Eugesta
ISSN : 2265-8777
Publisher : Université de Lille

14 | 2024
Varia

Ovid's *Amores* 2.8: A Genuine Offence

Ryan Shayne

https://www.peren-revues.fr/eugesta/1536

DOI : 10.54563/eugesta.1536

Electronic reference
Ryan Shayne, « Ovid's *Amores* 2.8: A Genuine Offence », *Eugesta* [Online], 14 | 2024, Online since 17 décembre 2024, connection on 24 février 2026. URL : https://www.peren-revues.fr/eugesta/1536

Copyright
CC-BY

Ovid's *Amores* 2.8: A Genuine Offence

Ryan Shayne

OUTLINE

Declamation vs Rhetoric
Ovid and Rhetoric
Masculinity and Oratory
Am. 2.7 and 8

TEXT

1 In her discussion of the Cypassis poems, "Ovid *Amores* 2.7 and 8: The Disingenuous Defence," Patricia Watson explores how the paired poems mimic the *controversiae* (debates) that formed part of the declamatory education of elite Roman males.[1] Although she engages with Ovid's use of persuasive techniques in *Am.* 2.7, her analysis of *Am.* 2.8 overlooks many of the forensic elements of the poem. Watson insists that 'Ovid is able to exploit to the maximum the stylistic distinction' between the poems.[2] I suggest that the changes in vocabulary and tone are not as absolute as Watson claims; rather, they mark the poet-lover's transposition from *reus* (defendant) to *suasor* (advisor),[3] and these changes are not sustained. The reversal recalls declamatory *controversiae*,[4] a point deemed irrelevant by Watson since 2.8 is not 'like 7, cast in the form of a speech'.[5] But why should it be? While 2.8 differs structurally from traditional *orationes* (speeches),[6] the poet-lover's attempts to ingratiate himself with Cypassis recall the *suasoriae* (persuasive speeches), and as he becomes more hostile, his language, tone, and use of formal persuasive techniques recall the forensic setting of 2.7. Although Watson notes that 'skilful persuasion is as vital in this poem as in its companion piece,' her analysis offers little detail on this point, and overlooks many forensic elements and formal persuasive devices. My final concern is the frequent tendency to describe the poem as a 'seduction.'[7] This is not an attempted seduction; it is a rape, in which the poet-lover leverages his declamatory education to gaslight[8] and bully a voiceless slave into silence and submission.

The use of formal persuasive techniques allows the poet-lover to manipulate Cypassis and impose his desires on her. Before I address these concerns, I outline what constitutes the 'declamatory,' Ovid's 'rhetorical' education, and the relationship between that education and Roman masculinity.

Declamation vs Rhetoric

2 I open this discussion with an inevitably oversimplified maxim: all that is declamatory is rhetorical, but not all that is rhetorical is declamatory. As declamation and rhetoric naturally overlap, the distinction between them is not always clear. It would be tricky to find Augustan Age literature that was not influenced by rhetoric, given its significance in the education of Rome's elite young men.[9] It seems necessary, therefore, to distinguish the declamatory from the generally rhetorical. As Higham notes, declamation is defined simply as 'an oratorical exercise on an invented theme… [the tradition has] a nuance of excessively loud and over-vehement oratory.'[10] As to how we might detect a declamatory influence, we can look to the works of Seneca the Elder (*Controversiae*; *Suasoriae*), Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* and *Declamationes Minores*) and pseudo-Quintilian (*Declamationes Maiores*). Where I note verbal parallels or similar rhetorical devices, I suggest only the likelihood that Ovid picked up these persuasive techniques from his own declamatory education and that, when employed by the poet-lover, they would have been recognisable. Winterbottom explains how we might detect a declamatory presence in a work of literature: i) certain themes, characters, narratives, and ii) a certain kind of style.[11] On the former, he remarks: 'the world of declamation…its inhabitants are stock-characters,' and says to watch out for: 'pleasure in invective on certain themes, such as riches, the vices of the age, fortune…war, pleasant places, and the accumulation of examples.'[12] On stylistic signifiers of declamation, Winterbottom offers a broad but important note:

> We are looking for a certain tone of voice, hectic, hectoring, and melodramatic. The declamatory writer takes pleasure in epigram and points, but also in outrageous paradox, exaggeration, and ingenuity

> of all kinds. His natural vehicle is not the long period but the short phrase, punchy and hard-baked. [13]

3 Thus, stylistic parallels between Ovid and famous declaimers may indicate a declamatory influence, although the identification of this influence does not require such parallels. To identify a declamatory influence, we need to look no further than the stylistic and tonal descriptors provided above. I suggest, therefore, that where we find Ovid using persuasive techniques that i) relate the outlined *topoi* (themes) typical of declamation, ii) are consistent with applications of the same techniques identified in the declamatory tradition, or iii) are consonant with the hectoring or melodramatic tone characteristic of declamation, we have grounds to infer a declamatory influence.

Ovid and Rhetoric

4 In the 20s BC, Ovid was sent to Rome where he received a rhetorical education under Arellius Fuscus. [14] That his rhetorical education can be detected in the *Amores* is not a novel idea. [15] Indeed, Ovid's early poetry has often been impugned on account of excessive artifice, or what some have termed 'rhetoricity'. [16] I see two main reasons for this criticism. First, it is based on a misunderstanding of what constitutes the 'rhetorical.' Thus, Hardie:

> One of the negative labels most frequently applied to early imperial literature is 'rhetorical', denoting a literature of empty verbal display as opposed to one seriously engaged with issues in the extratextual world…that aims at immediate emotional and sensationalist effects, as opposed to the subtle and allusive crafting of verbal structures. [17]

5 There is not necessarily an opposition between rhetoric and serious engagement. Second is the failure to appreciate the distance between Ovid the poet and his fictive poet-lover. [18] I am interested in the poet-lover's employment of formal persuasive techniques: [19] what this says about him, his addressee, and its relevance to gendered violence; I am less concerned with Ovid.

Masculinity and Oratory

6 It is my view that the poet-lover uses rhetorical strategies to exert authority over Cypassis: when he uses formal persuasive techniques, he draws on a privilege reserved exclusively for the elite Roman male, a rhetorical education,[20] and implicitly aligns himself with this tradition. In antiquity, masculinity and effeminacy was about more than sexual preferences and involvement in war or politics: another area in which Roman expectations of masculinity were observable was the declamatory schools.[21] The enforcement of 'masculine' traditions is reflected in the extant texts of declaimers,[22] so that the students of declamation engage in what Corbeill calls 'a process that, like myth, acts in the continual creation and reaffirmation of social values.'[23] As Gleason notes, these exercises in virility take place in exclusively homosocial contexts:

> In the high-stakes game of self-presentation among articulate upper-class males…There had to be a hierarchy within the population of eligible competitors… it was a polemic that had nothing to do with women, who had no place whatever in this performance culture.[24]

7 In *Am.* 2.8, however, the poet-lover, associated with *mollitia* (softness; effeminacy) by virtue of his genre,[25] attempts to assert his 'masculinity' and reinforce his 'authority' over a subaltern: he weaponises his rhetorical training to silence, bully, and ultimately rape Cypassis. Because this rhetoric is taken out of its proper homosocial context, the 'legitimacy' of the poet-lover's 'authority' is undermined: Ovid invites us to consider the flawed power dynamics in play.

Am. 2.7 and 8

8 Many have commented on the 'rhetorical' concept of the pairing, *Amores* 2.7 & 2.8, because the latter poem contrasts the former.[26] For this reason, coupled with Ovid's declamatory education,[27] it has been compared to declamatory *controversiae*, where a speaker adopts a *persona* and argues one side of a (legal) case in anticipation of the other (or both).[28] These *personae* were the only kind of *controversiae*

that Ovid, who preferred *suasoriae* (persuasive speeches), liked to declaim.[29]. Like *controversiae*,[30] Ovid's paired poems are divided according to themes: the first details a charge of infidelity; the second, its suppression. There is deliberate irony in the poet-lover's about-face: initially so adamant on his innocence (2.7), he immediately betrays that pose in his interrogation of Cypassis (2.8).[31] Although it seems humorous to frame a personal argument in full-blown forensic terms, a lover's spat as viewed from within the confines of the courtroom, throughout the 'spat,' we hear only the male voice; Cypassis is effectively mute.[32] Underlying the poet-lover's ironic turnabout is a more sinister reflection on the relationship between the rhetorical education of the elite Roman male, gender, and power.[33]

9 If Ovid creates a 'maximum…stylistic distinction' between 2.7 and 2.8, it is not, contrary to Watson's claim,[34] 'maintained': as 2.8 progresses, the poet-lover's use of persuasory rhetoric becomes increasingly blatant. Watson suggests that, in 2.8, there is a lack of forensic terminology when compared with 2.7, and that this contributes to their formal dissimilarity.[35] This is not true; there are several terms in 2.8 that have their place in forensic trials and declamatory literature: *sociati…index* ("informer of our union", 5); *delinquere* ("commit an offence", 9); *turpe putem* ("judge as base", 14); *iubeas… periuria* ("false oaths", 19); *renuis* ("deny", 23); *index anteacta fatebor* ("informer of what was done before", 25); *veniam culpae proditor* ("I shall come forward, betrayer of my own guilt", 26).[36] Although the structure of 2.8 does not seem, when compared to the organisation of 2.7,[37] strongly reminiscent of a formal *oratio* (speech), that alone is not enough to dismiss the poem's forensic qualities. Throughout 2.8 the poet-lover employs formal persuasive techniques, oratorical strategies, and a language and tone that have a place in the declamatory tradition.

10 Whereas in 2.7 the poet-lover constructs a formal defence against Corinna's accusations that he had sex with Cypassis, in the second he turns to the slave herself whom he interrogates, bullies, and ultimately blackmails. On the shift in tone and language, Watson, echoing Jäger,[38] argues that there is a change from 'elevated bombast' to 'an intimate, down-to-earth attempt at sexual blackmail'.[39] Although the poet-lover's approach appears

'intimate' and 'down-to-earth' at the beginning, this mood is not maintained, nor does the change constitute a departure from the forensic atmosphere of 2.7; on the contrary, I suggest it is in keeping with it.[40] The poet-lover is no longer the defendant; he acts as an advisor, and soon threatens to become an informant, with his new addressee as the *testis* (witness) under cross-examination. Accordingly, his approach changes: he begins with a *captatio benevolentiae* (seizing of goodwill) and when that seems ineffective, he resorts to intimidation.[41] According to Watson, the primary aim of 2.8 is seduction, as opposed to that of 2.7: exculpation.[42] This warrants revision: what begins as a search for answers by way of *captatio benevolentiae* ends in rape. The overarching aim is not 'seduction'; it is entrapment and ultimately subjugation. Granted, this can take many forms: in the beginning the poet-lover attempts to elicit answers from Cypassis by means of flattery; gradually, however, his tactics become patently violent. Even in his early flatteries the poet-lover attempts to exert his power over Cypassis, a power exercised by virtue of his sex and status, and accentuated by his persuasive skill. Thus, inasmuch as the opening register seems informal and the mood intimate when compared to the highly legalistic and formal language of 2.7, perhaps rather than abandoning the forensic approach, the poet-lover simply tailors it to fit his new aims and target.[43]

11 In the first two couplets, the poet-lover moves away from the blatantly forensic approach of 2.7 and assumes a more elliptical strategy as he contrives to curry favour with Cypassis with compliments:[44]

> Ponendis in mille modos perfecta capillis,
> comere sed solas digna, Cypassi, deas,
> et mihi iucundo non rustica cognita furto,
> apta quidem dominae, sed magis apta mihi.

> Perfect in setting hair aright in a thousand ways, but worthy to dress only that of goddesses, Cypassis, you whom I have found in our stolen delight not wholly simple, apt for your mistress' service, but more apt for mine.

12 The poet-lover recycles his own ideas from 2.7: the opening line recalls 2.7.23, and *non rustica* ("not wholly simple" or "not boorish")

corresponds to *perdocta* ("learned", 2.7.24). With informal language he creates the illusion of a safe, private space.[45] The approach is two-pronged: he invokes a more intimate atmosphere, but also, since Cypassis is subaltern, he adjusts (condescends) his language and register accordingly. Maintaining the formal, legalistic register of 2.7 would be an ineffective method of persuasion to apply to an uneducated slave.[46] With the suggestion that her hairdressing skills are worthy of a goddess (*solas digna…deas*), he makes the most of Cypassis' station as *ornatrix* (hairdresser-slave) and perhaps suggests that Corinna is not worthy of her services,[47] or if Corinna is the *dea*,[48] that the poet-lover must be a god. His flattery is intended to secure her goodwill,[49] and *voluntas auditoris* (goodwill of the listener) is, as Paulson notes, 'an object of expert manipulation'.[50] Underlying the compliments, however, are subtle reminders of her inferiority: she's amazing… at braiding her mistress' hair (*ponendis… perfecta capillis*) and pleasing the poet-lover (*mihi iucundo…furto*).[51] In other words, she is only good for carrying out servile duties,[52] especially those that please him (*mihi iucundo…magis apta mihi*). *Non rustica* also carries an erotic undertone: Cypassis is an "experienced" lover.[53] The compliments, albeit ostensibly flattering, remind her that i) she is dispensable, and ii) in no position to resist. Although *mihi iucundo* may suggest genuine, even mutual affection, the comparative drawn with Corinna, where *domina* is used (*apta quidem dominae*, *sed magis apta mihi*), keeps the unequal nature of the relationship in mind. *Capillis* recalls *capillos* and *capillis* (2.7.7; 23), but also the poet-lover's history of aggressive behaviour towards women.[54] I agree with Watson's suggestion that *iucundo* and *rustica* are softer and mark a lower register.[55] She does not comment, however, on the fact that *non rustica* reverses the insinuations of *contemptae sortis* ("despised lot", 2.7.20) and *famula* (2.7.21).[56] Although a slave, she is not a fool. Cypassis is also addressed by name to suggest that she is being treated as an individual.[57] The language and informal register certainly seems to reflect Cicero's recommendations to seize goodwill successfully: *lenitas voci*; *verborum comitas*; *non litigiosorum* ("gentleness of voice"; "elegance of language"; "not litigious").[58] The opening of 2.8 is thus a calculated interrogation. Accordingly, the poet-lover opens with a tone that is, on the surface, more endearing than the hostile rhetorical question that

opens 2.7: *ergo sufficiam reus in nova crimina semper?* ("am I then to stand trial on new complaints forever?").

13 The poet-lover employs hyperbole in the 'compliment' (*in mille modos perfecta*) to ingratiate himself with Cypassis. Perhaps he assumes that, as a simple slave, she could never see through his veiled interrogation.[59] The exaggerated depiction of Cypassis' skill and station also contrasts the lover's derogatory description of her in the previous poem (2.7.7; 17-22). He also describes their affair with sexual euphemisms (*cognita*; *furto*, "known"; "stolen")[60] to induce rapport. Again, the aim is to make her feel as though she is in a 'safe space'. That the poet-lover's register so dramatically contrasts the elevated style of 2.7 is therefore evidence of the persistence of formal persuasive techniques: the new persuasive situation demands a different approach. Watson in part acknowledges this:

> For the poet's arguments to produce the desired result, it is essential that the artistry of the poem should be concealed. This Ovid achieves by maintaining a tone of intimacy and informality, derived to a large extent from the vocabulary employed.[61]

14 Her point is, however, undermined by the fact that the poet-lover resorts to blackmail, and by her own admission: she notes: 'the chances are that no amount of persuasion will succeed… blackmail… will ultimately be needed,' but her statement implies that 'Ovid' achieves the 'desired result,' since he 'maintain[s] a tone of intimacy and informality'.[62] The tone is not maintained.

15 By line 5, the poet-lover's tactics begin to change: having attempted to induce feelings of safety and intimacy through disarming compliments and lower register, he then cuts to the chase and asks who between them is responsible for letting their secret slip: *quis fuit inter nos sociati corporis index?* ("who is the tattler of our coming together?"). Ovid's use of *index* ("tattler"), suspended to the end of the line, reintroduces the legal language of 2.7 (cf. 2.7.26: *indicio*, "evidence").[63] The term is frequently applied in trial speeches and declamations.[64] Ovid's employment of *sociati corporis* ("union of the body"), another sexual euphemism used to play down the affair (cf. 2.7.21: *Veneris…conubia…inire* ("mate with"), has another rhetorical function: it gives Cypassis the impression that she is his ally, or

rather, his accomplice,[65] and coupled with the genitive *corporis*, *societas* describes a pursuit of mutual advantage.[66] The poet-lover thus suggests that their interests are aligned, and applies a manipulative tactic that the *praeceptor* (teacher) recommends in the *Ars Amatoria*.[67] I agree with Oliensis that neither this line, nor that which follows, poses a rhetorical question.[68] Nevertheless, the question is rhetorically suggestive: it stresses the poet-lover's posture of conviction and frames him as the guiltless party. Also, if it is only between them (*inter nos*), and he is sure of his innocence, then by *expeditio* (elimination) he implies that Cypassis must be complicit.[69] The language of this line, the interrogative tone, and the pointedness of the question is in line with what we saw in *Am.* 2.7; the lover is still in mind to declaim. He therefore undermines the intimate atmosphere that he initially attempted to establish, and that Watson suggests is maintained. The question is the first of four that form a forceful cross-examination designed to coerce Cypassis into bed again.[70]

16 In line 6, the poet-lover does away with euphemism and uses the comparatively blunt *concubitus* ("affair") as he enquires about the source of Corinna's suspicions: *concubitus unde Corinna tuos?* ("where did Corinna get wind of your affair with me?").[71] The term is perhaps more revealing than he had thought. He thus continues his cross-examination in a way that further digresses from the 'intimate' atmosphere that he attempted to create (1-4). The poet-lover's wording contrasts his gentler characterisation of their affair (5). As McKeown notes, the use of *tuos* where we might expect *nostros* makes the question 'more intimidating'.[72] More importantly, however, this enables the poet-lover to distance himself from the *crimen* ("charge"); he shifts the blame onto Cypassis alone.[73] He thus employs *remotio criminis* (shifting the responsibility for the act, or shifting the act itself).[74] This insinuation is emphasised by the parallel word ordering of *tuos* and *index*. *Unde* further hints that he is concerned with a particular person rather than an incriminating circumstance.[75] The questions are carefully designed, therefore, to isolate Cypassis and back her into a corner.

17 The poet-lover then poses a leading question: *num tamen erubui?* ("can I have blushed?", 7).[76] Here, he employs ἐρώτησις (questioning with the expectation of a negative answer), in Latin known as *interrogatio* (leading question), where the rhetorical question guides

the addressee to a specific (strongly negative or affirmative) answer.[77] *Num* suggests a negative response: he was not the one who blushed. Blushing is an image used in broadly to suggest one's guilt, specifically that of adultery.[78] The image is particularly applicable in a forensic context,[79] hence its use by Quintilian:[80]

> Ita tu cum hoc videres non erubuisti? Non deprehendi visus es quasi adulter?
>
> When you saw it thus, did you not blush? Did you not feel as though you were caught in adultery?

18 Like the poet-lover, Quintilian employs the image in an *interrogatio*, and in a string of questions that resembles a cross-examination. Ovid devotes the remainder of the couplet to another leading question:[81]

> ...num, verbo lapsus in ullo, furtivae Veneris conscia signa dedi?
>
> Can I have let slip a single word that gave a tell-tale sign of our stolen love?

19 The non-verbal gestures of guilt (*conscia signa*) form a contrast, emphasised by *tamen*, to the poet-lover's self-characterised expressionless face (2.7.5-6). Thus, Fränkel:

> He makes it appear to Cypassis that it was she who by her awkward behaviour had almost given away their secret when he saved the situation by his presence of mind and a clever denial.[82]

20 Textbook gaslighting:[83] she is at fault for blushing, not he for exploiting her. Indeed, gaslighting eerily resembles *dissimulatio*, the manipulation of the truth, regarded by Quintilian as the essence of oratory itself.[84] Here we find another anaphoric *num* used to prompt a negative response: no word from the poet-lover revealed their affair either; it must have been Cypassis.[85] This technique appears throughout Quintilian's declamations where it is likewise signposted by *num* to prompt a negative answer.[86] Indeed, Quintilian recommends that declaimers use this technique on a number of occasions.[87] Ovid has thus far compressed four rhetorical ques-

tions into four lines: his execution of ἐπίπληξις (rebuke) or *percontatio* (persistent questioning),[88] a device used 'to effect a false dialogue or offer an air of intimidation,'[89] is on full display. It is surely no mistake that Cypassis is bombarded by this string of interrogative questions immediately after the poet-lover attempts, by way of flattery, to drop her guard. She is, figuratively speaking, denuded and subsequently assaulted. Any euphemism behind *furtivae Veneris* does little to mitigate this. Quintilian explains the interrogative utility of *percontatio* for both prosecutors and advocates in eliciting information again the will of the *testis*.[90] In this case, Ovid uses *percontatio* to afford the poet-lover the appearance of having covered all alternative possibilities, as he narrows down the *index* ("informer") to Cypassis. The device is often used in declamation to this effect, for instance:[91]

> Quid postea? Satellitesne contraxi? Aut arma habui? Aut divisi pecuniam? Aliquid inter amicos continui?

> What followed? Did I gather bodyguards? Or keep weapons? Or distribute money? Did I keep anything among my friends?

21 In two of the four successive questions, Ovid employs anaphora with *num*,[92] a kind of repetition seen also in Quintilian,[93] which may suggest that Ovid picked up this technique during his education, especially given the popularity of *percontatio* in the extant declamations.[94] Similarly, Ovid would be aware of Ciceronian uses of *num* in pretended interrogations.[95] Thus, the poet-lover, who Davis suggests resembles typical declaimers,[96] weaponises his rhetorical training by appropriating these techniques to create for himself leverage in the court of love.[97] Perhaps Ovid is reflecting on a resemblance between lover and declaimer, between the sharp, accusatory tone of the lover interrogating the woman he had 'seduced' and that of a typical declaimer making his case.[98] As the tone changes from ingratiating (1-4) to interrogative (5-8), we return from the intimacy of the bedroom to the scrutiny of the witness-box, only to find out that these spaces are not so dissimilar in Augustan Rome.[99] In both the elite male has a clear advantage.[100] While eliding differences between love elegy and forensic disputes may seem humorous, it also reflects the dark reality of the power dynamics in this hetero-

sexual love affair, where through his rhetorical education the elite Roman male can manipulate the 'reality' of his relationship(s) to suit his needs. We have already witnessed this through the poet-lover's conflicting characterisations of Cypassis: to Corinna, she is presented as no more than a contemptible slave (2.7.20-4) who is *tam…fida* ("so… faithful", 2.7.25) to her mistress,[101] but to Cypassis herself the poet-lover is adulatory (2.8.1-4) and suggests that they are equal partners in the affair (2.8.5). As 2.8 continues, these manipulative tactics become increasingly transparent.

22 In the following couplet, the poet-lover issues his fourth question, not to harangue Cypassis but to reintroduce feelings of intimacy and partnership:[102]

> Quid, quod in ancilla siquis delinquere possit,
> illum ego contendi mente carere bona?

> Well, suppose I did contend that he who could lose his heart to a slave was out of his senses?

23 Cypassis has heard his defence (2.7): the poet-lover argues that he did not mean it that no freeman would sleep with a slave (2.7.19-21). Watson contrasts the passages to support her argument that 2.8 has a less 'legalistic ring' than 2.7. Again, this fails to account for the poet-lover's different aims.[103] In 2.7, the poet-lover wants to suggest that a freeman sleeping with a slave is base and therefore unrealistic; in 2.8, he tries to lighten Cypassis' offence at that suggestion. A good rhetorician would naturally use language that plays down the remark. Thus, *ancilla* is used in place of *famula*, a 'derogatory antithesis to *liber*.'[104] Watson does not address the legal connotations of *delinquere*: it can mean generally to lack or fail, or to commit an offence, specifically a sexual misdemeanour.[105] *Contendere* has a rhetorical undertone and often signals that one is proposing an argument.[106] The exclamatory *quid* is oratorical, and when followed by an elaboration or suggestion it creates ὑπόφορά (a question posed and then answered) or *subiectio* (a question followed by a suggestion).[107] The construction (*quid*, *quod…*?) occurs frequently in Ciceronian texts and in (pseudo)-Quintilian's *Declamationes Maiores*.[108] *Subiectio* is used to reflect on the truth of

a statement,[109] and (pseudo)-Quintilian generally uses the aforementioned construction to produce one of two effects: to hark back to a widely accepted maxim, thereby invoking the *credibile* tactic (plausibility, e.g. *Dec. Mai.* 2.14.9), or to reflect on a fact/statement aimed to induce goodwill (e.g. *Dec. Mai.* 5.22.12). Here it produces both effects. *Credibile* is in play since *quid, quod…*? guides to a negative response (ἐρώτησις) and thereby undermines the question. The poet-lover thus suggests that he only used the generalisation (2.7.21-2) to quash Corinna's suspicion.[110] In this way, he stresses that he does not actually believe it, therefore Cypassis should not be offended, and that he has been consistent in his denial of Corinna's accusation, which reiterates that, if one of them let the truth slip, it must have been Cypassis. She should thus feel obliged to him. Language like *mente…bona* ("of sound mind") is a hyperbolic touch, since it is noticeably absent in the lover's original generalisation.[111] The emphasis on sanity exaggerates the robustness of his denial as it reinforces his probability-based argument; it also assumes the place of *liber* ("free"), now conveniently omitted, where the original emphasis was on free status. He thus tweaks the reality to make his denial appear more effective and to downplay the insult to Cypassis. This is the start of another attempted *captatio benevolentiae*.

24 The poet-lover then employs two mythological *exempla* (examples) to buttress his argument:[112]

> Thessalus ancillae facie Briseidos arsit;
> serva Mycenaeo Phoebas amata duci.
>
> The Thessalian took fire at the charms of the slave Briseis; a slave, Phoebas, was loved by the Mycenean chief.

25 Although historical *exempla* are more appropriate to declamation and mythological *exempla* are more commonly found in poetry,[113] as Watson notes, mythological *exempla* are not unheard of in forensic oratory.[114] Nevertheless, she decides that Ovid's argument is 'based securely in poetic tradition,' citing Propertian parallels.[115] Perhaps Ovid has both elegy and declamation in mind. The popular figures of Agamemnon and Achilles may simply be more familiar to the subaltern,[116] and thus offer a more persuasive *exemplum*

(example) than a historical alternative.[117] The rhetorical strategy applied has a place in oratory: by likening his situation to those of Achilles and Agamemnon, Ovid employs an *argumentum a maiore* (argument from the greater).[118] If an affair with a slave was acceptable for these great men, it should be acceptable for himself. The strategy is discussed by Quintilian and Cicero.[119] A similar *exemplum* is employed by Horace, who uses the same logic at *Carm.* 2.4.1-6.[120] The mutual subject (an affair with a slave), is accompanied by marked linguistic parallels (eg. *ancillae…Briseidos*; *ancillae…Briseis*, "the slave Briseis"),[121] and on the Horatian *exempla* Nisbet and Hubbard note: '[the] paradoxes suggest Roman declamation rather than Hellenistic epigram'.[122] Ovid's *exempla* aim to unwind the sentiment of 2.7.19-21;[123] by drawing on his education (rhetorical and mythological) the poet-lover tries to twist his former insult into a compliment. But Cypassis is no heroine, and she is well aware that the poet-lover is no hero.[124]

26 In the following couplet, the poet-lover unpacks his *exemplum*:[125]

> Nec sum ego Tantalide maior, nec maior Achille;
> quod decuit reges, cur mihi turpe putem?

> I am neither greater than Tantalus' son, nor greater than Achilles;
> why should I judge base for me what was fit for kings?

27 He highlights his inferiority to the figures with repeated comparatives (*maior*), and juxtaposition (*ego Tantalide*, thereby feigning humility and presenting himself as an affective slave of Cypassis, herself a domestic slave.[126] This comparison is another effort at capturing goodwill,[127] but its language is double-edged: the *reges*, in contrast to their slaves, align the poet-lover with the regal ranks and Cypassis with their counterpart. He thus tacitly reasserts his social superiority over her.[128] *Turpe* suggests debasement, but the term also has a forensic undertone.[129] In fact, Quintilian uses it in a maxim that recalls our current situation: *si turpis dominae consuetudo cum servo, turpis domino cum ancilla* ("if connexion to a male slave is disgraceful to the mistress of the house, so is the connexion of the master with a female slave").[130] If it befits even kings (*decuit reges*), surely the poet-lover's affair cannot be considered shameful (*mihi*

turpe putem). The poet-lover proposes this idea, as we should expect, in the form of a rhetorical question.[131] Tantalus (*Tantalide*), notorious for his inability to keep secrets, is hardly a good precedent. This perhaps looks forward to the imminent threat (26: *culpae proditor ipse meae*, "the betrayer of my own guilt").[132]

28 In the subsequent couplet, the poet-lover turns from *captatio benevolentiae* back to the 'blame game':[133]

> Vt tamen iratos in te defixit ocellos,
> vidi te totis erubuisse genis.
>
> Yet, when she fixed her angered eyes on you, I saw the blushes completely overspread your cheeks.

29 Ovid's language in these lines (*ut tamen…vidi te…erubuisse*) echoes that which he used earlier in to prove his denial of the accusation (*num tamen erubui?*).[134] Here blushing acts as a signifier of guilt, and the poet-lover uses this image to contrast his (postured) innocence to Cypassis' culpability.[135] The poet-lover heightens this contrast through hyperbole:[136] while he does not blush (*num… erubui?*), Cypassis' face is entirely overtaken with blushing (*te totis erubuisse genis*). Thus, Ziogas:

> [2.8.16] suggests the testimony of an eyewitness in court, anticipating Ovid's threat that he is ready to become an informer of their affair…should Cypassis refuse to gratify him sexually…he will… speak not as a defendant but as a witness in support of the prosecution.[137]

30 Although blushing can indicate guilt, it also reflects her fear (cf. 23: *novos…timores*, "new…fears").[138] Unsurprisingly, a menacing tone accompanies the poet-lover's accusation, brought out by the harsh dental alliterations of *t* and the assonance of *i* and *s*, which suggests 'intimidatory vehemence'.[139] The tone becomes *acutum/incitatum* (sharp/provoked) designed to convey *vis* (force).[140]

31 After pointing a finger at Cypassis, the poet-lover stresses by way of an *exclamatio* his greater presence of mind:[141]

> At quanto, si forte refers, praesentior ipse
> per Veneris feci numina magna fidem!
>
> But how much more contained was I, if you happen to remember,
> when I swore to my faithfulness in mighty Venus' name!

32 Notice the condescending tone developed by the sarcastic interjection: *si forte refers*.[142] Here, the poet-lover implements *dicacitas* (brief, sharp raillery or sarcasm), a device recommended by Cicero and Quintilian to induce humour, but used inappropriately here.[143] The poet-lover employs another comparative (*quanto…praesentior*) that exaggerates his composure and stresses Cypassis' inadequacy. So clever and superior is he that he even took an oath (*feci…fidem*), a reference to 2.7.27-8. Of course, the oath is meaningless,[144] so he is not really risking anything; he only makes Cypassis think that he is. Accordingly, the elevated register of *Veneris…numina magna* gives 'added sanctity to the oath,' as Martyn notes.[145] For taking the oath, Ovid also uses a unique construction: *feci…fidem*, a phrase extremely rare in Latin poetry.[146] While *feci…fidem*, seems out of place in poetry, it is well-established in prose.[147] The phrase has a particular rhetorical application: 'to win the belief of hearers/the public'; to create credibility.[148] The poet-lover takes an oath that is designed to persuade Corinna of his 'innocence.' Considering that this line is an exclamatory proof of his greater composure, it may be viewed as an instance of ἐπιφώνημα (an exclamation used to summarise an argument)[149]

33 In the next couplet, he invokes Venus with similarly elevated language:[150]

> Tu, dea, tu iubeas animi periuria puri
> Carpathium tepidos per mare ferre Notos!
>
> Thou, goddess, mayst thou bid the warm South Wind Sweep o'er the
> Carpathian deep the false oaths of a harmless heart!

34 Here Ovid alludes to the oath taken at 2.7.27-8. The language has a clear legalistic ring (*iubeas…periuri*).[151] Previously, the poet-lover

swore that he would not allow himself to be charged of a crime (2.7.28: *non admissi criminis…reum*, "I am not guilty of the charge"), yet here he proudly confesses to perjury to emphasise the shrewdness of his defence. In other words, his perjury should prove his 'innocence'. The irony reflects the poet-lover's contradictory approach, and is developed by the oxymoron, *animi periuria puri* ("harmless heart" and "false oaths") where the tension between perjury and purity is brought out by an abrasive plosive alliteration.[152] Ovid's apostrophe, *tu*, *dea*, *tu* ("thou, goddess, thou"), is poetic, but it is also applied in two of the ways recommended by Quintilian for declaimers: *ad invocationem aliquam convertimur* ("to turn to make an invocation or entreaty"), and *aversio* ("to avert" or "divert attention").[153]

35 In the couplet that follows, the poet-lover turns back to Cypassis, and his agenda is clear:[154]

> Pro quibus officiis pretium mihi dulce repende
> concubitus hodie, fusca Cypassi, tuos!
>
> In return for these offices to you, dusky Cypassis, pay me today the sweet price of your caress!

36 The prayer to the goddess is juxtaposed with an imperative to a slave. With terms used to describe transactions and patronage (*pro quibus officiis*, *pretium*, *repende*), the poet-lover suggests that Cypassis owes him a (sexual) favour for his denial of Corinna's claims.[155] The language is decidedly unflattering,[156] the 'service' performed is hardly selfless, and the reward, it seems, will gratify only the poet-lover (*pretium mihi dulce repende*). *Officium* can have a sexual connotation,[157] but it also often pertains to services rendered by an inferior:[158] the poet-lover positions himself as a dutiful *servus amoris* (slave of love) who deserves a reward from Cypassis, suddenly his *domina* (mistress).[159] By invoking the *servitium amoris* (the slavery of love) fantasy, he attempts to construct an alternate reality in which the power dynamics of this relationship are reversed,[160] as though Cypassis might be fooled into thinking that she is in control. The illusion is undercut by the poet-lover asking this favour in the form of a command (*repende*). Perhaps the

poet-lover feels entitled to sleep with Cypassis because of her subaltern status, yet despite his intimations,[161] it is not clear that the poet-lover is her *dominus* (master). As Wise notes, the suggestion is that Cypassis' body 'is available to him because he is socially superior to her,'[162] which is also an affront to Corinna as her actual *domina*. Coupled with the transactional language, *concubitus* ("caress" or "sleeping together") a technical term for prostitution,[163] emphasises that Cypassis' body is commodified for services rendered: this is not only an order, it is a threat. The putatively positive appellative, *fusca*, hardly compensates for the threat. On the contrary, it is another reminder of her objectification: it connotes the exotic, contrasting the *candida…femina* ("fair beauty") of 2.7.5; she is, to use the term loosely, 'fetishised'.[164] Interestingly, Ovid's language and syntax (*concubitus…tuos*) parallels that of line 6 (*concubitus…tuos*). First the construction came in a rhetorical question; now it is in an order. The poet-lover was interrogative, but now he is forceful. The flattery that began the poem (1-4) is overwhelmed by the hectoring, domineering voice that controls most of this pairing.

37 Frustrated, and seeing no need for consent, the poet-lover moves straight to coercion:[165]

> Quid renuis fingisque novos, ingrata, timores?
> Vnum est e dominis emeruisse satis.

> Why do you shake your head and refuse, ungrateful girl, and feign fresh fears? It will suffice to have earned the favour of only one of your masters.

38 Although this attempted coercion looks like a question, it involves another accusation. *Renuis* suggests 'emphatic…refusal,'[166] a clear sign of non-consent. *Fingisque* connotes fabrication,[167] and insinuates that Cypassis is making excuses. The poet-lover tries to invalidate her decision. The plural *novos…timores* echo Corinna's *nova crimina* ("new charges", 2.7.1).[168] Ovid's language is deliberately ambiguous. The *novos…timores* could pertain simply to Cypassis' fears that Corinna might catch them. Considering the poet-lover's impatience and the threats that follow,[169] however, the phrase also intimates that this is not her first refusal: Cypassis is perhaps the

victim of recurrent violence. The epithet, *ingrata* is particularly derogatory and, in a legal context, suggestive of a crime itself: 'to be *ingratus* towards one's owner or patron was recognised as an offence'.[170] Coupled with *dominis*, the term highlights her inferiority, and by extension the poet-lover's hierarchical authority as he usurps Corinna's legal role.[171] Hence, McKeown: 'Ovid speaks as if he and Corinna are man and wife, as if he therefore has rights of ownership over Cypassis'.[172] The implication is that Cypassis should not just be grateful that he denied the affair but also that he chooses *her* to rape. Of both Cypassis' owners (*e dominis*), only one, emphasised by the position of *unum est*, is satisfied with her services (*emeruisse satis*). There is a double-meaning on *emeruisse* ("having earned"): it alludes to dressing Corinna's hair and sleeping with the poet-lover, and perhaps has a 'humorous' effect.[173] More importantly, however, it is the second time that the poet-lover reduces Cypassis' worth to the fulfilment of these two tasks, and by extension, the gratification of her 'owner(s)'.[174] Can this really be regarded as a seduction gone wrong?[175] Henderson even proposes that Cypassis 'has earned her spell of masochistic suffering/pleasure.'[176] There is no textual evidence in either part of the pairing to suggest that Cypassis derives pleasure from her lack of choice; her passive role is attested by her voicelessness. Based on the textual clues, this is more likely a sustained and calculated rape.

39 The bullying tone implicit in the threat (*ingrata*, "ungrateful") is reinforced by the derisive term, *stulta* ("stupidly") of the penultimate couplet:[177]

> Quod si stulta negas, index ante acta fatebor,
> et veniam culpae proditor ipse meae.

> But if you stupidly say no, I shall turn informer and confess all we have done before; I shall stand forth the betrayer of my own guilt.

40 With *stulta*, the poet-lover is the one to make the judgement on the soundness of her reaction;[178] the term contrasts his greater presence of mind (*praesentior*). Not only has the poet-lover effectively muted Cypassis, he is also determined to usurp her ability to decide what is

'right' for her. Equally telling is *negas* ("you say no"): that the poet-lover presumes Cypassis' denial is further evidence that his approaches are recurrent and uninvited (cf. 2.8.23: *renuis*, "refuse"). In any case, this language undercuts Henderson's suggestion that Cypassis enjoys being bullied,[179] and Mills' claim that she is an 'enthusiastic participant' in the affair.[180] With his anticipation of the denial and premeditated rebuttal, the poet-lover employs *praemunitio* (proactive defence).[181] By physical or rhetorical force, he leaves her no escape. His hostility results from accumulated frustration: he wants to be rewarded for his persuasive skill with either an admission of guilt, a promise of silence, or best of all, sex.[182] Whether due to the inconsistent nature of his approach or Cypassis' own reservations, the only way that he can fulfil these aims is by turning to coercion.[183] Perhaps the fulfilment of these desires is intended, to him at least, to be a proof of his virility.[184] This is, of course, steeped in irony, since his 'manliness' can only be demonstrated over a defenceless subaltern.[185] Through verbal or physical force, Cypassis is used as an object of his self-gratification.

41 The poet-lover's threat contains many terms that have legal implications (*index ante acta*, "the informer of what was done before"; *culpae*, "guilt"; *fatebor*, "I shall confess").[186] *Index* is a forensic term and, coupled with *ante acta*, it suggests that the poet-lover is willing to act as a criminal informant.[187] Moreover, *venia* describes the reward for the *index* in legal processes (*confessio*), and its obtainment a chief aim of declaimers when arguing as a defendant.[188] *Veniam* is ambiguous,[189] but even understood as a verb ("I shall come forth"), when employed among so many legal terms, the word brings to mind the legal sense. *Fatebor* refers to an admission of guilt,[190] and similarly alludes to the *confessio* procedure.[191] The poet-lover implies that he would not suffer the crime, or rather, that Cypassis' punishment would be comparatively worse as Corinna's slave (cf. 2.7.22).[192] *Meae… culpae* ("my…guilt") also recalls the formal language of a confession.[193] The legal language emphasises the poet-lover's advantage and the severity of Cypassis' consequences for denying him. He implicates himself precisely because the outcome is unrealistic,[194] hence its placement within a conditional. After all, that is just how Ovid ends the performance of 2.7.[195] This brings a witty stylistic semblance to the ends of each counterpart of this

controversia-inspired pairing. We cannot help but notice the irony in the poet-lover's sexual impulses taking priority over the initial (ostensible) objective of quashing Corinna's suspicions, since the rape of Cypassis would leave him prone to further suspicions.[196]

42 Nevertheless, the poet-lover proceeds to issue a final threat:[197]

> Quoque loco tecum fuerim, quotiensque, Cypassi,
> narrabo dominae, quotque quibusque modis!

> ...and tell your mistress where I have met you, and how many times, Cypassis, and how many ways, and what they were!

43 In this couplet, Ovid employs ὁμοιοπροφορον (alliteration)[198] with four hard guttural alliterations of *q* in quick succession (*quoque*; *quotiensque*; *quotque*; *quibusque*) to develop a cacophonous and menacing sound that augments the poet-lover's badgering tone and end his performance with an air of exhaustivity.[199] Here we have συναθροισμός (grouping of words),[200] or more broadly, *amplificatio* (careful arrangement of words).[201] Of these terms, all four signpost indirect questions, and this provides the lover's threat an appearance of having covered all angles; the exaggerated details make it appear more plausible.[202] The couplet's asyndetic structure creates an ominous rhythm so that with each detail comes the impression that Cypassis' punishment will be increasingly more severe. *Narrabo* ("I will tell"), moreover, gives the impression of a tabloid confession,[203] and *dominae*, referring to Corinna, reminds Cypassis once more of her inferior position. Additionally, we find four instances of ὁμοιοτέλευτον (repetition of similar word-endings) through the enclitic *-que* attached to each of the alliterative terms.[204] These terms themselves are frequently combined in oratory, as McKeown notes: 'Ovid's threat of confession is couched in familiar forensic terms.'[205] Indeed, the declaimers often employ an accumulation of '*q*' sounds to produce a powerful percussive effect.[206] For instance, Cestius Pius' *narratio* (narration) as recalled by Seneca the Elder:[207]

> Quid agam? Exponam quando stuprum commiserit, cum quo quibus consciis? Ista quia probavi damnata est. Quid postea accessit quod

> illam virginam faceret? Quod iacuit in carcere, quod ducta est ad saxum, quod inde proiecta?

> What am I to do? Am I to explain when she committed the act, with whom, who were the accomplices? It is just because I proved all that that she was condemned. What has happened since to make her a virgin? That she lay in prison, that she was led to the rock, that she was thrown off it?

44 As in this example, the poet-lover's verbal torrent is intended to leave no room for debate. Ovid thus concludes 2.8 in a fashion that underscores the poem's hectoring, melodramatic tone — a reminder of the declamatory character of this pairing, [208]and the poet-lover's final attempt to impose a virile 'authority' over his addressee.[209]

45 We might, therefore, reconsider some of Watson's observations. She is right to note the stylistic difference and change of register between 2.7 and 2.8,[210] but ultimately, these changes are hardly as absolute as Watson suggests. In 2.8, the poet-lover's use of 'lower' register and language is not an outright abandonment of the forensic atmosphere of 2.7, nor is his approach maintained: at the beginning, the mood is intimate and the register informal (1-4); while he attempts to reintroduce the intimate mood (9-14), it is offset by his insistence on formal persuasive techniques, a domineering voice, and forensic terminology. There is a juxtaposition: the contrast between the poet-lover's approaches is key to their resemblance to the declamatory *controversiae*; it reflects the shift from *reus* to *suasor* and the declaimer's changing aims.[211] I suggest that amid these dramatic changes in addressee, setting, register, and strategy, there remains an uncanny likeness between the poems. This likeness develops as the poem goes on, and it is located not just in the use of legal terminology or formal persuasive tactics, but also in that melodramatic mood and hectoring tone. Moreover, 'seduction' is an inappropriate term to describe the poet-lover's silencing of the abused. This is a verbal assault, and the reader must suspect, a prelude to a physical rape. In 2.7, the poet-lover uses his rhetorical education, privileged to him by his status as an elite Roman male, to deflect accusations made by Corinna; in 2.8, he weaponises that same education to assert and reassert his authority over the subaltern and ultimately resorts, we suspect, to physical violence. Ovid's incorporation

of declamatory rhetoric into a typical elegiac scenario develops a unique portrait of the Augustan elegiac lover attempting to leverage his masculinity in the stereotypically effete realm of love elegy. The poet-lover thus seeks to impose a gendered advantage over his female addressees, especially the subaltern, Cypassis. He exploits rhetorical techniques to disarm (1-4), gaslight (9-14), badger (5-8), and silence her (21-2). The rhetorical approach is not merely a humorous about-face; it is a calculated and systematic exertion of a power that is exclusive to the elite Roman male. What makes the *controversia* such an effective vehicle for the expression of this idea is that, while it has the appearance of a dialogue, the addressees are essentially mute; neither Corinna nor Cypassis have a voice. Despite this, when the poet-lover demands sex from Cypassis, we hear her say 'no'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

OLD P. G. W. Glare (1968-82), Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford.

TLL Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Leipzig: 1900–.

Translations

D. R. Shackleton Bailey (2006), Quintilian: The Lesser Declamations I. Massachusetts.

D. R. Shackleton Bailey (2006), Quintilian: The Lesser Declamations II. Massachusetts.

G. Showerman (1977), Ovid: Heroides and Amores. Revised by G. P. Gould. Massachusetts.

M. Winterbottom (1974), Seneca the Elder Declamations I: Controversiae 1-6. Massachusetts.

M. Winterbottom (1974), Seneca the Elder Declamations II: Controversiae 7-10, Suasoriae Fragments. Massachusetts.

Academic Journals/Books

K. Abramson (2014), "Turning up the Lights on Gaslighting," in Philosophical Perspectives 28, p. 1–30.

J. N. Adams (1990), The Latin Sexual Vocabulary. Baltimore.

R. Alexandre, C. Guérin, & M. Jacotot (2012), Rubor et Pudor: vivre et penser la honte dans la Rome ancienne. Paris.

A. W. Allen (1950), "Sincerity and the Roman elegists," in CP 45, p. 145–60.

R. Armstrong (2005), Ovid and His Love Poetry. Bristol.

U. Auhagen (2007), "Rhetoric and Ovid," in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.), A Companion to Roman Rhetoric, Oxford, p. 413-24.

W. M. Bloomer (2007), "Roman Declamation: the Elder Seneca and

Quintilian," in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.), A Companion to Roman Rhetoric, Oxford, p. 297-306.

S. F. Bonner (1949), Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire. Liverpool.

J. Booth (1991), Ovid, Amores II, Translation and Commentary. Warminster.

J. Booth (2009), "The Amores: Ovid Making Love," in P. Knox (ed.), A Companion to Ovid, Chichester, p. 61-77.

P. L. Bowditch (2012), "Roman Love Elegy and the Eros of Empire," in B. K. Gold (ed.), A Companion to Roman Love Elegy, Massachusetts, p. 119-33.

M. Bradley (2009), Colour and Meaning in Ancient Rome. Cambridge.

C. Brück (1909), De Ovidio Scholasticarum declamationum imitatore. Gieben.

A. Cameron (1968), "The First Edition of Ovid's Amores," in CQ 18, 2, p. 320–33.

E. Champlin (2003), "Agamemnon at Rome: Roman Dynasts and Greek Heroes," in D. Braund & C. Gill (eds.), Myth, History and Culture at Rome, Liverpool, p. 295-319.

J. Connolly (2007), "Virile Tongues: Rhetoric and Masculinity," in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.), A Companion to Roman Rhetoric, Oxford, p. 83-97.

A. Corbeill (2007), "Rhetorical Education and Social Reproduction in the Republic and Early Empire," in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.), A Companion to Roman Rhetoric, Oxford, p. 69-82.

J. T. Davis (1977), Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid. Bern.

J. T. Davis (1981), "Risit Amor: Aspects of Literary Burlesque in Ovid's Amores," in ANRW 2.31, 4, p. 2460–506.

J. T. Davis (1989), Fictus Adulter: Poet as Actor in the Amores. Amsterdam.

K. De Boer (2021), "Violence and Vulnerability in Ovid's Amores 1.5-8," in AJPh 142, 2, p. 259-86.

W. Dominik (1997), "The style is the man: Seneca, Tacitus and Quintilian's canon," in Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature, London, p. 42-56.

I. M. Le M. Du Quesnay (1973) "The Amores," in J.W. Binns (ed.), Ovid, London, p. 1-48.

J. Fabre-Serris (2013), "Genre and Gender: uses and issues of the use of durus among the elegiacs," in Eugesta 3, p. 209-309.

E. Fantham (2009), "Rhetoric and Ovid's Poetry," in P. Knox (ed.), A Companion to Ovid, Chichester, p. 26-44.

W. Fitzgerald (2000) Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination. Cambridge.

H. Fränkel (1945), Ovid: a Poet Between Two Worlds. Berkeley.

E. Fraenkel (1916), "Zur Geschichte Des Wortes Fides," in RhM 71, p. 187–99.

L. Fulkerson (2013), "Servitium Amoris: the Interplay of Dominance, Gender and Poetry," in T. S. Thorsen (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy, Cambridge, p. 180–93.

K. A. Geffcken (1973), "Comedy in the pro Caelio," in Mnemosyne 30, p. 27-43.

R. Gibson (1995), "How to win girlfriends and influence them: amicitia

in Roman love elegy," in PCPhS 41, p. 62-82.

M. W. Gleason (1995), Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome. Princeton.

N. P. Gross (1979), "Rhetorical Wit and Amatory Persuasion in Ovid," in CJ 74, 4, p. 305–18.

J. Hallett (1973), "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-cultural Feminism," in Arethusa 6, 1, p.103–24.

J. Hall (2007), "Oratorical Delivery and the Emotions: Theory and Practice," in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.), A Companion to Roman Rhetoric, Oxford, p. 218-34.

P. Hardie (2006), "Ovid and Early Imperial Literature," in his Cambridge Companion to Ovid, Cambridge, p. 34-45.

S. Harrison (2006), "Ovid and Genre: Evolutions of an Elegist," in P. Hardie (ed.), Cambridge Companion to Ovid, Cambridge, p. 79-94.

S. Harrison (2017), Horace: Odes Book II. Cambridge, 2017.

J. Henderson (1991), "Wrapping up the Case: Reading Ovid, Amores 2.7 (+8) I," in MD 27, p. 37-88.

J. Henderson (1992), "Wrapping up the Case: Reading Ovid, Amores 2.7 (+8) II," in MD 28, p. 27–83.

T.F. Higham (1958), "Ovid and Rhetoric," in N. I. Herescu (ed.) Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide, Paris, p. 32-74.

N. Holzberg (2002), Ovid: The Poet and his Work. Ithaca.

K. Jäger (1967), Zweigliederige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare bei Properz und in Ovids Amores. Tübingen.

S.L. James (1997), "Slave-Rape and Female Silence in Ovid‟s Love Poetry," in Helios 24, p. 60-76.

S.L. James (2003), Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy. Berkeley.

M. Janan (2012), "Lacanian Psychoanalytic Theory and Roman Love Elegy," in B. K. Gold (ed.). A Companion to Roman Love Elegy, Massachusetts, p. 375-89.

I. Jouteur (2005), "Sur Un Mensonge d'Ovide: Amores II, 7-8," in Latomus 64, 1, p. 70–81.

A. Keith (2008), Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure. Bristol.

A. Keith (2009), "Sexuality and Gender," in P. Knox (ed.), A Companion to Ovid, Chichester, p. 355-69.

A. Keith (2023), "Seruitium amoris: Slavery and Imperialism in Roman Erotic Elegy," in H. Cornwell & G. Woolf (eds.), Gendering Roman Imperialism, Leiden, 223-46.

R. Kirchner (2007), "Elocutio," in W. Dominik & J. Hall (eds.), A Companion to Roman Rhetoric, Oxford, p. 181-94.

G. La Bua (2019), Cicero and Roman Education: the Reception of the Speeches and Ancient Scholarship. Cambridge.

H. Lausberg (1963), Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik: eine Einführung für Studierende der klassischen, romanischen, englischen und deutschen Philologie 2. München.

A.G. Lee (1962), "Tenerorum Lusor Amorum," in J. P. Sullivan (ed.), Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric. London, p. 149-80.

M. R. Lefkowitz (1981), Heroines and Hysterics. New York.

F. W. Lenz (1966), Ovid - Die Liebeselegien. Berlin.

S. Mack (1988), Ovid. New Haven.

J. R. C Martyn (1981), "Naso — Desultor amoris (Amores I-III)," in ANRW 31, 4, p. 2436-59.

K. McCarthy (1998), "Seruitium Amoris: amor seruitii," in S. Murnaghan & S. Joshel (eds.), Women and Slaves in the Greco-Roman World: Differential Equations, London, p. 174-92.

J. C. McKeown (1987), Ovid: Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes. Text and Prolegomena. Leeds.

J. C. McKeown (1989), Ovid: Amores II: A Commentary on Book One. Leeds.

J. C. McKeown (1998), Ovid: Amores III: A Commentary on Book Two. Leeds.

T. McGinn (1998), Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome. Oxford.

S. Mills (1978), "Ovid's Donkey Act," in CJ 73, 4, p. 303–06.

R. G. M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard (1978), A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II. Oxford.

E. Oliensis (2019), Loving Writing/Ovid's Amores. Cambridge.

N. Pandey (2018), "Caput mundi: Female Hair as Symbolic Vehicle of Domination in Ovidian Love Elegy," in CJ 113, p. 454–88.

L. Paulson (2022), Cicero and the People's Will: Philosophy and Power at the End of the Roman Republic. Cambridge.

R. Pichon (1966), Index Verborum Amatoriorum. Hildesheim.

M. van der Poel (2009), "The Use of Exempla in Roman Declamation," in Rhetorica 27, 3, p. 332–53.

A. Richlin (1997), "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools," in W. Dominik (ed.), Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature. London, p. 74-90.

A. F. Sabot (1976), Ovide, poète de l'amour, dans ses œuvres de jeunesse. Gap.

M. B. Skinner (1983), "Clodia Metelli," in TAPA 113, p. 273–87.

A. Sharrock (2006), "Ovid and the Discourses of Love: the Amatory Works," in P. Hardie (ed.), Cambridge Companion to Ovid, Cambridge, p. 150-62.

A. Sharrock (2012), "Ovid," in B. K. Gold (ed.), A Companion to Roman Love Elegy, Massachusetts, p. 70–85.

T. S. Thorsen (2013) "Introduction," in Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy, Cambridge, p. 1-22.

P. Veyne (1988), Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West. Chicago.

K. Volk (2010), Ovid. Oxford.

P. Watson (1983), "Ovid Amores 2.7 and 8: The Disingenuous Defence," in WS 96, p. 91-103. B.

B. Weinlich (1999), Ovids Amores Gedichtfolge und Handlungsablauf. Stuttgart-Leipzig.

L. P. Wilkinson (1955) Ovid Recalled. Cambridge.

C. Williams (2010), Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of

Masculinity in Classical Antiquity. Oxford.

M. Winterbottom (1980), Roman Declamation: Extracts. Bristol.

M. Winterbottom (2020), Papers on Quintilian and Ancient Declamation. Oxford, 2020.

J. Wise (2019), "Subaltern women, sexual violence, and trauma in Ovid's Amores," in A. Karanika & V. Panoussi (eds.), Emotional Trauma in Greece and Rome: Representations and Reactions, London, p. 44-58.

M. Wyke (2002), The Roman Mistress. Oxford.

E. Zimmermann Damer (2019), In the Flesh: Embodied Identities in Roman Elegy. Madison.

I. Ziogas (2021), Law and Love in Ovid: Courting Justice in the Age of Augustus. Oxford.

NOTES

1 Watson (1983), p. 91-103. Others that have provided a detailed treatment of the pairing: Jäger (1967), p. 11-15; Davis (1977), p. 98-107; Henderson (1991), p. 37-88; (1992), p. 27–83; James (1997), p. 60-76; McKeown (1998), p. 146-68. For smaller but relevant discussions: Lenz (1966), p. 196-97; Mills (1978), p. 303–06; Martyn (1981), p. 2442-48; Weinlich (1999), p. 121-23; Zimmerman Damer (2019), p. 108-110; Ziogas (2021), p. 117-23; Keith (2023), p. 234-36.

2 Watson (1983), p. 103.

3 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2446-48; McKeown (1989), p. 123; James (1997), p. 68. They suggest that 2.8 mimics a *suasoria*. I agree but am reluctant to fit the poem into a single form. I discuss more generally the oratorical elements unmentioned by Watson.

4 Watson (1983), p. 97, n. 35. cf. Cic. *De Or*. 1.158; *Inv*. 2, 25; Quint. *Inst*. 2.4.18; 5.13.50; Sen. *Con*. 10.5.12.

5 Watson (1983), p. 97. But see Martyn (1981), p. 2445-48; McKeown (1989), p. 123.

6 Watson (1983), p. 97.

7 For the many that use 'seduction' and similar terms, see James (1997), p. 66 n. 16. Mills (1978), p. 305 even suggests that Cypassis is an 'enthusiastic participant in the works of Venus.' Her argument is based on a series of speculative connections and questionable symbolism. More recently, Oliensis (2019), p. 68: 'seducing'.

8 Gaslighting involves manipulating someone to question their reasoning or their reality. For an overview of 'gaslighting,' see Abramson (2014), p. 1–30.

9 Higham (1958), p. 32-3; Winterbottom (1980), p. 59; (2020), p. 66.

10 Higham (1958), p. 33, n. 1.

11 Winterbottom (1980), p. 59.

12 Winterbottom (1980), p. 60; cf. Davis (1989), p. 18-19; Bloomer (2007), p. 299. See also Quint. *Inst*. 9.2.29–37.

13 Winterbottom (1980), p. 60; (2020): 232.

14 Sen. *Con*. 2.2.8-9. cf. Davis (1989), p. 3.

15 cf. e.g. Gross (1979), p. 305-18; Davis (1989), p. 3-36; McKeown (1987), p. 69-73; Auhagen (2007), p. 413-17.

16 cf. Fränkel (1945), p. 2, n. 4; Higham (1958), p. 41; Fantham (2009), p. 26.

17 Hardie (2006), p. 36.

18 Allen (1950), p. 152-54; Veyne (1988), p. 44; 67-8; Oliensis (2019), p. 1; 8-15.

19 Holzberg (2002), p. 51.

20 cf. Gleason (1995), esp. p. 98-162; Dominik (1997), p. 42-56; Richlin (1997), p. 74-90; Connolly (2007), p. 83-97; Hall (2007), p. 229-31.

21 Gleason (1995), p. 62-7; 74-7. cf. Williams (2010), p. 128-31; Connolly (2007), p. 88.

22 cf. e.g. Quint. *Inst*. 2.5.10; 12; 8. *pr*. 20; 22; 8.3.6–7.

23 Corbeill (2007), p. 75.

24 Gleason (1995), p. 160.

25 cf. Wyke (2002), p. 33–4; 166–68; Armstrong (2005), p. 51; Keith (2009), p. 355; Fabre-Serris (2013), p. 216-17; Thorsen (2013), p. 10-11.

26 cf. e.g. Brück (1909), p. 51-2; Jäger (1967), p. 12; Watson (1983), p. 92-3; Davis (1989), p. 3-36; Henderson (1991), p. 38-9; (1992), p. 36.

27 Sen. *Con*. 2.2.1.15. cf. e.g. Watson (1983), p. 97; Davis (1989): 15; On Ovid's rhetorical education generally, see Fränkel (1945), p. 5-8; Bonner (1949), p. 143-44; Wilkinson (1955), p. 5-12.

28 cf. Davis (1989), p. 12-15; 21; Bloomer (2007), p. 299; Keith (2008), p. 39; La Bua (2019), p. 114-15. See also: Cic. *De Or*. 1.158; *Inv*. 2, 25; Quint. *Inst*. 2.4.18; 5.13.50. Sen. *Con*. 10.5.12.

29 cf. Sen. *Con.* 2.2.12; Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.18.

30 Winterbottom (2020), p. 137. cf. Davis (1989), p. 10-12; 18-20.

31 cf. e.g. Wilkinson (1955), p. 67-8; Cameron (1968), p. 328; Du Quesnay (1973), p. 6; Davis (1981), p. 2491; Mack (1988), p. 60-1; Henderson (1992), p. 45; McKeown (1998), p. 146; Armstrong (2005), p. 59; Booth (2009), p. 69; Volk (2010), p. 68-9.

32 Thus Wise (2019), p. 47: '[Cypassis] is not seen as even human in status… with no ability to speak back, protest, or protect herself.'

33 Little attention has been paid to the violence perpetrated against Cypassis. It has been discussed in passing, cf. e.g. Armstrong (2005), p. 60; Sharrock (2006), p. 158; (2012), p. 74-5; Janan (2012), p. 385-87; Fulkerson (2013), p. 189; Pandey (2018), p. 463-64; Keith (2023), p. 236. The most detailed treatments come from James (1997), p. 60-76; Wise (2019), p. 50-4. Both have influenced my understanding of the poem, but neither treat the persuasive elements in detail.

34 Watson (1983), p. 97; 103.

35 Watson (1983), p. 97.

36 These translations are mine and are intended to emphasise the forensic colour of Ovid's language.

37 cf. Brück (1909), p. 51-2.

38 Jäger (1967), p. 12-14.

39 Watson (1983), p. 97.

40 Ziogas (2021), p. 121.

41 For informative diagrams of different oratorical approaches, focused on tone, register, and body language as per Cic. *Rhet. Her.* 3.20-7, see Hall (2007), p. 221; 225.

42 Watson (1983), p. 103.

43 cf. Cic. *De Or.* 3.210. Cicero lists four considerations that impact what approach is appropriate on any given occasion: *causa*; *auditor*; *persona*; *tempus*. See also Kirchner (2007), p. 192.

44 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.1-4. Translations of full lines from *Amores* are by Showerman (1977) unless otherwise indicated, and translations of some shorter phrases are my own.

45 I cannot agree with Davis (1977), p. 10: 'Ovid is very much relieved and at ease'.

46 He is 'stooping,' as it were, down to her level; it is not a sincere attempt to meet her half-way, à la Henderson (1992), p. 33: 'O and Cy can be one in language. Both of them are [Corinna's] slave-victim-donkeys.'

47 Martyn (1981), p. 2443; Armstrong (2005), p. 60.

48 Sabot (1976), p. 391.

49 cf. e.g. Cic. *De. Or.* 2.72-4; 182-3; Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.8-12; 20. See also: Martyn (1981), p. 2443; McKeown (1998), p. 158; Davis (1989), p. 16; Weinlich (1999), p. 121; Fantham (2009), p. 32.

50 Paulson (2022), p. 43. cf. Cic. *De. Or.* 2.32.

51 These services are coordinated by the ring composition.On the sexual connotations of *furtum*, see Pichon (1966) s. v.; McKeown (1998), p. 159. cf. e.g. Catull. 68. 136; 140; Prop. 2.2.4; 22b.50; 23.22; 30b.28. For *apta*, see Davis (1977), p. 101. For the legal sense of *furtum* here, see Ziogas (2021), p. 122.

52 cf. James (1997), p. 67: '[Cypassis is described] in terms of her utility to her owner and her owner's lover'; Wise (2019), p. 51. I disagree with Fantham (2009), p. 32: 'he is addressing Cypassis, whom he has found a sophisticated partner suited to his taste'.

53 cf. McKeown (1998), p. 159; Wise (2019), p. 51.

54 cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.7.11; 12; 39; 49; 50; 1.8.111. See Pandey (2018), p. 464-69; De Boer (2021), p. 277.

55 Watson (1983), p. 99.

56 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2443; Jouteur (2005), p. 74, who only mention *non rustica* and *sordida contemptae sortis.*

57 cf. Watson (1983), p. 99; Martyn (1981), p. 2443; McKeown (1998), p. 159.

58 Cic. De *Or.* 2.182; 183-4. cf. Hall (2007), p. 221; 225.

59 For hyperbole, see Cic. *Top.* 45; Quint. *Inst.* 9.1.29; Winterbottom (1980), p. 59-60.

60 McKeown (1998), p. 159; For *cognita*: Pichon (1966) s.v.; Adams (1990), p. 190; Henderson (1992), p. 35. cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 2.2.20; *Her.* 6.133.

61 Watson (1983), p. 98.

62 Watson (1983), p. 98.

63 cf. Fantham (2009), p. 32. For the legal application of *index*, see Ziogas (2021), p. 122-23. For the term and cognates referring to the betrayal of amatory secrets, see McKeown (1998), p. 9. cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 2.2.41, 53; 2.7.26; 3.14.12.

64 cf. e.g. Quint. *Dec. Min.* 254.17; 270.16; 277.10; 306.22; 351.1; Sen. *Con.* 4.8.1; 6.6.1; 7.1.24; 2.4; 8.6.1; Cic. *Cat.* 3.21; 4.3; 5; 10; *Sull.* 17; *Ver.* 2.5.161; *Cluen.* 21; 39; *Phil.* 1.20; 11.5; *Sest.* 44.95.

65 *OLD* s.v. 1; Pichon (1966) s.v. 4. cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2443; Zimmermann Damer (2019), p. 108. For this meaning, see also: Ov. *Am.* 1.10.36.

66 *OLD* s.v. 4b. cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.*7.6; *Tusc.* 1.62; *Off.*1.29.

67 Ov. *Ars.* 1.389-90; 394.

68 Oliensis (2019), p. 67.

69 cf. Cic. *Rhet. Her.* 4.40 on the device.

70 I am reminded of Cic. *Dom.* 117: *Quid? de collegio quis tandem adfuit*, "what, about the college? Who was there last?"; 118: *Quis ergo adfuit*, "who then was there?".

71 cf. Watson (1983), p. 102; Henderson (1992), p. 42. Adams (1990), p. 177 suggests that *concubitus* is euphemistic, but here it contrasts with *conubia* (7.21), suggestive of a marriage, for which see *TLL* s.v. 2; Ziogas (2021), p. 120.

72 McKeown (1998), p. 160.

73 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2447.

74 Cic. *Inv.* 1.15; 2.86-7; Quint. *Inst.* 9.1.30. On *remotio criminis*, see Paulson (2022), p. 50-1.

75 McKeown (1998), p. 160.

76 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.7.

77 Lausberg (1963), p. 145-6; Kirchner (2007), p. 189. cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 1.1.

78 For a general discussion on this, see Alexandre, Guérin & Jacotot (2012), p. 23-5.

79 cf. Ziogas (2021), p. 122.

80 Quint. *Dec. Min.* 291.6. Also note the use of *percontatio* (persistent questioning). Translations of the *Declamationes Minores* are by Shackleton Bailey (2006).

81 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.7-8.

82 Fränkel (1945), p. 184.

83 cf. Abramson (2014), p. 10-11; 12-16.

84 Quint. *Inst.* 9.1-2; 9.4; La Bua (2019), p. 219-64, esp. 219-21.

85 I disagree with McKeown (1998), p. 160 that the tone is still 'mild'. Although *num* does not always expect a negative answer, in this context (and in a string of pointed questions) it seems implausible that the poet-lover is 'expressing self-doubts'.

86 For the declaimers' use of anaphoric *num* in questions, cf. Quint. *Dec. Min.* 247.14; 248.5; 14; 255.11; 257.8; 260.26; 263.2; 4; 265.4; 267.9; 270.12; 13; 18; 272.11; 273.8; 278.6; 284.3; 293.2; 298.10; 301.15; 302.5; 305.7; 308.13; 310.7; 311.2; 6; 10; 314.9; 315.11; 322.10; 325.1; 330.1; 331.7; 332.11; 336.4; 7; 8; 10; 341.8; 342.7; 10; 345.2; 349.11; 365.3; 7; 37; Sen. *Con.* 1.1.18.15; 1.8.4.4; 7.4.1.18.

87 cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.15; 9.3.98.

88 Lausberg (1963), p. 143.

89 Lausberg (1963), p. 143.

90 Quint. *Inst.* 5.7.11; 27; 9.1.29. See also: Cic. *De. Or.* 3.53.203.

91 Quint. *Dec. Min.* 267.8.

92 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.7-8.

93 cf. e.g. Quint. *Dec. Min.* 267.8; 345.2.

94 For instance, Quint. *Dec. Min.* 246.4; 5; 6; 248.14; 249.11; 16-7; 20; 250.3; 7; 8; 252.11; 253.6; 254.16; 255.5; 10; 11; 257.1; 259.20; 21; 260.13; 15; 26; 27; 263.2; 264.12; 265.12; 266.9; 267.8; 9; 11; 268.15; 17; 18; 19; 20; 22; 23; 269.3; 10; 13; 271.13; 272.8; 273.14; 274.3; 8; 277.10; 278.1; 10; 11; 12; 283.2; 286.9; 291.3-4; 292.2; 4-5; 294.8; 296.1; 298.8; 15; 299.4; 301.16; 17; 18; 306.13; 25; 30; 31; 307.10; 309.15; 16; 311.2; 11; 312.6; 7-8; 315.8; 12; 20; 22; 316.11; 317.10; 13; 14; 319.6; 321.7; 19; 21; 31; 322.11; 325.1; 14; 226.6-7; 328.10; 14-15; 330.1; 9; 331.7; 26; 332.13; 335.10; 337.13; 17; 338.28; 340.6; 9; 342.10; 345.2; 347.4; 348.9-10; 349.10; 350.8-9; 351.9; 361.1. Note: these examples exclude instances of ὑπόφορά (e.g. *Dec. Min.* 284.4).

95 cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.122; 123; 172; 212; 216; 2.4.11; 46; 60; 128; 2.5.5; 50; 53; 132; 140; 147. With anaphora of *num*: *Verr.* 2.5.132; 147.

96 Davis (1989), p. 13.

97 I mean not to conflate Ovid and his elegiac persona; I suggest only that the persona displays rhetorical competency.

98 On the similarity between the forensic and the amatory, cf. Ziogas (2021), p. 123. For the declaimer's tone, cf. Winterbottom (1980), p. 59-60.

99 cf. Keith (2008), p. 21-2. See also: Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.11-12.

100 Compare Cicero's characterisation of Clodia through the manipulation of female stereotypes, e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 1.38. cf. Geffcken (1973), p. 40-3; Lefkowitz (1981), p. 32-40; Skinner (1983), p. 275-76.

101 cf. Lenz (1966), p. 196; Mills (1978), p. 304; Martyn (1981), p. 2443; Fantham (2009), p. 31.

102 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.9-10.

103 Watson (1983), p. 102.

104 Martyn (1981), p. 2449.

105 *OLD* s.v. 3a; McKeown (1998), p. 161; cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 17.221; *Trist.* 2.256, and at *Am.* 3.6.49 implying *stuprum* (illicit intercourse) for which see Pichon (1966) s.v. 2.

106 *OLD* s.v. 4. cf. e.g. Cic. *Clu.* 51; *Rhet. Her.* 3.25.

107 Cic. *Rhet. Her.* 4.33; Quint. *Inst.* 9.1.35; 3.87-90. cf. Lausberg (1963), p. 143.

108 cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 1.16; 19; *Ver.* 1.1.13; *Mil.* 43.7; *Phil.* 1.23; 5.9; 6.6; *Orat.* 158; *Leg.* 2.13; *De. Or.* 1.177; 183; 2.367; *Fin.* 2.28; 4.9; 5.52; *Tusc.* 1.46; 3.65; 4.43; *Div.* 1.33; 100; 2.83; 94; 95; 109; *Off.* 3.94; 95; *Rhet. Her.* 4.23; Quint. *Dec. Mai.* 2.14.9; 18; 2.18.7; 4.12.10; 5.13.13; 5.22.12; 8.8.5; 8.12.6; 8.17.21; 10.11.8; 11.5.3; 11.6.1; 11.6.9; 11.10.1; 12.12.6; 12.23.22; 12.23.23; 12.23.24; 13.17.9; 14.6.21; 18.10.1; 18.11.1.

109 Quint. *Inst.* 3.87-90.

110 For *credibile* (plausibility tactic), see Arist. *Rhet.* 1.2.14; Cic. *Inv.* 1.30.48; Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.16; 7.2.31; Lausberg (1963), p. 23-4.

111 cf. Winterbottom (1980), p. 59-60. For more on the tactic, see Watson (1983), p. 102, n. 59.

112 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.11-12.

113 Watson (1983), p. 97-8; Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.17. cf. van der Poel (2009), p. 332–33.

114 Watson (1983), p. 97, n. 37. cf. van der Poel (2009), p. 333; Cic. *Mil.* 3.8; Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.18.

115 Watson (1983), p. 98.

116 cf. e.g. on Agamemnon, Champlin (2003), p. 296: 'among the most familiar to the citizens of Rome, whatever their background'.

117 Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.10; 11.19. cf. La Bua (2019), p. 309-11.

118 McKeown (1998), p. 161. Watson (1983), p. 97 doubts the use of such an *exemplum* in real *orationes* (speeches). This is not, however, a *real* declamation, but a poem in the form of one; it need not adhere strictly to all the traditional rules.

119 Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.87-90; 11.10-12; Cic. *Top.* 3.11;4.23; 18.68; *Part. Or.* 1.2.7; *De. Or.* 2.172.

120 Hor. *Carm.* 2.4.1-6.

121 Harrison (2017), p. 76.

122 Nisbet & Hubbard (1978), p. 68.

123 cf. Lenz (1966), p. 196; Martyn (1981), p. 2444; McKeown (1998), p. 163; Weinlich (1999), p. 122, n. 93.

124 cf. James (1997), p. 66; 68-9.

125 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.13-4.

126 Keith (2023), p. 235.

127 Ovid's Ajax employs a similar strategy of mock-humility at *Met.* 13.1-18. cf. Cic. *De. Or.* 2.184.

128 cf. Keith (2023), p. 235.

129 *OLD* s.v. 3c; d. cf. Cic. *Rhet. Her.* 2.12; *Att.* 1.16.3; 4.3.4; *Rosc. Am.* 111; *Cluen.* 119; *Ver.* 3.65; *Cael.* 13; Quint. *Inst.* 1.2.4; 12.1.3. A similar effect is, I think, intended at Ov. *Am.* 2.17.1-2.

130 Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.34.

131 He does not ask Cypassis why the affair is deemed unacceptable; he tells her that it should not be.

132 McKeown (1998), p. 163 recognises the connection and cites Ov. *Am.* 3.12.30: *proditor…Tantalus*, "Tantalus, the betrayer".

133 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.15-6.

134 McKeown (1998), p. 163.

135 McKeown (1998), p. 163. cf. Quint. *Dec. Min.* 291.6.

136 cf. Winterbottom (1980), p. 59-60; La Bua (2019), p. 274 on hyperbole's rhetorical functions.

137 Ziogas (2021), p. 122.

138 cf. Janan (2012), p. 387; Wise (2019), p. 52.

139 McKeown (1998), p. 164.

140 cf. Cic. *De Or*. 3.217–19; Hall (2007), p. 222.

141 Ov. *Am*. 2.8.17-8.

142 McKeown (1998), p. 164.

143 Cic. *De Or*. 2.217-8; Quint. *Inst*. 6.3.21; 29. Quintilian also recommends humour in *controversiae* at *Inst*. 6.3.8-10; 17-21; 15.16.

144 cf. Ov. *Am*. 1.8.85f.

145 Martyn (1981), p. 2444. cf. Quint. *Inst*. 9.3.97-9 on *periphrasis* (elevated or intricate language).

146 McKeown (1998), p. 164.

147 cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am*. 115; *Balb*. 10; *Inv*. 1.25; *Att*. 16.5.2.

148 Fraenkel (1916), p. 188-89. cf. e.g. Cic. *Rhet. Her*. 1.6.9; *Inv*. 1.25; 31.

149 Quint. *Inst*. 8.5.11; 11.1.52. cf. Lausberg (1963), p. 131.

150 Ov. *Am*. 2.8.19-20. cf. McKeown (1998), p. 165.

151 *OLD periuro* 1.

152 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2444.

153 Quint. *Inst*. 9.2.38-9.

154 Ov. *Am*. 2.8.21-2.

155 cf. Gibson (1995), p. 80, n. 37. For *pretium* ("price") in sexual contexts, cf. McKeown (1998), p. 165. cf. e.g. Ov. *Am*. 2.1.34; 2.5.62; *Ars*. 1.155.

156 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2447, who notes the 'crude' character of *concubitus* and *pretium*. Cf. Ov. *Ars*. 1.383-6.

157 *OLD* s.v. 1c.; McKeown (1989), p. 300. cf. e.g. Sen. *Con*. 4. pr. 10.

158 McKeown (1998), p. 165. cf. e.g. Ov. *Am*. 1.10.57.

159 McKeown (1998), p. 165: 'the use of [*officium*] here is perhaps therefore humorously paradoxical.'

160 For the general idea of *servitium amoris* as a fantasy, and not a true reflection of the power dynamics underlying such erotic relationships, see Hallett (1973), p. 11-12; McCarthy (1998), p. 174-92, esp. 178; Fitzgerald (2000), p. 73-4; James (2003), p. 146-48; Fulkerson (2013): p. 180-93, esp. 181-82. As the paradigm relates to this passage, see Keith (2023): p. 136.

161 E.g. *conubia* ("wedlock", 2.7.21); *e dominis* ("out of your masters", 24), but the evidence is not decisive; Corinna may be a *meretrix* (courtesan), cf. James (2003), p. 250, n. 79; Wise (2019), p. 50. The only confirmation of marital status we find in the *Amores* is at 3.13, cf. Harrison (2006), p. 81.

162 Wise (2019), p. 51.

163 cf. e.g. Suet. *Cal.* 40. cf. McGinn (1998), p. 264.

164 cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.40: *est etiam in fusco grata colore Venus*, "and even a love of dusky hue will please". That her skin colour is one of many that the poet-lover likes is hardly a good thing; the use of *etiam* ("even") is telling. Cypassis' body is treated as an exotic object of play. cf. Ov. *Ars.* 2.657f.; Lee (1962), p. 158; Watson (1983), p. 99; Henderson (1992), p. 37; Booth (1991), p. 136; McKeown (1998), p. 165: 'such slaves were fashionable.' cf. Bradley (2009), p. 140: *fuscus* was 'a euphemism for the black African face.' See also: Martyn (1981), p. 2444. He argues that Ovid did not intend for the word to be derogatory, and he cites *Am.* 2.4.40 as support but fails to acknowledge that the poet-lover's attraction is based on her exoticism; this is, like an open insult, in its own right derogatory.

165 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.23-4.

166 Booth (1991), p. 137.

167 On *fingere*, cf. McKeown (1998), p. 166.

168 cf. Henderson (1992), p. 35.

169 cf. McKeown (1998), p. 166; Wise (2019), p. 53-4.

170 McKeown (1998), p. 166. cf. Suet. *Cl.* 25.1.

171 cf. Davis (1989), p. 60-1; Fulkerson (2013), p. 189.

172 McKeown (1998), p. 166.

173 McKeown (1998), p. 166.

174 cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.8.3.

175 Watson (1983), p. 103.

176 Henderson (1992), p. 29.

177 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.26-7.

178 Watson (1983), p. 99 comments on the 'lower tone' and not on the many legalistic terms that follow.

179 Henderson (1992), p. 29. The refusal also suggests that the poet-lover is not her *dominus*; if he were, would she even attempt to refuse?

180 Mills (1978), p. 305.

181 Cic. *Nat.* 1.44; Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.49; 9.1.30; 2.16-8; 9.3.99. cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.1–4; *Div. Caec.* 40. See also Lausberg (1963), p. 102; La Bua (2019), p. 279.

182 cf. Janan (2012), p. 386-7: '*Amores* 2.8…revels, not in the delights of the sex he (allegedly) had with her, but in his skill at persuading Corinna she was wrong.' But he also delights in persuading Cypassis.

183 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2445; Fantham (2009), p. 32.

184 cf. Bowditch (2012), p. 123: 'Although love elegy often inverts the gender norms of Roman society…the threats of violence posed by the elegist reassert his virility'; Gleason (1995), p. 131-60.

185 Displays of masculinity through rhetorical prowess are traditionally reserved for homosocial contexts: Gleason (1995), p. 160; Richlin (1997), p. 77-8.

186 cf. Ziogas (2021), p. 122.

187 cf. e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.1.109.

188 As implied by Quint. *Inst.* 7.4.20. Elsewhere in a forensic context: Quint. *Dec. Min.* 263.10; 265.4; 286.8; 315.9; *Dec. Mai.* 3.13; 8.5; 9.12; 15; Sen. *Con.* 7.1.15; 9.5.4; 4.1.1.

189 cf. Booth (1991), p. 137.

190 *OLD* s.v. 1b. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 76; *Ver.* 5.5; *Mil.* 15.

191 As at Ov. *Am.* 2.4.3. cf. McKeown (1998), p. 67.

192 *Contra* Jäger (1967), p. 14. cf. Davis (1977), p. 100, n. 8; Martyn (1981), p. 2448; Fantham (2009), p. 32; Zimmerman Damer (2019), p. 109.

193 cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 2.3; *Phil.* 2.23; 11.11; *Sest.* 111; Quint. *Dec. Min.* 249.13; 309.3; 315.20; 320.7; 10; 11; *Dec. Mai.* 6.7.21; 6.21; Sen. *Con.* 2.3.3; 3.7; 9.3.9; 4.3.1.

194 cf. Ov. *Ars.* 1.395.

195 cf. Watson (1983), p. 96.

196 cf. Davis (1981), p. 2480; James (1997), p. 67.

197 Ov. *Am.* 2.8.28-9. Cf. McKeown (1998): p. 167.

198 Lausberg (1963), p. 115-16.

199 cf. Wilkinson (1955), p. 68; McKeown (1998), p. 167-68.

200 Lausberg (1963), p. 38; 92. See also Cic. *Rhet. Her.* 4.26 on successive *commata* (divisions of colons) developing forcefulness.

201 cf. La Bua (2019), p. 275-77, who notes that *amplificatio* is particularly fitting in invective.

202 cf. Henderson (1992), p. 36-8.

203 cf. McKeown (1989), p. 356-7 on *narrare* suggesting 'gossip'.

204 Similarly, see Sen. *Con.* 2.5.11.1-3; 3.8.1.10-2; 9.2.6.2-4; 9.5.4.9-10.

205 McKeown (1998), p. 167. cf. e.g. Cic. *Cluen.* 124; *Cat.* 3.11; Sen. *Con.* 1.3.2.

206 cf. e.g. Sen. *Con.* 1.1.6; 1.1.8; 1.1.18; 1.2.5; 1.3.2; 1.4.8; 1.5.1-2; 1.5.7; 1.6.6; 2.5.11; 3.5.1; 8.4.1; 9.2.3; 9.2.6; 9.2.27; 9.3.11; 9.5.4; 10.2.14; 10.4.8; 10.5.26. Quint. *Dec. Min.* 245.5; 246.3-5; 248.4; 5; 12; 250.7; 252.6; 254.5; 260.31; 261.5; 7-8; 262.3-5; 268.22-3; 294.9; 280.3-4; 301.4; 302.5; 305.8; 313.8; 314.7; 316.9; 331.8; 26; 332.13; 333.8; 366.2; *Dec. Mai.* 4.14; 5.3; 7; 7.1; 7.17-8; 8.18; 9.2; 9.5; 17; 11.8; 9; 12.1; 13.7; 15.8; 10; 19.14.

207 Sen. *Con.* 1.3.2. Translation by Winterbottom (1974). Note: certain syllables unitalicised for emphasis.

208 cf. Winterbottom (1980), p. 59-60.

209 cf. Zimmerman Damer (2019), p. 109: 'from the *amator*'s perspective, this statement is phallic braggadocio of his sexual conquest.' The 'virile' quality of this 'authority' is rooted in its rhetorical colouring.

210 Watson (1983), p. 103.

211 cf. Martyn (1981), p. 2443; Ziogas (2021), p. 122.

ABSTRACT

English

In this article, I provide a close examination of Ovid's *Amores* 2.8 that focuses on how the poet-lover's use of persuasory rhetoric enables him to

bully and silence the subaltern Cypassis. My discussion challenges Patricia Watson's claim (in "Ovid *Amores* 2.7 and 8: The Disingenuous Defence") that this poem has comparably less forensic qualities and rhetorical elements than its counterpart (2.7). I argue that forensic and rhetorical elements permeate the text and become increasingly blatant as the poem proceeds. By employing declamatory and oratorical techniques, the poet-lover weaponises his rhetorical education, a privilege afforded to him by his status as an elite Roman male, in order to intimidate, manipulate, and ultimately blackmail Cypassis, the uneducated, defenceless, and mute subaltern. I suggest that it is a mischaracterisation to refer to this approach as a 'seduction'; it is a calculated exertion of power that enacts gendered violence.

INDEX

Keywords
Ovid, Amores, Gender, rhetoric, elegy, violence, masculinities

AUTHOR

Ryan Shayne