

IRIS BRECKE, *Ovid's Terence. Tradition and Allusion in the Love Elegies and Beyond*, Trends in Classics 156, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2024, xxiii+158pp., €99.95, ISBN 978-3-11-130703-9.

This interesting new monograph investigates the reception of Terence in Ovid's elegiac works, specifically the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Tristia* 2. Going beyond the 'comedy model,' Brecke (B.) argues for a close intertextual relationship between Ovid's poems and Terence's comedies, especially the *Eunuchus*, which, as much previous scholarship has argued, may be seen as a "particularly rich source for later writers in general when it comes to the Roman development of a type of subjective love, and as the comic play that perhaps most prominently points forward to the elegiac genre"(XVI).<sup>1</sup> The play famously includes a violent rape scene, an *exclusus amator*, and examples of the erotic topoi of love as madness and warfare. B. argues that "Ovid deploys Terence so as to address current societal issues, conservative morals and the status of art and the artist" (77), but the focus throughout the work is more narrowly on specific allusions. Because of this focus, there is also little discussion of Tibullus and Propertius as intermediaries in Ovid's reception of Terence. Summaries at the end of each chapter strive to connect the arguments of the individual readings to an "allusive network," some parts of which are more convincing than others. While I missed discussion of the indebtedness of elegy to such comic figures as the *lena* and *meretrix* of comedy, this monograph is a welcome addition to a growing body of recent scholarship that aims to explore a wider range of generic models for Ovid's poetry.

Chapter One investigates an "intricate allusive play" in *Tristia* 2, where for the only time Ovid mentions Terence by name, citing him as an example of the comic genre (359 *conviva Terentius esset*). This is seen as influenced by Horace's praise of Terence's art in *Epistle* 2.1.59, an important model for Ovid's poem. It is argued that both Horace and Ovid cite Terence as a comparison for themselves: aesthetically sophisticated, but unappreciated and misunderstood by their contemporary audiences (and, for Ovid, by Augustus). B. argues that the use of Terence in the defense of his poetic art is a point of contact between *Tristia* 2 and *Rem.* 357-436. B.'s suggestion that the recurring image/association in the exile poetry of Augustus as Jupiter (a massive topic) should be read in the light of the scene in the *Eunuchus* in which Chaerea claims to imitate Jupiter in his rape of Pamphila (584-91) is less convincing.

Chapter Two explores the crucial issues of marriage, rape, and status in the comedies of Terence and in the episode of the Sabine women in the first book of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*.

<sup>1</sup> Brecke acknowledges earlier ground-breaking scholarship, which argued that we should see in Terence, particularly the *Eunuchus*, a crucial forerunner of subjective love poetry, by David Konstan, "Love in Terence's *Eunuch*", *AJP* 107, 1986, 369-93 and Sharon James, "*Fallite fallentes*: Rape and Intertextuality in Terence's *Eunuchus* and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*", *Eugesta* 6, 2016, 86-111; see also John Barsby, "Ovid's *Amores* and Roman Comedy", *PLLS* 9, 1996, 135-57.

B. argues that tensions in Ovid's poetry regarding reciprocal elegiac love and the traditional values of marriage, recently reinforced by Augustus' legislation, are highlighted by allusions to Terence's employment of the stock comedic plot of rape-marriage between two citizens (*Andria*, *Hecyra*, *Eunuchus*, *Adelphoe*). B. observes the paradox in Ovid's use of the Sabine rape narrative to illustrate how the theater is good female hunting ground since the women in question are virgins (1.116), whose rape leads to marriage (as in the comic plot), which is not a goal of the poem or part of the elegiac erotic 'plot.' B. suggests that Ovid's implicit criticism of the "forced and violent nature of traditional Roman marriage" (25) is underlined by references to the unconventionally brutal rapes of Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*.

Chapter Three takes on the large topic of the metaphor of love as a disease, focusing on the *Remedia Amoris*. While admitting that the image is widespread in ancient literature, B. suggests that parts of the Ovidian programme in the *Remedia* are inspired by notions of lovesickness and erotodidaxis found in Terence's *Eunuchus* and *Andria*. For example, B. adduces the slave Parmeno's likeness to the *praeceptor* as "love doctor" (*Eun.* 923-40) as a possible source of inspiration for the image in Ovid. Again, some of these topoi are just too widespread (e.g. the dangers of *otium*, fake tears) to be convincingly pinpointed as Terentian in origin.

The topic of Chapter 4 is *servitium amoris*, mainly as it is represented in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Heroides* 20, in which a slave-like role is encouraged in order to gain access to the *puella*. B. argues that similarities in vocabulary suggest that Terence played a role in the development of Ovidian elegiac *servitium*. The connection between the wise slave of Comedy and the elegiac lover/*praeceptor* has been well established. B. presents Acontius in *Her.* 20 as an example of the combination of lover and trickster. Central to the argument is the opening scene of the *Eunuchus*, where "one can find clear prefigurations of what will become central notions of the image of *servitium amoris* in general, and as this is developed by Ovid in particular" (110). In this scene the young man Phaedria is the *exclusus amator*, shut out due to a *dives amator* (Thraso), figures which both become important in Roman love elegy. Moreover, Chaerea, in pretending to be the Eunuch, acts out the typical slave role in order to gain access to Pamphila.

Chapter Five addresses the theme of *militia amoris* in Ovid (*Amores* 1.9, 3.8) and argues that Terence "played a significant part in the development of this image" (112). In this the *Eunuchus* and *Hecyra* are the most important models again, with the former providing an example of a soldier-lover in the character of Thraso. The opening scene of the *Eunuchus* contains sustained military metaphors in the dialogue between Phaedria and Parmeno, equating the instability of warfare with that of love in a way that is suggestive for *Am.* 1.9. The *Hecyra* offers a scene between two *meretrices* (58-75) in which the elder Syra depicts the relationship with men in military terms, which B. argues prefigures Ovid depiction of the "battle of the sexes" in the *Ars Amatoria* (there is however, no discussion here of the possible influence of the female *lena* as a model for the *praeceptor amoris* in

Ovid). B. adds here also a discussion of amatory violence, which is traced back to Terence. B. argues that “all of the three Terentian *paraclausithyra* [in the *Adelphoe* and *Eunuchus*], can be interpreted as *militia*” (133). A final chapter helpfully summarizes the main arguments.

K. SARA MYERS  
University of Virginia  
ksm8m@virginia.edu

J.C. McKEOWN, R.J. LITTLEWOOD, *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume IV.i A Commentary on book three, Elegies 1 to 8*, Prenton: Francis Cairns Publications, 2023, xxviii-305 pp., ISBN 978-0-995461-23-9.

El volumen consta de Prefacio (pp. VII-VIII), de “References and Abbreviations” (pp. IX-XXVIII) y del comentario a cada elegía. En la bibliografía, añádase R. Maltby, *Book Three of the Corpus Tibullianum*, Cambridge 2021; A. Ramírez de Verger, *Publius Ovidius Naso. Carmina amatoria*, Monachii et Lipsiae, editio altera, 2006.

El comentario de *Amores* de J.C. McKeown se extendía hasta el libro II (1987, 1989, 1998). Es una grata noticia que se culmine la obra con el comentario del libro III, aunque por ahora solo llegue hasta la elegía 8.

El estudio de cada elegía se compone de bibliografía, resumen, introducción literaria y comentario verso a verso. El volumen está editado de forma impecable salvo el desliz de la p. 14 “see the introduction, p. \*”.

Paso a comentar algunos pasajes:

3.1.22 En lugar de *facta* Heinsius (1658, 264 in notis) propuso *furta* (‘amores furtivos’) apoyándose en *trist.* 2.432 (*detexit variis qui sua furta modis*), donde algunos manuscritos ofrecen las dos lecturas, *furta* / *facta*. Sobre *furta*, cf. *epist.* 18.64 (*flecte, precor, vultus ad mea furta tuos!*), *met.* 2.696 (*tutus eas; lapis iste prius tua furta loquetur*), *Catul.* 12.7 (*fratri, qui tua furta vel talento mutari velit*), *Catal.* 13.10 (*seu furta dicantur tua*), *Prop.* 2.2.4 (*Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tibi*), 4.8.34 (*et Venere ignota furta novare mea*), *Tib.* 1.2.36 (*obvia: celari vult sua furta Venus*), 1.5.69 (*at tu, qui potior nunc es, mea furta caveto*). Los autores no citan dicha propuesta.

3.1.41 El término amatorio *cura* ‘dolorem simul atque amorem significat’ (Pichon, s. v., 1966, 120), no ‘subject matter’.

3.1.46 Habría que especificar que el enamorado solía dejar antes de marcharse unos versos de reproche o de amor escritos en unas tablillas que dejaba colgadas a la puerta de su altiva amada.