The *Metamorphoses* of Ovid:
35 Years of Research
(1980-2014)

Volume 63

Luis RIVERO GARCÍA

(coord.)

2021

Note from the authors:

The extent of the bibliography analysed in this work is vast. For this reason, the authors have been allowed to organise it in a different way to the normal standards observed in *Lustrum*. The references will be listed chronologically in each chapter, ordered independently. In this way, we hope to make it easier for the reader to consult the work.

Huelva, May 2021.

THE *METAMORPHOSES* OF OVID: 35 YEARS OF RESEARCH (1980-2014)[1]

CONTENTS AND AUTHORS

VOLUME 2

[1] This volume has been produced with the help of the Research Projects FFI2013-42529 and PGC2018-098024-B-I00, financed by the Spanish Government and "FEDER una manera de hacer Europa" funds, and of the Centro de Investigación en Patrimonio Histórico, Cultural y Natural at the Universidad de Huelva (Spain). The contributors want to express their gratitude to Prof. Pedro P. Fuentes and the team of *L'Année Philologique* for their help at the initial stage of our work, and to Fiona Flores Watson for her translation of the English version. Titles marked with an asterisk (*) throughout the volume could not be read directly by the authors.

VIII.2c Reception and Pervivence in Antiquity – Latin literature – 1st and 2nd Centuries

I will start my review with general works about Ovid's reception in these centuries, and then I will follow an alphabetical order for the different authors or literary works.

General Works on 1st-2nd Centuries CE

1. P. Hardie, "Ovid and Early Imperial Literature", in P. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge 2002, 34-45.
2. C. McNelis, "Ovidian Strategy in Early Imperial Literature", in P. E. Knox (ed.), *A Companion to Ovid*, Maden (MA) 2009, 397-410.
3. A. Keith, "*Poetae Ovidiani*: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in Imperial Roman Epic", in J. F. Miller, C. E. Newlands (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, Chichester (New Sussex) 2014, 70-85.

Philip Hardie (1) carries out a panoramic review of the literary evolution between the Augustan and post-Augustan periods, and particularly of Ovid as a watershed. He analyses the implications of this shift, such as rhetoricism, textuality and self-reflexivity, the passion for the spectacular, and the presence of violence, paradox and wit etc. He considers the general reception of these characteristics of Ovidian poetry by theoreticians, and poets and prose writers, of the first two centuries CE.

In the wake of Hardie's reevaluation of Ovid, Charles McNelis (2) considers Martial's reworking of *Ars amatoria*; he then studies how Seneca uses *met.* in the *Apocolocyntosis* as a foundational text for the imperial ideas of time, history, and apotheosis; finally, he analyses the ways in which Statius, starting from Ovid's Achilles for his own depiction in the *Achilleid*, sets the *met.* against Virgilian epic norms.

Alison Keith (3) charts the enthusiastic reception of *met.* by Manilius, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Statius and Silius Italicus: this early imperial Roman epic is understood "as the earliest example of large-scale negotiation of the *Aeneid* through the lens of the *Metamorphoses*" (70).

Appendix Vergiliana

1. P. E. Knox, "Scylla's Nurse", *Mnemosyne* 43, 1990, 158-9.

2. S. Wheeler, "Into new bodies: the *incipit* of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as intertext in imperial Latin literature", *MD* 61, 2008, 146-60.
3. A. Egea Carrasco, "Realismo y parodia en el *Moretum* pseudovirgiliano", in J. F. González, J. de la Villa Polo (eds.), *XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 2010, II, 865-72.

The brief mention by Peter Knox (1) does not suggest a direct relation, but does point to a probable common source (perhaps Parthenius) for the figure of Scylla's nurse in *Ciris* and Ovid (*met.* 8.81-2 *talia dicenti curarum maxima nutrix / nox*).

2

Stephen Wheeler (2) considers how the Ovidian incipit was polemically imitated by Manilius (3.1-4) and, from both Manilius and Ovid, by the author of the *Aetna* (6-8; tangentially Wheeler also mentions *met.*'s presence in Stat. *silv.* 2.7.78) "as evidence for the reception of Ovid's masterwork" (149).

Adolfo Egea (3) studies the relationship between the *Moretum* and the episode of Philemon and Baucis in our poem and Callimachus' *Hecale*.

Apuleius

1. M. Scotti, "Il proemio delle *Metamorfosi* tra Ovidio ed Apuleio", *GIF* 34, 1982, 43-65.
2. M. Bandini, "Il modello della metamorfosi ovidiana nel romanzo di Apuleio", *Maia* 38, 1986, 27-32.
3. J. K. Krabbe, *The Metamorphoses of Apuleius*, New York 1989.
   Reviews: J. K. Dowden, *CR* 41, 1991, 490-1; J. Tatum, *CO* 68, 1991, 152.
4. G. Mazzoli, "Apuleio: metamorfosi, conversione e loro logiche", in *Storia, Letteratura e arte a Roma nel secondo secolo dopo Cristo. Atti del convegno (Mantova, 8-10 ottobre 1992)*, Firenze 1995, 193-211.
5. L. Graverini, "Sulle ali del vento: evoluzione di un'immagine tra Ovidio ed Apuleio", *Prometheus* 25, 1999, 243-6.
6. H. Müller-Reineke, *Liebesbeziehungen in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihr Einfluss auf den Roman des Apuleius*, Göttingen-London 2000 (Göttingen 1998[1]).
   Reviews: V. Hunink, *BMCR* 1999.05.02; Mª C. Álvarez Morán, *Gnomon* 74, 2002, 211-15; M. Lobe, *Gymnasium* 109, 2002, 170-2.
7. A. Magnani, "*Sensum tantum retinebam humanum*: Ovidio, Apuleio e la metamorfosi", *Vichiana* 4, 2003, 3-37.
8. R. M. Lucifora, "Il racconto della metamorfosi dall'epica (di Ovidio) al romanzo (di Apuleio)", in R. Pretagostini, E. Dettori (eds.), *La cultura ellenistica. L'opera letteraria e l'esegesi antica. Atti del Convegno COFIN 2001, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", 22-24 settembre 2003*, Roma 2004, 213-30.
9. L. Graverini, "A Booklike self. Ovid and Apuleius", *Hermathena* 177-178, 2004/05, 225-50.
10. A. Kirichenko, *"Lectores in fabula*: Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* between pleasure and instruction", *Prometheus* 33, 2007, 254-76.
11. G. Mazzoli, "Le *Metamorfosi* tra Ovidio e Apuleio", *Athenaeum* 95, 2007, 7-20.

12. R. Tordoff, "A note on Echo in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 5.25", *CQ* 58, 2008, 711-2.
13. M. Fucecchi, "Encountering the Fantastic: Expectations, Forms of Communication, Reactions", in P. Hardie (ed.), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, Oxford-New York 2009, 213-30.
14. T. Gärtner, "Die lykischen Bauern bei Ovid und eine Strukturimitation dieser Geschichte bei Apuleius", *Maia* 61, 2009, 568-70.
15. H. Vial, "*In noua mutatas formas corpora*, *figuras in alias imagines conuersas*: l'influence d'Ovide dans l'écriture apuléenne de la métamorphose", in R. Poignault (ed.), *Présence du roman grec et latin. Actes du colloque tenu à Clermont-Ferrand (23-25 novembre 2006)*, Clermont-Ferrand 2011, 121-45 (*Caesarodunum* 40-41 bis).
16. M. von Albrecht, "Ovid and the Novel", in M. P. Futre Pinheiro, S. J. Harrison (eds.), *Fictional Traces. Receptions of the Ancient Novel*, Groningen 2012, 3-19, I (Ancient Narrative Supplementum 14.1).
17. A. M. Keith, S. J. Rupp, "After Ovid: Classical, Medieval, and Early Modern Receptions of the *Metamorphoses*", in A. M. Keith, S. J. Rupp (eds.), *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, Toronto 2007, 15-32.
18. N. Fick, "La postérité des mythes grecs: Actéon chez Ovide et Apulée", *Pallas* 81, 2009, 169-78.
19. L. Nicolini, "Falsi miti e *fabulae* vere: Apuleio, *met.* 6, 29 e un insegnamento ovidiano", *MD* 69, 2012, 217-22.
20. L. Nicolini, "Uno sguardo ecfrastico sulla realtà: modi dell'influenza ovidiana in Apuleio", in M. Carmignani, L. Graverini, B. T. Lee (eds.), *Collected Studies on the Roman Novel. Ensayos sobre la novela romana*, Córdoba (Arg.) 2013, 157-78 (Ordia Prima. Studia 7).
21. S. Harrison, "Ovid in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in J. F. Miller, C. E. Newlands (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, Chichester (New Sussex) 2014, 86-99.

A brief critical review of the recent panorama of studies about the relationship between both *Metamorphoses* can be found in Lara Nicolini (20, 157-9). She then dedicates interesting pages (159-62) to considering the depth, and the organic and pervasive character, of the Ovidian influence, which is therefore less obvious or 'visible' than other classical authors', esp. Virgil. Stephen Harrison (21) points out the "clear affinities between the two authors [sc. Ovid and Apuleius], their interests, and their modes of operation" (86), and concludes (97): "Ovid's epic *Metamorphoses* was a key model for Apuleius' homonymous novel, which used both its material and its techniques". Of particular interest for our purposes is the section titled "The Two *Metamorphoses*" (90-7).

Mariateresa Scotti (1) makes a detailed analysis of the expressions in both Ovid's and Apuleius' incipits and examines their links, but also their programmatical differences (namely a different concept – or rather function – of 'metamorphosis').

Although within a general chapter on the presence of *met.* in the first centuries of our era, Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp pay special attention (17, 22-6) to the relationship between Ovid and Apuleius.

Michele Bandini (2) focuses on Apuleius' metamorphosis episodes of Pamphile (3.21) and Lucius (3.24), which he compares, respectively, with Ovidian metamorphosis into a bird (in the case of Pamphile) and that of Ocyroe into a mare (*met.* 2.633-75) (in the case of Lucius). Moreover, he emphasises the differences with Lucian's model.

Judith Krabbe devotes considerable pages (3, 37-81) to the Ovidian presence in the novel of Apuleius, but also to the differences between them ("l'unico studio organico sui rapporti tra i due autori", Nicolini 20, 157). Giancarlo Mazzoli (4) also compares the metamorphoses in Ovid and Apuleius, pointing out as a main differentiating characteristic the latter's reversibility. Mazzoli dedicates another article (11), as we saw in the general studies, to a panoramic review of the *Fortleben* of the Ovidian 'metamorphosis' concept, and of some examples up to Apuleius' work.

Adriano Magnani's article (7) focuses mainly on the differences between both writers, comparing the episodes of Io, Callisto and Actaeon in Ovid (*met.* 1.568-747, 2.411-95, 3.155-255), with those of Lucius and Actaeon in Apuleius (*met.* 3.24-5 and 2.4). Michael von Albrecht (16) studies the relationship between Ovid and the novel, first examining his reception in Petronius (6-10) and Apuleius (3-6), then considering Ovid's potential use of previous novels. For his comparison, he chooses the episode of Actaeon, but rules out Ovid's influence on Apuleius. Also devoted to the common myth of Actaeon, the paper by Nicole Fick (18) examines how Apuleius, in the most idealistic line of Platonism, makes of him a symbol of 'une mystique de la Beauté'.

Maria Rosa Lucifora (8) compares some aspects – especially visual – of metamorphosis in Ovid, Apuleius and Ps-Lucian, and contrasts them with precedents in Hellenistic and Roman poetry.

The article by Luca Graverini (5) examines the image of Europa riding the bull with her garments billowing in the wind. This image was introduced into the Latin language by Ovid (*met.* 2.833-75, *fast.* 5.603-18; referred to Daphne in *met.* 1.527-9), probably inspired by Moschus (129-30). The influence of Ovid's lexicon in these passages on two of Apuleius (*met.* 10.31.2, 4.35.4) is analysed. Graverini also points out the similarities in content between Ovid's Europa episode and Apuleius' Psyche. In addition, the author dedicates another article (9) to the relation between Ovid and Apuleius, but in this case rather to the influence of *Tristia*. However, in 242-3 he discusses the presentation that

Ovid makes of himself as a book, at the epilogue of *met.*, connecting it with the proem of Apuleius' romance.

The dissertation by Hendrik Müller-Reineke, initially published in 1998 and then, in a "2., verbesserte Auflage", in 2000, devotes its fifth chapter (6, 157-208) to "Der Einfluss Ovids auf die *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius" (namely the influence of the amatory topics). The previous chapters are dedicated, not always successfully (cf. *BMCR* 1999 Hunink), to marking out love themes in *met*.

Alexander Kirichenko (10) makes a detailed reading of certain sections in Apuleius' novel (esp. prologue and closure), and towards the end of his study focuses on comparing with *met.*: "I suggest that the structure of Apuleius' novel, as I have presented it, is intertextually linked to a famous Latin poem, which also progresses from Greece to Rome, consists of multiple intermingled fictions, and, on top of everything else, is related to it thematically and shares its title – namely Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" (272); "What I would like to concentrate on here is just one peculiar feature of Ovid's poem, namely the tension, similar to the one we have seen in Apuleius, between the chaotic and variegated fictional world characteristic of most of the narrative and an attempt to impose on it an ideological unifying principle, introduced, just as in Apuleius, in the last book of the work" (272-3); "Another common feature […] is that the ideological foundation introduces a moralistic attitude to the multiple fictions that constitute the main body of both narratives" (274; and, for similarities between Isiac religion and Pythagoreanism, 274-6).

Robert Tordoff's note (12) enriches the reading of the expression *deam eamque* in Apul. *met.* 5.25 when related to Ov. *met.* 3.501 (*vale, 'vale'*). Furthermore, both, in turn, are linked to the rationalist refutation of the acoustic phenomenon of the echo by Lucretius (4.572-94, and esp. 580-1, 586-9).

The chapter by Marco Fucecchi (13) starts by connecting Apul. *met.* 2.1.1-5 and Ov. *met.* 15.259-420, since in both texts, as opposed to what happens e.g. in Virgil's *Aeneid*, the occurrence of the marvellous is already present in the narrator's expectations.

Thomas Gärtner's note (14) lays bare the parallels in the content, but also in the narrative structure, which exist between Ovid's Lycian peasants (*met.* 6.370-81) and Apuleius' innkeeper (*met.* 1.8-9), all of whom metamorphosed into frogs.

Hélène Vial's chapter (15) also addresses the proems of both works and the concept of 'metamorphosis', understood not only in their individual and collective – even global – modalities, but also as textual transformations. From this perspective, she examines the

means, motivations and effects of Ovid's presence in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, also paying attention to the shared figure of the first-person narrator, and to the affirmation of literary hybridity.

Lara Nicolini (19) is the first to make a connection between Apuleius' expression (*met.* 6.29.1) *Asino vectore virgo regia fugiens captivitatem* and Ovid's reference to Europa as *regia virgo* in *met.* 2.868-9 (*ausa est quoque regia virgo / nescia, quem premeret, tergo considere tauri*). She draws interesting conclusions about the process of verification and literary validation of myth as practised by both authors. Nicolini also dedicates another article, already mentioned (20), to the debt between both *Metamorphoses*: in this instance, she focuses on Apuleius' imitation of the motive for ecphrasis as used by Ovid, and in light of certain conventions of contemporary rhetoric.

Calpurnius Siculus

1. M. Fucecchi, "Ovidio e la nuova bucolica di Calpurnio: osservazioni e proposte", in L. Landolfi, R. Oddo (eds.), *'Fer propius tua lumina'. Giochi intertestuali nella poesia di Calpurnio Siculo. Incontri sulla poesia latina di età imperiale (II)*, Bologna 2009, 41-65 (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino 106).
2. P. Esposito, "Interaction between *Bucolics* and *Georgics*: the fifth eclogue of Calpurnius Siculus", *TiC* 4, 2012, 48-72.

In a wide-ranging study assessing Ovid's entire oeuvre, Marco Fucecchi (1) goes beyond already-noted debts of Calpurnius as regards phraseological echoes, representation of the landscape, and – particularly – versificatory technique. He recognises in Calpurnius "una simile attitudine 'ricapitolativa'", in reference to the game of genres as practised by Ovid and to his "dialogo a tutto campo con la tradizione" (42). The study examines this common approach through three sections in which texts and characters are compared.

Although the article is focused on studying the Virgilian debt of Calpurnius' fifth eclogue, Paolo Esposito (2) considers the combined influence of other authors such as Tibullus and Ovid (e.g. Calp. 5.27-8 *tepidos tunc hostia cultros / imbuat* – Ov. *met.* 15.735 *ictaque coniectos incalfacit hostia cultros*).

Carmen De bello Actiaco

- M. N. Iulietto, P. Tempone, "Due nuovi contributi intertestuali per lo studio del carme *De bello Actiaco* (PHerc 817)", *Paideia* 67, 2012, 165-85.

Maria Nicole Iulietto relates, not to Lucan's aesthetic but Ovid's, the 'baroque' and macabre elements that are present in columns V and VI of *PHerc* 817, which contains the so-called *Carmen de bello Actiaco*, opting for an Augustan date ("classica") and not later ("argentea") of the poem.

Columella

- É. Prioux, "Columelle et le *genus floridum*: images programmatiques et parodie dans le livre X du *De re rustica*", *Dictynna* 10, 2013, *sine pag.*

Évelyne Prioux analyses the poetic characteristics of book X of Columella and his aspiration to a *genus floridum*, and shows the intertextual games which he establishes, mainly with Virgil's *buc.* and *georg.* and Ovid's *met.* and *Fasti*.

Florus

- S. Wheeler, "Ovid's Metamorphoses and Universal History", in D. S. Levene, D. Nelis (eds.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, Leiden 2002, 163-90.

Stephen Wheeler (169-70) addresses – and rejects – the possibility that Florus was inspired by *met.* 1.4 for his use of the word *deduximus* in 1.47.3.

Germanicus

- S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge 1987.
  Reviews: M. von Albrecht, *AJPh* 109, 1988, 461-3; W. S. M. Nicoll, *CR* 38, 1988, 245-7; W. Anderson, *Gnomon* 61, 1989, 356-8; J. Fabre, *REL* 66, 1988, 312; D. F. Kennedy, *JRS* 79, 1989, 209-10; B. R. Nagle, *CW* 82, 1989, 449-50; R. A. Tucker, *CB* 64, 1989, 102; S. Viarre, *AC* 58, 1989, 339-40; B. Rochette, *LEC* 58, 1990, 402-3; R. F. Thomas, *CPh* 85, 1990, 77-80; D. Porte, *RPh* 65, 1991, 71-2.

In pp. 6-16 of Stephen Hinds' book you can find an intertextual analysis of the episode of the birth of Hippocrene's fountain in Ovid, in his model Aratus, and – regarding, in turn, both sources – in Germanicus.

Hosidius Geta

1. S. C. McGill, "Tragic Vergil: Rewriting Vergil as a Tragedy in the Cento *Medea*", *CW* 95, 2001/02, 143-61.
2. G. Tronchet, "Hosidius le tragique et ses modèles ovidiens", in I. Jouteur (ed.), *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne*, Paris 2009, 89-137.

Scott McGill (1) focuses on Hosidius Geta's innovation, namely composing a tragedy out of a cento, and how he achieves this sort of 'acrobatic intertextuality' in order to accommodate Virgil to tragedy: by imitating two tragic non-Virgilian authors such as Ovid (*met.* 7.1-424; *epist.* 12; and, we must suppose, the lost *Medea*) and Seneca.

Gilles Tronchet's work (2) is in the same vein; however, as regards Ovid, he gives up on the speculation about the lost *Medea*. He adds, as against McGill, the *epist.* 6: "[L]a pièce d'Hosidius manifeste une curieuse familiarité avec l'univers poétique ovidien. Mais cette impression trouve à s'expliquer sans qu'il soit nécessaire de postuler une influence de la *Médée* perdue. L'allure de certains vers, l'agencement du propos dans certains développements, ressemble à des passages d'Ovide, en des oeuvres qui nous sont encore accessibles, où il avait traité les aventures de Jason et Médée : les Héroïdes VI et XII, lettres d'Hypsipyle puis de Médée au chef des Argonautes, ainsi que le début du livre VII dans les *Métamorphoses*" (91).

Juvenal

1. S. H. Braund, "Juvenal 8. 58-59", *CQ* 31, 1981, 221-3.
2. S. Lorenz, "*Dignae Ioue irae*: Ovids Deucalion und Pyrrha in Juvenals erster Satire", *Latomus* 63, 2004, 892-904.
3. K. Ehrhardt, "Cannibalizing Ovid: Allusion, Storytelling and Deception in Juvenal 15", *CJ* 109, 2013/14, 481-99.

Susan Braund (1) tries to unravel the sense of Iuv. 8.58-9, and for this she uses the parallel of *met.* 7.262-3. Sven Lorenz (2) focuses on the reference to Deucalion and Pyrrha in Iuv. 1.81-6 and its intertextual connection – albeit as an example of 'mock epic' – with

met. 1.313-415, going a step further to consider the relations between satire and epic in general. Kristen Ehrhardt (3) makes a metaliterary reading of Juvenal's satire 15 (482): "Although many readings seem to stop here, this particular African incident [i.e. the scene of Egyptian cannibalism] occupies only about a third of the entire satire; to read the poem solely in light of this initial episode is to miss the broader theme of narrative deceit in the guise of literary cannibalism that runs throughout the poem". Needless to say, Ovid's *met.* occupies an outstanding position among Juvenal's literary referents. The peculiar use of these allusions by the satirist makes them lose their *gravitas*, because "intertextuality becomes a vehicle for authorial deception. […] Juvenal's repeated allusions to perverted feasts in Ovid are themselves a variety of cannibalism, in this case a literary one in which satire gorges on and surpasses epic itself" (483). "By concluding with the figure of Pythagoras, Juvenal combines the themes of distorted feasts and false narrators with an ongoing engagement with the *Metamorphoses* that pushes the limits of satiric intertextuality" (485).

Lucan

1. J. Ciechanowicz, "Das Problem der Apostrophe IX,980-986 in der *Pharsalia* von Marcus Annaeus Lucanus", *Eos* 70, 1982, 265-75.
2. G. A. Jacobsen, *Waking Visions in Ovid's "Metamorphoses" and Lucan's "Bellum civile"*, Ph. D. Thesis Ohio State Univ. Columbus 1982.
3. P. Esposito, "Tra una battaglia e l'altra. Tracce ovidiane nella *Pharsalia*", *Vichiana* 16, 1987, 48-70.
4. S. Hinds, "Generalising about Ovid", in A. J. Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse. Ramus Essays on Roman Literature of the Empire. To Juvenal Through Ovid*, Victoria (Austr.) 1988, 4-31 (repr. in E. Knox (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, Oxford 2006, 15-50).
5. M. Paterni, "I colori dell'alba: nota a Lucan. *Phars*. II 719-721", *Maia* 40, 1988, 75-7.
6. D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1991.
   Reviews: M. Dewar, *CR* 42, 1992, 61-3; J. H. Gaisser, *BMCR* 1992.02.08; F. Graf, *MH* 49, 1992, 269; P. Hardie, *JRS* 82, 1992, 252-6; B. Rochette, *LEC* 60, 1992, 368; M. West, *TLS* 4645, 1992, 12; C. R. Beye, *CW* 86, 1993, 176; W. Dominik, *Prudentia* 25, 1993, 78-81; J. J. O'Hara, *Vergilius* 36, 1993, 87-96; B. Pavlock, *CPh* 88, 1993, 251-4; M. Putnam, *NECN* 20, 1993, 35-6; P. Toohey, *Phoenix* 47, 1993, 270-2; A. Ward, *CO* 70, 1993, 73-4; T. Yamashita, *JCS* 41, 1993, 110-13.
7. E. Batinski, "Cato and the Battle with the Serpents", *SyllClass* 3, 1992, 71-8.
8. E. Fantham, "Lucan's Medusa Excursus: Its Design and Purpose", *MD* 29, 1992, 95-119.

9. P. Esposito, *La narrazione inverosimile. Aspetti dell'epica ovidiana*, Napoli 1994 (Università degli Studi di Salerno. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 15).
Reviews: N. Scivoletto, *GIF* 47, 1995, 299-313; F. Zoccali, *BStudLat* 25, 1995, 226-7; P. E. Knox, *Gnomon* 70, 1998, 254-6.
10. P. Esposito, "Lucano e Ovidio", in I. Gallo, L. Nicastri (eds.), *Aetates Ovidianae. Lettori di Ovidio dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*, Napoli 1995, 57-76 (Pubblicazioni dell'Università degli studi di Salerno. Sez. Atti Convegni Miscellanee 43).
11. R. Siciliano, "Lucano e Ovidio: piccolo contributo allo studio sui rapporti", *Maia* 50, 1998, 309-15.
12. C. Saylor, "Lucan and models of the introduction", *Mnemosyne* 52, 1999, 545-53.
13. K. O. Eldred, "Poetry in Motion: The Snakes of Lucan", *Helios* 27, 2000, 63-74.
14. R. J. Tarrant, "Chaos in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and its Neronian influence", in G. Tissol, S. Wheeler (eds.), *The Reception of Ovid in Antiquity*, *Arethusa* 35.3, 2002, 349-60.
15. S. Wheeler, "Lucan's reception of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", in G. Tissol, S. Wheeler (eds.), *The Reception of Ovid in Antiquity*, *Arethusa* 35.3, 2002, 361-80.
16. M. Fucecchi, "La protesta e la rabbia del Sole: un'ipotesi su Ovidio lettore di Omero nella scena finale dell'episodio di Fetonte (*Met.* 2.381-400), con un'appendice su Lucano, *Iliacon* fr. 7 Mor. (= 6 C.)", *Sileno* 28/29, 2002/03, 3-27.
17. M. Malamud, "Pompey's Head and Cato's Snakes", *CPh* 98, 2003, 31-44.
18. I. Jouteur, "Au miroir de Méduse", *Euphrosyne* 33, 2005, 365-77.
19. S. Papaïoannou, "Epic Transformation in the Second Degree: The Decapitation of Medusa in Lucan, BC 9.619-889", in C. Walde (ed.), *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*, München-Leipzig 2005, 216-36.
20. J. Dangel, "Lucain et Méduse: les monstres dans l'épopée latine", in E. Karamalengou, E. D. Makrygianni (eds.), *Ἀντιφίλησις. Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture. In Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou*, Stuttgart 2009, 531-50.
21. J. Nagyillés, "Ovid-Allusionen bei Lucan", *ACD* 42, 2006, 95-115.
22. A. M. Keith, "Ovid in Lucan: the Poetics of Instability", in P. Asso (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Lucan*, Leiden-Boston 2011, 111-32.
23. P. Esposito, "Prima e dopo Lucano: dai modelli della *Pharsalia* alla *Pharsalia* come modello", in M. Citroni (ed.), *Letteratura e civitas. Transizioni dalla Repubblica all'Impero. In ricordo di Emanuele Narducci*, Pisa 2012, 313-26 (Testi e studi di cultura classica 53).
24. W. Hübner, "Die Metamorphose der Korallen bei Ovid", in J. Althoff, S. Föllinger, G. Wöhrle (eds.), *Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption 23*, Trier 2013, 115-37.
25. D. Nelis, "Empedoclean epic: how far can you go?", *Dictynna* 11, 2014, *sine pag.*

For a general view of Lucan's models (among which, *met.*), see Denis Feeney (6, 250-312).

One of the scholars who has dedicated the most time and energy to the presence of Ovid in Lucan's poem is Paolo Esposito. He devotes to the subject the three chapters

which form the second half of his monograph (9): (2.1) "Le battaglie in Ovidio e in Lucano" (87-106); (2.2) "Tra una battaglia e l'altra" (107-33); (2.3) "Ovidio nei *Commenta Bernensia*" (135-45). In the first of these chapters (in fact, a reelaboration of 10), Esposito examines the similarities and differences between the two poets in the descriptions of battle scenes (Ov. *met.* 5 and 12, and Luc. 3, 4 and 6). In the second one (the reelaboration of an earlier article: 3) he makes an analogous comparison, comprehensive and detailed, but this time departing from some texts which occupy the spaces between battles in Lucan. Here the author finds a clear example of Ovid's pervasive presence (not only *met.*), but also of Lucan's authorial independence. The third one is an interesting study as regards the indirect textual tradition of Ovid's *met.* Esposito collects all the references to Ovid in these texts, one by one. These references only concern *met.,* and are proof of the exegetical use of Ovid during the 9th-10th centuries, and probably already in the 4th century (see 144 n. 18). In a more recent article, dedicated as much to Lucan's models as his imitators, Esposito (23) suggests that the episode of the soldiers driven by thirst in Lucan (4.324-36) could be modelled on the Ovidian narration of the plague of Aegina (*met.* 7.554-7).

In a solid and excellently documented study (in note 16, 366-7, a very complete bibliography lists by passage the influence of *met.* on Lucan's poem), Stephen Wheeler (15) asserts that the presence of *met.* in Lucan is greater than has been traditionally thought. He considers that Lucan makes a dark cosmological reading (chaos, flood, Phaethon, and the speech of Pythagoras) of *met*., and that he is also interested in the poem's representation of pain and suffering. His interpretation is therefore that Lucan's *Bellum civile* manifests itself, in a certain way, as a continuation and revision – in a negative tone – of the culmination of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: the deification of the Caesars. In other words, Lucan demonstrates how the *Metamorphoses* anticipates his own poem.

Jerzy Ciechanowicz (1) interprets, based on comparisons with other passages, the apostrophe of *Pharsalia* 9.980-6 as addressed not to Julius Caesar, but to Nero. In this way, he justifies the allusion to the rivalry between poets, and dedicates some final considerations (274-5) to providing a commentary on this apostrophe as a paraphrasing of the end of *met.* (15.861-79). The same Book 9 of the *Pharsalia* is taken by János Nagyillés as a base for his study (21), in which he compares some passages with models of Ovid's work, among which some correspond to *met.* (8.494-6; 14.560-1; 13.518-19).

Garrett Jacobsen focuses the third and last chapter of his brief Ph.D. thesis (2, 100-27) on the comparative study of "Ovid and Lucan: Waking Visions and Structure". His starting point is this (101): "In Ovid and Lucan the use of waking visions corresponds to thematic necessity; the visions act as focal points for plot and theme. […] A comparative analysis of the waking visions in the two epics will reveal a similarity of artistic treatment and purpose: the emphasis with similar language of the pictorial nature of these visions and their origins in the mind of each character; and the use of these visions to articulate structure, theme, and characterization".

Stephen Hinds devotes some attention (4, 26-9) to the possible debt of Lucan's invocation to Nero (1.45-58) vis-à-vis the Ovidian Phaethon.

In a note dedicated to interpreting the exact sense of the expression *albaque nondum / lux rubet* (Luc. 2.720-1), Marco Paterni (5) defends that its meaning is *et alba lux nondum rubet*, using as proof the probable Ovidian model of *met.* 15.188-95. Together with *met.* 6.46-9, this assertion allows him to claim that the chromatic succession of dawn is expressed by the terms *albus* > *rubere* > *candidus*.

Raimondo Siciliano (11) offers, and briefly comments on, a list of Ovidian phraseological echoes in Lucan, of which some – the minority – share the narrative context of their model.

The article by Charles Saylor (12) is dedicated to showing that in the general configuration of the opening of Lucan's *Pharsalia,* well-known openings of the works by Lucretius, Virgil (*Aen.*), Horace (*carm.* 1.2) and, for our purpose, *met.* 1.168-292 come into play.

Richard Tarrant (14) studies the reception of Ovid's 'expanded notion of chaos', physical and moral, both by Seneca's *Thyestes*, as compared to Tereus' episode (*met.* 6.424-674), and in the opening of Lucan's poem (1.67, 72-80), where this dark reading foreshadows the breakdown of human institutions in civil war.

Marco Fucecchi reserves the appendix for an article about Ovid's Homeric sources (16, 21-7), which develops the hypothesis of a possible combined imitation of Homer and Ovid in the fragment of Lucan's *Iliacon* (fr. 7 Mor. = 6 C.).

Elaine Fantham (8) explores Lucan's use of the Ovidian Medusa myth. Martha Malamud (17) starts from Ovid's use of the Medusa figure (*met.* 4.695-803) in contexts

of violence and civil war, and also as an emblem of a peculiar sort of artistic production, "two themes that will preoccupy Lucan […]. As a figure that presides over the boundaries between original and imitation, victor and victim, self and other, living and dead, and life and art, the Gorgon's head is an emblem not just of civil war, but of Lucan's own artistic production, *Civil War*" (32). Both works, together with others which address the survival of Ovid in a collateral way, are examined by Sophia Papaïoannou (19). She emphasises the idea of Ovid's strong influence on Lucan, which she tries to show by analysing the same episodes of Perseus, and of Cato and the snakes (*BC* 9; on the Ovidian background of this latter episode, see also Batinski 7, Eldred 13, and Dangel, 20, who only mentions Ovid briefly in passing, on p. 543). As she takes it, "the poet of the *Pharsalia* distinctly echoes the Ovidian language as he embraces Ovid's propensity for emphasizing the spectacular and a broader skepticism on the ideology of epic heroism" (222). In the same year, Isabelle Jouteur also published an article on the same Medusa character, and the comparison between both episodes (18), although Jouteur focuses more on the characteristics which convert the Gorgon into "porte-parole de préoccupations esthétiques pour le premier [i.e. Ovid], et politiques pour le second [i.e. Lucan]" (367; she does not appear to be aware of Malamud's study, which stresses the same quality in Lucan).

Damien Nelis (25, esp. §§ 25-7) attempts to identify Empedoclean elements in Lucan's epic, through comparison with Ovid's.

Alison Keith argues that Lucan draws "on Ovidian subjects, themes, and poetic techniques to trace fissures in the optimistic Virgilian epic paradigm. Lucan's *Bellum Civile* enjoys pride of place in this dual reception of Virgil and Ovid as the first example of large-scale negotiation of the *Aeneid* through the lens of the *Metamorphoses*" (22, 111-2). From this dual perspective, she examines various passages of Lucan, as well as some rhetorical techniques and witticisms taken by Lucan from Ovid.

Wolfgang Hübner (24) analyses Perseus' battles against the marine monster and Phineus (*met.* 4.604-5.249), paying special attention to the metamorphosis of the corals (*met.* 4.740-52), while at the same time comparing the Ovidian episode with its reflections in Manilius (5) and Lucan (9).

Manilius

1. L. Baldini Moscadi, "Per un'interpretazione di Manil. 1, 926: una reminiscenza ovidiana", *SIFC* 53, 1981, 233-45.
2. V. Cristóbal, "Perseo y Andrómeda: Versiones antiguas y modernas", *CFC* 23, 1989, 51-96.
3. L. Baldini Moscadi, "Il mito adombrato o l'età dell'oro ritrovata (Manilio, *Astr*. 5,270-292)", *Prometheus* 17, 1991, 173-85.
4. C. Salemme, *Introduzione agli* Astronomica *di Manilio*, Napoli 1983 (2000[2]; Bollettino di Studi Latini 39).
   Reviews of the 1983 edition: A. Le Bœuffle, *REL* 61, 1983, 394-5; P. della Morte, *BStudLat* 14, 1984, 138-40; J. Soubiran, *REA* 86, 1984, 372-3; S. Costanza, *Orpheus* 6, 1985, 182-6; A. Ramírez de Verger, *Emerita* 54, 1986, 358-9; C. Harrauer, *WS* 100, 1987, 335; C. Santini, *Latomus* 46, 1987, 631-2.
   Reviews of the second edition: F. Corsaro, *Orpheus* 22, 2001, 401-3; B. Bakhouche, *RPh* 76, 2002, 178-9; C. Bonnet, *LEC* 70, 2002, 202-3; E. Calderón Dorda, *Emerita* 70, 2002, 179-81; F. Comparelli, *RCCM* 44, 2002, 171-4; P.-J. Dehon, *AC* 71, 2002, 335; L. Landolfi, *BStudLat* 32, 2002, 688-90; J. Soubiran, *REL* 80, 2002, 370; J.-H. Abry, *Latomus* 62, 2003, 728-9; J.-Y. Guillaumin, *REA* 106, 2004, 318-19; S. Rocca, *Maia* 56, 2004, 194-5.
5. L. Baldini Moscadi, "La Medea maniliana: Manilio interprete di Ovidio", *Prometheus* 19, 1993, 225-9.
6. L. Landolfi, "Andromeda: intreccio di modelli e punti di vista in Manilio", *GIF* 45, 1993, 171-94.
7. E. Flores, "Il poeta Manilio, ultimo degli Augustei, e Ovidio", in I. Gallo, L. Nicastri (eds.), *Aetates Ovidianae. Lettori di Ovidio dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*, Napoli 1995, 27-38 (Pubblicazioni dell'Università degli studi di Salerno. Sez. Atti Convegni Miscellanee 43).
8. S. Wheeler, "Into new bodies: the *incipit* of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as intertext in imperial Latin literature", *MD* 61, 2008, 146-60.
9. L. Fratantuono, "Andromeda, Perseus, and the end of the *Astronomica*", *Maia* 64, 2012, 305-15.
10. W. Hübner, "Die Metamorphose der Korallen bei Ovid", in J. Althoff, S. Föllinger, G. Wöhrle (eds.), *Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption 23*, Trier 2013, 115-37.

Some general considerations about the relation between the poetic journeys of Manilius and Ovid can be found in chapter IV.4 ("Mito ed evoluzione poetica in Manilio") of Carmelo Salemme's book (4, 99-106). Salemme points out that Manilius evolves, throughout the proems to each of his books, from the pre-Ovidian *vates* figure, pursuing the transmission of a scientific *veritas*, towards a posture more typical of an Alexandrian *poëta* (Book 5). The poetic evolution of Ovid was quite the opposite, but the evolution itself – from one position to another – brings together the two poets, making the paths of both writers compatible.

Loretta Baldini Moscadi (1) reviews various explanations of the controversial last verse of Manilius' *laus Augusti*, in turn the last of his first book (1.926). She takes this as

referring to Julius Caesar, exactly because of Ovid's corresponding *laus Augusti* (*met.* 15.818-31 and 858-60). In a later article (3), the same author draws attention to the more pessimistic tone of Manilius in his representation of the Golden Age (5.270-92), as compared with Virgil, Horace, Propertius and Ovid. While Moscadi does not rule out in principle that, rather than recreating the Myth of the Ages, Manilius could be making a typically rhetorical and conventional denunciation of luxury, in the end she admits the presence of the Golden Age motif through comparison with the contemporary treatment of Germanicus (96-137). Finally, the same author has another article (5) in which she identifies mythological and phraseological doubts of Manilius towards Ovid in his treatment of Medea's character (*met.* 5.34-5, 465-8, and esp. 3.9-13).

In his review of the documentation of Perseus and Andromeda's myth in Greek, Latin and Spanish literature, Vicente Cristóbal addresses (2, 64-6) its presence in Manilius and compares this, among other texts, with the Ovidian treatment (*met.* 4.610-5.249).

Luciano Landolfi (6) focuses on Manilius' Andromeda (5.540-618) in comparison with Ovid's (*met.* 4.670-764), and tries to go beyond the elegiac-epic contrast with which both had been compared. Landolfi believes that Manilius tries to clear out Ovid's verbose rhetoric from the episode, as well as moving the focus of attention from Perseus to the *pugnandi causa*, i.e. Andromeda, with the structural implications this brings for the narrative. Manilius, on the other hand, turns for his character to other heroines abandoned, or victims of religious superstition, like Catullus' Ariadne, or Ovid's (*epist.* 10), or Lucretius' Iphigeneia.

The same episode of Andromeda is used by Enrico Flores (7, 34) to illustrate the differences in poetic imprint between Manilius and Ovid. His article, however, is mostly dedicated to studying the affinity between the two poets, from the relation between Manilius' proem (1.6 and 13-14) and Ovid's Pythagoras (*met.* 15.146-9), with its programmatic and even political implications, to some phraseological echoes which show the debt of Manilius to Ovid. Flores even gives an example of what he interprets as an imitation of Manilius by Ovid: according to the chronology he proposes, in *Pont.* 4.4.41 (*inde domum repetes toto comitante senatu*), written at the end of 13 CE, Ovid would be taking up Manil. 4.59-60 (*totiens praedicta cavere / vulnera non potuit: toto spectante senatu*), "probabilmente della fine dell'11" (33).

Stephen Wheeler (8) considers how the Ovidian incipit was polemically imitated by Manilius (3.1-4) and, from both Manilius and Ovid, by the author of the *Aetna* (6-8; tangentially he also mentions its presence in Stat. *silv.* 2.7.78) "as evidence for the reception of Ovid's masterwork" (149).

Lee Fratantuono's article (9) revolves around the Perseus-Andromeda episode: he focuses on aspects of the originality of Manilius' work as regards his models, especially Ovid. For him "Manilius' epic is nothing less than an attempt to start a new tradition in Latin hexameter composition, the birth of a Stoic poetic cycle to rival the Epicurean works of Virgil and Ovid" (306); "The *Astronomica*, then, is a new didactic epic for a new political and historical era, a *De rerum natura*, if one will, for the principate" (313).

For the chapter by Wolfgang Hübner (10), see 'Lucan'.

Martial

1. J. P. Sullivan, *Martial: the unexpected classic*, Cambridge 1991.
   Reviews: D. Fowler, *G&R* 39, 1992, 232-4; J. Gérard, *REL* 70, 1992, 314-15; C. Segal, *TLS* 4656, 1992, 5-6; L. Ascher, *CW* 86, 1993, 522; K. M. Coleman, *JRS* 83, 1993, 221-2; R. Colton, *CO* 70, 1993, 76; D. Estefanía, *Emerita* 61, 1993, 392-3; M. Dondin-Payre, *AC* 62, 1993, 483-4; E. Fantham, *Phoenix* 47, 1993, 359-62; J. Gaisser, *BMCR* 1993.01.20; P. Howell, *CR* 43, 1993, 275-8; W. R. Johnson, *CJ* 88, 1993, 87-90; M. C. de Castro-Maia de Sousa Pimentel, *Euphrosyne* 23, 1995, 491-8; H. Perdicoyianni, *LEC* 65, 1997, 88.
2. G. Maselli, "Transparenza bloccante: suggestioni interestuali in Marziale 4, 22", *Aufidus* 24, 1994, 49-54.
3. M. Ruiz Sánchez, "Figuras del deseo: arte de la variación en Marcial y en Ovidio", *CFC(L)* 14, 1998, 93-113.
4. H. Szelest, "Ovid und Martial", in W. Schubert (ed.), *Ovid: Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, Bern-Frankfurt am Main 1999, II, 861-4.
5. C. Williams, "Ovid, Martial, and Poetic Immortality: Traces of *Amores* 1.15 in the Epigrams", in G. Tissol, S. Wheeler (eds.), *The Reception of Ovid in Antiquity*, *Arethusa* 35.3, 2002, 417-33.
6. R. Moreno Soldevila, "Water, Desire, and the Elusive Nature of Martial IV 22", *ExClass* 7, 2003, 149-63.
7. S. Hinds, "Martial's Ovid/Ovid's Martial", *JRS* 97, 2007, 113-54.
8. G. Rosati, "Ovid in Flavian Occasional Poetry (Martial and Statius)", in J. F. Miller, C. E. Newlands (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, Chichester (New Sussex) 2014, 55-69.

For Martial's complex borrowing from Ovid in metapoetic contexts, see the brief but interesting observations by John Sullivan (1, 105-7).

The article by Marcos Ruiz (3) investigates the relation between the appearance (explicit or implicit) of the metamorphosis motif, and the topic of desire, in Martial's 'epideictic' epigrams, and offers (107-13) a comparison between Mart. 4.22 (esp. ll. 3-8) and Ov. *met.* 4.354-8 (Salmacis and Hermaphroditus). The comparison of these same texts (in fact, already suggested by Friedlaender in 1886) is the focus of articles by Giorgio Maselli (1), and Rosa Moreno (6), who explains the symbolism of Martial's epigram within the frame of Book 4 and adds other elegiac contexts of Ovid.

The note by Hanna Szelest (4) illustrates, using different types of examples, "welch grossen Einfluss Ovids Sprache und Metrik auf die Epigramme des Dichters aus Bilbilis ausgeübt haben" (864).

Craig Williams' chapter (5) does not deal properly with *met.*, but alludes to its closing lines, while trailing the topic of poetic immortality in Martial's epigrams.

Stephen Hinds' long article (7) offers a thorough analysis of some 40 epigrams and their Ovidian background. It is divided into three sections: 1) Martial's *Ars amatoria*; 2) Martial's *Tristia*; and 3) Martial's *Metamorphoses*. In this last section (136-54, with the sub-sections "Deflating Epic Myth", "Material Miniatures", and "Ovid's *Liber Spectaculorum*") he deals mainly with the aesthetics of myth in the Roman arena, and offers a way of reading Martial through Ovid, but also Ovid through Martial.

Rosati (8) investigates the presence of Ovid's poems – *met.* included – in Flavian occasional poetry, namely the epigrams of Martial and the *Silvae* of Statius.

Petronius

1. A. Perutelli, "Enotea, la capanna e il rito magico. L'intreccio dei modelli in Petron. 135-136", *MD* 17, 1986, 125-43.
2. H. M. Currie, "Petronius and Ovid", en C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V*, Bruxelles 1989, 317-35.
3. G. Sommariva, "Il barbiere di Mida (Petr. *Satyr*. fr. 28 Ernout)", *FAM* 1, 1991, 107-17.
4. B. Baldwin, "Petronius and Ovid", *Eranos* 90, 1992, 63.
5. J. Nagore, "La parodia de Ovidio en Petronio, *Sat*., c. 126", *AFC* 15, 1997, 167-79.
6. R. Dimundo, "L'episodio di Circe e Polieno alla luce dei modelli epico-elegiaci (Petr. 126)", *Euphrosyne* 26, 1998, 49-79.
7. J. Fabre-Serris, *Mythologie et littérature à Rome. La réécriture des mythes aux Ier siècles avant et après J.-C.*, Lausanne 1998.

Reviews: F. Cupaiolo, *BStudLat* 29, 1999, 223-4; A. Deremetz, *REL* 77, 1999, 332-3; R. Le Mer, *Archives de sciences sociales des religions* 108, 1999, 72-3; B. Powell, *BMCR* 1999.09.06; F. Prescendi, *MH* 56, 1999, 255; P. Desy, *AC* 69, 2000, 344-5; P. Fedeli, *Aufidus* 14.42, 2000, 133-4; M. Fox, *JRS* 90, 2000, 236-7; N. Méthy, *RBPh* 78, 2000, 204-6; B. Rochette, *Kernos* 13, 2000, 310-13.

8. A. Setaioli, "La poesia in Petr. *Sat.* 135.8", *Prometheus* 36, 2010, 241-56.
9. M. Carmignani, "*Eumolpus poeta*: Ovidio y la *ultima manus* en *Sat.* 118", *Prometheus* 37, 2011, 169-78.
10. C. Mazzilli, "Dedalo e Pigmalione: la parodia dell'*ékphrasis* nel *Satyricon*", *Argos* 34, 2011, 31-53.
11. M. von Albrecht, "Ovid and the Novel", in M. P. Futre Pinheiro, S. J. Harrison (eds.), *Fictional Traces. Receptions of the Ancient Novel*, Groningen 2012, I, 3-19 (Ancient Narrative Supplementum 14.1).
12. M. Carmignani, "*Ille quidem totam gemebundus obambulat Aetnen*: el Cíclope ovidiano como inspiración paródica en Petronio, *Sat.* 100.3-5", *Emerita* 80, 2012, 355-70.
13. P. Habermehl, "Die Magie des Wortes: Thema und Variationen in den poetischen Einlagen Petron, *Sat*. 134-135", *Gymnasium* 121, 2014, 355-73.

Michael von Albrecht (11) studies the relationship between Ovid and the novel, and shows (6-10) a case of obvious reception in Petronius: both writers are united by their common aim of parodying epic. He also reads (10-14) Petronius' character of Oenothea (135.7-15) in the light of both Ovid's Philemon and Baucis, and Callimachus' Hecale. These obvious models had already been examined in the previous article by Alessandro Perutelli (1), as well as – *en passant* – in the chapter by Harry MacL. Currie (2, 328-9). Aldo Setaioli (8, esp. 251-4) is primarily interested in offering a thorough textual analysis of the fragment. Peter Habermehl (13) also studies the poetic interludes contained in Petr. 134-5, with its main themes of 'hospitality' and 'magic', as 'subversive homage' to Callimachus and Ovid.

Harry MacL. Currie offers pages (2) full of interesting general considerations about characteristics and attitudes common to Ovid and Petronius. He asserts that both share an interest in – as well as an ability for – the material details of the world (viz. colour). He also notes in both a "similarity in aesthetic outlook" (323), and points out their shared facility for the portrait, as well as their interest in psychology and physiognomy. "Mocking, iconoclastic on occasion, detached, observant, witty, enormously literate and cultivated, refined, sensitive to beauty, intelligent with a great range of awareness, sensual and strongly erotic – these are a few of the terms which could be with justice applied to both" (334). In an extremely brief note with the same title (4), Barry Baldwin points out that the words *duris haerentia mora rubetis*, from verse 3 of the epigram *Anth. Lat.* 694

R^2 (48 M), are a literal imitation of *met.* 1.105, which backs up Currie's thesis that the Ovidian poem was a major and direct influence on the *Satyricon*.

The object of Grazia Sommariva's study (3) is also a fragment, in this case a poetic fragment already attributed to Petronius by Scaliger (fr. 28 Ernout = *Anth. Lat.* 464-79 R^2. = 462-77 Shackleton Bailey). Among the elements which reflect its learned nature, this scholar analyses how concisely Petronius remakes the Ovidian episode of King Midas in Book 11.

Though the presence of *met.* is pervasive in Jacqueline Fabre-Serris' book (6), the author devotes particularly the second chapter of the second part, "Devenirs de l'héritage troyen" (149-68), to analysing the reception of the Trojan saga, as consolidated in the canonical versions of the *Aeneid* and *met.*, in Baebius' *Ilias Latina*, Nero's *Troica*, Seneca's *Troades* and *Agamemnon*, and Petronius' romance.

Marcos Carmignani (9) focuses especially on the *ars poetica* of Eumolpus in Petr. 118, just before the recitation of *Bellum Civile*, and specifically in the expression *tamquam, si placet, hic impetus, etiam si nondum recepit ultimam manum*. Carmignani connects Eumolpus' *impetus* ("improvisación") with Ovid's *Tristia*. Through the well-known passage 1.7.27-30, the reference to the *ultima manus* would be useful for Eumolpus, alluding *ex silentio* to the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses* with the "cruel ironía del *auctor absconditus*" (177), to insinuate that the subsequent *Bellum Civile* is his masterpiece. In another, later article (12), this scholar examines Petronius' parody of the Homeric cyclops (100.3-5), using the intermediation of Ovid's hypotext. Specifically, he considers that Petronius' expression *tremebundisque manibus* (100.5) is an allusion to *met.* 14.188: *Ille quidem totam gemebundus obambulat Aetnen*, and that it is "la pista que nos deja Petronio para comprender que la reacción de Encolpio carece absolutamente de *decorum*" (368).

Claudia Mazzilli (10) focuses on the ironic use of ecphrasis by Petronius, and analyses the description of Circe (126.13-18) as regards the hypotext of Pygmalion (*met.* 10.238-97). Rosalba Dimundo (6, 72-5) suggests the source of Daphne (*met.* 1.495-502), while Josefina Nagore (5) points out certain passages of Ovid's elegiac work as the model of Chrysis' entire speech.

Pliny the Elder

1. H. Zehnacker, "Pline l'Ancien lecteur d'Ovide et de Sénèque (*N.H.* XXXIII,1-3)", in H. Zehnacker, G. Hentz (eds.), *Hommages à Robert Schilling*, Paris 1983, 437-46.
2. F. Borca, "Metamorfosi palustri: nota a Ov. *Met*. 15.356-58 e Plin. *NH* 8.81", *Lexis* 16, 1998, 223-9.
3. O. Nikitinski, "Überlegungen zum Verhältnis des älteren Plinius zu Ovid", in W. Schubert (ed.), *Ovid: Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, Bern-Frankfurt am Main 1999, II, 815-41.

The general conclusion of the chapter by Oleg Nikitinski is (3, 824): "Es scheint, dass Plinius ausser *Halieutica* und *De medicamine faciei* nur *Fasten* und *Metamorphosen* – sehr sporadisch – benutzt (die meisten möglichen Parallelen aus *Metamorphosen* stammen aus dem XV. Buch)".

Hubert Zehnacker (1) maintains that Pliny's expression (33.1) *mirantes dehiscere aliquando aut intremescere illam* [sc. *tellurem*] is inspired by *met.* 2.272-8 and 301-3, and that slightly further on (33.3, e.g. *quam innocens, quam beata, immo vero etiam delicata esset vita, si nihil aliunde quam supra terras concupisceret, breviterque, nisi quod secum est!*) Pliny is also inspired, although maintaining a certain independence, by Ovid's descriptions of the Golden Age, particularly that of Book 1, although Pliny distances himself especially by means of his rationalist focus: "Pour stigmatiser les vices de son temps et tracer en quelques mots les perspectives d'une vie plus saine et plus heureuse, Pline s'est souvenu d'un ensemble de textes poétiques sur l'âge d'or, parmi lesquels les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide tiennent la première place" (445).

Federico Borca (2) compares a passage of Ovid (*met.* 15.356-8) with another from Pliny (8.81) to illustrate one aspect of the representation of the swamp's place in Roman culture: "l'acquitrino come spazio di raccordo e comunicazione tra la dimensione mondana e quella ultramondana, come luogo di passaggio per l''altrove'" (223).

Priapea

- E. Magnelli, "Capri e porci: *Priap*. 65 e i suoi modelli ellenistico-romani", *Dictynna* 11, 2014, *sine pag.*

Enrico Magnelli analyses some Hellenistic sources of *carmen* 65 of *Priapea*. He adds the reference to *met.* 15.111-15, where the bloody sacrifice of a pig and a goat is mentioned, although in the final text "tra i due animali ivi menzionati, l'avido ed astuto

dio degli orti abbia diretto le sue mire non sul capro bensì sul più appetitoso suino. Ancora una volta, i *Carmina Priapea* si divertono a reinterpretare il patrimonio letterario del passato in modo scherzosamente irriverente" (§ 6).

Quintilian

1. A. G. Elliott, "Ovid and the critics: Seneca, Quintilian, and "seriousness"", *Helios* 12, 1985, 9-20.
2. U. Todini, "Ovidio 'lascivo' in Quintiliano", in I. Gallo, L. Nicastri (eds.), *Aetates Ovidianae. Lettori di Ovidio dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*, Napoli 1995, 77-119 (Pubblicazioni dell'Università degli studi di Salerno. Sez. Atti Convegni Miscellanee 43).
3. L. Morgan, "Child's Play: Ovid and His Critics", *JRS* 93, 2003, 66-91.

For other studies dealing with antique criticism on Ovid, see 'Reception and Pervivence in Antiquity – Latin Literature – General'. Here we collect other studies which focus on the adverse opinion that, in the wake of both Senecas, Quintilian published about Ovid. This has maintained its influence, at least until the second half of the 20th century. Alison Elliott (1) starts from the judgements of Seneca the Elder and Quintilian, and then records their influence on other critics during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the modern era. Next, she reflects on the shortcomings of the opinions of the critics themselves, namely Seneca and Quintilian, which seem not to have been questioned (18): "Ovid's challenge to generic expectations resulted in the critical isolation of his poem [i.e. *met.*]".

On the same topic, Umberto Todini (2) offers a detailed study of the 20 or so passages of Quintilian's work which are linked to Ovid. He analyses the critical opinion of the *magister*, which, according to Todini, is responsible "in larga misura della quasi millenaria sfortuna critica del poeta" (119). Quintilian's adverse opinion is initially based on the "incontinenza di stile", and he applies it by means of words such as *lascivus*, *lascivire*, *ludere*, *iocus*... This negative judgement is largely due to those of both Senecas and, in conclusion, to Ovid's systematic transgression of the principles put forward by Horace for *epos* in his *Ars poetica*.

Finally, Llewelyn Morgan (3, esp. 69-73 and 89-91) goes into further depth along the same lines as Elliott, and broadens the repertoire of criticism directed at Ovid's work, particularly *met.* He explores the excessive dependence of this criticism on the principle of *decorum*, which is the main limitation of Seneca the Elder and Quintilian's opinions,

and shows how Ovid subverts, by emphasising childishness, traditional epic values such as masculinity, authority and adulthood.

Seneca Philosopher

1. R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, "Seneca emulo di Ovidio nella rappresentazione del diluvio universale (*Nat. Quaest.* 3,27,13 sgg.)", *A&R* 29, 1984, 143-61.
2. C. P. Segal, "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides", *TAPhA* 114, 1984, 311-25.
3. J. T. Gahan, "Imitation in Seneca, *Phaedra* 1000-1115", *Hermes* 116, 1988, 122-4.
4. R. Jakobi, *Der Einfluss Ovids auf den Tragiker Seneca*, Berlin-New York 1988 (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 28).
   Reviews: H. Zehnacker, *REL* 66, 1988, 313-14; J. Delz, *MH* 46, 1989, 257-8; R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, *A&R* 35, 1990, 117-20; E. Fantham, *Gnomon* 62, 1990, 271-3; R. Mayer, *CR* 40, 1990, 276-7; B. Rochette, *AC* 59, 1990, 372-5; F. Stok, *GIF* 62, 1990, 163-5; F. Decreus, *Latomus* 50, 1991, 712-16; P. Venini, *Athenaeum* 69, 1991, 319-20.
5. F. M. Dunn, "A prose hexameter in Seneca? (*Consolatio ad Marciam* 26.7)", *AJPh* 110, 1989, 488-91.
6. P. Esposito, "Una citazione ovidiana in Seneca", *Vichiana* 18, 1989, 52-62.
7. F. Stok, "Modelli delle *Troades* di Seneca: Ovidio", *QCTC* 6-7, 1988/89, 225-41.
8. A. De Vivo, "Parole oscure, oscure caverne (Ov. *met*. I 388, Sen. *nat*. V 14, 1)", *Vichiana* 18, 1989, 297-305.
9. R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, *Tra Ovidio e Seneca*, Bologna 1990 (Edizioni e Saggi Universitari di Filologia Classica 44).
   Reviews: G. Nuzzo, *BStudLat* 21, 1991, 58-62; A. Borgo, *Orpheus* 13, 1992, 413-15; L. Castagna, *Prometheus* 18, 1992, 92-4; C. D. N. Costa, *CR* 42, 1992, 196-7; P. Esposito, *Vichiana* 3, 1992, 270-4; G. Garbarino, *CCC* 13, 1992, 357-8; E. Mignogna, *Maia* 44, 1992, 215-16; M. L. Ricci, *InvLuc* 13-14, 1992, 315-17; F. Stok, *GIF* 44, 1992, 150-1; D. Weber, *WS* 105, 1992, 271-2; P.-J. Dehon, *Latomus* 52, 1993, 931-2; G. Focardi, *Sileno* 19, 1993, 596; M. Tartari Chersoni, *RFIC* 121, 1993, 226-8.
10. A. Borgo, "Presenza ovidiana in Seneca. Un difficile rapporto tra poesia e filosofia", in A. De Vivo, L. Spina (eds.), *'Come dice il poeta…'. Percorsi greci e latini di parole poetiche*, Napoli 1992, 131-8.
11. R. Nickel, "Vergleichendes Interpretieren", *AU* 36, 1993, 37-53.
12. G. Mader, "The Ovidian allusion at Seneca, *Troades* 1048", *Mnemosyne* 48, 1995, 86-9.
13. S. A. Cecchin, "Medea in Ovidio fra elegia ed epos", in R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti delle giornate di studio su Medea (Torino 23-24 ottobre 1995)*, Torino 1997, 69-89.
14. M. Ciappi, "Contaminazioni fra tradizioni letterarie affini di ascendenza tragica nel racconto ovidiano del mito di Procne e Filomela (*met*. VI 587-666)", *Maia* 50, 1998, 433-63.
15. A. De Vivo, "Seneca scienziato e Ovidio", in I. Gallo, L. Nicastri (eds.), Aetates Ovidianae. *Lettori di Ovidio dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*, Napoli 1995, 39-56 (Pubblicazioni dell'Università degli studi di Salerno. Sez. Atti Convegni

Miscellanee 43; repr. in A. De Vivo, *Frammenti di discorsi ovidiani*, Napoli 2011, 138-54).
16. R. Roncali, "Ovidio, il mito di Dedalo e il tiranno", *QS* 46, 1997, 45-58.
17. J. M. Bañales Leoz, "Ovidio en la prosa de Séneca", in J. L. Vidal, A. Alvar Ezquerra (eds.), *IX congreso español de estudios clásicos: Madrid, 27 al 30 de septiembre de 1995*, Madrid 1998, V, 43-7.
18. J. Fabre-Serris, *Mythologie et littérature à Rome. La réécriture des mythes aux I^ers^ siècles avant et après J.-C.*, Lausanne 1998.
Reviews: *uid. supra* 'Petronius'.
19. J. Dangel, "Orphée sous le regard de Virgile, Ovide et Sénèque: trois arts poétiques", *REL* 77, 1999, 87-117.
20. R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, "Dedalo, Catone e un'eco ovidiana (*met*. VIII 185 s) in Seneca (*prov*. 2,10)", *Maia* 54, 2002, 19-26.
21. R. J. Tarrant, "Chaos in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and its Neronian influence", in G. Tissol, S. Wheeler (eds.), *The Reception of Ovid in Antiquity*, *Arethusa* 35.3, 2002, 349-60.
22. R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, "Finale di tragedia: il destino di Ippolito dalla Grecia a Roma", *SIFC* 4 ser. 1, 2003, 160-82.
23. A. Schiesaro, *The Passions in Play. Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama*, Cambridge 2003.
Reviews: F. R. Chaumartin, *REL* 81, 2003, 398-9; J.-P. Aygon, *REA* 106, 2004, 660-2; P. J. Davis, *NECJ* 31, 2004, 344-6; G. W. M. Harrison, *BMCR* 2004.07.37; G. D. Williams, *Hermathena* 176, 2004, 104-8; E. Wilson, *TLS* 5272, 2004, 4-6; W. M. Calder, *CW* 98, 2005, 470-1; R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, *Gnomon* 77, 2005, 505-10; S. M. Goldberg, *Phoenix* 59, 2005, 396-8; M. Leigh, *JRS* 95, 2005, 291-2; J. A. Smith, *CR* 55, 2005, 540-1; P. Hardie, *RFIC* 134, 2006, 357-61; J.-A. Shelton, *Vergilius* 52, 2006, 216-21.
24. M. Janka, "Senecas *Phaedra*: Des Dramas Kern und sein episch-elegischer Rahmen", in J. Fugmann *et al.* (eds.), *Theater, Theaterpraxis, Theaterkritik im kaiserzeitlichen Rom. Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Prof. Dr. Peter Lebrecht Schmidt, 24./25. Juli 2003*, München 2004, 25-57.
25. R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, "Gli *sparsa miracula* di Ovidio (*Met*. 2.193) e Seneca (*Epist.* 90.43)", *Prometheus* 31, 2005, 59-64.
26. R. R. Marchese, *Figli benefattori, figli straordinari. Rappresentazioni senecane dell'"essere figlio"*, Palermo 2005.
Reviews: M. Armisen-Marchetti, *REL* 84, 2006, 389-91; N. Baglivi, *BStudLat* 36, 2006, 291-2; F. Ficca, *Vichiana* 8, 2006, 318-28; S. Stucchi, *Aevum* 80, 2006, 281-3; F.-R. Chaumartin, *Latomus* 67, 2008, 249-50; R. Fenga, *Maia* 60, 2008, 147-55; B. Ranieri, *Aufidus* 25.73, 2011, 120-3.
27. R. Roncali, "La voce della metamorfosi", *Phaos* 5, 2005, 75-82.
28. P. Parroni, "La fine di Ippolito in Euripide, Ovidio e Seneca e il problema dell'ambientazione dei due *Ippoliti* Euripidei", *Myrtia* 21, 2006, 65-73.
29. R. Tarrant, "Seeing Seneca Whole?", in K. Volk, G. D. Williams (eds.), *Seeing Seneca Whole. Perspectives on Philosophy, Poetry, and Politics*, Leiden-Boston 2006, 1-17.
30. I. Gildenhard, A. Zissos, "Barbarian variations: Tereus, Procne and Philomela in Ovid (*Met*. 6.412-674) and Beyond", *Dictynna* 4, 2007, *sine pag*.
31. C. Torre, "Tra Ovidio e Seneca: la traccia dell'epos di Pitagora nel programma filosofico delle *Naturales quaestiones*", in A. Costazza (ed.), *La poesia filosofica. Milano, 7-9 marzo 2007*, Milano 2007, 45-61 (Quaderni di Acme 98).

32. A. De Vivo, "Il volo di Fetonte da Ovidio a Seneca", *GIF* 61, 2009, 123-37 (repr. in A. De Vivo, *Frammenti di discorsi ovidiani*, Napoli 2011, 62-76).
33. S. Hinds, "Seneca's Ovidian *loci*", *SIFC* 9, 2011, 5-63.
34. A. La Penna, "Il regno dell'Erinni: un'eco significativa di Ovidio nell'*Octavia*", *Maia* 63, 2011, 88-9.
35. A. Basile, "Il mito di Atteone tra Ovidio e Seneca tragico", *Vichiana* 14, 2012, 222-34.
36. F. R. Berno, "Non solo acqua: elementi per un diluvio universale nel terzo libro delle *Naturales quaestiones*", in M. Beretta, F. Citti, L. Pasetti (eds.), *Seneca e le scienze naturali*, Firenze 2012, 49-68 (Biblioteca di Nuncius 68).
37. R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, "Medea tra terra, 'acque' e cielo: sul prologo della *Medea* di Seneca", in L. Landolfi (ed.), 'Ibo, ibo qua praerupta protendit iuga / meus Cithaeron'. *Paesaggi, luci e ombre nei prologhi tragici senecani. Incontri sulla poesia latina di età imperiale (IV)*, Bologna 2012, 31-50 (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino. Nuova serie 122).
38. L. Landolfi, "Orografia di delitti: Seneca, Edipo e il monte maledetto: per un'interpretazione del «prologo» delle *Phoenissae*", in L. Landolfi (ed.), 'Ibo, ibo qua praerupta protendit iuga / meus Cithaeron'. *Paesaggi, luci e ombre nei prologhi tragici senecani. Incontri sulla poesia latina di età imperiale (IV)*, Bologna 2012, 51-69 (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino. Nuova serie 122).
39. O. Mignacca, "Modelli augustei per le personificazioni infernali in Seneca tragico: spunti di riflessione", in G. Moretti, A. Bonandini (eds.), Persona ficta*: la personificazione allegorica nella cultura antica fra letteratura, retorica e iconografia*, Trento 2012, 283-99 (Labirinti 147).
40. P. Parroni, "Il linguaggio "drammatico" di Seneca scienziato", in M. Beretta, F. Citti, L. Pasetti (eds.), *Seneca e le scienze naturali*, Firenze 2012, 19-29 (Biblioteca di Nuncius 68).
41. L. Walsh, "The metamorphoses of Seneca's *Medea*", *Ramus* 41, 2012, 71-93.
42. D. Curley, *Tragedy in Ovid. Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre*, Cambridge 2013.
Reviews: N. Holzberg, *Gymnasium* 121, 2014, 613-14; G. Silva, *Euphrosyne* 43, 2015, 395-6; J. B. DeBrohun, *CR* 67, 2017, 416-18.

For Seneca's criticism of Ovid, see 'Reception and Pervivence in Antiquity – Latin Literature – General', 'Quintilian' and 'Seneca Rhetor'. For the tragic Seneca see also 'Sources and Models – Ancient Greek Authors – Tragedy'. A brief general overview of Seneca's indebtedness to Virgil, Ovid, and Horace can be found in Tarrant (29, esp. 1-5).

A general work about the tragic Seneca is the monograph of Rainer Jakobi (4). This builds on his previous Ph.D. thesis (Bonn 1986), in which he makes an exhaustive analysis of the diverse modalities of 'Imitationtechnik' (a list of them is on 202-8), wherein the younger Seneca continually mentions Ovid's poems in each of his tragedies. Among these stands out *met*. (passages listed in 220-8), and Jakobi adds new passages and information to the information available in previous studies and commentaries.

Stephen Hinds (33) makes a very rich and detailed study, organised according to Seneca's themes and sagas. Hinds attempts to go beyond Jakobi's selection and pick out other, less obvious details of Seneca's Ovidianism (9): "I shall be alert not just to strongly signalled allusions but also to a kind of background Ovidianism (if I may so term it) discernible within the seemingly indiscriminate intertextuality of a Senecan *topos*. The aim will be to complement the expected purple passages with some larger (if less tidy) impressions of the dramatic, rhetorical and conceptual space which Ovid and his poetry occupy in Seneca's tragic imagination".

It is not coincidence, therefore, that a student of Hinds, Dan Curley, has also recently published a monograph with very interesting observations on the tragic Seneca's debt to Ovid (42, 225-33), a carefully crafted reworking of his previous Ph. D. thesis (*Metatheater: heroines and ephebes in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'*, Univ. of Washington 1999: see also 'Literary genres').

Charles Segal (1) compares Seneca's description of Hippolytus' death with those of Euripides in the homonym play, and of Ovid (*met.* 15.497-529). But the comparison rather emphasises the differences of Seneca's 'baroque' style with the classicicm of the previous versions.

John Gahan (3) makes a brief analysis of Seneca's dependence (*imitatio*) on the description of Hippolytus' death (*Phaedr.* 1000-115) from the Ovidian model in Book 15. Gahan also examines Seneca's effort to outdo Ovid (*aemulatio*) "through a distinct succinctness in reference to the latter's verbosity or a deliberate elaborateness in contrast with Ovid's precision" (124).

Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini (22) focuses on this same episode, and on the macrostructural differences in the *lýsis* or *katastrophé* of the Euripidean and Senecan versions. Specifically, she centres her attention on elements which appear in the Ovidian text (which seem to indicate Seneca's debt to Ovid), but which can also be seen in the description of Caricles' death in the novel by Achilles Tatius (1.7.1-14.3). This leads her to suggest a common source in a Greek tragedy, now lost (170-1). Pierini's hypothesis is strengthened, she claims, by also observing certain elements, common to Seneca and Achilles Tatius, which do not appear in Ovid.

Markus Janka also dedicates the third part of his article (24, 36-56) to analysing the epic and elegiac elements in Seneca's *Phaedra,* in light of both Euripides' *Hippolytus* and Ovid's *met.* and amatory poems, emphasising the original elements of the Senecan drama.

For Parroni's (28) comparison of the character and location of Hippolytus in Euripides, Ovid and Seneca, see 'Ancient Greek authors – Tragedy'.

Fabio Stok (7) focuses on the debt of Seneca's *Troades* to *met.* 13; however, he attempts to go beyond the importing of emblematic writing style or textual echoes, and addresses an *imitatio* "che potrebbe essere definita macrotestuale anziché microtestuale, e che riguarda la struttura narrativa e la dinamica scenica della rappresentazione senecana". The hypothesis of his study is that "la narrazione ovidiana […] sia stata costantemente tenuta presente da Seneca, quale modello per singole soluzioni sceniche delle *Troades*, o anche quale spunto per proprie originali innovazioni rispetto al modello euripideo" ("Ovidio funziona quale una sorta di filtro fra Euripide e Seneca") (226). For Fabre-Serris' study (18) on the Ovidian background of Seneca's *Troades* and *Agamemnon*, see 'Petronius'.

Gottfried Mader (12) proposes "to read *Tr* 1048 [sc. *terra decrescet pelagusque crescet*] as a pointed rejoinder to *Met* 1 345 [sc. *surgit humus, crescunt loca decrescentibus undis*] and its contextual implications: reversing the thrust of the original, Seneca's adaptation suggests not *restoration* of order but the imminent and irrevocable *dissolution* of order" (my additions).

The study by Sergio Cecchin only addresses Seneca's work tangentially (13, 87-9). His interest focuses on the importance of magic as regards his main models (Euripides and Apollonius). The magic ceases to be instrumental, and "si espande e si sviluppa in modo tale da segnare definitivamente il personaggio di Medea e da costituire un ineliminabile precedente per le successive versioni di Seneca e di Valerio Flacco" (89).

Also dealing with Seneca's characterisation of Medea is Lisl Walsh's article (41): "Rather than focusing on Seneca's departures from the tragic legacy of Euripides (however important they are for an informed reading of the play), I would like to focus on Seneca's Medea as a potentially Ovidian character. Specifically, I would like to posit that the Senecan Medea reads more like a dramatisation of Medea's experience within the ellipsed Corinthian episode of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (7.394-97). Seneca's Medea (more so than Euripides' Medea) identifies with a specifically transformative project, and,

one might initially suspect, supplies a neat explication of the transformation missing from Medea's narrative in the *Metamorphoses*. What we find, however, is that, in dramatising her process of metamorphosis, Seneca irreparably alters our relationship with the transformed Medea" (71).

The dense article by Maurizio Ciappi collects multiple reminiscences (14, 459-61) – some not pointed out in earlier studies – of the Ovidian episode of Tereus-Procne-Philomela in Seneca's *Thyestes*. For Tarrant's (21) connection between the Ovidian Tereus episode (*met.* 6.424-674), and Seneca's *Thyestes* through Ovid's 'expanded notion of chaos', see 'Lucan'. Ingo Gildenhard and Andrew Zissos (30) also devote their attention to comparing both passages: they focus on shared negative elements, such as cruelty, bloodshed, crime and revenge, although Alessandro Schiesaro (23, esp. 70-138) had already emphasized this aspect.

Renata Roncali (16, 52-4) makes a thorough comparative analysis of the Daedalus-Icarus myth in *met.* 8.183-235 and *ars* 2.21-96. Furthermore, she examines its remaking by Seneca (*Oed.* 890-910), also in political code (like the myth – analogous in political terms – of Phaethon), as an example of the risks of failing to take the *medium iter*.

Anna Basile (35) analyses the presence of Ovid's Actaeon episode in *met.* 3 (cf. *epist.* 20.103-4 and *trist.* 2.104), as rooted in the Calimachean version of the myth, and in Seneca's *Phoenissae* (13-15) and *Oedipus* (751-63). She tries to explain the oddity of Actaeon appearing in *Phoen.* through the fact that both Oedipus and Actaeon have links to Mount Cithaeron, their involuntary 'guilt', and their vain efforts to escape. Luciano Landolfi's work (38) examines the relevant presence of Mount Cithaeron in the prologue of *Phoenissae*, focusing on its description as a dark 'luogo di sangue', and points out as models Euripides' *Bacchae*, Catullus (63.3 and 32), and the location of Ino's disgrace (*met.* 4.512-42).

Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini focuses on the prologue of Seneca's *Medea*, where, along with Euripidean models, she proposes (37, 38-9) interpreting the invocation to the Sun in ll. 27-36 as reminiscent of the Ovidian Phaethon (*met.* 2.298-9).

Oriana Mignacca (39) studies how Seneca uses allegorical personification in passages with infernal settings. In terms of our purposes, she analyses (289-97) the debt of *Herc. f.* 95-9 and *Thy.* 1-121 to Juno's underworld excursion, determined to punish Ino and Athamas (*met.* 4.447-511).

A comparison, in poetic code, of the Orpheus character in Virgil, Ovid and Seneca's *Hercules furens*, can be found in Dangel (19).

Renata Roncali (27) presents an example of the critical sharpness of Seneca the reader: in his *Apocolocyntosis* (4.3), the poet shows his recognition – before anyone else – of the *(ultima) vox* as an essential element of change – as the *sphragis* of a metamorphosis – in Ovid's work. To illustrate her point, the scholar offers a selection of Ovidian passages where this can be confirmed, as well as some parallels in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

Finally, Antonio La Penna's brief note (34) suggests reading l. 913 of *Octavia* (*regnat mundo tristis Erinys*) as a reworking of *met.* 1.241 (*... qua terra patet, fera regnat Erinys*; cf. 11.15), also combined with *epist.* 6.45 (*tristis Erinys*).

Now we will look at studies referring to Seneca's prose works (for a basic review of these passages, see Bañales 17). In a note not without imprecision (5), Francis Dunn makes a correct connection between the Senecan expression *Nos quoque felices animae et aeterna sortitae* (*Marc.* 26.7) and *met.* 15.456-8, along with Verg. *Aen.* 6.669.

Paolo Esposito (6) proposes a rereading of Ovid's description of the Iron Age (*met.* 1.144-8), from the quotation and rectification made by Seneca in *De ira* 2.9 (cf. *ben.* 5.16.3). The fact that Seneca recurs to this passage in Ovid, specifically to allude to unpardonable *nefas* of the civil war, allows Esposito to assert that Ovid's intention was to refer to the same political misfortune.

Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini (1, and see also 9, 177-210) studies the technique of quote-imitation used by Seneca in the *Naturales Quaestiones,* as regards the Ovidian episode of the flood (after Virgil, Ovid – and especially *met.* – is the most cited and imitated author in this work of Seneca). Francesca R. Berno (36) analyses the theory of elemental interchangeability in Sen. *nat.* 3.9-10 and the cataclysmic world dissolution pictured in 3.27-30. She relates them to Seneca's censuring of the Ovidian flood description in Book 1 and, at the same time, his positive, constructive evocation of Ovid's Pythagoras (Book 15) for expositing the physical theory.

Arturo De Vivo (8) affirms that the expression *caecis suspensa latebris* used by Seneca (*nat.* 5.14.1), and edited as a literal quote of Ovid (*met.* 1.388 *caecis obscura latebris*), is not as such, with a memory error on Seneca's part, but an allusion. De Vivo

links *obscura-suspensa* with *Aetna* 96-8, a text whose relative dating with regards to Seneca is still uncertain, but which De Vivo considers to be later than the *Naturales Quaestiones*. He believes that the change is intended to adapt Ovid's expression to the new context in which Seneca uses it.

An analysis of another quote with variation is carried out by Antonella Borgo (10), specifically *ben.* 4.14.1, where Seneca changes to *quae, quia non licuit, non dedit, illa dedit*, what in Ovid appears as (*am.* 3.4.4) *quae, quia non liceat, non facit, illa facit*. In this article, the scholar reviews – through different prose passages of Seneca, almost always linked to *met.* – the "grave contraddizione" of the Cordoban (138): "il compiacimento dell'uomo di cultura per la fantasia ed il gusto del poeta di Sulmona, la disapprovazione del filosofo per […] la sfrenatezza fantastica ed espressiva, che finiva con l'indurre il lettore all'errore morale".

In the wake of his previous work, but also that of Antonella Borgo, Arturo De Vivo (15) analyses the passages of *Naturales Quaestiones* in which Seneca references *met.* (18 of the 19 total mentions of Ovid) – above all, passages from two episodes: the creation of the world and Pythagoras's speech. De Vivo also observes here the ambivalence of the philosopher's posture regarding Ovid, whose poetic abilities he admires sincerely, but whom he continually faults in rhetorical-aesthetic terms, as well as ethical. The comparative chapter by Chiara Torre (31) focuses on the presence of the "epos di Pitagora" in the third book of the *Naturales Quaestiones*, although this scholar does not quote the works recently mentioned.

In a later study (32), Arturo De Vivo starts by pointing out references from Ovid's Phaethon episode in the prose work of Seneca (for a previous treatment, see Rosa Rita Marchese 26, 69-93). In some cases, these references are merely instrumental, used to illustrate the argument that is being made at that moment (e.g. criticising luxury). Then the work focuses on the long mention which Seneca makes from this episode in *De providentia* 5.10-11, here "interessato alla figura di Fetonte nelle sue potenzialità allegoriche e simboliche" (127): that is, as a symbol of the risks posed by the 'lofty ideals of *virtus*' (for a connection from this character to Emperor Gaius, see "Caligola come Fetonte", in Degl'Innocenti Pierini 9, 251-70).

As a second example of his defence of the didactic value of "vergleichendes Interpretieren", Rainer Nickel (11, 40-2) offers a comparison between Ovid's Icarus-

Daedalus episode (*met.* 8.183-259) and Seneca's (*epist*. 90.14-19). The latter uses the Daedalus character, prototype of the *homo faber*, for the *natura-artes* contrast. The same *epist.* 90 of Seneca is Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini's object of study (25); however she compares the reference to the *sparsa miracula* (90.43) with the Ovidian model of *met.* 2.193. According to the scholar, it is more a case of 'antithetical' homage, to the extent that the Ovidian Phaethon is defined as *ignarus* or *trepidus*. Seneca, however, hints at the primeval man, who contemplates the sky with a tranquil spirit, free from the errors, and horrors, of contemporary man.

Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini (20) also defends the variant *et licet armis* for *ibimus illac* in *met.* 8.186, based on a political interpretation which equates Daedalus-Ovid with Minos-Augustus. Moreover, she also compares Sen. *prov.* 2.10, where Cato refers to *legionibus*, *classibus* and *Caesarianus miles*: in her opinion, this points to Seneca reading *et licet armis* in the Ovidian passage.

Some references on the importance of Ovid in the 'dramatic style' of Seneca's prose writings are to be found in Parroni (40).

Seneca Rhetor

1. D. López-Cañete, "El ingenio de Ovidio", *Myrtia* 27, 2012, 111-46.
2. I. Peirano, "*Non subripiendi causa sed palam mutuandi*: Intertextuality and Literary Deviancy between Law, Rhetoric, and Literature in Roman Imperial Culture", *AJPh* 134, 2013, 83-100.

For Seneca's criticism on Ovid, see 'Reception and Pervivence in Antiquity – Latin Literature – General', 'Quintilian' and 'Seneca Philosopher'.

Daniel López-Cañete (1) makes a long lexical-semantic analysis of Seneca's portrait of Ovid in *contr.* 2.2.8.

Irene Peirano (2) starts off with the well-known story told by Seneca in *suas.* 3.3 about Ovid using the Virgilian expression *plena deo*, in order to focus on the real object of her article: studying the use of legal terminology in literary criticism. She examines the possible conclusions that could be drawn from this terminology, namely the connection between literary and legal judgement regarding the process of imitation (that is, as opposed to literary *theft*): "how legal imagery actively structures and informs the

representation of imitative practices as alternatively breaches of contract, theft, acts of open acknowledgment, and recognition" (85).

Silius

1. E. Burck, "Die Endphase der Schlacht am Metaurus bei Silius Italicus (*Punica* 15,759-16,22)", *WS* 16, 1982, 260-73.
2. M. Billerbeck, "Die Unterweltsbeschreibung in den *Punica* des Silius Italicus", *Hermes* 111, 1983, 326-38.
3. D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1991.
   Reviews: *uid. supra* 'Lucan'.
4. P. Asso, "Passione eziologica nei *Punica* di Silio Italico: Trasimeno, Sagunto, Ercole e i Fabii", *Vichiana* 1, 1999, 75-87.
5. A. Deremetz, "La Sibylle dans la tradition épique à Rome: Virgile, Ovide et Silius Italicus", in M. Bouquet, F. Morzadec (eds.), *La Sibylle: parole et représentation*, Rennes 2004, 75-83.
6. M. Wilson, "Ovidian Silius", *Arethusa* 37, 2004, 225-49.
7. A. Deremetz, "L'histoire du genre épique dans les catabases de Virgile, d'Ovide et de Silius Italicus", in J. P. Schwindt (ed.), *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne = Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung*, Heidelberg 2005, 111-21 (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften. Neue Folge 2, Reihe 116).
8. M. A. Vinchesi, "L'episodio del serpente libico nel 4 libro dei *Punica* di Silio Italico e il gusto del sensazionale nell'epica flavia", in L. Castagna, C. Riboldi (eds.), Amicitiae templa serena. *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò*, Milano 2008, II, 1585-606.
9. M. Korn, "Die Falernus-Episode in den *Punica* des Silius Italicus (7.162-211)", in A. Heil, M. Korn, J. Sauer (eds.), Noctes Sinenses. *Festschrift für Fritz-Heiner Mutschler zum 65. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg 2011, 74-8 (Kalliope 11).

For a general survey of Silius' models (and among them, *met.*), see Denis Feeney (3, 250-312).

Erich Burck (1) emphasises that, in his description of the battle of Metaurus (15.759-16.22), Silius reuses and adapts elements from Virgil (*Aen.* 1 and 12), and from Ovid's Callisto (Book 2), as well as from Livy (Books 26-27), for the characterisation of Hasdrubal.

Margarethe Billerbeck (2) studies the description of the underworld in Silius (13.523-612), based on the obvious Virgilian model, but with occasional additions from poets such as Seneca, Statius or, for our purposes, Ovid's descriptions of the underworld and hell (*met.* 4.439-40, 10.1-85, 12.59). According to Billerbeck, these additions (especially Seneca's *Herc. f.*) help to increase the degree of horror in the description.

Paolo Asso (4) studies various *aitia* in Silius and reaches this conclusion (86): "Nonostante l'identità strutturale dei *Punica* con l'*Eneide*, come narratore di particolari curiosi Silio è piú vicino all'Ovidio delle *Metamorfosi*, e soprattutto dei *Fasti*, che non all'*Eneide* di Virgilio".

Alain Deremetz (5) makes a comparative study of the Sibyl character and its distinctive characteristics in Virgil, Ovid (*met.* 14.101-53), and Silius, but finds in its (meta-)poetic nature an element common to all (82): "Notre Sibylle est donc un personnage qui joue un double rôle, celui de prophétesse des destins du héros au niveau de l'action racontée et celui d'un modèle poétique qui illustre le rapport de l'auteur à son œuvre". Some – though few – more notes about the topic, can be found in another almost contemporaneous work (7).

Marcus Wilson (6) addresses "Silius' somewhat atypical method of allusion. Compared with other writers of Latin epic, he tends to eschew signposting his intertexts by the technique of "quotation", that is, by repeating complete phrases or other word collocations from earlier poems. He prefers to signal the intertextual connection by alternative means, in particular, by coincidence of situation and detail rather than wording and, occasionally, by more explicit hints" (226). He divides these Ovidian details in Silius into four types: "when Silius rewrites a scene or story that was itself specifically portrayed or narrated by Ovid" (227-8); "where Silius invents a sustained episode out of one or more passages that he found in Ovid's words, but where the specific subject of the story itself has no Ovidian parallel" (228-9); "where the material is mythological or aetiological or amatory or involves transformation in a way reminiscent of the *Metamorphoses*, but has no actual Ovidian antecedent" (229); "a scene or episode that does not appear to have been principally inspired by Ovid, will nevertheless echo a passage or passages from Ovid with which it has some situational affinity" (229-30). This literary technique is illustrated by means of a comparative study of different episodes in Silius and Ovid (for our purpose, the Tyrrhenian sailors in Book 3, Pyramus and Thisbe in 4, Cephalus and Procris in 7, Daedalus and Icarus and Philemon and Baucis in 8, Orpheus' death and Alcyone's dream in 11, the poem's end …).

Maria Assunta Vinchesi (8) studies Silius' episode of Atilius Regulus (4.118-550), and in particular that of the huge Libyan snake (140-293), and emphasises above all the debt to Statius' *Thebaid* (Book 5), but through the mediation of Ovid's reference to the snake of Mars killed by Cadmus (*met.* 3.28-98).

In his brief note, Matthias Korn (9, 75-6) focuses attention on the *color Ovidianus* of the Falernus episode in Silius, on his debt primarily to the episode of Philemon and Baucis, and secondarily to those of the Tyrrhenian sailors and Minyas' daughters.

Statius

1. D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1991.
   Reviews: *uid. supra* 'Lucan'.
2. R. Iglesias Montiel, "Estacio y sus modelos épicos", in *Actas del III Coloquio de Estudiantes de Filología Clásica. Poesía Épica Griega y Latina, 10, 11 y 12 de julio*, Madrid 1991, 53-86.
3. F. Delarue, "Le palais du Sommeil: d'Ovide à Stace", *Lalies* 10, 1992, 405-10.
4. G. Rosati, "Momenti e forme della fortuna antica di Ovidio: l'*Achilleide* di Stazio", in M. Picone, B. Zimmermann (eds.), Ovidius redivivus. *Von Ovid zu Dante*, Stuttgart 1994, 43-62.
5. S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge 1998.
   Reviews: M. Gale, *G&R* 46, 1998, 239-40; R. Lyne, *TLS* 4975, 1998, 30; C. Nappa, *BMCR* 98.9.8; G. Conte, *JRS* 89, 1999, 217-20; M. Lowrie, *CW* 92, 1999, 384-5; P. A. Miller, *CPh* 94, 1999, 351-5; J. J. O'Hara, *CR* 49, 1999, 97-8; P. Tordeur, *AC* 68, 1999, 395; G. Tronchet, *REA* 101, 1999, 226-8; J. E. G. Zetzel, *Phoenix* 53, 1999, 171-3; S. Raimondi, *Faventia* 22, 2000, 165-7; A. Deremetz, *Latomus* 60, 2001, 783-4; B. Mota, *Euphrosyne* 30, 2002, 449-50; M. Negri, *Athenaeum* 90, 2002, 301-3.
6. A. M. Keith, "Ovidian *personae* in Statius's *Thebaid*", in G. Tissol, S. Wheeler (eds.), *The Reception of Ovid in Antiquity*, *Arethusa* 35.3, 2002, 381-402.
7. H. Lovatt, "Statius' Ekphrastic Games: *Thebaid* 6.531-47", *Ramus* 31, 2002, 73-90.
8. F. Morzadec, "Métamorphoses du paysage d'Ovide à Stace. Le "paysage ovidien" dans la *Silve* II, 3", in E. Bury (ed.), *Lectures d'Ovide. Publiées à la mémoire de Jean-Pierre Néraudau*, Paris 2003, 89-105.
9. C. Newlands, "Statius and Ovid: Transforming the Landscape", *TAPhA* 134, 2004, 133-55.
10. A. M. Keith, "Ovid's Theban Narrative in Statius' *Thebaid*", *Hermathena* 177/78, 2004/05, 181-208.
11. P. Hardie, "Statius' Ovidian poetics and the tree of Atedius Melior (*Silvae* 2.3)", in R. R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam, J. J. L. Smolenaars (eds.), *Flavian poetry*, Leiden 2006, 207-21.
12. A. M. Keith, "Imperial building projects and architectural ecphrases in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Statius' *Thebaid*", *Mouseion* 7, 2007, 1-26.
13. R. Parkes, "Hercules and the Centaurs: Reading Statius with Vergil and Ovid", *CPh* 104, 2009, 476-94.
14. R. Parkes, "Who's the Father? Biological and Literary Inheritance in Statius' *Thebaid*", *Phoenix* 63, 2009, 24-37.
15. R. Parkes, "Dealing with Ghosts: Literary Assertion in Statius' *Thebaid*", *Ramus* 39, 2010, 14-23.

16. C. Criado, "Teologías y teodiceas épicas. Estacio y la perspectiva ovidiana", *Emerita* 79, 2011, 251-75.
17. H. Baumann, "Der ewige Gärtner. Statius' *Silve* 2,3 als Geburtstagsgeschenk zwischen Intertextualität und Gartenbaukunst", *A&A* 59, 2013, 89-111.
18. C. Chinn, "Statius' Ovidian Achilles", *Phoenix* 67, 2013, 320-42.
19. D. Kozák, "*Si forte reponis Achillem*: Achilles in the *Ars poetica*, the *Metamorphoses*, and the *Achilleid*", *MD* 72, 2014, 207-21.
20. G. Rosati, "Ovid in Flavian Occasional Poetry (Martial and Statius)", in J. F. Miller, C.E. Newlands (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, Chichester (New Sussex) 2014, 55-69.

For a general survey of Statius' models (and among them, *met.*), see Denis Feeney (1, 337-91) and Rosa Iglesias (2). See also Criado (16, 256 n. 8) and Chinn (18, 320 n. 1) for recent bibliography on Statius, partially dealing with this connection.

Rosa Iglesias (2, 59-60, and 63-70) addresses the debt of Statius' *Thebaid* to *met.* in terms of structure and narrative technique, and the dependence of the Tisiphone and Allecto characters, paying special attention to the comparison between Statius' description of the palace of Sleep (*Theb.* 10.84-145) and Ovid (*met.* 11.592-649). The study by Fernand Delarue (3) also focuses on the latter episode: above all, he examines the aspects of *aemulatio* by Statius.

Alison Keith (6) shows to what degree Statius' techniques of characterisation in the *Thebaid* are indebted to Ovid, particularly in the Theban saga (Books 3 and 4), but also in the Calydonian boar hunt (8). From this evidence, she concludes that Statius illustrates thus the tragic repetition of the past in the episode of Seven Against Thebes. In a later article (10), this scholar recalls that Statius makes it clear, at the very outset of the *Thebaid* (1.4-17), that he is going to leave aside those episodes of the Theban saga that form the core of the Ovidian narrative (*met.* 2.836-4.603). Throughout her article, Keith emphasises different literary debts which link both epic poems, e.g. Oedipus' self-blinding as inspired in the Ovidian Tiresias (185): "The implication that the blind Ovidian seer informs Statius' blind Oedipus confirms the Flavian epic's literary descent from Ovid's Theban history and offers ironic comment on the conspicuous absence of Oedipus (and indeed the House of Labdacus) from Ovid's 'Thebaid'". In another article (12, 1), the same scholar addresses "Statius' descriptions of built forms, interior decoration, and spatial usage in the *Thebaid* in relation both to the architectural settings of the *Metamorphoses* (and their reception of Augustus' building projects) and to the contemporary architectural programs of the Flavian emperors".

Carole Newlands (9) suggests that in the *Thebaid* Statius presents Ovid's landscape (especially that of the Theban saga in Book 3), properly a *locus amoenus*, as a paradise lost: that is to say, "Statius' poem of civil war will depict the dissolution of the Ovidian paradise" (134).

Helen Lovatt (7, 78-80) looks at the presence of Ovid's fight between Centaurs and Lapiths in the ecphrasis of the prize bowl won by Amphiaraus (*Theb*. 6.535-8).

Ruth Parkes (13) considers the connection between Statius' *Thebaid*, Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *met.* as regards the character of Hercules (478-88) and the Centauromachy (488-92) (as for the latter, "Statius draws upon the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses* in his allusions to the fight and, in the process, manipulates our reading of these texts", 478).

This same scholar devotes another article (14) to examining "the complexities of Parthenopaeus' parentage as explored by Statius' *Thebaid*" (24). She proposes several "characters who are, or might be held to be, his parents" (namely the Ovidian Hippomenes, Meleager, and the two Atalantas, as well as the 'Gallan' or elegiac Milanion), and hence suggests "that the *Thebaid*'s use of multiple ancestry issues can serve as a figure for Statius' own relationship with his poetic predecessors" ("As there is no clear biological sire, so there is no clear poetic father-figure", 35).

Another article by Parkes examines the topic of literary self-consciousness (15). Regarding the portrayal of ghosts in Stat. *Theb.* 4.553-645, this study examines whether the episode "can be read as a meditation on the poem's place in the literary tradition. It views the scene as a commentary on the epic's artistic practices, wherein Statius both acknowledges his predecessors, especially Ovid and Seneca, and asserts his own literary contribution through the appearance of the ambushers depicted earlier in the poem" (14).

Cecilia Criado (16) focuses on the character of Jupiter in the *Thebaid,* and his relation to *fatum*. Specifically, Criado starts from the traditional question of "si la *series malorum* (Ou., *Met*. IV 564 y Stat., *Theb*. I 17) que atenaza la historia mítica de la estirpe de Cadmo se debe a la causalidad divina o a la humana" (252). After a detailed examination of philosophical and literary studies of the *Thebaid*, Criado draws attention (270) to the similarities between the Statian Jupiter, the Ovidian *rector Olympi/deum* and the Senecan *civitatis rector*, against the traditional interpretation, which related him to Stoic Providence.

In a chapter dedicated to the Ovidian presence in Statius' *Achilleid*, Gianpiero Rosati (4, 53-9) examines the crucial importance of *met.* as a model of ambiguity (sexual, but also of the characters' own identities) as shown especially in the episode of Achilles at Scyros. Additionally, he devotes the final pages (59-62) to considering the profound debt of Statius to Ovid in assigning "esistenza letteraria" to his characters (62): "È questo, mi sembra, il punto più avanzato del rapporto fra i due poeti, il segno di quanto profondamente Stazio abbia inteso e appreso la lezione di Ovidio. E il fatto che, nell'applicare il suo metodo, in quella pratica tutta ovidiana, autoriflessiva, di rinviare ad altri testi, sia anzitutto lui, Ovidio […], l'oggetto del richiamo, è forse l'omaggio più esplicito che Stazio rende al suo modello".

Stephen Hinds (5, 135-44) also devotes attention to Ovid's presence in Statius' *Achilleid*. Christopher Chinn (18) compares Ovid's Centauromachy, relating it not to the *Thebaid,* but to the *Achilleid*. Chinn asserts that Statius makes his Achilles character similar to Ovid's Cyllarus and also to Hylonome (*met.* 12.393-428), which in turn "implies various kinds of hybridity in the portrayal of Achilles in the *Achilleid*" (321). He considers that Statius also draws attention to the Ovidian models of Catullus 64 ("Links to Ovid via Catullus", 334-7) and Lucretius 5.882-9 ("Links to Ovid via Lucretius", 337-40).

The Achilles character in *met.* and in Statius' *Achilleid* is also the focus of Dániel Kozák's article (19). He compares both texts starting from the well-known judgement of Hor. *ars* 120-2. The evolutions of both characters do not agree with Horace's features, and this makes Kozák interpret a sort of intertextual dialogue with Horace.

Françoise Morzadec (8) studies the influence of landscape in different passages of *met.* as also applied to *silv.* 2.3, dedicated to Atedius Melior, who becomes "une sorte de modèle réduit a la maniere d'Ovide" (105). This same *silva* is also the object of study in the chapter by Philip Hardie (11), who sees therein a combination of Ovidian passages from *met.* (listed at 209 n. 7), and Horatian (see 218-21) models. Helge Baumann (17) interprets this same composition as a type of "Erinnerungslandschaft" ("Der Baum fungiert in der *Silve* 2,3 also als metapoetisches Symbol für die Wahrung von *memoria*", 105) starting from the Ovidian background and that of Verg. *Aen.* 8.

Gianpiero Rosati (20) investigates the presence of Ovid's poems – *met.* included – in Flavian occasional poetry, namely the epigrams of Martial and the *Silvae* of Statius.

Tacitus

1. W. Heilmann, "Die Eigenart der Taciteischen Vorstellung von der Urzeit in *ann.* 3.26", *Gymnasium* 107, 2000, 409-24.
2. J. Luque Moreno, "*Mentis inops*", *Myrtia* 25, 2010, 53-75.

Willibald Heilmann (1) studies the excursus on the 'Urzeit' that Tacitus (*ann.* 3.26) writes in continuation of, and in connection with, his criticism of the *lex Papia Poppaea* about marriage (9 CE). Heilmann devotes attention to Tacitus' surprising 'Geschichtskonzeption' (410): "Erstaunlich ist, dass Tacitus bis auf die Urzeit zurückgeht und die spätere Zeit als Abkehr von der Urzeit dagegenstellt". In his study, Heilmann compares similar representations of the Golden Age that "Tacitus sicher oder mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit kannte", such as Ov. *met.* 1.89-93 and 128-31 (see esp. 413-9), and Sen. *epist.* 90.4-6 and 36-40. He marks out their points of contact, and also their differences (417-8): "Als Tacitus seine Vorstellung von der Urzeit ann. 3,26 niederschrieb, hatte er offenbar philosophische Traditionen im Kopf, wie sie etwa in Senecas 90. Brief, 36-40 fassbar sind. Zugleich wirkten poetische, letztlich auf Hesiod zurückgehende Gestaltungen wie in Ovids Metamorphosen auf seine Darstellung ein. Dabei formulierte er eine eigenständige Auffassung". Against these conceptions, Heilmann analyses (419-24) that of Sallust, in whose work those concepts important to Tacitus can be seen recurrently: *modestia*, *pudor*, *aequalitas* and *dominatio*. However, according to Heilmann, clear differences exist between the two historians: "Sallust verhält sich in all diesen Punkten anders. Nirgendwo wird bei ihm, soweit wir sehen, die Vorstellung einer reinen Urzeit näher ausgeführt. Allgemein-Menschliches wird durchweg kurz oder beläufig einbezogen oder als Ausgangspunkt einer historischen Darlegung knapp umrissen, es wird aber nicht als Grundlage der Erörterung in Einzelheiten entfaltet" (420); "Man kann erkennen, wie Tacitus bei allen Anregungen, die er durch Sallust erhält, eigene Wege geht, die letztlich darin begründet sind, dass seiner Geschichtsschreibung andere politische Erfahrungen zugrunde liegen" (410).

Jesús Luque (2) studies the presence of the expression *mentis inops*, probably coined by Ovid, in later authors, and especially in Tacitus' work (*ann.* 14.10).

Valerius Flaccus

1. D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford 1991.
   Reviews: *uid. supra* 'Lucan'.
2. S. A. Cecchin, "Medea in Ovidio fra elegia ed epos", in R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti delle giornate di studio su Medea (Torino 23-24 ottobre 1995)*, Torino 1997, 69-89.
3. T. L. Wright, *Valerius Flaccus and the poetics of imitation*, Ph. D. thesis, Univ. of Virginia 1998.
4. O. Fuà, "Ipotesti di una Centauromachia (Val. Fl. 1, 140-148)", *Sandalion* 21/22, 1998/99, 47-55.
5. F. Bessone, "Valerius Flaccus und die Medeen des Ovid", in U. Eigler, E. Lefèvre (eds.), *Ratis omnia vincet. Neue Untersuchungen zu den* Argonautica *des Valerius Flaccus*, München 1998, 141-71 (Zetemata 98).
6. U. Auhagen, "Medea zwischen Ratio und Ratlosigkeit. Monologe bei Valerius Flaccus und Ovid (*met*. 7,11-71)", in F. Spaltenstein (ed.), *Untersuchungen zu den* Argonautica *des Valerius Flaccus.* Ratis omnia vincet *III*, München 2004, 91-103 (Zetemata 120).
7. T. Gärtner, "Untersuchungen zum Io-Mythos in der lateinischen Dichtung", *Prometheus* 34, 2008, 257-74.
8. P. J. Davis, "Remembering Ovid: The Io Episode in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", *Antichthon* 43, 2009, 1-11.
9. F. Delarue, "Le Jupiter de Valérius Flaccus: virgilien ou ovidien?", *REL* 91, 2013, 157-69.
10. A. Río Torres-Murciano, "*Spes lusa* (Val. Fl. 3.555): Hilas como anti-Julo", *CFC(L)* 33, 2013, 35-55.

As in the cases of Silius and Statius, the studies into the influence of Ovid on Valerius Flaccus become a clarification – a sort of restriction – of the presence, evident and pervasive, of Virgil and – in this case – Apollonius Rhodius and Homer (on the subject, see Wright 3). For a general survey of Valerius' models (and among them, *met.*), see Denis Feeney (1, 337-91).

For the work by Cecchin (2) on the influence of Ovid's Medea on Valerius Flaccus' character, see 'Seneca Philosopher'. On the same topic, see also Bessone (5) and Auhagen (6).

Oscar Fuà (4) points out Ovid's Centauromachy as hypotext for Valerius Flaccus' brief ecphrasis (1.140-8). In terms of the imitation method, "intento del nostro poeta è quello di fare avvertire ai lettori l'ipotesto non come qualcosa che venga semplicemente imitato e trascritto, bensì come qualcosa che fornisca alla sua scrittura spunti per raggiungere effetti di originalità" (51), an originality which is obviously based largely on the processes of selection and condensation.

Thomas Gärtner starts (7, 257-67) by studying the two Ovidian treatments (*epist.* 14.85-108 and *met.* 1.588-746) of the myth of Io, and then (267-74) addresses the similarities and differences between the episode of *met.* and Orpheus' song in Book 4 of Valerius Flaccus. Another article focused on the episode of Io is Peter Davis' (8): he draws attention to the mission of 'mise-en-abîme' of this "apparently irrelevant digression", which actually functions as a prefiguration to the fundamental Medea story in Books 5-8. Davis starts from the premise "that Valerius does allude to *Metamorphoses* 1 is clear" (1; "The Ovidian connection is plain", 2), which he illustrates through his technical, structural and even stylistic (syntactical and lexical) similarities. However, he also points out the differences in treatment between them, all against the background of the (ps-)Aeschylean *Prometheus Bound*.

The focus of the study by Fernand Delarue (9) is to break down the thesis that, after Lucan's experiment, Valerius Flaccus brought about the return of Virgilian gods to epic. After his detailed analysis of Valerius' Jupiter figure, Delarue asserts that he is much closer to Ovid's fickle Jupiter, than to the just ruler of the universe portrayed by Virgil.

Antonio Río Torres-Murciano (10) analyses the form followed by Valerius Flaccus to address the history of Hylas, in agreement with the model of Apollonius. According to him (39-42), Valerius introduces into the traditional version of the episode a Virgilian image of Juno, hostile to Hercules, and indirectly suggests to the reader the identification of Hylas as a copy of Iulus in the *Aeneid*. However, this expectation is frustrated by the hunting disaster and death of the boy, a death which Valerius depicts with touches of the Ovidian Narcissus (42-4).

Valerius Maximus

1. C. Santini, "La storia di Cipus in Valerio Massimo e Ovidio", in S. Boldrini (ed.), *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte*, Urbino 1987, III, 291-8.
2. J.-Y. Guillaumin, "Les cornes de Cipus", in F. Galtier, Y. Perrin (eds.), Ars pictoris, ars scriptoris*: peinture, littérature, histoire. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Michel Croisille*, Clermont-Ferrand 2008, 163-71.

Carlo Santini (1) compares the story of Genucius Cipus in Valerius Maximus (5.6.3) and Ovid (*met.* 15.565-621). Both narrations are built on the central concept of *imperium domi – imperium militiae*, from whence come oppositions such as *rex / exul*, or *hostis /*

civis; the religious implications of the tale are also analysed. Focused on the same episode, although without quoting the previous work, Jean-Yves Guillaumin's chapter (2) draws attention to the fact that, unlike Valerius Maximus, Ovid does not focus on the Cipus' characteristics of political *pietas*, but on his regal aspirations.