

Ovid Amores 1.6 Notes

Bibliography e.g. Yardley, J. C. 1987. "Propertius 4.5, Ovid *Amores* 1.6 and Roman Comedy", *PCPS* 213/ns 33: 179-189; McKeown *Amores* commentary 1989; Turpin commentary; de Boer, K. R. 2021 'Violence and Vulnerability in Ovid's *Amores* 1.5–8' *American Journal of Philology* 142.2, 259-286.

Cf. *Am.* 3.1.53-4 (Elegy pictures herself as written elegy) *uel quotiens foribus duris incisa pependi / non uerita a populo praetereunte legi!* "How often have I hung carved onto hard gates not afraid to be read by the people who pass by!", "these reminds us of earlier elegies in the *Amores*. The first setting is reminiscent of *Amores* 1.6, where a carved elegy, perhaps *Amores* 1.6 itself, along with the garland he mentions in line 67, could be another souvenir of the poet-speaker's sleepless and futile night." (Perkins CW 2011: 325)

"At three points in the collection Ovid explores the metaphor that maps the anatomy of the elegiac text on to the physique of the elegiac poet-lover. In a *paraclausithyron*, the speaker asks his girl-friend's door-keeper to admit him, slyly observing that long service to Love has wasted his limbs (or attenuated his clauses) to such an extent that the narrowest opening will suffice: ... (*Am.* 1.6.3-6). The use of *membra*, both limbs and clauses, in conjunction with a series of adjectives drawn from the critical register, activates the play with literary metaphor. Implicitly *exigua*, *tenua* or *tenuata* (suggested by the verb *tenuare*) and *parva*, the poet-lover's limbs, *membra*, evoke the exquisite delicacy of the clauses, *membra*, of his elegiac poetry⁵⁵). Moreover through an inherent ambiguity in the term *amor*, the long love that has made the lover's body slender may also be interpreted as the poet's lengthy period in the service of *Amor*, the deity who presides over the slender verse of the *Amores* (*Am.* 1.1.3-4; 2.1.3-4, 38; 2.18.3-4, 15-16; 3.15). The Ovidian speaker credits the god *Amor* with teaching him such useful skills for the practitioner of a love-affair as creeping silently past guards on unstumbling feet (...*Am.* 1.6.7-8; cf. *Tib.* 1.7.62) in lines that recall the opening scene of the *Amores*, where *Amor* imposes his metrical feet on a would-be epic poet (*Am.* 1.1.3-4, quoted above). The lover's feet move smoothly, *leniter*, in the style of elegiac verse (cf. *blanditias elegosque leues ... lenta uerba*, *Am.* 2.1.21-22) in which the poet's metrical feet move smoothly under the direction of *Amor* (cf. *carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor*, *Prop.* 1.9.12)." (Keith, A. 1999. "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory", *Mnemosyne* 52.1: 41-62: 59)

Time: late evening → dawn. Refrain (hymnic? komos?) (*tempora noctis eunt; excute postes* *seram*: 24, 32, 40, 48, 56), suggest slipping away of time and thus of opportunity for the poet-lover to gain admittance. *Paraclausithyron*, vigil at doorway. Addresses doorkeeper: only eg of *paraclausithyron* address to a slave in lyric and elegiac corpus: how much power would doorkeeper have to open door (note slave status, chained to door) ? What kind of status had he (nb low status role in household)? Though also remember thickness of doors of Roman houses (would anyone but the doorkeeper hear?). Think about prior elegiac material and need to change. Cf. *Prop.* 1.16 where twist= door speaking, including quoting lover's song. *Ov. Am.* 1.6 has the twist of talking to door custodian. Cf. also *Tib.* 1.2. Nb failure to persuade (cf. failure elsewhere in Book 1; cf. 3.6).

McKeown on 1.6: p121f. plays cf esp. Menander *Misoum.* Frg. A; Plaut. *Curc.* 147ff., Ter. *Eun.* 771ff.

See Yardley for comedy (1987 "Propertius 4.5, Ovid *Amores* 1.6 and Roman Comedy", *PCPS* n.213/ns 33: 179-189) e.g. where you might have master-slave inversion.

1 *dura*: nb mistress usually *dura*. How is the poet-lover hoping to win over the doorkeeper? Starts off being sympathetic (what later tactics?)

5-6 Pushing elegiac idea of wasting away with love: cf. "you will not so often be surprised by my wan colour, or why my whole body is shrunk to nothing" (Prop. 1.5.21-22).

11 Cupido: Cupid (and Venus): important in Ovid.

12 fortis: bravery, in sphere of love...

15: ianitor like a Jupiter figure. Is he really this powerful? Nb fulmen "gains from the context a hint of a false derivation from *fulcire*, creating a play on the senses "thunderbolt" and "doorbolt"." (Barsby)

19-20: verba and verbera word play which Yardley sees as deriving from comedy.

19-22: Ovid suggests he is owed a favour. De Boer notes this might remind slave of punishment he would receive if he admits an unwanted visitor. Nb physical reality of slave's existence.

19: de Boer cfs poem 1.5.17 (stetit . . . posito velamine) and suggests the pairing of these poems "encourages a re-reading of the sexual encounter in *Amores* 1.5 that reinforces its undercurrents of non-consensual violence".

25: McKeown notes Copley detects 'a modified version of an old carmen magicum' in Phaedromus' doorsong at Plaut. *Curc.* 147ff.

26: serva: reminds us of his servile status; emphasises passage's comic associations?

28: cf. 68; 73.

41: cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 153f.

47: wish to trade places. Nb servitium amoris motif. How much like the slave is Ovid? Is the poet-lover posturing?

53 addresses Boreas now. Will this work?

64 sollicito carcere dignus eras: change from start (indignus..).

65-6: dawn: life moves on.

69-70 tu dominae, cum te proiectam mane videbit, / temporis absumpti tam male testis eris: might some readers also think the time spent badly?

75: nb lover as slave of love. But how like a door?