

5610

Tp 493 p/1

A REVIEW OF

**“The Priepea and Ovid: A Study of the Language of the Poems”\***

BY R. B. STEELE



THE basis of the interpretation of the data presented is the practical equivalence of the works of Ovid (34,835 verses) and those of Tibullus, Catullus, Propertius, Lucretius, Horace and Vergil (35,029 verses). This is stated (p. 11): “Thus it can be seen that in many cases Ovid may be expected to use a word about as often as all the other poets together, and any marked deviation from this norm often possesses a significance that the careful student must take into account.”

Another statement (p. 19) is of the same import: “All other factors being equal, we should expect a given word to occur with about the same frequency in Ovid as in all the other poets together. Any considerable variation from this ratio of equality leads us to conclude that the word in question may justly be considered an Ovidian favorite.”

The data for some of the expressions, as *adriago* (68, 32) 1 Ov., 22 Verg., 0 al.; *nimirum* (10, 7) 2 Ov., 1 Verg., 6 Hor., 1 Prop., 2 Cat., 35 Lucr., 0 al.; and *incomptus* (1, 1) 2 Ov., 1 Verg., 3 Hor., 2 Prop., 0 al., indicate wide divergences in vocabulary, and invite to a consideration of the above fundamental proposition. Not only the number of occurrences for *incomptus*, but also its associations are worthy of notice. It occurs twice in both Ovid and Propertius with *capillis*, and also in Horace (Odes 1, 12, 41). It is also used with the physical equivalent *caput* (Ep. 5, 16). The *Priepea* shifts to *carminis*, and both Vergil and Horace have the equivalent *versibus* (Georg. 2, 386; A. P. 445 f.).

We shall divide the analysis of the data presented into the Quantitative and the Qualitative Phases of the question.

I. QUANTITATIVE PHASES

Expressed in the form of an equation for the vocabularies of the different authors considered,  $Ovid = \frac{Ovid}{34.85} (Tib) + \frac{Ovid}{15.1}$

$(Cat.) + \frac{Ovid}{9.1} (Prop.) + \frac{Ovid}{4.7} (Lucr.) + \frac{Ovid}{4.6} (Hor.) + \frac{Ovid}{2.7} (Verg.).$

The Visual Exhibit and Commentary for the elegiac poems (pp. 37-63) gives the mathematical data for individual words or collocations in the 196 elegiac verses in the

\* Richmond Frederick Thomason. Nashville, Tennessee, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1931. Pp. 100. 8°.

493p/1

Tp



139396

Priapea. The sum of the occurrences of these is approximately 10,000 for Ovid, and 5,000 for the other authors, or a ratio of approximately 2 to 1. However, this is merely the non-existent average for the widely differing ratios of individual words. These have a wide range, e.g. *verba* (68, 32) 317:110; *exemplum* (27, 6) 76:22; *imagine* (42, 3) 48:11; *crimen* (9, 13) 187:45; *mergo* (65, 1) 57:11; *forsitan* (3, 3) 78:13; *aequoreus* (9, 44) 41:3; *credibilis* (16, 3) and *vocatur* (68, 7) 19:1. In sharp contrast with these are some others, as *igitur* (1, 7) 82:137; *quia* (72, 1) 104 (?):175; *quoniam* (68, 35) 60:178), *invide* (3, 4) 12:16; *simplex* and *simpliciter* (3, 9) 12:20; *ineptus* (3, 8) 4:19; *crassus* (3, 10) 2:22; *adrigo* (68, 32) 1:22. These illustrations show the incalculable variability of occurrences in the mass, and the same can be shown for individual authors by an analysis of some individual poems. Scaurus, as recorded by Seneca Rhet. (Contr. 1, 2, 22), quoted "Ovidianum illud 'inepta loci'" (3, 8), yet the adjective, relative to length, is used more freely by four other poets (4 Ov., 10 Hor., 1 Tib., 3 Prop., 5 Cat.), and of the fifteen expressions for which the mathematical data are given only *forsitan* and *Latine* (4:0) distinctly favor Ovid. The data given for 8 terms in Pr. 43 distinctly favor Ovid only in the case of *uti viribus* (8 Ov., 1 Hor.). Of 38 terms in 68, sixteen relative to length favor Propertius.

The occurrences for Lucretius are noticeably few in comparison with those for Horace, and he has only a little less than 70 per cent of the words considered as has Propertius whose work is only one-half as long. This is a clear indication of variability in vocabulary for the individual poets, and this will be further shown by some noticeable examples. Although the sum of all occurrences may be the same, or approximately so, the following ten words illustrate the impossibility of calculating the occurrences for them individually.

	Ovid.	Tib.	Cat.	Prop.	Lucr.	Hor.	Verg.	sum
Hortus (1, 5) . . .	23	1	1	2		9	5	18
Ineptus (3, 8) . . .	4	1	5	3		10		19
Illud (9, 3) . . . .	57		5		29	12	6	52
Puella (13, 1) . . .	230	25	42	122	1	24	11	225
Nobilis (16, 2) . .	22		2	9		21	2	34
Terribilis (20, 6) . . . . .	20				2		9	11
Indignor (24, 3) .	23				4	3	11	18
Deliciae (27, 1) .	6		4	2			2	8
Instar (40, 4) . .	22		2		2	1	5	10
Mundus etc. (68, 7) . . . . .	6		4	3	1	9		17
	<hr/> 413	<hr/> 27	<hr/> 65	<hr/> 141	<hr/> 39	<hr/> 89	<hr/> 51	<hr/> 412

This uncertainty in the occurrence of words is also shown by *materia* (68, 19) "physical material" 11 *Ov.*, 78 *Lucr.*; *nimirum* (10, 7) 2 *Ov.*, 35 *Lucr.*; *quoniam* (68, 35) 60 *Ov.*, 136 *Lucr.* Other data also favor some other author than *Ovid*, e.g. (72, 4) "*Bracchia dare* (all forms): 3 *Ov.*, 1 *Priap.*, 1 *Aetna*, 2 *Verg.*, 2 *Hor.*, 1 *Prop.*, 0 al.," although the occurrences of *bracchia* are, 130 *Ov.* 55 al.; (72, 4) "*Macer* 0 *Ov.*, 1 *V.A.*, 3 *Priap.*, 4 *Hor.*, 4 al." On the basis of relative length the figures certainly favor *Horace* rather than *Ovid*. As the *Priapea* were written, not by all the poets under consideration, but possibly by some one, the work of *Horace*, as well as that of any of them, might be taken as the basis of extended comparisons, but we have taken that of *Propertius*, as it holds a midway position on the line of relative lengths. Of the 265 expressions for which numerical data are given, 169 or 62 per cent occur with as great or greater relative frequency in *Propertius* than in *Ovid*. A part of the detailed analysis of the mass is given under the following headings (pp. 13 ff.) :

	Ovid	Prop.
D. Extremely rare words occurring both in <i>Ovid</i> and the <i>Priapea</i> .....	43	27
E. Rare words occurring both in <i>Ovid</i> and the <i>Priapea</i> ..	32	18
F. Words in <i>Ovid</i> , the <i>Priapea</i> , and one other poet only.	28	5
G. The specifically <i>Ovidian</i> word in the exclusively <i>Ovidian</i> Phrase .....	51	8
H. Favorite words of <i>Ovid</i> occurring in the <i>Priapea</i> ....	23	22
I. Words drawn from the legal language.....	26	19

Words occurring not more than six times in all the poets excepting *Ovid* are classed as extremely rare, and those occurring not more than twelve times are classed as rare. One-half the first class are extremely rare for *Ovid* also, but a smaller number are rare. The 28 words under F, excluding *pedico*, occur relatively less frequently in *Ovid* than in *Propertius*, and the same is true for four out of five of the individual words, and the forms *perdiderim*, *-is* etc. (11 *Ov.*, 1 *Prop.*) are about evenly balanced. *Propertius* has all but *fecundus* of the favorite words of *Ovid* (H.), and three-fourths of the legal words (I.). The last examples are especially noticeable for, after a reference to the legal training of *Ovid*, it is stated (p. 20) :

"The following twenty-six words show well the juristic speech and reveal the police commissioner (*Trist.* iv, 10, 34) and the judge of many years' standing, who was later president of the centumviral court (*Trist.* ii, 93 ff.; *Pont.* iii, 5, 23; *Fast.* iv, 384)."

If we take into consideration the relative length of the work of *Ovid* and that of *Propertius*, 9.1 to 1, we must

conclude that the affirmative numerical data presented are not decisive in favor of Ovid as author of the *Priapea*, but leave the question still sub iudice.

If the equivalence of vocabularies is the basis of comparisons and freer usage favors Ovid, opposite conditions should have some weight against him, as in *Priapea* 10 *polio* (3:6), *vilicus* (1:3), *subinde* (0:2), *dolo* (0:3), *dicere mihi* (6:12), *nimirum* (2:45), *salsus* (1:36), and with these are found only *inguen* (19:13) and *rudis* (41:19) of a different balance. Propertius has 10 occurrences of *rudis*. A few individual words freely used by Ovid are especially noticeable: *Amica* (26:4), *amator* (23:8), *femina* (96:15), *puella* (230:122), *doctus* (58:21), *ocellus* (19:18) and *osculum* (119:13). In none of these would the multiplication of the number of occurrences in Propertius by 9.1 give the number for Ovid, nor would the division of the number in Ovid give the number for Propertius.

Professor Fairclough (T.A.P.A. 53 p. 15 ff.) has analyzed the poems of the Vergilian Appendix and given for each 100 lines the non-Vergilian element in the different poems: *Aetna* 20.8, *Culex* 21.25, *Ciris* 14.8, *Moretum* 54, *Copa* 65.8, *Dirae-Lydia* 16.3. There are in the elegiac *Priapea* nineteen words, five proper names, not in the received corpus of Ovid. This number is exclusive of the obscene terms. The inclusion of these, an essential part of the vocabulary of the *Priapea*, gives 29 or 14.8 per hundred lines, the same as the *Ciris*. The non-Ovidian element in the non-elegiac poems is much more noticeable, 107 not personal terms or 38.6 per hundred lines. *Priapea* 68 in its 38 lines, the same as the *Copa*, has eight non-Ovidian terms or 21 per hundred lines. More noticeable is Pr. 51 with its 28 lines showing 13 non-Ovidian terms or 46.5 per hundred lines. As negative terms are, theoretically at least, inversely proportional to length, decreasing as the length increases, the non-Ovidian element in the *Priapea* weighs much more against Ovid than any non-Vergilian element given by Professor Fairclough weighs against Vergil.

This non-Ovidian element enters into about 140 collocations, and in addition there is an uncounted number of others not found in Ovid, as 1, 1:

*Carminis incompti lusus lecture procaces,*

and 81, 2:

*Huc ades et nervis, tente Priape, fave.*

A good illustration is *pone supercilium* (1, 2, s. 2 Ov., 1 Hor.), an adaptation of the words of Horace (*Odes* 3, 10, 9),

both verse endings, the nouns differing only in the last syllable. For similar meanings Ovid has *ponere fastus* (Rem. 511; Met. 14,762). However, the searching out of these would add nothing definite to the discussion, as it would merely indicate that the grouping in the Priapea is not in Ovid. The number of Priapean words not in Propertius is twice as large as the non-Ovidian, and the non-Ciceronian is less than the latter for both the elegiac and the non-elegiac poems. This indicates that, exclusive of obscene terms, there is nothing peculiar about the vocabulary of the Priapea poems which is nearer to that of Cicero than to that of Ovid.

The word frequency is often used in the discussion, and that tacitly involves the question of ratios. An occurrence of some word four times in Ovid means that it occurs, theoretically, but once in a section nearly as long as the *Aeneid*. The occurrences of words in his works are not definitely proportional to the length of different sections, as can be illustrated by a few words chosen at random: *potestas* (Amatory 2, Met. 3), *potentia* (Am. 1, Met. 13, Late 5), *potens* (Am. 17, Met. 22, Late 11). The figures merely illustrate the fact that there is not a mechanical occurrence of words and that they cannot be calculated by mathematical processes. Because one writer took a certain word a certain number of times from the current vocabulary this gives no basis for a computation of the number of times the word is used by another author writing either more or less. This can be fairly illustrated by 110 words selected one from every tenth page of Wetmore's Index. Two of the words, *aenus* and *confringo* are not used by Ovid. Three, *canis* (28:67), *facies* (40:99), and *ira* (71:180), gave approximately the ratio of the length of the works of Vergil to those of Ovid (1:2.7). Sixteen occur the same or approximately the same number of times in both authors, as *demitto* (38:38), *ferrum* (123:122), *navis* (45:45). Twenty-nine are used by Vergil oftener than by Ovid, e.g., *acies* (73:14), *egregius* (23:3), *limen* (78:62), *rex* (151:75). In twenty-nine words the ratio falls below 2.7: *agnus* and *agna* (13:15), *antrum* (34:55), *mare* (73:105), *verto* (93:140). In the case of thirty-one the ratio rises above 2.7: *forma* (29:181), *prosum* (11:69), *turpis* (13:83), *vultus* (36:249). As the ratio is of no service in computing the occurrences of 97 per cent of 110 words it must be considered a nugatory factor in the determination of word occurrences, and the application of figures for this purpose brings

"No light, but rather darkness visible."

## II. QUALITATIVE PHASES

There is an application of the Zingerle-Eschenburg tests (J. p. 21 ff.) to show that the tests for Ovid apply also to the poems of the Priapea. Among these is a plentiful use of superlatives in -issimus, such as 27, 1 notissima (5 Ov., 1 Verg., 1 Prop., 2, 25, 3). Ficosissimus (41, 4) and fucosissimus (50, 2) do not occur in Ovid, and such superlatives giving the dactyl in the fifth foot are relatively more frequent in *Aen.* 1 than in *Met.* 1.

Of the forms in -bilis, nobilis (22 Ov., 21 Hor., 9 Prop.), terribilis (20 Ov., 9 Verg.), and miserabilis (34 Ov., 9 Verg.) quantitatively considered are not specifically Ovidian, and besides this, miserabile carmen (68, 15) is Vergil's phrase (Georg. 4, 514). Of the nouns in -tas the Priapea have commoditas (18, 1), Ovid three occurrences in his earlier works, and suavitas (69, 1), not in Ovid. With attached -que there are novitasque (80, 7), in Ovid *Met.* 3, 350, and siccitasque (69, 1), a word not used by Ovid. So far as novitas is concerned, it is used relatively much more freely by Lucretius than by Ovid (15: 16), but of the fifteen occurrences seven are in the fifth book. "Dactylic forms in -mina and -mine are immensely common in the later Ovid (Esch., p. 15)." Examples cited are libamine (2 Ov., 1 Verg.), and prurigine and tentigine not used by Ovid. This is a phase of the use of nouns increasing in the genitive, a feature noticeably observable in the Aratea of Cicero, and later in the works of Vergil. "Dactylic adjectives become very common in Ovid (Zingerle, p. 15)," but the Priapea poems have only luculenta (39, 6), not used by Ovid. "In the later technique the pentameter close is full of dactylic comparative forms, such as prosperiore lyra, utiliore cibo (Esch., p. 27)." The statement is equally true for the elegiac poems of Catullus. The phalaeceans and choliambi show 25 examples of forms in -osus, and the striking fact about these is that most of them are avoided by Ovid, one poem (36) furnishing comosus and pectorosior, and lacertosus used but once by him. Propertius has 31 adjectives in -osus. These features are not characteristic of Ovid alone, and present nothing decisive in regard to his authorship of the Priapea.

Eleven Ovidian Coinages are given (B. p. 12 f.); but to assert that they are such is to assume an answer to the question under discussion. If the Priapean poems were written before the works of Ovid he is not the coiner, but rather the appropriator, and the latter term may also apply to Ovid, as the user of words found in his works and the Priapea only (C. p. 13). Of the latter the new genitive

form in -ii, supercilii (49, 4), is the same and in the same position in the verse as imperii in Propertius (1, 6, 34) and gymnasii (4, 13, 2); cf. for same word ending verse supercilia, Catullus (67, 46).

The constructive part of the work is in the presentation of phrases common only to Ovid and the Priapea (K. p. 23 ff.). We give the tables showing the distribution of phrases among the various poets (III, p. 35; VI, p. 99), and also the quotient for the number in Ovid divided by the ratio of relative length to each author:

	A. III	No. Rel. Length	B. VI.	No. Rel. Length
Ovid	335		91	
Vergil	39	124	12	34
Horace	41	73	11	20
Tibullus	14	10	2	3
Catullus	11	22	2	6
Propertius	41	37	10	10
Lucretius	14	71	6	20

In A. Horace and Propertius are credited with the same number, although the work of the latter is only half as long, while Vergil has only two less. On the basis of relative length Ovid would have less than both Tibullus and Propertius. In B. Propertius has the same number as there would be in a section of Ovid equal in length, and nearly as many as Vergil and Horace. Leaving the numerically uncertain phases of the question, we turn to the 221 phrases in the elegiac part of the Priapea which are found only in Ovid among the poets of the Golden Age, and in these are not less than forty-eight full half verses or approximate half verses formed by such phrases and expressions. Good illustrations of these (p. 24) are *Sed ruber hortorum custos* (1, 5: *Fasti* 6, 333 At); *e tepida victima porcus hara* (65, 2: *Am.* 3, 13, 16 ex humili). However, there are numerous examples in which there is verbal identity, but not logical connection. Some illustrative examples of these will be given. The opening lines of the Priapea are:

*Carminis incompti lusus lecture procaces  
Conueniens Latio pone supercilium.*

There is given as a parallel *carminis lusus conueniens* from *Tristia* (5, 1, 5 f.):

*Flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen,  
Materiae scripto conueniente suae.  
Integer et laetus laeta et iuuenalia lusi.*

The theme of the latter is Vergil's (*Georg.* 4, 565):

*Carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,*

and the logic bears no relation to that of the Priapean lines. Other illustrations follow: *Qui raptus ab alite sacra* (3, 5): *alitibus rapere imperat* (*Fasti* 3, 807); *qui miscet amatori pocula* (3, 6): *pocula . . . porridge: rivalis misceat illa tuus?* (*A.A.* 2, 335 f.); 3, 7:

*Dum timet alterius vulnus inepta loci:*

*A.A.* 3, 455:

*Discite ab alterius vestris timuisse querelis;*

9, 6:

*Nec latet in tepido Palladis hasta sinu:*

*quo lateant Syrtes . . . sinu* (*Am.* 2, 11, 20); *hasta, Minerva, tua est* (20, 2): *Am.* 1, 7, 18:

*Procubuit templo, casta Minerva, tuo.*

21, 18:

*Indicio nec me prode, Priape, tuo:*

*A.A.* 3, 668:

*Mittor et indicio ab ipse meo.*

*Quaeque tibi posui . . . poma* (21, 3):

*Her.* 15, 183:

*Grata lyram posui tibi, Phoebe, poetria Sappho;*

*non stat in inguinibus mentula* (73, 2): *in obliquo missum stetit inguine ferrum* (*Met.* 5, 132); *tuos civis, Lampsace* (55, 6): *Tristia* 2, 204:

*Neve tuus possim civis ab hoste capi;*

*id.* 1, 10, 26:

*Et te ruricola, Lampsace, tuta deo.*

Ovid's mention of Lampsacus, a point on his route into exile, and of his own new political status are too far removed in point of time to be considered as having any bearing on the authorship of the Priapean line.

Another class includes examples with passages containing derivative words on the same base. The first is 1, 4:

*Nec quae de patrio vertice nata dea est:*

*Fasti* 3, 841 f.:

*An quia de capitis fertur sine matre paterni  
Vertice cum clipeo prosiluisse suo?*

Ovid has *patrio capiti* (Met. 14, 368), but not the direct *vertex*. Compare also *turpe quidem factu* (33, 5: t.q. dictu, Pont. 2, 3, 7) where *-tu* is all that the last words have in common. Some other illustrations of the class are: *contentus . . . Bacchus . . . racemo* (53, 1): *victa racemifero . . . Baccho* (Met. 15, 413); *curvos . . . ad lumbos* (51, 4): *sub incurvis . . . lumbis* (Met. 8, 804); *habuisset opus* (68, 10): *exhibuisset opus* (Ponto 3, 5, 22); *frondenti ramo . . . tegi* (68, 26): *fronde tegi* (Met. 1, 44); cf. *frondosus . . . ramus* (Met. 8, 410). The parallels are in Aen. 7, 67; 7, 135; and in the plural *ramis tegerem ut frondentibus aras* (Aen. 3, 25). Another good example is *obliquis . . . spectatis ocellis* (73, 1): *obliquantemque oculos* (Met. 7, 412). From the non-elegiac poems we select *Hercules lacertosus* (36, 2). Ovid uses the adjective but once in his 35,000 lines (Met. 11, 33), and the parallels cited have only the common noun *lacertos*. Of similar import is the note on *Penelopea* (68, 28) "*Penelopea* (Homeric form) and *Penelopeus*: 1 Ov., 1 Priap., 1 Cat. 0 al." Ovid has only the adjective form as is the case with *Taenaros* (75, 3) "*Taenaros*, *Taenaris* and *Taenarius*: 9 Ov., 1 *Priap.*, 1 Lygd., 1 Verg., 1 Hor., 2 Prop., 0 al. (noun *Taenaros* not in Ov.)." It may also well be questioned whether *Fasti* 3, 82:

*Vulcanum tellus Hypsipylea colit*

indicates any kinship with 85, 11:

*Tardo gratior aestuosa Lemnos,*

as Ovid has *Vulcania Lemnos* (Met. 3, 313), and *aestuosa* not at all.

Some of the phrases are commonplaces, as can be seen from their occurrence in Plautus or in Cicero, and it need not be assumed that there was any connection of the writer of the *Priapea* with these. Some may indicate influenced diction, but most words in question were taken from the same vocabulary current, and are expressive of the same or similar phases of activity.

The words of *Priapus* are frequently on the same plane as that of the characters of Plautus, as will be shown by the following illustrations taken from different parts of his works: The characters hail each other with *heus* and *heus tu* (45, 4; 52, 1), and the query *quid faciam* is not infrequent (3, 10; Epid. 255). There is a like appeal in *da veniam* (68, 2; Amph. 924; Cas. 1000), and the believable is expressed by *credibile est* (16, 3; Bacch. 616). *Fateor* 39, 5; Epid. 2) and *quod peto* (38, 4; Epid. 428) are both used. To speak *Latine* is desirable (10, 29; Poen. 1027),

and a rival (47, 3: Stich. 434) is not, but *deliciae populi* (27, 1: Most. 14) is the highest encomium. The *quaestus* of the meretrix is put to good use, *de quaestu libera facta suo est* (40, 2): *pro . . . nostro quaestu satis bene ornatae sumus* (Poen. 285). The effect of *una littera* is mentioned (7, 1: Rud. 1305; compare *syllaba* (67, 2: Epid. 121), and the *lanterna* also had a part (32, 14: Amph. 149; Aul. 566). Although not used by Ovid both *impudentia* (63, 17: Epid. 710) and *impudicus* (8, 2; Rud. 393) have a place. A few others will be mentioned: *adsero* (51, 7: Poen. 905), *excreo* (12, 9: As. 40), *divitior* (60, 2: Aul. 809), *famelicus* (70, 10: Cas. 130), *qui quoniam* (68, 35: Amph. 506). *Esse suam* (68, 14) is used several times in reverse order, e.g. *Curc. 488, hac lege* (68, 37: Asin. 166).

The vocabulary of Cicero more fully overlaps the vocabulary of the Priapean than does that of Ovid, and in it are some of the Priapean collocations, as *Latine dicere* (3, 10: ad Fam. 9, 22, 3); *una peccatur* (7, 1); *huc adde, non nimium* (49, 2: Q.F. 2, 7, 2); *si verum quaeras* (68, 20: ad Fam. 12, 8, 1 -is). The relative with *quoniam* is used as also *nec movet me* and with various forms of the verb. The feeling of Priapus, *me miserum* (56, 3), is the same as that of Ovid and of Cicero in exile, the latter also using *rem* and *res* with the adjective. Cicero has *versiculis duobus* as has Ovid. (*Her. 20, 238*) *v. scripta d. erit*, a slight variation from *versibus . . . s. d.e.* (5, 2). *Rogas ut in bonam partem accipias* is metrically expressed 2, 11:

In partem accipias bonam, rogamus.

*Terribilem* (56, 4) begins a verse (*de Div. 2, 30, 63*), and *umbilicum . . . terrarum* (*id. 2, 56, 115*) appears as *orbis umbilicum* in a similar connection (76, 5). The proverbial *ut aegroto, dum anima est, spes esse dicitur* (*ad Att. 9, 10, 3*) is in briefer compass 80, 9 *dum vivis, sperare decet*. Another good illustration of the kinship of poetry and Cicero's rhythmical prose is *tibi commendo in primisque ipsum* (*ad Fam. 13, 30, 1*) and *tibi . . . commendo in primisque patrem* (*Catalepton 8, 3 and 5*).

Taking these as illustrations of an incidental overlapping of a smaller by a larger vocabulary, we may safely hold that it is the same in many cases with the vocabulary of Ovid and the Priapea. The possibility of this is involved in the assumption of the equivalence of vocabularies, for if the poems belong in the mass that is not Ovid's, unimportant identities would fall into the same class as those in the work of Propertius and that of other poets. As illustrations of unimportant equivalence we give *cum liquor* (7, 1),

quaere cur (9, 2), deus habet (10, 10), arma ponit (27, 3), mihi credite (43, 3) and da veniam (68, 2). Illustrations of other classes of words are digitis . . . meis (55, 2), vir meus (68, 26).

Phrases occurring in the Priapea and also in some other part of the two appendixes (M., p. 31) number sixteen for the Vergilian and eight for the Tibullan. But twelve of these, one-half the entire number, do not appear in Ovid, and five are used relatively more frequently by some other author. The data for the non elegiac poems (p. 71 f.) are similar, both for the non-recurring elements in Ovid and the fewness of occurrences of the others. There are given thirty-seven phrases in the Priapea (p. 33) which occur once or twice, and are quite frequent in Ovid (usually three or more times). But only *volnera dare* (13 Ov., 1 Verg.), *utetur viribus* (8 Ov., 1 Hor.), *tu quicumque* and *et olim* (often Ov., 1 Hor.), *potui placere* (7 Ov., 1 Hor.), and *me miserum* (47 Ov., 2 Prop.) favor Ovid.

### III. LITERARY CONNECTIONS

In this section numerous equivalents in diction will be given, some of them forceful enough to indicate that they were taken from the Priapea or vice versa. Others are incidental samenesses, especially those cited to show the overlapping of the vocabulary of Tibullus and Propertius by that of Ovid.

#### 1. CATULLUS

In the expression of sensuousness and sensuality the Priapean poems are akin to Catullus, as 16, 1 and 14:

*Pedicabo ego vos et inrumabo,*

the verbs of which are worked, twice each, into Pr. 35. Two separated lines, Cat. 35, 7 and 5, 13, are joined and varied in Pr. 52, 11 f.:

*Quare, si sapiet, viam vorabit,  
Cum tantum sciet esse basiorum:*

*Quare qui sapiet malum cavebit,  
Cum tantum sciet esse mentularum.*

The words of the Priapea (3, 6 ff.) *amatori . . . quod virgo cupido dat . . . marito, dum timet . . . inepta* seem to have been suggested by Catullus (70, 3) *sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti*, and (17, 2) *vereris inepta*. To the same source are *due misella* (78, 5: Cat. 35, 14; 0 Ov.), *procreare* (37, 2: Cat. 60, 3; 1 Ov.), *femina nulla* (18, 2: Cat. 69, 1), *nec movet*

me (55, 3: Cat. 12, 12), me prodere (21, 2: Cat. 30, 22), pro officiis (82, 3: Cat. 68, 150). Words are sometimes in reverse order, as cymbalum . . . tympanum (Cat. 63, 21: 27, 3 f. pl.) fronde vireret (Cat. 64, 293: 25, 2) and adde huc (Cat. 68, 5: 63, 9). There are occasional adaptations and variations, as pertundo tunicam (Cat. 32, 11): pulset umbilicum (23, 6); mentula magna minax (Cat. 115, 8): falce minax et parte tui maiore (30, 1); insulsissimus est homo (Cat. 17, 12): insulsissima . . . puella (10, 1); pedicare cupis (Cat. 21, 4): p. volo (38, 3); patente porta (Cat. 15, 18) porta . . . patentiorem (52, 5); hinc abite, lymphae (Cat. 27, 5): 8, 1:

Matronae procul hinc abite castae.

Other pieces are taken over bodily, or with little change, e.g. satis superque (Cat. 7, 2: 77, 11); pessimi poetae (Cat. 14, 23 et al.: 61, 13); mollior . . . anseris medullula (Cat. 25, 1, f.: 64, 1 medulla); non assis facis (Cat. 42, 13: 8, 3 faciunt); manusque tollens (Cat. 53, 4: 12, 6); quae quoniam (Cat. 64, 198: 68, 35 qui); quod quondam (Cat. 68, 111: 26, 9 qui). Pudet fateri (Cat. 6, 5) has the same position as turpe fateri (55, 1), and (deo) tardo shortens tardipedi deo (Cat. 36, 7). The words of Catullus (68, 127) mordenti . . . rostro may be taken as fixing the text for 65, 1 rostro . . . lilia morsit, and Catullus fr. 2 as furnishing the suggestion for Lampsace (55, 6) and for ostreosa (75, 13) from ostriosior. Alliterative devices are a common feature, as pretio puella parvo (34, 2), and 52, 7:

Pulcre pensilibus peculiati:

Catullus 64, 351 Putrida . . . pectora palmis; 15, 18 f. pedibus patente porta Percurrent.

## 2. TIBULLUS

The description of Priapus, ruber hortorum custos (1, 5: Fasti 6, 333) has its equivalent in Tibullus (1, 1, 17) ruber custos ponatur in hortis, also e tepida victima porcus hara (65, 2; Am. 3, 13, 16 ex humili) and in e plena rustica porcus hara (1, 10, 26). Poenas luere (5 Ov., 1 Verg., 1 Hor. Priap. 51, 3; 67, 4) is used by Tibullus (1, 2, 80), and also poena manet (1, 8, 77: 13, 2). The finite form of oculo (1, 2, 37: 9, 5), and conspiciendus (1, 2, 70: 2, 3, 52: 39, 2) are rare, while oscula dare is common (55 Ov., 5 Tib., 5 Prop., Priap. 43, 2). Initial monosyllables with -que attached, a feature noticeable in Ovid, are occasionally used by Tibullus, as perque (1, 3, 38; 1, 4, 25), bisque (1, 3, 31), statue (1, 6, 49), utque (1, 7, 19), postque (1, 10, 24).

Two words forming the last half of the pentameter, as *surripuere meis* (55, 2) and *edidicique notas* (68, 4) occur occasionally in Propertius, but frequently in Tibullus. Infinitives in *-uisse* occur most freely, as *secubuisse boves* (1, 1, 30). There is also an occasional perfect indicative with *-que* attached, as *composuitque luto* (1, 1, 40), or without, as *incoluistis avi* (1, 10, 10).

Two of the above passages may have been written by Ovid, and an analysis of Tibullus 1, 7, 30 ff. shows the same possibility, on the basis of similar passages. At least one line (51) may be Ovidian.

30. *Et teneram ferro sollicitavit humum: t. . . h.* (Am. 3, 5, 16); cf. *bello sollicitare Iovem* (Fasti 5, 40).  
 31, 33. *Primus . . . docuit: Am.* 2, 11, 1.  
 32. *Pomaque non notis legit ab arboribus: lecturum poma* (Met. 14, 650); *non notis* (Her. 7, 16). A part of this work is assigned by Ovid to Ceres: Am. 3, 10, 11 ff.):

*Prima Ceres docuit turgescere semen in agris  
 Falce coloratas subsecuitque comas,  
 Prima iugis tauros supponere colla coegit  
 Et veterem curvo dente revellit humum.*

This has *falce . . . comas*, Tibullus *falce comam* and *subsecuisse manu* in the following poem (12).

- 35 f. *Matura . . . Expressa . . . uva pedibus: u. . . m.* (Met. 3, 484; 13, 795 rev; Rem. 189); *c. pressa bis uva pede* (Tristia 4, 6, 20).  
 37. *Voces inflectere: cf. flectit . . . vocem* (Am. 2, 4, 25); *nec vocibus . . . flectitur* (Met. 11, 399 f.).  
 41. *Requiem . . . affert: Met.* 12, 146.  
 42. *Crura . . . compede: compedibus. . . c.* (Am. 2, 2, 47); *crura . . . sonent: cf. tura . . . sonent* (Tristia 4, 2, 4).  
 44. *Levis aptus amor: Her.* 3, 42; Fasti 4, 100.  
 45. *Sed varii flores et frons redimita corymbis: v. F.* (Am. 3, 5, 9; Met. 10, 123); *f. r.* (Fasti 6, 321); *corymbis* same position (Met. 3, 665).  
 46. *Ad teneros . . . pedes: A.A.* 2, 534; *t. . . p.* (Her. 16, 66); Fasti 1, 410.  
 47. *Tibia cantu: Am.* 3, 13, 11.  
 48. *Conscia . . . sacris: Met.* 6, 588.  
 49. *Huc ades: Ovid* four or five times; *choreis: choreas* (Met. 14, 520).  
 50. *Multo tempora funde mero: m. . . m.* (Rem. 806); *fundat . . . merum* (A.A. 2, 695 f.).

51. Nitido stillent unguenta capillo: coronatis stillant unguenta capillis (Her. 20, 161). Nitida regularly with coma in Ovid.
52. Mollia sarta: Fasti 5, 340.
53. Tibi dem turis honores: Tristia 2, 76; cf. Met. 14, 128 tribuam tibi turis honorem.
54. Liba . . . dulcia melle feram: liba ferunt (Fasti 2, 642); dulcior . . . melle (Ponto 5, 4, 29 f.).
55. Facta parentis: Tristia 2, 168.
58. Antiquo . . . Lare: Tristia 4, 8, 22 pl.
59. Opibus congesta: congestas . . . opes (Fasti 4, 618).
60. Apta iungitur: apte iungitur (Am. 2, 17, 21 f.).
61. Te . . . e magna cum venerit urbe: te quod venias magnam . . . in urbem (Tristia 1, 1, 59); cf. Ponto 4, 5, 7; magnae . . . urbis (4, 5, 20).
62. Inoffensum rettuleritque pedem: abl. (Tristia 3, 4, 33 rev.); acc. plu. Am. 1, 6, 8); refero . . . pedem (Tristia 2, 16, et al.).
63. Multos celebrande per annos: Ponto 3, 2, 65; celebranda 2 Ovid.
- 63 f. Natalis . . . candidior semper candidiorque veni: cf. Natalis . . . Candidus huc venias (Tristia 5, 5, 13 f.).

The parallelisms indicated are the result of the incidental overlapping of vocabularies in presenting similar themes, or else of direct imitation. Whichever one is assumed it will apply equally well to the relation of the vocabulary of the *Priapea* and that of Ovid.

### 3. PROPERTIUS

Propertius has the new genitive form -ii at end of pentameters in imperii 1, 6, 34, and gymnasii 4, 13, 2, and these, so far as form is concerned, may in time precede or follow supercillii (49, 4). He also has ligamine (3, 27, 15) in the same position as libamine (70, 7). Sine is in the fourth foot (5, 4, 53; 5, 11, 45 and 79), and sine fraude (5, 7, 63; 6, 4) as in the *Priapea* (p. 22). Notissima occurs (3, 20, 3; 27, 1). Of the adjectives in -osus Propertius has thirty-one. Forms in -ine (rubigine and molimine 3, 20, 15; 17), and the abl. sing. and neuter acc. of nouns like corpora and latera are not infrequently placed in the fifth foot. The ending esse suam occurs (68, 14). This poem has as pentameter endings the following possessive pronouns, sua (16), tuo (28) and meus (36). Propertius has nearly 200 similar endings in the pentameter, a number of them preceded by esse, as suam (1, 3, 30); mea (1, 21, 10; 5, 3, 2; 5, 11, 92); tuum (5, 5, 36; 5, 6, 76; 5, 11, 78).

Ten of the thirty-seven phrases occurring in Ovid and in one other poet (p. 33 f.) are used by Propertius, indicating that they were the common property of poets. Some other collocations, e.g. *privignum . . . Phaedrae* (19, 6: 2, 1, 51 f.), and *ianua clausa*, together (65, 4; Prop. 3, 17, 12; 5, 9, 62: Ovid Rem. 506) may be taken as independent statements, as also *invida barba* (3, 4 pent.): *invida turba* (4, 1, 21 hexam.).

The result of one vocabulary overlapping another can be seen in a comparison of the vocabulary of Propertius, 3, 12 (19), with that of Ovid.

1. *Me invito: invita te* (Ponto 4, 1, 22); *discedis . . . Roma*: cf. *discedens Urbe* (Ponto 1, 4, 47).
2. *Devia rura coles*: Met. 1, 676; Fasti 2, 369; *rus colere* (Tristia 5, 10, 23).
4. *Non sinat esse: non sinit . . . esse* (Ponto 4, 8, 25); *teque probam* (Am. 3, 14, 14).
6. *Clamatae: clamato* (Met. 14, 397).
7. *Sola eris* (beg.): Tristia 1, 9, 6 end.
8. *Pauperis agricolae: pauperis agri* (Fasti 5, 515 same position).
9. *Poterunt corrumpere*: Her. 4, 165; Tristia 2, 301 same position.
11. *Tauros . . . arantes: araturis . . . bubis* (A.A. 3, 120); *bubus aras* (Her. 5, 116).
12. *Ponere falce comas: falce . . . comas* (Am. 3, 10, 12); *pone . . . comas* (1, 7, 68).
13. *Feres . . . tura sacello*: often in Ovid; *inferre sacello* (Fasti 1, 629).
16. *Externo . . . viro*: Her. 16, 310; 10, 98 acc. plu.
17. *Ipsa ego*, characteristic of Ovid: see Radford A.J.P. 44, 337.
- 17 f. *Sacra . . . suscipere*: Ovid four times.
23. The attitude of Propertius *Haec igitur mihi sit . . . audacia* is akin to that of Ovid *est mihi . . . impetus ire feras* (Her. 4, 38); cf. *ire sues* (22), and *hortari . . . canes* with *monere canes* (20).
26. *Niveos abluit unda boves: abluit unda* (Met. 4, 740); *boves niveos* (Ponto 4, 4, 31).
27. *Vita* is also the endearing epithet used by Ovid (Am. 2, 15, 21).
28. *Paucis . . . Luciferis*: cf. *tres luciferos* (Fasti 3, 877); and *tot Luciferi* (2, 568).
29. *Nec solae . . . silvae: sola non . . . silva* (Met. 2, 489).

30. Vaga . . . flumina: cf. vaga fulmina (Met. 1, 596).

31. Mutem tua nomina: nomina mutarunt (Fasti 6, 550).

#### 4. HORACE

The declaration (68, 18):

Principium sacri carminis illa fuit,

has a parallel in Sat. 2, 6, 22 f. tu carminis esto Principium, cf. tu Priapus esto (10, 5), and Ep. 2, 2 gives the philosophical value of the Iliad and Odyssey which the writer of the Priapea presents as a burlesque of the mentula type. There is the same touch in tentigine rumpi (Sat. 1, 2, 118: 23, 4 f.; 33, 5) and a similar one in tenta . . . praecordia (Ep. 17, 26) and mentula tenta (73, 2). The line (33, 6):

Falce mihi posita fiet amica manus,

and Odes 1, 16, 26 ff. dum mihi Fias recantatis amica Opprobriis are similar in composition, each having an ablative absolute and amica with a form of fieri. The same or equivalent collocations are scattered here and there: Ditesque Mycenae (Odes 1, 7, 9: 75, 2 sing.); nil maius . . . ipso (1, 12, 17): non . . . aliud . . . maius eo (80, 4); poenas luam (Ep. 17, 37: 51, 3 rev.); sibi damno (Sat. 1, 2, 52: 80, 5 damno nobis); esse suo (1, 6, 90: 68, 14 suam); inutile lignum, same position (1, 8, 1: 73, 3); crassa Minerva (2, 2, 3: 3, 10); des veniam (2, 4, 5: 48, 2 da); doctus eris (2, 4, 19 begins line: 71, 2 ends); turpe . . . fateri (Ep. 2, 1, 82 f.: 55, 1). The Priapea have novitasque (80, 7) and siccitasque (61, 8), see p. 22, as Horace libertasque (Ep. 2, 1, 147). Inempta poma (23, 2) and dapes inemptas (Ep. 2, 48) are akin. The verb albico, not in Ovid (76, 1 f.):

. . . meumque canis  
Cum barba caput albicet capillis,

may have been suggested by Horace (Odes 1, 4, 4):

Nec prata canis albicant pruinis.

Horace mentions pudor and novitas as desirable elements (Ep. 2, 1, 80 and 90), and (Sat. 1, 2, 52 f.) has the expression nec sibi damno . . . foret. These are combined (80, 7):

Sed potuit damno nobis novitasque pudorque  
Esse, repellendus saepius iste mihi.

lalage appears in the Priapea (4, 3) as in Horace (Odes 1, 22, 10 and 23), and the one may have been a suggestion for the other. Inutile lignum applied to Priapus (73, 3) is

brought over from Horace (Sat. 1, 8, 1), and *quod petis* (Ep. 2, 2, 74: cf. ad 38, 4) has the relative and verb unseparated. Both *sine fraude* (C.S. 41: 6, 4) and *opem ferre* (A.P. 461: 37, 8 rev.) are used. The alliteration in the positive terms (37, 12): *Compar consimilisque concolorque*, is in strong contrast with that in the negative ones *dispar . . . atque discolor* (Ep. 1, 18, 3).

### 5. VERGIL

"Vollmer compares *quis erit modus* (26, 1) with *Ecl.* 10, 28, but it is also in *Trist.* v, 1, 35 f." (p. 96). However, it is a compact Vergilian touch (*Aen.* 4, 98) with *nam forsed*, and in this respect differs from Ovid's:

*"Quis tibi, Naso, modus lacrimosi carminis?" inquis:  
Idem, fortunae qui modus huius erit.*

If it be held that Ovid has here reworked an earlier statement, the same must be admitted for Vergil in *Aen.* 12, 206 ff.:

*"Ut sceptrum hoc"—dextra sceptrum nam forte gerebat—  
"Numquam fronde levi fundet virgulta nec umbras,  
Cum semel in silvis imo de stirpe recisum,"*

and 25, 1 f.:

*Hoc sceptrum quod ab arbore ut recisum est,  
Nulla iam poterit virere fronde.*

The last phrase drops one letter from the phrase of Catullus (64, 293) while Ovid varies to *fronde virentem* (*Met.* 11, 108). The variations in *Aen.* 7, 296 f.: 74, 1 are noticeable: *medias acies mediosque per ignes Invenere viam*:

*Per medios ibit pueros mediasque puellas.*

The phrase *forsitan olim* (3, 3) at the end of the line, occurs at the beginning (*Tristia* 3, 7, 27) and is a variation from *forsan et . . . olim* (*Aen.* 1, 202). *Quondam nunc* are arranged in *chiasmus* (77, 12: *Aen.* 6, 448), while the invocation *ades . . . fave*, in Ovid also (*Am.* 2, 13, 21), is a variation from *adsis . . . favens* (*Georg.* 1, 18), and is strengthened in *adsis . . . firmes* (*Aen.* 8, 78). "Sine in the fourth foot of the hexameter is one of the Zingerle-Eschenburg tests" (9, 1), the position it has in 14 of 36 occurrences in Vergil, beginning with *Georg.* 3, 99 and in ten books of the *Aeneid*. The addition of *-que* to monosyllables (68, 30) was not unpracticed by Vergil, e.g. *tuque* (*Aen.* 12, 777), *idque* (12, 28), *eque* (*Ecl.* 7, 13), *inque sinum* (*Aen.* 7, 346), *perque* (11, 695 bis), *proque* (10, 82),

iamque (12, 479 bis), dumque (8, 34). The accumulation of comparatives (32, 1 ff.) aridior . . . pallidior, and (46, 1 ff.) candidior . . . morbosior . . . brevior . . . asperior pilosiorque, has a model in candidior . . . formosior . . . amarior. . . horridior (Ecl. 7, 38 ff.). Poma is associated with Alcinous (60, 1 f.; Georg. 2, 87; Am. 1, 10, 56; Ponto 4, 2, 10) and is as much Vergilian as Ovidian, and the same is true of Erigone (1 Ov., Georg. 1, 33), while Vergil has Sirius (62, 2) three times, Ovid not at all. The Telethusa of the Priapea (19, 1; 40, 1) is not the Telethusa of Ovid (Met. 9, 681; 695), and Vergil's Arethusa (Georg. 4, 351) may have suggested the name for the Priapea. It is worth noticing that the characterization of her affinity, Quintia, deliciae populi (27, 1) is slightly changed from that of Alexis d. domini (Ecl. 2, 2), but is kept at the beginning of the verse, as if this would be a key to its source.

There are a number of collocations, either in the same or in reverse order, as if one mind had framed the setting: Miscet . . . pocula (3, 5) : p. . . miscuit (Georg. 1, 9) ; custodem fecundi . . . horti (24, 5) : the opposite in custos es pauperis horti (Ecl. 7, 34) ; pro quibus (27, 5) : pro quo (Aen. 3, 604) ; cuius . . . pars (37, 9) : quorum pars (Aen. 2, 5) ; cingit . . . corona (40, 2) : cinxere corona (Aen. 10, 122; 11, 475) ; utetur viribus (43, 4) : v. usus (Aen. 8, 441) ; humi fusos (51, 18 line end) : fusos humi (Aen. 6, 423 line beginning) ; frondenti ramo (68, 26 : Aen. 7, 67; 3, 25 pl. rev; 7, 135) ; iam senior (76, 1 : Aen. 6, 304 et al.).

Other collocations may be taken as variational expressions: Carminis incompti (1, 1) : versibus incomptis (Georg. 2, 385) ; tectum . . . vestibus (1, 7) : veste tegens (Aen. 9, 488), incurva falce (11, 2) : procurvam . . . f. (Georg. 2, 421) ; adducta . . . manu (27, 4) : a. . . la-certo (Aen. 9, 402) ; movet gressus (36, 7) : tulit gressum (Aen. 6, 677) ; summi numinis instar (40, 4) ; magnique ipse agminis instar (Aen. 7, 707), victima porcus (65, 2) : taurus Victima (Georg. 2, 146 f.).

A few individual words are more Vergilian than Ovidian, as praetendo (9, 11) 9 Ov., 9 Verg.; sutilis (20, 3) 1 Ov., 2 Verg.; germen (61, 6) 1 Ov., 2 Verg. The non-Ovidian wish rumpatur (23, 5) is in slightly different form in invidia rumpantur ut ilia Codro (Ecl. 7, 27). Collocations such as novitasque pudorque (80, 7) with -que -que appear in the Eclogues (6, 2) Faunosque ferasque videres, occasionally in the Georgics, and are a marked feature in the Aeneid.

The non-Vergilian element is only about 25 per cent larger than the non-Ovidian for the elegiac poems, and

30 per cent for poems in other meters. These are less than we should expect for masses of poetry of such different length, and if we should assume Vergilian authorship for the poems of the Appendix there would be but little difference in the non-recurring elements. But judged on such a basis, either with or without the poems of the Appendix, the vocabulary of the Vergilian poems is nearer to that of the Priapea than is the Ovidian vocabulary.

## 6. LIVY, PETRONIUS, COLUMELLA

### Priapea 69:

Praedictum tibi negare possis:  
Si fur veneris, impudicus exis,

begins with a variation of the words of Livy (2, 29, 1) *ne praedictum negetis*, which are used in a far different connection. In the same way the words *nec movet amissi tam me iactura . . . quam* (55, 3) are used by Trimalchio (Petronius 30) *non tam iactura me movet quam*. The passive is found (117) *nec illum iactura moveri*. As we should expect in the vocabularies of two writers working in similar fields, there are other parallel statements. The rhetorical repetition of a name instead of using a pronoun, as in 37, 6:

Ut Phoebo puta filioque Phoebi

is found in the similar line (Petron. 109, 8):

Phoebo pulchrior et sorore Phoebi;

cf. *soror . . . Phoebi* (1, 3; fr. 34, 1). Two products mentioned in Pr. 51 are the same, *sorbum* (10: 135 pl.) and *nucem . . . abellanam* (12: 137 pl.). *Oscula dare* is of common occurrence, *uti viribus* is the same (43, 4: 108), and the manner is the same in *obliquis . . . ocellis* (73, 1) and *o. oculis* (113). Some unusual activities are the same, as *praetendo* (1, 7: 108; 8 Ov., 9 Verg. 0 al.), and *spatians* (16, 3: 126; 7 Ov., 0 al.). *Quod peto* with short *o* (38, 4) is in a pentameter line as *quae peto* (fr. 34, 2).

## 7. MANILIUS

Manilius freely uses material from the poems of the Appendix, and there is a possibility at least that he may have been helped in some places by the Priapea. *Principiumque* begins the line (68, 18) and also *Tristia* 3, 6, 26; *Fasti* 4, 29; 4, 360; 6, 552; but within the line A.A. 1, 712. It also has the initial position in Manilius (1, 617; 4, 352; 5, 735). Similar beginnings are *imperiumque* (1, 912);

ingeniumque (4, 902), dimidiumque 3, 366), naufragiumque (4, 126) indicating a well established usage for Manilius. Sine is in the fourth foot (9, 1) and also in Manilius. Spatiantem (16, 3) has the same position in M. 1, 17, and in each passage is construed with the ablative. Imposuit (16, 8) begins the line, as in M. 1, 338; 4, 208; 4, 695; 4, 905. Subducti . . . supercilii (49, 4) has the participle as in subducto . . . cultu (1, 393).

The association of Bacchus with Ceres (53) has racemo . . . musta in successive lines while Manilius (3, 663) has musta racemis together, the latter word for foliis (Georg. 1, 297). Final pudorque (55, 3: M. 5, 554) is an ending as in Met. 7, 72; 8, 327. Ibit (25, 6; 5, 352; 5, 396; 471; 482). Notice ingenio . . . corpore (80, 6) and a similar contrast M. 2, 615. Ad exemplum . . . dei 4, 895 for which Ovid has deorum thrice. The line (22, 1):

Femina si furtum faciet mihi virve puerve;

and Ponto 4, 9, 96:

Femina de nobis virve puerve queri

(cf. Tristia 2, 501:

Nubilis hos virgo matronaque virque puerque);

resemble M. 4, 584:

Frater erit, dulcisve soror, materve duorum.

## 8. COLUMELLA

Priapea 51 has seventeen terms connected with the garden. Of these Ovid has eight, while Columella 10 has all but amygdalum, pirum and sorbum, the last two elsewhere, as also the feminine amygdala. Some items are set forth in the same or similar way: brassicarum . . . caules (14): caule Brassica (325); 16:

Crescens semper in suum caput porrum:

167:

Nunc capitis porri longo resoluta capillo;

cucurbitas . . . ocimumve cucumeresque humi fusos (19 f.): intortus cucumis . . . cucurbita (380; 234); ocima (319); acresque caepas (22): lacrymosaque caepa (123); salaces . . . erucas (20): eruca salax (372); mentamque olentem cum salubribus rutis (21): menta (119) with the description of ruta expanded to a line:

Rutaque Palladiae baccae victura saporem.

We find elsewhere *aequoreo . . . deo* (9, 4): *pater aequoreus* (200). The artistic touch in Priap. 10, ending

*Sed lignum rude vilicus dolavit,*

is varied by Columella (30), and continues with *sed truncum fore dolatum . . . numen . . . terribilis membri . . . qui . . . inguinibus . . . falce minetur*. Compare with the last phrase, *falce minax* (30, 1) and for the remainder *me terribilem fuste Manus sine arte rusticae dolaverunt* (63, 9 f.; see 20, 6; 56, 4), and *inguinibus* (10, 4). There is a similar association in 62, 2:

*Cum sibi dilecta Sirius Erigone,*

to that in 400:

*Cum canis Erigone flagrans Hyperionis aestu,*

and also in 75, 10-12 *Cyllene . . . Hennaee* and 266-270 *Cyllenes . . . Ennaei*. The calculation based on *syllaba* (67) resembles that based on *littera* (251). There are a few other perhaps incidental identities, as in 49, 2:

*Non nimium casti carmina plena ioci:*

*plena iocis* (280); *nimium . . . plena* (102); and *manipli* (46, 8: 315).

As Columella announced that his plan was to supplement the work of Vergil, it is a safe inference that the above items were introduced by him as having a proper place among the other Vergilian items given.

## 9. LUCAN

The line (40, 4):

*Nunc pathicae summi numinis instar habent,*

and one in Lucan (1, 196 f.):

*Vestalisque foci summique O numinis instar,  
Roma*

are similar, the insertion of *-que O* changing the pentameter into a hexameter, or the omission making the opposite change. However, the Priapean statement has the ending of the words of Cicero *minimi momenti instar habent* (*de Off.* 3, 3, 11) with a change in the first part from the least to the greatest. We can then fairly hold that the Priapean writer modified the words of Cicero, and that his words were in turn modified by Lucan.

## 10. SENECA

There are scattered through the later works of Seneca short reminiscences of Vergil, without any suggestion as to their source, as *innoxius tactu* (N. Q. 3, 12, 2: Aen. 2, 683); *longo circuitu* (Ep. 71, 4: Aen. 3, 412 f.); *facilis victu* (Ep. 90, 13: Aen. 1, 445); *dis aliter visum* (Ep. 98, 4: Aen. 2, 428). The question *quis nos fessos tot malis portus excipiet?* (N.Q. 5, 18, 7) may be a combination of *portus* (Aen. 3, 707) and *excipit* . . . *fessos* (5, 41), as if the two were once parts of one scene. *Circulatrix*, used in the *Priapea* and by Martial may have been a suggestion for a similar and unusual use of the verb *circular*. However this may be, the apparent use of some passages by Seneca is especially noticeable. The first is 36, 1: Ep. 68, 7:

*Notas habemus quisque corporis formas:  
Nota habet quisque corporis vitia.*

We consider it impossible that two sentences of five words each, both referring to the body, should have the same adjective, verb, pronoun and noun in the same order, unless there has been careful imitation by one writer. The others involve the use of Homeric material, *si quid credis Homero* (80, 5): *si Homero fides est* (N. Q. 6, 26, 1); cf. *si Thaleti credis* (id. 4, 2, 22). The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are mentioned (68, 17: Ep. 88, 40):

*Nobilis hinc nata nempe incipit Ilias ira,  
Principium sacri carminis illa fuit.  
Altera materia est error fallentis Ulixi:*

*utraque materia consummata, et Odyssea et Iliade, principium adiecisse.* In the latter the order of *principium* and *materia* and the names of the works are reversed. *Propero* is used to express the action of Ulysses (68, 27: Ep. 66, 26).

## 11. MARTIAL

At many points there are indications of Martial's use of material from well known predecessors, as well as from the *Priapea* expressed in non-Ovidian words. In addition to these his personal attitude is the same as that indicated in the latter. He gives his personal experience with *notavi* (2, 71, 1), as does the *Priapea* (2, 1), sets forth his own views with *puto*, and appeals to his readers with *crede mihi, da veniam*, and *desine* construed with the infinitive. His exhibitions, though differing in kind, are located in the *magnus Circus* (27, 1: 6, 64, 12). In addition to these touches there is a free use of *Priapean* material as is shown in the following pages.

Martial wrote Priapean poems, among others 6, 49, which will be given in full with references to words in the Priapea which are used in the same way:

Non sum de fragili dolatus ulmo,  
 Nec quae stat (cf. 10, 8) rigida (4, 1; 45, 1) supina vena (33, 2)  
 De ligno (cf. 6, 1. 10, 4) mihi quolibet (14, 9) columna (10, 8) est,  
 Sed viva generata de cupressu  
 Quae nec saecula (57, 2) centiens peracta (70, 4; 34, 4)  
 Nec longae cariem (57, 1) timet senectae (61, 4 -us)  
 Hanc tu, quisquis es (14, 2) O malus, timeto (3, 8; 66, 3)  
 Nam si minimos manu rapaci (52, 1)  
 Hoc de palmite laeseris racemos (53, 1)  
 Nascetur, licet (24, 3) hos velis (82, 4) negare  
 Inserta tibi ficus (51, 5) a cupressu.

Priapea 68, 10 presents the *mentula* as a literary theme, and Martial follows the suggestion, e.g. 1, 35, 3 and 5 *hi libelli*. . . Non possunt sine *mentula* placere; 3, 69; 2:

Inque tuis nulla est *mentula* carminibus.

He also uses the term literally, as 7, 9, 14:

Cetera lascivis donavit poma puellis  
*Mentula* custodis luxuriosa dei.

The location of the *custos* is the same, 24, 1:

Hic me *custodem* fecundi vilicus horti;

3, 68, 9:

*Custodem* medio statuit quam vilicus horto.

Martial makes use of several personal terms which had already been used in the Priapea. Alcinous instead of Atalalus is taken as the typical rich man, but in apples, *si . . . tot haberes poma . . . Esses antiquo ditior Alcinoos* (60, 2). He is mentioned again *Alcinoi filia* (68, 25). Martial (7, 42, 6) mentions his *poma*, and (4, 64, 29) his *penates*. The daughter, *Nausicaa*, is spoken of as carrying the apples, and Martial declares (12, 31, 9 f.):

Si mihi *Nausicaa* patrios concederet hortos  
*Alcinoos* possem dicere "Malo meos."

*Erigone* is mentioned (62, 1 f.) *custodiet hortum* Cum *sibi dilecta Sirius Erigone*, and is taken by Martial to indicate the value of another (11, 69, 3 f.):

*Lydia* dicebar, domino fidissima Dextro,  
 Qui non *Erigones* mallet habere canem.

Ille tuus civis, Lampsace, Gallus ero (65, 6), may have suggested two terms to Martial, for he has (3, 24, 13) Gallus haruspex, and (1, 35, 15) :

Gallo turpius est nihil Priapo.

He has also Lampsacio . . . versu (11, 16, 3) and Lampsaciae . . . puellae (11, 51, 2). Atreus . . . cucubitarum (11, 31, 1) may have been a suggestion from cucubitarum ligneus (63, 12) as privignum . . . novercae (4, 16, 1) from privignum . . . Phaedrae in the same position (19, 6).

The traditional names (57, 4) :

Tithoni Priamique Nestorisque,

are in the accusative (76, 4), but for the first Martial has Peleos (2, 64, 3).

The literary reference ex Elephantidos libellis (4, 2) is repeated by Martial (12, 43, 4) molles Elephantidos libelli.

The non-elegiac poems of the Priapea contain but few more words not found in Martial than are not found in Ovid. As the mass of the work of the latter is nearly four times that of Martial in Books 1-12 the vocabulary of the epigrams is closer than is Ovid's to that of the Priapea. The most interesting figure in the latter is Quintia (27) :

Deliciae populi, magno notissima Circo  
 Quintia, vibratas docta movere nates,  
 Cymbala cum crotalis, pruriginis arma, Priapo  
 Ponit et adducta tympana pulsa manu:  
 Pro quibus, ut semper placeat spectantibus, orat  
 Tentaque ad exemplum sit sua turba dei.

The name is brought over from Catullus (86) where she is contrasted with Lesbia :

Nulla in tam magnost corpore mica salis.

She appears again as Telethusa (19, 1) circulatrix quae crisabit, and (40, 1) :

Nota Suburanas inter Telethusa puellas.

She has the same name in Martial (8, 51, 23), and with similar characteristics (6, 71, 1 f.) :

Edere lascivos ad Baetica crusmata gestus  
 Et Gaditanis ludere docta modis.

She is the same figure as in the Copa, and it is noticeable that the characterization by Catullus is transformed by Martial (3, 69, 2) :

Inque tuis nulla est mentula carminibus.

Priapea 42 has Laetus Aristagoras . . . De cera facta dat tibi poma, deus, and Martial (8, 41, 1) transforms:

*Tristis Athenagoras non misit munera nobis Quae . . . mittere . . . solet.*

He mentions him later in a different connection (9, 8, 95), and in the next epigram, when asked about the gentleman, hedged and politely declined to tell who he was.

The introduction to Priapea 1:

*Carminis incompti lusus lecture procaces,  
Conveniens Latio pone supercilium,*

is the model for Martial (1, 4, 1 f.):

*Contigeris nostros, Caesar, si forte libellos,  
Terrarum dominum pone supercilium,*

and later *spectas* and *legas* instead of the lecture and *aspicis* of the Priapean poem. The eleven syllable line (1, 115, 2):

*Loto candidior puella cycno*

is fashioned after (32, 1):

*Uvis aridior puella passis.*

There is the same relation between (11, 78, 5 f.):

*Pedicare semel cupido dabit illa marito  
Dum metuit teli vulnera prima novi,*

and Priapea 3, 7, ff.:

*Quod virgo prima cupido dat nocte marito  
Dum timet alterius vulnus inepta loci:  
Simplicius multo est 'da pedicare' Latine  
Dicere.*

These are noticeable statements, for *pedicare* is not used by Ovid, but occurs in a line of Lucan's quoted by Martial (10, 64, 6).

The characterization of the Priapea (31, 3) *iocosos* versus is akin to that of Martial (1, 35, 10) *iocosis carminibus*, and (4, 14, 12):

*Lascivis madidos iocis libellos.*

The substance of the request in the Priapea (44, 1 f.):

*Nolite omnia, quae loquor, putare  
Per lusum mihi per iocumque dici,*

is given by Martial (4, 49, 2), and the nouns with *per* are in the plural (1, 14, 1; 1, 35, 13). The substance of the warning (8, 1):

*Matronae procul hinc abite castae*

is applied (11, 6, 6) :

Pallentes procul hinc abite curae,

and (10, 72, 5) :

Ad Parthos procul ite pilleatos.

The tooth episode (12, 9) :

Dentem de tribus excreavit unum,

was a suggestion to Martial for similar statements (1, 19; 8, 57). The rhetorical touch (37, 6) :

Ut Phoebos puta filioque Phoebos

is also in Martial (9, 34, 5) Phoebum pariter Phoebique sororem. The reference to artists (10, 2 ff.) :

Non Praxiteles Scopasve fecit  
Nec sum Phidiaca manu politus;  
Sed lignum rude vilicus dolavit,

furnished the names to Martial (4, 39, 3) for

Solus Praxitelus manum Scopaeque  
Solus Phidiaci toreuma caeli.

He also has Phidiaca . . . manu (6, 73, 7; 10, 89, 2) and the adjective (3, 35, 1; 6, 13, 1; 7, 56, 5; 9, 24, 2). The last line of the Priapean description is changed to the opposite by Martial (6, 73, 1) :

Non rudis indocta fecit me falce colonus.

This has indocta instead of incurva, as in the Priapea (11, 2) :

Saeva nec incurva vulnera falce dabo,

a line which is akin to the statement of Tibullus in regard to Priapus (1, 4, 8) :

Armatus curva sic mihi falce deus,

rather than to Ovid's about Ceres (Am. 1, 15, 12) :

Dum cadet incurva falce resecta Ceres.

Identical and similar collocations are numerous: Future participle in vocative (1, 1: 5, 69, 1; 8, 1, 1; 10, 44, 1 and 9); ista lege (1, 8: 7, 96, 6; 1, 40, 1); non nimium (2, 3; 49, 2: 2, 48, 4; 6, 66, 1; 9, 81, 3). The euphony in virgineum locum (2, 5) is repeated in virgineamque domum (1, 70, 4). Sensus . . . corque (2, 6) is similar to cor . . . pudor 3, 27, 4; tibi sensus est pudorque (7, 95, 16); nec cor . . . nec genium 7, 78, 4; prima cupido . . . nocte marito (3, 7: 11,

23, 5 p. n.; 11, 78, 5 c. m.); simplicius multo (3, 9) : 3, 54, 2 m. s. (9, 15, 2; 10, 83, 9 s.; 6, 59, 7 quanto s.). Vena (33, 2: 11, 16, 5) is used with rigida (11, 16, 5) as with deo (4, 1; 45, 1); quidquid id est (2, 9: 6, 68, 11); Pierius chorus (1, 7: 7, 69, 8; 12, 3, 8; 9, 86, 3 grege P.; quid faciam (3, 10: 2, 93, 2; 3, 38, 13); una mihi peccatur littera (7, 21): errasti littera sed una (11, 18, 25); cf. 7, 51, 8; 9, 13, 5; blaesaque lingua (7, 2): blaeso . . . ore (5, 34, 8; quare . . . cur (9, 2: 11, 19, 1); mundi dominus (9, 3: 8, 32, 6; cf. 7, 7, 5 m. rector); insulsissimus beginning the verse (10, 1: 12, 55, 2); salsa res (10, 7; 3, 12, 2 rev.); columna (10, 9: 6, 49, 3; 11, 51, 1); putes (11, 4: 4, 54, 4); ne desit (12, 7: 7, 74, 3 non); pudore pulso (14, 7: 3, 68, 5 deposito . . . p.); Hesperidum . . . hortis 16, 2: 4, 64, 2 rev.); quid mecum tibi (17, 1: 1, 76, 1; 2, 16, 5); femina nulla (18, 1: 6, 40, 1 and 2); sutilibus . . . (20, 3: rosis . . . s. (5, 64, 4; s . . . coronis (9, 90, 6); ibit (25, 2: 10, 78, 1; 11, 7, 9); deliciae populi (27, 1: Spect. 2, 12); notissima (27, 1: 7, 64, 1; 9, 61, 1); sua turba (27, 6: 4, 29, 1); pudicior (31, 2: 2, 54, 2), tenta vena dei (33, 2: 6, 49, 2 rigida); amica manus (33, 6: 9, 41, 2); si dederis (38, 4: 8, 24, 3); imagine (42, 3: 4, 53, 6; 6, 27, 3; 9, Pr. 3; 9, 24, 4; 9, 74, 3); Pygmaeo . . . gruem timente (46, 3): furem Priapo non timente (3, 58, 47); quave suspicer causa (51, 1): unde suspicer (1, 96, 10); sessilesve lactucas (51, 19: 3, 47, 8 -que); humi fusos (51, 18: 8, 75, 4); salaces . . . erucas (51, 20: 3, 75, 3 rev.); capiant vix (53, 2: 9, 36, 10 rev.); manum rapacem (52, 1: 6, 49, 8); musta lacus (53, 2: 7, 28, 4); surripere (55, 2: 6, 72, 6); impudicum Ostendis digitum (56, 1 f.: 6, 70, 5):

Ostendit digitum, sed impudicum.

There is apposition of terms in *victima porcus* (55, 2): *hircus . . . victima* (3, 24, 2), and equivalence of sounds but in reverse order *pecus omne* (65, 3): *omne genus* (Spect. 21, 5). There is the same command in *de veniam* (68, 2: 2, 90, 4; 12, 60, 5); *artis opus* (68, 34: 6, 13, 2).

Other borrowed terms are: *spoliavit amica* (68, 13: 5, 42, 5 -bit); *esse suam* (68, 14: 6, 38, 4; 11, 53, 4); *fallentis Ulixei* (68, 19): *fallax U.* (3, 64, 4); *hac . . . lege* (68, 37: 9, 35, 12; 12, 42, 2); *pomaria curae* (71, 1): *pomaria fures* (6, 16, 3), *pomaria regis* (8, 68, 1) and *p. serpens* (10, 94, 1), same position; *inutile lignum* (73, 3: 7, 19, 1); *summa petet* (74, 2: 11, 46, 6); *Cecropias arces* (75, 4: 1, 25, 3); *tutela* (36, 7); *tutela . . . beata* (75, 8): *felix t.* (5, 1, 7); *citharoedus* (77, 14: 11, 75, 3); *quondam, nunc* (77, 12 f.: 11, 87, 1). The words *tepente . . . sinu* (83, 3) are repeated (7, 20, 14) although a different adjective is used (9, 6) in

tepedo Palladis . . . sinu. Martial (9, 59, 8) has plurima mappa for Palladis hasta, one word in each beginning with p, and both the others have two a's.

A number of individual words have the same connotation, as hiatu (12, 13: 3, 72, 5); Suburanus (40, 1: 11, 78, 11); rivalis (47, 3: 3, 70, 2); laboriosus (61, 14: 11, 106, 3); edidici (68, 4: 5, 21, 4); arrectus (68, 32: 10, 55, 1); inquilinus (70, 1: 1, 86, 12); quadra (70, 2: 9, 90, 18); fibula (77, 17: 7, 82, 1).

The o in puto and other verbs is freely shortened by Martial, as is the first in the Priapea. The ending altiora tangam (28, 5) is parallel to nequiora tangunt (2, 4, 4), and similar endings are noticeable in the pentameters, as ulteriora petis (1, 26, 4) and nobiliore rogo (1, 78, 8). The comparative with dissyllable ends the hexameter, as invisior umbra (7, 21, 3). Sit nive candidior (4, 42, 5) begins the line, the words begin and end 7, 33, 2 in reverse order, and are within the line (12, 82, 8). As in the Priapea adjectives in -osus are freely used.

Martial uses many words not found in Ovid, and several of these with a sensuous or sensual connotation occur also in the Priapea. A single illustration will suffice (19, 1 and 3):

Quae clunem tunica tegente nulla,  
Crisabit tibi fluctuante lumbo,

and 27, 1 vibratas docta movere nates. Compare with these (5, 78, 27):

Vibrabunt sine fine prurientes  
Lascivos docili tremore lumbos.

With these we place crassae mentula Burdigalae (9, 32, 6) having an application of the adjective different from that in mentula crassa (80, 1).

Form and substance are parallel in Martial and the Priapea, and so far as these features are concerned either may have been the model for the other.

#### IV. "THE METRICAL ART OF THE PRIAPEA"

Professor R. S. Radford (pp. 84-94) presents first the endings of the pentameter verses. On the basis of the quotation by Quintilian (9, 3, 70) of a pentameter ending furiam, it is held that a similar freedom characterized the first edition of the Amores (about 14 B.C.), and the Priapea shortly preceded these (p. 87). The utter disregard of the rule for dissyllabic endings by Catullus had its effect on the writer of the Priapea. Besides this, Martial (11, 20) quotes

six elegiac lines from Augustus with two trisyllabic endings in the pentameters, futuam and sapiam, both similar to furiam, and these might have been taken as models for any poet of his day. In the use of polysyllabic endings the poems are in harmony with the early usage of Ovid as well as with that of Propertius who has the new genitive ending -ii just as the Priapea. The percentage of dactyls in the distich (49.5%) is slightly less than for the early Amores, and slightly greater than for 196 lines from the first book of Propertius. It is the same with the dactylic beginnings of lines: Priapea (72.6%), Ov. Amores (73.3%), Propertius 71%). There is given (p. 89) the ranking of some of the schemata in the Priapea and of the mature Ovid. To these we add those for 196 verses of the early Amores (1, 2, 13, 14, 15) and for the same number in Propertius:

	Priapea.	Ovid.	Amores	Propertius
Dsss	1	2	1	1
ddss	2	1	4	2
dssd	3	3	3	6
sdss	4	(?)	10	3
ddsd	5	4	5	7
dsds	5	5	81	3
dddd	5	6	10	8
dddd	5	(?)	6	11

There is not much difference in the highest rankings, but sdss drops low in the mature Ovid and in the Amores, as does ddds in the latter. Three of the first four in the Priapea are in Ovid and Propertius and two in the early Amores. Taking into consideration the agreements as well as divergences in the schemata, and practical agreement with Propertius in the other phases presented the Priapea may as well be written by him as by Ovid.

## V. DATE OF PUBLICATION

It is stated (p. 96): "None of the poems of our Priapean collection can be from the hand of Catullus himself, since they abound in post-Augustan words such as subinde (10, 6; 70, 5; 77, 2), non nisi (74, 2), etc., and also exhibit a metrical precision and elegance which is much superior to that of the Republican poet." Horace has subinde (Sat. 2, 5, 103; Ep. 1, 8, 15), and it is utterly impossible to determine when the word was first used. The comparatively few lines of Catullus cannot be taken as the full measure of his vocabulary, and what words some other poets used cannot be determined from the drift-words which have floated down from their argosies. Non nisi was used by Cicero early in his career, and no one can determine when this

piece was taken up by the poets. We also have no data bearing on priority of use in the case of *siticulosus* appearing in Horace (Ep. 3, 16) *siticulosae Apuliae*, and in the *Priapea* (63, 3) *s . . . aestatem*; and (61, 12) *corvus . . . s*. Some other words, as *circitor* (17, 1), *circulatrix* (18, 1), *larvalis* (32, 12) and *seminalis* (26, 2) are suitable for the vocabulary of Petronius or Martial and for the audience which they addressed. Yet they may have been introduced in the *Priapea*. *Fascinosus* (79, 4) and *seminosus* (51, 17) seem limited to the *Priapea*, as do two meanings of *ustulo* (45, 2; 61, 7). The very rare *rubrico* (72, 14) occurs in Petronius (46, 7), and *criso* (29, 4), used by Juvenal and Martial, might be considered as an innovation in the *Priapea* were it not for a quotation from Lucilius, and also *vermino* (58, 2), used by Seneca, is in a quotation from Pomponius. Aulus Gellius and his friend Julius Celsinus listened to a reading of the *Alcestis* of Laevius (19, 7) noting some peculiar expressions, and passing by *cetera enim quae videbantur nimium poetica . . . et quae multiplica ludens composuit, quale illud est, quod vituperones suos subducti-supercilicrptores appellavit*. This marks the descriptive genitive in the *Priapea* (49, 3 f.) :

. . . non est  
Mentula subducti nostra supercilii,

as a borrowing, rather than as of genetic kinship to *Tristia* 2, 309 f.:

*Saepe supercilii nudas matrona severi . . . videt.*

*Assis* which appears in Catullus (5, 3; 42, 13) takes the place of the Plautine *floci*, and may be taken as the one term indicating a date later than Plautus.

Scaurus used "*Ovidianum illud 'inepta loci'*" (*Priap.* 3, 7), and from this the conclusion is drawn (p. 9): "It is clear that this statement of Ovidian authorship naturally applies to the whole book of the *Priapea* and possibly to the whole Appendix. It would not be necessary to attest each poem of Horace's *Odes*, and when Quintilian (vii, 3, 28) accepts as Vergilian one poem of the *Catalepton*, he is rightly accepted by scholars as accepting the whole."

If these words, like *arma virumque*, are taken as an index of a poem there must have been a verbal tradition in which the poems passed current under the name of Ovid. If they were known and spoken of by men as Ovid's why was the written poem put out under the name of another man? Professor Radford discusses the question in "*Ovid's Car-*

mina Furtiva." <sup>1</sup> Ovid himself presents two distinct periods in his life (Trist. iv, 10, 19-26, quoted p. 50) :

At mihi iam puero caelestia sacra placebant,  
 Inque suum FURTIM Musa trahebat opus.  
 Saepe pater dixit 'studium quid inutile temptas?  
 Maeonides nullas ipse reliquit opes.'  
 Motus eram dictis, totoque Helicone relicto  
 Scribere temptabam verba soluta modis.  
 Sponte sua carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos  
 Et, quod temptabam scribere, versus erat.

The second passage (Trist, iv, 10, 55-56, quoted p. 54) is as follows:

Utque ego maiores, sic me coluere minores:  
 Notaque non tarde facta Thalia meast.  
 Carmina cum primum populo iuvenalia legi,  
 Barba resecta mihi bisve semel fuit.  
 Moverat ingenium totam cantata per urbem  
 Nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi.

The first reference is to the boy Ovid; the second to the iuvenis. Whether his first barber experience was at the age of 16 or of 23, it was the date of the beginning of a new experience in which there was nothing *furtim*. It was an open, above-board appeal to the public. If the event is set for the year 20 B.C. (op. cit. p. 56), it marks for Ovid at the age of 23 the end of his father's restrictions. It would be indeed a strange incongruity, an Ovid openly declaiming, but as author hiding behind the name of another. Much greater would be the incongruity years later at the date set for the publication of the *Priapea*.

The date could be definitely fixed for some of the poems at least if we had definite information in regard to *Quintia* (27) and *Telethusa* (19, 40). The conditions under which they exhibited themselves existed at least as early as the days of Cato, for *Valerius Maximus* (2, 10, 8) tells the story "eodem . . . spectante populus, ut mimae nudarentur, postulare erubuit." *Seneca* (Ep. 97, 8) tells the same story to show that moral conditions in his own day were not worse than they had been at an earlier period. *Lactantius* (de *Falsa Relig.* 1, 20, 6) gives more details: "Celebrantur illi ludi cum omni lascivia convenientes memoriae meretricis. Nam praeter verborum licentiam, quibus obscenitas omnis effunditur, exuuntur etiam vestibibus populo flagitante meretrices, quae tunc mimarum funguntur officio, et in conspectu populi usque ad satietatem impudicorum luminum cum pudendis motibus detinentur."

<sup>1</sup> *Philological Quarterly* 7, 45-59 (1918).

Martial (8, 67, 4) has *Floralicias . . . feras* without mention of the personal participants, but Juvenal mentions *Medullinae fluctum crisantis* (6, 322), with which may be compared 19, 4:

*Crisabit tibi fluctuante lumbo.*

Ovid in his long account of *Flora* (*Fasti* 5, 195 ff.), with becoming modesty, does not give any details but merely discusses (v. 349):

*Turba quidem cur hos celebret meretricia ludos.*

Cicero (*Verr.* 2, 5, 14, 36) does not give any intimation in regard to the character of the games, "*mihi Floram matrem populo plebique Romanae ludorum celebritate placendam.*"

## VI. INTERPRETATION OF DATA

There are three interpretations of the resemblances. Ovid may have written the poems; he may have borrowed freely from them as from other poems; they may be due to some writer steeped in the phraseology of Ovid. The imitations cited suit any one of the explanations. *Priapea* 20 compares the weapon of *Priapus* with that of other gods:

*Fulmina sub Iove sunt, Neptuni fuscina telum,  
Ense potens Mars est, hasta, Minerva, tuast.  
Sutilibus Liber committit proelia thyrsis,  
Fertur Apollinea missa sagitta manu.  
Herculis armatast invicti dextera clava,  
At me terribilem mentula tenta facit.*

A part of *Am.* 3, 3, 27 ff. is similar:

*Nobis fatifero Mavors accingitur ense,  
Nos petit invicta Palladis hasta manu,  
Nobis flexibiles curvantur Apollinis arcus,  
In nos alta Iovis dextera fulmen habet.*

However Cicero has (*N. D.* 1, 36, 101: "*Et barbati quidem Iovis, galeatae Minervae; num igitur esse talis putas? Quanto melius haec vulgus imperitorum, qui non membra solum hominis deo tribuant, sed usum etiam membrorum. Dant enim arcum, sagittas, hastam, clipeum, fuscinam, fulmen. . .*")

The *Priapean* author seems to have read the last of this backward as he has *fulmen, fuscina, ensis* for *clipeum, hasta . . . sagitta*, and to have added a reference to *Liber* and to *Hercules*. Ovid omits these two, but has the *hasta, arcus* and *fulmen* of Cicero.

The harvest scene is described (53) :

Contentus modico Bacchus solet esse racemo,  
 Cum capiant alti vix cita musta lacus,  
 Magnaque fecundis cum messibus area desit,  
 In Cereris crines una corona datur.  
 Tu quoque, dive minor maiorum exempla secutus,  
 Quamvis pauca damus, consule poma boni.

Ovid describes his environment (Tristia 3, 10, 71 ff.) :

Non hic pampinea dulcis latet uva sub umbra,  
 Nec cumulant altos fervida musta lacus.  
 Poma negat regio. Nec haberet Acontius, in quo  
 Scriberet hic dominae verba legenda suae.

A part of this is also in Fasti 3, 557 :

Tertia nudandas acceperat area messes,  
 Inque cavos ierant tertia musta lacus.

However, Tibullus (1, 15, 22) has *area dum messes . . . teret*, and *musta later* (v. 24), as also (1, 1, 10) *pleno pinguia musta lacu*.

The theme of Am. 3, 7 is stated in the first lines :

At non formosast, at non bene culta puella,  
 At, puto, non votis seape petita meis.

The mentulization of this is given (80, 1) :

At non longa bene est, at non bene mentula crassa;

Cf. *crassa Minerva est* (3, 10). It is only the first lines of the poems that are similar, for the remainders are entirely different. Catullus (86) has *formosast (bis), candida, longa, rectast*. The Priapean poem takes *longa*, Ovid *formosast*. In verse 8 :

Bracchia Sithonia candidiora nive,

Ovid modifies one in Catullus (80, 2) :

. . . labella  
 Hiberna fiant candidiora nive;

and in 10

Lascivum femori supposuitque femur,

adapts *tenerum supposuisse femur* (Cat. 69, 2). In each of these passages, three authors are involved, and no decision can be reached based on data referring to only two.

We shall now present two phases of the work of Ovid which seem to clearly differentiate it from the Priapea. Professor Radford (T. A. P. A. 51, 169) selects fourteen poems of the Amores with 658 verses as belonging to the

first edition. In these are several expressions which are cited in the Commentary. Among these are *inermis ero*,\* in the pentameter close (1, 2, 22: 9, 14) and *consuetis . . . spectaris ocellis*\* (1, 14, 37): *obliquis . . . spectatis ocellis* (71, 1); *vulnera . . . dabis* (1, 15, 12: 12, 2 *dabo*\*), *ut placeas* (1, 14, 38: 27, 3 -t) *pro quibus officiis* (2, 8, 21: 82, 3); 7, 5 *pro quibus*; *incurva falce*\* (1, 15, 12: 11, 2). The words are the same, but in different connections *si bene te novimus* (1, 2, 43): *bene si non nota fuissent* (68, 11). In addition are *adde quod* (1, 14, 13: 63, 9), 27 *Ov.*, 5 *Hor.*, 5 *Lucr.*, 0 *al.*; and *esse suam* (1, 13, 32: 68, 11), bracketed by Ewald. The four that are starred are placed among the specifically Ovidian phrases, but in considering the pairs it is worthy of note that the phrase *si te bene novimus* is a neat adaptation of the words of Horace *si bene te novi* (*Ep.* 1, 18, 1).

The non-equivalent terms are more numerous. Of these 3, 3, 27: 20, 2, has been considered above. The line (1, 14, 31):

*Formosae periere comae quas Apollo vellet,*

has nothing in common with *Phoebus comosus* (36, 2), an adjective not used in the poets considered. Another line (2, 11, 20) is similar:

*Quo lateant Syrtes magna minorque sinu,*

in an entirely different sphere from 9, 6:

*Nec latet in tepido Palladis hasta sinu.*

The difference in logical content is noticeable in *si mos antiquis placuisset matribus* (2, 14, 9) and *quod nisi . . . placuisset*\* . . . *Mentula* (68, 9). It is the same with *Fulmina sub Iove sunt* (20, 1): and 3, 3, 30:

*In nos alta Iovis dextera fulmen habet.*

Only in form is *opus* in 3, 3, 40:

*Non pater in Baccho matris haberet opus,*

equal to *opus* in 68, 10:

*Mentula, quod caneret, non habuisset opus.\**

Different verbs are used in 3, 8, 24 *canto carmen inane*, and *cecinit miserabile carmen* (68, 15), the last phrase borrowed from Vergil. The closing of doors is too common to be made a connective between *laudato ianua clausast* (3, 8, 7), and *sit, facias, ianua clausa*\* (62, 4). The same is true of *lego* with different forms of the noun in *legisse libellos* (3,

11, 30), and *libros non lego,\* poma lego* (18, 2). *Haec verba loqui* (68, 32) "is found only in Ovid," but not *verba modesta loqui* (3, 14, 16). Somewhat nearer are 36, 10:

Quod si quis inter haec locus mihi restat,

and 3, 9, 59 ff.:

Si tamen e nobis aliquid nisi nomen et umbra  
Restat.

Taken in their entirety these citations do not bring out anything conclusive in regard to Ovidian authorship, and we turn to a comparison of the four unrevised poems (2, 13, 14, 15) in the first book (198 verses) with other parts of Ovid.

Am. 1, 2, 4: *Lassaque versati corporis ossa dolent*;  
Tristia 4, 3, 26: *Fessaque iactati corporis ossa dolent*.

Am. 1, 2, 8: *Et possessa ferus pectora versat Amor*;  
Her. 12, 211: *Viderit iste deus qui nunc mea pectora versat*.

Am. 1, 2, 10: *Cedamus! leve fit, quod bene fertur, onus*;  
Tristia 2, 222: *Inque tuis umeris tam leve fertur onus*.

Am. 1, 2, 14: *Detrectant prensi dum iuga prima boves*;  
Rem. 235: *Adspicis ut prensos urant iuga prima iuencos*;  
Ponto 3, 7, 15: *Ductus ab armento taurus detrectat aratrum*;  
Her. 4, 21: *Scilicet ut teneros laedunt iuga prima iuencos*.

Am. 1, 2, 42: *Ibis in auratis aureus ipse rotis*;  
A. A. 1, 214: *Quattuor in niveis aureus ibis equis*.

Am. 1, 13, 10: *Roscida purpurea supprime lora manu*;  
Ponto 2, 8, 24: *Iustaque vindictae supprime frena tuae*.

Am. 1, 13, 12: *Navita nec media nescius errat aqua*;  
A. A. 2, 606: *Garrulus in media Tantalus aret aqua*.

Am. 1, 13, 16: *Prima vocas tardos sub iuga panda boves*;  
Her. 6, 10: *Isse sacros Martis sub iuga panda boves*;  
Ponto 1, 8, 54: *Ducam ruricolas sub iuga curva boves*.

Am. 1, 13, 18: *Ut subeant tenerae verbera saeva manus*;  
Her. 20, 77 f.: *Utque solent famuli, cum verbera saeva verentur,*  
*Tendere submissas ad tua crura manus.*

Am. 1, 13, 24: *Lanificam revocas ad sua pensa manum*;  
A. A. 1, 452: *Et revocat cupidus alea saepe manus*.

Am. 1, 13, 44: *Luna! neque illius forma secunda tuae*;  
Am. 1, 8, 25: *Et cur non placeas? Nulli tua forma secundast.*

Am. 1, 14, 5: *Quid, quod erant tenues, et quos ornare timeres*;  
Am. 3, 10, 3: *Flava Ceres, tenues spicis redimita capillos*.

Am. 1, 14, 8: *Cum leve deserta sub trabe nectit opus*;  
A. A. 2, 46: *Et leve per lini vincula nectit opus*.

Am. 1, 14, 12: Ardua derepto cortice cedrus habet:  
Med. 87: Parte minus quarta dereptum cortice gummi.

Am. 1, 14, 34: Pingitur umentis sustinuisse manu:  
A. A. 2, 216: Ingenua speculum sustinuisse manu;  
Am. 1, 14, 36: Quid speculum maesta ponis, inepta, manu?

Am. 1, 14, 35: Quid male dispositos quereris perisse capillos?  
Ponto 3, 3, 16: Nec bene dispositas comptus, ut ante, comas.

Am. 1, 14, 44: Ipsa dabas capiti mixta venena tuo:  
Ponto 2, 9, 68: Mixtave sunt nostra dira venena manu.

Am. 1, 14, 48: Empta . . . merce: A. A. 3, 165: crinibus emptis.

Am. 1, 15, 6: Ingrato vocem prostituisse foro:  
A. A. 3, 97: Nec vos prostituit mea vox. . . .

Am. 1, 15, 7: Mortalest, quod quaeris, opus; mihi fama perennis  
Quaeritur, in toto semper orbe canar.  
Met. 7, 56: . . . non est mortale quod optas; Am. 1, 10, 62: fama  
perennis erit,  
A. A. 2, 740: Cantetur toto nomen in orbe meum;  
Am. 1, 3, 25: Nos quoque per totum pariter cantabimur orbem.

Am. 1, 14, 45 f.: Nunc tibi captivos mittet Germania crines:  
Culta triumphatae munere gentis eris:  
Fasti 1, 645, 7: . . . passos Germania crines  
Inde triumphatae libasti munera gentis.

Am. 1, 15, 22: Aureaque Ausonio terga petita duci:  
Her. 6, 103 f.: Aesonides . . . Aurea Phrixiae terga revellit ovis.

Am. 1, 15, 26: Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit:  
Fasti 5, 93: Hic, ubi nunc Roma est, orbis caput, arbor et herbae.

Am. 1, 15, 28: Discentur numeri, culte Tibulle, tui:  
Am. 3, 9, 66: Auxisti numeros, culte Tibulle, pios.

Am. 1, 15, 29: Hesperiiis. . . . Eois: Fasti 1, 14: Eoas partes Hesperiasque.

Am. 1, 15, 31: Ergo, cum silices, cum dens patientis aratri  
Depereant aevo, carmina morte carent:  
Tristia 4, 6, 13 ff.: Hoc tenuat dentem terram renovantis aratri:  
Hoc rigidas silices. . . . Ut patria careo.

Am. 1, 15, 34: Cedat et auriferi ripa benigna Tagi:  
Met. 2, 251: Quodque suo Tagus amne vehit, fluit ignibus, aurum.

Am. 1, 15, 37: Sustineam coma . . . myrtum: Am. 1, 2, 23: Necte  
comam myrto.

Am. 1, 15, 39: Pascitur in vivis Livor: Tristia 4, 10, 123 f.: Nec . . .  
Livor . . . momordit opus.  
Ponto 3, 4, 74 Livor et iniusto carpere dente solet.

Am. 1, 15, 42: Vivam, parsque mei multa superstes erit:  
Tristia 1, 2, 44: Dimidia certe parte superstes ero:  
Tristia 3, 7, 50: Me tamen extincto fama superstes erit.

Manibus post terga retortis (Am. 1, 2, 31) is a palpable imitation of manus . . . post terga revinctum (Aen. 2, 57), and Ovid in his statement (Am. 1, 15, 15) :

Nulla Sophocleo veniet iactura cothurno,

borrowed from Vergil (Ecl. 8, 10) sola Sophocleo . . . cothurno, but in verses 14 and 19 :

Quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet:  
Ennius arte carens animosique Accius oris,

he transforms some of the judgments of Horace (Ep. 2, 1, 59) :

Vincere Caeilius gravitate, Terentius arte;

(v. 56 Accius alti; A. P. 259 ff. Enni . . . curaque carentis). A part of Ovid's line (Am. 1, 15, 42) parsque mei multa, rearranges the words of Horace multaque pars mei (Odes 3, 30, 6). The cry in the procession (1, 2, 34) :

Vulgus "io" magna voce "Triumphe" canet,

repeats the scene described by Horace (Ep. 9, 18 ff.) Galli, Canentes Caesarem . . . "io triumphe" . . . "io triumphe." The words of Horace iacentes sic temere (Odes 2, 11, 14) and iacere . . . in tenaci gramine (Ep. 2, 24) seem to have been combined by Ovid (Am. 1, 14, 22). Contulerim appears in both (Sat. 1, 5, 14; Am. 1, 14, 33). Lucretius is complimented (Am. 1, 15, 23 f.) by attaching to the characterization of his poetry a modification of his own words :

Carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti,  
Exitio terras cum dabit una dies,

the last line supplying an object and rearranging the words of Una dies dabit exitio (5, 95).

The examples given are enough to show that variation in form of statement, both of his own words, as well as of others, must be considered as one of the fundamental elements of Ovid's style. In this respect his writings stand in strong contrast with those of Vergil in which there are numerous repeated lines. If the Priapean poems were written immediately before the publication of the second edition of the Amores they must have been contemporaneous with the poems of the first edition, and consequently would have the same stylistic characteristics. But the appearance of forty-eight half verses of the Priapea in the works of Ovid is not in harmony with the tendency for variation so clearly shown by him.

The sensuality expressed in the *Priapea* is indicative of a mental attitude different from that expressed in the works of Ovid. He may have been two-sided like Martial, a sort of literary Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, but such is not the inference based on his later works. The father's influence over him (*Tristia* 4, 10, 19 ff.) may be compared with that over Horace (*Sat.* 1, 6, 71 ff.) with

. . . pudicum

(Qui primus virtutis honor) servavit ab omni  
Non solun facto, verum opprobrio quoque turpi.

If we emphasize *pudicus* for Ovid, it will explain the absence from his works not only of terms expressing sensuality but also of some adjectives, nouns and verbs whose connections in the *Priapea* may have unfitted them for use by Ovid. Among these we place *barbatus* (12, 14; 13, 7; 74, 2), *fatuus* (39, 8) and *impudicus* with *digitus* (56, 1). Ovid uses the noun 83 times, the adjective not at all. The affirmative *pudicus* is used 27 times by Ovid, all in affirmative statements, excepting the comparative form (*Ib.* 349 f.):

Nec tibi contingat matrona pudicior illa,  
Qua potuit Tydeus erubuisse nuru,

varying from *pudicior Vesta* (31, 2). Ovid does not use *immodestus*, and the expression *vota modesta parum* (*Tristia* 3, 8, 18), in a different sphere, is the nearest to *nec satis modestas . . . manus* (15, 1 f.). Some other adjectives which are avoided are *indecens* (12, 13), *insulsissima* (10, 1), *libidosus* (47, 6), *luculentus* (39, 6), and *macer*, 12, 13; 26, 8; and 72, 4 *brachia macra*. The noun is one of Ovid's favorites, occurring 130 times. Although using the nouns he does not have the adjective in *pallorem* (*Ov.* 13) *maciemque* (*Ov.* 11) *larvalem* (32, 12). It is the same with *puella* (*Ov.* 227) . . . *misella* (78, 3 ff.). *Turba* (*Ov.* 149) *putida* has the moral tone of the *moecha putida* in *Catullus* (42, 11-12; 19-20). Ovid uses *salax* three times, once with *erucas* (*Rem.* 799: 51, 20), but avoids personal associations, as it has in *vicinae . . . passeribus salaciores* (26, 4 f.) and *deo salaci* (34, 1).

Some parts of the body are not mentioned by Ovid, as *clunes* (19, 2), *colei* (14, 8; 29, 4), *podices* (77, 9). Ovid has *oblitus* (5), *favilla* (15) and *niger* (64), but nothing similar to (14, 10):

Nigra fornicis oblitus favilla.

He does not use *saliva* (26, 12), and *stomachus* only with literal meaning, three times, and not as in *stomachum mo-*

vetis (77, 1). He does not have vappa, and consequently no equivalent for nos vappae (14, 6). He avoids *lanterna* which Priapus has (32, 14) :

*Lanternae videor fricare cornu.*

This verb not used by Caesar or Cicero, but later by Martial (11, 29, 8), is avoided by Ovid, as are *effeminatus* (58, 2) and *excavo* (51, 4), although he has *cavo* nine times. Other like compounds are *exscreo* (12, 9; 2 Ov.) and *exspuo* (26, 12), used once in a far different connection, *exspuit hamum* (Hal. 36). The verb in *amica rivalem Lasciviendo languidum . . .*, *precor, reddat* (47, 3 f.) is far differently connected in *agnus Lascivitque fuga* (Met. 7, 320 f.). The statement in 12, 15) :

*Ut credas Epicuron oscitari,*

may be taken as a burlesque on Horace's *dormitat* *Homerus* (A.P. 359), and perhaps with an eye also to the exaltation of Epicurus by Lucretius (3, 1 ff.), and the contrasted character (3, 1065) :

*Oscitat extemplo, tetigit cum limina villae.*

The association of *comeso* (70, 7) is with common dogs, although of the twelve examples of *edo* in Ovid, one (Her. 9, 380) is associated with Cerberus, and another (Her. 12, 123) with Scylla. *Tentus* with physical connotation in the *Priapea* (33, 2; 81, 2), occurs in Ovid with *cornu* (Met. 6, 242), and *carbasa* (Her. 10, 30), but he does not have the comparative, as (6, 5) *tormento citharaque tensor*; and (68, 16) *cithara tensor ipse sua*. Taken as a whole, the actions portrayed have the same ethical coloring as those portrayed by Catullus and retouched later on by Martial.

There are, however, some words or equivalent collocations which are used in different connections giving an entirely different tone to the statement, as in *tenera spoliavit amica* (68, 13) : *tenerae declamat amicae* (A.A. 1, 465) ; *commoditas . . . in . . . pene* (18, 1) : *commoditate frui* (Her. 16, 310) ; *uti c.* (Her. 17, 176; A.A. 2, 372) ; *conducta est puella* (34, 2) : *conducto . . . toro* (Am. 1, 10, 44) ; *puella . . . fruenda* (50, 5) ; *facies fruenda* (Her. 20, 118) ; *te ventris arma laxabunt* (31, 3) : *laxantur corpora rugis* (A.A. 3, 73) ; *pervigil traho noctem* (63, 8) : *pervigil in . . . sidera* (Am. 1, 6, 44).

The description of the midnight hag with *rugosas manus*, *infirmo . . . gradu*, *barbato macer eminente naso*, and especially *scissa sub tunica stolaque rufa*, contains adjectives

not used by Ovid or with different associations. The last quotation is the most noticeable. Ovid makes Canace say (Her. 11, 57) *scissa tunicaque comaque*, but he does not use *rufus*, and *stola* but three times in his latest works, twice in connection with *vitta*.

The ethical tone of the works of Ovid can also be contrasted with that in the poems of Propertius. The Priapea (3, 7) has *prima nocte* which Ovid uses in an entirely different connection (Fasti 5, 111) :

Ab Iove surgat opus. Prima mihi nocte videnda  
Stella est in cunabula officiosa Iovis,

and, perhaps with reference to the Danaïdes (Ib. 529) :

Sit tibi coniugii nox prima novissima vitae.

Propertius has the words (2, 5, 15; 4, 14, 5 plu.), and takes them as the theme of one poem (4, 20). More noticeable is the development of 5, 8 which is like some of the Priapean poems. In this poem *crotalistris* Phyllis (39) is akin to *Telethusa circulatoria* (19, 1) and *Quintia . . . cum crotalis* (27, 2 f.), and her music, *adducta tympana pulsa manu*, resembles that of *Nanus* (42) :

Iactabat truncas ad cava buxa manus.

One may compare the declaration (3) *Lanuvium . . . est tutela draconis*, with *tutela Phodos est . . . Solis* (75, 8). The two lines (26: 3, 4) :

Vincet ubi erasas barba pudenda genas:  
Cum tenet obsessas invida barba genas,

are identical in construction, with a time-clause in each, *barba* with an adjective, and a participle with *genas*, the parts of the first two being in reverse order because of the differences in quantity of the time particles and of the adjectives. Counting the form *spectaculum* (56) as one, the poem has fourteen words not used by Ovid, including the Priapean *saliva*. There are more than a score of others which occur from one to three times in Ovid. Among these are *impurus* (23: Ib. 223; *Tristia* 2, 416), and with this may be placed *sobrius* (30) not used in the *Metamorphoses* nor in the late epistles. A few words are used with great restraint, as *lectica* (78) associated by Ovid with *domina* (Rem. 663; 665; A.A. 1, 488), *lectulus* (35: Her. 10, 58; *Tristia* 1, 11, 38), *lucerna* (43: Her. 19, 195; A.A. 1, 245; 3, 751), and especially *taberna* (62) which occurs only in the *Nux* (132). Yet Ovid sometimes wrote with an eye to the words of Propertius who has (15) *avecta est Cynthia*

mannis, the words of which are distributed by Ovid who uses the verb but once associated with Helen, Phrygiis avecta carinis (Am. 1, 10, 1) and the noun but once associated with his amata, rapientibus esseda mannis (Am. 2, 16, 49).

To characterize in a word, we may say that Ovid presents the pudic, and Catullus, the Priapea, Petronius and Martial the impudic phases of Roman life.

## VII. SUMMARY

The application of numerical data to individual words yields no positive results owing to the incalculable variations in the occurrences. If comparisons are made based on relative length, the results favor Propertius rather than Ovid as author of the Priapea. The use of the same words may be the result of the overlapping of a smaller by a larger vocabulary. This is especially noticeable in the case of the vocabulary of Cicero and that of the Priapea. In the case of collocations the overlapping is shown both for a section of Tibullus, and also one of Propertius. A number of Augustan writers and some later ones, either independently or dependently, have pieces of Priapean phraseology. This is a feature most noticeable in Martial who freely utilized material from the Priapea, as their author or authors utilized material from Catullus. Metrical data furnish no definite basis for a decision in regard to authorship. A comparison of Priapean material with that in the early Amores, and of four of these poems with the other works of Ovid seems to establish for him the rule of variation in dealing with his own material. In this respect he differs in the use of Priapean material, as is shown by the forty-eight half verses utilized. The ethical tone of the Priapea differs from that shown not only in the early works written at the same time as the Priapea, but also from that in the later ones. The final conclusion is that the early training of Ovid held him throughout his entire career to a type of ethical expression entirely different from that of the Priapea.

VANDERBILT, UNIVERSITY,  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.







