (5). As she argues, we are compelled to read Ovid's heroines as female writers because Ovid presents them as such. In my treatment of the heroines of elegy, I view the heroines as speakers (or writers) within the narrative of the poem, just as I have considered the figures of the lover-poet and the *praeceptor*, distinct from the elegist himself.

forgotten and, sometimes, forgetting themselves. Since their own bodies, rather than their partners', are implicated in the preservation of memory, the heroines fear not only loss of memory, but loss of bodily sense perception. They use the letter as a material reminder to simulate their presence, a physical object that is construed as a visceral connection to their bodies. *Heroides* explores the ways in which written and oral memories can engender near-corporeality by evoking intense remembrance in a way the poet-lovers of elegy do not consider. The production of embodied memory in *Heroides* is characterized by tensions between the materiality of the text, the corporeality of the absent *puella*, and, in some cases, the dematerialized and disembodied voice of the writer.

Sparking Memory: Burning Letters in *Remedia*

Near the end of *Remedia*, the *praeceptor* counsels the lover to perform a small, but valuable, task:³ do not read the *puella*'s letters. Rereading letters, like revisiting certain places,⁴ can revive memory and restore love: *scripta cave relegas blandae servata puellae: / constantes animos scripta relecta movent* (*Rem.* 717-718; Take care not to reread the cherished letters of your charming girl; reread letters move even steadfast hearts). Love letters are dangerous to the lover attempting to forget his love, since they provide verbal cues to memory, reminding the lover of details of the love affair and his *puella*'s amorous professions. Exchanges of letters between the lover and his *puella* are an elegiac topos, their content ranging from poetic seduction to pragmatic planning of assignations.⁵ Indeed, the Ovidian *praeceptor* has already advised the student-lovers of *Ars Amatoria* how to properly communicate *via* letter to maintain the elegiac

³ *exiguum est, quod deinde canam, sed profuit illud / exiguum multis, in quibus ipse fui* (*Rem.* 715-716; It's a small thing that I next intone, but this small thing has been a boon to many, and I count myself among them). Despite the acknowledgement that this task appears of little import, the personal endorsement of the benefit of this *praeceptum* emphasizes its rhetorical value.

⁴ The theme of avoiding certain *loca* is revived in *Rem.* 725-740, immediately following the advice on letters See Ch. 2 for the connection between the memory of love and space.

⁵ For a list of *comparanda* in elegy, see Gibson (2003), 288-289.

relationship when the lovers cannot be physically together. He argues, in his advice to male lovers, that their writing should be as smooth as their speech, so that they seem to be speaking in the *puella*'s presence (*praesens ut videre loqui*, *Ars* 1.468).⁶ The written letter, then, stands in for oral speech and can effectively make the writer appear present for her/his partner. Reading the letter of the *puella*, therefore, is just as dangerous as seeing her in the flesh.

Before receiving the advice to avoid letters, the lover-student of *Remedia* has already been instructed to avoid communication with his *puella* after cutting off the love affair. In a series of *praecepta* that encourage the lover to keep quiet, the *praeceptor* portrays the *puella*'s words as dangerous and the lover's as ineffectual against the power of female speech. Indeed, conversation with the *puella* is seen as a battle, and the lover must gird himself for war with the armor of *praecepta*: *quod si vos aliquis casus conducet in unum, / mente memor tota quae damus arma tene* (*Rem.* 674; But if some chance should bring you together in the same place, remember and mentally take up the arms which I give you). The *puella* is figured as fierce Penthesilea (676),⁷ as the lover-student becomes a soldier in the war of words. To avoid being swayed by the speech of the *puella*, the best approach is to avoid engaging at all. He argues that the lover ought not complain to the *puella*, lest his explanations backfire:

*nec causas aperi, quare divortia malis,
nec dic quid doleas, clam tamen usque dole.
nec peccata refer, ne diluat; ipse favebis,
ut melior causa causa sit illa tua.
qui silet, est firmus; qui dicit multa puellae
probra, satisfieri postulat ille sibi.* (*Rem.* 693-698)

(Don't reveal the reasons why you want to separate; don't say what's bothering you, but

⁶ The *praeceptor* addresses letter-writing, for men, at 1.437-86 and, for women, at 3.467-98.

⁷ Henderson (1979), *ad loc.*, points out that Ovid "harnessed the combat of Greeks and Amazons in the service of the *militia amoris* metaphor" previously, in *Ars Amatoria*. Here, however, as elsewhere in *Remedia*, the lover-student must fight against love, rather than for it.

keep quietly bothered nonetheless. Don't rehearse her offenses, lest she refute them. You will help her yourself, making her case better than yours. A silent man is a resolute man; a man who lists all his girlfriend's flaws out loud is just asking to be won over.)

The lover should refrain from telling the *puella* his grievances, lest she (pretend to) rectify them and convince him to return to her. Like opposing counsel, she will turn the lover's arguments against him until she wins her case. Here, then, the *puella* is a master rhetorician, using her words (and his) as weapons against the lover. Female speech is a trap that the lover must sidestep by remembering the *praeceptor*'s advice to remain silent.

In addition to not speaking himself, the lover must also avoid listening to his *puella*'s complaints. Far from being a helpless damsel in distress, the *puella* shrewdly manufactures insincere speeches, oaths, and tears to get what she wants:

*at tu nec voces (quid enim fallacius illis?)
crede, nec aeternos pondus habere deos.
neve puellarum lacrimis moveare, caveto;
ut flerent, oculos erudiere suos. (Rem. 687-690)*

(Don't believe their speeches (for what is more deceitful than that?), and don't think the eternal gods are of any consequence to them. Don't let yourself be moved by female tears. Beware! They have taught their eyes to cry.)

Here, the *praeceptor* emphasizes the female capacity for deceit,⁸ as the *puella* makes a tearful attempt to persuade the lover to return to her. She lies, and her very voice (*voces*) is false; she swears by the gods, but her oaths are false; even her tears are false, trumped up to persuade the gullible lover. Feigned tears and false words, however, ought not sway the lover who keeps the *praeceptor*'s warnings in mind. The good lover-student knows to neither speak nor listen to the *puella*, whose attempts to communicate with him are nothing but an attempt to remind him of their love and make him forget his resolve. He will recognize her voice and tears as falsehoods

⁸ For deceit as characteristic of the *puella* and, especially, of the female body, see Ch. 3. For the gendered politics of weeping in elegy, see James (2003).

and, thus, avoid the snare of female speech in her presence.

The proscription against letters is an integral part, then, of this warning against the dangers of women's speech. By rereading (*relegas*, 717) the letters of the *puella*, the lover risks entering her presence unarmed with the *praeceptor's* advice. The letter, which can emulate the presence of the absent *puella*, also can hide her subterfuge. Since he can neither hear her voice nor see her tears, both marked as cues to the *puella's* deceit, the lover may fail to recognize her written words as untrustworthy. Rereading her letters, then, is simply too dangerous for the lover who must not only refrain from remembering the emotional details of the love affair that the letters might include, but also avoid his *puella's* physical presence.

Lest he be tempted to disobey the *praeceptor's* injunction, the lover must, out of dire necessity, destroy the *puella's* letters. Immediately after instructing the lover not to reread the letters, he advises that they, as well as other material reminders of the beloved, must be burned if the lover is to forget his *puella*:

*omnia pone feros (pones invitus) in ignes
et dic 'ardoris sit rogas iste mei.'
Thestias absentem succendit stipite natum;
tu timide flammae perfida verba dabis?
si potes, et ceras remove; quid imagine muta
carperis? hoc periit Laodamia modo. (Rem. 717-724)*

(Place all [the letters] (even though you do so reluctantly) in the fierce fire, and say: 'This is the pyre of my ardor.' The daughter of Thestius [Althaea] set aflame, by his firebrand, her absent son; will you be fearful in handing over false words to the flames? If you can, also put away waxen images: why are you consumed by a mute image? Laodamia died in this way.)

Here the *praeceptor* advises that the lover not only avoid rereading the letters his beloved has sent him, but that he burn them to avoid temptation. He imagines the lover as reluctant to carry

out this erasure of a material connection to his beloved, and he exhorts the lover to be brave, like the mythical Althaea, who killed her son, Meleager, by destroying his firebrand, a totem on which his life depended.⁹ If she was able to set on fire the non-corporeal manifestation of her loved one, the *praeceptor* asks, why can't the lover do the same, especially since his *puella* was not a blood relative, but a deceitful woman? He follows this advice by encouraging the lover to add more fuel to the flames. Waxen images, though silent, can be deadly, the *praeceptor* argues, bringing as evidence the case of Laodamia, who mourned over the image of her husband Protesilaus until she was driven to suicide.¹⁰ The lover must destroy all material manifestations of his beloved or he risks, as always in *Remedia*, death caused by love.

While the instruction itself is clear, the connection between letters and images is somewhat tenuous, as is the association between the incineration of physical reminders of the beloved and the *exempla* of these mythical figures. As we have seen in *Remedia*, however, letters in elegy function as material objects that make present the absent subject, and this characteristic ties together letters and images, as well as the advice and the *exempla*. Physical objects, although they are but mute images (*imagine muta*, 723) and, therefore, do not have the verbal power of letters, similarly can emulate the presence of someone who is absent. Althaea was able to exert control over Meleager's physical body by using his firebrand. So, the lover, through burning his *puella*'s letters, the manifestation of the love affair, holds power of life and death of the elegiac relationship. Just as Laodamia, unable to avoid looking at the waxen image of her dead husband,

⁹ As Davisson (1996) points out, Althaea is the only positive female *exemplum* given in *Remedia*. She particularly notes the stark irony of such a positive spin on the story of Althaea: "Whereas the positive male *exempla* usually required us to supply the negative consequences from our own knowledge, here the *praeceptor* is so blunt—*Thestias absentem succendit stipite natum*—as to give us pause for thought before imitating this most unmaternal mother" (250).

¹⁰ In the *Fabulae* of Hyginus (who may be a contemporary of Ovid), Laodamia's father burned the image of her husband to stop her obsessive mourning. She threw herself on the pyre with the image and thus committed suicide. Scholars postulate that Hyginus's tale may have been based on Euripides (now lost) *Protesilaus*. See Lyne (1998) for details of the tradition of the Laodamia-Protesilaus story.

could not help but constantly recall him, so the lover who does not take control of such physical reminders by destroying them will be destroyed himself. Letters and images, objects that appear to make present the beloved, are exceptionally dangerous to the lover and must be destroyed.

The myth of Laodamia here particularly underscores the role of material objects in preserving, or, alternately, destroying, the memory of the beloved. In Laodamia's story, the waxen image appears to function primarily as a memory trigger, a material prompt to a mental image of the beloved. Like a letter, then, the image not only recalls past details of the love affair, but also emulates the presence of the absent lover. Indeed, the fact that image of Protesilaus is specifically made of wax (*ceras*, 723) particularly emphasizes not only its connection to letters, often inscribed on wax tablets, rather than papyrus,¹¹ but also its cultural association with memory.¹² Laodamia is consumed by her husband's memory, evoked by the image that makes him appear present. This brief *exemplum* both highlights and complicates the role of materiality in preserving memory. The lover must burn the letters and waxen images, which both act as physical triggers to memory and make past memories present for the lover.

Ovid's choice of *exempla* in this passage points us towards an explanation of how physical manifestations of memory function for elegy's abandoned women. The character of Laodamia was marked as a *puella relictā* figure previously in love poetry by Catullus (68), Propertius (1.19), and even by Ovid in his earlier *Heroides* (13), as I explore below. Laodamia, and her fellow abandoned women of the elegiac tradition, are ideal analogues for *Remedia's* *puella*, as these heroines represent the goal of *Remedia*: the woman forgotten. Remembering the

¹¹ Indeed, at *Ars* 3.494-5, the *praeceptor* gives a particular warning that the *puella* must completely erase wax tablets which have carried notes to the lover, lest someone read their traces.

¹² The use of wax as a metaphor for the mind, on which images might be imprinted, can be traced throughout discussions of memory from the ancient world, from Aristotle to Cicero. Latin mnemonics treatises frequently compare memorization to writing on a wax tablet (cf. Cicero, *De oratore* II,88.360). See Yates (1966), 35-36; Small (1997), 132-133.

speech of abandoned women, constructed to preserve the memory of the love affair, is dangerous to the lover. In order to fully understand this threat to student-lover of *Remedia*, we must first explore how the *puellae relictæ* of previous love poetry construct memory.

The Abandoned Woman Archetype: Catullus's Ariadne

The abandoned woman, the *puella relicta*, is a literary trope common to Latin love poetry. Left behind by a lover who has forgotten her, she laments her loneliness and the betrayal of her lover. Alone and remote (either literally or emotionally), she gives a soliloquy, in which she expresses regret about her lover's broken promises and the pain caused by separation from her family, no longer ameliorated by erotic passion. Vulnerable and isolated, she often conveys fear for her life and imagines, sometimes presciently, her own death. She might wish harm on her faithless lover, calling the wrath of the gods down upon him or even swear to herself exact revenge. As with all topoi, the details of the story may change, but the basic script remains the same.¹³ One of these essential features of the elegiac abandoned woman is the *puella*'s anxiety about a loss of her voice and, concomitantly, a loss of memory. The heroine's *querela* attempts to memorialize her perspective on the events of the love affair, and she expresses concerns about being remembered, as well as concerns about her own forgetting. The laments of the abandoned woman, the *puella relicta* deserted by a hero, much like the complaints of the poet-lover, the *exclusus amator* denied love by his cruel mistress, reveal her own strategies for memory production, comparable to those of the elegist himself.

Although there are many, the most significant model for the figure of the abandoned

¹³ Indeed, the script of the *puella relicta*'s lament is perceived, even by modern scholars, to be so consistent that *Heroides*' catalogue of abandoned women has often been charged with monotony. For more discussion of elegiac scripts, and Ovid's alterations to them, see Ch. 5.

woman in Latin elegy is Catullus's Ariadne.¹⁴ Within the narrative of the poem, her ecphrastic depiction on a tapestry reflects the visual topos of her lonely lament on the shore of Dia and her canonization in both literary and visual media as the essential archetype of the *puella relicta*.¹⁵ Catullus's characterization of Ariadne, itself influenced by previous models,¹⁶ becomes a source for representations of abandoned women thereafter, especially throughout elegy. Further, the poem's specific attention to memory firmly establishes Catullus's Ariadne as a particularly salient model for a study of abandoned women and their methods of memory production.

As scholars have noted,¹⁷ the theme of remembering and forgetting runs throughout Catullus 64. Much of the language of memory is focused on Theseus, marked as forgetful, and his tendency to forget is tied to both his abandonment of Ariadne and his father's death. The

¹⁴ For Catullus's Ariadne as an influence on the *puellae* of Latin elegy, see Gardner (2007). For Catullus's influence on elegy more generally, see Luck (1969), 56-69; Ross (1975); Lyne (1980) 19-61.

¹⁵ The scholarly discussion of ecphrasis in Cat. 64 is vast. On the unity between the ecphrasis and the rest of the *epyllion*, see Putnam (1961). Laird (1993) argues that 64's ecphrasis is unique in emphasizing characteristics not usually observed in visual art, like sound; Catullus's treatment can "expose the way that verbal narrative can efface the ontological difference between Ariadne in a picture and Ariadne directly described" (29). As many have noted, the ecphrasis reflects the frequency of Ariadne as a figure in Roman visual art. For a brief overview of the myth's iconographic tradition, see Schmale (2004), 136-139. Fitzgerald (1995), Elsner (2007), and Dufallo (2013) compare the ecphrasis passage with Campanian wall painting. Wiseman (2015) takes the discussion of the reciprocal influence of visual media and poetry even further, suggesting that we read Cat. 64 as a script for staged performance (109-110).

¹⁶ On 64's Ariadne ecphrasis within the ancient ecphrastic tradition, see Schmale (2004), 103-129. Thomas (1982), Clare (1996), LeFèvre (2000), Armstrong (2006), and DeBrohun (2007) focus on the influence of Apollonius's *Argonautica* as the model for 64. Sebesta (1994) instead contends that Theoc. *Idyll* 15 is 64's primary model. Reitz (2002) suggests that Ariadne's monologue borrows its structure from drama, including comedy.

¹⁷ Since Klingner (1956), scholars have acknowledged memory and its loss as a motif in 64. Heil (2003) and Armstrong (2006) offer the most extensive recent treatments of memory in Cat. 64. Heil (2003) focuses on "die poetologischen und intertextuellen Implikationen der auffälligen Verwendung der Begriffe *memor* und *immemor*" (60 n.4). He argues that Catullus leaves the question of Theseus's culpability for his forgetfulness up to the reader as part of an intertextual reference to the traditional version of the myth, which primarily focuses on Theseus as an epic hero: "Der *immemor* Theseus vergißt Ariadne, der *immemor* Catull ,vergißt' Theseus, indem er die Geschichte fast ausschließlich aus der Perspektive Ariadnes erzählt" (65). Armstrong (2006) similarly treats the interaction between personal and poetic memory in Cat. 64, but she sees less ambiguity in the question of Theseus's culpability: "For Catullus' Ariadne, a victim of Theseus' lack of memory, it is a firmly held belief that there is a moral duty to remember the good deeds others have done and to be generous in return. The character's condemnation of Theseus as forgetful, *immemor*, and her concern with memory complements and intertwines with the poet's own interest in capturing within his work memories of the earlier texts which have helped to form the character in his poem" (18). According to Armstrong, 64 shares an "obsession with the morality of remembrance" with the rest of Catullus's corpus (55). Seider (2013) compares the irreconcilability of memory between two lovers in the relationship of *Aeneid*'s Dido and Aeneas to that of Cat. 64's Ariadne and Theseus, arguing that Aeneas's culpability for his forgetfulness depends on, but ultimately differs from, Theseus's blameworthiness (114-121).

epithet *immemor* is directly applied to Theseus twice (at 64.58, by the narrator; at 64.135, by Ariadne herself), and his actions are often taken without recourse to mindful thought. Although his father entreats him to remember (*memori...corde*, 64.231), the narrator consistently states that Theseus's heart is forgetful (*immemori...pectore*, 64.123; *oblito...pectore*, 64.208). Previously mindful of his father's orders (*mandata prius constanti mente*, 64.209, repeated at 238), his mind no longer remembers (*mente immemori*, 64.248). Most of these complaints against Theseus's memory are doled out by the poet-narrator, not Ariadne herself. Ariadne, instead, focuses on her own strategies for memorialization, designed to counter Theseus's ingrained forgetfulness.

Ariadne's memorialization in verse is, first and foremost, visual. Within the context of the poem, her story is, of course, represented on a piece of visual art, and the portrait she presents to her audience, both inside and outside the narrative of the poem, is striking. Our first image of her is silent and still; she is simply a viewer as everything else moves around her on the shore. She watches as forgetful—and mobile—Theseus flees, beating the sea with his oars (*immemor at iuvenis fugiens pellit vada remis*, 64.58). Even her environment is in motion, the winds and waves stripping her of her clothing, as her headband, garment, and even her girdle slip off into the sea, leaving her head, chest, and breasts bare (64.63-65) She stands motionless, a marble statue (*saxea...effigies*, 64.61), as the waves play at her feet (64.67).¹⁸ Indeed, her only movement is internal: *magnis curarum fluctuat undis* (64.62, she swells with great waves of worry). Her agitated mind is, indeed, not even truly in the same place as her immobile body, but is with Theseus as he sails away (*toto ex te pectore, Theseu, / toto animo, tota pendebat perdita mente* (64.69-70; her whole heart, her whole soul, her whole mind, lost, rests on you, Theseus). The viewer/reader's visual memory of Ariadne, then, is a mixture of pathetic and erotic. Her

¹⁸ Notably, the statue depicts a Bacchant, a detail that both foreshadows Ariadne's future marriage to Bacchus and characterizes her as passionate and frenzied. For the significance of this Bacchic imagery, see Syndikus (1990), 141-142; Laird (1993), 20-21; Gardner (2007), 163-164.

loneliness evokes pity, while her nakedness spurs a voyeuristic desire. However, although immobile, she is not entirely passive in the creation of this memory; she is, indeed, the viewer in this scene: *necdum etiam sese quae visit visere credit, / ut pote fallaci quae tum primum excita somno / desertam in sola miseram se cernat harena* (64.55-57; and she does not yet believe that she sees what she sees, as, stirred from deceitful sleep, she first sees herself deserted on the lonely sand). Even as she watches Theseus, she also sees herself, and, although she is presented to the reader as an object to be viewed, the reader sees her portrait through her own eyes.¹⁹ She determines her own visual memorialization, striking a pose that evokes both pity and desire in the viewer/reader.

The second part of the ecphrasis passage, a flashback episode that relates the narrative of events on Crete, is also framed in terms of memory. As Elsner (2009) points out: “The object of Ariadne’s gaze here is not just the receding Theseus, but also the memory (*commemorem*, 117) of his arrival at Crete and his incursion into her story (or her entrapment in his), as Catullus shifts

¹⁹ The emphasis on visuality in Cat. 64 is widely acknowledged by scholars, but different interpretations of Ariadne’s subjectivity abound. Fitzgerald’s (1995) discussion established the gaze as an integral theme of the poem, but he views Ariadne as primarily an object of the male gaze, exposed to a masculine viewer as her own desiring gaze is “frustrated” (149). Gaisser (1995) is concerned with the threads of focalization in Cat. 64, asking who the speakers (and viewers) in the narrative are: “If we ask ourselves at this point, ‘who sees?’ the answer must be ‘Ariadne.’ Or to be precise: we (the external audience) see the scene through Ariadne’s eyes” (595). My own interpretation completely concurs with this assessment; however, I disagree with Gaisser’s next assertion that “Ariadne sees herself deserted (57), but mostly she sees Theseus.” Ariadne indeed looks for Theseus, but our view, through her eyes, is primarily focused on her. (Indeed, in the first part of the ecphrasis, 64.52-75, only six lines focus on images of Theseus (64.53, 58-59, 73-75), whereas the figure of Ariadne herself is given a long and detailed description.) Armstrong’s (2006) analysis, while she allows Ariadne some agency, argues for a necessary distance between the reader/viewer and Ariadne as viewer herself: “The reader who looks at the tapestry, for all his presumed or at least potential sympathy for Ariadne is detached from her, and even opposed to her, constructed by the sensuality of the text as an excited observer” (194). I disagree that the perspectives of Ariadne and the viewer must be at odds. Indeed, I see no reason that the text’s focus on Ariadne’s body cannot be an expression of her own perspective; it is rhetorically beneficial for her to take advantage of both the reader’s pity, as well as his erotic desire. (I do agree with Fitzgerald that Ariadne’s body is meant to be viewed through the male gaze, but, in a passage characterized by female focalization, this male gaze is constructed by a female viewer.) My thoughts most concur with Elsner’s (2007) view that “Ariadne may also figure the extratextual viewers of the ecphrasis—Catullus himself and his readers, whose access to this picture is always vicariously through its description, and whose response to the subject of this description is continuously focalized through Ariadne’s gaze” (23). The visual imagery of the poem remains focused on, and focalized through, Ariadne herself, and she takes advantage of the (male) viewer’s penchant for erotic voyeurism to portray herself as worthy of both pity and desire.

to recounting the earlier part of the myth.”²⁰ The use of *commemorem* in a statement of praeterition (*sed quid ego a primo digressus carmine plura / commemorem*, 64.116-117; but why should I, having abandoned my first subject, recall any more...?) shows the narrator hastening to return the narrative to Ariadne’s memory, away from Theseus and his forgetfulness. Although this backstory is not always told necessarily through her eyes,²¹ Ariadne emerges as the protagonist in the end, as Theseus’s status as a hero is constantly cast into doubt and his characterization is deemphasized. After this return of memory to Ariadne, she appears on the shores of Dia again, more active this time, as she cries out (*clarisonas imo fudisse e pectore voces*, 64.125; she poured out keening cries from the depths of her heart), alternately running up steep hills and back down to the sea (64.126-128). Over the course of 80 lines, she transitions from an immobile object of *pathos*, an image that ensures her visual memory in the mind of the viewer/reader, to an active subject, and, as we will see, she secures her memorialization through her speech.

Ariadne first addresses her soliloquy to absent Theseus: *sicine me patriis avectam, perfide, ab aris, / perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?* (64.132-133; and so, have you, you liar, abandoned me on the shore, taken from my father’s home, Theseus, you liar?) Her speech begins with her two main complaints: first, that she has been taken from her home and family and, second, that she has been left behind by the man who ought to have taken the place of that family. She emphasizes Theseus’s faithlessness, accusing him of forgetting not just her, but his promises to the gods: *sicine discedens neglecto numine divum / immemor a, devota domum periuria portas?* (64.134-135; and so you are leaving, no thought to the will of the gods,

²⁰ Elsner (2007), 22.

²¹ The question of perspective in Cat. 64 is thorny. Gaisser (1995) asks ‘Who speaks?’ and ‘Who sees?’ in 64, traces shifts in focalization throughout the poem. DeBrohun (1999), through a close reading of one passage in Ariadne’s lament, analyzes the confusion of voices throughout 64.

forgetful—ah!—carrying home your faithfully false oaths?) Theseus's perjuries, she goes on to articulate, include a broken promise of marriage (64.141), which she now believes no woman should ever trust:

*nunc iam nulla viro iuranti femina credat,
nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles;
quis dum aliquid cupiens animus praegestit apisci,
nil metuunt iurare, nihil promittere parcunt;
sed simul ac cupidae mentis satiata libidost,
dicta nihil meminere,²² nihil periuria curant.* (Cat. 64.143-148)

(No longer should any woman believe a man swearing an oath or hope that a man's speeches are trustworthy. For they, while their minds desire something and are eager to attain it, fear swearing nothing, avoid promising nothing; but, as soon as the passions of their voracious minds are sated, they remember none of their words, they care about none of their false oaths.)

Ariadne insists that men's speech is necessarily deceptive, that they are unequal to the task of remembering oaths made to women, and that, thus, women should never trust them. However, it is unclear whether, here, Ariadne characterizes Theseus's forgetfulness as malice aforethought or merely depraved indifference, that is, whether he intentionally swore an oath he never meant to uphold or if he simply did not care enough about the oath, in the end, to uphold it.²³ In either case, she charges him as culpable for his negligence. He, like all men, she argues, is incapable of maintaining the measure of memory that true *fides* requires.²⁴ The first part of her mnemonic strategy, then, is to establish herself as an authority over memory, contrasted with Theseus's

²² I follow Syndikus's (1990) reading, which argues for Czwaliński's conjecture *meminere* (over *metuere*).

²³ On the culpability of Theseus, cf. Courtney (1990), Heil (2003), and Armstrong (2006). (See n. 17 above.)

²⁴ As Ross (1969) points out, Catullus adopts the language of the Roman aristocratic concept of *amicitia*, comparing the breaking of erotic bonds to the destruction of homosocial ties that form the foundation of Roman politics (80-95). For a brief summary of the critiques against Ross's claim by Lyne (1980), Minyard (1985), and Fitzgerald (1995), see Skinner (1997), 143-144 (especially n. 27), and (2003), 69-70 (especially n. 19). Skinner's own argument finds middle ground between the two extremes of Ross and Lyne, asserting that Catullus's language has both political and social resonances within the Roman aristocratic *milieu*.

forgetfulness.

Next, Ariadne attempts to make up for Theseus's lack of memory by reminding him what he owes her. As she points out, she saved his life on Crete (64.149-150). Instead of being remembered and receiving care in exchange for such a service, however, she will be forgotten and left to die herself: *pro quo dilaceranda feris dabor alitibusque / praeda, neque iniacta tumulabor mortua terra* (64.152-153; for this, I will be given as prey to beasts and birds, to be torn to pieces, and I will be left untombed, with no earth scattered over my dead body).

Ariadne's concern about Theseus's forgetfulness is twofold; because he has forgotten the assistance she has given him, she will not be remembered after her death. Her anxiety about being memorialized after death corresponds to the concerns of the lover-poets of elegy, whose memory production strategies require the *puella* to mourn the elegist, stepping into the role of a female family member at his (heavily eroticized) funeral.²⁵ Here, Ariadne laments that she has neither lover, since he abandoned her, nor family, since she abandoned them, to provide her with a proper burial. Her speech can be her only memorial.

Her soliloquy, however, goes unheard within the narrative of the ecphrasis. Although she gives advice to other women and attempts to persuade Theseus, she acknowledges that no one is listening: *sed quid ego ignaris nequiquam conquerar auris, / externata malo, quae nullis sensibus auctae / nec missas audire queunt nec reddere voces?* (64.164-166; but why should I, maddened by my trouble, in vain issue complaints that fall on deaf ears, which, endowed with no senses, cannot hear or return the words I've cried?) Ariadne's monologue stresses the fruitlessness of her lonely, unheard lament, as she attributes her inability to be memorialized to the desolation that surrounds her. Her environment is particularly described as lacking human senses; it has no ears to hear her: *sic nimis insultans extremo tempore saeva / fors etiam nostris*

²⁵ See Ch. 1.

invidit questibus auris (64.169-170; thus cruel fortune, adding insult to injury in my final hour, has now begrudged me ears to hear my complaints).²⁶ The deaf island also cannot speak: *nulla fugae ratio, nulla spes; omnia muta, / omnia sunt deserta, ostentant omnia letum* (64.186-187; there is no escape plan, no hope; everything is mute, everything is deserted, everything lays out death). Ariadne laments that, not only will no one hear her speech, she will leave no trace on the silent island, which has no words to remember her. Ariadne's speech ties memory to human sense perception, particularly, to bodily sense organs that produce and hear voices. Her memory is embodied within her, and she is anxious that, with nobody to pass it on, her memory will decay along with her corpse.

Yet, she holds out hope that the gods may hear her. Even in such an insensate environment, her exhausted body will not become senseless (*nec...a fesso secedent corpore sensus*, 64.189), before she calls, one last time, on the gods for vengeance. Although she has been forgotten by Theseus, and even by her environment, the gods can memorialize her pain by punishing Theseus. She prays to both Jupiter (171ff.) and the Eumenides (192ff.), imploring the latter to remember her lament and enact revenge on Theseus:

*huc huc adventate, meas audite querellas,
 quas ego, vae, misera extremis proferre medullis
 cogor inops, ardens, amenti caeca furore.
 quae quoniam verae nascuntur pectore ab imo,
 vos nolite pati nostrum vanescere luctum;
 sed quali solam Theseus me mente reliquit,*

²⁶ 64.170 picks up the play on *aura/auris* ('air'/ 'ear') from 64.164. This playful use of a *figura etymologica* may underscore the multiple layers of irony in this passage. Ariadne's anxiety over not being heard is, of course, ironic, since her speech has quite the audience, both within the narrative of the poem and outside it. However, the internal audience, that is, the viewers of the tapestry on which Ariadne is depicted, certainly cannot hear her lament, although they may intuit it; they see only the visual image. Alternately, the external audience, the readers of Catullus's poem, do take in her words, although they may or may not hear them read aloud. The play on *aura/auris*, combined with Ariadne's insistence that no one will hear her story, ironically calls attention to the layers of storytelling within the poem.

tali mente, deae, funestet seque suosque. (Cat. 64.195-201)

(Hither, hither, come to me, hear my complaints, which I,—ah!—miserable wretch, am compelled to produce from my deepest marrow, helpless, burning, blind with mindless passion. And since they genuinely rise from deep in my heart, do not suffer my grief to vanish into thin air. But, just as Theseus had a mind to leave me all alone, with such a mind, goddesses, let him ruin himself and his own.)

Ariadne's prayers emphasize the connection between her speech and her body. Her entreaty is ripped from her very marrow (*extremis...medullis*), from the depths of her heart (*pectore ab imo*), and her emotions blind her eyes (*amenti caeca furore*). The memory encapsulated in her laments is visceral. Significantly, her blindness, caused by her anxiety over not being remembered, is echoed by Theseus's own sightlessness as he forgets his father's mandates. After Jupiter assents to Ariadne's prayers (64.204-206), Theseus is blinded by his own forgetfulness: *ipse autem caeca mentem caligine Theseus / consitus oblito dimisit pectore cuncta, / quae mandata prius constanti mente tenebat...* (64.207-209; but Theseus himself, burying his mind in a blind fog, let go from his forgetful heart every order which he had before held in his stalwart mind...). Theseus forgets his previous promise that he would change his sails to inform his father that he had not died on his quest to Crete; his father, seeing the unchanged sails and distraught by the assumed loss of his son, commits suicide because of Theseus's forgetfulness. The contrast between Theseus's previous mindfulness (*constanti mente*) and his current state of forgetfulness (*oblito pectore*) underscores the discrepancy between his and Ariadne's accounting of different types of memory. For Theseus, the epic hero, erotic memory is easily dismissed, but paternal remembrance is worth keeping in mind. Ariadne, on the other hand, values the memory of the love affair over familial devotion. Theseus is punished for discounting erotic memory by his inability to remember his father's commands. He is, then, doubly forgetful, and his failure to remember doubles his pain: *qualem Minoidi luctum / obtulerat mente immemori, talem ipse*

recepit (64.247-248; he himself received such pain as he gave, because of his forgetful mind, to the daughter of Minos). Ariadne, on the other hand, for all of her anxiety that she would be left for dead and forgotten, receives both a savior, in the form of Bacchus, and eternal memorialization in Catullus's poem.

The strategies of memory production evinced by Catullus's Ariadne are reflected in the depictions of abandoned women throughout later love poetry. Indeed, a focus on memory in the stories of abandoned women appears to be part of the tradition Catullus develops. In particular, poem 64's emphasis on intertextual memory influences the topos of the abandoned woman in Latin elegy. As Conte's (1985) landmark study on poetic memory makes clear, Ovid's Ariadne 'remembers' her past as Catullus's Ariadne. At *Fasti* 3.473-475, Ariadne recalls her previous laments against Theseus, and her language signals a reflexive allusion to Ariadne's speech in Catullus 64.²⁷ The character of Ariadne remembers her own intertextual past as an abandoned woman of love poetry, to whom memory is of paramount importance. The character of Ariadne appears again in the Ovidian *corpus* in the tenth letter of *Heroides*. Again, on the shore, she makes her laments to Theseus, as he sails away; only this time, she expresses herself, somewhat implausibly, in epistolary form.²⁸ The letters of *Heroides* engage in clever play with the tropes of the abandoned woman topos, even as they adopt and adapt the memory production strategies of previous *puellae relictæ*.

Epistolary Embodiment: Strategies for Memory in *Heroides*

²⁷ For a further discussion of reflexive allusion, see Ch. 5.

²⁸ On the unrealistic setting of Ariadne's letter, see Kennedy (1984). Regarded as the seminal work on *Heroides*, this article has exculpated the collection from the ridicule of previous scholars, who complained that the implausibility of heroines writing letters (while on deserted islands, for example) only results in absurdity unworthy of Ovid's genius (and, hence, the claim that the letters are not actually Ovidian). Kennedy addresses this complaint by arguing that, far from being ridiculous, the epistolarity of the letters in fact is the most significant element of *Heroides*. As he demonstrates, Ovid addresses the time of writing and the motivation for writing within the narrative, and he shows that the letters themselves can play a role in the plot, affecting the characters' decisions (especially in the double *Heroides*). He argues that deviation from the canon, rather than the result of a poor manuscript tradition, allows the reader to understand the letter-writer as a subject.

Following in the footsteps of Catullus's Ariadne, as well as the abandoned women of previous elegy, the heroines of *Heroides* take charge of their own memorialization. Afraid of losing their voices as they have lost their heroes, they seek to tell their stories from their own perspectives. The epistolary form suits this purpose particularly well, since, at its very essence, the letter offers the power of speech to an absent writer. In this way, *Heroides* gives a voice to those often rendered silent in the literary tradition.²⁹ In their writing, the *puellae relictæ* of *Heroides* evince some of the same strategies we have seen adopted by the poet-lovers of elegy. The heroines, in exhorting their lovers to remember them, recall personal memories of episodes within the love affair, prioritizing erotic remembrance over familial duty. Consequently, they levy a charge of forgetfulness against lovers who do not value amorous memory over all else. These abandoned women fear not only being forgotten but forgetting themselves, expressing anxiety at the same time about loss of memory and bodily sensory perception. The heroines, like their lover-poet counterparts, eroticize memory by emphasizing the role of the female body in amorous remembrance. Finally, they use the letter itself as a material reminder, construing the text as a visceral connection to their own bodies to simulate their physical presence.³⁰ Each letter of *Heroides* gives to the absent *puella* the opportunity for memorializing the love affair from her point of view, ensuring that the reader will remember her, even if her lover may not.³¹

Most straightforwardly, the letter may be utilized as a direct exhortation for the reader to

²⁹ For the literary consciousness of the heroines, see Fulkerson (2005). Her intratextual study of *Heroides* focuses on the heroines as writers participating in an epistolary community, in which the heroines engage with each other's letters as readers. Through his heroines' attempts to circumvent their fates and rewrite themselves as subjects, she argues, Ovid questions the extent to which fate can be rescripted, either for literary characters or for readers/writers in the real world.

³⁰ As Casanova-Robin (2007) puts it, "Le corps, véritable incarnation de la voix scripturaire, est donné à voir dans ses aspects les plus concrets..." (55). Her analysis of "poétique du corps" in *Heroides* focuses on the symbolic role of the body as "une figure prégnante du sujet," which metatextually associates the self with the act of writing.

³¹ Much of the scholarship on *Heroides* has focused on a different type of memory: poetic memory. Barchiesi (1992) observes that "l'arte allusiva" is the most important feature of *Heroides*: "Le lettere non sono comprensibili, e non vogliono essere comprese, fuori dal loro intertesto" (10). For intertextual analyses of *Heroides*, see especially Landolfi (2000) and Jolivet (2001).

remember the writer. Near the end of Canace's letter, she makes full use of this feature of the epistolary form by urging two separate audiences to remember her after her death.³² Although the letter is addressed to her brother, with whom she has been engaging in an incestuous affair, her first appeal for memory is directed to her sisters: *amissae memores sed tamen este mei* (*Her.* 11.106; but still remember me, although I am gone). This plea, given in the context of wishing her sisters better luck than she herself has received, serves as a warning. If her sisters remember her bad example, they may avoid her fate. The second call to memory is directed towards Canace's brother and lover Macareus, the primary addressee of the letter: *vive memor nostri, lacrimasque in vulnera funde, / neve reformida corpus amantis amans* (*Her.* 11.125-126; live and remember me, and pour out your tears over my wounds, and, loving me, do not shrink from the corpse of your beloved). Here, there are no well-wishes for the bereaved; Canace expects to be properly mourned by her lover. She, like the lover-poets of elegy, requires the mourning of her beloved for her memorialization. The memory of the couple's love is preserved, not only through Canace's own text, but through Macareus's tearful devotion to her wounded corpse after her death. Canace's body, then, represents the focal point of her memorialization after death, and the emphasis placed on the female body mirrors the role eroticization played in the lover-poet's funeral. However, the effect that this eroticized funeral will have on her memorialization depends on the response of Macareus. Canace's imprecation that he should not shrink from her (*neve reformida corpus*) constitutes a much less authoritative vision for the future than the vivid death fantasies of the elegists. Her pleading use of imperatives emphasizes that her verbal entreaty must be obeyed in order for her eroticized memory of the love affair to be preserved, not

³² Or, rather, two audiences within the narrative. The external reader, although not explicitly addressed, is implicitly encouraged to remember the story as well. On internal/external audiences in *Heroides*, see Farrell (1998), who points out that, although the letters create an implied internal reader (the addressee within the narrative), they also force the reader to acknowledge her/himself as an interceptor of the letter.

just in her letter, but through the memorialization of her corpse at her funeral. Although Canace shapes her remembrance by issuing direct invocations to memory in her letter, the success of her strategy is uncertain, as it depends on the response of Macareus himself.

Another epistolary tactic for remembering and being remembered in *Heroides* is the recollection of personal memories as part of the text of the letter. The writer may recall a particular action or fact, and, without a direct appeal to the reader, compel the addressee to remember and respond. Medea's letter to Jason commences with such a coercive reminiscence: *at tibi Colchorum, memini, regina vacavi, / ars mea cum peteres ut tibi ferret opem* (*Her.* 12.1-2; but as queen of Colchis, I remember, I had time for you, when you begged for my art to give you aid). Medea's reprimand of Jason abruptly begins by reminding him of her use of witchcraft to save his life as he pursued the Golden Fleece in Colchis,³³ as well as by forcing him to recognize his obligation to reciprocal faithfulness. Her strategic reminiscence implies that, if Medea could sacrifice her position as queen of Colchis to save Jason's life, he should at least repay the debt by remaining loyal. Medea is not the only heroine to employ the memory of the occasion on which she broke ties with her natal family in order to follow her hero. The Ariadne of *Heroides*, like her character in Catullus 64, also uses her memory against Theseus.³⁴ She emphasizes the hardships of being abandoned on a deserted island, one of the most difficult of which is losing Theseus as her fiancé and protector. A brief recitation of her lineage culminates in the promise of a marriage to Theseus: *cui pater est Minos, cui mater filia Phoebi, / quodque magis memini, quae tibi pacta*

³³ Her memory (*memini*), in an instance of reflexive allusion, reminds the reader of the immense literary tradition that surrounds Medea and Jason. In his analysis of *Her.* 12's intertextual resonances, Hinds (1993) calls Medea an essentially intertextual heroine, "the most central marginal figure in Hellenic culture" (45).

³⁴ For a detailed discussion of the parallels between the Ariadne of Cat. 64 and *Her.* 11, see Jacobson (1974), 213-227. Cf. also the treatments of Verducci (1985), who calls *Her.* 11 a "travesty" in comparison to Catullus 64 (246), and Smith (1994), who argues, *contra* Verducci, that the Ariadne of *Heroides* "invokes the tradition whence she comes, not so much expressing her 'debt' to it but rather establishing herself in a kind of intertextual mythology that gives life to literary characters" (251). Knox (1998) suggests that we seek beyond Cat. 64 for intertextual resonances in *Her.* 11, proposing the possibility of lost Hellenistic sources.

fui (10.91-92; My father was Minos, my mother was the daughter of Phoebus, and—that which I remember even more—I was engaged to marry you). Ariadne explicitly values the memory of her near-marriage to Theseus more than her relationship with her parents. This privileging of romantic love over family ties reflects, as we have seen, the lover-poets' focus on *amor* over *honor* in elegiac memorialization. The blood relationships between heroines and their natal families are deemed less significant than the erotic bonds they share with their heroes. In the same way that the elegists demand *fides* from their *puellae* in exchange for such a prioritization, the heroines justify their need for reciprocity, driving them to mine their own memories to build their cases against their heroes.

The heroine's privileging of amorous memories over familial ones triggers not only the recollection of her own memories in her letter, but the charge of forgetfulness against her lover. The heroine who values her romantic relationship above all else expects her hero to share these principles, and the abandoned heroine may accuse her hero of failing to remember her. Penelope indicts Ulysses as too daring in battle, exclaiming: *o nimium nimiumque oblite tuorum!* (*Her.* 1.41; you, too, too forgetful of your own!). She sarcastically mocks his imagined defense, saying: *at bene cautus eras et memor ante mei!* (*Her.* 1.44; but you were really careful and thinking of me first!). Penelope signals here that Ulysses, in being too rash a warrior, was not appropriately valuing his memories of home above his desire for glory. This dissonance between two competing modes of memorialization, the memory of love and the memory of glorious deeds, again parallels the elegists' disparagement of *honor* in favor of *amor* in their creation of memory. Here, the tension between the two strategies of memorialization has particular intertextual significance, as it pits the epic heroism of Ulysses against Penelope's example of the

elegiac abandoned woman.³⁵ Medea, too, accuses her epic hero of negligence, calling him *immemor Aesonides*, the unremembering son of Aeson (12.16), who would have died without her help in his quests.³⁶ The forgetful lover draws the ire of the elegiac heroine whose argument rests on prizing stable love over fickle fame and personal memory over genealogical, historical, or military ties.

These accusations of forgetfulness are accompanied and complicated in *Heroides* by an anxiety about forgetting, in addition to being forgotten. As we have seen above with Medea and Ariadne, the heroine's claim to being remembered often relies on her ability to remember her own past. Any memory loss, then, may impair her ability to be remembered permanently. Unlike some of the other memory production strategies of abandoned women, this fear of forgetting is not paralleled in the treatment of memory by the lover-poets of elegy. Although both lover-poets and *puellae relictæ* use writing to control their own memory, the laments of abandoned women display a distinct type of anxiety about losing control of their bodies and minds and, thereby, losing the ability to maintain memory. In her letter, Hermione, married against her will to Neoptolemus (the son of Achilles), writes to Orestes, to whom she was previously betrothed. As Spentzou (2003) has noted, Hermione "wonders explicitly about the role of memory"³⁷ as she recalls the tales of her family's bad luck in love: *vix equidem memini, memini tamen. omnia luctus, / omnia solliciti plena timoris erant* (*Her.* 8.75-76; I can scarcely remember it all, but I remember nonetheless; everything was grief, everything was full of anxious fear). Inculcated into a tradition of anxiety by this generational memory,³⁸ she is driven to a state of amnesia in her intense distress at being forced to share a bed with a man who is not her true mate:

³⁵ See Kennedy's (1984) excellent exploration of intertextuality in the first epistle (416-422).

³⁶ The language of this episode, even as it evokes an epic hypotext, also refers back to the *immemor* Theseus of Catullus 64, which itself was heavily influenced by the depiction of Jason and Medea in Apollonius's *Argonautica*.

³⁷ Spentzou (2003), 77.

³⁸ See Williams's (1997) discussion of Hermione's relationship to her forebears.

*nox ubi me thalamis ululantem et acerba gementem
condidit in maesto procubuique toro,
pro somno lacrimis oculi funguntur abortis
quaque licet fugio sicut ab hoste viro.
saepe malis stupeo rerumque oblita locique
ignara tetigi Scyria membra manu;
utque nefas sensi, male corpora tacta relinquo
et mihi pollutas credor habere manus.
saepe Neoptolemi pro nomine nomen Orestis
exit, et errorem vocis ut omen amo. (Her. 8.107-116)*

(When gloomy night has relegated me, wailing and groaning to my chamber, and I lie down on my sorrowful couch, instead of sleep, my eyes employ welled-up tears, and, in whatever way I can, I flee from my husband as though an enemy. Often I am overwhelmed with sadness, and, forgetting my situation and my location, I touch the Scyrian's limbs with my senseless hand; and when I realize the wrong, I withdraw from the sordidly grazed body, and I believe my hands to be defiled. Often, instead of the name Neoptolemus, the name Orestes escapes, and I cherish the verbal mistake as an omen.)

Hermione's anxiety about losing Orestes is so overpowering that she loses sense of her mind and body. Her sorrow is depicted bodily: she cannot keep from crying and moaning, she cannot sleep, and she unconsciously reaches out to her bed-partner for comfort, although she does not desire him. In addition to this lack of corporeal control, Hermione's mind seems to waver between delirium and lucidity, as she describes being unaware (*ignara*) that she is performing regrettable actions and then suddenly realizing (*sensi*) that she has committed an undesirable act. The word *oblita* particularly signifies her disordered amnesiac state. She cannot remember important details about her life, including where she is or to whom she is married. This description of the utter turmoil of her mind and body culminates in the disconnect between her recognition that she is with Neoptolemus (generated, ostensibly, by bodily sense perception) and

her voice, which calls out for Orestes. The Freudian slip indicates a unity in disorder. Although severed from reality, her mind and body are connected in their loss of memory. Her amnesia, as she describes it, is a disorientingly patchy erasure of memory, which threatens to upset her ability to construct not only her own remembrance, but also her reality.

Ariadne, abandoned on a deserted island, also worries over memory loss, but her anxiety about forgetting is not focused on the disorder of her mental state, like Hermione, but rather on the preservation of tactile memories of her time with Theseus. She gives a description of the scene after Theseus sets sail, as she mourns his loss and begins to obsessively dwell on the traces Theseus has left behind on the island:

*aut mare prospiciens in saxo frigida sedi,
quamque lapis sedes, tam lapis ipsa fui.
saepe torum repeto qui nos acceperat ambos,
sed non acceptos exhibiturus erat
et tua quae possum pro te vestigia tango
strataque quae membris intepuere tuis.
incumbo lacrimisque toro manante profusis... (Her. 10.49-55)*

(Or I sat on a rock, looking out on the cold sea, and I was as much a stone myself as my seat was a stone. I often return to the couch which welcomed us both, but would not see us welcomed again, and, instead of you, I touch your traces, which is all I can do, and the blankets which were once warmed by your limbs. I lie down, the couch growing wet with my flowing tears...)

Ariadne grows more and more physically connected to the island as she associates different locations with Theseus's body. As she sits on a rock on the shore, looking towards the spot on the horizon where his sails disappeared, she imagines her body becoming part of the stone.³⁹ As she becomes increasingly insinuated into the landscape, she loses her bodily autonomy. She has no desire to do anything but lie down on the couch where she once lay with Theseus, attempting

³⁹ A reference back to Catullus's Ariadne, who is compared to a stone statue on the shore (*saxea...effigies*, 64.61).

to join her body with the traces (*vestigia*) he left behind.⁴⁰ Her anxiety about forgetting and being forgotten by Theseus compels her to become part of the landscape which she has encoded with memories of his presence on the island. Ariadne's memory of Theseus is entirely corporeal, but, as she attempts to connect bodily with Theseus through the objects he touched, that corporeality becomes less invested in the human body than the material landscape. She abandons the realm of voice and text, as her memories become entirely focused on her body and physical environment rather than her verbal remembrance.

The abandoned women of *Heroides* echo their male lover-poet counterparts in eroticizing the memory of the female body and linking it to the written text. Both *puellae relictæ* and poet-lovers embody the memory of the love affair within the feminine corporeal form in order to materially preserve the remembrance of love. However, since it is her own body, rather than her lover's, that is entangled in this strategy of memory production, the *puella relictæ* displays anxiety about memory loss, connected to the loss of bodily sense perception. For her, the letter, linked viscerally to her body, must act as a material reminder to simulate her physical presence. The abandoned women of *Heroides* utilize methods of memory production that embody remembrance, in a way the poet-lovers of elegy do not.

In *Heroides*, the letter itself, as a physical object, represents another strategy for abandoned women's memory production, as the epistolary form represents an opportunity to be present before their lovers' eyes, while remaining absent from their beds. The letters act as material proxies, representing the women themselves and acting as a trigger to memory for the forgetful lover. Many of the letters intensify this simulated presence through a textual focus on the materiality of the letter and the corporeality of its writer. Briseis, the captive consort of

⁴⁰ As Battistella (2010) points out, *ad loc.*: "le tracce lasciate da Teseo sul *torus* analoghe a quelle dell'amante in Ov. *Am.* 1.8.97 *ille viri videat toto vestigia lecto.*"

Achilles stolen away by Agamemnon,⁴¹ perhaps most explicitly highlights this emphasis on the physicality of writing a letter, just as she begins:

*quam legis, a rapta Briseide littera venit,
vix bene barbarica Graeca notata manu.
quascumque adspicies, lacrimae fecere lituras;
sed tamen et lacrimae pondera vocis habent.* (Her. 3.1-4)

(The letter you are reading comes from captured Briseis, written in hardly proper Greek by my barbarian hand. My tears made whatever blots you see; but still tears, too, have the weight of words.)

Not only does Briseis here call attention to the epistolary form by explicitly referring to her letter as a *littera*, she complicates this epistolarity in two ways. First, she claims that the composition of the letter was particularly difficult, since Greek is not her native language. This opening notice raises the issue of translation, not only word-by-word, but also character-by-character, as Briseis struggles not just mentally to compose, but manually to write. The mention of her ‘barbarian hand’ evokes the act of putting pen to papyrus, calling up an image of the writer in the mind of the reader. Briseis, then, accentuates both her own corporeality (i.e., her hand) and the materiality of the text (i.e., her handwriting) by figuring writing as a physical exercise.⁴² Second, she asserts that the blots on the page were made by her tears, a statement that serves not just as a pathetic plea for pity, but as a connection between the material stains on the papyrus and Briseis’s own bodily fluids.⁴³ Her body, then, becomes materially part of the physical letter read by Achilles. This focus on materiality and corporeality thus links the physical acts of writing and

⁴¹ As Barchiesi (1987) points out, Briseis constantly reminds us of her position as a slave, even as she evokes the elegiac trope of *servitium amoris*, in a literalization of elegiac slavery: “La degradazione simbolica dell’amante elegiaco è sostituita da una soggezione concreta e brutale” (76).

⁴² The impact of this theme of translation is, of course, exaggerated by the fact that the reader is not reading the poem in Greek, but in Latin. Farrell (1998) argues that this dissonance calls further attention to the epistolary form of the poem (334-335).

⁴³ Although there is, ostensibly, no material blotting on the letter viewed by the external reader. Farrell (1998) points out that the focus on the materiality of the page in *Heroides* calls attention to editorial interpolation, since such marring does not occur in the reader’s edition.

crying, as both generate concrete effects on the page. Briseis further associates the production of tears and words when she claims that both have substantial power. Her statement that ‘tears have the weight of words’ establishes an equivalence between the bodily production of the writer and her literary production. The use of *pondera*, in its most basic sense a term describing a physical burden, underlines the materiality of both the tears and the words, designating both as weighty and concrete impediments to forgetfulness. The tangible text, associated with Briseis’s body through her hands and her tears, simulates her physical presence and places the onus of remembering her on Achilles’s shoulders.

Similarly, Canace, about to commit suicide after engaging in an incestuous affair with her brother, Macareus, produces a vivid image that links her body to the text:

*siqua tamen caecis errabunt scripta lituris,*⁴⁴
oblitus a dominae caede libellus erit.
dextra tenet calamum, strictum tenet altera ferrum
et iacet in gremio charta soluta meo.
haec est Aeolidos fratri scribentis imago. (Her. 11.1-5)

(If anything written here is marred by dark blots, then this little scroll is erased by the blood of its mistress. My right hand holds a reed pen, the other holds a drawn sword, and paper lies unrolled in my lap. This is the image of Aeolus’s daughter writing to her brother.)

Canace creates an evocative portrait of herself as she writes her suicide note, in which the actions of death and writing are located on her body and on the page. She begins with the striking image of blood obliterating the writing on the scroll, drawing an association between the materiality of the text and her bodily fluids, similar to the effect of Briseis’s tears. But instead of indicating a normal bodily function (like crying), the blood testifies to the fact that Canace’s suicide has been

⁴⁴ I follow the majority tradition in excising the two verses that precede line 1 in later manuscripts. Cf. Knox (1995), *ad loc.* For an opposing view, see Reeson (2001), *ad loc.*, who maintains the two lines.

completed, in a way that she can no longer vocalize after her death. The word *oblitus*, then, describes not only the destruction of the letter, but the destruction of Canace's body. This simultaneous erasure indicates that this text may be more than a memory trigger, and, indeed, represents an embodiment of Canace's memory. If her memory has been channeled into the text, its obliteration threatens Canace's very existence as a function of memory. This threat, however, is somewhat ameliorated, as Canace chooses not to dwell on the possibility of being forgotten, but jumps backward in time to present an image of the unfinished text. She appears as a writer, pen poised over the scroll, both objects clearly situated on her body. The roll is open on her lap, and the pen is held in her right hand, as the left holds an object far more sinister. The parallel placement of the pen and the sword over the scroll points at an equivalency between the two objects in the composition of the text, as both make their physical marks on the page. The connection between the completion of the text and the corporeal death, and the danger of the complete erasure of Canace's memory, adds extra urgency to Canace's strategic shaping of her own memory in this letter.

Heroides, then, encompasses a sweeping array of perspectives on the connection between materiality and strategies for memory production. From Briseis, who claimed that bodily tears and material text are equally authoritative, to Ariadne, whose focus on corporeality entirely displaces verbal communication, we see that strategies for remembering and being remembered in *Heroides* involve a complex interrelationship between the corporeality of the women and the materiality of their letters.⁴⁵ Two letters in particular further complicate this parallel between the

⁴⁵ Spentzou (2003) analyzes the connection between the female body and writing through French feminist methodological models. She adopts Cixous's concept of the overflow of writing in the *écriture féminine* of the heroines, noting how bodily fluids (tears, blood) testify to their passion in writing. She particularly notes how the heroines' tears become a "carnal alphabet" (111), linking the physicality of crying with the materiality of letter-production. More body-focused language is used when Spentzou compares the heroines' writing process to giving birth (e.g., the blood-covered letter in Canace's lap, 155-56).

material and the corporeal in relation to memory by inserting a third element: the disembodied voice. The rest of this chapter will consider the cases of Laodamia and Sappho, in relation to Ovid's advice in *Remedia* that the lover should burn the letters and waxen images of his beloved in order to forget her. As we have seen, these letters provide a material prompt to memory, making the absent *puella* appear present before her lover. In the eyes of these abandoned women, their letters appear to embody physically the remembrance of love. But the letter of the *puella relicta*, who fears becoming voiceless, sometimes also represents the immaterial voice as the most important aspect of the memory of love.

Laodamia's *Imagines* in *Heroides* 13 and *Remedia*

The tension between voice, body, and materiality and their roles in memory is perhaps clearest in *Heroides* in the case of Laodamia. Her letter is a display of pathetic irony, as she pleads for caution and a swift return to her husband Protesilaus, who has, unbeknownst to his wife, already died in the Trojan War. Although Laodamia does not recognize him as such, she indicates in her address that she has already seen his ghost: *sed tua cur nobis pallens occurrit imago? / cur venit a labris muta querela tuis?*⁴⁶ (*Her.* 13.109-110; But why does your pale visage appear before me? Why do mumbled laments issue from your lips?). This apparition of Protesilaus is only partially present, in both body and voice. Laodamia can hear him, but she cannot understand him; she can see him, but they do not truly interact. This lack of both touch and speech becomes starker in the following lines as she imagines Protesilaus's actual homecoming:

*quando ego te reducem cupidis amplexa lacertis
languida laetitia solvar ab ipsa mea?
quando erit, ut lecto mecum bene iunctus in uno*

⁴⁶ I follow Reeson (2001), 176, in adapting the readings of Palmer and Baehrens here.

*militiae referas splendida facta tuae?
quae mihi dum referes, quamvis audire iuvabit,
multa tamen capies oscula, multa dabis.
semper in his apte narrantia verba resistunt;
promptior est dulci lingua refecta mora. (Her. 13.115-122)*

(When shall I, having embraced you, returning to my longing arms, be undone by this languorous bliss of mine? When will it be that, soundly joined with me in one bed, you will recall the splendid acts of your bravery? And while you recall them for me, although it is enjoyable to hear them, you will nevertheless steal many kisses, and give many. Well-narrated words always meet with these hindrances; the tongue refreshed by sweet delay is quicker.)

This scene of homecoming stands in contrast to the earlier description of Protesilaus's shade. Unlike the ghost, the Protesilaus of Laodamia's imagination is a loquacious storyteller and attentive lover, present in both body and mind. Laodamia looks forward to a reciprocity of touch, embracing Protesilaus's body, receiving his kisses, and joining with him in sexual union.⁴⁷ In her fantasy, however, this bodily interaction is inextricably tied to verbal engagement. Protesilaus's words must come from his own lips in order for their hearing to be enjoyable (13.119). She imagines that his lips not only will bestow kisses on her body but will also engage her in conversation, relating his experiences during their time apart, as she does in her letter to him. The verb of speaking used here (*referre*) indicates an act of recall; Protesilaus is depicted remembering aloud his valorous exploits in war. Laodamia, then, imagines a reversal of the current situation: it is the war that is at risk of being forgotten and that must be preserved in stories, not Laodamia herself. The couple's verbal and physical contact secure their love without the need to devise strategies for remembering.

This fantasy homecoming scene soon fades into reality, however, and Laodamia reveals

⁴⁷ As Roggia (2011) observes, the “carica erotica della scena” (221) evokes the Laodamia of Cat. 68b. Landolfi (2000) contextualizes Ovid's Laodamia by comparison to Catullus's (164-170).

the strategy for remembering she has created in her husband's absence:

*dum tamen arma geres diverso miles in orbe,
quae referat vultus est mihi cera tuos:
illi blanditias, illi tibi debita verba
dicimus, amplexus accipit illa meos.
crede mihi, plus est, quam quod videatur, imago;
adde sonum cerae, Protesilaus erit.
hanc specto teneoque sinu pro coniuge vero
et tamquam possit verba referre, queror. (Her. 13.151-158)*

(But while you bear arms as a soldier in another world, I have a waxen image that calls back your visage to me: to it, I utter endearments, the words owed to you; it receives my embraces. Believe me, the image is more than what it seems; add a voice to the wax, and it will be Protesilaus. I look at this image, and I hold it, in place of my real husband, in my bosom, and I complain to it, as though it can call back in words.)

Laodamia channels the memory of her husband into a material object, a waxen image of him that recalls (*referat*) a vision of his face to her mind. The wax object acts as memory trigger, calling up a mental image of the lover in the mind of the beloved.⁴⁸ But Laodamia's waxen image is more than just a physical reminder of her husband.⁴⁹ She interacts with it in place of her husband, embracing and speaking to it as though it could reciprocate. As she claims, there is more to the image than meets the eye. If Laodamia could but add his voice to the waxen image, she declares, it would actually become Protesilaus himself. This incredible claim serves to further complicate the inextricability of voice and physicality described in Laodamia's imagined homecoming of Protesilaus. The fantasy of the almost-living waxen image similarly focuses on the importance of tactile interaction and vocal communication. Verbal echoes between the two

⁴⁸ Just as, as we have seen above, the letters of the heroines throughout *Heroides* function (or, rather, are *supposed* to function) as prompts to memory for the lovers who read them.

⁴⁹ As Jacobson (1974) acknowledges, "the statue serves for Laodamia as almost a second Protesilaus, more than simply a memento..." (208). He goes on to argue that the image "sharpen[s] the pathological (or at least peculiar) character of his heroine, who, with husband still alive, seeks vicarious sexual pleasure with his statue" (211).

passages underscore the similarity of emphasis on touch (e.g., the *amplexus* in 13.115 and 154) and words spoken aloud (cf. the *apte narrantia verba* of Protesilaus in 13.121 to the *debita verba* of Laodamia in 13.153). The most striking parallel is the use of *referre* as a verb of speaking and remembering twice in each brief passage. In 13.118 and 119, Protesilaus himself recalls aloud his deeds in war, but in 13.152 and 158, Protesilaus's analogue, the waxen image, is the subject of the verb. While the image creates an effective visual reminder for Laodamia of her husband, it fails to speak back to her.⁵⁰ It is significant that Laodamia does *not* claim that the waxen image replies to her; indeed, her description seems to stress the utter passivity of the object.

The waxen image (*cera*) of Laodamia in *Heroides* recalls the *muta imago* of the Laodamia of *Remedia*.⁵¹ Of course, as an epistolary collection, *Heroides* is a particularly salient text to consider in tension with *Remedia*'s advice to burn the *puella*'s letters. *Heroides* concentrates not on the pitiable lover who must forget his love or be consumed by it, but rather on the woman whose love has already been (or may be) forgotten. The tactical themes of the texts are thus inverted: whereas the lover in *Remedia* focuses on strategies for forgetting, the women of *Heroides*, like all abandoned women in elegy, are concerned with being forgotten and devise strategies for remembering (or being remembered). Laodamia's interaction with the image here, then, can help resolve some of the questions prompted by the *Remedia* passage. In her story, both voice and materiality are required to recall (*referre*) the memory of love. As Laodamia acknowledges, the image, although it corporeally and materially recalls him, is not truly Protesilaus without his voice.

⁵⁰ Hardie (2002) identifies the verbal conflict of the episode: "The words exchanged with the waxen image are on the point of edging out epistolary words as a surrogate for direct conversation. In fact the only response that Laodamia will receive directly from Protesilaus in this word will be the words exchanged when he returns briefly from the dead: the *revenant* can be thought of as a conflation of the waxen image...and the ghostly dream vision..." (136-137).

⁵¹ above: *si potes, et ceras remove: quid imagine muta / carperis? hoc periit Laodamia modo. (Rem. 723-724; if you can, also put away waxen images: why are you consumed by a mute image? Laodamia died in this way.)*

The significance of wax as a material should not slip by unnoticed here. As scholars have noted, the wax image is a *materia amoris*.⁵² Reeson (2001) argues that this material detail secures the genre of Laodamia's story as elegiac, rather than tragic, since the images in previous versions of the tale had been made of metal. As he states, "metal images are cold," but wax is "more sensuous than metal."⁵³ As I noted above, wax is also associated with both text and memory, through the association of wax tablets with memorization. Wax carries a further connotation in an epistolary collection like *Heroides*, as it represents a common material of letter writing. The material of wax is, then, not only associated with the elegiac genre, but also with the discourse of memory, indicating its role as a particular instrument of preserving elegiac, epistolary remembrance.

When Ovid has his *praeceptor* suggest, then, that the lover-reader destroy both letters and wax images of the beloved in order to forget love, he recalls his own conclusions about the role of wax images in the memory of love in Laodamia's epistle. The memory of the beloved cannot persist without both voice and materiality. However, remembering the tale of Laodamia in conjunction with Ovid's advice leads the reader to question Ovid's counsel, since it is, indeed, the desolation Laodamia experiences at the burning of this waxen image that causes her to commit suicide by jumping onto the pyre with it. As the memorious reader of Ovid recognizes, tossing the letters and images of his *puella* into the fire may create not just a pyre for his ardor (*ardoris sit rogas, Rem. 720*), but his own pyre, as well.

Sappho Speaks: Voice, Memory, and Genre in *Heroides* 15

In addition to the two elements emphasized most by *puellae relictae* in their construction of memory in the epistles of *Heroides*, the text's materiality and the *puella*'s corporeality, we

⁵² Cf. Spoth (1992), 104. He compares Laodamia's literal creation of a waxen image to the "Egozentrische Manipulation des Partnerbildes" (105) typical of elegy.

⁵³ Reeson (2001), 201.

can, then, add a third: the writer's disembodied voice. In Laodamia's case, all three are necessary for the preservation of the memory of love in *Heroides*. In the letter of Sappho (*Her.* 15), this emphasis on the voice of the writer is particularly salient, since she is the only one of the heroines who is not just a letter-writer, but a poet herself. Whereas Laodamia's letter proved that materiality cannot be without voice, the epistle of Sappho demonstrates a strong connection between orality, textuality, and corporeality. This letter's theme of remembering love through poetry combines these three elements, intertwining them in the poem of a literary heroine with a both a textual and a bodily poetic corpus.

The letter of Sappho is the most frequently questioned of the *Heroides* with regards to its authenticity, and this controversy has made it one of the most popular epistles in Heroidean scholarship.⁵⁴ Although the majority of scholarship has focused either on the poem's authorship and/or its intertextual resonances, another thread in the scholarly analysis of *Her.* 15 has paid attention to the intersection of genre and gender/sexuality. As a lyric poet, Sappho often writes on female homoerotic desire; as an elegiac *puella*, however, Ovid's Sappho must participate in a elegy's heteronormative discourse. As Lindheim (2003) points out (albeit not explicitly acknowledging the issue of genre here), the Ovidian heroine's letter eschews her previous desire for women, completely devoting herself to a male lover, Phaon; Ovid, as she puts it, "sets Sappho straight."⁵⁵ Smith (1994), as part of his broader argument about the combination of

⁵⁴ This epistle's separate manuscript tradition, non-Ovidian vocabulary, and metrical issues make up the bulk of the problems determining the authorship. For a brief summary of the issue of Ovidian authorship, see Knox (1995) 12-14. I am less concerned about its author than the tradition in which it follows; for, even if it was not written by Ovid himself, it certainly carries on the Ovidian theme of memory and love in the laments of abandoned women. As Hinds (1993) puts it, "a poet can fail to be Ovid without failing to be a poet" (45). Although I most frequently refer to the internal author, Sappho, in my analysis, I will consider Ovid as the external author, for the purpose of consistency.

⁵⁵ Lindheim (2003), 136-176. In her analysis, Lindheim compares Sapphic fragments to *Her.* 15, arguing that "Ovid, subtly distorting the Greek verse, manages through the mouthpiece of his Sappho to reconstruct a Sappho whose desire and goals in self-portrayal replicate, reiterate those of her fourteen fellow heroines in the epistolary collection" (176).

elegiac and epistolary forms in *Heroides*, connects the question of Sappho's sexuality to genre: "Just as genre cloaks genre, so the author of these poems (Ovid) is cloaked by another author (the heroine); and, as befits such a sexual reversal, in each case she writes to a male. I would suggest that this is why Ovid makes the recipient of Sappho's letter a man instead of a woman..."⁵⁶ Whereas love in lyric can feature a variety of sexualities, erotic desire in Latin elegy can only exist between a man and a woman. Ovid's Sappho, then, must abandon both lyric and homoeroticism in order to become an elegiac abandoned woman.

In her letter, Sappho writes to her lover Phaon, whom she quizzes over whether or not he recognizes her poetry:

*ecquid, ut adspecta est studiosae littera dextrae,
protinus est oculis cognita nostra tuis?
an, nisi legisses auctoris nomina Sapphus,
hoc breve nescires unde veniret opus? (Her. 15.1-4)*

(When you saw the letters of my learned right hand, did you at all recognize them as mine right away with your own eyes? Or, if you had not read the name of the author as Sappho, would you not know whence comes this little work?)

Like both Briseis and Canace before her, Sappho here highlights both the corporeality and the materiality of writing by detailing the physical aspects of the production of poetry. The phrase used to describe this body part (*studiosae dextrae*) further underscores another prominent aspect of this introduction, tying the material nature of writing to the learnedness of the poet. Her self-description as an *auctor* calls attention to her erudition, as well as her place in the literary tradition. The focus on writing as a physical act stresses the fact that she now participates in the

⁵⁶ Smith (1994), 267. Particularly here, he defends Ovid from the charge of engaging in "transvestite ventriloquization," as Harvey (1989) put it. See n. 2 above for a more detailed discussion of feminist scholarship on *Heroides*.

written tradition of elegy, having renounced the oral tradition of lyric.⁵⁷

Sappho's past literary output, on the other hand, is described as both oral and written. She recalls both Phaon reading her text and herself reciting her poetry:

*at me cum legeres, etiam formosa videbar;
unam iurabas usque decere loqui.
cantabam, memini (meminerunt omnia amantes);
oscula cantanti tu mihi rapta dabas.
haec quoque laudabas, omnique a parte placebam,
sed tum praecipue, cum fit amoris opus. (Her. 15.41-46)*

(But when you would read me, I seemed even more beautiful; you always used to swear that speaking was becoming for me alone. I used to sing, I remember (for lovers remember everything); you would give stolen kisses to me, while I was singing. You would praise these too, and I pleased you in every way, but especially during the work of love.)

In this passage, both the material text and the immaterial voice are present. To Sappho, remembering love in poetic form clearly involves both singing and reading, implying both oral and written production of poetry. Both of these forms of writing are connected to the corporeality of the writer. As Phaon reads her written poetry, Sappho appears beautiful (*formosa*); this focus on her beauty in conjunction with her material text draws a link between her body and the physical poetic work. Her memories of her own text are colored by the reading of Phaon, as well as her own (or, perhaps, his) perceptions of her beauty. The play of memory in the passage intertwines lyric and elegiac modes in line 42: *cantabam, memini (meminerunt omnia amantes)*. First, the line concentrates on the orality of Sappho's poetry, as the description of the act of remembering occurs in the context of her singing (*cantabam, memini...*). The second half of the

⁵⁷ Fulkerson (2005) notes Sappho's anxiety at the beginning of the epistle, which she connects to the character's constant claims to poetic fame throughout the poem: "This concentration on Sappho's poetic pretensions is not surprising; after all, Sappho, unlike the other writers of the *Heroides*, can hardly be portrayed as a novice at poetry. But at the same time, she is new to the genre of Roman elegy.... Sappho wonders if her reader will recognize her poetry even though it has been composed in the 'wrong' meter (and language)" (154).

line, however, makes clear that the memory of her past lyric occurs in the context of her present elegy, in which she, as a lover, remembers the love affair. Even the memory of her lyric poetry is tinged by her remembrance of elegiac love. The letter further entangles the two genres with embodied memory, as the physical exchange of kisses is (appropriately) connected to the oral production of poetry. As with Laodamia above, the mouth of the lover is imagined to supply both kisses and words in equal share. The disembodied voice of the poet, while it is at the center of the memory of love in this passage, does not stray far, but remains closely tethered to its bodily conduit. The remembrance of the lover is, then, expressed through oral and written poetry, both of which are tied to the body of the poet.

Just as the memory of love is communicated through both voice and text, Sappho's anxiety about being forgotten is conveyed in her desire for both oral and material connections to her absent lover.

*si tam certus eras hinc ire, modestius isses,
et modo dixisses 'Lesbi puella, vale!'
non tecum lacrimas, non oscula nostra tulisti.
denique non timui, quod dolitura fui.
nil de te mecum est, nisi tantum iniuria; nec tu
admoneat quod te pignus amantis habes.
non mandata dedi. neque enim mandata dedissem
ulla, nisi ut nolles immemor esse mei. (Her. 15.99-106)*

(If you were so settled on leaving, you could have gone more tastefully, and you could have at least said 'Lesbian girl, goodbye!' You took neither my tears nor my kisses with you. Indeed I was not afraid of the way I was about to suffer. I have nothing of yours, except just this injustice; nor do you have a token which might remind you of your lover. I gave you no commands. But indeed I would not have given any anyway, except that you not be forgetful of me.)

Sappho here expresses a desire for both a vocal and a corporeal farewell from her lover. After

first lamenting that he didn't even give her a verbal warning of his departure, she complains that she was also granted no material comforts: no tears, no kisses, not even a small memento. She imagines that these material aspects of their parting would provide her with bodily comfort, a preparatory salve for her future pain (*dolitura*). After discussing her physical loss at having missed the opportunity to say goodbye to Phaon, Sappho returns to her complaint that she received no vocal send-off. She laments that she did not have a chance to verbally remind him not to forget about her (*nolles immemor esse mei*).⁵⁸ Sappho displays a desire to participate, like other heroines before her, in the elegiac tradition of castigating her lover for abandoning her, for valuing other things over love. Phaon, in leaving without either an oral or material goodbye, deprives Sappho of her elegiac moment, privileging neither voice nor body, but sacrificing both. Sappho responds by begging, in an un-Heroidean fashion, that Phaon send her a letter if he means to abandon her for good.⁵⁹ As Fulkerson argues, Sappho breaks the rules established by Penelope (who, programmatically, requests that Ulysses simply come home to her rather than sending a return letter) because “she either wants Phaon to return or to write back to her; in either case she will be freed from the world of *Heroides* (and of elegy) so that she may return to the kind of poetry she knows how to write.”⁶⁰ Sappho's failure to secure this elegiac closure reminds the reader that she, as a lyric poet, does not belong in elegy. Unlike her fellow heroines, she cannot even accuse her lover of being *immemor* as he departs. Her vacillation between lyric and elegiac, oral and textual, memory has caused the poetess to lose control over both modes of memory production in her poetry.

Conclusion

⁵⁸ As Jacobson (1974) notes, it is a form of metatextual irony that Sappho desires the elegiac trope of a departure scene: “Ovid's Sappho complains that she—both as a lover and poet—has been deprived of this staple” (290).

⁵⁹ *hoc saltem miserae crudelis epistula dicat* (*Her.* 15.219; At least let a cruel letter tell this to me, wretched).

⁶⁰ Fulkerson (2005), 157.

The abandoned women of elegy, left vulnerable and alone, nevertheless find ways to remember love through their own voices. Although their strategies of memory production, like prioritizing affect over honor, often parallel the mnemonic methods of their poet-lover counterparts, the *puellae* evoke bodily remembrance in a completely novel way. Abandoned women fear not only being forgotten, but forgetting themselves. Thus they situate the memory of the love affair on their own (female) bodies, not to eroticize the Other (as the poet-lovers do), but in order to simulate their own corporeal presence. The heroines of *Heroides* link their bodies to the written text, using the letter as a material reminder to make the absent present. Throughout this chapter, I have focused on the tension between two elements of the construction of embodied memory in *Heroides*, the text's materiality and the *puella*'s corporeality, a tension sometimes complicated by the writer's own disembodied voice. All three play a role in the memory production strategies of abandoned women of *Heroides*.

When, in *Remedia*, the *praeceptor* advises the lover to destroy the material objects of his *puella*'s remembrance, he underscores the importance of this physicality to memory: *omnia pone feros (pones invitus) in ignes / et dic 'ardoris sit rogas iste mei.'* (*Rem.* 717-718; place all [the letters] (even though you do so reluctantly) in the fierce fire, and say: 'This is the pyre of my ardor.') Burning her letters or other material mementos of the love affair cuts off the potential for the memory of the absent *puella* to appear physically present. But also, by instructing the lover to speak while the letters are burning, the *praeceptor* realigns the power of the immaterial voice with the lover, rather than his *puella*. All three elements of memory are destroyed simultaneously, allowing (at least theoretically) the lover to leave the world of rereading and reliving elegy. However, as the memorious reader of elegy, and of *Heroides* specifically, will recall, forgetting an abandoned woman will only prompt her lament, giving her a voice in poetry.

As we have seen, the voices of *puellae relictæ* trigger elegiac memory production. Once again, Ovid's *praecepta* prove to perpetuate elegiac remembrance, rather than cue its erasure.

CHAPTER FIVE:

Receiving, Rescripting: Poetic Memory and Forgetting in *Remedia Amoris*

Introduction

In the first four chapters, the primary focus has been identifying the ways in which *Remedia's* *praecepta* on how to forget love and love elegy identify characters' strategies for elegiac memory production. Looking at individuals' memories (that is, autobiographical recall within the narrative of the poems) reveals that elegiac characters, including the *puella*, the abandoned woman, and the lover-poet himself, concern themselves with personal memory and forgetting: their being forgotten after death or separation, forgetting the beloved, *not* forgetting the beloved, and, sometimes, forgetting themselves. The poet-lover also evinces concerns about his or his *puella's* being remembered as part of his poetry, a personal concern that borders on larger issues of poetic memory and *fama*. Leaving aside the poet-lover's responses as a character in the narrative, this chapter will explore the poet-lover/Ovid/*praeceptor* as a teacher/reader and his implied audience of students as readers. Just as the previous chapters considered the memory production strategies of individual characters, here I explore how poets and readers make (poetic) memory.

In this chapter, I argue that Ovid functions as a reader and teacher of previous elegy, including his own, encouraging his readers/students to read in the same way he does. As a teacher, he models reading for his students in his play with poetic memory, implicating his

students in his own reuse of the poetic past. In exploring these lessons in reading, I utilize the methodological models of allusion, intertext, and readership in antiquity, and I propose a method for reading intertextual memory that employs the principles of episodic and schematic memory theory as a cognitive approach to memory. By reading allusion and tropes within the context of cognitive memory studies, I show that *Remedia*, while not eliminating love altogether, rewrites the genred expectations of love elegy, complicating the memories of readers, who are compelled by the Ovidian *praeceptor* to flout generic boundaries as they remember the poetic past.

In this analysis, I utilize both literary and cognitive models of memory to examine Ovid's play with the poetic tradition in *Remedia*. In accord with the principles of my cognitive approach, this chapter delineates two types of memory: episodic and schematic.¹ Episodic memory is memory of specifics, i.e., episodes, details, or distinct sets of data. Schematic memory is more generalized memory, based on cultural expectations, stereotypes, and conventional formulae. First, I discuss episodic memory, applying the concept of Remember/Know judgments to previous literary scholars' observations about Ovidian intertextual play. The second part of this chapter considers schematic memory, particularly the idea of behavioral scripts, to examine Ovid's use and misuse of generic conventions in *Remedia*. The chapter concludes with a reflection on the potential function of these cognitive methodologies for discerning more about the reader's reactions to Ovid's generic play.

Forgetting Poetry in *Remedia*

Near the end of *Remedia*, Ovid issues one of his final *praecepta* to his students, encouraging them to avoid all love poetry. Reading elegy is dangerous to the lover who strives to forget love:

¹ For more detail on the terms used throughout this chapter, see the discussion of cognitive memory in the introduction.

eloquar invitus: teneros ne tange poetas!
summoveo dotes impius ipse meas.
Callimachum fugito: non est inimicus Amori:
et cum Callimacho tu quoque, Coe, noces.
me certe Sappho meliorem fecit amicae,
nec rigidos mores Teia Musa dedit.
carmina quis potuit tuto legisse Tibulli,
vel tua, cuius opus Cynthia sola fuit?
quis poterit lecto durus discedere Gallo?
et mea nescio quid carmina tale sonant. (Rem. 757-765)

(I say this unwillingly: don't touch the gentle poets! Irreverently, I take away my own gifts. Avoid Callimachus; he is not an enemy to Love. And you, Coan, also do harm along with Callimachus. Sappho certainly made me better for my girlfriend, and the Muse of Teos gave no strict morals. Who could read without risk the songs of Tibullus, or yours, whose work was Cynthia alone? Who, having read Gallus, could walk away unfeeling? And *my* poems sound kind of like that, as well.)

This catalogue of poets, culminating in a falsely modest reference to Ovid's own contribution to the canon of love poetry, comprises a list of banned books, to be excised from the libraries of the student wishing to forget love. But as we have seen throughout *Remedia*, Ovid's proscriptions usually undermine themselves, and this precept is no exception. The *praeceptor* here instructs his students to avoid reading poetry, including his own verse, a paradoxical rule contained within the very text it proscribes. Even if we give Ovid the benefit of the doubt and assume that he meant to exclude *Remedia* from his dangerous *dotes* (758),² this so-called safe poem does just as much to remind the reader of love as previous love poetry. As we have seen, Ovid makes constant reference to his predecessors' poetry, as well as his own, throughout *Remedia*, to such a degree that comprehension of the latter is not possible without recourse to the former. Nearing the end of his list of remedies, the poet underscores the paradoxical nature of purposefully forgetting

² As Lucke (1982) wishes to do, *ad loc.*, when she attempts to explain the reasons for this 'Widerspruch.'

love by pointing out that his own text is full of flaws, because in reading it, the student has also been reading previous love poetry.³ Ovid is an active reader and (re)writer of the genre of love elegy, and this catalogue serves more to tell us whom we, as readers, should study, rather than whom we, as students, should avoid.

This catalogue is yet another example of a precept in *Remedia* that, under the guise of teaching the student to forget, actually reveals that love, as it is inscribed in elegy, cannot be forgotten. No matter what the student reads, where (s)he goes, or what (s)he looks at, (s)he merely ends up reinforcing memories of love. The same is true of poetry. The reader cannot purposefully forget ‘poetic memory,’ the poetic tradition of the genre. One cannot start over fresh as a reader (or a poet).⁴ But the poet can alter this memory, inserting himself into the tradition. *Remedia* demonstrates Ovid’s strategy of memory alteration, implicating a full catalogue of love poets and embracing them fully until the reader’s memories of Ovid’s predecessors’ poetry are tinged by the memory of their reuse by Ovid.

Ovid’s Reflexive Intertextuality in *Remedia*

Ovid’s treatment of poetic memory has been the focus of many scholars interested in literary allusion. In Conte’s landmark study of poetic memory in Latin poetry (1985), he draws attention to Ovid’s ‘reflective allusion’ in the case of Ariadne. At *Fasti* 3.473-475, the abandoned woman remembers (*memini*) her previous laments against Theseus, her language signaling a direct allusion to Ariadne’s speech in Catullus 64. The character herself recalls her intertextual past and marks this process of memory in her words, compelling the reader to

³ Houghton (2009) points out that the sexual—in addition to the intertextual—resonances of these lines keep the reader from obeying the precept: “Taken together, this extraordinary accumulation of innuendo over the course of five lines is guaranteed, whatever else it does, to keep the reader’s mind on the subject of sex (285).”

⁴ Cf. Martindale’s (1993) thesis that we cannot get back to the ‘original’ meaning of any ancient text. My approach here adopts the premise of reception theory that meaning is made at the point of reception. In this chapter, I consider both Ovid’s reception of the past and his readers’ reception of Ovid’s reception of the past.

recognize the allusion along with her. Following from Conte's observations, other scholars have remarked on Ovid's use of memory terms as intertextual cues, leading the reader to expect allusive dialogue with previous poetry.⁵ Hinds, in particular, asserts that memory words can function in Ovid's works as signposts or footnotes to metapoetic dialogue through 'reflexive annotation,' by which poets consciously mark out their allusions as such for the reader. The memory of the character, the reader, and the poet are implicated together in the poet's reflexive annotation.

To return to our particular focus within the Ovidian corpus, *Remedia* also displays reflexive allusion, marked as such through use of memory terms. Just as at *Fasti* 3.473, the word *memini* at *Rem.* 273 also cues an instance of reflexive allusion in *Remedia* in the speech of Circe.⁶ To support his proscription against magic as an aid for the lovelorn, Ovid introduces the example of Circe, who, although a powerful witch, was unable to keep Odysseus by her side.⁷ This Homeric character is adapted for the purpose of elegy, and she gives a speech in the style of an elegiac *puella*:

*non ego, quod primo, memini, sperare solebam,
iam precor, ut coniunx tu meus esse velis;
et tamen, ut coniunx essem tua, digna videbar,
quod dea, quod magni filia Solis eram.
ne properes, oro; spatium pro munere posco:
quid minus optari per mea vota potest?
et freta mota vides, et debes illa timere:*

⁵ Barchiesi (1986, 1993), Hinds (1998), Kennedy (1993, 2006), and Miller (1993), to name a few.

⁶ To my knowledge, no one has explicitly argued that the use of a memory term here indicates reflexive annotation. Miller (1993) does not mention it in his systematic study of Ovid's use of memory terms to cue allusion. Brunelle (2002) points out the *diceris* that introduces the speech in line 271 as a "sort of 'Alexandrian footnote'... a nod to the literary tradition about Circe" (58, n. 10), citing Hinds (1998), but he does not go into detail about the implications of this observation. Pinotti (1988), *ad loc.*, similarly mentions the *diceris*, glossing this word as an indicator that this is "una storia già narrata da altri."

⁷ On this passage, see Brunelle (2002), Davisson (1996), and Barchiesi (1986).

utilior velis postmodo ventus erit.
quae tibi causa fugae? non hic nova Troia resurgit,
non aliquis socios rursus ad arma vocat.
hic amor et pax est, in qua male vulneror una,
tutaque sub regno terra futura tuo est. (Rem. 273-284)

(I do not now ask for that which, at first, I remember, I used to hope, that you might want to be my husband. And yet I considered myself worthy to be your wife, because I am a goddess, because I am the daughter of the great Sun. Do not rush, I beg. I ask you for the gift of time; what less could I wish for my prayers to achieve? You see the sea agitated, and you ought to fear it. The wind will be more favorable to your sails later. What reason do you have to flee? No new Troy is now arising, no one is calling his allies back again to arms. Love is here, and peace, in which I alone am badly injured, and the land will be safe under your control.)

Unlike his later use of this word in Ariadne's *Fasti* speech, the *memini* in line 273 does not footnote for the reader a particular passage in its most immediate hypotext, Book 10 of the *Odyssey*. Homer's Circe does not, indeed, give a speech begging Odysseus to remain behind with her.⁸ Instead, as other scholars have noted,⁹ Ovid here echoes both Homer's Calypso and Vergil's Dido, using these models to build a new scene for Circe as the abandoned woman.¹⁰ It is particularly significant that Ovid has chosen a memory word as a marker of reflexive annotation in this work because of the emphasis placed on remembering and forgetting in *Remedia*. A poor

⁸ However, as Ruth Scodel has pointed out to me, Ovid may be making a play on the gap between the actual narrative of the visit to Aeaea in Book 10 and Odysseus's summary of this trip in Book 9.31-32, which implies that Circe should give an entreating speech: ὡς δ' αὐτως Κίρκη κατερήτυεν ἐν μεγάροισιν / Αἰαίη δολόεσσα, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι (And even so Circe was detaining me in her halls, Aeaea's wily woman, longing for me to be her husband).

⁹ In particular, Geisler's (1969) chart of *Vorbilder* (e.g., Calypso's speech at *Odyssey* 5.203-213; Dido's speeches throughout *Aeneid* Book 4; and in the epistle of Ovid's own Dido in *Heroides* 7), as well as his list of other parallels outline the possible resonances here (296-298). See also Pinotti (1988), 172, and Prinz (1914), 49, for other parallels.

¹⁰ Or, as Brunelle (2002) points out, there is a difference between a *puella relicta* (like Catullus's Ariadne) and a *puella reliquenda* (like Vergil's Dido). "Circe displays none of the emotional excess of the traditional *puella relicta*: she neither rips nor removes her clothing, she does not weep, she does not wonder what will become of her" (60).

example for Ovid's student, Circe remembers; if she operated by *Remedia*'s edicts, she ought to instead forget the love affair to which she clings.

The reflexivity of this particular instance of intertext is even more pointed, as the narrator frequently alludes to his own exploits in love, as well as other poets and poetry. Ovid, as we might expect, uses the didactic mode to push the technique of reflexive annotation even further. In addition to the allusions to both Homer and Vergil, this passage in *Remedia* also interacts with Ovid's treatment of Calypso in *Ars Amatoria*.¹¹ In Book 2, Ovid advises his students to engage their intellects in the pursuit of love and uses the example of Ulysses, who entranced Calypso with his mastery of words. As Brunelle (2002) points out, the Ulysses of *Remedia* remembers his encounter with Calypso in *Ars Amatoria*: "Ulysses left Calypso behind, but he also learned his lesson: talking too much and listening too much to a lover's suggestions can lead to delay and deception. In the *Remedia*, the educated Ulysses neither responds to Circe's pleas nor apparently even listens to them.... The student of the *Remedia* remembers what happened to Ulysses in the *Ars*, and so, it seems, does Ulysses."¹² Here, then, it is not just Circe's memory (and the cue to memory provided by her words) that cues the intertextual memory of the reader, but also the memory of the silent Odysseus. The reader must recall stored memories of previous love elegy in order to interpret Ovid's advice, thereby violating his advice that his students ought to avoid love poetry altogether. A memorious reader must interpret Ovid's poetry alongside allusions to Ovid's predecessors, mobilizing stored knowledge of previous love elegy to instantiate and understand Ovid's narrative.

¹¹ On Calypso in *Ars Amatoria* 2, see Myerowitz (1985), 167-74.

¹² Brunelle (2002), 65-66. Brunelle's explanation of the interruption in the timeline is compelling: "To be sure, in the chronology of his Homeric journey from Troy to Ithaca, Odysseus encounters Circe before he comes to Calypso, and in that sense the scene in the *Remedia* occurs before the scene in *Ars* 2. But in the chronology of the Ovidian students, who have read the *Ars* before the *Remedia*, Ulysses leaves Calypso on Ogygia (in the *Ars*) before he leaves Circe on Aeaia (in the *Remedia*)" (65-66).

Allusive Memory and Remember/Know Judgments

In this chapter, I analyze intertext within the scope of cognitive memory studies. If we approach reflexive allusion from the perspective of behavioral psychology, the Ariadne passages, for example, reveal another aspect of the study of allusion in Ovid. In particular, the concept of Remember/Know judgments from behavioral psychology can confirm and explain previous scholars' observations.¹³ When participants in studies are presented with a set of objects to recall, they unconsciously categorize the objects in their responses. For objects expected to be present within the schematic context (for example, books in a professor's office), participants use statements containing *know* judgments (e.g., 'I know that there were books.'). These objects are categorized as such because their presence confirms the participants' schematic memory. Objects that are unexpected in such a context (i.e., schema-inconsistent) are more frequently recalled with *remember* judgments (e.g., 'I remember that there was a zombie standing next to the books.'). Schema-inconsistent items are preserved within episodic, rather than schematic, memory and, as such, their specifics are often better remembered by participants, at least for short periods of time.

Schematic memory corresponds to the conventions of a genre, style, or topos. Tropes and other generic conventions belong to the category of schematic memory because they evoke formulae and expectations based on the generalized knowledge of a genre. Specific allusions, however, belong to the category of episodic memory, since they correspond to precise, fixed data points (episodes) within two or more sets of works. We ought to consider allusion as schema-inconsistent because it purposefully removes the reader from the schematic context of the hypertext by bringing in information from outside of this schematic context. When a reader

¹³ The observations here are based on and comprise data from the following psychological studies: Tulving (1985); Lampinen et al. (2000, 2001); Tuckey & Brewer (2003); Long & Prat et al. (2008); Koppel & Berntsen (2014).

encounters an allusion his/her episodic memory of the particular hypotext is cued, interrupting the schematic consistency of the hypertext. Indeed, part of the game of intertextuality is to find more and more unexpected and, thereby, engaging ways to allude to one's predecessors. Even though, as genre-savvy readers, we may, in fact, *expect* allusions to appear in Latin poetry (in a way that our study participant may not quite anticipate seeing a zombie), we must categorize them as schema-inconsistent, not because we do not expect allusions, but because we cannot predict exactly what their nature will be.

When we categorize allusion as belonging to episodic, schema-inconsistent memory, we then expect it to attract *remember* judgments. Reflexive allusions, which are signposted by memory terms, then, completely fit into this system outlined by cognitive memory studies. Because Ovid is recalling a specific passage of Catullus 64 in his *Fasti*, he has Ariadne *remember* (*memini*), rather than *know*, what she has said in the past. Alternately, play with generic tropes does not utilize this type of memory language, even though it also comprises intertextual memory. In other words, tropes are not marked by memory terms because, as unspecific and broad, they belong to the category of schematic memory, rather than episodic memory. The 'reflexive allusion' observed by scholars functions exactly as we might expect according to the findings of cognitive memory studies.

Schematic Memory: Genres and Tropes, Scripts and Nodes

Although I return to allusive memory near the end of this chapter, I will now focus on poetic memory, in terms of genres and their tropes, rather than individual instances of allusion. Just as we can use cognitive memory studies to give us a frame to interpret specific allusion as episodic memory, we can also employ cognitive schema to discuss intertextuality, construed more broadly. By describing common features of a generic discourse as 'scripts' or 'nodes,'

rather than ‘generic conventions’ and ‘tropes,’ we can make ‘poetic memory’ more explicitly about processes of remembering, using cognitive theory to explain literary transmission in a different way. Since *Remedia*, as I have shown in previous chapters, is so deliberately and consciously focused on the particulars of remembering and forgetting, it is a perfect starting point for this type of memory analysis.

In behavioral psychology, a ‘script’ refers to a behavioral stereotype, the memory structure that organizes a person's general knowledge of a routine situation and the sequence of actions expected in such a situation.¹⁴ A ‘script-text’ is a written form of a script that delineates the actions that comprise a particular version of a script (e.g., a script-text may tell the story of Jane attending Latin class, which will cue the script for ‘Attending Latin Class’). Reading the text cues the script(s) in the reader's memory but also creates an episodic memory structure, separate from the underlying script itself, called an instantiation, a specific memory (also called a memory trace) of reading a particular script-text. There can be any number of versions of these script-texts, some of which may more fully detail the actions of the underlying script or may refer to yet more specific underlying scripts (e.g., the ‘Waiting for Class to Begin’ script may be contained within the ‘Attending Latin Class’ script). Scripts, then, are not static, but contain nodes, points of divergence at which different underlying scripts can be cued. Jane’s Latin class, for example, may begin in a variety of ways; the ‘Attending Latin Class’ script’s first node could cue any number of underlying scripts, including the ‘Take a Quiz’ or ‘Review Homework’ scripts. Underlying scripts have their own sets of script conditions, the motivations and goals that the script entails, but they do not generally violate the script conditions of the main script. So, when Jane’s ‘Attending Latin Class’ script forks at the node towards the ‘Take a Quiz’ script, her

¹⁴ For more detail about these terms and the studies from which they derive, see the Introduction.

overall goals of attending class do not change, but she does acquire the new goal of passing the quiz.

A script-text may, however, deviate from the norms of the main or underlying script(s), changing the script conditions. Indeed, good storytelling relies on such deviations to generate interest. Deviations from a script occur in three general types: errors, obstacles, and distractions. Errors merely involve a failure to reach the end-goal of a script (e.g., Jane shows up to class, only to find that class has been canceled and the entire script must be repeated at a different time). An obstacle removes a condition necessary to enable an imminent action, and it requires corrective action to continue in the script (e.g., Jane cannot find the classroom and must ask for directions). Distractions impose new goals on the actors that remove them, temporarily or permanently, from the script (e.g., Jane gets bitten by a zombie on the way to class and shuffles off with the horde in search of brains, class no longer a priority). Readers of interrupted script-texts remember these interruptions as part of their instantiation (i.e., the episodic memory of reading the script-text), distinct from the permanent storage of the script itself. The underlying script is activated in the reader's schematic memory, but it is the deviation that remains in the reader's instantiation of the script-text, her/his episodic memory. The aberration present in episodic memory must be interpreted, since it does not align with the underlying script. Significantly, part of this interpretation, if the deviations occur consistently enough, may involve the creation of new nodes, or even new scripts, that accommodate deviations to established scripts.

I read *Remedia* as a developed narrative that relies on the scripts readers have learned from previous elegy. While reading Ovid's poetry, his readers instantiate these accustomed scripts in episodic memory, drawing cues from the poems to recall how the narrative ought to

work according to the underlying script. But Ovid intrudes on these scripts, introducing obstacles and distractions to interrupt the flow of the normal narrative.¹⁵ The underlying script is both activated and interrupted, and the instantiated memory trace must develop new nodes as the reader learns the conditions of the new script and adapts her/his memory to these conditions. In this way, Ovid ensures the recall of both the original script, embedded in the schematic memory of the reader by his/her previous readings of elegy and cued by his invocation of its conditions, and his new script, intruded into the flow of the original script but containing a new set of conditions. Particularly, I argue that Ovid's new script conditions, established throughout his didactic works, but especially promoted in *Remedia*, set up a new goal for the lover-student: the desire for love-play and sex, rather than the ruinous and dangerous love usually scripted for the elegiac lover. Reading Ovid's poetry does not erase the underlying script of elegy (i.e., the reader does not forget the established scripts of elegiac love), but neither does it leave the elegiac script completely intact. The memory trace of Ovid's intervention remains when the reader returns to reread previous elegy. Ovid's new conditions for elegiac poetry persist in the mind of the reader.

***Remedia's* Genre-Logic: The End of Love Elegy**

In the rest of this chapter, I particularly consider the scripts of schematic memory as a structure by which to explore questions of genre in *Remedia*. This text, often hailed as the 'end of love elegy,'¹⁶ deals extensively with generic concerns. In the midst of his discussion of the appropriate ways to have sex with one's girlfriend,¹⁷ Ovid breaks off into a long *excursus* on the suitability of such topics to the genre of love elegy. This 'digression' is a nearly 40-line

¹⁵ By pointing out Ovid's intrusions on the scripts of elegy, I do not mean to say that he is the first elegist to defy readers' expectations. Indeed, I am proposing that this framework of cognitive memory studies can be applied to understand generally how tropes and generic conventions, as well as intrusions on those conventions, work in a variety of genres. I find Ovid to be a particularly useful exemplar because his flouting of generic expectations is so blatant and, indeed, because he plays off of the genre subversion of his predecessors, always taking their defiance of scripted expectations to the next, more conspicuous level.

¹⁶ Cf. Conte (1989). See Introduction.

¹⁷ As previously discussed in Ch. 3.

programmatic statement on the nature of elegy, as well as epic, tragedy, comedy, and iambic, framed as a response to his critics:

*multa quidem ex illis pudor est mihi dicere; sed tu
ingenio verbis concipe plura meis.
nuper enim nostros quidam carpsere libellos,
quorum censura Musa proterva mea est.
dummodo sic placeam, dum toto canter in orbe,
quamlibet impugnent unus et alter opus.
ingenium magni livor detractat Homeri:
quisquis es, ex illo, Zoile, nomen habes.
et tua sacrilegae laniantur carmina linguae,
pertulit huc victos quo duce Troia deos.
summa petit livor; perflant altissima venti:
summa petunt dextra fulmina missa Iovis.
at tu, quicumque es, quem nostra licentia laedit,
si sapis, ad numeros exige quidque suos.
fortia Maeonio gaudent pede bella referrī;
deliciis illic quis locus esse potest?
grande sonant tragici; tragicos decet ira cothurnos:
usibus e mediis soccus habendus erit.
liber in adversos hostes stringatur iambus,
seu celer, extremum seu trahat ille pedem.
blanda pharetratos Elegia cantet Amores,
et levis arbitrio ludat amica suo.
Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles,
Cydippe non est oris, Homere, tui.
quis feret Andromaches peragentem Thaida partes?
peccet, in Andromache Thaida quisquis agat.
Thais in arte mea est; lascivia libera nostra est;
nil mihi cum vitta; Thais in arte mea est.*

*si mea materiae respondet Musa iocosae,
vicimus, et falsi criminis acta rea est.
rumpere, Livor edax: magnum iam nomen habemus;
maius erit, tantum quo pede coepit eat.
sed nimium properas: vivam modo, plura dolebis;
et capiunt animi carmina multa mei.
nam iuvat et studium famae mihi crevit honore;
principio clivi noster anhelat equus.
tantum se nobis elegi debere fatentur,
quantum Vergilio nobile debet epos. (Rem. 359-396)*

(I am certainly ashamed to say many of these things; but, in your cleverness, imagine more from my words. For some people recently have seized on our little books, and they judge my Muse as shameless. So long as I please thus, so long as I am sung the world over, let one man or another attack my work regardless. Envy belittles the genius of great Homer; whoever you are, Zoilus, you only have a name because of him. And *your* poems, through which, under your command, Troy brought here its conquered gods, impious tongues have lacerated. Envy aims at the highest places; the winds blast the loftiest summits; lightning sent from the right hand of Jove hits the highest ground. But you, whoever you are, whom my license offends, if you have any sense, weigh each poem by its own meter. Mighty wars rejoice to be remembered in Maeonian feet; what place can there be there for pleasure? Tragedians resound grandly. Fury suits the tragic buskin; the sock should be worn for quotidian scenes. The frank iambus should be drawn to attack opposing enemies, whether it is fast-paced or drags its last foot. Gentle Elegy should sing of Loves aquiver, an airy mistress who plays according to her own pleasure. Achilles ought not be discussed in Callimachean meter; Cydippe is not for your lips, Homer. Who would consider Thais playing the part of Andromache? Whoever acts as Thais in the role of Andromache fails. Thais is part of my art; mine is a licentious lasciviousness. I have nothing to do with bridal fillets; Thais is part of my art. If my Muse answers for her playful subject, I have won, and she has been found guilty of a spurious charge. Go to hell, gluttonous Envy! My name is already great; it will be greater, should it walk so far as on that first foot. But you rush off too fast! If only I live, you will groan

all the more; my wits hold many poems yet. For the pursuit of fame gratifies me and has grown from my honor; my horse pants at the beginning of the ascent. Elegy admits that it owes as much to me as noble epic owes to Vergil.)

This *excursus*, prominently placed in the very middle of the poem, functions as a programmatic declaration of the propriety of subject matter to its genre (as well as Ovid's prowess at treating the *materia* of elegy). Ovid contends that his choice of topic should not be criticized as inappropriate since it conforms to the standards of the elegiac genre. Set apart from noble epic, grand tragedy, quotidian comedy, and self-righteous iambic, elegy is characterized as playful and a bit ribald. The genre, delineated as such, has been mastered by Ovid, who presents his expertise as equivalent to Vergil's command over epic. Notably, the fact that Ovid has received censure from critics places him in the company of Homer, as well as Vergil. This rhetorical move flanks Ovid with the two great epic poets, protecting him from the brunt of criticism through their poetic authority. However, even though their shared experience of incurring others' *livor* (*Rem.* 363), Ovid specifically distinguishes his generic *materia* from Homer's. Distancing himself from Homer and epic, he aligns himself instead with Callimachus and erotic poetry, claiming that the two genres are inherently antithetical. However, that the Callimachean mode Ovid seems to be following most closely here is polemic iambic,¹⁸ rather than elegiac,¹⁹ indicates that the great gulfs between genres that Ovid delineates in this passage do not quite hold water. And, as Davisson (1996) points out (and as I discuss below), Ovid himself will violate the prohibition against using Homeric characters like Achilles in Callimachean meter (*Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles*, 381) three times in *Remedia*.²⁰ Brunelle (2000-1) outlines the paradox of

¹⁸ Geisler (1969) points out in his note *ad loc.* that the *livor*/φθόνοϛ motif enters Roman poetry "unter dem Einfluß des Kallimachos."

¹⁹ Geisler (1969) argues at 381f. that *Callimachi numeris* must refer to elegiac couplets, as in the *Aetia*, rather than other meters used by Callimachus, because of the reference to Cydippe in 382.

²⁰ I primarily engage with the interaction between elegy and epic in *Remedia*, since Ovid focuses so much, both in this particular passage and in his *exempla*, on epic as the antithesis of his elegy. Other scholars have addressed

this passage in a different way, drawing attention to the focus on meter as a generic cue. If the reader follows Ovid's genre-logic here, then the very meter of *Remedia* invalidates its stated aims: "the elegiac form of the poem has erotic connotations, and simply reading and hearing these alluring rhythms can prevent the patient from achieving a full recovery from the disease of love."²¹ Given the paradoxical nature of this passage, the question of what is suitable to love elegy is hardly answered. Genre is very much at issue in *Remedia*.²²

Gamers and Lovers: Rescripting Elegiac Love

Ovid continues to play with elegy through his utilization of elegiac tropes. Although he has forbidden his students to read love poetry, he continues to allude to his poetic predecessors specifically and employ generic tropes throughout *Remedia*, reminding readers of those very texts he purports to want them to avoid.

By referencing generic tropes, Ovid underscores the scripts of elegy, reinscribing them in the mind of the reader. However, the *praeceptor* of *Remedia* asserts that he will purposefully be deviating from the script, introducing errors, obstacles, and distractions to keep the forlorn lover from reaching the end of his story, death. In creating these deviations, he forces the lover out of

Ovid's intertextual engagement with other genres in his didactic works. Küppers (1981), Toohey (1996: 169-173), Kennedy (2000), and Volk (2002: 157-195) consider *Remedia* within the broader context of didactic poetry. Among more specific studies, both Leach (1964) and Woytek (2000) treat the relationship between *Remedia* and Vergil's *Georgics*; Sommariva (1980), Shulman (1981) and Brunelle (2000-1) read *Ars/Remedia* alongside Lucretius. Wildberger (2007) identifies the ways in which Ovid, drawing from Lucretius and elsewhere, uses philosophical arguments to act as a "Therapeut zur Affekttherapie" for his readers. And, for something completely different, see Gavaille (2009) and Pinotti (2006), who treat comedic elements in *Ars Amatoria/Remedia*.

²¹ Brunelle (2000-1), 129.

²² In contrast to the relatively little scholarly attention paid to *Remedia* as a whole (see Introduction), many scholars interested in Ovid's exploitation of generic convention have found this particular passage illustrative of Ovid's play with genre. Conte's landmark essay (1989) on Ovid's resistance to elegiac closure begins from this *excursus*, using its paradoxically strict delineation as a jumping-off point for exploring the nature of elegy's generic boundaries and the ways in which Ovid transgresses them. Hinds (1987) connects the paradoxical relationship of generic distinction in this passage and generic mixture throughout in Ovid's works to his discussion of genre in Augustan poetry generally. As he notes in his discussion of this *excursus*, "appreciation of...the *Remedia* itself does depend on an awareness of the fact that it represents a bold marriage of elegiac norms on the one hand and norms of didactic epos on the other. Whether they are being kept or broken, generic rules are always relevant to an Augustan poem" (117). Apart from the discussion of its generic implications, there is another strand of scholarship on this passage that treats the *excursus* as autobiographical (and the critic as Augustus); cf. Geisler (1969) and Henderson (1979), *ad loc.*, as well as Woytek (2000), 200-207. Holzberg (2006) counters this trend.

the usual elegiac scripts, that is, the tropes of elegy, changing the script conditions to produce a new elegiac script, a new trope, of his own creation. The new script conditions, the motivations and goals that the script entails, are based on the desire for sex and love-play, rather than the committed and destructive love typical of the elegiac lover. The privileging of playful over destructive love is characteristic of Ovid's didactic works,²³ and it is emphasized throughout *Remedia*. In forming his new scripts, Ovid makes use of the script conditions of his previous didactic, *Ars Amatoria*, in which the student, rather than being mindlessly devoted to one mistress, learns to play the game of love while always remaining in control. This new type of elegiac lover, to whom I refer as the 'Love-Gamer,' is diametrically opposed to the 'Lovelorn Lover,'²⁴ and his scripted goals, actions, and ends leave him in no danger of the fate faced by his more traditional elegiac counterpart. By establishing new script conditions, Ovid undermines previous elegy, transforming its values and ends as he saves his student from the certain death prompted by his participation in the usual elegiac script.

To justify such drastic action, undertaken under pain of death, the first catalogues of tropes Ovid gives are lists of lovers who died from the wounds of love. He addresses his text to those mistreated by their mistresses, encouraging them to follow his advice, lest they perish from their misfortune. He gives a couple of examples of the methods of such deaths: *cur aliquis laqueo collum nodatus amator / a trabe sublimi triste pependit onus? / cur aliquis rigido fudit sua pectora ferro?* (*Rem.* 17-19; Why has some lover tied his neck with a noose and hanged himself, a gloomy burden, from a high beam? Why has another gouged his own chest with an

²³ See discussion of Myerowitz (1985) in Introduction.

²⁴ I introduce these two terms to describe these tropic characters and the scripts their presence cues. The 'Love-Gamer' represents the Ovidian new elegiac lover introduced by Ovid's didactic poetry; emotionally distanced and interested only in the game of love, his scripted goal is, for the most part, sexual pleasure. The 'Lovelorn Lover,' on the other hand, encapsulates the figure of the elegiac lover unlucky in love, obsessed with his *puella* but unable to reach her. His mention can cue any number of the accustomed elegiac scripts for the tropes associated with such a figure (e.g., the *exclusus amator*; the suicidal lover-student of *Remedia*). The tropes Ovid includes under the umbrella of the 'Lovelorn Lover' topos are discussed below.

obdurate sword?) Either the noose or the sword awaits any lover caught in an unrequited love with a hard mistress. Although both Geisler and Henderson *ad loc.* cite possible specific points of reference for these forms of suicide, I argue that they function here as tropes, generalized to the schema of ‘tragic deaths of the despondent.’ Ovid here refers the reader to the end of the ‘Lovelorn Lover’ script, in which the different methods of suicide correspond to different nodes at which the script can deviate, always with the same conclusion: death. However, these tropes of self-inflicted death are not part of a specifically elegiac script, but belong to a larger script of erotic poetry, which Ovid, as we have seen (e.g., *Rem.* 756-765, above) traces back to Callimachus and the other Hellenistic poets. Here, Ovid makes a rhetorical move to bring this realm of poetry into the Roman elegiac fold, intertwining the scripts of the two traditions. He connects the Hellenistic script of the mythological suicidal lover to the Roman script of the tortured elegiac lover in order to create a pretense for his instruction, the ‘Lovelorn Lover’ script ending in death.

To more fully affix the end of suicide onto the elegiac script, Ovid follows up his description of the tropes of death with an inventory of elegiac tropes:

*effice nocturna frangatur ianua rixa,
 et tegat ornatas multa corona fores:
 fac coeant furtim iuvenes timidaeque puellae,
 verbaque dent cauto qualibet arte viro:
 et modo blanditias rigido, modo iurgia posti
 dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans. (Rem. 31-36)*

(See to it that the door is broken in the nightly fray and that the portals are covered, decked with many a garland. Have youths and nervous girls meet secretly and fool their wary husbands by any means necessary. And let the excluded lover first flatter, then berate, the doorpost and croon a sad song.)

Ovid here leads the reader through the script of the elegiac love affair, each episode or node of the story reflecting a different trope of elegy. The lover makes known his love by loitering by the door of his beloved, getting into fights with his rivals,²⁵ and leaving garlands at her home. The successful lover will arrange a secret meeting, unbeknownst to his beloved's spouse, while the visit of the disappointed lover will deteriorate into begging, name-calling, and weeping. As he made clear earlier in the poem,²⁶ the *praeceptor* will not concern himself with the successful lover's script, but will only deal with the 'Lovelorn Lover', whom he purports to be able to save from his deadly fate. Indeed, he explicitly mentions the trope of the *exclusus amator*, the locked-out lover who follows the prescribed script of the *paraclausithyron*. This script consists of a series of specific conditions: the *ianua clausa* of the mistress, the *exclusus amator* denied access, and his *vigilatio*, comprised of a song, directed to the door itself, about his misery in love. As Copley (1956) notes, this script is an elemental part of Roman love elegy: "The lament of the *exclusus amator* is in [the elegists'] eyes the first, the chief, and the most characteristic manifestation and symptom of love..."²⁷ By instructing the reader to avoid the '*Exclusus Amator*' script, then, Ovid overturns the most basic schema of elegiac love.

Towards the end of saving the lover, the narrator implores Cupid to be satisfied with the tears he has already received up to this point in the script (*his lacrimis contentus eris*, 37), those already caused by rejected love. The *praeceptor* does not assert that he will prevent the elegiac script from starting, then, but that he will turn the lover away from the node that would assign him a script of death, altering the course of the script, which, previously, has only ended fatally.

²⁵ As Henderson (1979) notes *ad loc.*, these fights between rivals were a "recurrent feature of the erotic κῶμος or *comissatio*."

²⁶ *siquis amat quod amare iuvat, feliciter ardens / gaudeat, et vento naviget ille suo* (*Rem.* 13-14; If any man loves and is pleased by that love, may he be happy in that felicitous passion and sail along on a favoring wind).

²⁷ Copley (1956), 70. See Copley for the development of the *paraclausithyron* as a literary motif throughout both the Greek and Roman periods.

Even as he reasserts the different tropes of elegy, Ovid asserts that he will change the script irrevocably for his students.

His claims become even more exaggerated as he continues the argument, culminating in a declaration that, if he had been able to reach the great figures of the mythological past with his precepts, he would have saved them from their tragic ends.

*vixisset Phyllis, si me foret usa magistro,
et per quod novies, saepius isset iter;
nec moriens Dido summa vidisset ab arce
Dardanias vento vela dedisse rates;
nec dolor armasset contra sua viscera matrem,
quae socii damno sanguinis ulta virum est.
arte mea Tereus, quamvis Philomela placeret,
per facinus fieri non meruisset avis.
da mihi Pasiphaën, iam tauri ponet amorem:
da Phaedram, Phaedrae turpis abibit amor.
crede Parim nobis, Helenen Menelaus habebit,
nec manibus Danais Pergama victa cadent.
impia si nostros legisset Scylla libellos,
haesisset capiti purpura, Nise, tuo. (Rem. 55-68)*

(Phyllis would have lived, if she had had me as her teacher, and she would have walked more often the path she only took nine times. Nor would dying Dido have seen, from her high citadel, the Dardanian ships giving sail to the wind. Nor would pain have armed against her own flesh and blood that mother, who punished her husband with the loss of his bloodline. By my art Tereus, however pleasing he found Philomela, would not have deserved to have been turned into a bird because of his crime. Give me Pasiphaë, soon she will no longer love the bull; give me Phaedra, her shameful love will disappear. Turn over Paris to me, and Menelaus will keep Helen, and conquered Pergamum will not fall to Danaan hands. If impious Scylla had read my books, the purple would have clung to your head, Nisus.)

In this passage, the *praeceptor* asserts that he could have saved a bevy of mythological characters; by following his advice, they could have avoided falling so deeply in love that they committed their disgraceful crimes. Characters like Phyllis, Dido, and Medea, although they may have still fallen in love, might have been able to forget that love (as their lovers have forgotten them) and to move on before committing suicide (or, in the case of Medea, filicide). Tereus, Pasiphaë, and Phaedra, furthermore, might never have engaged in their ill-conceived loves in the first place. And, most surprisingly, had Paris, the infamous lover, been subjected to *Remedia*'s teachings, he might have never stolen away Helen, and the whole Trojan War might have been avoided! If the *praeceptor* could influence the mythological past, he would entirely rewrite the scripts of Greco-Roman myth, avoiding the need for tragic endings. Significantly, the *praeceptor* does not assert that he would have kept many of these characters from falling in love in the first place; instead, he claims that he could have convinced them to fall out of love in time to avoid their unhappy fates. In other words, he does not profess an ability to avoid the script of tragic love entirely, but to avert its fatal conclusion, directing the characters towards a happier (or at least more neutral) ending. In doing so, Ovid purports to introduce an obstacle to the 'Lovelorn Lover' script. As described above, an obstacle is a deviation from a script that removes a condition necessary to enable an expected action, requiring corrective action to continue the script. The necessary condition that Ovid removes from the script is, of course, love. By persuading these characters to forget their love, he causes them to turn away from the all-consuming, unfettered, destructive desire that causes lovers to engage in nefarious acts. The removal of love from the sequence of actions is an obstacle that the script cannot sustain. Unable to return to the 'Lovelorn Lover' script, the characters must abandon the script altogether, turning away from their destructive ends.

Shortly after this catalogue of mythological characters who could have been saved by his preventatives, Ovid reaffirms his goal of rescripting the narrative of love elegy by referencing his previous works: *Naso legendus erat tum, cum didicistis amare; / idem nunc vobis Naso legendus erit* (*Rem.* 71-72; You should have read Naso then when you learned to love; you should read the same Naso now). The *praeceptor* does not reject his previous works with this declaration, but establishes continuity between them.²⁸ The student who wants to conquer love through skill should read *Ars Amatoria*; the student who wishes to defeat love through avoidance of its scripted outcomes should read *Remedia Amoris*. Significantly, the *praeceptor* does not claim that he can eliminate love altogether, but that he, as the ultimate authority on love elegy, can rewrite its conclusions. Here and throughout *Remedia*, Ovid claims such dominance over the genre of love elegy that he can change its very structure according to his whims. In the same way that Vergil could change the ends of epic, leaving characters mid-act rather than completing their scenes,²⁹ Ovid purports to change the script of love elegy, allowing the characters of myth to avoid their seemingly inevitable fates.

After this prologue, the *praecepta* begin, teaching students to subvert the scripts of love elegy. In particular, he teaches the student to avoid the untenable situation of the *exclusus amator*.

*dixerit, ut venias: pacta tibi nocte venito;
veneris, et fuerit ianua clausa: feres.
nec dic blanditias nec fac convicia posti
nec latus in duro limine pone tuum.
postera lux aderit: careant tua verba querelis,
et nulla in vultu signa dolentis habe.* (*Rem.* 505-510)

²⁸ As Brunelle (2000-1) phrases it, “Ovid acknowledges no difference in the effect of his poetic tone and that of his literary sources, because he is his own literary source” (135).

²⁹ See discussion of *Rem.* 359-396 above.

(Say she has said that you should come; come on your appointed night. Say you've come, and the door is shut. Deal with it. Don't flatter, don't clamor at the door, don't lie down on the hard threshold. When morning comes the next day, remove complaints from your vocabulary, and make sure no signs of suffering are on your face.)

The student must be, quite literally, vigilant in avoiding falling into the script of the *paraclausithyron*. He must make sure that he doesn't allow emotion to control his actions, resolving himself to leave if he is not immediately allowed in, rather than becoming trapped in the role of *exclusus amator*. Instead, he must feign indifference, stoically revealing no pain at his mistress's cruel actions. To make sure that he truly avoids this trap, he must not only fool her, but even himself: *te quoque falle tamen* (*Rem.* 513). He avoids the script of the locked-out lover by pretending himself in a different role, that of the insouciant libertine, undisturbed by love because he, in accordance with the conditions of the 'Love-Gamer' script, desires only sexual pleasure. He should perform disinterest not only when his mistress rejects him, but even when she makes overtures: *ianua forte patet? quamvis revocabere, transi. / est data nox? dubita nocte venire data* (*Rem.* 519-520; Is her door perhaps open? Though she may recall you, walk on by. You've been granted a night? Hesitate to come on the given date). The lover should be (or, at least, should pretend to be) so apathetic that the mistress will think that he has forgotten her, even as she has remembered him. In this pretense, the elegiac roles of the characters are reversed: the lover becomes cruel and unfeeling, while the mistress is excluded and disempowered.

Here, Ovid introduces a deviation from the elegiac script, a distraction, which, in the terminology of cognitive memory studies, imposes new goals on its actors, removing them, temporarily or permanently, from the script. Instead of acting out the *paraclausithyron*, the lover's action is diverted from the unhappy path of elegiac love. His goals are redirected; no

longer desiring only the acceptance of his mistress, he convinces himself that sex alone (rather than the love of his mistress alone) is his goal. Towards this end, this particular precept concludes with the advice that, if the lover finds he cannot endure, he can always take pleasure from an easier source than his cruel mistress (*protinus ex facili gaudia ferre licet*, *Rem.* 522). The *praeceptor* reroutes the script of elegy by switching out the cast of characters, the *exclusus amator* and his cruel mistress exchanged for the Ovidian disciple already skilled in love's game. *Remedia* rewrites the expected conclusion for the 'Lovelorn Lover' script, advising the lover to follow a different path than his elegiac predecessors. By changing the goal of the lover, Ovid introduces a new possible end for the script. Having reached a certain node, the lover can either follow the elegiac path of destructive love or he can choose Ovid's new 'Love-Gamer' script. By following the *praeceptor*'s advice, the lover is empowered to diverge from the accustomed script of deadly elegiac love, no longer endangered by his unreciprocated passion.

The advice about avoiding complaints against the mistress in the passage above is echoed in other places, in seemingly contradictory terms. About fifty lines after he advises the lover not to fall into the '*Exclusus Amator*' script, he continues to advocate stoic silence about the mistress:

*tu quoque, qui causam finiti reddis amoris,
deque tua domina multa querenda refers,
parce queri; melius sic ulciscere tacendo,
ut desiderii effluat illa tuis.* (*Rem.* 643-646)

(And you, repeating the reason for your love's end and recalling your many complaints against your mistress, just stop complaining. You'll take better revenge by being silent, so that she may be forgotten from your yearning thoughts.)

As above in *Rem.* 505-510, the *praeceptor* advises against vocalizing complaints or accusations against the mistress. As he emphasizes in his language, constantly repeating criticisms about her

causes one to remember (*refers*), while being silent causes one to forget (*effluat*). Forgetting and remembering the mistress, however, are more complicated processes than simply making a statement or keeping silent. It is not just personal episodic memory of the mistress and her faults that are at play here, but also the schematic memory of the script the *praeceptor* wishes his students to avoid. Here, he once again diverts the student away from the ‘*Exclusus Amator*’ script, which is enacted when the lover issues complaints against his mistress, following his scripted lines. In other words, it is not simply the complaining itself that endangers the lover, dooming him to remember his beloved, but it is the prompting of the script that starts the lover on his charted course towards death. If he stays quiet, the script will not begin. In advising silence, Ovid introduces an obstacle to this script, derailing the lover from his fatal track. The failure to enact the script fully causes the lover to avoid its end. By keeping silent, then, the lover avoids both reliving personal, episodic memory and enacting schematic memory that would subconsciously lead him down a dark path.

This advice to keep quiet, however, seems to differ from a precept given earlier in the text, in which the student is encouraged to remember and enumerate the faults of his mistress.³⁰ Her perfidy and greed bring the lover pain and misery, which he should enshrine as warnings in his memory:

*saepe refer tecum sceleratae facta puellae,
et pone ante oculos omnia damna tuos.
‘illud et illud habet, nec ea contenta rapina est:
sub titulum nostros misit avara lares.
sic mihi iuravit, sic me iurata fefellit,
ante suas quotiens passa iacere fores!
diliget ipsa alios, a me fastidit amari;*

³⁰ For a lengthier treatment of the mistress’s faults, especially physical flaws, see chapter 3.

institor, heu, noctes, quas mihi non dat, habet!'

haec tibi per totos inacescant omnia sensus:

haec refer, hinc odii semina quaere tui. (Rem. 299-308)

(Often remember the deeds of your corrupt mistress, and lay all your losses before your eyes. 'She's gotten this and that, and she's not even content with such robbery! The greedy woman has sent my house and home to the auction block. She swore to me, and cheated me sworn, even as often as she let me lie before her door! She loves other men herself, but is contemptuous of being loved by me. Alas, a huckster shares her nights, which she doesn't give to me!' Let all these things sour your feelings; remember these things, and therein seek the seeds of your hate.)

The *praeceptor* here brings up another part of the 'Lovelorn Lover' trope, the avarice and faithlessness of the mistress. The motif of the *rapax puella* is constant throughout elegy and, indeed, as Geisler (1969) points out *ad loc.*, "überall in der Literatur."³¹ But, in *Remedia*, it is treated as a trope particular to the genre, the lament of an elegiac lover outwitted by his mistress, who has defrauded and betrayed him. The lover is instructed to recall and keep in mind the emotional and financial toll of his affair. According to the *praeceptor*, the lover's anger at being swindled, his grief at his monetary loss, and his jealousy of other men may be combined to form a hatred so powerful that he will forget his love and remember only his hate. Although this precept seems to contradict Ovid's advice that he should cease grouching about his mistress, it actually represents another deviation from the script. Usually, the goal of the lover in the elegiac script is to obtain his love, engaging his mistress's exclusive sexual favors. Although the elegiac lover may resent or even loathe his mistress for her refusal to allow the lover to reach completion of this goal, he never truly gives it up. Here, Ovid inserts a distraction, which impedes the progress of the script by placing new goals on the actors. By following this precept, selectively remembering the mistress's greed and keeping those memories constantly in mind, the student

³¹ Although, true to German philological form, Geisler does, of course, give specific examples as well, in Tibullus and Propertius (among others), *ad* 301.

can train his mind to cultivate a more powerful hatred than the milder one normally experienced by elegiac lovers. According to the *praeceptor*, this more forceful hatred actually sours more positive emotions, like love, replacing their power to exert control over the lover. Introducing such a potent and constant hatred as the one resulting here forces the lover to alter his goals. The love of his mistress alone is no longer his purpose, and the lover deviates from the script as his priorities change.

But, then, what is the new goal of this angry lover? What outcome does his new script achieve? As we saw previously (*Rem.* 522, above), the new goal desired by the ‘Love-Gamer’ is sexual pleasure, not all-consuming love. Another passage underscoring this change in purpose also encourages the lover to recall aspects of the elegiac script:

*nunc tibi rivalis, nunc durum limen amanti,
nunc subeant mediis inrita verba deis.
nec compone comas, quia sis venturus ad illam,
nec toga sit laxo conspicienda sinu.
nulla sit, ut placeas alienae cura puellae;
iam facito e multis una sit illa tibi. (Rem. 677-682)*

(Call to mind now your rival, now her stony-hearted threshold, now her worthless vows, spoken in the midst of the gods. Don’t style your hair because you’re going to go to her, and don’t let your toga attract attention with its ample folds. Take no trouble to please her now that she’s somebody else’s mistress; make clear that she is now one of many to you.) The lover is instructed to, internally, remember the litany of his mistress’s flaws, while ignoring her publically. He should protect his mind with the memory of his past, remembering both what he should not and should not do, recalling both roles simultaneously. The refusal to perform certain tasks (e.g., taking pains over one’s hair or clothes before encountering his mistress) serves as an obstacle to the script, since it keeps the lover from successfully acting out his role. Alternately, performing indifference provides a distraction from the script, changing the goals of

the lover, who no longer desires his mistress alone. (Or, at least by the *praeceptor*'s reckoning, he *should* not suffer from these desires any longer.) By introducing these obstacles and distractions, Ovid interrupts the elegiac script of the 'Lovelorn Lover,' compelling his students away from the expected, deadly outcomes of the schema.

Homeric Elegiac? Epic Characters, Elegiac Tropes

Ovid, however, is not only interested in disrupting *elegiac* scripts. Indeed, he takes great pains to implicate other genres, especially epic, in his rescripting of elegy. As we have seen above in his long programmatic piece at *Rem.* 359-396, Ovid pretends to create categorical distinctions between genres, only to continuously undermine his own arguments. His list of generic divisions culminates in a definition of elegy that distinguishes it from specifically Homeric epic:

*Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles,
Cydippe non est oris, Homere, tui.
quis feret Andromaches peragentem Thaida partes?
peccet, in Andromache Thaida quisquis agat. (Rem. 379-382)*

(Achilles ought not be discussed in Callimachean meter; Cydippe is not for your lips, Homer. Who would consider Thais playing the part of Andromache? Whoever acts as Thais in the role of Andromache fails.)

Elegy is distinguished from epic by its meter and its characters. The former, of course, is a perfectly sensible genre marker, since meter is a defining characteristic of these genres. The latter assertion is more problematic, since many ancient mythological characters appear in multiple genres. Andromache, for instance, receives treatment in both Homeric epic and Euripidean tragedy. Ovid often takes advantage of the genre ambivalence of certain characters to use epic characters for elegiac means. Indeed, his previous use of Andromache in *Ars Amatoria*,

as an example of the importance of certain sexual positions,³² certainly undermines his message here, that Andromache does not belong in love poetry. However, his insistence on Achilles as an especially epic character is the most immediately striking example in this passage, as Achilles will enter the narrative of *Remedia* in less than one hundred lines.³³ Ovid underscores his use of epic, especially Homeric, characters in this paradoxical passage in order to emphasize his masterful rewriting of generic scripts from elegy and beyond.

We have already seen instances of Ovid's interpolating characters from other genres into his elegiac handbook. The catalogue of mythological characters given at *Rem.* 55-68 (above) includes characters from Callimachean epigram (Phyllis), Vergilian epic (Dido), Euripidean tragedy (Medea, Pasiphaë, Phaedra), and Homeric epic (Paris/Helen, Scylla), as well as characters often used as examples broadly throughout ancient literary sources.³⁴ But some of these characters had already been incorporated into the elegiac tradition writ large, either by previous love poets or by Ovid himself.³⁵ Their appearance in a list of figures troped as elegiac is relatively unsurprising, although the implications that Ovid's work could rewrite their stories and

³² In these lines, Andromache does indeed seem to play the part of Thais: *parva vehatur equo: quod erat longissima, numquam / Thebais Hectoreo nupta resedit equo.* (*Ars Amatoria* 3.777-778; Only a small woman should ride astride; because she was so tall, his Theban bride never found her seat on Hector's saddle.) As Barchiesi (2006), in his discussion of Andromache in *Ars*, points out, "*Thebais* is only a couple of letters away from the unruly *Thais*" (109).

³³ Indeed, as Davisson (1996) points out, Achilles is an actor in three *exempla* in *Remedia* (256). I discuss two of these below.

³⁴ The Tereus/Philomela/Procne story is commonplace, as Geisler (1969) notes: "Die Sage wird in griech. und lat. Literatur oft erwähnt...wie hier als exemplum für Verbrechen (per facinus) aus Liebe" (*ad* 61f.). Pasiphaë, although she has a clear Euripidean source (*Cretes*), was also popular amongst the Alexandrians and Roman Neoterics, including Gallus (Henderson (1979), *ad loc.*). Scylla presents a particularly interesting case because Scylla, daughter of Nisus, is often conflated with Scylla, the Homeric sea-monster, especially in Roman sources (including by Ovid himself at *Am.* 3.12.21). Geisler, *ad loc.*, argues that Ovid identifies "die Scylla Nisi mit dem homerischen Meerungeheuer." I agree, given the context of the couplet about Scylla, which immediately follows a reference to the *Iliad*. Indeed, since the passage seems to reach its height of absurdity with the statement that Ovid could have voided the entire Trojan War and, thereby, all of Homeric epic, it is oddly anticlimactic to follow with a reference to the relatively obscure Scylla, unless we understand this reference to be an extension of the dramatic implication about Homer made in the previous lines. If the Scylla here is understood to be both the daughter of Nisus and the monster who eats Odysseus's crew, then the rhetorical flow of the passage appears to run much more smoothly, since the final two couplets both involve an overthrow of Homer.

³⁵ Ovid had already treated Phyllis, Dido, Medea, Phaedra and Paris/Helen in *Heroides* and Pasiphaë in *Ars Amatoria*.

unwrite his and his predecessors' elegy is shocking. Ovid's appropriation of Homeric characters is the most innovative of these borrowings, especially given the inflammatory implications of Ovid's reuse. He claims that his advice could have kept Paris from stealing Helen, stopping the whole Trojan War: *crede Parim nobis, Helenen Menelaus habebit, / nec manibus Danais Pergama victa cadent* (*Rem.* 65-66; Turn over Paris to me, and Menelaus will keep Helen, and conquered Pergamum will not fall to Danaan hands). In these lines, Ovid attributes to himself the ability to rewrite all of Homer (and the majority of other ancient literature, besides) in two simple steps. First, he re-genres these characters by changing their motivations and goals, and thereby the scripts they follow, from epic (motivated primarily by honor) to elegiac (motivated primarily by love).³⁶ Then, he purports to cure them of this love, derailing them from their scripted elegiac ends. By changing the goals of Homeric characters, Ovid alters the script conditions in such a way that the characters actually prompt a different script for the reader, removing them completely from the Homeric world. However, he then even changes the script conditions of elegy, so that the usual scripts of elegy (e.g., the 'Lovelorn Lover') no longer apply, leaving as possibilities only the script created by his Ovidian didactic elegy, the 'Lover-Gamer' motivated by sex.

Why should Ovid incorporate epic characters into an elegiac framework, only to free them immediately from following elegiac scripts? As with other types of borrowings, incorporating epic characters into elegy can be a way for elegists to claim authority over even the most respected genre. Here, Ovid asserts a claim over both elegiac and epic scripts by subverting each, although in different ways.

³⁶ Pinotti (2006), in her brief study of Homeric *exempla* in *Remedia*, discusses this transfer of generic values as "dissacrazione giocosa del mondo mitico e dell'eroismo iliadico, che 'degrada' il codice epico omerico" (53), a continuation of Ovid's irreverent engagement with his predecessors in *Ars* and *Heroides*. I do not entirely disagree with this assessment, but my focus here is on the *process* of the bathetic move from epic to elegiac, rather than the variety of possible intertexts.

Paris is perhaps the Homeric character most easily adapted to love elegy. More suited to love than war, he is driven less by honor than his fellow heroes. Ovid makes use of his character as an example throughout *Remedia*. As we have seen, he first claims that, if Paris had heeded his advice, he would never have gone so far as to take Helen from Sparta, and, thus, the entire Trojan War would have been avoided (*Rem.* 65-66). Here, Paris's *exemplum* is a negative one; students should not act as Paris did, but should take Ovid's advice, or they might end up in a similarly sticky situation. The next time Paris is mentioned however, he represents a positive example of conduct to be emulated. To divide his attention and interest in his beloved, Ovid advises the lover to take on two mistresses at once. To demonstrate the principle of the diminishment of intensity through division, he gives a catalogue of mythological lovers who found distraction in a second love. Among Minos, Phineus, Alcmaon, and Tereus, Ovid gives the example of Paris, who would have stayed with Oenone, if Helen had not stolen his heart (*Rem.* 457-458). The logic of this advice, however, is not quite sound; none of these stories, of course, turns out well in the end.³⁷ Paris may have succeeded in forgetting his love for Oenone, but it is his love for Helen that starts a war. However, Ovid does drag these characters away from their original contexts into a different sort of script. Paris, in love with Oenone, becomes the elegiac lover, trapped in a love he cannot escape. If we understand him to be following Ovid's advice in *Remedia*, turning away from the pursuit of love towards the pursuit of sex, his relationship with Helen diverges not only from the Homeric script, but from the elegiac script, as well. Paris is transformed from a Homeric hero who does not dwell sufficiently on honor, to a hopeless elegiac

³⁷ Ovid seems to acknowledge, tongue-in-cheek, that his choice of *exempla* may not quite support his argument, when he abruptly cuts himself off with praeterition: *quid moror exemplis, quorum me turba fatigat? / successore novo vincitur omnis amor* (*Rem.* 461-462; Why do I delay with examples, the great number of which is exhausting? All love is conquered by the next-in-line). A quick abandonment of the evidence and a bald restatement of the argument may easily distract the reader from the fact that these examples are not necessarily the best to follow. As the immediately following Agamemnon passage shows, however, Ovid does not truly give up on the persuasive power of *exempla* here. Indeed, as Henderson (1979) notes, *ad loc.*, "*fatigat* is ironical (the reader knows very well that Ovid has unusual stamina when it comes to exemplification)."

lover who is unable to control his passions, to an Ovidian lothario who pursues only the pleasures of sex. As his goals shift, his genred script changes from epic war, to elegiac love, to Ovidian didactic.

Despite the seemingly natural adoption of Paris by elegy, Ovid never spares the hero more than two lines at a time. His treatment of Agamemnon, on the other hand, is a far more extensive, more substantial exploration of the value of Homeric *exempla* to the elegiac lover, and it follows shortly on the heels of the example of Paris. This passage, which gives an elegized summary of the first book of the *Iliad*, explicitly utilizes the authority of Homeric epic to further solidify the argument that the lover, to bring his first love to an end, should take on a second mistress:

*ac ne forte putes nova me tibi condere iura
(atque utinam inventi gloria nostra foret!),
vidit id Atrides: quid enim non ille videret,
cuius in arbitrio Graecia tota fuit?
Marte suo captam Chryseida, victor amabat:
at senior stulte flebat ubique pater.
quid lacrimas, odiose senex? bene convenit illis:
officio natam laedis, inepte, tuo.
quam postquam reddi Calchas ope tutus Achillis,
iusserat, et patria est illa recepta domo,
'est' ait Atrides 'illius proxima forma,
et, si prima sinat syllaba, nomen idem;
hanc mihi, si sapiat, per se concedet Achilles:
si minus, imperium sentiet ille meum.
quod si quis vestrum factum hoc incusat, Achivi,
est aliquid valida sceptrum tenere manu.
nam si rex ego sum, nec mecum dormiat ulla,
in mea Thersites regna licebit eat.'*

*dixit et hanc habuit solacia magna prioris,
et posita est cura cura repulsa nova.
ergo adsume novas auctore Agamemnone flammam,
ut tuus in bivio distineatur amor. (Rem. 465-486)*

(And lest you, perhaps, think that I am giving new laws to you—if only the honor of the discovery were mine!—Atrides saw it. For what could that man not see, with all Greece under his authority? He, the conquering hero, loved Chryseis, captured by his own effort in war. But her father was foolishly crying everywhere! Why do you weep, tiresome old man? They're on good terms. You hurt your daughter, you boor, with your self-righteousness. After Calchas, safe with the help of Achilles, had ordered her to be returned, and she was taken back into her father's house, Atrides said, 'There is one nearest her in beauty, and, if the first syllable gives leave, the name is the same. Achilles, if he's smart, will relinquish her to me of his own accord; if not, he will feel my mastery. But if any of you are questioning this act, Achaeans, it's worth something to hold a scepter in strong hands. For if I am king, and no girl should sleep with me, Thersites may as well reign.' He spoke, and he took her as full consolation for the last girl, and his old affection was pushed aside by a new one. So, on the authority of Agamemnon, take up a new flame, and your love will fork itself.)

The *praeceptor* claims Agamemnon as an authority for his own advice, demonstrating that the hero was able to forget his first love merely by taking up with a second woman. Agamemnon here becomes the exemplar for Ovid's new elegiac script. He does not behave like the typical elegiac lover, weeping over the loss of his beloved.³⁸ He remains in control of his emotions and makes a strategic play for power, threatening Achilles with violence and the other Achaeans with chaos if he does not get his way. Agamemnon, unlike Paris before him, does not leave the epic script, only to go through the transition of becoming a typical elegiac lover before he, finally,

³⁸ Indeed, all the weeping here is done by Chryses, the elderly father relegated to the role of the *senex*. Pinotti (2006) points out that the language used to describe Chryses codes to both elegy and comedy: "È evidente qui l'interferenza del codice elegiaco con quello dell'epica: in base alla morale elegiaca, i vecchi sono per definizione ostacoli ai legami erotici dei giovani, decrepiti moralisti guastafeste capaci solo di incomprensioni o di interferenze con il mondo della gioventù e dell'amore" (46). She also notes a Homeric intertext for this passage; at *Il.* 9.612-614, when Achilles implores Phoenix not to try to sway him by weeping.

becomes Ovid's ideal lover. Instead, Ovid changes Agamemnon's script conditions such that the hero appears to prompt a variation on the epic script, one that is both epic and Ovidian new elegiac. The passage itself evokes epic convention, with its Homeric speech format, including the formulaic *dixit* following Agamemnon's speech (483), which parallels the ὦς φάτο after the corresponding speech at *Il.* 1.188. Ovid's Agamemnon is still motivated, to some degree, by honor; he will not countenance challenges from his inferiors, and he shores up his power amongst his men with threats, similar to his Homeric counterpart.³⁹ However, Ovid's Agamemnon differs in his rhetorical focus. The passionate words of the angry Homeric hero, focused on his punishment of Achilles, are constrained to only two lines (477-478) in Ovid's version. Instead, his Agamemnon emphasizes the benefits of being supreme ruler (479-482), especially the carnal rewards inherent in power. Agamemnon's main motivator here is the Ovidian elegiac desire for sex; the epic goal of honor is only valuable insofar as it helps Agamemnon achieve his primary directive.⁴⁰ And achieve it he does, according to Ovid. By following the Ovidian elegiac script of the dispassionate lover, rather than either the epic or traditional elegiac scripts, Agamemnon is able to achieve his end, sex without the complications

³⁹ Homer's Agamemnon is also full of threats for Achilles, which he justifies as both retribution for Achilles' disrespect and a deterrent to others who may want to challenge the warlord as well:

...ἀπειλήσω δέ τοι ὧδε:
 ὡς ἔμ' ἀφαιρεῖται Χρυσηίδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,
 τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σὺν νηϊ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς ἐτάροισι
 πέμψω, ἐγὼ δέ κ' ἄγω Βρισηίδα καλλιπάρηον
 αὐτὸς ἰὼν κλισίην δὲ τὸ σὸν γέρας ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῆς
 ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν, στυγέη δὲ καὶ ἄλλος
 ἴσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι καὶ ὁμοιωθῆμεναι ἄντην. (*Il.* 1.181-187)

(But I will threaten you like so: just as Phoebus Apollo takes away from me the daughter of Chryses, whom I will send, along with my ship and my companions, so I, going to your tent myself, will take away beautiful-cheeked Briseis, your prize, so that you will know well how much better I am than you and others will fear to declare themselves equal to me and openly compare themselves to me.)

⁴⁰ The possibility that Agamemnon may be valuing pleasure over honor in this decision does raise its head in the *Iliad*. Thersites accuses Agamemnon of being motivated by sex: ἥε γυναῖκα νέην, ἵνα μίσγειαι ἐν φλότῃ, / ἦν τ' αὐτὸς ἀπονόσφι κατίσχει; (*Il.* 2.231-233; Or is it the young girl, whom you're holding back for yourself so that you can make love with her?) The reference to Thersites at *Remedia* 482 appears to acknowledge that Ovid's interpretation of events has put a positive spin on what was, in the Homeric hypertext, an insulting accusation against Agamemnon.

of consuming love. He is even able to use this sexual success, due to his rhetorical efforts, towards the maintenance of his political and military power, a fringe benefit that would surely please Homer's Agamemnon as well. Agamemnon emerges from his script-change as a positive *exemplum* for the student of *Remedia*, his passionate and vindictive tendencies in Homer altered to create a new, calculating lover who prompts Ovid's new elegiac script and achieves its satisfying end.

Unfortunately, Agamemnon's brother, Menelaus, is not quite so successful in his script-change. The opposite of his sibling, Menelaus is a negative *exemplum* in *Remedia*, since he cannot forget his old love, even though she has taken up with someone new. Menelaus's example is introduced as part of the *praeceptor's* advice to avoid thinking about rivals. A lover who abandons his mistress may risk relapse if he sees her with a new man. Instead, he should imagine that he has no rivals, since dwelling on the thought can stir up previously conquered emotions. Menelaus provides the example which the student ought not follow:

*quid, Menelae, doles? ibas sine coniuge Creten,
et poteris nupta lentus abesse tua.
ut Paris hanc rapuit, nunc demum uxore carere
non potes: alterius crevit amore tuus. (Rem. 773-776)*

(What are you crying about, Menelaus? You left for Crete without your spouse, and you were able to remain unhurriedly absent from your bride. But once Paris snatched her away, only now are you unable to be without your wife; your love increased only because of the love of another.)

Menelaus, although it is he who abandoned his wife, is stuck in the script of the elegiac lover. Like an *exclusus amator*, he watches, weeping, from the periphery as his *puella* steals away with another man. Instead of retaliating against a challenge to his honor, as the epic Menelaus did when he attacked Troy to retrieve his wife, the Ovidian Menelaus's response occupies a different

emotional sphere. He realizes he loves Helen only when another man wants her. Although the goal of both versions is the same (namely, retrieving Helen), their motivation differs. As we have seen, Ovid's alterations of epic scripts always involve a change from honor to love.

Unfortunately for Menelaus, the elegiac script he prompts is not the one with the happy ending. With his example, the *praeceptor* warns readers away from the folly of thinking they operate within the bounds of the Ovidian elegiac script, which promises pleasure without the burden of emotion, if they merely choose elegy over epic values. Menelaus may have thought he had jumped from the epic to the new elegiac script, like his brother, but he instead fell into the trap of traditional elegy.

Immediately following the example of Menelaus, Achilles is similarly characterized as an *exclusus amator*, thwarted by his rival Agamemnon, who remains the Ovidian hero *par excellence*:

*hoc et in abducta Briseide flebat Achilles,
illam Plisthenio gaudia ferre viro.
nec frustra flebat, mihi credite; fecit Atrides,
quod si non faceret, turpiter esset iners.
certe ego fecissem, nec sum sapientior illo:
invidiae fructus maximus ille fuit.
nam sibi quod numquam tactam Briseida iurat
per sceptrum, sceptrum non putat esse deos. (Rem. 777-784)*

(Achilles bemoaned this too, in the case of Briseis's abduction, that she should give pleasure to the Plisthenian hero. And he didn't weep for nothing, believe me. Atrides did it; if he had not done it, he would have been a blundering amateur. I totally would have done it, and I'm not any smarter than he was. That was the great thrust of their dispute. For, when he swears by his scepter that Briseis was never touched by him, he does not consider his scepter sacred.)

Both Menelaus and Achilles appear as *exempla* of elegiac lovers who are turned out in favor of a rival. Having escaped the confines of the epic script, they fall into the elegiac script of the *exclusus amator*, rather than the more empowering elegiac ‘Love-Gamer’ script that Ovid advocates. The repeated presence of Achilles among these script-changes should remind the reader of Ovid’s previous insistence that Achilles does not belong in love poetry (*Rem.* 379; *Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles*). Ovid indeed takes pains to make a place for Achilles among his Homeric *exempla*, as he subverts their epic goals and assigns them elegiac motivations. The subjection of Achilles in particular to the perils of the traditional elegiac script is no coincidence, but a completion of Ovid’s disruption of the epic script. In Ovid’s elegy, Homer’s great hero Achilles loses pride of place to his amatory rival, Agamemnon, who emerges as the prime positive example of Ovid’s new elegiac lover. Agamemnon, never committing the ultimate sin (to Ovid) of being *iners* (780), perfectly follows his Ovidian script and receives, at its conclusion, his prize, stolen from Achilles. No longer a Homeric, but an Ovidian, hero, Agamemnon appraises love at a higher value than honor, breaking his sacred vow to the gods in order to fulfill a higher purpose: *amor*.⁴¹ Through this deft manipulation of Homeric characters and elegiac tropes, Ovid claims authority over both epic and elegiac scripts.

⁴¹ Agamemnon’s sanctified oath in the *Iliad* (19.258-265) occurs in the context of an animal sacrifice to the gods:

ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεῶν ὕπατος καὶ ἄριστος
 Γῆ τε καὶ Ἥλιος καὶ Ἐρινύες, αἳ θ’ ὑπὸ γαῖαν
 ἀνθρώπους τίνονται, ὅτις κ’ ἐπίορκον ὁμόσση,
 μὴ μὲν ἐγὼ κούρη Βρισηΐδι χεῖρ’ ἐπένεικα,
 οὔτ’ εὐνῆς πρόφασιν κεχρημένος οὔτε τευ ἄλλου.
 ἀλλ’ ἔμεν’ ἀπροτίμαστος ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἐμῆσιν.
 εἰ δέ τι τῶνδ’ ἐπίορκον ἐμοὶ θεοὶ ἄλγεα δοῖεν

πολλὰ μάλ’, ὅσσα διδοῦσιν ὅτις σφ’ ἀλίτηται ὁμόσσας. (*Il.* 19.258-265)

(Let Zeus now know first, highest and best among the gods, and the Earth and Sun and Erinyes, who from beneath the earth punish men, whoever swears a false oath, that I did not lay a hand on the girl Briseis, wanting her neither for my bed or any other reason, but she remained untouched in my huts. If any of this is sworn falsely, may the gods give me a great many sorrows, as many as they give anyone who, in swearing, sins against them.)

Reading *Remedia*: Generic Mixing and Readers' Memory

So far in this chapter, I have interpreted poetic memory through a cognitive lens, reading for the ways in which an author may play with the poetic tradition by manipulating both episodic (i.e., allusive) memory and schematic (i.e., generic) memory. The poet, in rewriting poetic memory, claims mastery over his predecessors as both their writerly descendant and as a teacher to future generations of readers. Having claimed such authority, he teaches his students to read in the same way he does, unraveling intertext through its many obscure layers, only to find that the hypertext and hypotext do not quite correspond in meaning. Memory is the primary task of both the writer and the student, whom Ovid instructs to gird himself for war with his memories of the precepts given to him: *mente memor tota quae damus arma tene* (*Rem.* 674; Remember and, mentally, take up the arms which I give you). In Ovid's view, reading is manipulation of memory, and he models this method of reading by performing it in his own play with poetic memory.

I now propose to consider how such treatment of poetic memory implicates the reader. How might readers respond to Ovid's generic befuddlement? What impact might his disruptions of script-texts have on readers' memories of poetry? How might the new conditions for elegiac poetry be stored in the memory of the reader?

Episodic Memory: Two Loves, Two Readers

In order to discuss the reader's memory, we first must look into who the reader of *Remedia* is. The text itself is addressed, as we have seen, to lovers unhappy in love (*Rem.* 15ff., above). In addition to his *decepti iuvenes* (41), Ovid also explicitly addresses female readers explicitly (*sed quaecumque viris, vobis quoque dicta, puellae, / credite*, *Rem.* 49-50; But

By obeying his lust, Ovid's Agamemnon breaks this vow and risks the wrath of the gods. What would be an unimaginably sacrilegious act in the *Iliad* seems more akin, in *Remedia*, to another elegiac commonplace, the lover's (or *puella*'s) broken oath.

whatever I say to men, ladies, also accept as true for you), although, as other scholars have noted, Ovid's attention to women has a tendency to lag in *Remedia*, with most of his advice directed explicitly towards men.⁴² However, the primary reader, mentioned in the first line, is Love himself: *legerat huius Amor titulum nomenque libelli: / "Bella mihi, video, bella parantur" ait* (*Rem.* 1-2; Love had read the title and name on this little book: "War, I see! You're planning wars against me!" he says). Love himself is *Remedia*'s first reader (and critic).⁴³ But as we have seen, Ovid responds with a defense of his new work, telling Love that he merely writes for those lovers who are so far gone that they might die. Ovid argues that, far from reversing his previous work, he merely continues it, waging war on Love's behalf, not against him. He is, after all, the *idem Naso* (*Rem.* 72) that the reader has read before. Love, to Ovid, is bipartite: one half is all-consuming and destructive; the other is dispassionate and playful.⁴⁴ As I have argued above, these two different types of love are distinguished as two separate elegiac scripts in *Remedia*.

And, as this two-faced Love is the first reader of *Remedia*, these two types of love can also help to mark out two types of reader.⁴⁵ First, *Remedia* can be read at its surface level, from the perspective of a student desperately in need of a *praeceptor* to teach him to fall out of love. This student-reader sees himself⁴⁶ as an elegiac lover, and he emotionally engages with the text

⁴² See especially Gardner (2008), who points out that the *praecepta* are more applicable to men than women. Through an analysis of Ovid's gendered *exempla*, Gardner argues that "*Remedia* aggressively concludes [the course of love] for its male pupils, and leaves female pupils to flounder inconclusively in the sort of erotic snares at once reviled and celebrated by the poet-lovers of previous elegy" (71).

⁴³ Cf. Park (2009) on the personification of Amor/Cupid in Ovid's proems and the effect this manipulation of *amor* has on the reader. Park's analysis of *Remedia* is abbreviated, but insightful: "By externalizing the internal emotion of love in the *Ars*, the *praeceptor* misleads the inattentive reader of the *Remedia* into thinking that love is controllable, and thus purports to fulfill the double promise he made with the phrase *praeceptor Amoris*, for he is both an instructor of love and the teacher and commander of Cupid. But the ideal reader perceives the flaws in these formulations and recognizes the failure of the *praeceptor's* promise" (237).

⁴⁴ See discussion of Rosati's (2006) 'Love 1' and 'Love 2' in Introduction.

⁴⁵ Cf. Rabinowitz's (1987) concepts of 'actual audience' (who read for narrative and emotional content) and 'authorial audience' (who read impersonally for textual cues).

⁴⁶ I will refer throughout to this first reader, the student-reader, as male, since, given that Ovid's advice in *Remedia* is most often directed towards men, it is difficult to imagine a female audience who might be able to consistently apply his precepts in a sincere way.

as a self-help book, following its dictates, which he takes at face-value. His goal is to control his passion, and his reading of the text, including its allusions and generic mixture, will contribute to his affective memory of reading. The second reader corresponds to Ovid's new elegiac didactic mode. (S)he reads ironically and dispassionately, seeking pleasure through clever wordplay and obscure intertext, not through a deeply emotional experience of reading. Indeed, it is a joke for this cynical reader, as (s)he picks up on the paradoxes and ironic allusions within Ovid's precepts, that the hypothetical student will be emotionally affected by that which, to the cynic, is only play. The student-reader actively engages his emotional memory as he reads, while the cynical reader avoids affective intrusions on her/his poetic memory.⁴⁷

In order to address how these two readers may react differently to Ovid's memory play, I will now examine how readers in general handle both episodic and schematic memory while reading. First, as we explored earlier in this chapter, reflexive allusions often act as episodic memory both for characters within the narrative and for the reader. When *Remedia's* Circe remembers her previous dealings with Ulysses, she remembers Homer's *Odyssey*, and so do Ovid's readers. When a reader recognizes an allusion, (s)he recalls not only the text whence it derives, but also her/his own personal instantiations of reading that text. In other words, allusions not only cue the remembrance of the text itself, but of the emotional and situational context of reading, individual to each reader. I, for example, may remember not only the words of Circe's speech in *Odyssey* 10, but I may also recall the experience I had discussing this text with my students in Great Books, infusing my reading of Ovid with a pleasant memory of a positive

⁴⁷ This is not to say, of course, that the cynical reader may lose control, at times, of her/his guard against affect. These readers, if they are to be understood as real people, may not consistently remain within the categories I have delineated here. The student-reader may start to read cynically after following through on the logic of one of the particularly obvious paradoxes. Or the cynical reader may find that a particular *exemplum* resonates with her/him on an emotional level. We might even imagine a third type of reader, able to fluidly transition between sincere and ironic readings. However, to keep this argument as coherent as possible, I will continue to focus on the two that appear to me to be the most easily recognizable and distinguish these readers from one another categorically.

teaching experience. The student-reader, similarly, will respond affectively as he recognizes the allusive potential of the reference. Picking up on the allusion to Dido, perhaps, he will recall, along with the text of the *Aeneid*, his emotional response to reading Dido's words, weeping in pity for Dido, like Augustine.⁴⁸ But, unlike Augustine, he might also weep for himself, implicitly connecting his remembrance of the text with his experience of an unrequited love similar to Dido's. He will interpret the reference to the rising of a new Troy⁴⁹ as a pathetic prediction doomed to be disproven, the essence of tragic irony. The cynical reader, on the other hand, may recall all the implied hypotexts for the allusions in the Circe passage and dispassionately recognize their differences and intricacies, taking pleasure in the clever play of the levels of references. (S)he is also likely to laugh at the implied student-reader, who, in his self-pity, does not recognize that the Homeric Circe is not an impassioned lover and, therefore, her making such a speech is intentionally bathetic. (S)he will interpret the lines about a new Troy as comic irony, a playful, rather than an emotionally charged, nod to the Vergilian intertext. In this way, allusion will cue different memories for the different readers, their contrasting recollections causing them to construe the intertext in contrasting ways.

Schematic Memory: New Elegiac Scripts

Schematic memory, on the other hand, will function similarly for all readers. Scripts, stored in the schematic memory of the reader, are cued when their conditions (such as character motivations, goals, plot structures, settings, etc.) are invoked. Readers instantiate scripts as they

⁴⁸ In *Confessions* 1.13.20-21, Augustine considers the power that reading can have over both emotion and memory. He laments that his pity of Dido's death made him forgetful of his own wretchedness over being separated from God: *...tenere cogebat Aeneae nescio cuius errores, oblitus errorum meorum, et plorare Didonem mortuam, quia se occidit ab amore, cum interea me ipsum in his a te morientem, deus, vita mea, siccis oculis ferrem miserrimus.* (I was compelled to remember the errors of a certain Aeneas, forgetful of my own errors, and to weep over the death of Dido, because she killed herself for love, when meanwhile I most wretchedly should tolerate with dry eyes my own death, among these things, apart from you, God, my life).

⁴⁹ *Rem.* 281-282: *quae tibi causa fugae? non hic nova Troia resurgit, / non aliquis socios rursus ad arma vocat.* (What reason do you have to flee? No new Troy is now arising, no one is calling his allies back again to arms.)

read, creating episodic memories that are distinct from the scripts that remain in their schematic memory. A reader will have separate memories of the experience of reading a particular text, each instantiation marked by a different emotional or situational context. An individual's experience of reading the story of Cinderella, for example, will inevitably be different when (s)he is an adult than when (s)he was a child. However, scripts themselves, contained within schematic memory, can also be altered to some degree by these instantiations. If a particular instantiation (or several instantiations) intrudes on the script, introducing errors, obstacles, or distractions to change the characters' goals or the plot, the traditional narrative of the script may be changed in the memory of the reader. As the underlying script is simultaneously activated and interrupted, the reader learns the new script conditions (different goals, for example) and adapts her/his memory to these conditions. In an individual's mind, the plot details of the Grimm brothers' "Cinderella" may, over time, be conflated with Disney's version, for example, causing the 'Cinderella' script to be refashioned in her/his schematic memory. A script may develop new nodes, possibilities which the script may follow, or a new script entirely may emerge. In any case, this manipulation of memory entails the recall of both the underlying script, prompted by its particular conditions, and the new script, intruded into the narrative of the underlying script but containing a new set of conditions. Watching Disney's *Cinderella* does not cause the viewer to forget the underlying 'Cinderella' script, but it may alter the script through its interventions, causing a memory trace that links certain aspects to particular instantiations. For example, while the image of the bloodied heels of Cinderella's stepsisters will be linked as particular to the Grimm instantiation, the remembered song lyrics of "Bibbidi-Bobbidi-Boo" will be associated with instantiated memories of *Cinderella* (1950). However, the presence of a fairy godmother who effects Cinderella's transformation may become a new possible node, or perhaps even a

new defining condition, of the 'Cinderella' script. The memory trace of the intrusion will remain in the mind of the reader and may impact the underlying script, changing the script conditions, creating new nodes of narrative possibility, or establishing a new script altogether.

Ovid's intrusions on love elegy function in a similar way. As we have seen above, Ovid intrudes on elegiac scripts with obstacles and distractions, changing the script conditions to change its ends. He creates new nodes within the elegiac script or, more frequently, causes characters to veer so far off their paths they end up in a new script altogether. This new Ovidian elegiac script, with its goal of detached sexual pleasure, rather than the affective experience of love, implicates features of other genred scripts into its new script conditions. Andromache may appear with equal ease as Thais, despite Ovid's claim to the contrary. But how do Ovid's readers respond to this insistence on new nodes and scripts for elegy? Can his rescripting actually work its way into the schematic memories of readers?

To explore possible answers to these questions, I return to the example of Circe. In *Remedia*, Ovid rewrites Homer's Circe as an elegiac abandoned (or, rather, about-to-be abandoned) woman. As I argued above, this passage is an example of reflexive allusion, episodic memory denoted by a use of a memory word. But Ovid also, as with his other Homeric *exempla*, manipulates epic scripts to incorporate Circe into his new elegiac mode. He makes room for himself to create a new instantiation of the elegiac script by borrowing a character from epic and interpolating a scene that could not have taken place in the *Odyssey*. He activates two scripts simultaneously: 'Homeric Epic Goddesses' and 'Elegiac Abandoned Women.' By invoking conditions of both of these scripts, he interrupts them both, creating a memory trace that conflates the two schema in the mind of the reader.

As with the 'Cinderella' script, it is possible that some of the conditions of these two scripts may become permanently incorporated into the larger schema. In the schematic memory of the reader, a new node may be established that may enable an epic goddess to abjectly beg a hero to stay with her. For this reader, the invocation of this script's conditions (as with any other script) will cue the script in her/his mind. Having read the speech of Ovid's Circe, the reader may expect the next epic goddess (s)he encounters to make a similar speech to a hero. Or, the reader, returning to Homer, may find that (s)he is surprised by the lack of such a speech, the Ovidian version having become normalized in the schematic memory of the reader. Indeed, the reader may misremember the *Odyssey* itself, creating a false memory of Homeric Circe asking Odysseus (not Ulysses!) to stay behind with her.

Conclusion

I conclude here by returning to Ovid's injunction against reading love poetry. 'Don't touch the gentle poets!' (*Rem. 756: teneros ne tange poetas!*), Ovid insists. But if the student were to follow Ovid's arguments to their furthest logical conclusion, he would inevitably deduce that he could safely read no literature, as Ovid has painstakingly implicated so many genres into his creation of a new poetic memory. As I have explored here, reading *Remedia* complicates both the allusive, episodic memory and the generic, schematic memory of the reader, creating a problematic memory trace that forces readers to transgress the boundaries between genres as they remember the poetic past. It may be, in fact, this tricky memory trace that causes Ovid to discourage his students from reading poetry in the first place. The reader-student, if he follows this particular precept and forgets all poetry, might never catch wise to Ovid's allusive ironies. The cynical reader, on the other hand, because (s)he recognizes Ovid's intertextual play, is more receptive to his memory manipulation through generic muddling. Although it is the reader-

student who wishes most to forget love, it is the cynical reader, intent on remembering every reference and allusion, whose memory of previous love elegy is most altered by her/his reading of *Remedia*.

CONCLUSIONS

*est prope Collinam templum venerabile Portam;
(inposuit templo nomina celsus Eryx);
est illic Lethaeus Amor, qui pectora sanat
inque suas gelidam lampadas addit aquam.
illic et iuvenes votis obliviam poscunt,
et si qua est duro capta puella viro. (Rem. 549-554)*

(Near the Colline Gate, there is a venerable temple (lofty Eryx has put a name to it);
Lethaeus Love is there, who heals the heart and pours cool water upon his own flames.
And there young men seek forgetfulness by their prayers, as well as any girl who has
been taken in by a harsh lover.)

Ovid's Lethaeus Love is, of course, a paradox, a figure both hot and cold, fire and water. His attempts to douse his own flames, we must imagine, will result only in steamy consequences for the lover. In the same way, attempts to forget love will only result in the creation of new memories, altered but still amorous. As we have seen, *Remedia Amoris*, as a handbook on forgetting love, serves the paradoxical purpose of teaching the student to remember love elegy, and Ovid's methods of forgetting correspond to strategies of elegiac memory production. In elegy, these memories are written on tombstones, on monuments, on the female body, and, of course, in poetry itself. The *praeceptor's* advice to avoid poetry (*Rem. 756: teneros ne tange poetas!*) makes explicit the tacit message of *Remedia's* references and allusions to previous love poetry. The memorious reader knows that love is most effectively remembered in verse.

Ovid's sense of metapoetic reference and remembrance does not end with his 'end of elegy,' of course. The quintessential example of Ovid's 'reflexive allusion,' the Ariadne of *Fasti* recalls her own story in Catullus 64. She clearly does not remember the precepts of *Remedia*, however, when she issues a complaint against Bacchus for taking a new lover; for, as mindful readers will recall, *Remedia* issues specific injunctions against complaining to the cruel lover (643-646) and dwelling on thoughts of rivals (767ff.). Despite Ariadne's ignorance of his didactic work, however, Ovid's later poetry continues his program of exploring poetic memory. But how exactly does Ovid remember *Remedia*? DeBloois (2000) and Fish (2004) both examine the relationship between Ovid's amorous didactic works and his later exilic poetry. The exiled Ovid looks back on his role as *praeceptor* and finds himself unable to follow his own advice; he cannot forget the love poetry he has forsworn. A future extension of the current project could examine how Ovid's strategies for forgetting, and previous elegy's methods for remembering, operate in the interplay between memory and forgetting in Ovid's later works.

The last chapter of this dissertation concludes with an experiment in blending cognitive memory studies and reception studies, considering how readers of *Remedia* might remember and reread previous poetry. As I argue, *Remedia*'s play with poetic memory complicates both allusive, episodic memory and generic, schematic memory, creating a multivalent memory trace in the mind of the reader, eliding the boundaries between genres as readers recall the poetic past. In future projects, I will apply this model to later receptions of *Remedia* itself, asking how *Remedia* is remembered by later readers. In the medieval *aetas ovidiana* of the 12th and 13th centuries, seemingly unironic use of *Remedia* as a handbook on sexual abstinence contrasts with complex and critical readings of Ovid's didactic precepts in amorous works like the *Guigemar* of Marie de France or the *Roman de la rose* of Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, as well as in the

many vernacular translations and adaptations of Ovid's precepts. Viewing these texts, as well as other postclassical works that complicate the relationship between love and memory in the classical poetic past, through the lens of cognitive memory studies, as well as reception studies, will aid our understanding of how readers recall Ovid's memory and forgetting of love. For, as we have seen, the Ovidian *praeceptor*, in instructing his students to forget, teaches his readers to remember.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. N. (1982). *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London: Duckworth.
- Ahl, F. (1985). *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Aldrete, Gregory. (1999). *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- André, Jean-Marie. (1962). *L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine des origines à l'époque augustéenne*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Arendt, Hannah. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Armstrong, Rebecca. (2006). *Cretan Women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baar, Mechthild. (2006). *Dolor und ingenium: Untersuchungen zur römischen Liebeslegie*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. (2006). "Women on Top: Livia and Andromache" in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1993). "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 95: 333-365.
- (ed.). (1992). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae 1-3*. Florence: F. Le Monnier.
- (1987). "Narratività e convenzione nelle *Heroides*." *MD* 19: 63-90.
- (1986). "Problemi d'interpretazione in Ovidio: continuità delle storie, continuazione dei testi." *MD* 16: 77-107.
- Bartsch, Shadi. (2006). *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bassi, Karen. (1994). "Desired Silence: *Amor* and *Mors* in Tibullus 1.1." *Syllecta Classica* 5: 53-61.
- Battistella, Chiara (ed.) (2010). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula 10: Ariadne Theseo. Introduzione, testo e commento. Texte und Kommentare Bd 35*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Beasom, Patrick T. (2013). "Forgetting the *Ars Memoriae*: Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 579-84." *CQ* 63: 903-906.
- Berti, E. (2007). *Scholasticorum Studia. Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale*. Biblioteca di Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 20. Pisa: Giardini.
- Bodel, John. (1999). "Death on Display: Looking at Roman Funerals" in *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. eds., Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowditch, Lowell. (2009). "Palatine Apollo and the Imperial Gaze: Propertius 2.31 and 2.32." *American Journal of*

Philology 130.3: 401-438.

Bower, G. H., J. B. Black, and T. J. Turner. (1979). "Scripts in memory for text." *Cognitive Psychology* 11: 177-220.

Boyd, Barbara Weiden. (1997). *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Boyle, A. J. (2003). *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*. Bendigo, Vic.: Aureal Publications.

---- (1974). "Propertius 1.19: A Critical Study." *Latomus* 33: 895-911.

Braun, K. A., R. Ellis, and E. F. Loftus. (2002). "Make my memory: How advertising can change our memories of the past." *Psychol. Marketing* 19: 1-23.

Braun-LaTour, K. A., M. S. LaTour, J. Pickrell, and E. F. Loftus. (2004). "How (and when) advertising can influence experience." *J. Advertising* 33: 7-25.

Bretzigheimer, G. (2001). *Ovids Amores: Poetik in der Erotik*. Tübingen: G. Narr.

Bright, David F. (1978). *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in His World*. Leiden: Brill.

---- (1976). "Non Bona Dicta: Catullus' Poetry of Separation." *Quaterni Urbinati di cultura classica* 21: 105-19.

Brown, Robert D. *Lucretius on Love and Sex. A Commentary on De Rerum Natura IV, 1030-1287 with Prolegomena, Text, and Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Brunelle, Christopher. (2005). "Ovid's Satirical Remedies" in *Gendered Dynamics in Latin Love Poetry*. eds., Ronnie Ancona and Ellen Greene. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

---- (2002). "Pleasure, Failure, and Danger: Reading Circe in the *Remedia*." *Helios* 29: 55-68.

---- (2000-1). "Form vs. Function in Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*." *CJ* 96: 123-40.

---- (1997). *Gender and Genre in Ovid's Remedia Amoris*. Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Cairns, Francis. (2006). *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---- (1979). *Tibullus, a Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caplan, Harry (ed. and trans.) (1954). *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Casanova-Robin, Hélène. (2007). "Poétique du corps et représentation de soi dans les *Héroïdes* d'Ovide" in *Amor Scribendi: Lectures Des Héroïdes D'Ovide*. ed., Hélène Casanova-Robin. Grenoble: Millon.

Christianson, S. (1992). *The Handbook of Emotion and Memory: Research and Theory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Clare, R. J. (1996). "Catullus 64 and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius: Allusion and Exemplarity." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 42: 60-88.

Clarke, Jacqueline. (2004). "'Goodbye to All That': Propertius' *magnum iter* between *Elegies* 3.16 and 3.21." *Mouseion Series III*, vol. 4: 127-43.

Clarke, John R. (1998). *Looking at Lovemaking: Constructions of Sexuality in Roman Art, 100 B.C.-A.D. 250*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Conte, G. Biagio. (1994). *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*. trans., Glenn W. Most. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. [= (1991). *Generi e lettori: Lucrezio, l'elegia d'amore, l'enciclopedia di*

- Plinio*. Milano: A. Mondadori.]
- (1989). "Love without elegy: the *Remedia amoris* and the logic of a genre." *Poetics Today* 10: 441-69. [= (1986). "L'amore senza elegia: I *Remedia amoris* e la logica di un genere" in *Ovidio, Rimedio contro l'amore*. ed., C. Lazzarini. Venice: Marsilio.]
- (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. trans., Charles Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- (1985). *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario*. Turin: G. Einaudi.
- Copley, Frank O. (1956). *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Madison, WI: American Philological Association.
- Corbeill, Anthony. (2004). *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Courtney, E. (1990). "Moral Judgement in Catullus 64." *Grazer Beiträge* 17: 113-22.
- Curran, L. C. (1975). "'Nature to Advantage Dressed': Propertius 1.2," *Ramus* 4: 1-16.
- Currie, Sarah. (1998). "Poisonous Women and Unnatural History in Roman Culture" in *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*. ed., Maria Wyke. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cutuolo, P. (1983-4). "Sugli aspetti letterari poetici e culturali della cosiddetta *Laudatio Turiae*." *Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Napoli* 26: 33-65.
- Davis, Gregson. (2005). "From Lyric to Elegy: The Inscription of the Elegiac Subject in *Heroides* 15 (Sappho to Phaon)" in *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*. eds., William W. Batstone and Garth Tissol. New York: Peter Lang.
- Davis, P. J. (1995). "*Praeceptor Amoris*: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and the Augustan Idea of Rome." *Ramus* 24.2: 181-195.
- Davisson, Mary. (1996). "The Search for an *alter orbis* in Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*." *Phoenix* 50.3: 240-261.
- (1993). "*Quid Moror Exemplis?*: Mythological *Exempla* in Ovid's Pre-Exilic Poems and the Elegies from Exile." *Phoenix* 47.3: 213-237.
- DeBloois, Nanci. (2000). "Ovid's *Remedia exilii*." in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History 10. Collection Latomus*. ed., C. Deroux. Bruxelles: Latomus.
- Debrohun, Jeri Blair. (2007). "Catullan Intertextuality: Apollonius and the Allusive Plot of Catullus 64" in *A Companion to Catullus*. ed., Marilyn B. Skinner. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- (2003). *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- (1999). "Ariadne and the Whirlwind of Fate: Figures of Confusion in Catullus 64.149-57." *Classical Philology* 94.4: 419-430.
- De Caro, A. (2003). *Si qua fides: gli Amores di Ovidio e la persuasione elegiaca*. Palermo: Palumbo.
- Dimundo, R. (2003). *Ovidio: lezioni d'amore: saggio di commento al I libro dell'Ars amatoria*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- (2000). *L'elegia allo specchio: studi sul I libro degli Amores di Ovidio*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Dixon, Suzanne. (1988). *The Roman Mother*. London: Croom Helm.
- Dolansky, F. (2011). "Honouring the Family Dead on the Parentalia: Ceremony, Spectacle, and Memory." *Phoenix* 65: 125-57.
- Dufallo, Basil. (2013). *The Captor's Image: Greek Culture in Roman Ecphrasis*. New York: Oxford University

Press.

---- (2007). *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Dufallo, Basil and Peggy McCracken (eds.) (2006). *Dead Lovers: Erotic Bonds and the Study of Premodern Europe*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Durling, Robert M. (1958). "Ovid as *Praeceptor Amoris*." *CJ* 53: 157-167.

Durry, Marcel. (2002). *Éloge Funèbre D'une Matrone Romaine: (éloge Dit De Turia)*. 3rd edition. Paris: Les Belles lettres.

Eck, W. (1984). "Senatorial Self-Representation: Developments in the Augustan Period" in *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. ed., F. Millar and E. Segal. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Edwards, Catharine. (2007). *Death in Ancient Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

---- (1996). *Writing Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---- (1993). *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, Jaś. (2007). "Viewing Ariadne: From Ekphrasis to Wall Painting in the Roman World." *Classical Philology* 102.1: 20-44.

Enk, P.J. (1946). *S. Properti elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos)*. Leiden: Brill.

Erasmus, Mario. (2008). *Reading Death in Ancient Rome*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Erker, Darja Šterbenc. (2011). "Gender and Roman Funeral Ritual" in *Memory And Mourning: Studies On Roman Death*. eds., Valerie M. Hope and Janet Huskinson. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Evans, Jane DeRose. (2009). "Prostitutes in the Portico of Pompey? A Reconsideration." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139: 123-45.

Fantham, Elaine. (1997). "Images of the city: Propertius' new-old Rome" in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. eds., Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Farrell, Joseph. (2003). "Classical Genre in Theory and Practice." *New Literary History* 34.3: 383-408.

---- (1998). "Reading and Writing the *Heroides*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98: 307-38.

---- (1997). "The Phenomenology of Memory in Roman Culture." *CJ* 92.4: 373-383.

Favro, Diane. (1996). *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Favro, Diane and Christopher Johanson. (2010). "Death in Motion: Funeral Processions in the Roman Forum." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 69.1: 12-37.

Fedeli, P. (2005). *Properzio. Il libro secondo*. ARCA 45. Cambridge: Francis Cairns Publications Ltd.

---- (1985). *Properzio. Il libro terzo delle elegie*. Bari: Adriatica Editrice.

---- (1984). *Sexti Properti Elegiarum Libri IV*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

---- (1980). *Sesto Properzio. Il primo libro delle elegie*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore.

Fentress, J. and C. Wickham. (1992). *Social Memory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Fish, Jeffrey. (2004). "Physician, Heal Thyself: The Intertextuality of Ovid's Exile Poetry and the *Remedia Amoris*." *Latomus* 63.4: 864-872.

- Fitzgerald, William. (1995). *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Flaschenriem, B. (1997). "Loss, Desire, and Writing in Propertius 1.19 and 2.15." *ClAnt* 16: 259-77.
- Flower, Harriet. (2006). *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace And Oblivion In Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- (1996). *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fredrick, D. (1997). "Reading Broken Skin: Violence in Roman Elegy" in *Roman Sexualities*. eds., J. Hallett and M. Skinner. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fredricksmeyer, E. (1993). "Method and Interpretation: Catullus 11." *Helios* 20: 89-105.
- Fordyce, C. J. (ed.) (1961). *Catullus. A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fulkerson, Laurel. (2005). *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, And Community in the Heroides*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2004). "Omnia vincit amor: Why the Remedia Fail." *CQ* 54: 211-23.
- Fyler, J. M. (1971). "Omnia vincit amor: Incongruity and the Limitations of Structure in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry." *CJ* 66: 196-203.
- Gaisser, Julia Haig. (1995). "Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64." *AJP* 116.4: 579-616.
- (1977). "Mythological Exempla in Propertius 1.2 and 1.15." *AJP* 98.4: 381-391.
- Galinsky, K. (ed.) (2014). *Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory. Supplements to the Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 10*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, for the American Academy in Rome.
- (1996). *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (1981). "Augustus' Legislation on Morals and Marriage." *Philologus* 125: 126-144.
- Gardner, Hunter H. (2008). "Women's Time in the Remedia Amoris" in *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*. eds., Genevieve Liveley and Patricia Salzman-Mitchell. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- (2007). "Ariadne's Lament: The Semiotic Impulse of Catullus 64." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137: 147-179.
- Gavoille, Élisabeth. (2009). "La comédie de l'amour dans l'Ars Amatoria et les Remedia Amoris" in *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne*. ed., Isabelle Jouteur. Nancy: ADRA.
- Geisler, H. Joachim. (1969). *P. Ovidius Naso Remedia Amoris, mit Kommentar zu Vers 1- 396*. Diss. Freie Universität, Berlin.
- Gibson, R. K. (2007). *Excess and Restraint: Propertius, Horace, and Ovid's Ars Amatoria. BICS, Suppl. 89*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- (2006). "Ovid, Augustus, and the Politics of Moderation in Ars Amatoria 3" in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2003). *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book 3*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gowing, Alain M. (2005). *Empire And Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Graham, Emma-Jayne. (2011). "Memory and Materiality: Re-embodiment of the Roman Funeral" in *Memory and Mourning: Studies On Roman Death*. eds., Valerie M. Hope and Janet Huskinson. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Greco, Maria. (2006). *Cultus e gioco dell'amore in Ovidio*. Lecce: Congedo.
- Green, Peter. (1979) "Ars Gratia Cultus: Ovid as Beautician." *AJPh* 100: 381-92.
- Greene, Ellen. (2006). "Catullus, Caesar and Roman Masculine Identity." *Antichthon* 40: 49-64.
 ---- (1999). "Travesties of Love: Violence and Voyeurism in Ovid *Amores* 1.7." *CW* 92.5: 409-18.
 ---- (1998). *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (1962). *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit: Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Neuwied: H. Luchterhand.
- Habinek, Thomas. (1997). "The invention of sexuality in the world-city of Rome" in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. eds., Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. (1950). *La mémoire collective*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France. [= *The Collective Memory*. trans., Francis J. Ditter, Jr. and Vida Yazdi Ditter. New York: Harper & Row Colophon Books.]
 ---- (1925). *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire. Les Travaux de L'Année Sociologique*. Paris: F. Alcan.
- Hallett, Judith P. (1973). "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism." *Arethusa* 6.1: 103-124.
- Hardie, Philip. (2012). *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 ---- (2006). "Lethaeus Amor: The Art of Forgetting," in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 ---- (2002). *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, Elizabeth D. (1989). "Ventriloquizing Sappho: Ovid, Donne, and the Erotics of the Feminine Voice." *Criticism* 31.2: 115-138.
- Heil, Andreas. (2007). "Der vergessende und vergessene Held: Theseus und das Problem der *memoria* in Catull's Carm. 64" in *Klassizismus und Modernität: Beiträge der internationalen Konferenz in Szeged (11-13, September 2003)*. Acta Universitatis Szegediensis, Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica 30: 59-68.
- Heldmann, Konrad. (1981). "Schönheitspflege und Charakterstärke in Ovids Liebeslehre. Zum Proömium der 'Medicamina faciei.'" *WJA* 7: 153-176.
- Hemelrijk, Emily. (2004). "Masculinity and Femininity in the *Laudatio Turiae*." *CQ* 54.1: 185-197.
- Henderson, A. A. R. (1979). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Remedia Amoris*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Henderson, John. (2002). "A Doo-Dah-Doo-Dah-Dey at the Races: Ovid *Amores* 3.2 and the Personal Politics of the *Circus Maximus*." *Classical Antiquity* 21.1: 41-65.
- Heyworth, S. J. (2007a). *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 ---- (ed.) (2007b). *Sexti Properti Elegos*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 ---- (1992). "Propertius 2.13." *Mnemosyne* 45: 45-59.
- Heuer, Friderike and Daniel Reisberg. (1992). "Emotion, Arousal, and Memory for Detail" in *The Handbook of*

- Emotion and Memory: Research and Theory*. ed., S. Christianson. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Hinds, Stephen. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (1993). "Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine." *MD* 30: 9–47.
- (1988). *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1987). *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. New Rochelle, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Holleman, A. W. J. (1971). "Ovid and Politics." *Historia* 20: 458-66.
- Hollis, A. S. (1977). *Ovid Ars Amatoria, Book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1973). "The *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*" in *Ovid*. ed., J. W. Binns. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Holzberg, N. (2006). "Staging the reader response: Ovid and his 'contemporary audience' in *Ars* and *Remedia*" in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1997). *Ovid: Dichter und Werk*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck. [= (2002). *Ovid: the poet and his work*. trans., G. M. Goshgarian. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.]
- Hope, Valerie M. (2009). *Roman Death: Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome*. London: Continuum.
- Hope, Valerie M. and Janet Huskinson. (eds.) (2011). *Memory and Mourning: Studies On Roman Death*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. (1983). "Some Problems in the 'Laudatio Turiae.'" *BICS* 30: 85-98.
- Houghton, L. B. T. (2011). "Death Ritual and Burial Practice in the Latin Love Elegists" in *Memory and Mourning: Studies On Roman Death*. eds., Valerie M. Hope and Janet Huskinson. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- (2009). "Sexual Puns in Ovid's *Ars* and *Remedia*." *CQ* 59: 280-285.
- (2007). "The Drowned and the Saved: Shipwrecks and the Cursus of Latin Love Elegy." *Cambridge Classical Journal* 53: 161-179.
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2006). *Propertius: Elegies Book IV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobson, Howard. (1974). *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jaeger, M. (1997). *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- James, Sharon. (2003). *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Janan, Micaela. (2001). *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Janka, M. (1997). *Ovid, Ars amatoria, Buch 2: Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Jolivet, Jean-Christophe. (2001). *Allusion et fiction épistolaire dans les Héroïdes: recherches sur l'intertextualité ovidienne*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome.
- Jones, D. A. (1997). *Enjoinder and Argument in Ovid's Remedia amoris*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag.
- Kaster, Robert A. (2005). *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Keith, Alison. (2014a). "Imperial Geographies in Tibullan Elegy." *CW* 107.4: 477-492.
- (2014b). "Roman Topography and Imperial Geographies in Latin Elegy" in *Lire la Ville: fragments d'une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique. Scripta antiqua, 65*. eds., Damien Nelis and Manuel Royo. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.
- (ed.) (2011). *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- (2008). *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*. London: Duckworth.
- (1994). "Corpus Eroticum: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*" *CW* 88.1: 27-40.
- Kellum, Barbara. (1997). "Concealing/revealing: gender and the play of meaning in the monuments of Augustan Rome" in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. eds., Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1993). "Sculptural Programs and Propaganda in Augustan Rome: The Temple of Apollo on the Palatine" in *Roman Art in Context: An Anthology*. ed., E. D'Ambra. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kennedy, Duncan F. (2006). "Vixisset Phyllis, si me foret usa magistro: Erotodidaxis and Intertextuality in *Ars* and *Remedia*" in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2000). "Bluff Your Way in Didactic: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*." *Arethusa* 33.2: 159-176.
- (1993). *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1984). "The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid's *Heroides*." *CQ* 34.2: 413-422.
- Kenney, E. J. (ed.) (1961). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keppie, L. J. F. (1991). *Understanding Roman Inscriptions*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kierdorf, W. (1980). *Laudatio funebris. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 106. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain.
- Klingner, Friedrich. (1956). "Catullus Peleus-Epos." *SBAW* 6: 1-92.
- Klodt, Claudia. (2014). "Place as Argument: Roman Topography in Rhetorical Strategy" in *Lire la Ville: fragments d'une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique. Scripta antiqua 65*. eds., Damien Nelis and Manuel Royo. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.
- Knecht, A. (1972). *Gregor von Nazianz: Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Knox, Peter. (1998). "Ariadne on the Rocks: Influences on Ovid, *Her.* 10" in *Style and Tradition. Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. eds., Peter Knox and Clive Foss. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- (1995). *Ovid Heroides: Select Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koppel, Jonathan and Dorthe Berntsen. (2014). "The cultural life script as cognitive schema: how the life script shapes memory for fictional life stories." *Memory* 22.8: 949-971.
- Küppers, E. (1981). "Ovids *Ars Amatoria* und *Remedia Amoris* als Lehrdichtungen." *ANRW* 2.31.4: 2507-51.
- Kuttner, Ann. (1999). "Culture and History at Pompey's Museum." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129: 343-373.
- Labate, M. (1984). *L'arte di farsi amare: modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Laird, Andrew. (1993). "Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64." *JRS* 83: 18-30.

- Lampinen, J. M., J. M. Faries, J. S. Neuschatz, and M. P. Tolia. (2000). "Recollections of things schematic: The influence of scripts on recollective experience." *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 14: 543-554.
- Lampinen, J. M., S. M. Copeland, and J. S. Neuschatz. (2001). "Recollection of things schematic: Room schemas revisited." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition* 27: 1211-1222.
- Landolfi, L. (2000). *Scribentis imago: eroine ovidiane e lamento epistolare*. Bologna: Pàtron..
- Landolfi, L. and Paolo Monella (eds.) (2005). *Arte perennat amor: riflessioni sull'intertestualità ovidiana: l'Ars amatoria*. Quarto Inferiore. Bologna: Pàtron.
- Leach, Eleanor. (1988). *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (1964). "Georgic imagery in the *Ars Amatoria*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 95: 142-54.
- LeFèvre, Eckard. (2000). "Alexandrinisches und Catullisches im Peleus-Epos (64)." *Hermes* 128: 181-201.
- Lindheim, Sara. (2011). "What's Love Got To Do With It?: Mapping Cynthia in Propertius' Paired Elegies 1.8A-B and 1.11-12." *American Journal of Philology* 132.4: 633-665.
- (2003). *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's Heroides*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lindsay, Hugh. (2009). "The man in Turia's life, with a consideration of inheritance issues, infertility, and virtues in marriage in the 1st c. B.C." *JRA* 22: 183-198.
- Lipking, Lawrence. (1988). *Abandoned Women and Poetic Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lively, Genevieve. (2012). "Mater Amoris: Mothers and Lovers in Augustan Rome" in *Mothering and Motherhood in Ancient Greece and Rome*. eds., Lauren Hackworth Petersen and Patricia Salzman-Mitchell. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Loftus, E. F. (2005). "Planting misinformation in the human mind: A 30-year investigation of the malleability of memory." *Learning & Memory*, 12.4: 361-366.
- (1993). "The reality of repressed memories." *Am. Psychol.* 48: 518-537.
- Long, Debra L., Chantel Prat, Clinton Johns, Phillip Morris, and Eunike Jonathan. (2008). "The importance of knowledge in vivid text memory: An individual-differences investigation of recollection and familiarity." *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 15.3: 604-609.
- Lowrie, Michèle. (2008). "Cornelia's Exemplum: Form and Ideology in Propertius 4.11" in *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*. eds., Genevieve Liveley and Patricia B. Salzman-Mitchell. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Luck, Georg. (1959). *The Latin Love Elegy*. London: Methuen.
- Lucke, C. (1982). *P. Ovidius Naso, Remedia amoris: Kommentar zu Vers 397-814*. Bonn: Habelt.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1998). "Love and Death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius, and Others." *CQ* 48.1: 200-12.
- (1980). *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maltby, Robert. (ed.) (2002). *Tibullus: elegies: text, introduction and commentary*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns

- (1991). *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- Marchese, Rosa Rita. (2012). *Morir d'amore: il nesso amore/morte nella poesia di Propertio*. Palermo: Palumbo.
- Martindale, C. (1993). *Redeeming the text: Latin poetry and the hermeneutics of reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGinn, T. A. J. (1998). *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McKeown, J. C. (1998). *Ovid: Amores Vol. III. A Commentary on Book Two*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- (1989). *Ovid: Amores Vol. II. A Commentary on Book One*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- (1987). *Ovid: Amores Vol. I. Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool: Francis Cairns.
- McKie, D. (1984). "The Horrible and Ultimate Britons: Catullus 11." *PCPS* 210: 74-8.
- Miller, John F. (2009). *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1993). "Ovidian Allusion and the Vocabulary of Memory." *MD* 30: 153-164.
- Miller, Paul Allen. (2007). "'I get around': sadism, desire, and metonymy on the streets of Rome with Horace, Ovid, and Juvenal" in *The sites of Rome: time, space, memory*. eds., David H. J. Larmour and Diana Spencer. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2004). *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (ed.) (2002). *Latin Erotic Elegy: An Anthology And Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Milnor, Kristina. (2005). *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minyard, John Douglas. (1985). *Lucretius and the Late Republic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Monella, Paolo. (2008). "La nuova retorica dello spazio nell'elegia erotica ovidiana" in *Amicitiae templa serena. Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò II*. eds., L. Castagna and C. Riboldi. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. (2005). "Freedmen and Decurions: Epitaphs and Social History in Imperial Italy." *JRS* 95: 38-63.
- Mozley, J. H. (trans.) (1929). *Ovid: The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Müller, C. W. (1995). "Imaginationen des Todes in den elegien des Tibull und Propert." *Antike und Abenland* 41: 132-40.
- Murgia, C. E. (1986). "The Influence of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* on *Ars Amatoria* 3 and *Amores* 3." *Classical Philology* 81: 203-20.
- Myerowitz, Molly. (1992). "The Domestication of Desire: Ovid's Parva Tabella and the Theater of Love" in *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. ed., Amy Richlin. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (1985). *Ovid's Games of Love*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Myers, Micah Young. (2008). "The frontiers of the empire and the edges of the world in the Augustan poetic imaginary." Diss. Stanford University.
- Nappa, Christopher. (2005). *Reading After Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, And Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Nicolet, C. (1991). *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Nora, Pierre. (1989). "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*." *Representations* 26: 7-24.
- Olson, K. (2008). *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-presentation and Society*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Orlin, Eric. (2007). "Augustan Religion and the Reshaping of Roman Memory." *Arethusa* 40.1: 73-92.
- Osgood, Josiah. (2014). *Turia: A Roman Woman's Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Sullivan, Timothy. (2011). *Walking in Roman Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papaioannou, Sophia. (2006). "The Poetology of Hairstyling and the Excitement of Hair Loss in Ovid, *Amores* 1, 14." *QUCC* 83.2: 45-69.
- Papanghelis, Theodore D. (1987). *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet On Love And Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papponetti, G. (ed.) (1991). *Ovidio: Poeta della Memoria*. Sulmona: Herder.
- Park, Arum. (2009). "Two Types of Ovidian Personification." *CJ* 104.3: 225-240.
- Parker, Grant. (2009). "The Gender of Travel: Cynthia and Others" in *Callida Musa: Papers on Latin Literature in Honor of R. Elaine Fantham*. Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 61. eds., Rolando Ferri, J. Mira Seo, and Katharina Volk. Pisa/Roma: Fabrizio Serra.
- Pinotti, Paola. (2006). "L'eseplificazione omerica nei *Remedia Amoris*" in *Ovidio fra Roma e Tomis: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Sulmona 13-15 giugno 2003*. ed., G. Papponetti. Sulmona: Centro ovidiano di studi e ricerche.
- (1988). *Publio Ovidio Nasone Remedia Amoris*. Bologna: Pàtron.
- Prinz, K. (1917). "Untersuchungen zu Ovids *Remedia amoris*, II." *WS* 39: 91-121, 259-91.
- (1914). "Untersuchungen zu Ovids *Remedia amoris*, I." *WS* 36: 36-83.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. (1961). "The Art of Catullus 64." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 65: 165-205.
- Quenemoen, Caroline. (2006). "The Portico of the Danaids: A New Reconstruction." *American Journal of Archaeology* 110.2: 229-250.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J. (1987). *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ramage, E. S. (1994). "The So-called *Laudatio Turiae* as Panegyric." *Athenaeum* 82: 341-70.
- (1973). *Urbanitas: Ancient Sophistication and Refinement*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press for the University of Cincinnati.
- Ramsby, Teresa R. (2007). *Textual Permanence: Roman Elegists And the Epigraphic Tradition*. London: Duckworth.
- Raucci, S. (2011). *Elegiac Eyes: Vision in Roman Love Elegy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rea, J. A. (2007). *Legendary Rome: Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*. London:

Duckworth.

Reeson, James. (2001). *Ovid Heroides 11, 13 and 14*. Leiden: Brill.

Reitz, Christiane. (2002). "Klagt Ariadne? Überlegungen zur Rede der Ariadne in Catulls *carmen 64*." *Gymnasium* 109: 91-102.

Reitzenstein, Erich. (1969). "Die Cornelia-Elegie des Properz (IV 11)." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 112: 126-145.

Rimell, Victoria. (2006). *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference and the Poetic Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roggia, A. (ed.) (2011). *P. Ovidii Nasonis: Heroidum Epistula XIII: Laodamia Protesilao*. Florence: F. Le Monnier.

Rosati, Gianpiero. (2006). "The Art of *Remedia Amoris*: Unlearning to Love?" in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---- (1985). *Ovidio: I cosmetici delle donne*. Venice: Marsilio.

Ross, David O. (1975). *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---- (1969). *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Royo, Manuel. (2014). "Un sacrifice pâle et un lieu d'herbe": l'espace et le temps dans les descriptions poétiques de Rome" in *Lire la Ville: fragments d'une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique. Scripta antiqua, 65*. eds., Damien Nelis and Manuel Royo. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.

Salzman-Mitchell, Patricia. (2005). *A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image, and Gender in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Scarth, E. (2008). *Mnemotechnics and Virgil: The Art of Memory and Remembering*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Schank, R. C. and R.P. Abelson. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schmale, M. (2004). *Bilderreigen und Erzähllabyrinth: Catulls Carmen 64*. München: K.G. Saur.

Scivoletto, N. (1976). *Musa iocosa: studio sulla poesia giovanile di Ovidio*. Roma: ELIA.

Sebesta, Judith L. (1994). "Mantles of the Gods and Catullus 64." *Syllecta Classica* 5:35-41.

Seider, A. M. (2013). *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: Creating the Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharrock, Alison. (2000). "Constructing Characters in Propertius." *Arethusa* 33.2: 263-284.

---- (1994). *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria 2*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---- (1991). "Womanaufacture." *JRS* 81: 36-49.

Shea, Kathleen. (2011). "(Re)visions of Love: Augustan Visual Culture in Ovid's *Amores*." Diss. Rutgers University.

Shulman, J. (1981). "Te quoque falle tamen: Ovid's anti-Lucretian didactics." *CJ* 76: 242-53.

- Skinner, Marilyn B. (2003). *Catullus in Verona*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- (1997). "Ego Mulier: The Construction of Male Sexuality in Catullus" in *Roman Sexualities*. eds., Judith Hallett and Marilyn Skinner. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny. (1997). *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, R. A. (1994). "Fantasy, Myth, and Love Letters: Text and Tale in Ovid's *Heroides*." *Arethusa* 27: 247-73.
- Sommariva, G. (1980). "La parodia di Lucrezio nell' *Ars* e nei *Remedia* ovidiani." *A&R* 25: 123-48.
- Spentzou, Efrossini. (2003). *Readers and Writers in Ovid's Heroides: Transgressions of Genre and Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spoth, Friedrich. (1992). *Ovids Heroides als Elegien*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Stambaugh, J. E. (1988). *The Ancient Roman City*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Studel, M. (1992). *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids "Ars amatoria"*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.
- Storoni Mazzolani, L. (1970). *The Idea of the City in Roman Thought*. trans., S. O'Donnell. London: Bloomington.
- Sullivan, J. P. (1972). "The Politics of Elegy." *Arethusa* 5.1: 17-34.
- Sumi, Geoffrey. (2009). "Monuments and Memory: The Aedes Castoris in the Formation of Augustan Ideology." *CQ* 59.1: 167-186.
- (2011). "Topography and Ideology: Caesar's Monument and the Aedes Divi Iulii in Augustan Rome." *CQ* 61.1: 205-229.
- Sweet, D. (1987). "Catullus 11: A Study in Perspective." *Latomus* 46: 510-26.
- Syme, Ronald. (1978). *History in Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Syndikus (1990). *Catull: eine Interpretation*. v. 2. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- (1984). *Catull: eine Interpretation*. v. 1. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Tatum, W. Jeffrey. (2007). "Social Commentary and Political Invective" in *A Companion to Catullus*. ed., Marilyn B. Skinner. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Terdiman, R. (1993). *Present past: modernity and the memory crisis*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Thomas, Richard F. (1982). "The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg., *Georg.* 4.116-48." *MD* 29: 35-70.
- Toner, J. P. (1995). *Leisure and Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Toohy, P. (1996). *Epic lessons: an introduction to ancient didactic poetry*. London: Routledge.
- Toynbee, J. M. C. (1971). *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Treggiari, S. (2005). "Women in the Time of Augustus" in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. ed., K. Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tuckey, M. R. and N. Brewer. (2003). "The influence of schemas, stimulus ambiguity, and interview schedule on eyewitness memory over time." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 9: 101-118.
- Tulving, E. (1985). "Memory and Consciousness." *Canadian Psychology* 26:1-12.
- Vasaly, Ann. (1993). *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Verducci, F. (1985). *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vial-Logeay, Anne. (2014). "La topographie de Rome chez Cicéron: quelques remarques sur l'invention d'un paysage politique" in *Lire la Ville: fragments d'une archéologie littéraire de Rome antique*. *Scripta antiqua* 65. eds., Damien Nelis and Manuel Royo. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.
- Vitale, Maria Teresa. (2009-10). "Su alcuni 'itineraria' poetici al femminile." *Itineraria* 8-9: 407-420.
- Volk, K. (2006). "Ars Amatoria Romana: Ovid on Love as a Cultural Construct" in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. eds., Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2002). *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1981). "Family and Inheritance in the Augustan Marriage Laws." *PCPS* 207: 58-80.
- Walter, Uwe. (2004). *Memoria Und Res Publica: Zur Geschichtskultur Im Republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike.
- Warden, J. (1980). *Fallax Opus: Poet and Reader in the Elegies of Propertius*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Watson, Patricia. (2002). "Praecepta amoris: Ovid's Didactic Elegy" in *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. ed., Barbara Weiden Boyd. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- (2001). "Parody and Subversion in Ovid's *Medicamina faciei femineae*." *Mnemosyne* 54.4: 457-71.
- Weinrich, H. (2004). *Lethe: the art and critique of forgetting*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Welch, Tara S. (2005). *The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Whitaker, Richard. (1983). *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy: A Study in Poetic Technique*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Whitehead, A. (2009). *Memory*. London: Routledge.
- Wiggers, Nancy. (1976). "Epic Themes in Propertius II.9." *Phoenix* 30.4: 367-374.
- Wildberger, Julia. (2007). "Ovids *Remedia amoris* aus affektpsychologischer Sicht" in *Ovid: Werk, Kultur, Wirkung*. eds., Markus Janka, Ulrich Schmitzer, and Helmut Seng (Hrsg.). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- (1998). *Ovids Schule der "elegischen" Liebe: Erotodidaxe und Psychagogie in der Ars amatoria*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Wilkinson, P. (1955). *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, G. D. (1997). "Writing in the Mother-Tongue: Hermione and Helen in *Heroides* 8 (A Tomitan Approach)." *Ramus* 26: 113-137.

- Wiseman, T. P. (2015). *The Roman Audience: Classical Literature as Social History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wistrand, Erik. (1976). *The So-Called Laudatio Turiae: Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Woodman, A. J. (2012). *From Poetry to History: Selected Papers*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Woytek, E. (2000). "In medio et mihi Caesar erit: Vergilimitationen in Zentrum von Ovids *Remedia amoris*." *WS* 113: 181–213.
- Wray, David. (2001). *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wyke, Maria. (2002). *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1995). "Taking the Woman's Part: Engendering Roman Love Elegy" in *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus Essays for J. P. Sullivan*. ed., A. J. Boyle. Bendigo, Vic.: Aural Publications.
- (1994). "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World" in *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*. eds., L. Archer, S. Fischler, and M. Wyke. New York: Routledge.
- (1989). "Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy." *Helios* 16: 25-47.
- (1987). "Written Women: Propertius' *scripta puella*." *JRS* 77: 47-61.
- Yardley, J. C. (1996). "Roman Elegy and Funerary Epigram." *Echos du monde classique/Classical Views* 40.15: 267-73.
- (1977). "Cynthia's Ghost: Propertius 4.7 Again." *BICS* 24: 83-87.
- Yates, Frances. (1966). *The Art of Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zanker, P. (1988). *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. trans., Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- (1983). "Der Apollontempel auf dem Palatin: Ausstattung und politische Sinnbezüge nach der Schlacht von Actium" in *Città e Architettura nella Roma Imperiale*. ed., Kjeld de Fine Licht. Odense: Odense University Press.
- (1968). *Forum Augustum: Das Bildprogramm*. Tübingen: Verlag Ernst Wasmuth.
- Zetzel, J. E. G. (1996). "Poetic Baldness and its Cure." *MD* 36: 73-100.