

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

Ovidian Intertextuality

Sergio Casali

Introduction

The first word that Ovid published, the first word of the first elegy of the first book of the *Amores*, is a 'quotation': *arma gravi numero* ('weapons with solemn rhythm'). Ovid begins his elegiac collection by creating in the reader the false expectation of an epic poem (as it is well known, the first word of a Latin work could be also used as its title), and in order to do that he 'quotes' the first word of the *Aeneid*. Furthermore, as McKeown notes (1989: 12), 'not only is the distribution of consonants in Ovid's first line closely comparable to that in Vergil's, but also the sequence of vowels in the first hemistich corresponds almost exactly (Verg.: *a, a, i, u, e, a, o*—Ov.: *a, a, a, i, u, e, o*; i.e. only an *a* has been displaced). The correspondence of vowels seems too precise to be coincidental.' Ovid begins his poetic career with the most intertextual move one could imagine, and the rest of his work will be fully consistent with this beginning. Attention to Ovid's intertextual strategies (quotations, sources, models) has always played a fundamental role in the study of his poetry; but it is true that a turning point, a tangible intensification of the interest in this aspect of the Ovidian corpus, emerged in the middle of the 1970s, to coincide with the rise of a theoretical interest in the very concept of intertextuality in classical literature. It is not by chance that from then on Ovid has been (together with Virgil) the undisputed protagonist of the most important attempts at verifying the various theories of intertextuality. It is clearly impossible to review in a systematic way all intertextual studies on Ovid, which would require a review of nearly the whole of the Ovidian bibliography. So, I will limit myself to some key works, indicating also some critical genealogies which have played a significant role in stimulating subsequent research.

Mars' and Ariadne's Memories

We can start from the book which has had the greatest influence on recent intertextual studies in Latin. In Conte's chapter entitled 'History and System in the Memory of

Y

Poets', the first two examples of intertextuality discussed are from Ovid (1985: 35–9 = 1986a: 60–3), and for their suggestiveness they have had a success even independent from the theoretical context in which they are located (where Conte suggests an assimilation of poetic memory to a rhetorical function). In the *Metamorphoses*, in the context of the apotheosis of Romulus, Mars reminds Jupiter that once upon a time, in an earlier council of the gods, he had promised to receive Romulus in the sky (*Met.* 15.812–15):

tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum
(nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notau)
'unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli'
dixisti . . .

Once upon a time, in a council of the gods, you told me (I still remember your pious words: I keep them fixed in my memory): 'There will be one of the yours which you will raise into the blue regions of the sky.'

And in the *Fasti* (2.483–9), Mars speaks in the same way, with the same quotation of Jupiter's words (487). Now, the words of Jupiter's that Mars recalls reproduce exactly a line of the *Annals* of Ennius (fr. 54 Sk.), where in fact Jupiter made that promise to Mars.

A similar instance occurs elsewhere in the *Fasti*, when Ariadne is desperate because Bacchus, the god who had saved her and married her when Theseus had abandoned her on a desert island, has now brought with him from a voyage the daughter of an Indian king to be his lover. Ovid's Ariadne is once again bemoaning her misfortunes on a beach, exactly as when Theseus abandoned her (*Fast.* 3.471–5):

En iterum, fluctus, similis audite querellas.
en iterum lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.
Dicebam, memini, 'periure et perfide Theseu!';
Ille abiit, eadem crimina Bacchus habet.
Nunc quoque 'Nulla uiro', clamabo, 'femina credat'.

There, oh waves, yet again hear my laments, similar to my ancient ones! There, oh beach, yet again receive my tears! I used to say, I remember, 'deceitful and perjured Theseus!' He left, and now Bacchus does the same wrong to me. Now again I'll cry: 'Let no woman trust a man!'

In this case, the words Ariadne 'remembers' are the words she had pronounced in the key text for the story of Ariadne in Latin poetry, Catullus' Poem 64 (132–5, 143–4):

Sicine me patriis auectam, *perfide*, ab aris,
perfide, deserto liquistis in litore, *Theseu*?
Sicine discedens neglecto numine diuum
immemor, a, deuota domus *periuria* portas?
. . . nunc iam *nulla uiro* iuranti *femina credat*,
nulla uiri speret sermones esse fidelis.

Is this the way, then, *treacherous, treacherous Theuses*, you carried me off from the altars of my fathers for abandoning me on a lonely shore? Is this the way you leave, without fearing the power of the gods—feckless!—to carry home accursed *false oaths*? . . . Now *let no woman believe* any more *a man* who makes an oath, let no woman expect that the words of a man are trustworthy’.

In his discussion of these examples, Conte is interested in making a distinction between allusion as *metaphor* and allusion as *simile*: the first case represents standard allusions, where one poetical phrase alludes to a preceding phrase of another author, and by doing so it assumes for itself the sense, or part of the sense, of the phrase to which it refers (‘integrative allusion’); to the second case belong the Ovidian examples, where the memory of the character is, so to speak, tautological, and does not effect any addition in meaning (‘reflexive allusion’). Ovid’s strategy here is simply to call attention to the very literariness of his discourse, to his operation in a wholly intertextual world, where the stories already narrated by others can be taken up and continued without a break. The character ‘remembers’ what is remembered by the poet and the reader; from Ennius or Catullus we can pass to Ovid without any problem.

Conte’s discussion of these two examples will recur many times in other treatments of Ovid’s literary self-consciousness. For example, Hinds (1987b: 17) recalls the example of Ariadne as ‘an especially clear instance of self-referential elaboration of allusion’, pointing out that the use of the word *memini* in that passage as a reference to the literary tradition can be seen as an especially elaborated instance of the so-called ‘Alexandrian footnote’ (Ross 1975: 78), namely the use of words and phrases referring to ‘relating’ and ‘narrating’ (e.g. *dicitur, ferunt, fama est*) as techniques for pointing out a poetic allusion. Subsequently, Miller (1993) performed a systematic study of Ovid’s use of *memini* and similar phrases for referring to the re-use of a preceding text.

Literary Existence and the Self-consciousness of Poetry

The attention that Conte attracted to these Ovidian examples functioned as a powerful stimulus to the development of the study of Ovid’s ‘intertextual imagination’, especially in Italy. In 1974 Conte’s analysis clearly emphasized the ‘artificiality’ of Ovid’s poetry, its character as metapoetry. Five years later, in the second issue of a new journal edited by Conte himself, Rosati published an article entitled ‘Literary existence: Ovid and the self-consciousness of poetry’, which can be seen as a real manifesto for the ‘formalist’ and self-reflexive approach to Ovid’s poetry. Rosati’s opening words already point the way to an important trend in Ovidian studies (1979: 101): ‘To investigate the poetics of Ovid, the last of those who seemed to realize the happy season of poetry at Rome and at the same time the self-conscious heir to Latin “classicism”, means to investigate the degree of self-consciousness acquired by that poetry in its most mature expression. Already in his great predecessors Ovid saw how poetry had retreated into itself, had interrogated itself about its own identity (and not only in the frequent discussions of poetics in neoteric and Augustan poetry), also

because the need for an answer had become more pressing. Having by now acquired a firm certainty about a role of its own, poetry will not limit itself to protesting its necessity, it will peremptorily claim other rights.'

Rosati takes Book 2 of the *Tristia* as a point of departure. In that poem one can see the very essence of Ovid's poetry: 'art is not the reflex of reality, the sphere of the one is not connected to that of the other by a necessary relationship of identity and mimesis'. Rosati constructs an Ovidian poetics of the autonomy of poetry on the basis of a review of Ovid's programmatic declarations in the course of his production. Intertextuality is an essential element in such a poetics. In this respect, the close of the *Metamorphoses* (15.871–9) is a key example for Rosati (1979: 119–21): 'Vergil too had predicted the immortality of the *Aeneid*, basing it on the immortal destiny of Rome (*Aen.* 9.446–9); and Horace, with greater autonomy, had declared his trust in his own poetic *monumentum* by connecting this eternity, as an outcome parallel to, but independent from, the *Capitolium* (*Carm.* 3.30.1–9). In contrast, Ovid does not take the eternity of Rome as a guarantee of his own immortality; for line 877 [*quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris*, 'where Roman power extends in conquered lands'] indicates a geographical, not a temporal, extension, to indicate the immense space of the known world. Rather he invokes the 'prophecies of the poets' [879, *uatum praesagia*]: it is they that are the guarantors that assure the eternity of his work, if they have any truth (and *sunt quiddam oracula uatum: Pont.* 2.1.55). Paradoxically, the poet's trust in his eternal glory is not based any more on an external element, on a datum of reality, but on the firm self-consciousness of poetry itself, which in that way defines the parameters of its own destiny: as if to say, poetry is immortal, because poetry says so. The only certainty, the only benchmark in relationship to which it is possible to measure the duration of things is not Rome any more, but the eternity of poetry: a significant proof of the degree of autonomy that it has achieved and that it does not hesitate to claim. It is in this way, above all, that one can appreciate the meaning of Ovid's explicit reference to Horace's *sphragis*: if it is true, as Ovid affirms, that the glory of the poets finds the guarantee of its eternity in the *praesagia uatum*, what better way for the poet himself to affirm the proud certainty of his own immortality than to found it, through the gesture of the allusion, on the *praesagia* of a *uates* already consecrated to this glory? The reference to Horace, to that *praesagium*, the truth of which the years were already demonstrating, guaranteed an immortal fame to the person who affirmed such fame in the internal logic of the poetry itself. The measure of the duration of Ovid's work is here the work of Horace, a firmer certainty than that Rome to which the poet cannot get out of paying the ritual homage, though in a shrewdly restrictive way.'

The article closes with a discussion of the concept of intertextuality and the term itself (Rosati 1979: 135–6): 'Conscious of its unyielding otherness from the real, [literature] withdraws into its most authentic dimension: it evades common reality to live in a sort of recreated world, namely the literary Text. Then, those who live in the space of fiction, those who exist in the literary universe are no longer *mendacium*: they acquire an identity of their own, a reality of their own in the realm of appearance. Jupiter and Mars, Ariadne, Byblis, Ulysses, and the other "inhabitants" of literary myth are conscious of an identity and of a past of their own, for which they

feel responsible; they are aware of a literary existence of their own that they have already lived in countless other texts. In Ovid's text, where they become aware of this, they come out to declare this awareness of their own, to acknowledge their literary nature. Literature awakens to its nature as an intersection of relations, as a combination of texts: in *intertextuality* it singles out its true dimension. The *sign reifies itself, it becomes the referent*: literature refers only to itself. And then, having definitely escaped the tutelage of the real . . ., this poetry will necessarily be nothing but reflected poetry, poetry which looks at itself in the mirror, and narcissistically alludes to itself.⁷

With his reference to Jupiter and Ariadne Rosati obviously alludes to Conte's treatment mentioned above; by referring to Byblis and Ulysses he hints at two other articles published in that period: Ranucci (1976), which shows how Byblis in *Met.* 9 self-consciously refers to a different version of her own story, and Labate (1980). In his short note Labate gives another suggestive example of Ovid's attitude toward the stories he narrates and the memory of his characters. In the course of his quarrel with Ulysses for Achilles' weapons in *Met.* 13, Ajax emphasizes that Achilles' shining weapons are not apt for someone like Ulysses, who is accustomed to fighting in night ambushes: the brightness of the helmet could reveal him to the enemy (*Met.* 13.105–6), and the weight of the armor could slow him down (13.115–6). Ajax is surely reminding Ulysses of the context of Homer's *Doloneia* in the tenth book of the *Iliad*, but not so much in the version that Ulysses has really 'lived' (in *Il.* 10), as in the remake which Virgil has made of it in *Aen.* 9: it is there that Euryalus, Ulysses' unlucky literary heir, is revealed to the enemies by the brightness of Messapus' helmet, which he has seized in the course of the night slaughter (*Aen.* 9.373–4), and is slowed down in his escape by the weight of the weapons he has stolen (9.384–5).

Speaking Volumes: The *Heroides* and Intertextual Irony

Alessandro Barchiesi, who had already made an important contribution to the study of intertextuality in Virgil (Barchiesi 1984), is the scholar who has most systematically developed these approaches to Ovid's intertextuality with a series of articles published from the middle of the 1980s (now collected in Barchiesi 2001a). The first of these articles has as its subtitle 'Continuities of the Stories, Continuations of the Texts' (Barchiesi 1986), and, in the familiar form of a collection of short exegetical essays, it offers a number of observations, which lead eventually to a concluding section entitled 'Ovid's Intertextual Imagination'. With this, attention begins to focus on a work of Ovid which was until then rather undervalued, notwithstanding the important monograph of Jacobson (1974), and which was destined to become the main testing ground for analyzing Ovid's intertextual dynamics: the *Heroides*.

There is a sort of 'little *Heroides*' also in *Rem.* 263–88, where Circe vainly tries to detain Ulysses. In order to do that, she reminds him, among other things, of the fact that 'a new Troy is not rising again here (i.e. in Latium, *non hic noua Troia resurgit*), nobody is calling again allies to arms (*Rem.* 281–2). In this case, it is not Circe's literary competence that is being called into question; rather, it is her incompetence:

the sorceress does not know that the things she is presenting to Ulysses as impossible are destined to happen soon after. As the reader of the *Aeneid* knows, a new Trojan War really is on the verge of being fought in Latium, and it is precisely there where a new Troy is fated to rise again: as the disguised Venus says to Aeneas in *Aen.* 1.205–6: *tendimus in Latium . . . / . . . illic fas regna resurgere Troiae* ('we are moving toward Latium . . . there it is granted that the kingdom of Troy rise again') (Barchiesi 1986: 82–93). In this case we find again the same passion for chronological intersections of the stories (Ulysses sails along the coasts of Italy just before the arrival of Aeneas), and we also find a sharing of literary competence between author and reader behind the heroine's back: it happens that she inadvertently anticipates with extreme precision the (intertextual) future in the exact moment when her situation of ignorance is most acute.

This Ovidian technique—ironic prefiguring realized through intertextual anticipation, when a character who lives in a precise moment of the model-text 'unintentionally' foretells his/her own future or others' by using words destined to appear in the continuation of the model-text—finds prominent application in the *Heroides*. The whole of Ovid's work is profoundly intertextual, but certain works and certain parts find their very *raison d'être* in intertextuality. The *Heroides* are elegiac letters that are imagined as written by literary heroines in a precise moment of the 'high level' (usually epic or tragic) text in which they have already lived the most important of their literary lives. They know their past, and they reinterpret it elegiacally (transcoding their story from one genre to another, elegy); but they do not know their future, and readers will amuse themselves in recognizing the unintentional quotation, behind the heroine's back, as has been recently lamented by scholars who have tried to confer new power to the Ovidian heroines (Spentzou 2003).

A very important stimulus to intertextual study of the *Heroides* was provided by Kennedy's oft-cited article (1984) on the epistle of Penelope. Kennedy proposes to take seriously the epistolary status of the first series of the *Heroides* (1–15), and so he asks exactly when and why Penelope writes her letter to Ulysses (*Her.* 1). Asking these questions means to ask when and why Penelope writes within the narrative world of the *Odyssey*, which is the 'objective' reality against which we read *Her.* 1. As for the reason why Penelope writes, we know what the woman says in *Her.* 1.59–62: Penelope asks questions about her husband of every stranger who arrives at Ithaca, and gives them a letter to hand to Ulysses, if ever they should meet him. Clearly, then, someone has arrived at Ithaca now also. And when does Penelope write her letter? We know from lines 37–8 that the letter is clearly dated to the day when Telemachus came back to Ithaca from Sparta and related some news to Penelope about his father. But from the *Odyssey* we also know that the meeting between Telemachus and Penelope takes place the morning before the day on which the suitors are killed. When Penelope writes her letter, therefore, Odysseus, disguised as a Cretan beggar, is already on Ithaca, and very likely it is to him that Penelope is going to give the letter addressed to her husband: 'once we realize it, much of what Penelope says takes on considerable irony: her appeal to Ulysses not to write back, but to come in person (2), her complaints about how slowly time passes for her (7 f.), about how she does not know where he is (57 f.), and above all the closing

couplet of the poem, in which she laments “I, who was a girl when you left, though you should come home *immediately* (*protinus ut uenias*, 116), will seem to have become an old woman”. Penelope will not have to wait very long to find out her husband’s reaction to the physical changes the intervening twenty years have wrought in her’ (Kennedy 1984: 417). Kennedy also points out the importance, until now undervalued, of foreshadowing in the poetics of the *Heroides* (1984: 420).

It is precisely with a quotation from Kennedy that Barchiesi begins his article on ‘Narrativity and Convention in the *Heroides*’ (1987), in which he combines Kennedy’s interest in the ‘cut’ of the model-texts in which the epistles are written with analysis of the crucial importance of the genre of Roman elegy for the poetics of the *Heroides* (cf. Spoth 1992). The essential feature of elegy is the ‘constant effect of an individual voice, which attracts toward itself every theme’, reinterpreting it monologically. In the same way, the writers of the *Heroides* reinterpret texts which belonged to other genres in the light of the elegiac code (on the concept cf. Conte 1989) and of their monological subjectivity (Barchiesi 1987: 68): ‘the contribution of elegy is different, in terms of its quality, from the influences of other genres, because it is not only a matter of materials and narrative techniques, and not even of a unifying theme, love, but above all of a unifying perspective. Elegy teaches the heroines how one can “reduce” every external reality by attracting it toward the *persona* of the lover; and how one can nourish a poetical discourse through the resistance, the unyieldingness of a personal point of view toward the “external” world, while partiality of the point of view and pragmatic direction (the intention of the *Werbung*, the elegiac courtship) back each other up.’

Ironic prefiguring is systematically treated in Barchiesi (1993). A particularly compelling example is found at the beginning of *Her.* 4, where Phaedra begins her seductive letter to Hippolytus with an exhortation to read her epistle without any fear: *Perlege, quodcumque est. Quid epistula lecta nocebit?* (*Her.* 4.3 ‘Read it all, for what it is worth: what harm can come from reading a letter?’) But Ovid’s readers know that, on the contrary, letters can be very harmful: it will be the false letter which Phaedra herself, in Euripides’ *Hippolytus* (one of the main model-texts of *Her.* 4), will leave on her corpse after her suicide, in which she falsely accuses her stepson of having attempted to seduce her, in order to provoke the anger of Theseus and Hippolytus’ own death (Barchiesi 1993: 337).

The studies of Barchiesi have inspired much new criticism of the *Heroides*, both in Italy and in the English-speaking world. Deianira’s epistle (9), for instance, has been studied in the light of his work on ironic prefiguring. Deianira insists that Hercules—the hero who has not been destroyed by his many labors and the hatred of his stepmother Juno—has been shamefully conquered by a woman, who has subjected him to her erotic power (namely, Iole, his new concubine, and before her the queen Omphale). Deianira inadvertently anticipates in elegiac-metaphorical terms (the shame of the *servitium amoris*) the laments which Hercules himself will pronounce in the model-text Sophocles’ *Trachiniae* when he, the great hero never conquered by any enemy, will be destroyed, in fact, by a woman—Deianira herself, who has poisoned him to death with the gift of the deadly robe of Nessus the centaur (Casali 1995c).

Furthermore, it has been noticed that even when Ovid's model-text has not been preserved, it is possible to verify how the epistles play upon an ironically 'elegiac' prefiguring of the future events that the heroines will meet. Williams (1992) has analyzed the structure of Euripides' lost *Aeolus* and has described the dramatic irony that pervades the letter of Canace (*Her.* 11). Canace writes to her brother Macareus, for whom she has conceived an incestuous love, immediately before committing suicide, as she has been commanded to do by her father Aeolus after his discovery that they have had a baby. Nevertheless, the reader who knows Euripides' *Aeolus* knows that in the very moment when Canace is lamenting her father's unshakeable cruelty and the inexorability of her fate, Macareus is begging Aeolus to spare her life. And the reader also knows that Macareus' attempt is successful: Aeolus annuls the death sentence and Macareus rushes to bring the news to his sister. But it is too late: Canace is dead and Macareus kills himself in turn. The awareness of this tragic irony provides new resonance to the whole epistle.

More recently, again taking her bearings from Kennedy's seminal article (1984) to focus attention on the precise circumstances of the epistolary moment, Fulkerson (2003) suggests that the real addressee of Hypermestra's epistle (*Her.* 14) is not the 'official' one, namely Lynceus, but instead her father Danaus, who keeps her imprisoned. In fact, it is very likely that he will succeed in intercepting and reading the letter. So it is to him, more than to Lynceus, that Hypermestra writes, a strategy that for once will be successful, since, as every reader knows, the heroine is destined to survive and found a royal line at Argos.

Intertextuality and Word Plays: Looking for Ovidian Subtlety

In 1987 Stephen Hinds, author of an important monograph (1987a), to be discussed below, as well as a valuable theoretical reflection on intertextuality (1998), published a general article on Ovid (1987b), which has also played a significant role in the intensification of the scholarly interest in this author. In this article Hinds proposes to counteract three commonplaces about Ovid: (1) that he is a superficial and overly explicit poet, (2) that he is excessively literary, and (3) that he is a passive panegyrist. In arguing against these generalizations, Hinds writes what we can call a veritable manifesto in support of the tendency to take Ovid's lack of seriousness very seriously, especially in the field of intertextuality. The kind of intensified subtlety of analysis that Hinds proposes for Ovid's intertextuality is exemplified in *Am.* 1.5, where, as previous critics have noticed, Ovid describes Corinna's entrance into the bedroom in a way possibly reminiscent of the entrance of Lesbia into the house of Catullus 68. Hinds goes further and sees in Ovid's diction a precise intertextual reference to Catullus: *ecce, Corinna uenit tunica uelata recincta, / candida diuidua colla tegente coma . . .* (*Am.* 1.5.9–10, 'Lo! Corinna comes, draped in an ungirt tunic, with her divided hair covering her fair neck . . .') alludes to Catullus 68.70–1: *quo mea se molli candida diua pede / intulit . . .* ('there with gentle foot my fair goddess made an entry . . .'). As Hinds puts it (1987b: 8), 'The reference to the Catullan goddess is offered for an instant only, as the pentameter opens—only to be withdrawn, as the

syntax of the line completes itself. Corinna is not, after all, a *candida diva*: the epiphany fades. The adjective qualifies her *colla*, not herself; and *div-* emerges as the first syllable of *dividua*, qualifying *coma*.⁷ This pushes the envelope in Ovidian subtlety, while also imposing demands upon the competence of the reader, but it is a significant example of a tendency which is surely new in Ovidian criticism. All the more so if we recall another paragraph of Hinds about this passage of *Am.* 1.5, in which the analysis becomes very subtle indeed (10): ‘A few bold believers in word-play may wish to go further, and faster, here. Corinna, a divided *diva* (the allusion in *dividua* alludes to its own processes), aptly inhabits this highly patterned world of borderlines—and of midpoints (lines 1, 2, 26). She is like Catullus’ *candida diva* in poem 68, poised on the threshold of definition (line 10); she is like *Semiramis*, “half” in name (line 11); and she is like *Lais*, whose etymologically marked name (line 12) makes her half of Catullus’ *Laudamia*, half of his *Protesilaus*.’

Another aspect of Ovid’s intertextuality considered by Hinds is ‘the allusion which is so constructed as to draw attention to its status of allusion’ (1987b: 7). We are reminded here, of course, of Conte’s example of Mars and Ariadne (and see below the play on *cinnama/Cinna* in Knox 1986). Another is noted by Hinds in *Am.* 2.6, the elegy on the parrot which is clearly inspired by Catullus’ poem on Lesbia’s *passer* (3). In the opening line of the elegy, ‘the conspicuousness of Ovid’s allusion to Catullus amounts to an extreme case of self-reference: *psittacus, Eois imitatrix ales ab Indis, / occidit . . .* (*Am.* 2.6.1–2), “The parrot, winged imitator from the Eastern land, is dead . . .” . . . Corinna’s engaging *psittacus* is modeled on Lesbia’s famous *passer*, or “sparrow”: and it is called an *imitatrix ales* by Ovid not just because, as a parrot, its role in nature is to mimic: but because its role in the Latin erotic tradition is to “imitate” that particular bird celebrated by Catullus’ (1987b: 7). A similar approach to Corinna’s parrot was adopted simultaneously by Boyd (1987).

Hinds proposes other examples of this technique in *Her.* 14.109–100, where *Hypermestra* closes her digression on the story of *Io* by saying,

ultima quid referam, quorum mihi cana senectus
auctor? Dant anni, quod querar, ecce, mei.

Why should I recall far-off things, which are narrated to me by white-haired old men?
Lo, my very years give me reasons to complain.

This is a typical ‘Alexandrian footnote’ by which Ovid, with a metaliterary gesture, attracts the reader’s attention to the ‘source’ of his own digression. Now, we could ask ourselves whether these ‘white-haired old men’ (*cana senectus*) who tell the story of *Io* to *Hypermestra* allude to some particular source. The most famous treatment of the myth in Latin poetry was certainly the epyllion *Io* by Calvus. By defining the old age which has narrated *Io*’s story as *cana*, Ovid perhaps alludes, through the Roman etymological technique of calling things by their opposites (*a contrariis*), to the word designating old age that is precisely the opposite of *cana*, as far as hair is concerned, namely *calua*. This interpretation may be assisted if indeed the Romans used to contrast the two words in a way that is almost standard: Hinds recalls an

anecdote in Macrobius (*Saturnalia* 2.5.7), where Augustus, to reproach his daughter Julia who used to tear away her precociously white hair, asked her ‘whether, some years later, she would prefer to be white-haired or bald’ (*cana . . . an calua*).

Intertextuality, Genre, Callimacheanism

In 1986 Peter Knox published a book on the *Metamorphoses* which was destined to be very influential. Knox locates himself in the tradition of the Alexandrianism of the so-called ‘Harvard school’, whose main sources of inspiration are Wendell Clausen (e.g. 1964) and David Ross (1969, 1975), a school that has given a vigorous impulse to the study of intertextuality, including more theoretical approaches (see above; Thomas 1982, 1986). Knox’s monograph is centered above all on the genre of the poem, its historical-literary background, and its diction and style—fields in which Knox argues for the fundamental importance of the traditions of elegy and the Alexandrian/neoteric epyllion rather than of traditional epic poetry. But inevitably intertextuality also plays a crucial role in his discussion.

Virgil’s sixth *Eclogue*, with the song of Silenus, which starts from a cosmogony to continue on with a catalogue of love myths, is seen as a crucial precedent for the poetic program of the *Metamorphoses* (Knox 1986: 10–14), with comparisons made to the song of Orpheus in Apollonius (1.486–511) and Clymene in Virgil’s *Georgics* (4.345 ff.). With its elegiac texture, and echoes from *Am.* 1.1, the story of Apollo and Daphne sets the foundations for the general tone of the narratives of the poem; it is a programmatic declaration ‘that the themes which interested him [i.e. Ovid] as an elegist will dominate the narrative to follow’ (Knox 1986: 17). An intertextual relationship with the probable model in the Apollo of Euphorion’s *Hyacinthus* (fr. 48 P.) is singled out by Knox in Ovid’s adaptation of the Propertian and Gallan topos (cf. Ross 1975: 66–9) of the *medicina amoris* and incurable love. In telling the story of Atalanta and Hippomene as an insertion within the tale of Venus and Adonis, Ovid’s Orpheus uses it as a kind of Alexandrian self-comment in order to allude to an important literary model of the container-story, namely the *other* version of the myth of Atalanta, the one which involves Milanion. But for Knox the real protagonist of intertextuality in the *Metamorphoses* is Callimachus (Knox 1986: 67–9): he is probably the source of the foundation myth of Cyrene in *Met.* 15, and the entire episode of Pythagoras in *Met.* 15 reveals the influence of the Pythagorean dream of Ennius at the beginning of his *Annals*, a dream that already alludes in a fully Alexandrian way to the dream of Callimachus at the beginning of the *Aitia* (70–2). Further, Ovid’s panegyrics of Julius Caesar and Augustus are connected by Knox with the panegyrics of the Ptolemies in the *Aitia* (75–6). A section that has given rise to many discussions is his treatment of the intertextuality of the prologue of the *Metamorphoses* with the prologue of the *Aitia*. Ovid’s request to the gods in 1.4 that they inspire him to compose a *perpetuum . . . carmen* has usually been seen as motivated by Ovid’s wish to write a ‘unified continuous poem’, of the type that Callimachus (fr. 1.3) says he was criticized for not having written. But, anticipating the conclusions of Cameron (1995: 303–38), Knox points out that the response to the Telchines in the *Actia*

does not establish oppositions among literary genres, of epic against elegy. Neither the ‘unified continuous poem’ of Callimachus nor the *perpetuum . . . carmen* of Ovid refers to epic (Knox 1986: 10): ‘Callimachus is careful not to distinguish between the epic and elegiac forms . . . The only poets named in the Prologue are elegists, Mimnermus and Philetas (fr. 1.9–12) . . . And Callimachus’ most celebrated target [elsewhere in his poetry] was not an epic, but the elegiac *Lyde* of Antimachus. In the polemical setting of the *Aetia* Prologue διηγεκέξ is a neutral term.’ Rather, it is the case that *deducite . . . carmen* in *Met.* 1.4 aligns the poem with the *deductum carmen* of Virg. *Ecl.* 6.5, poetry that is ‘subtle’ in the Alexandrian and neoteric manner. Ovid’s self-consciousness in alluding to his neoteric models is further emphasized through the suggestion that Ovid, in introducing the story of Myrrha in *Met.* 10, which will be modeled on Cinna’s *Zmyrna*, plays on the name of his source when he gives a catalogue of aromatic plants: 10.307–9 *sit diues amomo, / cinnamaque costumque suum sudataque ligno / tura ferat floresque alios Panchaia tellus . . .* (‘Let the land of Panchaia be rich in amomum, let it produce cinnamon, and its costus, and the incenses exuded from wood, and the other flowers . . .’).

Shortly after Knox’s volume, another book was published, which similarly focuses on issues of genre and intertextuality, albeit from quite a different perspective. Hinds (1987a) proposes a close reading of the two passages in which Ovid narrates the Rape of Proserpine (*Fast.* 4.417–620 and *Met.* 5.341–661). His study aims at a re-examination of the question of the differences in literary genre between the two narratives, with a reconsideration of the classic treatment of Heinze (1919). But the bulk of the book is dedicated to a detailed study of the literary models of Ovid’s stories, with a special attention to the programmatic and metaphorical points present in Ovid’s poetic texture. Hinds analyzes the complex web of Ovidian references to Hellenistic poets, such as Aratus and Callimachus, and above all discusses the influence of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* on both narratives of the Rape of Proserpina, counteracting the common opinion that there is no direct influence of Homer on Ovid’s tales.

The influence of Knox and Hinds is clear in two monographs published in the 1990s, which offer deep intertextual readings of passages from the *Metamorphoses*. Keith (1992) is devoted to an analysis of the stories contained in *Met.* 2.531–835. In her first chapter Keith carefully examines the relationship between the story of the crow and the rook in Ovid and in the *Hecale* of Callimachus. Myers (1994) is especially interested in the issues of genre already discussed by Knox (1986) and Hinds (1987): her aim is to show that the *Metamorphoses* ‘should be read simultaneously as a cosmogonic epic in the tradition of the lofty “scientific” or cosmological epics of Hesiod and Lucretius and as learned Alexandrian poetry in the tradition of Callimachus’ *Aetia*’ (Myers 1994: ix). Ample space is devoted to the demonstration of how etymologies, conversations, and narrative situations in the *Metamorphoses* are profoundly indebted to the *Aitia* of Callimachus, an approach which had previously been adopted to the *Fasti* by Miller (1991).

A different way of looking at the intertextual relationship with Callimachus is proposed by Sharrock (1994a), who performs an extremely close reading of the digression on Daedalus and Icarus, and of the epiphany of Apollo in *Ars* 2 (21–98,

493–508), showing how the two Ovidian narratives are studded with self-reflexive references to Callimachean poetics. In particular, in examining the epiphany of Apollo, who unexpectedly appears in order to suggest to the poet-teacher of love the Delphic precept ‘know yourself’, Sharrock (1994a: 197–290) shows how the epiphany of the god simultaneously reworks different epiphanies of Apollo in the *Aitia*, and how the divine instructions have metapoetic relevance for Ovid’s poetic enterprise (cf. Miller 1983).

Intertextuality and Augustanism: Ovid and the *Aeneid*

As we have seen in our brief survey, the study of Ovid’s intertextuality often leads to renewed consideration of the theme of Ovid’s literary playfulness. But sometimes intertextuality can help to illuminate more ‘political’ aspects of Ovid’s work. This is especially the case in Ovid’s intertextual relationship with the quintessential Augustan poem, Virgil’s *Aeneid*, a relationship that, as we have seen, was fundamental for Ovid from the very beginning of his career. Virgil is a constant presence in the whole of Ovid’s work, but there are Ovidian texts that find their very meaning almost entirely in their relationship with the *Aeneid*. Two examples are *Her.* 7, the letter of Dido to Aeneas, and the so-called ‘little *Aeneid*’ of the *Metamorphoses* (13.623–14.608), in which Ovid re-tells Virgil’s story. The political value of these texts lies in the fact that in them Ovid acts as an *interpreter* of the *Aeneid*, and acting as an interpreter of the Augustan text par excellence means taking up a definite position regarding Augustan discourse as a whole. Ovid does not always have an evident ‘political’ purpose in his exegetical approach to the *Aeneid*. Sometimes, rather than reacting to Virgil’s text in itself, he seems instead to pick up on a certain pedantic attitude of the interpreters of Virgil of his own age. For example, at the end of Book 6 of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas arrives at Caieta (900–1): *Tum se ad Caietae recto fert limite portum. / ancora de prora iacitur; stant litore puppes* (‘Then he moves straight toward the harbor of Caieta. The anchor is dropped from the prow, the sterns rest on the shore’). But the following book begins with the aetiological explanation of the name of Caieta: the site takes its name from Aeneas’ nurse, Caieta, who dies there (*Aen.* 7.1–4). In the commentary of Servius we find a note which points out Virgil’s ‘inconsistency’ in 6.900 and tries to explain it: *AD CAIETAE PORTUM: a persona poetae prolepsis: nam Caieta nondum dicebatur* (‘toward the harbor of Caieta: it is an anticipation from the person of the poet: for it was not yet called Caieta’). It is a pedantic observation typical of the ancient exegesis of Virgil, and not only of the fourth and fifth centuries AD, but also of the period immediately following the death of Virgil by, for example, Hyginus, a contemporary and friend of Ovid. Now, in the ‘Aeneid’ of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid describes the arrival of Aeneas at Caieta with these words (14.156–7): *Troius Aeneas . . . / litora adit nondum nutricis habentia nomen* (‘Trojan Aeneas arrives at the shore which had not yet the name of his nurse’). As Hinds notes (1998: 109 n. 14), in part of an important treatment of Ovid’s ‘Aeneid’, ‘Servius’ pedantic note on *Aen.* 6.900 is exactly anticipated by Ovid’s mock-pedantry.’ To be sure, in this case we may also notice a slightly aggressive, irreverent approach toward

the text of the *Aeneid*, but probably the first target of Ovid's irony, rather than the *Aeneid* itself, is a certain way of reading the *Aeneid*.

But other Ovidian choices have clear political implications. The seventh epistle of the *Heroides* has been seen as the first example of a 'negative' reading of the *Aeneid* by Knox (1995: 19–25). In his reading of *Aen.* 4, Ovid appears as the prototype of the 'pessimistic', or 'non-Augustan', reader of the *Aeneid*. To give Dido an exclusive point of view and an isolated voice, with no reply from Aeneas, amounts to a dramatic radicalization of the narrative strategy of Virgil, who in *Aen.* 4 had conceded to Dido the possibility of freely expressing her antagonism toward Aeneas' divine mission. Ovid, by giving voice *only* to Dido, emphasizes the 'dangers' that a multivocal epic such as the *Aeneid* involves for the encomiastic and propagandistic intent that apparently characterizes it. Furthermore, it is precisely the most seriously antagonistic aspects of Virgil's Dido that Ovid makes explicit and heightens. So, for example, Virgil's Dido expressed in an oblique and ambiguous way her doubts about the credibility of the narrative which Aeneas has told her about his escape from Troy (*Aen.* 4.596–9); Ovid's Dido picks up this cue and expands it in an extremely harsh way (*Her.* 7.77–80). When she accuses Aeneas of not having done enough to save his wife Creusa during the last night of Troy, or even of having taken the opportunity to get rid of her, Ovid's Dido only makes explicit and exaggerates a suspicion destined to occur quite often to Virgil's interpreters (Knox 1995: 21–2): 'Commentators ancient and modern have been worried by the possible implications of Aeneas' last words to his wife as he flees Troy with his family, reported indirectly by Virgil, *longe seruet vestigia coniunx* (2.711). How Aeneas lost Creusa and how the reader is to judge him are questions enjoined by the ambiguities in Virgil's portrayal of this scene in the *Aeneid*. Ovid's answer, through the voice of Dido, is unambiguous (81–4): 'Aeneas has lied about everything, and Dido is not his first victim (*Her.* 7.83–4): 'if you ask where is the mother of beautiful Iulus, she is dead, abandoned alone by her cruel husband' (*occidit a duro sola relictā uiro*). A similarly 'negative' interpretation of the multivocality of the *Aeneid* has been proposed when in the '*Aeneid*' of *Met.* 13–14 Ovid chooses to abridge the plot of Virgil's poem using in first person, as the epic narrator, words and expressions that in the *Aeneid* Virgil had attributed to the 'partial' speeches of antagonist characters, enemies of Aeneas and of his mission (see Casali 1995b and Thomas 2001: 78–84).

FURTHER READING

The word 'intertextuality' was introduced into the theoretical lexicon by Kristeva (1969: 146), even if in a rather different sense, with reference to a more general interconnection of cultural codes and discourses. For a history and a discussion of the concept of intertextuality in classical studies see Farrell (1991: 3–25) and Edmunds (1995, 2001); theoretical reflections are to be found in Conte and Barchiesi (1989), Fowler (1997), Barchiesi (1997c), and Hinds (1998). An important study that touches on intertextuality through repetition is Wills (1996). Another book that combines a systematic analysis of the Ovidian

intertextuality in the *Amores* with an attempt at a theoretical classification is Boyd (1987). Rosati (1983) develops his ideas on self-reflexivity in Ovid's poetics, while a more recent study (Rosati 1999) investigates the imagery of 'weaving' as a self-reflexive metaphor in the *Metamorphoses*. The importance of the stories of Narcissus and Pygmalion for a theoretical approach to Ovidian self-reflexivity is highlighted, from different points of view, by Sharrock (1991; Pygmalion as a figure of the elegiac poet who first creates the woman and then falls in love with his own creation) and by Hardie (2002c: 143–227). Hardie (2002c: 150–65) also offers elegant new perspectives for the study of Ovid's intertextuality: see, for example, the theme of the echo and the reflexion in Lucretius and in the episode of Narcissus in the *Metamorphoses*, and the reading of Perseus' battle in the palace of Cepheus (*Met.* 4–5) in its relationship with Aeneas looking at the pictures in the temple of Juno at Carthage in *Aen.* 1 (178–86). Special attention to intertextuality characterizes the commentaries on single *Heroides* published in the 1990s: Barchiesi (1992), Casali (1995a), Knox (1995), Rosati (1996a), Kenney (1996), Bessone (1997), and Reeson (2001). On intertextuality and 'Augustan discourse', see Barchiesi (1993, 1997a). On Ovid and Virgil, see the essays collected in *Vergilius* 48 (2002) and especially Boyd (2002b). On the political value of Virgilian intertextuality in the *Fasti*, see Brugnoli and Stok (1992). On Ovid as an interpreter of Virgil, the article by Lamacchia (1960) is seminal; regarding the story of Cyparissus as a commentary on the killing of Silvia's stag in *Aen.* 7, Connors (1992–3: 4–12); on the etymologies: O'Hara (1996); on the Theban history in *Met.* 3–4 as developing a 'negative' reading of the *Aeneid*, see Hardie (1990). On *Her.* 7 and the *Aeneid*, see Desmond (1993), Miller (2004a), and Casali (2004–5). On the 'little *Aeneid*' in *Met.* 13–14, see Stitz (1962), Döpp (1969), Baldo (1995), Tissol (1997: 177–91), and Papaioannou (2005).