

©2013

Lisa A. Whitlatch

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE HUNT FOR KNOWLEDGE: HUNTING IN LATIN DIDACTIC POETS

by

LISA A. WHITLATCH

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School-New Brunswick
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Classics

Written under the direction of

Prof. Leah Kronenberg

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

MAY 2013

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Hunting for Knowledge: Hunting in Latin Didactic Poets

By LISA A. WHITLATCH

Dissertation Director:

Prof. Leah Kronenberg

My dissertation explores the use of hunting in five didactic poems as a means to characterize their attitudes towards the human ability to acquire true understanding. Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, Vergil's *Georgics*, Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, Grattius' *Cynegetica* and Nemesianus' *Cynegetica*—didactic poems written in Latin from the first century BCE to the third century CE—respond to questions of human perception and knowledge in different ways, but they all use the hunt to represent the human search. Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* uses hunting as a metaphor for the reader's actions, and parallels himself, his philosophical forefather Epicurus, and the reader to dogs hunting out proofs and *ataraxia*, “freedom from care,” the goal or prey of the Epicurean hunt. According to Lucretius, this hunt has the potential to be successful: humankind can obtain its ultimate goal of *ataraxia* if it follows Epicureanism. Vergil's *Georgics* is less optimistic about the ability of humankind to be successful in their hunt for knowledge. Farmers, the protagonists of the *Georgics*, are presented as knowing how to hunt and can follow the tracks of Justice, but there is no indication that they obtain it. The poem closes

with the myth of Aristaeus, which displays the deceitful nature of prey (Proteus) to humankind (Aristaeus) and presents man's imperfect methods for capturing knowledge. Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, a playful didactic about seduction, similarly puts forth a pessimistic view of human knowledge via hunting metaphors. The reader's education, presented as a hunt for the beloved, ultimately backfires and his knowledge fails him, as violently allegorized in the myth of Cephalus and Procris in Book 3. Grattius' *Cynegetica* makes the figurative use of the hunt into the literal subject of the poem, but Grattius' hunting poem is also an exploration of knowledge and morality. It reasserts an optimistic view of knowledge while at the same correcting Lucretius' Epicurean moral and religious views. I finish by looking at Nemesianus' *Cynegetica*, which provides a useful contrast to the previous works since the surviving fragment turns away from metaphysical and epistemological questions in favor of practical advice and literary reflection.

Acknowledgements

There are too many people to thank for helping me complete this project. First and foremost, my adviser Professor Leah Kronenberg has been the most invaluable reader, reviewer, and supporter during this entire project. It would not have been such a comprehensive work without her assistance. Professors Serena Connolly, Timothy Power, and Carin Green have all provided valuable feedback for this version of the dissertation and its further development. I want to thank the Classics Department at Trinity University for the foundation to complete my graduate work. As important has been the support of my family and friends as I struggled through questions about Latin poetry and life. I love you all, and thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Lucretius' <i>De Rerum Natura</i> and Philosophical Hunting	31
Chapter 2. Vergil's <i>Georgics</i> and the Struggle for Knowledge	62
Chapter 3. The Subversion of Hunting Imagery in Ovid's <i>Ars Amatoria</i>	79
Chapter 4. Grattius' <i>Cynegetica</i> and the Appeal to Experience	111
Epilogue. Nemesianus' <i>Cynegetica</i> and Hunting as Leisure	145
Conclusion	161
Bibliography	164

Introduction

“There cannot be two passions more nearly resembling each other than hunting and philosophy”.¹ David Hume’s assessment of the shared emotions in the pursuit of animals and wisdom makes explicit an understanding in ancient authors that the analogy between hunting and philosophy is useful for making intangible concepts like knowledge and justice into something tangible. The relationship between the two pursuits is witnessed in the Pre-Socratics, and it becomes commonplace in Plato’s dialogues, which are influential on later philosophy.² From these philosophical works, the hunt is incorporated into the Roman didactic tradition not only to represent but also to actively critique the acquisition of knowledge.³ In this project, I will examine the symbolic relationship between hunting and perception of knowledge through an investigation of the metaphorical and literal uses of hunting in Roman didactic poetry.⁴ In particular, I will demonstrate that Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Grattius all utilize hunting imagery to express their didactic goals, and an analysis of the similarities and differences in their uses of hunting imagery exposes fundamental differences in their conceptions of knowledge. This project provides to us a new narrative within Latin poetry on access to knowledge.

I. Didactic Poetry

¹ Hume 1739: *T* II.3.10 451.

² For a Pre-Socratic use of hunting, see Empedocles frag. B101; for Plato, see *Rep.* 430e9, *Parmenides* 128c, and *Lysis* 218c.

³ Cf. Part II.C below for brief history of hunting in literature. On the adoption of Greek imagery by Lucretius, the father of Latin didactic, cf. Parker 1952, Vallillee 1968, Clay 1983, Cox 1986, Schrijvers 1997, Sedley 1998, and Garani 2007.

⁴ Hunting in earlier Greek didactic poetry does not seem to be a major part of their self-conceptualization, and Bartley 2003 argues that metaphor was not a major aspect of early Greek didactic. On education in general in the Greek world, cf. Griffith 2001. Too 2001 defines multiple “ancient educations,” not simply education in a classroom setting, and so didactic poetry could be considered its own kind of education (16).

In order to understand the function of hunting in didactic poetry in particular, we must understand the definitions of didactic and certain key features of poetic instruction. We will first discuss how to define the necessary characteristics of didactic poetry (Part A). Then, we will look at secondary elements, their definitions, and their functions in ancient poetry (Part B).⁵

A. The Didactic Genre

Didactic literature, as most scholars understand it, begins with Hesiod.⁶ Later authors who have written texts that we consider didactic create a link between their work and Hesiod's, notably through references to his home, Ascra.⁷ The ancient concept of genre is problematic as it was frequently understood in relation to the form and performance context of a poetic work.⁸ Such fluid generic relationships can cause scholars to feel uneasy about the application of a label. Genre exists as a sort of Platonic ideal, as Gale has stated, and there is no pure, perfect didactic poem.⁹ Conte defines genre as a dynamic instrument for reaching the reader, and this is a useful working definition, especially since ancient authors, while interested in genre, did not follow restrictive parameters for it.¹⁰

⁵ The term "secondary elements" is borrowed from Fowler 2000 and refers to pan-generic literary figures such as metaphor.

⁶ The *Works and Days*, written to Hesiod's historical or fictional brother Perses (25-41), contains instructions on agricultural practices. Hesiod's self-conception of his project may have been significantly different (cf. Near Eastern influences, discussed foremost by Walcott 1966 and West 1966), if indeed he existed at all. cf. Volk 2002: 44-49 on the unique literary place of Hesiod's work.

⁷ E.g. Vergil's Ascrean song (2.170-176), see Boyle 1979; Damschen 2004: 108-110 finds ASCRA in an acrostic in Grattius' *Cynegetica*.

⁸ The performance context is especially key in ancient Greece, although by the Hellenistic period generic categories became more clearly defined (cf. Scott Garner 2005, Jenkyns 2005).

⁹ Gale 2004: xii.

¹⁰ Conte 1994. There are early works of classification by Aristotle that indicate a general interest in the matter. Aristotle was interested in categorization of all kinds, from animal (*Historia Animalium*) to political (*Politica*) to categorical itself (*Categoriae*). Aristotle rejects didactic poetry as a genre in his *Poetics*: if a work is didactic, even if it is in meter, it is not poetry (*Poetics* 1447b.16-20). In the beginning, then, didactic poetry was either an oxymoron or a subset of heroic epic. It is not until late antiquity that the

The most recent and influential description of the primary characteristics of the genre is Volk's *Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*.¹¹ Her four characteristics of the genre are: explicit didactic intent; persona of student and teacher; poetic self-consciousness; and poetic simultaneity, or the authorial conceit that the poem is being composed during performance. The latter two are poetic traits that seem not to define didactic as much as to contrast poetic with prose form; however, the definition does limit the genre to the clearest examples.¹² The persona of student and teacher is a particularly key concept to note. The author and the external audience cannot necessarily be equated with the instructor persona and the internal audience.¹³ The two groups may share similarities, and certain authors may assume the instructor role and offer serious lessons, but other authors may not. While there is a particular emphasis on teacher and

didactic genre itself has recognition. The *Tractatus Coislinianus* is of unknown date and rejects Aristotle's division by proposing the existence of non-mimetic poetry. In this category occurs educational poetry (*Tractatus Coislinianus*, category IB, Volk 2002: 30-34). The *Ars Grammatica* by Diomedes supports the modern concept of didactic poetry by defining it as narrative poetry such as was written by Empedocles, Lucretius, Aratus, Cicero, and Vergil (Diomedes *Ars Gramm. Lat.* I.482.14-483.3). But some scholars still reject didactic as a genre; Harder 2007 in particular rejects a rigid definition of genre for the discussion of didactic, preferring what she calls "the history of genre," which constantly shifts the boundaries of a particular genre (24). However, while the ancient concept of genre is more flexible, authors were concerned with generic models and questioning the conventions of what they were writing by the period of Roman literature (e.g. Ovid's programmatics in *Amores* 1.1). Conventions, then, must have existed.

¹¹ Volk 2002.

¹² Some scholars want to be more specific in their descriptions of didactic poetry by creating subgenres. Further classification, however, seems unnecessary given that there are no unique characteristics offered for each of the proposed subgenres of didactic and therefore no unique reader expectations. Toohey 1996 explains the genre's development through six phases: oral phase (Hesiod), Hellenistic era (Nicander), post-Hellenistic seriousness (Cicero and Lucretius), polyphonic yet serious (Vergil and Ovid's *Fasti*), leisure didactic (Horace, Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*) and divine/control-centered didactic (Manilius, Grattius). These phases are problematic as they follow no actual chronology and the determination of seriousness is subjective; however, what Toohey's phases can offer us is a rough thematic and chronological survey of didactic poetry which is far more comprehensive than other lists. To define didacticism, Effe 1977 emphasizes the relationship between theme and matter, delineating three types of didactic poetry according to the relation between the supposed subject matter and implied theme (i.e. *sachbezogenen, formalen*, and *transparenten*). Quinn 1979 describes the necessity of the assertion of instruction, whether or not the instruction is sincere, and the author's close attention to the audience. Fowler 2000 lists the seemingly obvious characteristics: the persona of a teacher, the persona of a pupil, a matter to be taught, and, of course, verse form. Dalzell 1997, Gibson 1998, and Paschalis 2000 each classify didactic poetry according to its content alone.

¹³ Cf. Rutherford 1995 for an example of the split address between the farmer and Maecenas and Augustus and how the split problematizes the poem.

pupil in didactic poetry, it is similar to other genres in other poetic characteristics and can contain a combination of styles: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* is a notable example since the work is as much elegiac as it is didactic.¹⁴

B. Figurative Language

It is not the formal characteristics of the genre that make the poems so engaging, but the stylistic choices, the so-called secondary elements that Fowler explores, allow didactic poems to stand out individually.¹⁵ Before returning to the particular subject of my dissertation, I want to establish three things: 1) that we should not treat any imagery as dead, or having lost all associated implications because it is common, 2) that the differences between simile, metaphor, and allegory are more semantic than cognitive, and 3) that because of 1 and 2, there is meaningful interaction between texts which use hunting symbolically and texts which use hunting as its subject matter.

1) What Metaphors Mean

Metaphor is a subject easier for a reader to understand in context than for an academic to explain and define.¹⁶ At its most basic, a metaphor is a linguistic figure where a primary subject is compared to a secondary subject without the use of like or as. There are several theories of metaphor, and a source of contention is the difference between what metaphors mean (i.e. the understanding of a passage) and what metaphors do (i.e. the cognitive steps needed to obtain a metaphor's meaning). In the interaction view, described by Black and White, the two are the same.¹⁷ By means of an implied

¹⁴ Cf. Chapter 3 for a more full discussion on Ovid's generic play. Didactic poetry does not have to be in dactylic hexameter (e.g. Accius' *Pragmatica* or Callimachus' *Aetia* and Ovid's *Fasti*, if the latter two are considered didactic).

¹⁵ Fowler 2000.

¹⁶ General works introducing metaphor are Johnson (ed.) 1981, Kovecses 2002, Knowles and Moon 2006, Punter 2007, and Gibbs (ed.) 2008.

¹⁷ Black 1962 and White 1996.

sentence, “associated implications” from the secondary subject affect the meaning of the metaphor and the interpretation of the primary subject.¹⁸ Therefore, metaphor cannot be fully translated between languages without loss of understanding, which is an important factor for working with Latin poetry.¹⁹ In this view, it will be necessary to understand the full context of the work in the original language.

The literal view, described by Davidson, rejects this theory on the basis that no special metaphorical meaning arises from an implied sentence.²⁰ It is possible that metaphors *do* more than what they mean, but for a reader to understand the figure he needs only what is written. Translations and alternate statements do not greatly affect a reader’s understanding. In this view, dead metaphor cannot exist. Dead metaphor is when a metaphor has become so common in a language that people no longer need to think of the associated implications to understand it. Death for a metaphor can only happen in an interpretation like the interactive view of White and Black, because only here does the reader need to have an implied sentence and cultural context to understand a living metaphor. If a metaphor is dead, there is no longer an implied sentence: American students who kill an exam rarely consider the implicit violence of academia. The literal view is therefore important in working with ancient texts because it frees us from determining whether a metaphor is dead, but this view also removes the need to examine specific word choice and implications.

¹⁸ Meaning has full explication in the comparison of the “principal” subject and the “subsidiary” subject, or the literal meaning of an implied sentence (White 1996 focuses on the “implied sentence,” see Black 1962: 44-47 for terminology). These implications are then used to interpret the principal subject. For example, “Richard is a lion,” is understood by the literally true implied sentence of “Richard is a lion, and a lion is strong,” but if we do not understand the connotations of “lion,” we cannot understand the metaphor. “Associated implications” from Black 1962: 44.

¹⁹ Loss of understanding is technically called loss of “cognitive content” (Black 1962: 46).

²⁰ Davidson 1981.

The impasse between the interactive view, with its need to translate, and the literal view, which ignores verbal specifics and lets all metaphors live, is bridged by Lakoff and Johnson's work exploring the Cognitive Metaphor Theory.²¹ Lakoff and Johnson veer from both aforementioned viewpoints by arguing that metaphor is not solely in the words written or not written, but is in fact part of human cognitive ability. People do not only write in metaphor; they think in metaphor. Whether dead or alive, metaphors provide insight into the way humans think about the world. This wider scope complements Black's view and results in a theoretical underpinning which seems most fitting for Classical studies: in order to understand metaphorical meanings, we need a more complete view of cultural context independent of any specific utterance.²² When dealing with Latin literature, it is probably best to keep all views in mind. Understanding the literal meaning will be important, but Roman literature frequently alludes to other texts. Even the metaphors that serve an important function within the text establish connections to other texts and other ways of thinking. To choose an example from my work, hunting did have a presence in Roman society and literature, and we will have to fully understand how pervasive hunting was historically in order to recognize feelings of pursuit and entrapment in didactic poetry. In order to acknowledge both the importance of associations and of the original language while also avoiding the concept of metaphor as dead, we can use the Cognitive Metaphor Theory.

2) The Cognitive Similarity of Figurative Devices

In addition to metaphor, other figurative language constructions face similar conceptual problems. Aristotle, Demetrius and Quintilian each discuss figures of speech

²¹ Lakoff and Johnson 1981.

²² Black 1962, especially 25-47.

in their works of literary criticism.²³ Among figures of speech, metaphor is most frequent and most beautiful, according to Quintilian, but both simile and metaphor are worthless and unpleasing if they are not apt.²⁴ McCall demonstrates that the terminology is inconsistent for ancient simile, with eight terms being used, and at times it is considered closer to metaphor while at other times closer to analogy.²⁵ Innes creates a basic framework as a compromise between ancient and modern definitions.²⁶ To clarify for ease of discussion, however, similes shall be defined as comparisons marked as such, while metaphors are comparisons without verbal markers. Allegories are extended metaphors, according to Innes, a definition that I find useful and will apply.²⁷ *Exempla* are historical or mythological stories used in order to provide support for the author's argument. Simile, metaphor, allegory, and *exempla* are all cognitively related for ancient authors, despite modern attempts to distinguish them. The history of hunting and hunting myths are often used in figurative language to convince the audience about some issue,

²³ Aristotle *Rhet.* 1412a-1413a, Demetrius *De El.* 78-90 and Quintilian *IO.* 8.6.4-18. While these works are useful for a general concept of imagery, their advice is geared towards prose writers. Poets use language more freely, as says Quintilian: *Quare poetis quidem permittamus sane eius modi exempla [...] non idem oratorem decebit.* "Therefore we even happily allow to poets examples of this sort [...] but] the same is not fitting for the orator" Quin. *IO.* 8.3.73-74. Because of this different set of expectations, what figure is used at what time is not always straightforward. Aristotle writes: εἰσὶν δὲ καὶ αἱ εἰκόνες, ὥσπερ εἴρηται καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω, αἱ εὐδοκιμοῦσαι τρόπον τινὰ μεταφοραί· αἱ γὰρ ἐκ δυοῖν λέγονται, ὥσπερ ἡ ἀνάλογον μεταφορά, [...] καὶ αἱ παροιμίαι δὲ μεταφοραὶ ἀπ' εἰδους ἐπ' εἶδος εἰσὶν. "There are also similes, just as was mentioned above, which are the acceptable metaphors in a way: for they always are chosen from two things, just as the suitable metaphor. [...] And the proverbs are metaphors from an image within an image..." Arist. *Rhet.* 1412b-1413a. Simile, metaphor and *exempla* (proverb) all accomplish the same cognitive role for Aristotle. The difference is stylistic, as some figures are more easily understood than others. Demetrius' view is comparable: Ἐπὶ μὲντοι κινδυνώδης ἡ μεταφορὰ δοκῇ, μεταλαμβάνεσθω εἰς εἰκασίαν· οὕτω γὰρ ἀσφαλεστέρα γίγνεται ἄν. "However, whenever the metaphor seems dangerous, let it be exchanged for simile: for thus it would become safer" Dem. *De El.* 80. There is no true difference, but only a degree of appropriateness. To be less dangerous and safe stems from a medical understanding of figurative language, where the ability to think of two disparate images together is a type of madness (Gumpert 2012).

²⁴ Quintilian *IO* 8.3.72 and 8.6.4-5. In modern scholarship, Punter 2007 also argues that different types of imagery can cause essentially the same effect.

²⁵ McCall 1970.

²⁶ Innes 2003.

²⁷ Innes 2003.

and whether the author uses a metaphor, a simile or an *exemplum*, at heart these figures fulfill a similar function.

3) Relationship Between Tenor and Vehicle

If we accept that we should think about the entire hunting system when we come across a figurative use (Part A.1), and if we accept that different figurative uses stem from the same conceptual drive (Part A.2), it can be argued that there is also some relation between figurative uses and literal uses. Just as Homeric heroes are hunters and also comparable to other men and animals in hunting situations, so too can the subject matter of didactic poetry either be about hunting or taught through hunting language.²⁸ To use formal terminology, whether hunting is the tenor (subject for comparison) or vehicle (means of comparison), there is a cognitive similarity.²⁹ To understand the one, you must understand the associated implications of the other. Given the strong presence of hunting as imagery alongside concrete examples of hunting, I should be able to investigate the influence of one upon the other. The associated implications that hunting acquires in other types of poetry expand the reader's interpretation of the activity.³⁰ When the reader then encounters a work about hunting, his understanding of the work is modified by other cultural associations. In my dissertation, I explore this relationship between hunting as subject and hunting as symbol, but first, as our poetic topics have been defined, we need to provide an account of the hunting system in the Greek and Roman world.

²⁸ Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981 and Lonsdale 1990 focus on the animal in the Homeric epics. Cf. Part II.C on hunting in literature.

²⁹ Richards 1936 is the traditional formal treatise on metaphor that coined the terms tenor and vehicle. Punter 2007 raises another issue that comparisons indicate not only the similarities between the subjects but also the differences, and these disassociated implications, as it were, are equally useful for interpreting passages with figurative language.

³⁰ Part II.C.

II. Hunting in the Greco-Roman World

There are several topics that need to be discussed in order to familiarize the reader with hunting: the definition of and methods of hunting, including equipment (Part A); the function that hunting played in the lives of Greco-Romans (Part B); and the representation and symbolic use of hunting in Ancient Greek and Roman literary arts generally (Part C).³¹ These topics will help us to fully understand the occurrences of hunting in Latin didactic poetry because they will allow us to put technical terms and situations in context.

A. Methods of Hunting

Hunting is a general term in modern English and is used colloquially for the capture of any animals, despite the existence of the words “fishing” and “fowling,” which are the proper terms for the pursuit of fish and birds, respectively. In the Greek and Roman mindset, there was a distinction between hunting, fishing, and fowling, and the activities were considered unequal.³² For this dissertation, I will focus on hunting proper (*venatio*)—that is, the activity of men pursuing land animals, generally with the aid of nets, dogs, and horses. The most common type of prey is hare (*lepus*), but the depiction of deer (*cervus*) as well as more dangerous prey such as boar (*aper*) or bear (*ursus*) is not

³¹ With this geographic limitation, I do not intend to imply any lack of hunting elsewhere. Hunting was a significant feature of life in Egypt, the Near East, Etruria, and elsewhere, each of which interacted with the Greco-Roman world.

³² The three practices, described in didactic works under the titles *cynegetica*, *halieutica*, and *aucipia*, are frequently ranked. Cf. Pseudo-Oppian’s *Cynegetica* 1.47-80, which prioritizes hunting versus Oppian’s *Halieutica* 1.1-55, which prioritizes fishing, as well as Plato’s *Laws* 822D-824C, where hunting provides the Athenian speaker with an example of the relationship between laws and the best citizen. In Plato’s *Laws*, many types of hunting are allowed legally: fishing in certain bodies of water, fowling in certain areas, hunting at certain times. Unsurprisingly, the hunting of men through piracy and brigandry is outlawed. But even though there are rules for many types of hunting, praise is reserved for the hunting of land animals on horseback with dogs and weapons. Fishing, fowling and hunting with nets are considered inappropriate activities for the good man, even if they may be legally acceptable. The ranking of the activities is likely related to the ranking of the animals themselves, cf. the recurring sequence of mammals, then birds, then fish in the discussions in Aristotle’s *History of Animals*, Plutarch’s *Whether Land or Sea Animals Are Cleverer*, and even *Genesis* 1:20-30, from a separate tradition.

uncommon.³³ So-called big game, such as lions (*leo*) or panthers (*panthera*), was also hunted, although its appearance is more common in relation to the Roman games than hunting for sustenance or protection purposes.³⁴

Hunting starts with a man properly equipped. We are fortunate that literary and visual evidence from the ancient world has survived to provide us with a detailed picture of hunting.³⁵ Many people are familiar with the image of Artemis the Huntress, and hunters were arrayed in the same way.³⁶ The tunic was light, of camouflaged color, and

³³ For hare, Hull 1964: 59-75 is devoted to this animal, and a similar dedication is seen in Xenophon's *Cynegetica* 5 and 8 and other complete *cynegetica* (e.g. the first place for discussion in Julius Pollux *On* 5.66-75, the use of hares in training dogs in Nemesianus *Cyn.* 182-194, and Arrian's *Cynegetica* wholly dedicated to coursing, the chase of hares without nets). Although hunting hares might not be the most challenging or dangerous chase, it is frequently depicted on vases (e.g. Amyx 1962 on vase Cs20.36, esp. 128-131), with hare suitable as an offering to potential lovers (Barringer 2001: 70-124 on erotic hunts, esp. 95-98 for hare). Deer (Xen. *Cyn.* 9, Poll. 5.76-78) were often grouped with hare as timid and swift prey (e.g. Verg. *G.* 3.410, Grat. 200-201, and Nem. *Cyn.* 51). Boar (Xen. *Cyn.* 10, Poll. 5.79-80), on the other hand, along with bears and large cats, were used in art and literature to signify a more dangerous effort, cf. Descoeudres 1979 for an Augustan hunting cup with both bear and boar hunting.

³⁴ Big game is a general term for large animals that invokes images of African safaris, elephants and large cats. Xenophon's *Cynegetica* 11 briefly mentions techniques for catching such animals, and they played a much larger role in Eastern paradises (e.g. displays of kings hunting lions like Ashurnasirpal II from his palace at Nimrud, now at the British Museum). Since most big game was not native to Italy or common to most of Greece after the 8th century, these animals were not an expected part of daily hunts. The situation was different in earlier Greek society and culture, when lions were more populous and were more the enemy of shepherds than the king of animals, cf. esp. *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 568-573, when Hermes is given dominion over the flocks and lions, and *Iliad* 18.573-586, where lions attack a herd of cattle. The various techniques for hunting are well represented in the Small and Great Hunts in the Piazza Armerina.

³⁵ Hull 1964 and Anderson 1985 serve as solid introductory texts in English to the various materials available, and also represent the two sides of the scholarly spectrum. Hull, a hunter himself, undertook his project not as a Classicist, but as someone who learned to hunt by reading technical works: "there are not enough books on hunting by people who know exactly what they are talking about and none at all on ancient Greek hunting by anyone who has ever had experience of a similar nature" (xii). Anderson 1985, on the other hand, seeks to present the ancient material as a historian, not being "overcurious in comparing ancient with modern practice" (xii). Neither of these works is perfect, nor do they claim to be, but they are very useful for approaching the overwhelming amount of evidence on this subject, along with seminal works such as Manns 1888, Johannes 1907, Keller 1909, Aymard 1951, and Toynbee 1973. While Keller 1909 and Toynbee 1973 focus on animals more broadly, the others focus on hunting either Greek (Manns 1888), Roman (Aymard 1951), or both (Johannes 1907).

³⁶ Although sometimes seen in a full length *peplos* (e.g. depictions in vases at the MMA 06.1021.191, Chicago A1C_1907.323 and Walters Art Museum 23.7) or as the all-mother Artemis of Ephesus, Artemis/Diana is stereotypically a huntress with a short girded tunic, boots, and tied-up hair. As seen in pieces at the MMA 56.171.63, Louvre 10.03-06148 and Berlin sk63, this form is immortalized in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* with its countless tales of nymphs who are just like Diana (e.g. Daphne at 1.473-503, Callisto at 2.401-416, and even Venus during her brief stint as a huntress at 10.503-559).

not restrictive to his motions; his boots offered full protection to the foot and lower leg.³⁷ His weapons included spear, staff, and sword.³⁸ The hunting party consisted of men and their slaves, although the exact role of slaves is often omitted.³⁹ Humans can, of course, always kill an animal simply with his own weapons, and at its most basic, hunting is depicted as a man throwing sticks at rabbits.⁴⁰

One type of hunting required the use of nets. There were three main types of nets: hayes nets (τὰ δίκτυα, *rete*), road nets (τὰ ἐνόδια, *plaga*) and purse nets (ἡ ἄρκυς, *cassis*).⁴¹ The hayes net is both the general word for net and a type that is smaller than the road nets, which appropriately are placed in the paths of the prey, and both were intended to direct the prey to the purse net. The purse net is a specific type of net for capturing, which had a little purse that would enclose around the prey. All these nets would—or at least could—be used together to direct and catch prey. In addition to these nets was other rope equipment intended to either scare the prey or snare it. The *formido* or *metus* was a rope lined with feathers to scare the prey towards the net.⁴² Foot-snares,

³⁷ Cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 6, Grat. 338-340, Poll. 5.17-18, Opp. *Cyn.* 1.96-109, Hull 1964: 1-4. In art, although heroic nudity changes the visualization (e.g. Louvre 03-05-04/32), hunters are frequently depicted in appropriate costume (e.g. Hadrian rondels on the Arch of Constantine, the Lion Hunt Sarcophagus at the Capitoline Museum, and vases at Boston BMFA.13.198 and Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien 10-03-02/65).

³⁸ Cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 6, Grat. 108-147 and 341-343, Poll. 5.19-24, Opp. *Cyn.* 1.91-94, Hull 1964: 4-8. The purpose for these weapons was not only making the kill: swords, for example, were better fit for clearing pathways through dense wood, as with a machete, although they were certainly deadly for an animal trapped in a net (Hull 1964: 4-8).

³⁹ The obfuscation of slave roles is perfectly reasonable to the ancient mindset; for exceptions, cf. Nemesianus *Cyn.* 298 or Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 8.4-5, told from the servant's perspective. Thibodeau 2011: 45 argues that Vergil did not omit slaves, but rather the *vilicus* (41-47). Xen. *Cyn.* 2.3 at least tells us that the netkeeper must speak Greek, which indicates both that perhaps other members of the hunting party could not speak Greek and that some slaves participating in the hunt perhaps had some training for their role.

⁴⁰ Cf. images of men throwing *lagobaloi*, Hull 1964: 5, although we see nets and dogs more frequently.

⁴¹ Cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 2, 6, 10, Grat. 24-60, Poll. 5.26-35, Opp. *Cyn.* 1.147-157, Nem. *Cyn.* 299-302, Hull 1964: 10-18.

⁴² Cf. Verg. *G.* 3.371-372, Grat. 75-88, Nem. *Cyn.* 303-320.

laquei, were hidden and meant to catch a deer or boar hoof, and then leave marks in the ground as the animal retreated.⁴³

Dogs (*canes*) were an important part of hunting, as is evidenced by the long discussion about them in every *cynegetica*.⁴⁴ There were two main breeds in antiquity, Spartan and Molossian hounds, although many are known.⁴⁵ Dogs could be used either on their own or in conjunction with nets, and the choice of one method over the other depends upon various factors including historical period, as different dog breeds were available at one time or the other, or philosophical perspective, as nets could be considered deceitful.⁴⁶ Nets would be set up early in the day, and then dogs would be taken out.⁴⁷ When a path was found, the dogs were released one at a time to track the prey.⁴⁸ The prey leave tracks (*vestigia*) to follow. Although *vestigia* may not always

⁴³ Cf. Verg. *G.* 1.139, Grat. 89-94.

⁴⁴ The word itself derives from the Greek word for dog, κύων. Cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 3, 7, Grat. 150-496, Poll. 5.38, 40, 52, Opp. *Cyn.* 1.368-538, Nem. *Cyn.* 103-238, Hull 1964: 20-58. Even the less hunting-centric texts recognize the importance of dogs (cf. Verg. *G.* 3.404).

⁴⁵ Spartan hounds are sleeker, greyhound types (e.g. red figure amphora at the Louvre 10-03-04/37), while Molossians are heavier, mastiff types (e.g. red figure oinochoe at the Louvre 10-03-04/68). If one wanted to write a quick sketch of a hunt, these are the default breeds to choose (Verg. *G.* 3.404, Hor. *Ep.* 6, Nem. *Cyn.* 107, 224). Grattius and Nemesianus are more exhaustive in their lists of breeds (Grat. 151-259, Nem. *Cyn.* 225-236), although any distinctions between dog breeds can change rather quickly between generations (Phillips and Willcock 1999: 14).

⁴⁶ The difference of historical period is seen Xenophon's successor Arrian, who praises the joys of coursing because of the Celtic breed of dog he uses that had been unavailable to Xenophon. Arrian's positive attitude towards hunting is unsurprising, considering the hunting ardor of the contemporaneous Hadrian (*HA* Life of Hadian 20.12, Dio Cass. 69.10, CIL 12.1122). Xenophon's *Cynegeticus* 12-13, on the other hand, represents a philosophical perspective and is explicit about hunting's educational, civic and philosophical value. The physical betterment relates to a philosophical betterment. Xenophon argues that it is through these works that humankind will find Virtue; if people knew that Virtue was to be found in hunting, they would all participate. Many, however, do not realize that Virtue and all gods are watching, and they therefore are not willing to put effort into their deeds (cf. Plato *Rep.* 432b, Verg. *G.* 2.471-474, Opp. *Hal.* 2.664-88). If people understood the gods were watching, they would try harder. This religious and moral discussion sets hunting in opposition to Sophistry—the practical versus the impractical, the good versus the bad, the civic-minded versus the self-serving. Xenophon's attitude is not entirely dissimilar to Plato's in the *Laws* 763B, but the details of the hunt differ. Xenophon's practical approach teaches how to hunt with nets; Plato's aristocratic ideals lead him to prefer the use of horses over nets, and the Athenian speaker at *Laws* 824a distinguishes the best hunting—on horseback—from deceitful and lazy hunting with nets.

⁴⁷ Xen. *Cyn.* 6-7, Arrian *Cyn.* 19, Opp. *Cyn.* 4.56-76, Nem. *Cyn.* 321, Hull 1964: 70-73.

⁴⁸ Xen. *Cyn.* 5-6, Arrian *Cyn.* 15, Hull 1964: 73-74.

refer to a hunt, at its root, it does indicate the footsteps of an animal that can be followed. The dogs were generally trained to not kill the prey, but to either capture it living or drive it into the nets.⁴⁹ The human hunters followed the dogs and offered encouragement, and when the dogs succeeded, they were praised.⁵⁰ Human hunters sometimes rode on horses.⁵¹ Riding on horses allowed the humans to keep pace with dogs and to participate more in the hunt. Hunting from horseback might have still relied on nets, but it could also result in the catching of the prey in flight.⁵²

These techniques applied to any prey, although certain types of prey were better caught with specific techniques.⁵³ Boar, for example, could be chased into a net, but would be killed with a particular spear.⁵⁴ Readers are given unique instructions to hunt lions, leopards, and tigers, and Oppian discusses more types of animals, but the basic skills needed for the tracking of deer and rabbit are the most familiar to a general Roman audience.⁵⁵ Therefore by hunting, I will mean the unstaged conflict between men and wild animals, frequently with the use of nets, dogs or horses.

⁴⁹ Nem. *Cyn.* 186-188, Arrian *Cyn.* 16, 22. Arrian even recommends not capturing the prey with a dog.

⁵⁰ Xen. *Cyn.* 5-6, Arrian *Cyn.* 17-18.

⁵¹ Grat. 497-541, Nem. *Cyn.* 238-298. The use of horses requires more expense, and it could even come under medical critique because of the bodily stress from riding a horse (cf. Galen's *On Exercise With a Small Ball*).

⁵² 'Coursing' is hunting from horseback without nets, the subject with which Arrian is concerned (*Cyn.* 20, 23-24); Hull 1964: 75 distinguishes this activity from hunting altogether.

⁵³ On the wide use of basic hunting techniques, cf. Opp. *Cyn.* 4.42-55.

⁵⁴ Boar spears are equipped with "delays" (*morae*) that would stop a boar from running himself through with the spear and attacking the hunter. Cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 11, Grat. 108-113, Opp. *Cyn.* 3.364-390, Fig. 2 in Hull 1964: 227.

⁵⁵ On big cats, cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 11. For other techniques of specialty hunting, cf. Opp. *Cyn.* 4 and Hull 1964: 98-103. Cf. n.33 above on hare and deer hunting. This type of hunting is distinguished from hunting in the amphitheaters and hunting in Roman villas. For information about the *venationes* in the amphitheaters, an increasingly popular subject, cf. Jennison 1937, Auguet 1972, Futrell 1997, Kyle 1998, Beacham 1999, Bomgardner 2002, and Fagan 2011. Most of this scholarship is geared towards understanding the phenomenon of the amphitheater games more broadly, but the hunts receive some mention. Villa hunting is a blend of wild hunts and staged hunts and has been considered an import from Macedonia by the Scipios, which in turn originated from Eastern monarchs (Polybius 31.29.1-12). The bulk of the evidence is from the mid- to late-Republic, documented well by Green 1996a. Later known as *vivaria*, these parks were originally known as *leporaria*, or warrens, which held a population of rabbits for the entertainment

B. Function of Hunting

Now that we have this framework for what was undertaken during a hunt, we can turn to its value for Greco-Roman society. It is impossible to know the earliest methods of hunting and the symbolism of the event in prehistoric Greece and Rome: mythological stories may encode some of the beliefs and anxieties surrounding the hunt, but the versions of myth best known today are from significantly later sources.⁵⁶ In the historical period, the frequent appearance of hunting makes it clear that it had a prominent place in Greco-Roman life. Green has distinguished three types of hunting, each of which has a different symbolic value.⁵⁷ First, one can hunt for purely survival reasons: to protect one's land and to supplement one's diet. There is no doubt that the Greeks and Romans engaged in this sort of hunting; it would be impossible to live in a wooded, hilly area without needing to defend oneself from wild beasts.⁵⁸ Second, there is also hunting for

and profit of the owners (Varro *RR* 3.12, Columella 9.1). Scipio also referred to them as *roboraria*, due to the oak used in its construction (Aulus Gellius 2.20). As these areas developed, they began to hold many other animals including stags, roes and even boars. Varro calls them θηροτροφεῖον (3.12), but Aulus Gellius perhaps more accurately connects these to the Greek paradises (2.20). Instead of a sudden importation from Macedonia through Scipio Aemilianus, the progression indicates a gradual development from a blend of Greek and Roman traditions (Green 1996a, Corbeill 2001). From the evidence we have, the *vivarium* does not seem to have become a complete hunting park as seen in the East. Most importantly, as opposed to paradises of Eastern kings, the Roman *vivaria* were not meant for supporting wild cats; in fact, the importation of panthers was originally outlawed, whether for safety or sumptuary reasons. The law was repealed so that aediles were able to import these beasts for games in the Circus Maximus (Palmer 1997: 43, Livy 39.5, 39.22.2, 44.18.8). Both amphitheaters and villas are important in Roman culture, and didactic authors drew information from staged hunts as well as wild hunts (e.g. Lucr. 6.197-198 and Grat. 256-257). The technical points of the two, however, will not be the focus of this dissertation.

⁵⁶ Proper handbooks on mythology include Hyginus and Apollodorus. The lack of any standard versions of myths and mythological hunters obscures the purpose and function of myth. Popular knowledge of mythology today is commonly based upon Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a significantly later source. An attempt at understanding the earliest civilization has been important in theory about myth, specifically how humans coped with the tension of identifying with other animals and nevertheless killing them (e.g. Girard 1979, Burkert 1983). Myth in general has a complex relationship with history, religion, and psychology (cf. Von Hendy 2002 and Segal 2004).

⁵⁷ Green 1996a.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Codex Theodosianus* 15.11.1, which allows the necessary killing of lions for safety reasons but not for capture or sport.

purely sport and leisure reasons.⁵⁹ Third, there is communal hunting, which is the kind that bears the most symbolic value in Green's assessment, as it makes the hunt a social initiative.⁶⁰

This threefold function of hunting in society produces many associated implications, which we defined in Part I.B as the characteristics of the secondary subject that inform our interpretation of the primary subject in a metaphor. First, we should address the better-documented symbolism of hunting in Greece, and then we will be in a better place to discuss what might have been happening in Roman society.⁶¹ In Greece, there is no question that the activity provided sustenance for all classes, protection for oneself and one's property, and social interaction.⁶² It became seen as training for the men in a society, and this concept is one aspect of the hunt reflected in the mythology of ancient Greece.⁶³ One part of the Greek, particularly Athenian, educational system was the *erastes-eromenos* relationship, and hunting, too, played a role in erotic pursuits.⁶⁴

The functions and associations of Greek hunting may or may not be wholly applicable to Roman life. No one could argue that the first kind of hunting, sustenance

⁵⁹ We will see this attitude clearly with Nemesianus in the Epilogue.

⁶⁰ None of these categories is mutually exclusive: communal hunting, especially if undertaken as military training, would almost naturally include some intent to protect territory from wild beasts. Individuals might have enjoyed these outings as a sport activity.

⁶¹ Italian populations could also give an indication of Roman customs, but they are also not as well-documented as Greek society. The existence of hunting is implied by Etruscan tombs (cf. Aymard 1951: 26-28, e.g. The Tomb of Hunting and Fishing, and many other also contain lions, cf. Holloway 1965 and 2006 on the relationship between Etruscan and Greek traditions) and the Cult of Diana Aricia. The Greek world is important not only for its historical evidence but also its literary influence on the Italian world (Part C below).

⁶² Barringer 2001.

⁶³ Rituals such as the Spartan training (Xen. *Spartan Constitution*) or Cretan Barracks (Strabo 10.4.20-21) have received much attention from anthropologists and myth-ritualists, e.g. Van Gennep 1960, Vidal-Naquet 1986, Durand and Schnapp 1989, David 1993. On education in general in the Greek world, cf. Griffith 2001. The proper way to educate citizens is a major concern in fifth century Athenian literature, from the works of old comedy (Aristophanes' *Clouds*) to philosophy (Plato's *Republic*).

⁶⁴ As noted previously, prey would be gifts and there are many depictions of gift-giving to younger men (cf. n. 33, Schnapp 1997 and Barringer 2001: 70-124).

and protection, did not occur; however, many scholars have wanted to limit the early Roman hunting experience to only these practices, and they argue that all later symbolic value was imported from surrounding territories and from Greece. Their criticism is in part based on comments from Sallust, who denigrates hunting and farming as servile labors not pursued by respectable Romans except for survival purposes, and Polybius, who discusses the importation of Macedonian game parks by the Scipios, which may indicate that leisure hunting was not previously a Roman activity.⁶⁵ Such an opinion makes little sense considering the importance of hunting in other areas of the ancient world, including those very close to Rome, and Green's article is persuasive in arguing for a similar role for hunting in Rome as in Greece before certain aspects were taken from Macedonia during the second century BCE.⁶⁶ Because Greek models had been incorporated into the Latin tradition at an early period, it is perhaps less urgent to pinpoint the origin of hunting's associated implications for the didactic poems under study.⁶⁷ It will suffice to say that there were multiple motivations for hunting in the Greco-Roman world, and each hunting experience can involve several associated implications, such as status, military prowess or amatory ability. We will see in Part C below that these historical motivations for hunting and their associated implications were reflected, defined, and expanded in literature.

C. Representations of Hunting

⁶⁵ Sall. *Cat.* 4.1, Polyb. 31.29.1-12, cf. Green 1996a, who identifies and ultimately rejects the scholarly tradition of this problem beginning with Orth 1914.

⁶⁶ cf. n. 61 above and Green 1996a. Greek influence, of course, came early in Italy, but that does not negate native importance of hunting.

⁶⁷ Corbeill 2001 discusses the influence of Greek education in Rome as well as Rome's manipulation of the Greek tradition to fit Roman standards, the aforementioned "incorporation".

In the Greco-Roman world, aspects of hunting were seen in multiple genres, including epic, dramatic, erotic and philosophical texts, each of which had a different perspective on hunting and expanded the associated implications. In this section, I would like to take a very condensed view of hunting in ancient literature, touching briefly upon epic, tragedy, comedy, elegy, history, philosophy and satirical texts. Although I do not here discuss any genre at length, there is one point to be made with this evidence: from the earliest literary appearances of the hunt throughout its history, the literal and metaphorical depictions of hunting have been intertwined. As early as the Homeric epics, Greek poetic works contained hunting not only as an important plot event, but also as a literary device to expand the audience's understanding of a character or situation.⁶⁸ An overview of some of the conventional generic uses of hunting will offer a better lens through which to look at didactic poetry.⁶⁹

Epic and drama, whose content often derives from cultural myths, easily display the equally prominent roles of literal and metaphorical hunts. The mythological heroes, whose stories are encoded in ancient epic and tragedy, demonstrate by example the heroic education offered by the hunt.⁷⁰ Hunting similes and metaphors also color the texts, comparing a hero to a lion or some other animal in order to emphasize the traits of a

⁶⁸ Cf. Buchholz 1973, Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981, and Lonsdale 1990.

⁶⁹ For general sources on hunting and animals in literature, see Classen 1960, Steindl 1971, Dunn 1980, Mainoldi 1984, Murgatroyd 1984, and the beginning of Green 1996b. Classen 1960 focuses on Plato's hunting with a summary of epic, lyric, tragic, comedic and prose genres until Plato. Steindl 1971 in particular collects an array of evidence on hunting in poetry to show depictions of hunters, prey and dogs, with authors as varied as Aesop, Callimachus, Accius and Seneca. Mainoldi 1984 focuses on the figure of the dog in Greek literature. Dunn 1980, Murgatroyd 1984 and Green 1996b contribute to the comparison between love and hunting: the element of pursuit present in the hunt is central to most of the literary representations of hunting. Dunn 1980 also discusses the symbolic relationship between hunt and warfare, and finds that the Roman *cynēgetica* writers use hunting symbolically, but with an emphasis on bucolic leisure rather than martial effort (36-37).

⁷⁰ E.g. the Calydonian Boar Hunt at *Il.* 9.529-605 and the hunt of young Odysseus at *Od.* 19.418-458, the two heroes who are the subject of Felson Rubin and Sale 1983. Pindar (*Nem.* 3.78-90) and Xenophon (*Cyn.* 1) also fashion a relationship between hunting and heroes.

certain character with an image from nature.⁷¹ The Homeric examples cast a long shadow over the epic tradition and tragedy.⁷² One of the key characteristics of tragedy is reversal of fortune, and hunting allows one means to depict reversal.⁷³ The wild and the hunt are dangers to order, and because mythological heroes are hunters, the plots can hinge upon hunting.⁷⁴ For one example, Euripides' *Hippolytus* tells the story of Theseus' son Hippolytus. His zeal for hunting overshadows his concern for all other activities, and his rejection of balance, specifically of love to balance hunting, causes his death.⁷⁵ The forced love interest Phaedra is also presented as longing for the actual hunt, although Hippolytus becomes her ultimate prey.⁷⁶ In the case of Hippolytus, the hunt equals a rejection of love: the virginal Diana has a constant struggle with Aphrodite.⁷⁷ A metaphorical hunt, on the other hand, is used to demonstrate the tricks and wiles of characters.⁷⁸ Knowledge of hunting permeates the epic and tragic worlds of heroes.

⁷¹ The comparisons can either be flattering or problematic, e.g. the strength and danger of Achilles as a lion (*Il.* 20.164-177) or Agamemnon's deer-hearted cowardice (*Il.* 1.225). Other metaphorical or literal hunt scenes in the Homeric epics include *Il.* 5.136-142, 8.335-342, 10.360-364, 11.129, 11.474-481, 11.544-556, 12.41-48, 12.310-311, 16.156-173, 18.318-322, 18.487-488, and 18.573-586 and *Od.* 5.273-274, 6.102-106, 9.154-158, 10.157-163, and 17.290-327.

⁷² E.g. the hunts in *Aeneid* 1.180-194, 4.129-159 and 7.479-502 and the hunters like Nisus at 9.176-179, Camilla at 11.532-835, and Iapyge at 11.678 (cf. Aymard 1951: 116-128, Dunkle 1973), as well as its recurring use in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (e.g. 1.452-567, 2.401-530, 3.138-252, 7.661-865, 8.260-444, 10.148-219, 10.503-739). Because myth on its own contains hunting, the appearance of hunting in many mythological texts, whether epic or tragic or otherwise, has as much to do with the source material as with explicit or implicit generic affiliation.

⁷³ Aristotle *Poetics* 11; Schnapp 1992 discusses the reversal within mythological hunts (e.g. the myth of Actaeon).

⁷⁴ E.g. Euripides' *Bacchae*, where the stability of the state (Pentheus) is undone by the Bacchantes-turned-huntresses. The tension between nature and culture, in the Structuralist view, is one of the basic contradictions to be resolved in mythology, and so it is unsurprising that this contradiction would also appear in mythological plays (cf. Vernant and Vidal-Naquet 1988, and Segal 1988, especially 58-60 on *Hippolytus*).

⁷⁵ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* Burnett 1986. Other dramas that used—or might have used—hunting include Sophocles' *Phaedra*, Sophocles' *Procris*, Sophocles' *Meleagros*, Euripides' *Hippolytus Veiled*, and Seneca's *Phaedra*.

⁷⁶ Eur. *Hipp.* 215-230.

⁷⁷ This conflict is not unique to Hippolytus or even mythological figures. One criticism of hunting, which differs from Plato's criticism of its moral value, is its ability to distract men from duty, familial or otherwise (cf. Horace *Odes* 1.1.25-28 or Columella 7.12).

⁷⁸ Cf. Aes. *Ag.* passim, Soph. *Ajax* 1-38, Vidal-Naquet 1988, Heath 1999.

The genres of comedy, amatory elegy, and didactic contain hunting, and these uses demonstrate a broader use of hunting in genres more concerned with the everyday world and non-mythological subjects. Its presence in comedy moves hunting from the mythological to the personal sphere, and indicates its public appeal.⁷⁹ In love poetry, the hunt acquires a different connotation when the prey changes from wild animals to people. Aphrodite and Eros ensnare people and force them to love, and lovers chase their beloved.⁸⁰ This non-literal hunting shows the expansion of the metaphorical significance of the hunt: the hunt can indicate more than heroism or a tension with civilization. Hunting, along with fishing and fowling, appears as an image in erotic poetry throughout antiquity, and, as Murgatroyd notes, it remains relatively static: hunting imagery grows in the sense that it is used in other genres, but its associated implications hinge upon the sense of pursuit.⁸¹ By the Hellenistic period, we also have hunting similes in didactic literature.⁸² The didactic works reinforce the symbolic reading of hunting as educational, once again tied to pursuit, although the metaphorical use of hunting in didactic before the Roman period was limited.

⁷⁹ E.g. Aristophanes *Lys.* 781-796, and then in the Latin world, Plautus *Capt.* 85-87, 184, *Cas.* 319-320, *Cas.* 476, *Men.* 835-839, *Mil.* 268-269, Terence *Phormio* 6-8, *Andr.* 55-57; Murgatroyd 1984, Green 1996a.

⁸⁰ On the role of gods, see Ibycus 7 and Lucr. 4.1146-1150, cf. Chapter 1, Part III.D. Related to Love's snares is also the wounding of lovers by Love, e.g. Claud. *De nuptilis Honorii* 5-7 or Ov. *Met.* 1.452-567. Compare Hadrian's dedication of hunting spoils to Love (*Epigrammata Graeca* 811, Anderson 1985: 105). On the hunting lover, see Soph. frag. 846 and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, Chapter 3.

⁸¹ Murgatroyd 1984. Hunting's role in amatory poetry is perhaps related to its role in erotic relationships, cf. n. 64.

⁸² E.g. Nic. *Ther.* 169-171. Bartley 2003 discusses the shift in didactic poetry from its origins with Hesiod, lacking in poetic figures, to its later use of metaphor. This study has a rigid definition of simile and metaphor, since surely parts of the *Works and Days* can be read allegorically (e.g. 414-503 on plowing, cf. Beall 2004), which arises from the same cognitive process (cf. Part I.B above). However, the increase in explicit figurative language is noticeable.

Hunting also had a place in prose genres. Historians and biographers report significant hunting parties, which show hunting to be a thing worthy of remembrance.⁸³ As we have already seen in Plato and Xenophon, hunting also had a significant role in philosophy.⁸⁴ Hunting itself is under critique in the *Laws*, and the hunting of people is found in Plato's assessment of sophists and generals.⁸⁵ Most influential to this dissertation is the trope of philosophy as hunting, employed in the pursuit of education and defining terminology.⁸⁶ Dogs are even considered an animal representative of a philosopher set upon his path.⁸⁷ These different interpretations of hunting are not exclusive: Socrates is susceptible to erotic hunting and guardians in the *Republic* are trained like hunting dogs for military prowess.⁸⁸ The pursuit of knowledge becomes especially influential upon Lucretius, but hunting maintains other associated implications that continue to be used in poetry and prose.⁸⁹

The literal and symbolic value of hunting is criticized in some sources. If Varro's *Menippean Satires* can shed any light on the relative value of hunting, which is not always a given with satire, especially one so fragmentary, at least some people thought that watching a hunt in the theater could provide an acceptable substitute for hunting. Cèbe's commentary offers the interpretation that neither the entertainment nor the financial profit from the hunt are acceptable reasons to hunt for the satirical speaker;

⁸³ E.g. Hdt. 1.34-45, Plutarch *Themistocles* 29, Sue. *Domitian* 19. On the contrary, Sallust at one point argues that hunting is inappropriate work (*Cat.* 4.1, cf. n. 65 above).

⁸⁴ Pre-Socratics also contained this image (e.g. Empedocles frag. B101, Garani 2007). Hunting is no less useful in philosophy to describe emotions (e.g. Seneca *De Clem.* 1.12.4-5).

⁸⁵ E.g. Plato *Sophist* 218e-223b, *Euthydemus* 290b-290d.

⁸⁶ Cf. *Republic* 432b-432e and Dio Chrys. 4.34, which criticizes sophists.

⁸⁷ *Republic* 375e.

⁸⁸ Plato *Protagoras* 309a; *Rep.* 5.452d-457e.

⁸⁹ Cf. Chapter 1. Balbus, when speaking in a philosophical dialogue of Lucretius' contemporary Cicero, also praises the moral and educational virtues of hunting in a similar fashion to Xenophon (*De Natura Deorum* 2.64), although the physical benefits of hunting can be used to bad ends, as by Catiline (*In Cat.* 1.10.26).

instead, following in the footsteps of many philosophers, the speaker views the only good reason for hunting to be its moral gain.⁹⁰ The few fragments that remain from the *Meleagri* may indicate this opinion, but all that can be said confidently is that the main speaker is disparaging of hunting, perhaps due to the effeminate style of clothes worn by the hunters.⁹¹ The satire serves as another piece of evidence in a debate about moral versus subsistence hunting.

In addition to its cultural value, hunting is itself a subject that must be taught: we have three complete *cynegetica* in Greek (Xenophon, Arrian and Pseudo-Oppian), one very fragmentary text from the Hellenistic period (Sostratus), and two partial works in Latin (Grattius and Nemesianus). Although the *cynegetica* span a period of eight hundred years, they share several features. Each work contains a description of dogs, nets, and horses. Most hunting texts contain a religious dimension and offer explicit moral advice. The information sometimes differs: Arrian in particular writes his *Cynegetica* explicitly to correct information in Xenophon's *Cynegeticus*.⁹² These instruction manuals are not separate from other occurrences of hunting but continue to engage with mythological figures and moral questions.

III. Hunting in Latin Didactic Poetry

In the course of this project, I will approach Latin didactic poetry and the commonalities between hunting and the perception of knowledge. A dedicated study on this subject is lacking, but not because of lack of ancient evidence, as we will see in each chapter. We have already seen the use of hunting in philosophy and other ancient genres

⁹⁰ Frag. 298-300; Cèbe 1987. Lucilius frag. 164 (Marx' edition) indicates that this satirist also had a hunting scene.

⁹¹ Frag. 297, 301-302, Krenkel 2002. Also see Juv. *Sat.* 1.22-23 on the horror of huntresses, in particular their scandalous attire.

⁹² Arrian *Cyn.* 1.

as a representation of various pursuits. I will discuss three so-called major and two so-called minor didactic authors and describe their use of hunting as a reflection of their attitudes towards knowledge and whether or not education can be successful.⁹³ My interpretation shifts the focus of didactic poetry from concern about a particular realm of knowledge, or a subject imparted, to concern about epistemology and the possibility of knowledge in general. I will discuss more on terminology in Part A below. In Part B, I will introduce the authors under discussion, and in Part C, I will discuss the key literature on the subject.

A. Terminology

In addition to hunting, the terms of which are defined and explained in Part II.A, my dissertation involves two central areas: knowledge and education. To educate (Latin: *instituire, erudire, educare*) means to train a person in a particular subject or way of life (*doctrina* or *disciplina*). A technical skill is more commonly an *ars*, a parallel to the Greek τέχνη and a key word particularly in Vergil's *Georgics* and the appropriately named *Ars Amatoria* of Ovid.⁹⁴ One can see the idea of formation at the core of the Latin words for education: *instituire*, from *in* + *statuere*, to "establish in [someone's mind];" *erudire*, from *ex* and *rudis* to "to [make someone learned] from their rusticity;" and *educare*, from *ex* and *ducendi* to "lead [a person] out."⁹⁵ To educate is to improve and indoctrinate the student with some cultural or civic standards: *educare* can explicitly be

⁹³ Minor literature here only means less well read, and should not be confused with the technical sense of minor literature theorized by Deleuze and Guattari 1986, in which minor literature is one written by a minority group in the language of the dominant culture. Nemesianus could be a minor author by that standard as a North African writing in Latin.

⁹⁴ *Ars*, *TLL* s.v. "ars," additionally can be the competency needed for a certain *disciplina*. In the *Georgics*, the *artes* are key to the theodicy, *G.* 1.118-146, cf. Chapter 2 Part II.

⁹⁵ Etymologies are from *TLL* s.v. "instituo," "erudio," and "educare."

linked to *formandis moribus*.⁹⁶ Although the education in Latin didactic poetry is far from traditional formative education, it is nevertheless a type of education: an instructor-poet guides his audience to obtaining knowledge. In this endeavor, *Ratio* (Reason) frequently helps, particularly in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Grattius' *Cynegetica*.⁹⁷

Didactic poets are ostensibly concerned primarily with the obtaining of an *ars*, but the goal of my dissertation is to show how hunting imagery leads to an exploration of an abstract state of knowing, as well. Cicero's *Academica*, written in the same cultural climate as Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, is a philosophical treatise that debates different philosophical approaches to epistemology. The debate underlying the text is whether there is the possibility of arriving at any knowledge with certainty, and the reliability of perception and the efficacy of *virtus* become parts of the search for reliable knowledge. Each philosophical school has their own answer to this question, but not only philosophers in a technical sense of the word ask this question. It is reasonable that didactic poets, who want to teach, would be interested also in whether their attempt at education could be successful, and human perception and *virtus* factor into didactic poems, as well. Skills should make humans morally better or at least more productive, as the explanation at Lucr. 3.307-309:

...quamvis doctrina politos
constituat pariter quosdam, tamen illa relinquit
naturae cuiusque animi vestigia prima.⁹⁸

Doctrina improves humankind, although tracks (*vestigia*) of worse nature remain.⁹⁹ In this dissertation, I have found that one way that the poets could approach the question of

⁹⁶ "for forming customs," *TLL* s.v. "educō" §I.

⁹⁷ Cf. Chapter 1, n. 28 and Chapter 4, n. 71.

⁹⁸ "Although knowledge establishes certain polished men as equals, nevertheless those well-known first tracks of nature of each spirit remain" Lucr. 3.307-309.

certain knowledge subtly is the use of hunting. Not every didactic poet chose this method, but the works of Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, and Grattius demonstrate that hunting was a productive model to show each author's understanding of knowledge and how to attain it—if attainment is possible. In Lucretius, Grattius, and Nemesianus, the hunt is successful: knowledge is attainable, and humans have a capacity for wisdom (*sapientia*, *sapio*). In Vergil and Ovid, the hunt can be deceitful (*fallax*, *fallere*): knowledge is unstable. *Fallo* at its root is related to stumbling on a path, and so here hunting and making a mistake can be related. If hunting can deceive—trip up a hunter—the audience strays from the truth.¹⁰⁰

B. Latin Didactic Poets

Lucretius is the father of Latin didactic poetry, composing the *De Rerum Natura* in the late first-century BCE.¹⁰¹ By choosing a poetic format, Lucretius deviated from Epicurus' dislike for poetry, but it was a conscious decision.¹⁰² His choice of a hunting framework complements his desire to appeal to the Roman public. His poetry contains characteristics of both philosophical poetry and epic poetry and fashions Epicurus as an epic hero against false fears. In Chapter 1, I discuss Lucretius' conception of knowledge as something that can be readily grasped, like the prey of a hunter, and his optimistic outlook towards the successful perception and assent of the truth.

⁹⁹ The *theodicy* of both Vergil (*G.* 1.118-146) and Grattius (7-15) also demonstrate the improvement of human life because of *artes*.

¹⁰⁰ Short 2013 discusses the spatial metaphors related to making a mistake in Latin, and he focuses particularly on the concept of the path. Hunting, dependent upon the path of an animal, works well with this basic Roman metaphor.

¹⁰¹ Earlier Latin didactic poets include Ennius, who doubtlessly influenced the genre, but Lucretius reinvented the genre with his combination of Greek and Latin sources. For an introduction to his sources and influence, cf. Gale 2001: 2-5, 61-63.

¹⁰² This dislike has been overstated, cf. Chapter 1 (esp. n. 3).

Vergil's *Georgics* is a four book series of advice for farmers on agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, and apiculture. Completed around 29 BC, the *Georgics* is a major contribution to the genre, but it calls the assent of the philosopher into question.¹⁰³ Hunting, a valuable paradigm for Lucretius, is a part of the lifestyle of Vergil's farmer in a world where agriculture serves as an educational model. In Chapter 2, I explore Vergil's educational model as one that does not guarantee a successful hunt of knowledge and that demonstrates an ambiguous attitude towards human perception.

Ovid's major didactic contribution is the *Ars Amatoria*, a three book didactic poem about how to be a lover.¹⁰⁴ This work is most famous for its role in his relegation to Tomis, and interpretation of the work has been influenced with this hindsight.¹⁰⁵ I move to interpret the work on its own terms rather than with the benefit of knowledge of later events. Even more than the *Georgics*, the *Ars Amatoria* exposes uncertainty about true knowledge, and one means of demonstrating this is through his use of hunting metaphors and *exempla*. The tension between the implications of hunting as violent and of hunting as erotic leaves the hunter-pupil without reliable lessons. In Chapter 3, I will discuss his doubt about knowledge, now a mercurial prey and one open to personal revaluation.

¹⁰³ Cf. Chapter 2.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Chapter 3. There will be mentions of his other didactic works, including the fragmentary *Medicamina Faciei Femineae*, a treatise on makeup; the *Remedia Amoris*, a companion work to the *Ars Amatoria* which teaches how to forget love; and the spurious *Halieutica*, a fragmentary poem on fishing. Each work contains references to hunting, but I will focus on the *Ars Amatoria* as it is an extant project that shows a unified hunting framework. The *Remedia Amoris* fittingly has an opposite perspective on hunting, while the references in the *Medicamina Faciei Femineae* and *Halieutica* are more standard and scarce. The relative chronology of these works is difficult to state, as Ovid often revised his works. They were all completed by his relegation to Tomis in 8 CE. The uncertain chronology of Ovid's works also casts doubt on whether Grattius' *Cynegetica* predates Ovid's works.

¹⁰⁵ It is the assumed *carmen in carmen et error*, Ov. Tr. 2.207.

The two *cynegetica* by Grattius and Nemesianus focus on actual hunting lessons more than even Vergil's *Georgics*, but as we saw in Part I above, allegory and metaphor are closely connected. Lucretius and Ovid rely upon hunting metaphors, but for Grattius, hunting is the subject that serves as an allegory. Grattius' and Nemesianus' works may be about hunting, but through associated implications, we are able to interpret other lessons. I am interested in the continuity between the Latin didactic works from Lucretius to Nemesianus. Grattius' *Cynegetica* was written at some point before 8 CE, definitely after Vergil's *Georgics* and possibly after Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*.¹⁰⁶ His poetry was cited in Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* and therefore can be dated earlier than this elegy, but anything more definite cannot be agreed upon. Grattius, like Lucretius, is optimistic about grasping certain knowledge as the preparations for hunting and the care of dogs proves successful. Unlike Lucretius, however, Grattius returns the gods to an active role in the world and reestablishes actual hunting as a morally and philosophically sound model for life. Knowledge comes from the gods and is successfully spread to his audience.

The remaining didactic poem with significant hunting passages is Nemesianus' *Cynegetica*.¹⁰⁷ The *Cynegetica* was written in the late Roman Empire during the reign of Carus, Carinus and Numerian. The information in the proem dates the poem to 283 – 284 CE. Nemesianus composed a classically styled poem inspired by Vergil and others. As discussed in the Epilogue, the text shows a distinct attitude towards hunting that is less concerned about knowledge in the abstract and more concerned about leisure and the practical application of knowledge. Nemesianus thus departs from the tradition of earlier

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Chapter 4.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Epilogue.

works, which links hunting to an abstract conception of knowledge, and can serve as an appropriate author to tie together by contrast the conclusions drawn from the other texts.

When we bring these texts into a dialogue about hunting, we see that the use of this figure, imported from the Greek philosophical tradition via Lucretius, becomes a means to express and critique conceptions of certain knowledge. My project will focus on this symbolic trend. We have seen in this Introduction that hunting ultimately was used flexibly in the ancient world and involved a web of associated implications. The theme of pursuit can be morally good or bad, can contain erotic or hostile undertones, and either encourages dedication in all spheres of life or distracts one from other business. Undoubtedly, though, hunting has many uses and associations: hunting goes far beyond education. The Latin didactic poets under discussion capitalize on this imagery so their texts could teach about knowledge.¹⁰⁸

C. The State of Literature

My contribution arises not from the collection of primary sources on hunting and animals in the Roman world, admirably compiled by Aymard 1951 and Toynbee 1973, but from the interpretation of the material. For this topic, literature review will be best handled individually in each chapter. Before we examine other political, ethical and poetic implications in didactic texts, we should look at educational implications. Formal Roman education has received much productive recent interest, but the education in Roman didactic poetry is not a traditional education for youth.¹⁰⁹ When Morgan describes the cognitive development in the literary education of the Roman elite, she finds something of a minimization of the role of the pupil, who is the field to be sowed,

¹⁰⁸ In my discussion, only Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* and pseudo-Ovid's *Halieutica* are didactic works with significant mentions of hunting that are not treated in full, although they are mentioned in Chapter 3.

¹⁰⁹ Morgan 1998, Too 2001, McDougall et al. 2008.

capable but inactive without the teacher's effort.¹¹⁰ Hunting is not one image of the cognitive development discussed by Morgan, because there is a different sort of education under examination in didactic poetry. Morgan is interested in basic Roman education; the didactic audience already has a level of literacy. The metaphor of hunting might be more appropriate to the advanced audience, one already with some understanding and on the search for more than just *artes*. The hunting paradigm in didactic poetry dramatizes the teacher's educational model and confidence (or lack thereof) of obtaining certain knowledge. An explicit intention to teach is one of Volk's qualifications for didactic poetry, and I want to explore the construction of this intention.

One way these texts have been approached is the ethical interpretations. Lucretian and Vergilian studies on animals, such as Gale's, focus on the human interaction with animals and how humanity deals with the tension of both being an animal and being in power over animals.¹¹¹ One can read on this issue particularly in scholarship on the use of animals in warfare in Lucretius, the focus of Taylor, Merlan, Keller, Beye, and Furley.¹¹² Hunting in Lucretius is sometimes considered in relation to other poetic figures, and Clay and Mitsis provide conflicting views on whether Lucretius' attitude towards his reader is positive as represented by hunting.¹¹³ Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, however, is the work that blurs the line most between animal and human, and the dehumanization of women in particular can cause unease, as in Anderson.¹¹⁴ My work in complicit in the same way: I am reading the animal prey as anything but an animal, and

¹¹⁰ Morgan 1998: 240-270.

¹¹¹ Gale 1991.

¹¹² The debate framed as Lucretius as progressivist versus primitivist: Taylor 1947, Merlan 1950, Keller 1951, Beye 1963, and Furley 1977; cf. Chapter 1, Part II.

¹¹³ Clay 1983, who finds a positive relationship between Epicurus, Lucretius, and his reader, and Mitsis 1993, who fashions Lucretius as manipulative.

¹¹⁴ Anderson 1990 is one of the more pessimistic readings of Ovid's poem, but he is not alone in reading misogyny in the narrator.

perhaps this interpretive method is unethical. Henderson serves particularly as a warning against ignoring our attitudes towards animals vis-à-vis our attitude towards Grattius' *Cynegetica*.¹¹⁵ My interpretation does not explicitly concern this topic, but use of hunting, an activity that uses animals like tools, once more shows how the human mind can separate the framework of an activity from the reality of the situation.

In this way I move away from the main interests of scholarship in Lucretius, and I also do not focus on the political issues in Vergil, Ovid or Grattius.¹¹⁶ These three authors all wrote at some point in the career of Caesar Augustus, and so it is with reason that political opinions are sought in their poetry. My focus on knowledge is related to the political climate in as much as I am concerned about control over images and knowledge, but I prefer first to take the work on its own level: a didactic poem, intending to teach its audience and concerned with education and knowledge. If there are lessons for the political situation, it is still worthwhile to consider how the poets intended to teach their audience and if they could. In this respect, I offer less of a new perspective with Nemesianus: scholarship on this late antique author has focused on his poetic place as well as his perspective in relation to North African aristocratic education.¹¹⁷ However, by putting Nemesianus in a framework with his four predecessors, I can better evaluate the similarities and differences on their attitudes towards education.

By not focusing on ethical, political, or other concerns, I do not intend to negate their presence. I only intend to focus on a narrative within the didactic genre from

¹¹⁵ Henderson 2001.

¹¹⁶ Vergil's optimism and pessimism is a dissertation in itself, and Ovid's poem, as mentioned previously, is frequently read in relation to his relegation to Tomis, cf. Chapters 2 and 3 for further bibliography. The political angle of Grattius is taken particularly by Aymard 1938, who relates the poem to Augustus' moral reforms, and Henderson 2001.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Küppers 1987.

Lucretius to Nemesianus about the efficacy of education and the stability of knowledge.

The authors are explicit about their concerns with teaching an audience, such as

Lucretius' famous self-defense for using poetry at 1.943-950 and 4.18-25, Ovid's fear of his own success at 3.672, and Grattius' divine mission to teach hunting through poetry at 21-23. Didactic texts have an expectation for results, and I investigate the ways the authors responded to this expectation.

Chapter 1: Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Philosophical Hunting

I. Introduction

Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* teaches the nature of atoms and the world with an Epicurean view, whose ultimate goal is for the reader to attain *ataraxia*.¹ Lucretius constructs his lessons in verse with analogies and metaphors to make its material intelligible to his Roman audience.² Scholarship has turned away from an imagined conflict between Epicurean philosophy and the use of poetry, and metaphor, as an integral part of ancient poetry, was appealing to Lucretius for many reasons even though Epicurus may have disapproved of this verse form.³ The reasons for Lucretius' use of figurative language include the poverty of the Latin language to express eloquently some of the complex Greek philosophical concepts, its utility as a memory aid for philosophical concepts, and his imitation of epic style.⁴ Throughout Lucretius' work, *vestigia*, literally the tracks left by something, becomes a standard word for a proof,

¹ *Ataraxia*, peace of mind, for the most part, has been interpreted as a state of mind that necessarily separates the philosopher from the political world, but cf. n. 12 below for the modern opposite view.

² Memmius, the dedicatee, is likely to be identified as Gaius Memmius, a Roman politician mentioned in Catullus 10 and 28 (Volk 2002: 74). There are variant views about Lucretius' attitude towards Memmius, on which see Volk 2002 section 3.1, "The Teaching Speech". For Lucretius' understanding of teacher-student relations, cf. Part III.B below.

³ Cf. Introduction Part I.B on the ancient categories of figurative language, including metaphor, and n. 23 especially notes the freedom taken by poets with such language. Owing to Epicurus' hostility towards poetry, a division between philosophy and poetry has plagued centuries of Lucretian scholarship. The dichotomy became especially powerful after St. Jerome's biography of Lucretius (*CT* 171, cf. Part III.D below) and then the idea of *anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce* (Patin 1883). The interpretation of a schizophrenic Lucretius held sway into the 20th century with works such as Postgate 1926, Beye 1963, and Bright 1971, but a productive relationship between poetry and philosophy was argued as early as Hohler 1926 and Pope 1949. The complementary nature of poetry and Epicurean philosophy has finally begun to be accepted with only minor apology (cf. Gale 1994 and 2001). Obbink 1995 is a useful volume on the subject, and Leen 1984 and Schrijvers 2007b are useful in showing Lucretius' means of defense against misinterpretation due to poetry: a careful, explicit correlation of language between the subject to be explained and the explanatory figure.

⁴ The problem of complex Greek terms is Lucretius' own defense for using new words at 1.136-139, cf. Sedley 1998. As Volk 2002 and Fowler 2000 argue, the reader should expect epic flourishes in didactic, cf. West 1969: 23-34 and Aicher 1992 for some examples. On mnemonic use, cf. Clay 1983, especially 216-220: "...what is remarkable about this didactic poem is the effort its poet expends in attracting his reader to its argument. ... The reader [...] is first a Roman" (216-217).

which creates a symbolic system where the philosopher-pupil follows in these tracks to learn and grasp corporeal knowledge.⁵ In this chapter I will be discussing how Lucretius uses hunting in order to meet his teaching goals while creating a paradigm for Epicurean philosophical tradition and epistemology.⁶

The philosophical content of the *De Rerum Natura* is several times explained by analogy to commonly known tropes about animals, such as the fierceness of lions or the timidity of deer, which are particularly used to explain the nature of the body and spirit.⁷ Lucretius himself provides a programmatic statement in Book 2 for his use of analogy:

*dumtaxat rerum magnarum parva potest res
exemplare dare et vestigia notitiae.*⁸

This explanation of the utility of analogy and metaphor for instruction uses a hunting metaphor (*vestigia*) and so succinctly indicates the fundamental importance of hunting for Lucretius' educational strategy. His programmatic statement for analogy indicates that the reader can use images accessible to Romans (which include hunting) to understand the more difficult concepts of Epicureanism. The use of analogy in this way is complementary to Epicureanism in general, as it is a philosophy that relies on sense observation and analogy to sense observation for things unseen.⁹ The use of a tracking

⁵ *Vestigia* occurs 23 times in the *De Rerum Natura*: 1.402, 1.406, 2.124, 2.356, 3.4, 3.309, 3.320, 3.389, 3.530, 3.673, 4.87, 4.365, 4.472, 4.705, 4.993, 4.1002, 4.1140, 5.55, 5.738, 5.1261, 5.1447, 6.422, and 6.757.

⁶ Hunting is far from the only repetitive image in the *De Rerum Natura*. For example, West 1969 categorizes the images into five main groups: the theater, games, buildings, light and fire, and religion and word play. A full analysis of hunting, however, has yet to be undertaken.

⁷ cf. Part II below. These stereotypes are as old as the *Iliad*, e.g. "deer-hearted" cowardly Agamemnon (1.225) or "lion-hearted" brave Achilles (7.228); cf. Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981, Lonsdale 1990, and Introduction Part II.C.

⁸ "At any rate, a small thing is able to give a model for great things and tracks of knowledge" *Lucr.* 2.123-124. The translation by Leonard and Smith 1942: 324, "spoors of knowledge," puts particular emphasis on the hunting aspect of *vestigia*.

⁹ Cf. DeWitt 1943, Asmis 2009. In Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*, the Epicurean speaker Velleius describes Epicurus' philosophical prowess as not only mental but also almost physical (*sed etiam sic tractet ut manu*,

metaphor in this programmatic statement demonstrates that hunting will be a prominent image not only for Lucretius' instructional method but also for the philosopher's assent to knowledge.

In general, hunting is used either metaphorically to describe aspects of Epicureanism or as historical evidence to affirm some theory, and the scholarly literature has tended to focus on only one type of use at a time.¹⁰ I intend in this chapter to put all types of Lucretius' hunting uses in closer conversation. After all, to understand a metaphor according to the interaction view or Cognitive Metaphor Theory, one must consider the entire cultural system underlying the metaphor, and all figurative language requires similar cognitive work.¹¹ It is important to consider both the traditional Roman view of hunting as well as how an Epicurean changes the values attached to the image system.¹² Overall, I argue that Lucretius has a coherent conception of philosophical hunting that he sets in opposition to traditional hunting, and this new philosophical hunting encourages the reader to be an active learner instead of a passive student. It also symbolizes an optimistic theory about perception. Epicureanism offers the possibility of

"but also he touches it in such a way like with his hand" *DND* 1.19). This description supports the view that Epicurean knowledge was a solid, graspable thing.

¹⁰ West 1969, Jeffreys 1983, Mitsis 1993, and Fowler 2000, for example, each provide a discussion of hunting metaphors as part of discrete projects on imagery, Cynicism, relationship to audience and relationship to epic respectively; see also Leen 1984 and Schrijvers 2007b on excellent treatments of Lucretius' imagery as philosophical aid. For Lucretius' use of humanity's historical relationship with animal, see the debate on Lucretius as progressivist versus primitivist: Taylor 1947, Merlan 1950, Keller 1951, Beye 1963, and Furley 1977 in Part II below.

¹¹ Cf. Introduction, Part I.B, especially Black 1962; Lakoff and Johnson 1981; and White 1996.

¹² The introduction to the collection of articles in Fish and Sanders 2011 most recently makes an explicit point that Epicureanism did engage with the world, despite earlier scholarly opinions on *ataraxia*. Nichols 1976 notes the common belief, "there is no Epicurean political philosophy," which he intends to debunk in part through the role of Memmius but generally by a division of religion from politics (13). However, with Memmius as the internal audience, the text is not divorced from political meaning. Lucretian scholarship is currently challenging many of the long-held assumptions about the *De Rerum Natura*. I support this scholarly trend by arguing that Lucretius was critiquing current Roman values and had an interest in an active philosophical school, contrary to what Epicurus may have wanted ("Epicureanism was not intended to be a popular philosophy" (Bailey 1947: 2.761)).

certain knowledge, which can be captured by the senses, just as a hunter can capture his prey. Lucretius thus initiates a theme that will run through several didactic Latin authors: namely, that hunting imagery is associated with an optimistic interpretation of the possibility of human understanding.

I will begin by showing how Lucretius sometimes relies on the audience's knowledge of hunting in analogy to make his poetry more persuasive. With this persuasive tool, Lucretius also establishes the claim that the capacity for wisdom and philosophy is central to all human beings, a claim which is useful for convincing the reader to convert to philosophy (Part II). Then I will follow by arguing that hunting is not just used for examples, but it becomes a recurring metaphor to explain the readers' role in the philosophical quest (Part III). Two parts of the *De Rerum Natura* will have particular prominence in this chapter: the nature of the soul in Book 3 and the archaeology of Book 5. Both of these books, incidentally, also begin with proems invoking the hunt. The soul, in the Epicurean view, is mortal, dies with the body, and is composed of various humours that are passed from parents to offspring. Lucretius supports this view through the discussion of characteristics of animal breeds and uses this as evidence that humans need not fear death. In Book 5, Lucretius turns to the mortal nature of the world and the evolution of human society, when humans distinguish themselves from animals and create arts such as hunting. These sections in collaboration with hunting metaphors throughout the six books show the nature of knowledge alongside other aspects of human life.

II. Human Need for Philosophy

The *De Rerum Natura* employs a variety of analogies, and prominent among them is the nature of animals.¹³ In this section, I want to focus upon one analogy in particular that focuses on the personality of animals, including animals encountered in a hunt: 3.741-753. Although this discussion is not part of the model for knowledge perception per se, it adds to our understanding of how Lucretius imagined his wide Roman audience and how they could be prepared for their role in the educational process because of their innate capacity for wisdom.¹⁴ Our wisdom and the proper use of reason lead humanity to the study of philosophy, as discussed in Part III, and Lucretius shows his reader that philosophical education can be understood as a type of hunt. Ultimately, this line of reasoning allows Lucretius to prioritize Epicureanism over other activities and to explain his understanding of the relationship between pupil, teacher and the prey of knowledge.

At 3.741-753, Lucretius offers a series of absurd statements based on animal traits to prove the ridiculousness of the idea that souls could migrate between bodies. This passage echoes an earlier analogy, both in style and in philosophical content, which is a common feature of Lucretian proofs as per Schrijvers' study.¹⁵ Lucretius is teaching about the nature of the soul in both locations, and the repetition of the same analogy reinforces his argument. From the earlier lesson, the reader has already learned and ideally accepted that the soul has a certain composition that produces a certain

¹³ Cf. West 1969 for other categories and Schrijvers 2007b on the concept of root (or recurring) metaphors, where as an example Schrijvers discusses the analogy of particles with seeds for Lucretius' argument that nothing comes from nothing.

¹⁴ Lucr. 3.753. Wisdom is natural in the way that courage is natural for lions, etc. Bailey 1947: 2.1043, following Heinze, observes that in Epicurean philosophy, animals are without logic. Sorabji 1993: 7-16 refers to the assumption that animals are reasonless as "the crisis," started in force by Aristotle. De Lacy 1948 discusses the idea of the popularization of Epicurean philosophy, which Lucretius himself proclaims in his famous honeyed cup image (Lucr. 1.943-950 and 4.18-25). This image, an important statement of method and purpose, also contributes to the idea of a reader forced to take the medicine of philosophy. However, my analysis of hunting blurs the rigid doctor-patient, teacher-pupil boundaries.

¹⁵ Cf. Lucr. 3.296-306, in which Lucretius explains the nature of the soul with the different temperaments of different animals. As Schrijvers 2007b has pointed out, Lucretius continues to use a root analogy for many related proofs.

personality. If Lucretius is right in 3.296-306, he will probably also be right in 3.741-753. The soul is connected to the body in life and death, and therefore the character of the soul must be conditioned by the body and its heritage instead of being defined by an independent entity moving from body to body:

*Denique cur acris violentia triste leonum
seminium sequitur, vulpes dolus, et fuga cervis
a patribus datur et patrius pavor incitat artus,
et iam cetera de genere hoc cur omnia membris
ex ineunte aevo generascunt ingenioque,
si non, certa suo quia semine seminioque
vis animi pariter crescit cum corpore quoque?
quod si immortalis foret et mutare soleret
corpora, permixtis animantes moribus essent,
effugeret canis Hyrcano de semine saepe
cornigeri incursum cervi tremeretque per auras
aëris accipiter fugiens veniente columba,
desiperent homines, saperent fera saecula ferarum.¹⁶*

Lucretius' logic ideally will persuade his audience to adopt the Epicurean viewpoint, but the potential for philosophical wisdom is not only through him. Lucretius indicates that philosophical growth is not only possible, but also natural in humans: at 3.753, the relative wisdom of humanity is above wild beasts. Lucretius conceives of wisdom (the verbs *desipio* and *sapio*) as a characteristic of the soul, along with violence, cleverness or cowardice. Wisdom is the trait given to humans, and the reader is expected to accept that association easily. There are repercussions for this acceptance: namely, that Lucretius establishes that this innate wisdom is in his audience and so implicitly assumes their capability for their philosophical training.

¹⁶ "Furthermore why does sharp violence follow the grim race of lions, or cleverness foxes, or flight is given from their fathers to deer and fear from the father stirs up their limbs? And now why are all the other things of this sort generated in the limbs and in their character while they grow, if not because a certain strength of spirit grows equally with its own seed and species with each body? But if the soul were immortal and accustomed to change bodies, animals would have mixed up traits: often a dog from Hyrcanian seed would flee the flight of a horned stag, and the hawk would tremble fleeing through the winds of the air at the dove's approach; men would be dumb, the wild generations of wild beasts would be wise" Lucr. 3.741-753.

The innate superiority of human over animal wisdom is a concept more fully developed in the evolution of the world in Book 5.¹⁷ Humans and animals came into being in much the same way, but then humankind changed, wearing animal skins and taking a path to civilization apart from animals.¹⁸ Many articles have discussed Lucretius' record of the use of animals in human history to question whether Lucretius was a progressivist, who was optimistic about human progress, or a primitivist, who idealized the Golden Age.¹⁹ The dichotomy, however, is false: rather than supporting either side, Lucretius sees neither time period as ideal, although he knows that the past was needed for lessons from experience.²⁰ Some scholars, however, have read Lucretius' attitudes towards animals as very favorable.²¹ Humanity and animals certainly do have a close relationship in the *De Rerum Natura*, both historically and metaphorically, but the analogy at 3.741-753 makes it clear that human nature sets us apart. In the description of the human spirit at Book 3.753, whatever the complex views Lucretius himself may hold about the relationship between humans and animals, he appeals to the audience with the sentiment that without our wisdom, we are not human. Animals may have enviable innocence, but they are not human and they will never be able to attain philosophical understanding as they lack wisdom, and the progression of human society to Epicureanism is part of the history of humankind of Books 5 and 6. We humans have greater challenges but also greater rewards, such as Epicureanism. Without Epicureanism, a mark of our wisdom, we live more like beasts.

¹⁷ Lucr. 5.772-1457. By superiority, I mean the dominance of humankind as witnessed in the relationships with other animals (5.855-870).

¹⁸ Lucr. 5.953-957, 5.1420-1422.

¹⁹ Taylor 1947, Merlan 1950, Keller 1951, Beye 1963, and Furley 1977.

²⁰ On these points, see especially Taylor 1947 and Merlan 1950.

²¹ E.g. Betensky 1972, Jope 1989, Gale 1991, and Shelton 1996 all comment upon the relationship between humans and animals, and (especially in Shelton) the human is understood to be a part of the world cycle with a close relationship to animals.

Epicureanism is not actually inevitable for a human being, but the human developments in Book 5 and the wisdom of humanity in Book 3 make the origin and use of philosophy seem innate. Humanity is wise in relation to animals, and so our access to reason helps us overcome our baser natural instincts to become calm philosophers.²² Lucretius' choice of analogy with wild animals makes philosophy an expected part of human life: just as lions are violent, so humans are wise. There are, of course, many other examples and mentions of hunting and wild animals in Lucretius, but now I want to turn to the occurrences of philosophical hunting, where the activity is used not only as a parallel to explain a philosophical concept, but itself metaphorically demonstrates how the reader gains knowledge or what philosophy should accomplish.²³ The analogy in Book 3, generally intended to appeal to a wide audience, helps to set the stage for Epicurean methodology.²⁴ Prepared to think about animals and human wisdom in analogy, the reader can be more prepared for his metaphorical role as animal in Epicurean education. Philosophical hunting comes to usurp the traditional understanding

²² Cf. discussion of 3.319-322, Part III.C below.

²³ For other appearances of animals or hunting in Lucretius, see 2.355-356, 3.388-390, 3.670-673, 4.87-89, 4.364-365, 4.1203-1207, 5.966-993, 5.1260-1261, 6.756-759, and 6.1222-1224. The majority of these passages—4.1203-1207, 5.966-993, and 6.1222-1224 being the exceptions that deal with dogs or wild boar—are of interest to me because of the word *vestigia*. *Vestigia* in these passages is of interest when Lucretius relates tracks to sensory perception, but while the passages may be relevant, I want to keep the focus on passages more engaged with hunting.

²⁴ Lucretius may have been appealing to the most common method of hunting to appeal to a broad audience. Lucretius' metaphors rely upon the custom of hunting with dogs and nets, and his account of hunting history also ends with that: *sive feras interficere et ditescere praeda; / nam fovea atque igni prius est venarier ortum / quam saepire plagis saltum canibusque ciere*. "Whether [they want] to kill wild animals and to grow wealthy with prizes; for first it arose to hunt with pitfalls and fire before they enclosed a grove with nets and stirred up prey with dogs" Lucr. 5.1249-1251. Horses, however, were commonly ridden by aristocratic hunting to follow their hunting dogs. The omission cannot have been because he was unaware of this method. Hunting from horseback had been around for centuries in the Greco-Roman world, as discussed in the Introduction, Part II: the praise for hunting on horseback distinguishes the philosophy of Xenophon and Plato. Hunting on horseback became popular in the Roman Empire, particularly with the elites of Hadrian's era among others. Due to the cost of raising horses, this style of hunting had an aristocratic flavor. This observation supports the principle of appealing to many people through analogy and also subtly reinforces that Lucretius is more interested in the object of the hunt than the class of the humans who participate.

of hunting and prey that has served as an analogy in Part II by expanding beyond *exempla* to become a model for Epicurean life.

III. Philosophical Hunting

In the following section, I want to move beyond the use of analogy and into Lucretius' use of metaphor.²⁵ The characteristics of animals do not only help to prove an argument, but the philosopher and the audience act the parts of certain animals for their intellectual growth.²⁶ I will first continue the description of how Lucretius establishes wisdom and the ability to use reason as an innate skill, as we saw in human nature in Part II above. Now using metaphor instead of analogy, Lucretius can establish that the philosophical hunt is governed by nature and reason, and therefore it is greater than a traditional hunt (Part A). When he recasts philosophy as a type of hunting, he also manages to recast the relationship between Epicurus and his followers (Part B), who need to act like dogs (Part C). Nets, standard equipment in a historical hunt, are furthermore associated not with philosophical hunting but with the distractions of modern life (Part D).²⁷ The Epicurean school, handing down a tradition where knowledge is a concrete goal attainable through human perception and philosophical education, is well expressed by this hunting paradigm in Lucretius.

A. Naturalized Philosophy

²⁵ The difference between analogy and metaphor is essentially the difference between simile and metaphor: both are comparisons of two subjects, but one is marked as such. More information about definitions of figurative language can be found in the Introduction, Part I.B., but I will restate that both figures serve cognitively similar functions. The metaphor is simply more vivid.

²⁶ The comparison is used despite the fact that animals as a whole lack reason: the paradigm of a hunt is greater than this logical inconsistency. Also cf. Sorabji 1993: 47 for the Epicurean view that animals still have perception, if not belief or other understanding that comes from perception.

²⁷ Cf. Introduction Part II, and also note passage 5.1249-1251, n. 24 above, which states that nets are the final evolution of hunting.

Nature and Reason, both foundational for Epicureanism, fulfill their guiding functions in roles modeled from hunting.²⁸ Lucretius explicitly argues for the naturalness of Epicurean philosophy in a metaphor in the proem of Book 2. The reader searches for the right path, but the reader's purpose in life is actually clear:

*qualibus in tenebris vitae quantisque periclis
degitur hoc aevi quodcumque! nonne videre
nihil aliud sibi naturam latrare, nisi utqui
corpore seiunctus dolor absit, mente fruatur
iucundo sensu cura semota metuque?*²⁹

This passage contains a metaphor of Nature barking, the action of a canine.³⁰ Bailey argues against a nature as guard dog image in the sense that nature does not enforce something:

Giussani must be wrong in taking [the line] to mean that 'nature barks at man' sc. continually enforces on him. Like Lachmann he does not approve of the restriction of *natura* in the sense of 'human nature,' and for this reason adopts this interpretation and takes *sibi* with *videre*, *hominem* being assumed as subject.³¹

I approve Bailey's understanding that nature barks for itself, with *videre* as an exclamatory infinitive, but in the view of the whole work and the customs of hunting in particular, nature as dog can logically bark to a human to show him the way, which is the bark of a hunting dog rather than the bark of a guard dog. The implied sentence of the metaphor, in other words, indicates a hunting dog rather than a guard dog. Leonard and

²⁸ The word *ratio* itself occurs over two hundred times, and is the guide to Epicurean philosophy, or at least history (Lucr. 5.1446-1447). Cf. Cox 1971, who discusses Lucretius' *ratio* in comparison with other philosophical schools, Clay 1983, who notes that *ratio* can be a philosophical argument (37-38), and Costa 1984: 52. Cf. Bailey 1947: 3.1547, Asmis 2009 and Gale 2009: 215 on Epicurean epistemology.

²⁹ "In what shadows of life and in how many dangers is spent whatever this is of life! Don't you see that nature barks for nothing for itself except that grief be removed, separated from the body, and she should enjoy a mind removed from care and fear with pleasant sense?" Lucr. 2.15-19.

³⁰ *OLD* "latro (1)" can have the broader meanings of any clamorous sound (§4), and at times even the sound of the ocean (§1d) or of certain birds (§1c). However, most of the definitions relate to dogs.

³¹ Bailey 1947: 2.799.

Smith support the barking as canine.³² The sound signals Nature's lead for individuals to attain *ataraxia*, a calmness achieved by a distance of the mind from grief, care and fear. Jeffreys has noted possible references to Cynic philosophy in this passage, but it is also important to consider the characteristics of dogs in Lucretius' work itself.³³ Like a canine companion, Nature here is pointing out a secret path through the darkness of modern life (*qualibus in tenebris vitae*, 15) to *ataraxia*.

The ability for dogs to communicate effectively is assumed in Book 2, but made explicit in Book 5. We see in 5.1063-1066 that even humans can understand the basic intent behind barks:

*inritata canum cum primum magna Molossum
mollia ricta fremunt duros nudantia dentis
longe alio sonitu rabie restricta minantur
et cum iam latrant et vocibus omnia complent.*³⁴

In these lines, Lucretius mentions Molossians, one of the two major breeds in antiquity and "a favoured breed" as Gale notes.³⁵ In only two of the twelve mentions of dogs in the *De Rerum Natura* does Lucretius name the breed, so it may be worth noting when he does.³⁶ This example is part of Lucretius' argument for the natural and gradual development of language. However, the choice of Molossian dogs may not be simply a

³² Leonard and Smith 1942: 313.

³³ Jeffreys 1983. Again, dogs are philosophical, which will become increasingly important in Part C.

³⁴ "First when the great soft jaws of Molossian hounds froth, stirred up, revealing harsh teeth, drawn back in anger, they threaten with a far different sound than when they now bark, and fill up everything with their sounds" Lucr. 5.1063-1066.

³⁵ Gale 2009: 189. Costa 1984: 123 also remarks on the fame of this breed, citing the works of Aristotle, Aristophanes, Grattius, Nemesianus, Vergil, and Horace; cf. Introduction Part II. A for favored dog breeds.

³⁶ The other references to dogs are in lines 1.404, 3.750, 4.681, 4.705, 4.733 (technically about Cerberus), 4.999, 4.1203, 5.864, 5.892 (technically about Scylla), 5.1251 and 6.1222. The other named breed is Hyrcanian at line 3.570: The Hyrcanian breed was known to be ferocious, recorded in external evidence from both Cicero and, later, Grattius (Aris. *H.A.* 8.607a, Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 1.45.108, Verg. *Aen.* 367, and Grat. 161-170. cf. Hull 1964: 27). Bailey 1947: 2.1121 and Kenney 1971: 180 note that the breed may have been believed to be interbred with tigers, but the latter notes that "in this context the idea [of interbreeding] seems slightly inopportune, and L. probably cites this breed merely to exemplify extreme ferocity."

favorite or random choice. Instead, there is evidence that they were famous in antiquity for their barking.³⁷ The familiarity of the audience with the dog breed helps Lucretius prove that language was a natural development in Book 5 and something understandable to humans. The audience in Book 2 could also follow Nature's bark.

Not only nature, but also Reason (*ratio*) is a guide. Proof of Reason's guidance is that the account of the development of humanity in Book 5 could not have been written without Reason. Nature at 2.17 was trying to show us all *ataraxia* by barking (*latrare*), and Reason at 5.1447 puts Lucretius on the hunt for the past. The programmatic statement for writing history in Book 5 utilizes another hunting metaphor that hinges upon tracks, just as his programmatic statement on analogy did.³⁸ Lucretius' method is ultimately guided by Reason, and that help is why the method is effective:

*propterea quid sit prius actum respicere aetas
nostra nequit, nisi qua ratio vestigia monstrat.*³⁹

What Lucretius is doing in Book 5 is explaining the past as a logical cause and effect of probable events. He accomplishes this history through observation and reasoning, foundations of Epicurean epistemology, described here as hunting out the traces (*vestigia*) of this evolution. *Ratio* fulfills the function of a dog, pointing out the tracks and guiding Lucretius to put the path together. If *ratio* were not leading, the path could very well lead to false or bad knowledge. It is only with *ratio* that Lucretius is able to fashion a story about the past that is useful for his work, but the creation requires effort.

³⁷ In this case, there is external evidence about Molossian canine language: the Molossians were known to be loud in Gratius (Il.196-197). It is difficult to know the exact features of any ancient dog breed due to breeding practices and the relatively quick generation of dogs (cf. Hull 1964: 20-23 and Phillips and Willcock 1999: 12-18), but the fact that authors independently corroborate several details indicates at least a common acceptance of this breed's characteristics.

³⁸ Lucr. 2.123-124.

³⁹ "Therefore our age is unable to look back at what was done before unless in some way Reason points out the tracks" Lucr. 5.1446-1447.

Ratio can only point out the path (*monstrat*). It is up to Lucretius to hunt out the information for himself.

Not only Lucretius, but also Epicurus and all those after him follow this hunting paradigm. This tradition is stated most obviously in the proem to Book 5 when the victories of philosophy and Epicurus are compared to those of traditional hunting and Hercules. Lucretius explains in Book 6 that Epicurean philosophy began only when Epicurus witnessed that physical security was not sufficient for mental peace. Epicurus' enlightenment would not have been possible without the development of human society, imperfect though it may have been.⁴⁰ The need to eliminate wild beasts was one part of human evolution, as Lucretius will indicate later with humankind's initial fear of animals, and Hercules' skill in killing beasts seemed necessary in the proem to Book 5.⁴¹ However, the victories of Hercules were eventually outdone by the more important deeds of Epicurus. The historical evolution recounted in Books 5 and 6 shows both the escape from primitive fears as well as the creation of new anxieties, and the new fears require new heroism. Hercules tamed the beasts, as part of the natural evolution of humankind as discussed in Book 5; Epicurus tamed the mind, an essential means of dealing with the horrors in the world like the plague in Book 6.⁴² The development within the proem of Book 5 from the supposed good works of Roman gods to the truly good philosophy of Epicurus mimics the development of human society within the final two books.

Because philosophy is fashioned as a natural development that parallels hunting, Lucretius views Epicurus' work as a type of battle and Epicurus himself as a new kind of

⁴⁰ Lucr. 6.9-23 and Nichols 1976: 146 n.73.

⁴¹ On human fear of animals, cf. Lucr. 5.982-5.987.

⁴² Cf. Lucr. 5.966-993 where, in fact, Lucretius explains that wild beasts were the only true fear of the earliest people, which is contrary to the opinion that early humans feared night (see especially Bailey 1947: 3.1479 on this question). But as humans learned to overcome this fear of violent death, other fears arose.

hero, even though the outcomes of the works of Hercules and Epicurus are dissimilar.⁴³

Ultimately, the new hero Epicurus is greater than the old hero. Hercules is a traditional hero who engages in traditional hunting. Hercules, a demigod much like Epicurus in Lucretius' view, accomplished many deeds, and he can be considered a foundational hunter-hero.⁴⁴ After recounting some of Hercules' famous labors, Lucretius judges that the end result of Hercules' work is ultimately considered null:

*...ita ad satietatem terra ferarum
nunc etiam scatit et trepido terrore repleta est
per nemora ac montis magnos silvasque profundas;
quae loca vitandi plerumque est nostra potestas.*⁴⁵

Hunting might once have been a necessary part of life, but in the present, for the most part, the Roman elite has no unavoidable need for hunting.⁴⁶ On the other hand, Epicurus defeats the mental evils, and these new hunts require a different strategy: *expulerit dictis, non armis* (5.50).⁴⁷ This method replicates the manner in which Epicurus engages with his audience: *atque omnem rerum naturam pandere dictis* (5.54).⁴⁸ In addition, both men

⁴³ Cf. Hardie 1986, Gale 1991, Aicher 1992, and Gale 2001 on the heroic in Lucretius. Also cf. Murley 1947, although he sees *Natura* as the hero. Volk 2002, on the other hand, recognizes the heroic touches but separates these epic elements from the core of Lucretius' didactic work (69-73).

⁴⁴ Many of Hercules' labors require hunting; cf. Gale 2009: 112-114 on the passage's presentation of Hercules' supposedly good works, both cultural and philosophical for Cynics and Stoics, versus Epicurus' actual good works.

⁴⁵ "Thus even now the Earth teems to fullness with wild beasts, and it is replenished with trembling terror throughout the groves and great mountains and vast woods; these places are mostly in our power to avoid" Lucr. 5.39-42. Gale 2009: 114 notes the "deflating effect of the phrase." There are some textual problems with the preceding passage on the labors, and Munro indicates a lacuna between lines 28 and 29. However, from what remains, the labors listed are: the Nemean Lion, the Arcadian Boar, the Cretan Bull, the Lernaean Hydra, the Cattle of Geryon, the Stymphalian Birds, the Mares of Diomedes, and the Apples of the Hesperides. This list omits four of the canonical labors, including the retrieval of Cerberus from Hades, which may be purposeful. cf. the discussion of Hercules in Chapter 4, Part II.B.

⁴⁶ Leonard and Smith 1942: 649 discuss exceptions. People living outside of the city would have more need to hunt.

⁴⁷ "He defeated them with words, not arms" Lucr. 5.50. Gale 2009: 115 considers this an implicit comparison, but I would argue that it is explicit. *Armis*, even before the *Aeneid* and the word's association with the *Iliad*, has a martial sense. Bailey 1947: 3.1329 additionally notes that Lucretius means to praise Epicurus for his nonviolence.

⁴⁸ "And [he was accustomed] to expound upon the entire nature of things with words" Lucr. 5.54. Costa 1984: 53 also relates these words to the proem of Book 6 (*veridicis igitur purgavit pectora dictis*, "He

are evaluated by Lucretius: he uses the phrase *ut opinor* (5.6, 5.39) in his discussion of each.⁴⁹ Despite casting this as opinion, Lucretius is very persuasive, and he frames his opinion in terms of *ratio*, a key concept in the work. Epicurus is the one who finds reason (*rationem invenit*, 5.9), and if you believe Hercules could rival him, you are far from reason (*longius a vera multo ratione ferere*, 5.23).⁵⁰ It is time to replace these Herculean accomplishments with something that has more lasting value: a very real peace of mind instead of futile labor. Labor should be spent on self-improvement. It may seem unusual that *ataraxia*, peace of mind, requires hard work and even some sacrifice; however, to obtain greatest pleasure, temporary pains must be endured sometimes.⁵¹ The civilizing efforts of humankind rise and fall, as even Hercules' work did not stop wild animals everywhere, but Epicurus provides lasting peace for the individual.⁵² Both traditional hunting and other schools of philosophy who view Hercules as a philosopher hero are ultimately subordinated to the methods of Epicurus.⁵³

purged his chest therefore with honest words" Lucr. 6.24). This proem recapitulates the good that Epicurus has accomplished.

⁴⁹ "as I think" Lucr. 5.6; 5.39.

⁵⁰ Lucr. 5.9; 5.23. Bailey 1947: 3.1325 states that *ratio* in the Hercules passage does not technically mean "true wisdom," i.e. Epicurean philosophy, but the reader at this point might associate the word with Epicureanism anyway.

⁵¹ Although Cicero is a biased source, the speaker for Epicureanism in *De Finibus* explains: *ut aut reiciendis voluptatibus maiores alias consequatur aut perferendis doloribus asperiores repellat*. "[The wise man takes care that] either after rejecting some pleasures he should seek other greater pleasures or, accepting some pains, he should repel other harsher pains" (1.33).

⁵² Lucretius seems to play with this idea of frightening animals throughout the *De Rerum Natura*. The Epicurean philosopher ultimately need not fear, but the verb *minari*, and related words *minitare*, "to threaten," and *minax*, "threatening," are frequently used in relation to animals (e.g. Lucr. 5.1325, 5.1065, 3.657) and natural phenomena (e.g. Lucr. 1.68, 6.572, 1.276, 5.1193). Note the use of *minari* at 5.1065 previously: the verb is the expected choice for Lucretius to use to explain the frightening language of dogs. Wild animals can threaten in a way similar to storms, but of course, Epicureanism would encourage the pupil not to actually fear either of these phenomena despite their threats. Leonard and Smith 1942: 612 connect some violent dreams to exposure to the Roman games. This atmosphere disturbs the soul, but ultimately, the philosopher can avoid this fear.

⁵³ Cf. Packman 1976 for Hercules as a Stoic hero, although Frischer 1982 argues that the relationship between Hercules and the Stoics is later than Lucretius. Frischer 1982: 209-231 discusses the transformation of Hercules into a Pythagorean and Cynic philosopher before Lucretius and Epicurus' iconographic similarities to the mythological hero, and then Lucretius' dismissal of Hercules' labors.

B. Epicurus' Relationship to his Followers

Lucretius' claim for Epicurus' superiority is presented more subtly at the end of the proem of Book 5 by the implicit creation of Epicurus' philosophical school. Hunting, historically, was certainly taught and passed down from father to son.⁵⁴ Yet, Lucretius omits any lessons Hercules may have passed down and instead underscores that he—Lucretius—follows Epicurus and reason in his work at 5.55-56:

*Cuius ego ingressus vestigia dum rationes
persequor ac doceo dictis...*⁵⁵

Lucretius' use of *dictis* in particular creates a parallel between Epicurus' work and Lucretius' faithful imitation.⁵⁶ Not only does Lucretius imitate Epicurus, but also the pupil has become the teacher—Lucretius pursues (*persequor*, 5.56) tracks like a hunting dog to show the way to his readers, and Epicurus, the deified teacher, is now the object of pursuit. Philosophical growth requires role reversal. Epicurus is ultimately not the prey of Lucretius and the readers' hunt: knowledge and the *ataraxia* that follows are the prey of all Epicureans, so we may want to consider Epicurus as a lead dog that can find the prey and is then followed.⁵⁷

But this is not the first or only time in the *De Rerum Natura* that Lucretius creates a hunting framework for his endeavor. We have discussed Nature (2.15-19) and Reason (5.1446-1447) leading humans to philosophy and right thinking, and in the Proem of

⁵⁴ Cf. Green 1996a and Corbeill 2001.

⁵⁵ "Whose [Epicurus'] tracks I trod, while I follow his arguments and teach with his words" Lucr. 5.55-56. Gale 2009: 115 relates this image to the idea of a journey, and Costa 1984: 55 discusses Lucretius' emphasis on his closeness to Epicurus, but there are also clear hunting echoes.

⁵⁶ *Dictis* used by both men in Lucr. 5.50, 5.54, 5.56, and 6.24.

⁵⁷ If we take Epicurus to be prey, our overall understanding is the same, but the differences with traditional hunting become more pronounced. The reversal between pursuer and pursued is not the fate that Hercules or any real hunter would desire, and so the reader witnesses a fundamental difference between unfulfilling traditional hunting and necessary philosophical hunting. For the shifting role of dogs, see Part III.C below.

Book 3, Epicurus is leading Lucretius again. In fact, Lucretius uses similar vocabulary in the proem of Book 3.3-4:

*te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc
ficta pedum pono pressis vestigia signis.*⁵⁸

The passage begins with a focus on the initial prey: Epicurus (*te*) is pursued (*sequor*), and it is Epicurus (*tuis*) who seems to be the initial focus. However, the next line surprises the reader. The *vestigia* are the object of *pono*—I, Lucretius, put down these tracks where you have left signs (*tuis pressis signis*). Kenney states that *signa* and *vestigia* “hardly differ in meaning,” and while this might be true if the metaphors are dead, *signum* has a more general definition of any token left behind and at times a military connotation.⁵⁹ *Vestigia*, as we have seen, are used by Lucretius to mean evidence, as they are the prints left by an animal to follow. When Lucretius leaves tracks, he ceases to be merely the hunter. He is now someone to be followed himself, either as a lead dog or as a type of prey. But whereas the reversal of hunter and hunted is seen as dangerous in mythological stories, and would be less than ideal on a hunting trip, here Lucretius embraces the change. Indeed, the shift reflects the methodology of his work: he followed the tracks of Greek philosophy and then crafted his own markedly untried path (*avia... loca*, 1.926, 4.1) in Latin literature.⁶⁰ His readers in turn will be able to follow him and his tracks. Epicurus and Lucretius are most important here for the path that they left.

C. The Nature of Dogs

⁵⁸ “I follow you, o glory of the Greek race, and now I place tracks made of my feet in your pressed signs” Lucr. 3.3-4. Cf. *persequor* (5.56) and *sequor* (3.3) and *vestigia* (5.55 and 3.4), while *vestigia* are limited to tracks, appropriate to hunting situations.

⁵⁹ Kenney 1971: 75, *OLD* “signum” §8, 10 and 11.

⁶⁰ The “untrodden path” occurs twice: Lucr. 1.926-950 and 4.1-25, and it is noteworthy that he uses *avia loca* for this purpose instead of *vestigia*, which would indicate tracks; cf. Sedley 1998. The reference is obviously Callimachean and remains a statement of metapoetic challenge, cf. Epilogue, n. 16.

With the figures of Epicurus and Lucretius, we see an emphasis on the hunt and the prey. Their tracks are tantamount, and the reader participates in this hunt, but not as a human hunter reaping the benefits of the dogs' labor. Instead, Lucretius makes explicit that the reader in this pedagogical relationship functions as a dog as well. As a standard part of the hunt, dogs may be able to represent the hunt generally, but the attention given to the characteristics of dogs in the *De Rerum Natura* demonstrates their usefulness as an educational model. At 1.402-411, the first extended hunting simile about the reader's responsibilities, Lucretius sets a standard for the rest of the work:

*verum animo satis haec vestigia parva sagaci
sunt per quae possis cognoscere cetera tute.
namque canes ut montivagae persaepe ferarum
naribus inveniunt intactas fronde quietes,
cum semel institerunt vestigia certa viai,
sic alid ex alio per te tute ipse videre
talibus in rebus poteris caecaque latebras
insinuare omnis et verum protrahere inde.
quod si pigraris paulumve recesseris ab re,
hoc tibi de plano possum promittere, Memmi.⁶¹*

This simile has been discussed in research about Lucretius' general practice of poetic figures, which creates a careful balance between what is written in the simile and the real situation that is related.⁶² It is easy to map the role of the reader onto the role of the dog,

⁶¹ "But these small tracks, through which you are able to know the rest safely, are enough for the wise spirit. For indeed as mountain-treading dogs with their noses often come upon the quiet places of wild animals covered with foliage, when at once they set upon the certain tracks of the road, thus with one thing here from another thing there, you yourself through your own ability are able to see safely in such things and to curve through the dark hidden places and to draw out the truth from there. But if you are slow or you recede a little from the matter, I am able to provide this to you clearly, Memmius:..." *Lucr.* 1.402-411. Bailey 1947: 2.664 reads line 404 as *montivagae...ferai* so that "mountain-treading" can retain a habitual sense. He also notes that *quietes* is unparalleled, and it may be a technical hunting term, as suggested by Ernout. Technical precision would be fitting for Lucretius' style.

⁶² Cf. West 1969: 74-75 and Leen 1984: 111-112. This passage is not the implied sentence of a metaphor but the explicit sentence of the simile, which is considered easier to understand. Lucretius writes out both sentences—the activity of the reader and the activity of the hunting dog—so that the reader knows what he is. Cf. Introduction on metaphor, Part I.B.

both searching for prey hidden in dark places and relying on individual strengths such as sight, touch, or scent to find the tracks.

The detail of the dogs' strong noses is important because it is a recognized strength of canines. Dogs, as we will see in passages 4.991-1010 and 4.680-682, are strongest in respect to their noses (*naribus*, 4.993), and so Lucretius logically provides this detail in his first characterization of dogs. His discussions of real dogs reflect the traits he desires in his philosophical dogs. The skills and training of dogs are a central point of Lucretius' discussion on dreams at 4.991-1004:

*venantumque canes in molli saepe quiete
iactant crura tamen subito vocisque repente
mittunt et crebro redducunt naribus auras.
ut vestigia si teneant inventa ferarum,
expergefactive secuntur inania saepe
cervorum simulacra, fugae quasi dedita cernant,
donec discussis redeant erroribus ad se.
at consueta domi catulorum blanda propago
discutere et corpus de terra corripere instant,
[iactant crura tamen subito vocisque repente
mittunt et crebro redducunt naribus auras
ut vestigia si teneant inventa ferarum
expergefactive secuntur inania saepe]
proinde quasi ignotas facies atque ora tuantur.⁶³*

Lucretius begins with a distinction between the two jobs of dogs: hunting dogs and guard dogs. Although there is a separation between the two, and the training for hunting dogs

⁶³ "And hunting dogs nevertheless often toss their legs about in soft rest suddenly and they suddenly send out cries and swiftly breathe in the air with their noses as if they held the discovered tracks of beasts, and woken up, they often follow the empty images of stages, as if they saw them given to flight, until they return to themselves having shaken off the error. But the pleasant offspring of dogs accustomed to the home shake themselves and, from there, begin to take their body from the earth as if they were watching unknown forms and faces" Lucr. 4.991-1004. The order of these lines is controversial, but the confusion does not affect sense. Leonard and Smith 1942: 610 take *discussis...erroribus* to refer metaphorically to the shaking off of nets, which interpretation well complements the connection between sleep and love (cf. Part III.D). However, it also makes sleep more damaging than Lucretius' introduction indicates: *animi curas e pectore solvat*. "[Sleep] loosens cares of the soul from the chest" Lucr. 4.908.

was in some way specialized, the jobs at heart are clearly connected.⁶⁴ The dogs' natural instincts are to chase and protect, keeping threats away from their owners. This protective nature is the central drive for both activities and what the dogs dream about during the night, but the roles are distinct to the human owners. The image that Lucretius conjures of the sleeping dog is both detailed and engaging, which speaks to his familiarity with hunting dogs and their appeal to his Roman audience.

His examples to explain his philosophy are regularly reinforced with these “small matters,” as per his programmatic statement, and the canine dream sequence explains more than his point that people dream about their daily labor.⁶⁵ The details remind the reader of the strengths of dogs and of his own role and skills as a philosophical dog. The dog while dreaming sniffs at the breeze (*crebro redducunt naribus auras*, 4.993), and Lucretius had earlier established scent as the strength of dogs in the section on the sense of smell at 4.680-682:

...tum fissa ferarum
ungula quo tulerit gressum promissa canum vis
ducit....⁶⁶

This example is part of the demonstration that certain animals are affected by scents differently, and dogs in particular are strong enough to hunt out certain species of animals

⁶⁴ This distinction is also seen in Aristotle's *History of Animals*, Book 9, which was an important source for Lucretius' knowledge of animals, according to Schrijvers 1997. On different training, cf. Columella 7.12. In Chapter 2, we will discuss further how the inclusion of hunting dogs in a text on farming was not guaranteed.

⁶⁵ Lucr. 2.123-124.

⁶⁶ “They frequently lead the breezes back through their noses” Lucr. 4.993. “Then the strength of dogs sent ahead directs [you] wherever the cloven hoof of wild animals has brought its step” Lucr. 4.680-682. Leonard and Smith 1942: 584 follows Robin 1923 in noticing an Empedoclean reference (Emp. Fr. 101) and is surely right that *promissa* has the passive sense “urged forward.”

with their noses in the same way that the reader hunts out proofs. The olfactory strength of dogs can easily find the prey, just as the human *animus* can follow paths.⁶⁷

However, canine scent is not infallible. The section on scent at 4.673-705 is followed by a discussion of sight (4.706-721), and Lucretius provides a smooth transition through the continued use of hunting dogs as examples. Dogs are as much the cause for the failure of hunts as they are the cause for success: *errant saepe canes itaque et vestigia quaerunt* (4.705).⁶⁸ Scents are not always the most reliable way to find prey, and dogs also must cast about for physical tracks that can be seen.⁶⁹ Lucretius is explaining to his reader why, if scent is the so-called strength of dogs, dogs also need their sight to track. It is common to have two specialties in hunting dogs, one whose sense of smell is superior and one who relies on his sight.⁷⁰ This detail provides a logical means for Lucretius to conclude the section on scent and to transition to his discussion of sight.

However, how does the fallibility of dogs reflect on the chance of success for the reader in Book 1.402-411? Leonard and Smith note that *semel* indicates that the dogs may need more than one pass to find the prey, and so the reader may need several proofs as well, even if Lucretius does not want to list every one.⁷¹ Furthermore, scholars are divided on the interpretation of Lucretius' attitude towards power in the simile: does Lucretius have ultimate control or is the reader supposed to be independent? The different views are clearly expressed by Clay and Mitsis. Clay takes Lucretius' words at

⁶⁷ Lucr. 1.402. Again, we see the innate wisdom of human is key (cf. Part II above).

⁶⁸ "Often dogs go astray and thus search also for tracks" Lucr. 4.705. Leonard and Smith 1942: 586 note that *quaerunt* also indicates error or vain searches. *OLD* "quaero" supports the sense of an attempt with no guarantee about the outcome. However, whether the searching is successful or not, I argue that *vestigia* refers to the physical tracks and not the scent of the prey again, although the latter sense is not unattested (*OLD* "vestigium" §1.d). This line is referenced in *OLD* "vestigium" §1.a.

⁶⁹ The various problems with hunting by scent are discussed in Xen. *Cyn.* 5.

⁷⁰ Cf. Grat. 250 and Phillips and Willcock 1999: 6-8.

⁷¹ Lucr. 1.406 and Leonard and Smith 1942: 244.

face value and insists on the independence of the readers. The reader must learn to discern arguments for himself.⁷² Mitsis argues that Lucretius is in full control and that the simile works as a rhetorical device intended to lull the reader further into Lucretius' benevolent but complete control because the reader does not want to be like a dog or like the ignorant Memmius.⁷³ However, there is nothing negative about the role of the dog. We have already seen Epicurus and Lucretius tracking, and here the reader takes this role as well. The dogs in 1.402-411, like Hercules in 5.39, deal with beasts (*ferarum*), while the audience, like Lucretius and Epicurus, tracks philosophical knowledge. There is no way to find anything, least of all philosophy, without the tracks of those who have come before us. But are such followers independent or dependent? The role of the dogs is somewhere in between. Dogs have a liminal position in hunting, as they take the commands of human hunters, but they also have to use their own senses and bear the brunt of the work.⁷⁴ Lucretius expects the same from his reader; Lucretius states in this passage that the reader must explore reasons independently, but the image indicates they have to learn (or be trained) before they can be fully in charge. As each follower of Epicurus traces (or retraces) the paths already there, they also leave their own paths behind and create a coherent philosophical tradition. The reader is not a dumb lackey of Lucretius or left to his own devices; he is an important part of the cycle of philosophical education and has freedom without complete independence.⁷⁵

⁷² Clay 1983. Solomon 2004 similarly finds that Lucretius tempts the reader with pleasing poetry or presents him with contradictions so that he can learn independence.

⁷³ Mitsis 1993. His argument is supported by Volk 2002.

⁷⁴ Cf. Introduction Part II on the standard procedure of hunts.

⁷⁵ In fact, in Epicurean teaching in general, scholars have seen a flexibility for individuals within the basic tenets of Epicurus' aims (cf. de Lacy 1948).

We can now evaluate nature's ability to bark at 2.17 with a consideration for the role of the audience.⁷⁶ The metaphor of *naturam latrare* may work one of two ways. First, the reader here may be a human hunter who is not quite as perceptive as his animal companion. This interpretation shows more clearly the power and knowledge relationships between the dog who is searching actively and the unmentioned human hand guiding it. Dogs work somewhat independently: this much is clear from the fact that Lucretius wants his reader to work out some things for himself (1.402-411) and from the fact that nature-as-dog knows best (2.15-19). However, the dog is only one part of the picture. Nature's best efforts cannot actually make the audience-hunters learn if they are unwilling to listen. The more likely interpretation is that nature might be the lead dog, guiding the other hounds (the readers). There is no human hunter under consideration. Practice and training are very important for young hunting dogs, and Arrian recommends releasing them at most two at a time whether at play or in work.⁷⁷ One must not assume that the relationship implied in *naturam latrare* means that Nature is barking to a human hunter. Both interpretations require external knowledge about hunting, and whichever way the reader understands the metaphorical relationship, what is most important is that the reader follows Nature's cue and that dogs are the best models for people on the philosophical path. The benefit of the latter interpretation is that it is more consistent with the view of the reader in Book 1.402-411, and it shows the origin of a coherent and continuous philosophical tradition beginning with nature and passing to Epicurus and his followers.

⁷⁶ The discussion is continued from Part III.A above. The role of nature in Book 2.15-19 may also be the same as the role of Epicurus in the proem to Book 3.

⁷⁷ Arrian *Cyn.* 15.

But as we read at 4.705 on scents, dogs can be misled, and one must beware of following the wrong tracks. Nature at 2.15-19, which is the good, universal nature of *De Rerum Natura*, contrasts with the base natures of human instinct at 3.319-322:

*illud in his rebus video firmare potesse,
usque adeo naturarum vestigia linqui
parvula, quae nequeat ratio depellere nobis,
ut nil impediat dignam dis degere vitam.*⁷⁸

Here nature is in the plural, referring to the characteristics of humans that are under discussion at 3.307-322. The tracks of these natures lead to base human emotions, which are at odds with our innate capacity for wisdom.⁷⁹ Reason, like Nature at 2.17, points us to the proper path where we can live like gods by suppressing emotion and maturing.⁸⁰ Our human natures are prone to mistakes, fears and anxieties, as opposed to the singular *Natura* of 2.17, and we are subject to individual flaws. Not all paths are ones worth following, but reason (*ratio*) can direct paths to better prey as we learn to minimize the traces of the wrong prey. This possibility for personal growth is affirmed later in Book 3 at 741-753.⁸¹ It is our capacity for wisdom and our ability to use reason that can help us to overcome our weaker instincts. This is not something that animals can accomplish.⁸² Reason, in union with the true Nature of the world, should be our master: to put it in the

⁷⁸ "I see in these matters one thing that I am able to affirm, that as up to this point the tracks of nature left behind are so slight which reason is not able to push away from us that nothing should impede us from living a life worthy of the gods" Lucr. 3.319-322.

⁷⁹ Lucr. 3.753 in Part II above. Holtsmark 1967 relates the simile in Book 1.402-411 and the proem in Book 2.15-19 to this blindness in humans that can cause misdirection, but the picture is much broader, as we see here. Leonard and Smith 1942: 450 define *naturarum* as "natural" or "inborn" faults. These faults can be softened by knowledge (*doctrina*), which explanation begins the section at Lucr. 3.307-309:

...quamvis doctrina politos / constituat pariter quosdam, tamen illa relinquit / naturae cuiusque animi vestigia prima. "Although knowledge settles certain polished men as equals, nevertheless those well-known first tracks of nature of each spirit remain." Not only does *vestigia* mean the traces that cannot be dismissed in both contexts, but knowledge could be considered a tool of human wisdom, our natural talent at 3.753.

⁸⁰ *Ratio* was also the guide to history at 5.1446-1447.

⁸¹ Cf. Part II above.

⁸² Only humans were considered to have the capacity for wisdom, cf. the Epicurean speaker Velleius in *De Natura Deorum* 1.18 and Sorabji 1993.

language of Lucretius' hunting metaphors, Reason is the guiding hunter encouraging the dog-pupils to pursue the most valuable prey.⁸³

Lest his point be unclear, Lucretius gives other examples of the danger of following the wrong path or desiring the wrong prey. The way to avoid the wrong prey comes from reason, which lays down the proper tracks. The ability to find the true path is not always easy, but it has become more evident since the work of Epicurus who revealed the importance of obedience to *Ratio*. *Ataraxia* should replace all other kinds of prey, and so the cessation of hunting was necessary. Humankind needed progression.⁸⁴ But on the other hand, modern life has brought about its own vices and allows the wrong application of human reason.⁸⁵ We must beware of using our reason to change or control true Nature and of listening to base instincts.⁸⁶ At 4.1139-1140, we see that the lover has been misled:

*aut nimium iactare oculos aliumve tueri
quod putat in voltuque videt vestigia risus.*⁸⁷

In this case, the hunter—the lover—is thrown into torment because of the things he sees (*vestigia*). Jealousy distracts the man because his beloved has traces of a smile, perhaps while looking at another man. Hunters and their trusty hounds can be misled, as we saw, despite the strength of their noses and their keen eyesight.⁸⁸ If one follows up the tracks jealously, he will be hurt. This hunt is not the path to true knowledge or peace of mind, but a false path, and the reader can draw a lesson from this lover's torment.

⁸³ The benefit of having Nature instead of Epicurus or some other human be the guide is to avoid the reliance upon a master instead of philosophy itself (cf. Cicero *DND* 1.10).

⁸⁴ Lucr. 6.9-23 and Nichols 1976: 146 n.73.

⁸⁵ Cf. Part D below.

⁸⁶ Saylor 1972 and Shelton 1996 discuss the misapplication of reason.

⁸⁷ "Or because he thinks she tosses her eyes about too much or watches another, and he sees tracks of a smile in her face" Lucr. 4.1139-1140.

⁸⁸ Cf. Lucr. 4.705.

Similarly at 3.725-729, when Lucretius discusses the true nature of the soul, Lucretius describes a hunt. However, this is a hunt without tracks because the hunt could only occur in theory:

... *hoc tamen est ut
quaerendum videatur et in discrimen agendum,
utrum tandem animae venentur semina quaeque
vermiculorum ipsaeque sibi fabricentur ubi sint,
an quasi corporibus perfectis insinuentur.*⁸⁹

This passage questions the intended prey (the body) as much as it questions the existence of the soul as hunter. Are the bodies already formed or are they merely constituent parts that will come together to house the soul? Since the prey is wholly unknown—and in Lucretius’ view, wholly fictitious—it leaves no tracks (*vestigia*) here. Instead, the metaphor hinges upon *venor*, to hunt, and here the soul is the hunter.⁹⁰ Lucretius is concerned with describing the nature of the soul, and therefore the emphasis on its potential activity is logical. But the analogy in Lucretius’ view is empty. No such hunting occurs. What might be considered positive associated implications of the activity—exercise, power, control, education—are all moot.⁹¹ Hunting is vain without a true object of pursuit, or as Leonard and Smith say, the situation is “ironical by implication”.⁹² The focus on the hunt in the metaphor at 3.725-729 is not normal in the *De Rerum Natura*, as Lucretius usually focuses on the tracking activity of dogs and their prey. There are few times where there is a glimpse of any agency outside the dog and the

⁸⁹ “This nevertheless seems to require investigation and must be brought into examination, whether in fact each soul of little worms hunts for the seeds and themselves makes for themselves where they should be, or they entwine themselves as if in bodies already made” *Lucr.* 3.725-729. Bailey 1947: 2.1116 considers this passage humorous, and Kenney 1971: 176-177 notes the extreme ridiculousness of this passage, introduced by a “pompous periphrasis.”

⁹⁰ The soul is not necessarily a human hunter, although it is possible. In the *OLD* “*venor*” is defined as “to hunt,” both transitively and intransitively, with animals and humans as the subject.

⁹¹ Cf. Introduction Part II for various associated implications of hunting.

⁹² Leonard and Smith 1942: 484.

beast, which symbolize Epicurus, Lucretius, and the reader hunting *ataraxia*, but the hunter appears here without tracks because it is not an optimistic view of knowledge. This passage is instead a nonexistent hunt, or untrue information, so there are no paths to track.

D. The Use of Nets

One last aspect of hunting remains to be discussed: the use of nets.⁹³ Nets and dogs traditionally would be used together, but emphasis on the independent strengths of dogs results in a de-emphasis on the use of nets in Lucretius.⁹⁴ In metaphors in the *De Rerum Natura*, nets also take on the negative associations of civilization. Our capacity for wisdom is a powerful tool, but in our pursuit of order and civilization, through the misapplication of reason, we sometimes create more anxiety than we alleviate, and anxiety is like a net.⁹⁵ Guilt is one of the symptoms of the modern age:

*inde metus maculat poenarum praemia vitae.
circumretit enim vis atque iniuria quemque
atque, unde exortast, ad eum plerumque revertit.*⁹⁶

In this metaphor, fear traps a guilty man: it may be worth noting that *metus* is a term for a particular type of net. The *metus*, known more commonly as the *formido* because of its appearance in Vergil, is a scare net made of a rope line decorated with variously colored

⁹³ Cf. Introduction Part II.A on the standard use of nets in the hunt.

⁹⁴ Cf. Introduction Part II.A and also *Lucr.* 5.1249-1251 discussed at Part II n.24 above, which lists nets and dogs as the final development in hunting.

⁹⁵ Cf. *Lucr.* 4.1139-1140.

⁹⁶ “From here, fear of punishment stains the prizes of life. In fact, force and injury encircle each one, and, from where they began, they by and large turned back against him” *Lucr.* 5.1151-1153. Costa 1984: 129 notes the “widely attested, proverbial folk-wisdom” of this passage, but none of the three parallels offered involve nets. On the other hand, Bailey 1947: 3.1506 finds a fitting parallel in a legal speech of Cicero (*Verr.* 2.5.150). Leonard and Smith 1942: 742 note the relation of the verb *maculat* to bloodstains, indicating violence, and, I would add, perhaps hunting violence in particular or the fact that the scare consists of rope and colorful feathers.

feathers that would scare the animals—particularly the deer—towards the purse net.⁹⁷ It is therefore not the fear (*metus*), but the force (*vis*) and injury (*iniuria*) which finally enclose (*circumretit*) the prey (the guilty man). This metaphor is meant to shed light on law, which was necessary to ease humankind's violence towards one another. However, the legal method only cures the symptoms, not the cause, and still results in distress for humankind.⁹⁸ The true way to better civilization would be *ataraxia*, as Nature barks to us to steer us away from *metus*.⁹⁹ The choice of metaphor is particularly telling because this example uses nets, a man-made object like law and the other trappings of civilization, instead of the more common tracks and dogs in the *De Rerum Natura*. Nets are useful to a certain extent, but they are not needed for the acquisition of true knowledge.

Nets feature prominently also in Lucretius' depiction of Love, another malady of the modern world.¹⁰⁰ Lucretius warns his readers to avoid Love:

*nam vitare, plagas in amoris ne iaciamur,
non ita difficile est quam captum retibus ipsis
exire et validos Veneris perrumpere nodos.
et tamen implicitus quoque possis inque peditus
effugere infestum...*¹⁰¹

Drawing on the popular image of erotic hunting, Lucretius here emphasizes the trap and its powerful grasp by using three words for snares (*plagas, retibus, nodos*).¹⁰² As with

⁹⁷ E.g. Verg. *G.* 3.368-375.

⁹⁸ Lucr. 5.1154-1160.

⁹⁹ Lucr. 2.17-19.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Lucr. 4.1030-1287, but in particular Lucr. 4.1146-1150. The digression against Love became so infamous as to inspire St. Jerome (*CT* 171) to imagine that Lucretius became crazy to the point of suicide because of a love potion. For a full study, see Brown 1987. Romantic love is specifically a problem of the modern world, cf. Lucr. 5.1017-1018.

¹⁰¹ "For it is not as difficult to beware lest we are tossed into the nets of love as it is to escape once captured in the nets themselves and to rupture through the strong knots of Venus. And nevertheless even caught in the snare, you can flee harm..." Lucr. 4.1146-1150. Bailey 1947: 3.1310 adds that *infestum* probably refers to the snare, contrary to Leonard and Smith 1942: 625. Brown 1987: 273-275 discusses the image in combination with historical hunting and literary precedents to argue for the damaging, binding power of love.

guilt in 5.1151-1153, the metaphorical nets increase the condemnation of artifice in the passage, which in this case is modern Love. In the history of civilization in Book 5.962-965, Lucretius makes clear that humankind at first did not get too emotionally attached in sexual unions: they were casual affairs. It was only later that people began to settle into families.¹⁰³ Love as it is now occurs in Roman society is something artificial, man-made, and avoidable.¹⁰⁴ Sexual, romantic love must be avoided, because if we, the hunter, become the prey, it is very difficult to escape from a net once we have been captured. This situation is a negative reversal of roles.

Uniquely, we have here one of the rare occurrences of a guiding human agent in hunting metaphors. The emphasis is still on the prey, but the reader is allowed to see Amor and Venus pulling the strings of the hunt. As with many of the unsuccessful hunting references, the irony is that Love is a force that is best not followed or, in this case, be directed by. As long as we maintain our mastery of ourselves, Love cannot direct anything, an accomplishment not easy for Venus herself. Lucretius appeals to her in the proem of the *De Rerum Natura* as the mother of the world and the pacifier of Mars, and a cultured reader would be aware of the trapping of Venus and Mars by Hephaestus. Love can trap others, but when imagined as a goddess, it is as susceptible as others are to love, and we should not desire to follow that embarrassing example.¹⁰⁵ Nets, a representation of negative aspects of civilization, contrast to the positive hunting techniques that lead the reader to the right prey.

¹⁰² Murgatroyd 1984 traces the development of amatory hunting from Ibycus on, cf. Introduction Part II.C. Cf. Chapter 3 for a more complete discussion of erotic hunting and Brown 1987: 134 for Hellenistic sources.

¹⁰³ Lucr. 5.1017-1018.

¹⁰⁴ Epicureanism did not condemn marriage wholesale (cf. Arkins 1984, Brennan 1996), but such an intense personal relationship is capable of disturbing *ataraxia*.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Chapter 3 for a fuller discussion of the trapping of Mars and Venus as depicted in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*.

IV. Conclusion

Lucretius' poem teaches the reader that mastery of any material is accomplished only through hard work and reflection upon the nature of the world. It will take a distinct effort to recognize that this work is necessary and avoid the weaker traces of human flaws to pursue the best path, but this work will lead to contentment. The idea of working for oneself underlines the first hunting metaphor of the entire work, 1.402-411. The reader has to put in effort himself. Otherwise, he will not get the proper training. The proofs are the mental sustenance for the young philosopher, and so the very act of capturing the prey helps to increase the student's philosophical strength. The reader, charged with the same work as Epicurus and Lucretius, has a clear path before him as a canine hunter. The prey, *ataraxia*, and the change of emotional state it will affect are the focus, and nature leads us to follow the path. All philosophical hunters are dogs, and they always have to follow tracks—reasons, arguments—instead of simply reaping the rewards. In the Greek and Roman world, a human hunter may arguably gain more benefit than his effort deserves, especially in the context of Roman villa hunting or public games, where the people are mere spectators of animal slaughter. This activity lacks the value of an active hunt.¹⁰⁶ Philosophy without personal effort will accomplish nothing in the long term or in the short term. It is little wonder then that we have seen Lucretius focus on dogs and the action of following paths: he uses these images to encourage the reader to do the work for himself and to become an active part in the philosophical cycle.

¹⁰⁶ As popular as such games were, the mass viewing of slaughter does not contribute to the traditional educational goals of hunting (cf. Green 1996a and ancient criticism of games most strongly offered by Seneca *Epistulae* 7). On the other hand, the *Menippean Satires* of Varro (*Meleagri* 293-303) offer the comical view of a man hating the hard work of the hunt in favor of the pleasure of the games.

The canine role is appropriate in Book 1, when the reader is just beginning his Epicurean training and embraces his learning role. But as the *De Rerum Natura* progresses, and the reader obtains knowledge, the reader gains mastery and can better understand the full scope of his role in the philosophical cycle. Lucretius accomplishes his picture of the reader's role by emphasizing the role of prey and animals as opposed to human beings in his hunting imagery, and he even allows a change of roles between pursuer and pursued in order to distance the Roman audience member's role in traditional hunting from what is now required. Lucretius encourages his readers to be dogs not to trivialize them or put them further under his control, but because every philosopher is a dog. The actions of the audience in Book 1 are the same as the actions of Lucretius and Epicurus. They all have hunted and, in turn, they will all be followed as younger generations want to know the truth of Epicureanism. For Lucretius, hunting is a worthwhile activity, but only to attain *ataraxia*. Lucretius' hunting paradigm is not only optimistic about training but also about the stability of knowledge. Thanks to *Natura*, *Ratio*, Epicurus, and other philosophers, true understanding is attainable. Epicurus was an almost divine human being, but his philosophical prowess is not utterly above human ability: in fact, with careful study of the *De Rerum Natura*, even though starting in the seemingly humble role of a dog, any reader can become a valued part of the educational process. Hunting allows Lucretius to naturalize and heroize his method of education, the founder of Epicureanism, and even the reader, a move that challenges later Latin didactic authors to reevaluate the roles of the reader and the poet in education. But more than that, the poetic image serves as an optimistic paradigm for attainable, concrete knowledge through perception.

Chapter 2: Vergil's *Georgics* and the Struggle for Knowledge

I. Introduction

Vergil's *Georgics* teaches its audience about farming, but whereas its didactic predecessor the *De Rerum Natura* claimed to teach and, in fact, taught Epicurean philosophy, the *Georgics* is generally interpreted as using farming as an allegory for a different sort of lesson.¹ One minor figure in the *Georgics* is the hunt, but its role and the exact nature of this other lesson are controversial.² Scholars debate the poem's optimistic or pessimistic view towards Augustus and life in general, its relationship to Lucretius and other poets, and its use of allegory.³ There has been less work done specifically on animals and the hunt; Gale offers a concise review of scholarly opinion on the general treatment of animals in the *Georgics*, which appears to be generally sympathetic, but the hunting of animals is a separate issue less studied.⁴ Although there is not, and will probably never be, a consensus on how to interpret the *Georgics*, there are several features that are consistently mentioned in many different interpretations, including the

¹ Despite its poetic form, the *De Rerum Natura* accomplishes Epicurean instruction; cf. Chapter 1, particularly n.3. Lucretius' teaching is imperfect and omits certain parts of Epicurean doctrine, e.g. a discussion of *isonomia*, as examined in McKay 1964 and discussed more generally in Wondrich 1997. Nevertheless, Lucretius, if not explains, at least does not contradict the major tenets of Epicureanism. It has not been problematic to identify the author with the narrator in the *De Rerum Natura*, but the views of the *Georgics* narrator may or may not represent Vergil's. For this reason, I will attempt to interpret the narrator's instructional project and will not assume his views are identical to Vergil's.

² There is no end to the nuanced interpretations of the *Georgics*, including seeing farming as an allegory for education and knowledge itself (e.g. Kromer 1979, Ross 1987, Schiesaro 1997, Hardie 2004), as political commentary (e.g. Drew 1929, Muecke 1979, Wallace-Hadrill 1982, Morgan 1999, Nappa 2005) or as a means for understanding ourselves (e.g. Putnam 1979, Batstone 1997, Reay 2003, Thibodeau 2011).

³ According to Perkell 1989: 3, the optimistic and pessimistic poles are represented, respectively, by Wilkinson 1969 and Ross 1987 (whose reading is also supported by Thomas' commentary (1988), which, as Perkell 1989: 16 notes, will have and has had a major impact on the way the *Georgics* is interpreted). Since 1989, the debate has only grown; Batstone 1997: 143-144 provides a short essay on the poem's bibliography up to that point, and also Gale 2000: 1-4 and Volk 2008: 2-13 provide excellent summaries of modern scholarship. Several key passages allow the reader to consider Vergil's attitude towards Augustus and contemporary Italy. Most authors agree on the strong influence of Lucretius (e.g. Farrell 1983, Gale 1991, Gale 2000), although Thomas 2007 argues that this connection has been overstated.

⁴ Gale 1991: 415. Also cf. Liebeschuetz 1965 for a sympathetic view on the commonalities between human and beast.

idea that the narrator's perspective changes over the four books and that the farmer is a soldier in his battle against nature.⁵ It can perhaps safely be agreed that the work raises questions about the present political and social customs of Rome, although it may not answer them.⁶ While interest in the political situation is relevant to some interpretations, and Vergil encourages these interpretations when his narrator appeals to Maecenas and Caesar, the narrator's primary concern as a teacher is an educational structure that can lead the reader to knowledge, both agrarian and moral.⁷ In this chapter, I, like Perkell, focus on one theme throughout, instead of breaking up the discussion into book divisions.⁸ I argue that the struggle of the human against nature, represented in part as a hunt, indicates a level of uncertainty on the part of the narrator about the accessibility of knowledge.

Education, or the process of obtaining knowledge, might not be the sole object under scrutiny in Vergil's *Georgics*, but didactic poetry implicitly is concerned with methods of education.⁹ Mynors suggests that the inclusion of hunting in the *Georgics* was for reasons of pleasure and epic associations, but I would add it also allows Vergil an

⁵ The relationship between the order of the books and the speaker's various perspectives has become a frequent discussion in scholarship (e.g. Otis 1963: 144-214, Leach 1981, Nelson 1998: 87-88, Gale 2000: 18-57, and Kronenberg 2009: 132-142, who discusses the Hesiodic and Aratean *religio* of Book 1 versus the Lucretian *ratio* of Book 2), and as early as Drew 1929 the books were divided into two groups, with Books 3 and 4 serving as a second chapter that echoed Books 1 and 2. Others have divided their analysis into book-by-book rather than thematic discussion (e.g. Putnam 1979, Ross 1987, Gale 2000: 159-185, Hardie 2004, Kronenberg 2009: 156-184), as different books can have their own perspective (Leach 1981). Thomas 1988: 1.16-24 gives a summary of the books and their perspectives. The farmer as soldier is accepted in scholarship due to Vergil's own language: human violence is common and underlies the farmer-as-soldier motif in the *Georgics* (e.g. the description of farming at *G*.1.99 with the militant *exercet* and *imperat*, Ross 1987: 47; cf. Heckel 1998 and Gale 2000, Chapter 7, on the use of military language generally).

⁶ It is not inconceivable, however, that the point of the *Georgics* is solely an expansion of thought for the reader, forcing him to think about multiple views, as Batstone 1997 has argued.

⁷ As examples of the *Georgics*' political context, Maecenas and Octavian Caesar both figure in the proems to Books 1 and 3, the openings of the two so-called parts of the *Georgics* (Drew 1929).

⁸ Cf. Perkell 1989: 19-24 on his project on the Iron Age poet-speaker of the *Georgics* and pity.

⁹ Cf. Kromer 1979 on the didactic tradition in the *Georgics* and both Schiesaro 1997 and the Introduction Part III on teaching in didactic poetry.

opportunity to consider potential problems in education and to critique Lucretian methodology.¹⁰ In Lucretius' paradigm, the reader could follow the paths to proofs and the tracks of their master to obtain *ataraxia*.¹¹ The educational paradigm is less consistent in the *Georgics*, and whether or not the reader can obtain true understanding and other educational benefits is unclear. This interpretation owes much to Schiesaro's work on Vergil's boundaries of knowledge.¹² He acknowledges that problems of knowledge are central to didactic texts and that the *Georgics* is a sustained reaction to Lucretius. Schiesaro, however, focuses on *signa* and *causae* in the *Georgics* and argues that Vergil supports a rigid theodicy of knowledge.¹³ Knowledge comes from the gods and requires proper interpretation from poets such as Vergil. My focus on hunting adds a further detail to this interpretation, as it demonstrates some of the problems of the theodicy, notably possible failure and deceit that contrasts to Lucretius' successful hunts.

My interpretation further complements and challenges Hardie's reading that farming is a model for education, where the reader/farmer/teacher molds the earth and animals into their proper form.¹⁴ This indoctrination is the purpose of education, according to Hardie, and he presents the common ancient metaphor of education as farming in other texts, as well. Although he acknowledges that education can fail or be in

¹⁰ Mynors 1990: 241-242.

¹¹ Cf. Chapter 1.

¹² Schiesaro 1997.

¹³ The use of *signa*, popular in the *Georgics*, is an indication that interpretation is necessary. *Signa* is used 17 times in Vergil (1.229, 1.239, 1.257, 1.263, 1.351, 1.394, 1.439 (twice), 1.463, 1.471, 3.34, 3.236, 3.440, 3.503, 4.108, 4.219, 4.253). Perkell 1989: 153-166 notes 22 occurrences of *signum* and *signare*, words associated with limited 'real' farming knowledge and philosophical epistemology. *Signum* is also the most accurate translation for σημεῖον, the Epicurean method of deduction discussed by Philodemus' *De Signis*, and Lucretius does use the word as frequently as he uses *vestigia*. The difference is that the *signa* and the *vestigia* in Epicureanism lead to knowledge, but in the *Georgics*, they can fail and farmers can face situations in ignorance (cf. Perkell 1989, Chapter 3 and Schiesaro 1997). The more common use of *signa* than *vestigia* in the *Georgics* may relate to the differences between Vergil's conception of knowledge and Lucretius'.

¹⁴ Hardie 2004.

the wrong hands, which is seen in events like the plague or Civil War, he is generally optimistic that Vergil provides a positive paradigm for education to Romans and Augustus in particular. Hardie sees the *Georgics* as an education of Roman culture. My interpretation is less certain that Vergil does endorse a particular model for education.

The *signa* ultimately might not help Romans, as the speaker has seen men destroyed in storms despite the divine weather signs, and the end of Book 1 provides an account of meteorological signs and the damage if unheeded.¹⁵ Kromer and Kronenberg have argued that the *Georgics* also shows conflict between different types of knowledge, particularly in the Aristaeus episode.¹⁶ This perspective is useful, and demonstrates all the more clearly that any absolute knowledge is untenable for mortals. If we create a division between Vergil and the narrator, one could argue that the narrator's inconsistencies may not indicate pessimism on the part of Vergil, but within the context of the poem, mastery of knowledge. This idea is encapsulated by the final mythological story in Book 4: the myth of Aristaeus, who seeks knowledge from the gods themselves.¹⁷ In order to examine Vergil's paradigm for education, I will first discuss hunting as an *ars* of humans. Under Jupiter's plan, humanity developed skills, but humanity does not always apply their skills properly. The farmer at times may be cast as deceitful or failing to obtain true understanding, which is the result of the appropriate application of human arts. In Part III, I focus on metaphorical or allegorical hunts, which demonstrate more clearly what is at stake in the hunts. The farmer is not only in search

¹⁵ *G.* 1.311-514.

¹⁶ Kromer 1979 and Kronenberg 2009, especially 182-183.

¹⁷ Many interpretations look for the key to the *Georgics* in this passage, as it is the end of the final book and so has significance of place, and it also mythologizes questions about the gods, knowledge and poetry (e.g. Otis 1963: 145, 187-214; Davis 1979; Davis 1980; Putnam 1989: 12-13 (with further bibliography in n. 27); Habinek 1990; Schiesaro 1997: 65-68; Batstone 1997: 126-129, with n. 9 for further bibliography; Morgan 1999, which is wholly dedicated to the digression; Gale 2000: 57; Kronenberg 2009: 176-184; Thibodeau 2011: 191-201).

of animals, but also Justice (A) and information (B). The underlying uncertainty about successful hunting indicates a different conception of knowledge from that previously seen in Lucretius. The struggle of the hunt in Lucretius has a consistent resolution, and the readers' roles change as they adapt to philosophy and become masters. Readers in the *Georgics* are in a constant struggle to understand, and the poem does not resolve the conflict.

II. The Role and Failure of Hunting

Many of the appearances of hunting in the *Georgics* are literal, that is, a part of the farmer's life, although these also reflect upon the evaluation of knowledge.¹⁸ In this section, we will see that humanity can fail for one reason or another in its use of the technical arts. Early in the *Georgics*, the narrator hypothesizes the rise of human labor—and the supposed improvement of humanity—after the end of the Saturnian Golden Age through the plan of Jupiter.¹⁹ Among the Iron Age labors are traditional hunting techniques at 1.139-140:

*tum laqueis captare feras et fallere uisco
inuentum et magnos canibus circumdare saltus.*²⁰

In the four books of the *Georgics*, the narrator considers hunting and fowling to be activities that are a part of the farmer's life. Their appearance is much less frequent than in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and their use superficially seems more straightforward as

¹⁸ Cf. Introduction Part I.B on the cognitive relationship between different types of figurative language, specifically metaphor and allegory.

¹⁹ The evolution reminds the reader of other ages of humankind, especially Hesiod *Works and Days* 109-201 and Lucr. 5.925-1457, cf. Mynors 1990: 25. Campbell 1982 focuses particularly on the Lucretian and Hesiodic comparanda for this scene to examine the relative benevolence or malevolence of the gods and, in his view, the ultimate ambiguous value of progress with a possible Stoic view. Cf. Catto 1986 for another perspective on the Lucretian reaction, blending Epicurean philosophy with the positive influence of gods, and for Lucretius' influence in general, cf. Gale 2000. On the Hesiodic connection in particular, cf. La Penna 1962, Perkell 1989: 9-10, Schott 1994, and Nelson 1998.

²⁰ "Then it was discovered how to capture wild animals with snares and to deceive them with birdlime and to enclose the great groves with dogs" *G.* 1.139-140.

most uses of animals and hunting are literal in the *Georgics*.²¹ The narrator includes tips on hunting and on training dogs for hunting even though agrarian writing does not require it. Other authors condemn or ignore hunting, but the narrator defends hunting and recommends it during otherwise inactive times.²² Winter, for example, is considered an ideal time for many activities other than traditional farming, as the farmer would not at that time be busy with his harvest.²³

During our education, we learn how to use animals, and readers are meant to work closely with dogs. The description of dogs at *Georgics* 3.404-413 is not very specific, especially in comparison with dedicated *cynetica*, and it instead presents a stereotypical hunting scene: the narrator names only the two main breeds of dogs, Spartan and Molossian; he lists four major types of prey in Italy, hare, doe, boars, and stag; and he gives a short picture of hunting with dogs, mentioning the barking and the nets. This emphasis on the literal hunt is a difference between the *Georgics* and the *De Rerum*

²¹ As just one component of hunting, *vestigia*, necessary to capture prey, occurs 23 times in Lucretius versus 6 times in Vergil (2.258, 2.402, 2.474, 3.59, 3.171, and 3.195).

²² Columella 7.12 is hostile towards hunting because it distracts the farmer from his obligations, and it is a waste of resources. Interestingly, although he hates what he sees as unnecessary roles for dogs, he encourages the training of horses for the circus at 6.29, indicating a difference in attitude towards the purposes of dogs and horses on the farm. Cato in the *De Agricultura*, on the other hand, simply overlooks hunting when it comes to dogs: *Canes interdum clausos esse oportet, ut noctu acriores et vigilantiores sint* ("Dogs, meanwhile, should be closed in so that they are sharper and more vigilant at night" 124). Dogs are only seen as guards. Varro recognizes that there are two types of dogs, dogs for hunting and dogs for the farm, but he is interested only in the latter and recommends against obtaining dogs from hunters: *Videndum ne a venatoribus [...] emas [...], si viderint leporem aut cervum, quod eum potius quam oves sequentur*, "It must be seen to lest you buy [dogs] from hunters [because] if they see a rabbit or a deer, they follow it rather than the sheep" (*DRR* 2.9). Horace *Odes* 1.1.26 also presents hunting as a distraction from familial duties. Mynors 1990: 71 notes that, logically, hunting was an important part of country life, but Thomas 1988: 2.118 notes that hunting dogs were not a necessary topic. He argues they were included to foreshadow the plague. Thibodeau 2011 is particularly interested in the Vergilian connection to technical agrarian writers, and "dogs" does not appear in his general index, although "horses" and "hunting" do, and he notes that the *Georgics* throughout ignores or emphasizes unexpected parts of the farmer's life to spark the reader's desire for knowledge (Chapter 4, esp. 116-117, cf. also Spurr 1986 and Thomas 1999, Chapter 5 "Prose into Poetry: Tradition and Meaning in Virgil's *Georgics*"). Thibodeau's focus remains on agricultural knowledge and an optimistic curiosity about greater knowledge instead of the unattainable knowledge about the world, which is the focus on my chapter.

²³ *G.* 1.299-310.

Natura. Lucretius was more interested in the dog and the prey because of his concept of education. Although Lucretius acknowledges human use of dogs in the History of Humankind, the *De Rerum Natura* focuses explicitly on the metaphorical use of dogs.²⁴ The line between humans and dogs in Lucretius is blurred, as the dog stands for the hunting party and the reader has to search out the tracks. In the *Georgics*, while the line between dog and human blurs slightly, the emphasis is on the dog doing work for the farmer.²⁵ The farmer is a hunter who knows how to use dogs because of the skills inspired by Jupiter's plan.

But this order is threatened. As the natural order begins to dissolve in the *Georgics* during the plague at the end of Book 3, the dogs are used as an indication of the state of the human world.²⁶ In the natural order of things, especially during the hunt, dogs and stags are enemies. But now, when the world is suffering, even dogs do not have the spirit to attack deer:

²⁴ E.g. Lucr. 5.855-877 on animal contracts where dogs are one of the animals under human control so that they do not die out.

²⁵ Reay 2003 and Thibodeau 2011, especially Chapters 2 and 3, discuss different levels of audience, from wealthy landowners to subsistence farmers, and the power relations between the different levels of humans may also be reflected in human-animal power relations. The wealthy landowner would have people to do his work for him; he would have dogs as well (cf. Thibodeau 2011: 71-72 for the animal and human role shifts in this passage). Vergil has blurred the lines between animals and humans, frequently by making the animals appear sympathetic to humans (cf. Liebeschuetz 1965, but cf. Otis 1963: 190 and Nelson 1998: 94-97 who argue the attention to animals reminds the reader that animals and humans are separate), and here the farmer and the dog are joined in mutual labor. Gale 1991 argues that humans do become animals and vice-versa metaphorically, but literally humans are violent towards animals in an effort to maintain order. Vergil does not minimize the role of the human hunters or the function of nets in the way that Lucretius had done; as Thibodeau says, he "elevat[es] his animals and humbl[es] his readers" so that they meet, not so that his audience becomes animals (72); also cf. Betensky 1972, who argues that Vergil has greater stratification between animal, human and god than Lucretius. Lucretius particularly separates philosophical hunting from historic hunting with nets, associating such tools with the dangers of Love (cf. Chapter 1, Part III).

²⁶ *G.* 3.474-566; Thomas 1988: 2.117-118 argues that dogs are under discussion in Book 3 especially for this reason. The failure of the *ars* during the plague is no new subject of scholarship (e.g. Perkell 1989: 119-123, Clare 1995), but I mention it here as a point about hunting, the absence of which is a sign of our skills that fail us here. Without hunting, there is no civilization and no education.

...timidi dammae ceruique fugaces
nunc interque canes et circum tecta uagantur.²⁷

The deer are safe to wander around, but this peace is unnatural. Instead of reflecting an idyllic Golden Age when hunting was not a part of human life, it reflects the loss of civilization and proper order. Interpretations of the violent end of *Georgics* 3 vary, but the way that the role of the dogs, powerful hunters in both the proem in Book 3 and in their normal jobs on the farm described at 3.404-413, devolve from the beginning to the end of the book reflects the way that human customs weaken in the face of tragedy.²⁸

Dogs are discussed first in the list of victims:

hinc canibus blandis rabies uenit, et quatit aegros
tussis anhela sues ac faucibus angit obesis.²⁹

Dogs were pitiable victims in Lucretius' version of the plague, and the Vergilian narrator also focuses on them before turning to the larger evidence of dissolution.³⁰ In the *Georgics*, the arts to combat the plague at first maintain their helpful role in the farmer's life.³¹ Unfortunately, the cures eventually fail humanity.³² Education fails, and that is represented partially through the elimination of the hunting spirit, or the skill previously learned:

...cessere magistri
Phillyrides Chiron Amythaoniusque Melampus.³³

²⁷ "Timid deer and swift stags now wander about amid the dogs and around the walls" *G.* 3.539-540.

²⁸ Cf. Drew 1929 on the plague as a double of the Book I account of Civil War; Gale 1991 focuses on the humanization of animal victims; and Clare 1995 optimistically argues that the breakdown of the Iron Age arts is fixed in Book 4.

²⁹ "From here rabies comes to the fawning dogs, and a shaking cough shakes the sick swine and chokes them in their fat jaws" *G.* 3.496-497.

³⁰ *Lucr.* 6.1222-1223 versus *G.* 3.496-497 to the end of each book.

³¹ *G.* 3.509-514 contains one possible cure for horses along with the seemingly inevitable failure of such aid: *mox erat hoc ipsum exitio*, "soon this itself led to death" *G.* 3.511.

³² The book grimly ends on the death of the farmer who came in contact with diseased clothes: *contactos artus sacer ignis edebat*, "the sacred fire was eating at the touched limbs" *G.* 3.566.

³³ "The teachers yielded, Chiron son of Phillyra and Amythaonian Melampus" *G.* 3.549-550. Cf. Clare 1995 on the importance of this line as an indication of the failure of education. The Golden Age here has also been called a "parody" (Davis 1979: 28, Hardie 2004: 99).

There is no clear answer on how to recover from the loss in Book 3.³⁴ Our education can fail us, and our civilization with it, through no fault of our own.

The failure can be interpreted as a part of the criticism of the Iron Age. The Iron Age state of the world is possibly criticized throughout the *Georgics*, and along with the criticism of the skills learned is a criticism of the struggle required to obtain this knowledge. *Labor* is called *improbis* in *Georgics* 1.146, and the ambiguity of this description has cast a shadow over the *Georgics* and its scholarship.³⁵ On the one hand, *improbis* might simply indicate the *artes* require long, hard work, but on the other hand, *improbis* has a morally negative definition.³⁶

The *labor improbis* in Book 1 could be a sign of the fallen state of humans, and the word *fallere* at 1.139 raises the idea of hunting as deceit. *Fallere* means “to deceive,” and the humans in the Iron Age learn to deceive with birdlime.³⁷ This activity is technically fowling, but its occurrence is nested between two activities of hunting proper and so the lesser activity is grouped with the superior type of hunting.³⁸ *Fallere* occurs seven times in the *Georgics*, and most of the situations involve not only basic deception, but also capture in particular.³⁹ Nets and tricks, although very common and useful in

³⁴ Hence Book 3 is frequently considered a pessimistic book (e.g. Thomas 1988: 1.12-13, Perkell 1989: 115).

³⁵ Whether *labor improbis* can have a positive or at least neutral shade of meaning is a major question outlined in Otis 1963: 157-158; Wilkinson 1963; Campbell 1982, especially 573-576; Catto 1986; Mynors 1990: 29-30; Batstone 1997: 137-138, who himself finds *improbis* unsurprising as *labor* was marked as difficult from the beginning; Gale 2000: 143-195, Chapter 5; Kronenberg 2009: 147-148, with n. 58 for further bibliography, who criticizes the idea of a dominant view of *labor*. Thibodeau 2011: 55 simply argues that *improbis* renders the argument more Roman.

³⁶ Kronenberg’s article on “labor” in the forthcoming *Vergil Encyclopedia* provides a short summary of this issue.

³⁷ OLD s.v. “fallo” at *G.* 1.139-140.

³⁸ Cf. Introduction Part II on hunting hierarchy.

³⁹ *G.* 1.139, 1.425, 1.463, 2.152, 2.467, 3.392, and 4.447. Of these, only 1.463, which discusses the sun’s *signa* that do not deceive, and 2.467, which describes farmers as not knowing how to deceive, do not seem to imply a sense of capture, although the metaphorical capturing of someone with deceitful information is

hunting, can undercut the image of an ideal hunter-warrior who does not have to rely on tricks.⁴⁰ To complicate the matter further, in the Praise of the Farmer, it is said that the farmer does not know how to deceive: *nescia fallere vita* (2.467).⁴¹ He does not know how to deceive in Book 2, where he can see the tracks of Justice, and yet he does know how to trick animals in Book 1. The narrator either is inconsistent or he implicitly separates tricking animals from tricking humans.

III. Greater Hunts for Justice and Knowledge

However, there is an underlying sense that the *artes* and knowledge we have acquired in the Iron Age may not always put us on the right path to greater understanding. According to Jupiter's plan, necessity makes us sharp, but ingenuity is a double-edged sword. With hard work we may be able to distinguish the signs that lead towards understanding, but there is no guarantee that we take the right course with our deceitful tricks. This question is presented in the hunt for Justice (A) and Aristaeus' hunt for Proteus (B). As Thomas says, "the absence of deceit is not absolute, but is conditional upon the correct pursuit of *labor*."⁴² The *Georgics* lacks a general educational model that can guarantee we learn to apply our skills in the correct manner, and we will see here how hunting becomes more clearly joined to questions of justice and knowledge.⁴³

always understood. At *G.* 1.425-426, it is the farmers who are taken by the traps (*insidiis*) of night, but only if they do not watch for the signs.

⁴⁰ Cf. Introduction Part II for variant views on the heroic hunter. Mynors 1990: 29 finds an idea of "cheating" in the word *laqueis*, or foot snares, as well. Cf. Chapter 3, as *laquei* in the *Ars Amatoria* also reflect problematic traps.

⁴¹ *G.* 2.458-474, particularly 2.467: "life unawares of how to deceive". Mynors 1990: 164 posits two translations of 2.467, either the farmer does not know how to deceive or the farmer does not know deceit itself. He finds the former the more logical interpretation.

⁴² Thomas 1988: 1.248.

⁴³ Batstone 1997 finds the lack of epistemological certainty the central feature of the *Georgics* as a positive goad for the reader, and there is also the perspective that there are different kinds of knowledge (e.g.

A. The Tracks of Justice and the Potential for Moral Education

The farmers in the *Georgics* receive praise for their life explicitly because their use of technical knowledge gives them understanding beyond technical expertise: our first education leads to greater benefits.⁴⁴ In the Praise of the Farmer, the speaker celebrates the rustic lifestyle, and he praises not only farming but also other activities of the farmer, which includes hunting implicitly:

...illic saltus ac lustra ferarum
et patiens operum exiguoque adsueta iuuentus,
sacra deum sanctique patres; extrema per illos
Iustitia excedens terris uestigia fecit.⁴⁵

On the literal level, the speaker imagines a people adept at working on the land and, therefore, familiar with the inhabitants of the wild world. Wild animals, the youth, and the sacred exist together in one community. It is implied that the youth are able to hunt prey because they know the locations of the wild beasts (*ferarum*) and they are hardworking. The meaning of the passage is that the natural lifestyle fosters piety and justice among farmers, as *illos* refers to the *agricolas* at the beginning of the passage.⁴⁶

The skills inspired by Jupiter's plan lead to a good life. It is very fitting, then, that Justice leaves tracks (*vestigia*) that, metaphorically, the farmers will be able to follow or even hunt, given the context of the passage. With the tracks of Justice in front of them, they

Perkell 1989, especially Chapter 3, "The Poet's Truth," on 'real' farming knowledge versus 'true' poetic knowledge; Gale 2000 argues that the poem presents many perspectives, none of which is clearly right; and Kronenberg 2009 has found within the *Georgics* a conflict about different types of knowledge).

⁴⁴ *G.* 2.458-474.

⁴⁵ "...there are groves and haunts of wild animals and youth who are able to endure labors and are accustomed to little, the sacred things of the gods and the sacred fathers; Justice made her last tracks among them while departing from the lands" *G.* 2.471-474. This passage is highly intertextual (e.g. La Penna 1962: 142-144 on Greek sources, and notes below), but my focus is on the hunting, which Thomas 1988: 1.249 considers "aristocratic primitivism," or the idealization of the past in this passage, but the *Georgics* contains more than rhetorical idealization.

⁴⁶ Mynors 1990: 165 notes that Vergil's *illos* corrects Aratus' account where Justice's last tracks were in the hills (cf. Kromer 1979 on justice and strife).

will be able to follow the correct path in life even with the goddess gone, as her tracks mark the end of her time on Earth (*extrema*). Through metaphor, this description implies that despite the unjust condition of the modern world, talented hunters of Justice may be able to find a just path in life through hard work.⁴⁷ Justice becomes metaphorical prey, and the prey reflects the nature of the ideal hunters. The speaker can be very optimistic about the benefits of farming, and the reason for the praise is at the end of the passage: Justice, the last sign of a divine, better world, has left visible tracks for farmers alone. But in order to approach this goal, the farmer needs to know how to hunt. The tracks (*vestigia*) may imply a canine search, and so here we have a possible exception to the separation between dogs and humans as well as what seems to be an optimistic situation. In the *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius was optimistic about human perception capturing knowledge in hunts, and this *Georgics* passage hints at the same situation. The farmer might be successful in his perception of Justice.

There is, however, potential pessimism in this passage and hunting in general. Perkell acknowledges the ambiguous morality implied in the life of the farmers, but in addition to the absence or presence of justice that is her focus, I want to focus on the method in which the narrator presents the farmer's work.⁴⁸ Justice is no longer on Earth, and violence, which is implied by the language of the hunt, is necessary to follow her. While farmers can see her tracks, and may even be able to follow a just path, there is no assurance that they will find Justice herself; this distinction is between just in the sense of

⁴⁷ Cf. Introduction Part II.C on different philosophies and paths to Justice represented through hunting, esp. Plato *Rep.* 432b.

⁴⁸ Perkell 1989: 38-39 and 112-114.

having laws in society versus intangible justice.⁴⁹ At *Georgics* 2.258, farmers sometime see the traces (*vestigia*) of cold in plants, but can miss these signs and lose their crops. This literal failure prefaces potential greater moral failure. The human may not have adequate tracking skills, and the technical knowledge may not lead to true knowledge and moral improvement.

B. Aristaeus

The myth of Aristaeus ties the work together in Book 4 with the idea of ultimate human failure, or at least limitation.⁵⁰ Book 4, the discussion of apiculture, ends with the account of the *bougonia*, which is the means of restoring one's stock of bees should they all die at once.⁵¹ Aristaeus, the mythological and semi-divine farmer figure, lost his bees because of a curse arising from the death of Eurydice. On the advice from his mother, he ambushes the seer Proteus to obtain the sea god's knowledge. In the *bougonia*, the demigod seeks knowledge, and knowledge comes from the gods, but as we will see, this acquisition of knowledge is imperfect. Capturing divine prey does not result in understanding for Aristaeus. Commentary on education and knowledge underlies the entire book and this event in particular.⁵² First we will see how the *bougonia* can be

⁴⁹ Nelson 1998: 138-140 establishes a Vergilian distinction between being just and justice, *Iustitia*, who is just out of the reach of humankind.

⁵⁰ Cf. n. 17 above. The scene is very important for interpretations of the *Georgics*, in particular the attempt to figure out who "wins" between Orpheus and Aristaeus and who "is" Vergil. Perkell 1989: 25 and *passim*, especially 67-89 on Aristaeus and Orpheus in general, aligns Vergil and the didactic poet with Orpheus in the contest of Orpheus versus Aristaeus, but Habinek 1990 importantly observes that Aristaeus does win, no matter who has our sympathy. Schiesaro 1997 finds the poet to be like Cyrene, and Kronenberg 2009 aligns Vergil with Proteus. Although the inset story of Orpheus is emotionally and poetically powerful, for the discussion of hunting in this chapter, I will only focus on the main narrative of Aristaeus, which Schiesaro 1997 notes is an image of the struggle for knowledge, but he does not mention the aspect of the hunt.

⁵¹ *G.* 4.281-558. The spontaneous generation of bees from a bull corpse is an impossible situation, cf. Thomas 1988 2.196 and Chapter 4, Part III.B. However, it was an accepted practice (Mynors 1990: 293-296, Thibodeau 2011: 191-192).

⁵² It has often been noted that the bees are an image of the nature of human society, and perhaps even Roman society under Augustus (e.g. Thomas 1988 2.146-147; Perkell 1989: 123-130; Habinek 1990; Knox

considered a hunt, and then we will discuss how this hunt creates uncertainty about the acquisition of knowledge.⁵³

Aristaeus' capture of Proteus can be considered a hunt on the narrative level and through the use of keywords. First, Aristaeus does literally capture Proteus after hiding in wait through the use of chains, a narrative detail which may be a Vergilian invention (*vincla*, 4.405, and *manicis*, 4.439).⁵⁴ Cyrene uses the word *vincla*, which is more appropriate to hunting in general, whereas the latter word *manicis* specifically denotes chains for the hands.⁵⁵ Second, the scene is also like a hunt as the forms that Proteus takes include beasts (*horribilemque feram*, 4.442) appropriate to the hunt.⁵⁶ Third, the capture, like the hunt explicitly in the *Georgics* with birdlime, is tinged with deceit. There is a play on this idea in the opening exchange between Proteus and Aristaeus. When Proteus asks what Aristaeus wants, Aristaeus replies that it is impossible to deceive Proteus so the god should not deceive him in turn at 4.447-448:

...neque est te fallere quicquam
sed tu desine velle....⁵⁷

1992: 50-53, esp. n. 27; and Kronenberg 2009: 154-155, but cf. Batstone 1997: 139-141 and Nelson 1998: 224 who disagree that the bees represent humans). Hardie 2004: 99-106 relates this society specifically to the Golden Age and the lack of formal education.

⁵³ The scene has also been considered a "binding of the god" (Ross 1987: 214-233, esp. 224-226), but the binding and hunting of a god are not mutually exclusive.

⁵⁴ Morgan 1999: 44-46 and 89-90, *G.* 4.405, 4.439. The use of chains was not necessary, as they are absent from the Homeric source, *Odyssey* 4.383-570; Morgan 1999 discusses the introduction of the elements of chains into the Vergilian account, but the interpretation is focused on the linguistic connection to *vis* and the Stoic binding of the world for order.

⁵⁵ *OLD* s.v. "vinculum" §2.a, for bonds for an animal, and "manicae" §1, for handcuffs.

⁵⁶ "and a bristling beast," *G.* 4.442. Cyrene gives a full list of Proteus' animal forms from *G.* 4.406-408.

⁵⁷ "Nor is it possible to deceive you at all; but you cease to want [to deceive me]" *G.* 4.447-448. Perkell 1989: 57 considers Proteus to be a victim like Orpheus, but the deceitful nature of the hunt in the *Georgics* blurs the line between hunter (Aristaeus) and prey (Proteus), and this blurred line becomes more pronounced in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* (cf. Chapter 3). Kronenberg 2009: 183-184 notes that Aristaeus must ultimately ignore Proteus' words if he wants a so-called happy ending, and so I would argue again that the hunt is unsuccessful and the hunter tries to change the prey.

Proteus is caught on a physical level, but on another level, he is not taken. It is not possible to trap or to hunt a god, and it is not possible to force knowledge from him. Aristaeus, however, can request knowledge. There is a mutual relationship in this exchange. Farmers in the *Georgics* can deceive, and they can be deceived by their arts. Aristaeus tries to avoid this outcome. The gods will give what signs they want to give, and it is up to the human to interpret them as well as possible.

The need for human interpretation is made clear by the outcome of the event. Proteus provides a response which gives an *aition* for the loss of the bees: the death of Eurydice and the curse of Orpheus. But after Proteus gives one *morbi causa*, Cyrene offers a conflicting cause of the Nymphs as Eurydice's avengers.⁵⁸ It is not Proteus' knowledge directly that helps Aristaeus, but rather Cyrene's interpretation of the prophecy and her explicit directions to her son. The hunt captured some information, but it only brought Aristaeus part of the way closer to what he needed to know. The rest of his education was given freely by his goddess mother, but the information she offers is also partial. Cyrene's instructions are more practical, while Proteus' account is more focused on the personal loss of Orpheus and Eurydice.⁵⁹ Even when a human captures prey and receives an oracle, he needs to interpret it properly to reap the rewards. Mortals without a divine connection would be left in the dark. The Fourth Book ends with an optimistic scene, but one that is ultimately dependent upon the gods' goodwill. Our hard work and struggles, whether in hunting or warfare, cannot guarantee the desired outcomes. Complete knowledge will always be in the lap of the gods.

⁵⁸ *G.* 4.396-397, 4.532. Thomas 1988: 2.218 argues that Cyrene is aware that Proteus did not give the remedy.

⁵⁹ Alternatively, Cyrene's report may contain a different type of knowledge altogether (Kronenberg 2009: 182-184). Perkell 1989: 183-190 particularly notes that the reader's sympathy does not go to Aristaeus but "the truth of myth and poetry" (190).

IV. Conclusion

Understanding, in an absolute and abstract sense, is outside the realm of human reach. In the *Georgics*, the gods do not always listen or offer clear answers: there is a “boundary of knowledge.”⁶⁰ Schiesaro considers this “boundary” to be the difference between Lucretius and Vergil: Lucretius encourages us to know the causes of things, but the inconsistencies and failures in the *Georgics* indicate that we cannot know divine causes. The difference reflects their conceptions of education. Because we can know the causes of things, Lucretius encourages his readers to rely on perception and the hunt of philosophical proofs.⁶¹ In the Vergilian conception of education, although humans strive to know, only gods have ideal knowledge. The average reader can never become divine nor gain gods’ knowledge.⁶² The hunt, in essence, is never fulfilled.

The *Georgics* of Vergil, a famously ambiguous author, contains negative assessments of hunting, which reflect upon his interest in the relationship between justice and labor as well as upon his conception of education as something which may fail. The narrator of the *Georgics* demonstrates concern about its effectiveness: humans may fail in their skills, and the skills may or may not lead them to Justice and greater understanding. There may be no knowledge that human education can obtain without divine favor. What is worse from the point of view of an educator is that the prey that we are after might even deceive humans. Vergil’s own position and whether or not this relates to politics are further inquiries. The “boundary of knowledge” may reflect some pessimism on Vergil’s part or be an optimistic appeal for Caesarean order. My interpretation tends

⁶⁰ Schiesaro 1997, cf. discussion above at n. 13.

⁶¹ Cf. Chapter 1, Part III.

⁶² Jupiter is both the reason for *artes* and the origin of *signa* (1.125-146). It was not outside the realm of possibilities to become a god in the Roman world, with Julius Caesar’s recent deification and Octavian’s anticipated deification in Book 1.24-42, but that affected the boundaries of knowledge only doubtfully.

towards the former: Vergil expects inconsistency to be a part of his world. The space for multiple voices in the *Georgics* opens a path for further destabilization of knowledge that Ovid will take, while Grattius and Nemesianus take different paths and attempt to reinvigorate the stability of knowledge of literal hunting. While hunting is not usually considered a major theme in the *Georgics*, I hope to have shown in this chapter that Vergil demonstrates his idea of knowledge at least partially through hunting, both of a literal and metaphorical kind. Hunting may be favorable for the farmer, and humans need such labor, but it is not wholly reliable. Farmers can be deceptive, and the prey can deceive in turn. In this interpretation, Vergil differs from Lucretius by allowing an amount of uncertainty, and I would argue that the engagement is intentional as paths (*vestigia*) and signs (*signa*) were also a major component of the *De Rerum Natura*. The hunt is an optimistic conceptualization of knowledge in the *De Rerum Natura*, and the tracks lead to something that could be fully found and understood. The world in the *Georgics* is not so optimistic: to actually capture and fully understand absolute knowledge may be outside human ability.

Chapter 3: The Subversion of Hunting Imagery in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*

I. Introduction

Hunting is a recurring image in the *Ars Amatoria*, and Ovid employs it more frequently than either Lucretius or Vergil did.¹ He does follow in their footsteps, however, by using the image to engage with his audience in a critical examination of knowledge. Ultimately, the frequent occurrence of this image serves as a means for Ovid to demonstrate the difficulty of distinguishing between truth and falsehood in general as the existence of ultimate knowledge may be negated. Ovid rejects finite knowledge, and therefore any hunt for it is problematic. I will demonstrate first how hunting is central throughout the three books, and, second, how Ovid exposes the tension between different interpretations of hunting imagery and so pushes his reader to be critical about imagery and truth. In the *Ars Amatoria*, the instructor attempts to combine educational and erotic hunting, just as he combines the didactic and elegiac genre. Ovid uses the resulting tension between these types of hunting, as well as the tension within amatory hunting itself, to display the limit of an image's meaning instead of accepting one interpretation over the other.

Many scholars doubt the didactic credibility of the work because of the metrical choice: the *Ars Amatoria* is written in elegiac couplets instead of dactylic hexameter, a metrical choice that gives the work a less formal tone.² The supposed subject matter of

¹ Lucretius has around 20 references to hunting, and Vergil around 10. Ovid himself has around 20 in a work significantly shorter than the *De Rerum Natura*. Hunting is not the only recurring image in the *Ars Amatoria*. Steudel 1992 focuses on three analogy complexes, one of which is hunting along with fishing and fowling. The other two are farming/sailing and animals. I consider the third to sometimes overlap with the first. Ovid also uses other tropes standard in elegy, such as war imagery (e.g. Ov. *AA* 2.177-250).

² According to common opinion, dactylic hexameter, the meter of epic, has the highest register (cf. Introduction Part I). However, there is precedent for didactic works to be written in the meter that reflects the subject matter, such as Accius' *Pragmatica* on theater, written in trochaic (Goldberg 2005: 26).

love is less dignified than the subjects of Lucretius' and Vergil's poems.³ But like his predecessors, Ovid uses hunting as support for his subject throughout. Books 1 and 2 contain instructions for men to find and keep a lover, a situation that is often framed as a hunt of men against animals. After the introduction (1.1-40), the teacher persona lists potential places to find the female prey, such as at the theater (1.89-134), games (1.135-170), triumphs (1.171-228) and banquets (1.229-252), as well as a variety of ways to win her (1.265-770). In Book 2, after the reader successfully has won the woman's attention, or trapped her as the case may be (2.2), the instructor teaches men the ways to keep her interest (2.97-744). Throughout these two books, Ovid establishes the narrator's expertise in love, poetry, and hunting, and creates a rapport between him and the male audience. In Book 3, the instructor turns to the female audience and teaches them how to dress themselves to meet and ensnare men like some sort of net (3.419-420). The instructor imagines that the readers will be successful in seduction by the end of the poem, but scholars are more suspicious.

Whether or not the *Ars Amatoria* is a successful poem ultimately depends upon what the poem is really about and what it is intending to accomplish. Because of the less formal structure of the poem, several scholars maintain that all the content is empty and that Ovid is a failed teacher, as Tarrant, James, Miller and Watson have all argued in some manner.⁴ Miller and Watson in particular suggest that the persona of the

³ Ovid himself in *Tristia* 2 tries to convince Augustus of this non-serious intent. The second half of the poem (207-578) defends his poetry from the charges against him, predominantly by arguing that his poetry is frivolous and deceptive, a statement with which many scholars would agree. The *Ars Amatoria*, however, was published several years before Ovid's relegation, and the delay has caused scholars to place more blame on the *error* than the *carmen*.

⁴ Cf. Miller 1993, Tarrant 1997, Watson 2007, and James 2008. Many other intentions have been hypothesized. For interpretations that focus on gender issues, see Romano 1972, McLaughlin 1975, Myerowitz-Levine 1982, Watson 1984, Anderson 1990, and James 2008. For Ovid's complicated view of Augustus in the *Ars Amatoria*, see especially Sharrock 1994, Davis 1995, Green 1996b, and White 2002.

praeceptor amoris is a character from comedy whom readers would recognize as fallible and so expect the inevitable failure of his teachings. But despite the failings of the persona, Kennedy argues that the reader is seduced by the text and is able to invest emotionally in it. In this way, it succeeds since the text on seduction seduces the reader.⁵ The reader is compelled to have faith not in the lessons themselves, but in the idea of didacticism and the illusion of it within the poem. The poem is, according to Blodgett, only an illusion, like all art and life itself.⁶ I agree that Ovid is concerned about the illusions and fictions of poetry, but his poetry is more than a deceptive game. The issues he raises may seem unconnected and sometimes removed from the subject of love, but Ovid's use of hunting nevertheless provides a means to unite the *Ars Amatoria* and trains the reader to be critical of symbols and not to be accepting of illusions. The narrator at 2.311-312, the middle of the work, explicitly trains his male readers on deception:

...*nec vultu destrue dicta tuo./*
*Si latet, ars prodest....*⁷

The instructor and his male audience strive to be consistent in appearance and word, but more is hidden below the surface. Like Vergil, Ovid does not consider truth to be a tangible object for humans to hunt, but unlike Vergil, he does not have a hierarchical understanding of knowledge where there are gods who seem to have the knowledge humans do not. Instead, an analysis of Ovid's hunting imagery through the *Ars Amatoria* ultimately reveals that when we try to hunt for something, we have no idea about what

Commentary on literature, which is the most relevant interpretation to this chapter, is the focus of Krókowski 1963, Blodgett 1973, Eidinow 1993, Miller 1993, Tarrant 1995, Toohey 1997, Downing 1999, and Kennedy 2000.

⁵ Kennedy 2000.

⁶ Blodgett 1973.

⁷ "Don't refute your words with your expression. If art hides, it profits" Ov. *AA.* 2.312-313.

we might capture. The ‘truth’ can change unexpectedly, and our guides and the tracks can mislead.

Although hunting is presented as a straightforward teaching aid by the speaker, the speaker’s overconfident use of imagery ultimately exposes the problems of hunting in the *Ars Amatoria*. Male gender bias may not be a problem per se, especially with a male poet in the Roman world, but the choice of hunting as a major image and the passive role of women become problematic. The education offered becomes compromised between words and expression.⁸ The final mythological excursus of the entire work, the myth of the hunters Cephalus and Procris (3.685-746), puts emphasis on hunting and its problems. In this myth, the jealous Procris spies on her husband Cephalus and is killed by him in ignorance. In the privileged last place, this mythological *exemplum* combines various themes of his work, including treatment of women and adultery, and exposes hunting’s unsuitability for the female audience.⁹ However, the male lover is also left bereft in the myth, in opposition to the speaker’s previous confidence in the success of the hunter-lover.¹⁰ This final mythological digression shows a concern about the difficulty in using imagery in didactic poetry. Indeed, Ovid’s work might be understood as questioning the stereotypical imagery used in didactic and elegiac poetry. However, Ovid offers no alternatives to traditional imagery and merely probes the theoretical questions of what imagery is and what it can accomplish in the quest for knowledge.

⁸ The advice to make the two seem the same was given at 2.312-313. Failure of this results in the failure of the art, but consistency is also bound to fail eventually (2.314): *adimit merito tempus in omne fidem*, “Time destroys faith in everything won.”

⁹ It is also the only mythological excursus in Book 3 (cf. Cristante 2007: 413).

¹⁰ For one heart-wrenching moment, the speaker cries “Miserable me!” and shows pity for the woman and sympathy for the man (Ov. *AA* 3.736). Cristante 2007: 417 observes that this is the cry of Cephalus himself in the *Metamorphoses* 7.846, and it is also the cry of Ovid himself in *Am.* 1.1.25 (cf. Gibson 2003: 376).

My interpretation follows in the scholarly tradition of so-called Ovidian failure, where the instructor's intention to educate on love is unsuccessful.¹¹ I argue that Ovid undercuts his own instructor's ability, and that he also does something constructive: he trains his readers to question a poet's authority because knowledge is unattainable. The surface of the poem may show, as Anderson writes, that "the teacher, Cephalus, and chauvinistic men have what they really secretly want: not a lover embracing a compliant female in selfish sex but a husband, in the full panoply of hunter, holding the corpse of the wife whom he has speared as an animal," but Ovid subverts the teacher's intentions and makes him untrustworthy.¹² Once there is doubt in the teacher, the reader needs to interpret the prey himself, which may differ from the prey the teacher offered.

I will now turn to discuss the uses of hunting in particular. I will first briefly address the question of why Ovid chooses hunting. In addition to creating a literary relationship with Lucretius and Vergil, Ovid had other generic reasons for using hunting (Part II.A). From the question of why, I will then turn to discuss Ovid's specific uses of hunting and their interpretations which both support the speaker's lessons (Part II.B) and then undercut them (Part II. C).

II. Hunting in the *Ars Amatoria*

A. The Problem of Mixed Genres

Hunting, as mentioned, is a common figure in all three books. One reason that Ovid utilized this particular image is its association with multiple genres, especially didactic and elegiac poetry. As I have discussed in the Introduction, as well as the previous two chapters, hunting in didactic poetry provides a paradigm to reflect the

¹¹ Cf. Miller 1993, Tarrant 1997, Watson 2007, and James 2008.

¹² Anderson 1990: 142.

success or failure of the hunt for knowledge. Ovid was influenced by this tradition, and as a love poet he was further interested in using an image that also had erotic value. By the Augustan period, amatory hunting was a conventional image.¹³ Amatory hunting usually involves either Cupid capturing someone or the lover pursuing the beloved.¹⁴ While hunting usually aids the hunter in obtaining love, it can also be associated with losing one's love, such as when hunting distracts someone from his familial duties or when hunters in mythological stories flee from or suffer because of love.¹⁵ Thus, hunting imagery has a complex relationship with love, and the reader might not immediately know which outcome will be associated with a particular hunting episode in love poetry. By working with two genres, didactic and elegiac, Ovid confuses the contexts and exposes the multiple possibilities of interpretation instead of choosing one approach for his reader to follow.¹⁶ The tension between the interpretations is seen particularly in the disjunction between Ovid, the mastercraftsman who has awareness of the imagery, and the instructor persona, the comic fallible figure who seems unprepared to negotiate successfully between the two interpretations. On the surface, Ovid fashions an instructor endowed with technical expertise in hunting.¹⁷ However, the instructor persona uses this

¹³ Cf. Dunn 1980, Murgatroyd 1984.

¹⁴ Cf. Introduction Part II.C. The first case of the former is supposedly found in Ibycus 7, and the latter situation as early as Sophocles frag. 846 (Murgatroyd 1984).

¹⁵ Distraction from the duties to one's family, for example, is seen in Horace's *Odes* 1.1.26. Mythological hunters often suffer because of love in Ovid's own *Metamorphoses*, such as Callisto (2.410-530) and Meleager (8.260-545).

¹⁶ Didactic and elegiac are not, of course, the only generic manifestations of hunting. See also its use in epic: in epic poetry, heroes often hunt to indicate their strength, but if their hunting pursuits turn to pursuits of love, tragedy strikes (cf. Introduction Part II).

¹⁷ It is impossible to say where Ovid himself learned about hunting and whether he took inspiration from other didactic works. As we can deduce from its use in didactic poetry, hunting seems to be a generally familiar activity, but Ovid is recognized for his technical aptitude and innovation with imagery (cf. Newlands 1986 and Sharrock 2003). When Murgatroyd 1984 provides a survey of the figure of the amatory hunt, Ovid is credited with frequent and novel uses of the image. Indeed, Capponi 1988 has given Ovid the moniker *Cynegeticus* ("the hunter") because of his accurate and frequent use of hunting, and

knowledge for his problematic instructions, as we will see in Parts B and C, and ultimately his status as an expert is undermined.

B. The Expert Teacher Persona

Despite the instructor's ultimate failure, Ovid initially demonstrates his instructor's expertise and establishes his authority. The examples in Book 1 and 2 particularly accomplish this goal. First of all, the instructor assures the reader that his didactic work, despite its subject matter, will follow the same rigorous technical treatment as any other work by alluding to the content of hunting, fowling, and fishing didactic poetry in two passages: 1.45-48 and 1.391-393. In the former passage, there is special emphasis placed on hunting. The lover is encouraged to know where to find women just as the hunter knows well the location of his prey:

*Scit bene venator, cervis ubi retia tendat,
scit bene, qua frendens valle moretur aper.*¹⁸

First, the quick barrage of allusions to traditional didactic subjects establishes the generic affiliation of the instructor's own project with other didactic works, as Murgatroyd and others have noted.¹⁹ Second, the connection provides a mode of expression for the narrator: because the *Ars Amatoria* is just like a *Cynegetica* and the lover is just like a hunter, hunting knowledge can be used to express knowledge of love.²⁰ If the didactic persona knows the technical aspects of hunting, he must also be dependable in his advice

Baligan 1968 argues that Ovid, not Grattius, wrote an Augustan poem on hunting. Ovid was a poet with flare for technical material.

¹⁸ "The hunter knows well where to stretch his nets for deer, in which valley the boar stays, gnashing its teeth" Ov. *AA* 1.45-46.

¹⁹ Murgatroyd 1984: 367, Pianezzola 2007b: 193, and Gavaille 2007. Steudel 1992: 149 also notes the humorous game in aligning his work with technical didactic treatises. Hollis 1977: 41 notes that this relation equally establishes that love is as strenuous as hunting, a claim that the speaker will later try to deny (cf. Part C, n. 54 and n. 55 below).

²⁰ One might be able to say that the speaker privileges the didactic over the elegiac connection through this generic alignment, but we will see that this alignment breaks down in Part C.

on love. With this example, the instructor is able to make the alignment of hunters and lovers early in his work.

The technical alignment of the *Ars Amatoria* then affects the language of instruction: if hunters are a suitable comparison to lovers, the instructor can use technical hunting vocabulary to strengthen his teachings. We see this type of language throughout. The addressee is encouraged three times to hunt and to set up his nets: 1.89, 1.263-264, and 1.270-271. 1.89 begins a section on where to hunt: *Sed tu praecipue curvis venare theatris*.²¹ This section is neatly ended with another metaphor in 1.263:

*Hactenus, unde legas quod ames, ubi retia ponas,
praecipit imparibus vecta Thalea rotis.*²²

The lover-hunter now knows the terrain of his prey just as the hunter in 1.45-48 knew where to place his nets. With the completion of a section, the instructor marks the progression of his pupil's knowledge.

The next lesson at 1.265-274 provides reassurance for the reader about his potential for success:

...*cunctas*
*posse capi: capies, tu modo tende plagas.*²³

The use of *plaga* for net instead of *retia*, which was used in both 1.45 and 1.263, indicates a different technique.²⁴ The word *retia* can be used generally for any net, but in particular it is the common net for trapping prey, a hayes net, while *plaga* is a road-net that, as its name implies, was set up in the roads to block the path of the prey and to direct

²¹ "But you especially hunt in curved theaters" Ov. *AA* 1.89.

²² "Thus far, the Muse conveyed by uneven wheels has taught from where to choose what you love, where to set your nets" Ov. *AA* 1.263-264.

²³ "all are able to be captured; you will capture, just stretch out your road-nets!" Ov. *AA* 1.270-271.

²⁴ Ovid or the narrator may also have wanted a change of vocabulary for the purposes of *variatio*, but that is no reason that they additional type of net could not also encourage better hunting.

it into a hayes net or purse-net for capture.²⁵ The prey therefore does not have a path of escape. If a hunter-lover is worried about catching any woman he wants, the new additional net would be a comfort, both because it has a more precise use and because he can use both nets together, as he would in a Roman hunt. The instructor again is able to use hunting terminology to support his own work and to increase its credibility. He is also targeting his instruction to the male Roman audience and making the audience trust him through his appeal to an activity that is already a part of their cultural experience.²⁶

The persona uses hunting terms accurately in Books 1 and 2, and this technical aptitude helps the reader gain confidence in the teacher. The opening of Book 2 immediately indicates the work's unity through continuity of hunting imagery:

Dicite 'io Paeon' et 'io' bis dicite 'Paeon!'
*Decidit in casses praeda petita meos.*²⁷

The hunt of Book 1 is complete, and the prey is trapped in the nets (*casses*): a *cassis* is the purse-net that would close around the prey at the end of a hunt. Book 2 concerns the ways to keep a lover, and the snares used to capture the woman should naturally be maintained to keep her affection: the same words for nets are applied precisely.

Because male lovers are equated with hunters, women are naturally allotted the role of prey in Books 1 and 2. The relation between women and prey again allows the instructor to display his hunting knowledge while providing relevant information. For example, women are twice compared to vicious boars. First, the instructor encourages

²⁵ For clarification of Latin terms using Greek terminology, cf. Capponi 1982: 601 and the Introduction Part II.

²⁶ Women may also have been familiar with the hunt, but it is more difficult to know what level of involvement and technical expertise they might have had. Of course, if we believe that Sulpicia was a woman, then there is evidence that women were at least familiar with erotic hunting imagery ([Tib.] 3.13-18, cf. Green 1996b: 224-225). Sulpicia, however, if she is a female writer, is an exception.

²⁷ "Say 'O, Paeon!' and twice say, 'O, Paeon!' The sought prey has fallen into my purse-nets" Ov. *AA* 2.1-2. The nets, as Baldo 2007: 272 notes, are metaphorically the *artes* of the *Ars Amatoria* itself.

the addressee to use the maid to get to the mistress.²⁸ This is a difficult situation, at least if the maid is pretty, as the lover should avoid the temptation to seduce the maid first lest she betray his intentions: *Non bene de laxis cassibus exit aper* (1.392).²⁹ The maid is the prey, a vicious boar, and this time she is already caught, safely out of the way of the lover and his true prey. To sleep with the maid would let the metaphorical cat out of the bag—or boar out of the net. It would be difficult for a boar to escape from the net without the help of the hunter, and he would be in a dangerous situation if he let it loose. Likewise, the slave of the mistress would be harmful to the lover and his goals if she were freed from his snares, or more precisely, if she was involved in an affair and then sabotaged the lover's relationship with the mistress. Letting her out of the *cassis* is a bad idea, and the purse-net is employed the first time in the *Ars Amatoria* for the new idea of a caught woman let loose. The boar is certainly chosen here for its ferocity, as opposed to timid prey like a hare or stag, and any hunter fears the escape of captured prey.³⁰ Women are boars also at 2.373-374:

*Sed neque fulvus aper media tam saevus in ira est,
fulmineo rabidos cum rotat ore canes.*³¹

The woman-boar here rages against the hunting dogs, but this time the metaphor is tamer than the reality. A woman scorned is far worse than a wild boar.

Once the metaphorical system that equates men with hunters and women with prey has been established, the narrator is able to manipulate it for rhetorical purposes.

²⁸ Ov. *AA* 1.351-398.

²⁹ "a boar does not leave well from the loosened purse-nets" Ov. *AA* 1.392. The line is perhaps a reference to Lucretius' view of guilt itself as a net (5.1151-1153).

³⁰ The hunt for a boar requires unusually violent work, and the hunter is equipped with a spear fitted with "delays" (*morae*), which were projections on the side of the spearhead meant to stop the boar from running along the spear and attacking the hunter, cf. Grat. 108-113.

³¹ "But the tawny boar is not so savage in the midst of anger, when it whirls away the rabid dogs with his shining tusks" Ov. *AA* 2.373-374.

For example, at 1.272 he argues that no woman can escape from the net (*plaga*). It would be more likely for prey to chase the hunter: *Maenalius lepori det sua terga canis*.³² It is unlikely for a dog to flee a hare, and the choice of breed may strengthen the unlikelihood. *Maenalius* is used to describe anything from Arcadia.³³ Our major source on breeds of dogs in the Augustan era is the *Cynegetica* by Grattius, and he most likely refers to these dogs as *Lycaones*, another term for Arcadian: *at contra faciles magnique Lycaones armis* (160).³⁴ The dogs are notably strong and so less likely to flee than other breeds of dogs. The parallel here is conceptually complex because the reader would expect women to be put in the role of the prey. However, in this example, the likelihood of fleeing connects women to dogs: neither of them will run. The shift from woman as prey to woman as hunting dog can be seen as part of the absurdity of the male reader's fear. The instructor is using his knowledge and the reversal of a normal hunting situation to assure his male readers that the possibility of women escaping is impossible and ridiculous.

The equation between women and hunting dogs, however, is not limited to unlikely situations. Men are human hunters and women are prey in the first two books, but both sexes are given the role of dogs at different points. Dogs can serve this double role because they are not only hunters, but they are also animals and under a person's control.³⁵ When women are dogs, however, the instructor does not have full confidence in their courage and intelligence at 2.331: when a mistress is ill, the instructor advises the male lover to be attentive. Through these actions, the beloved will be impressed:

³² "the Maenalian hound would sooner give its back to a hare" Ov. *AA* 1.272, a form of *adynaton* (Hollis 1977: 90). Lucretius uses a similar *adynaton* to describe the nature of the soul (Chapter 1, Part II).

³³ *OLD* s.v. "Maenalius."

³⁴ "But on the other hand, Lycaonian hounds are obedient and large in their flanks" Grat. 160. *OLD* s.v. "Lycaon". Hollis 1977: 90 supports this view, as well, with a reference from Oppian's *Cyn.* 1.372.

³⁵ Cf. Introduction Part II. This flexibility has shown to be very important for didactic imagery, especially in Chapter 1.

*omnibus his inerunt gratae vestigia curae.*³⁶ The instructor here does not make explicit that women therefore function like dogs sniffing out clues, but *vestigia* is at its root a tracking and hunting term. The *vestigia* are literally the footprints left by a creature, so in this case the male's concern is the prey and the women are subtly skilled at tracking. This prey, however, wants to be found, and the lover's concerned actions leave only the signs of a caring individual. From these tracks, the lady will be able to believe that the lover cares, whether or not he actually does. The women are equated with dogs that can easily be deceived. They find tracks of concern, but this concern is an affectation encouraged by the instructor, and so the reader is explicitly shown a problem with hunting for knowledge. Tracks are supposed to be clear evidence, but the prey can intentionally leave them to confuse the truth. Additionally, the speaker encourages the pupil to be like Proteus (1.759-762), which creates a very problematic hunt for knowledge especially if the reader thinks of Vergil's *Georgics* Book 4. The speaker encourages his reader to change shape to be caught, but by being caught, the reader will catch the woman of his choice.³⁷ Even when the hunter succeeds, he or she may not catch what they thought they would.

The capabilities of women are not neglected entirely, but when the narrator offers tricks for them to find and keep a man, his sympathy is for the man. He discusses the difference between inexperienced and knowledgeable men, each of whom requires a different technique. The new lover will run if he notices the net: *Dissimulate tamen* [...]

³⁶ "The tracks of pleasing concern will be present in all these things" Ov. *AA* 2.331.

³⁷ Cf. Thibodeau 2011: 227 on the figure of Proteus in the *Ars Amatoria* vis-à-vis the *Georgics*. The deceived is the deceiver, cf. Chapter 2, especially Part III.B. False tracks are also seen in Lucretius: Lucretius uses *vestigia* as a word for philosophical proofs and warns his audience about the danger of following false signs (esp. n. 87). By teaching his reader to create false tracks, the speaker in the *Ars Amatoria* is indirectly contributing to the loss of *ataraxia*.

novus viso casse resistet amans (3.553-554).³⁸ The comparison of men to prey is straightforward, but how the rest of the analogy works out is unclear. Did the women lay the nets or are they the nets themselves?³⁹ Nets, like women, have a reputation for being deceitful.⁴⁰ Deceit may not be the most flattering trait, but women are a deceitful race, according to the narrator in Book 1.645-658. The narrator encourages this underhanded behavior by the advice to deceive (*dissimulare*, 3.553), and then he explains why some deceit is necessary to comfort a lover.⁴¹ In the metaphors in Book 1, it was only the older, experienced women, seeing the nets from far off, who would give trouble to the standard hunter: *Longius insidias cerva videbit anus* (1.766).⁴² Men as prey work differently, and women should not make the new ones afraid. When he comes to her doorway as a prize, she should be gentle. This advice is helpful to the women, but it also demonstrates the instructor's sympathy for the male lover although he is now addressing a female audience.⁴³

The bias is not inherently a problem, except that it betrays the narrator's words and makes explicit his conflict of interest in teaching men and teaching women.⁴⁴ Two hunting metaphors in Book 3 place further emphasis on men as prey and again reveal more fully the instructor's gendered sympathy.⁴⁵ In 3.662, the narrator explains with a hunting metaphor that other women will hunt the beloved if one is too trusting of these

³⁸ "Nevertheless deceive [...] the new lover will resist when the purse-net has been seen" Ov. *AA* 3.553-554. Gibson 2003: 317 notes that the hidden nets indicate technical expertise, citing Xen. *Cyn.* 10.7. Again, the speaker knows hunting well.

³⁹ In reference to Ov. *AA* 3.427-428. See discussion below.

⁴⁰ Cf. Introduction Part II on nets. The speaker encourages women to be deceitful here and also believes they have a duplicitous nature (cf. 1.665-666, n. 72).

⁴¹ Ov. *AA* 3.555-576.

⁴² "The old hind will see the traps from farther away" Ov. *AA* 1.766.

⁴³ Cf. Miller 1993 for more on the subject of the sympathy for the male audience.

⁴⁴ Cf. Ov. *AA* 2.311-314 where the narrator advises the male pupils to maintain an appearance to match their speech.

⁴⁵ Ov. *AA* 3.662 and *AA* 3.670.

women: *Et lepus hic aliis exagitatus erit.*⁴⁶ The lover is a timid hare, and the other women are presumably dogs, barking and stirring up the prey. Rather than focusing on the dogs, the instructor focuses on the prey, which is apparently disturbed by the onslaught of attention. The instructor then has a crisis of conscience for betraying his gender and teaching women tricks: *Non docet infestos currere cerva canes.*⁴⁷ Men are here equated with hind and women, their hunters, with dogs. Once more in the hunting analogies, women are not equated with a *human* hunter, and the dogs (women) are hateful or aggressive (*infestos*). The perspective is sympathetic to the male lover, and the hunting imagery throughout the third book has continued to support male agency and comfort, despite the instructor's claim that the book is a sword given to the Lemnian women to slay him.⁴⁸ He exaggerates his violent portrayal of women, especially in relation to the power his own work gives them. The question of the danger of this work hinges upon the validity of his lessons: his fear may be justified if his lessons are successful. But will women be able to hunt down men?

C. Ovid's Ironic Twist: Undermining the Expert

We return now to the issue of didactic success. The instructor's knowledge has proven to be precise and has also supported the male readership more than the female. Ovid, however, allows the instructor's male bias to undercut his expertise because the exposed tension encourages the reader to be more critical about knowledge. Despite the effort the instructor puts into the alignment of men with hunters and women with prey,

⁴⁶ "And the rabbit will be stirred up here by the others" Ov. *AA* 3.662. Gibson 2003: 350-351 and Cristante 2007: 411 note its proverbial nature.

⁴⁷ "The hind does not teach the hateful dogs to run" Ov. *AA* 3.670. The line displays lovely alliteration (Cristante 2007: 412), but strangely for the *Ars* reverses the gender of the prey (Gibson 2003: 352).

⁴⁸ Ov. *AA* 3.672.

there are two female mythological hunters in the first two books.⁴⁹ In order to maintain his dichotomy, however, his emphasis is not on females-as-huntresses. For instance, the reader learns that Diana, the goddess of hunting, in fact, is a woman who hates love.⁵⁰ This detail raises the question of whether hunting, the goddess of which is a virgin, is an appropriate metaphor for amorous activity, which is a conflict not unique to the *Ars Amatoria*.⁵¹ The narrator could downplay hunting's conflict with love: the difference between a literal and a metaphorical hunt is not difficult to understand. There is confusion, however, when the instructor wants to use hunting to understand love, but then claims that the two are not alike at all at 2.193-196. The speaker hides the problem in Book 1 and says only that Diana is a virgin and will hurt lovers because she hates love. There is no mention of her being a goddess of hunting.⁵² When discussing Atalanta, another huntress, in Book 2, he focuses on her beloved who is forced to carry the nets and go hunting.⁵³ The instructor assures the reader that his own orders, on the other hand, are mild at 2.193-195:

*Non te Maenalias armatum scandere silvas
nec iubeo collo retia ferre tuo.*⁵⁴

But he has, in fact, ordered men to mimic this hard labor through his analogy of love with hunting: he has explained how to place nets and warns the reader to be prepared to endure

⁴⁹ Ov. *AA* 1.259-262 and *AA* 2.185-196.

⁵⁰ *Illa, quod est virgo, quod tela Cupidinis odit...* ("That one, because she is a virgin, because she hates the weapons of Cupid...") Ov. *AA* 1.261. I agree with Hollis 1977's reading of *quod* as causal.

⁵¹ Confusion and conflict between love and hunting is the background to the *Hippolytus*, and, recent to the *Ars Amatoria*, Vergil's *Aeneid* Book 4 contains a variety of literal and figurative hunting that demonstrates the tension in Dido and Aeneas' relationship.

⁵² Until Book 3.144-145, see n. 100 below.

⁵³ Ov. *AA* 2.185-196. Her lover Milanion is the focus and the subject of lines 189-191.

⁵⁴ "I do not bid you, armed, to climb the Maenalian woods, nor to bear the nets on your neck" Ov. *AA* 2.193-195.

the hardships of love.⁵⁵ A gap between metaphorical vehicle and tenor is the problem with didactic metaphor, especially when it concurrently functions within another genre, such as elegy, which has a different understanding of hunting metaphors: the metaphor's implied sentence becomes unclear.⁵⁶ Instruction sometimes requires suppression of certain details or conflicts, and Ovid uses his instructor's focus to make the reader more rather than less aware of the suppression.

The contradictions and problems of hunting imagery become clearer in Book 3 when the speaker distances a part of his readership. It would seem problematic to use hunting imagery or any other male-dominant activity in a book addressed to women, and the instructor explains this dilemma at 3.381-385:

*Hos ignava iocos tribuit natura puellis,
materia ludunt uberiore viri.
Sunt illis celeresque pilae iaculumque trochique
armaque et in gyros ire coactus equus;
Nec vos Campus habet.*⁵⁷

In this passage, the narrator focuses on gymnasium sports, but the activities of the male population would also include other leisure sports unfamiliar to the inactive women. The narrator surprises the supposedly female reader by thereafter including hunting references in the rest of the book. The general situation of prey being caught in traps is the same, but will male and female hunters be given similar instructions? The comparison of

⁵⁵ The hardships of love are elsewhere represented by advice to look ill (Ov. *AA* 1.723-744) and by the comparison of love to warfare (Ov. *AA* 2.177-250). Baldo 2007: 294 notes in this passage as well a parody of the *Georgics* Book 3 Proem: *silvas...sequamur / ...haud mollia iussa*. The labor of the *Ars* is not hard only because it takes place in the city (293-294).

⁵⁶ Cf. Introduction on metaphor as well as Part II.A above.

⁵⁷ "Sluggish nature doles out to girls these games; men play with richer material. They have swift balls and the javelin and metal hoops and arms and the horse compelled to go in circles. The Campus does not have you [women]..." Ov. *AA* 3.381-385. Gavaille 2007 observes the ultimate irony that, as a man, the speaker simply cannot teach from experience in this case. Gibson 2003: 255 also notes the problem of the city's historical topographical gender divide and the difficulty this division presents for women in search of prey. Cristanti 2007: 389 observes that the list repeats the precepts from the first two books, no doubt to indicate a division between the books.

women to dogs chased by hares at 1.272, however, has already indicated that Roman women are more suitable as prey, and the hunting imagery in Book 3 proves equally problematic for female agency. Yet, even though the imagery may no longer be apt, the instructor continues to use it.

One issue with female hunters is their agency, or rather their lack of it: women do not have the same active skills as their male counterparts in the opinion of the instructor. Although their lack of activity is effective, the narrator has not taken his own advice to match his words with his appearance: although women do not share in male actions, once the narrator has entered into a hunting allegory, he continues with the formula to the point that hunting becomes inappropriate.⁵⁸ In 3.427-428, a simile compares women to nets:

*Saepe canes frustra nemorosis montibus errant,
inque plagam nullo cervus agente venit.*⁵⁹

Here, the prey (stag/man) is caught not by skill (*canes frustra, nullo...agente*) but by simple happenstance. As opposed to the Book 1 male hunter who knew what he was doing, women are like inanimate nets. While the male hunter-lover is encouraged to set traps for the woman who catches his eye in Book 1, women are encouraged to look good and frequent popular areas. With maximum exposure, she is sure to attract someone even if just by chance. They cannot actively do anything other than deceive men. Their agency is denied, and they have to rely on chance and tricks. Despite the knowledge that he theoretically is addressing a female audience, his tone and examples are sympathetic to men and demonstrate that women are unable to be hunters in their own right. This

⁵⁸ Ov. *AA* 2.311-314.

⁵⁹ "Often dogs wander through woody mountains in vain, and the stag comes into the road-net with no one driving" Ov. *AA* 3.427-428. Gibson 2003: 273 and Cristanti 2007: 394 note a possible allusion to Cicero *Off.* 3.68. Gibson 2003: 274 compares the women not to nets, but to luckless Hellenistic lovers, but this interpretation is rather generous towards women.

claim could be accepted if the narrator did not fear their violence.⁶⁰ The narrator does not or cannot suppress other perspectives. With a focus on the multiplicity of images, the text forces the reader to question the possibility of finding a unitary truth.

Laquei or “foot snares” are one recurring example of a hunting image that becomes problematic for the reader both because of its questionable usefulness and because of its deceitfulness.⁶¹ As with the types of nets, the instructor does understand the use and problems of the *laquei*. *Laquei* are a normal part of hunting, discussed by Grattius from lines 89-94. While Grattius encourages their use, he does admit that this trick is often not useful at 93-94:

...quam dissimulantibus armis
saepe habet imprudens alieni lucra laboris.⁶²

The snare is apparently as much help to a third party who can capture the slowed animal as to the hunter who actually set up the noose. *Laquei* are equally problematic in the *Ars Amatoria* because of the ambiguity of who is being caught in the traps. In line 1.646, the instructor advises his hunter-lover to be wise and not to deceive unless he has been deceived first: *in laqueos quos posuere, cadant*.⁶³ After two mythological *exempla*, he adds in conclusion: *ergo...exemplo doleat femina laesa suo* (657).⁶⁴ It is the woman here who is injured by her own tricks, but the instructor omits the injury for which the woman is to pay. This section concludes as if women as a race are given to perjury and naturally deserve whatever happens to them. While the sentiment is not a new one, the *exempla*

⁶⁰ Ov. *AA* 3.1-5, 3.667-672.

⁶¹ This deceitfulness is also a part of *laqueus* in Vergil's *Georgics*.

⁶² “How often an unwise man has the profits of a stranger's labor with deceitful weapons” Grat. 93-94.

⁶³ “Let them fall into the traps which they have placed” Ov. *AA* 1.646. According to Hollis 1977: 135, as well as by Pianezzola 2007b: 260 who points to its repetition in *RA* 501-502, this is a proverbial statement. The status of proverb alone may excuse the interpretive confusion.

⁶⁴ “therefore...let a woman injured by her own example grieve” Ov. *AA* 1.657.

that the speaker employs involve men.⁶⁵ Jupiter excuses the oaths of men from being fulfilled by his laughter, and Thrasius and Perillus are destroyed by their own creations intended to destroy people.⁶⁶ The instructor presents nothing in this passage to rationalize vengeance against women.

Men and women both are deceiving and deceived, injuring and injured. *Laquei* indicate an uncomfortable fluidity in the love affairs between being the hunter and being the hunted.⁶⁷ It is unsurprising that this slightly disjointed section troubles Green.⁶⁸ She argues that the traps, *laquei*, in 1.646 refer to the traps set by men, the deceitful race. Women, on the other hand, are absent because they have no place in the hunt. The so-called love that the instructor is teaching to men is full of deceit and dishonesty, and, unfortunately, the hunting of women in the city includes the hunting of married women. Men's traps will injure other men and thereby damage the community.⁶⁹ Green is correct to observe that the punishment of men by men in the *exempla* could easily refer to hunter-lovers being punished by the legitimate husbands, but the instructor reminds his audience to keep oaths in everything except promises to women.⁷⁰ The text itself implies that it is women who deserve to be punished.⁷¹ Women in the *Ars Amatoria* are depicted as contrary beings who say "no" when they really mean "yes," and are considered

⁶⁵ As just one example of an attack against deceitful women, Catullus 70 argues that the promises of women ought to be written in the wind and water.

⁶⁶ Ov. *AA* 1.633-636, *AA* 1.647-656.

⁶⁷ The power relations established by the speaker depend upon someone being the hunter and the other being the prey. We will see that his discomfort with role-reversal becomes more pronounced in Book 3. The desire for fixed roles in the hunting metaphors used here contrasts particularly with Lucretius' use of metaphors, in which hunting pupils were encouraged to become hunted themselves (cf. Chapter 1, Part III).

⁶⁸ Green 1996b.

⁶⁹ Green 1996b: 255-258.

⁷⁰ Ov. *AA* 1.631-646.

⁷¹ Ov. *AA* 1.657.

deceitful.⁷² In this way women lie and possibly deserve to be hurt in turn. The instructor here is attempting to show a traditional distrust of women, but his examples once more prove his lack of mastery with poetry.

The fluidity is seen again in a passage that is clearly about an adulterous pursuit and a legitimate husband's punishment: the story of the adultery of Mars and Venus at 2.561-600. In order to catch them in the act, Vulcan sets traps in the bed:

*Mulciber obscuros lectum circaque superque
disponit laqueos...veniunt ad foedus amantes:
impliciti laqueis nudus uterque iacent.*⁷³

The instructor makes clear that the lovers are caught in snares, not in nets, as he later calls them *vincula* (2.596), chains, and *insidias* (2.594), traps, which is another word for *laquei* used in Grattius.⁷⁴ This mythological digression has naturally drawn attention for its possible commentary on Augustan adultery laws.⁷⁵ The instructor advises his pupils not to act like the husband, whose jurisdiction it is to handle a woman's adultery (2.595-598):

*nec vos rivali laqueos disponite, nec vos
excipite arcana verba notata manu.
Ista viri captent, si iam captanda putabunt,
quos facient iustos ignis et unda viros.*⁷⁶

The instructor here makes one of his several self-pardons for his poetry, when he argues that he only writes what is legal, but the passage also recalls the first occurrence of *laquei*

⁷² For example, 1.665-666: "she will fight....nevertheless she wants to be conquered in the fight." The deceit is "a notion which recurs time and time again in the love-poets," according to Hollis 1977: 56. Women are encouraged in this deceitful behavior by Ovid *AA* 3.553-554.

⁷³ "Mulciber places hidden traps around and over the bed...the lovers come to the disgrace: each one lies naked bound in traps" Ov. *AA* 2.577-580.

⁷⁴ Grat. 91.

⁷⁵ Sharrock 1994: 114-117.

⁷⁶ "Don't you put down traps for a rival, nor take up hidden words written by hand. Let the husbands take those things, if they think these things should be taken very soon, men whom fire and water make legal husbands" Ov. *AA* 2.595-598. Baldo 2007: 333 notes the repetition of *laqueos disponere* from 2.578.

in Book 1.646: *in laqueos quos posuere, cadant*.⁷⁷ He warns his reader to let the deceitful people harm themselves. In Book 1, it seemed to apply to women, but the warning after the digression in Book 2 is directed towards men. In the digression, Vulcan is the one who sets the snares; he is a deceiver, in a way, since he pretends to go to Lemnos and his work deceives (*fallit*, 2.578) the eyes.⁷⁸ He does not get caught in his own trap, but by catching the adulterers, he was metaphorically caught in a terrible situation. His own skill ruined him (2.591-592):

*saepe tamen demens stulte fecisse fateris,
teque ferunt artis paenituisse tuae.*⁷⁹

Once the adultery was public knowledge, Mars and Venus felt able to commit the act freely.⁸⁰ Because of this unfortunate outcome, the instructor recommends that his addressees not place down traps. As he already indicated in the first book, people who lay down traps are just as easily caught in them. A hunter can become the hunted or the injured.

The instructor remains consistent about the problems of *laquei*. If you are deceitful, it is probable that you will use *laquei*. When the instructor encourages mildness in women towards the new lover in 3.591-592, a foot-snare is mentioned again:

*Dum cadit in laqueos captus quoque nuper amator,
solum se thalamos speret habere tuos.*⁸¹

⁷⁷ "Let them fall into the traps which they have placed" Ov. *AA* 1.646.

⁷⁸ Ov. *AA* 2.578. *Fallere* was also marked as a hunting word in Vergil's *Georgics*, Chapter 2.

⁷⁹ "Often, nevertheless, out of your mind, you confess to have acted foolishly, and they say that you repented your own skill" Ov. *AA* 2.591-592. Baldo 2007: 333 reads *irae* over Kenney's *artis*. Both readings make good sense, but *artis* has an added self-reference to the title of the *Ars Amatoria* and maintains Ovid's general interest in the use of art and skill.

⁸⁰ Ov. *AA* 2.589-590.

⁸¹ "While the lover just recently captured falls into the foot-snares, let him hope that he alone has your bedroom" Ov. *AA* 3.591-592. Gibson 2003: 329 notes that this scene marks the transition from hunt to capture, equivalent to the opening of Book 2.

As with the purse-nets which caught the new lover in 3.554, it is not explicitly stated who placed these snares. Perhaps the lover is one of the people at line 1.646 who might fall (*cadant*) into his own traps, or perhaps women are capable of setting their own traps provided that they are deceitful snares. The instructor implied as much at 1.657 when he stated that women would grieve at their own behavior and at 3.553 when he encouraged women to deceive. It is appropriate for a woman to deceive her lover until he is used to being caught, and, because women deceive, it is appropriate for men to deceive them in turn. This circularity supports the technical reality of *laquei*: Grattius' lines do not give an indication that he found the trick particularly efficient.⁸² The snare is not particularly useful in the opinion of either author, and the male pupil has been advised to hunt with nets, but to avoid snares at all costs. Snares show the reversal possible between the hunter and the hunted. The concern with being caught is especially strong given that his audience is theoretically composed of adulterers.⁸³ The instructor might claim at various points throughout his work that his advice does not break any laws, but this is generally considered a false conceit.⁸⁴ The women to be hunted, or at least some of the women who could read the *Ars Amatoria*, are legally banned from the affairs taught in the *Ars Amatoria*.⁸⁵ If a lover were to set up snares for the other lovers of his beloved, he would only reveal himself. By using the full range of hunting equipment, the instructor

⁸² Grat. 93-94. It is possible that Ovid used Grattius as one of his sources, but even if not, the opinions are contemporary and support one another. Similarities at *AA* 2.351 and Grat. 286 as well as Ov. *Met.* 1.322-323 and Grat. 103-104 support the possibility that Ovid could have used Grattius as a source for his own poetry. There was a relationship between these two authors, and Ovid had a real interest for obscure technical works that would heighten the incongruous, humorous and anachronistic moments of his poetry, cf. n. 17.

⁸³ Green 1996b in particular focuses on this aspect.

⁸⁴ Cf. Green 1996b and White 2002, despite Ovid's claims of innocence in *Tristia* 2.

⁸⁵ Ovid tries to make the claim at *Tristia* 2.253-312 that women should not be reading anything if men are worried about the effect of literature on their morality.

demonstrates the more dangerous side of love.⁸⁶ Although this scope displays the instructor's honesty, it also removes the comfort he elsewhere tries to offer his audience.

The instructor undercuts himself yet again in his discussion of the love of animals. Although the instructor has established a series of power relations between dominant hunters and subordinate prey to understand the pursuit of love, love can be something rewarding between people and not a pursuit of one against the other. At 2.467-510, the instructor digresses on the origin of the world:

*Prima fuit rerum confusa sine ordine moles,
unaque erat facies sidera, terra, fretum.*⁸⁷

In the course of this description, he focuses on the importance of love and love's role in civilization until Apollo interrupts his song and leads him into a different lesson. The history of the world arises from the lesson on how to appease women. The act of sex is a way to calm women (2.459-460), just as love settled the world. The animals join as equals instead of competitors: *cerva parem sequitur, serpens serpente tenetur* (2.483).⁸⁸ Animal passion arose from Venus naturally, not through art, and humans, too, originally loved without artifice (2.479-480). This version of history shows a different way for men and women relate.

The literary allusions in this passage further challenge the instructor's assumption that hunting is more readily comprehensible than love in modern Rome.⁸⁹ In the *Ars*

⁸⁶ Cf. Ov. *AA* 2.185-196; hunting is no pleasant recreation (contrary to Nemesianus' *Cynegetica*, cf. Epilogue).

⁸⁷ "The first mass of things was confused without order, and the stars were one shape, as was the earth, the sea" Ov. *AA* 2.467-468.

⁸⁸ "The hinds follows her equal, the serpent is held by the serpent" Ov. *AA* 2.483.

⁸⁹ This passage is central in the comparison between the three major Latin didactic works: the *De Rerum Natura*, the *Georgics*, and the *Ars Amatoria*. Watson 1984 and Holzberg 2002 discuss the interaction among the three authors, and it is clear that the instructor takes the perspective that love is not dangerous, but is vital to civilization. He references Lucretius 5.1014-1018 when he says that desire softens humankind: *blanda truces animos fertur mollisse voluptas* ("it is said that soft desire softened hard spirits")

Amatoria origin of the world, love occurs before civilization and, therefore, before hunting, just as in Lucretius. In Lucretius, as humankind develops from its primitive origins to cultured society, human beings separate themselves from the primitive, wild life of animals, but not without a downside. Their culture softens them and makes them create settled relationships and societies, which unfortunately lead to greed and ambition for power.⁹⁰ But humankind also develops more advanced technology as humanity works together, including the development of more complicated methods for hunting. The method of hunting with nets, which is a common feature of the hunting metaphors in the *Ars Amatoria*, is actually the last in a long line of hunting styles in the *De Rerum Natura*.⁹¹ Love precedes hunting, but the natural ease of love has disappeared, if the existence of the *Ars Amatoria* indicates anything.

The super acculturation of Rome has made culture, such as hunting with nets, seem like a more well-known subject than nature, which should be associated with sexual relationships. Nature itself has become a complicated ritual of culture in Ovid, and Lucretius also used the artifice of nets to represent the modern method of love.⁹² On the one hand, the Ovidian instructor presents hunting to understand modern Roman affairs, but on the other hand, he explains the most foundational human activity of love with a sport that only reached its present state after humankind had settled, according to

Ov. *AA* 2.477). The speaker then turns from a Lucretian reference to a Vergilian. Vergil ends his discussion of love among the flocks by focusing in particular on mares: *ante omnis furor est insignis equarum* ("the madness of mares is marked before all" Verg. *G.* 2.266). The instructor follows this example at 2.487: *in furias agitantur equae* ("mares are driven into madness" Ov. *AA* 2.487). The instructor's words, in general, seem to confirm the evolution of the world and the characteristics of animals in love that were seen in his predecessors, although Ovid's instructor has no negative assessment.

⁹⁰ Lucr. 5.925-1457, esp. 5.1014-1018.

⁹¹ Lucr. 5.1250-1251, although Lucretius does support the parallel between hunting with nets and Love (cf. Chapter 1, Part III.D).

⁹² Cf. Chapter 1 on 4.1146-1148, Part III.D.

Lucretius.⁹³ In a twist, he recognizes that to modern Romans, hunting appears as something more basic and more well known than seduction, although it should be the opposite. Ovid undercuts the relation established by the instructor with this allusion: hunting is actually a part of culture, and love is the foundation of culture. Hunting is not historically a prerequisite for love. Lucretius may have also used nets in his description of love, but Lucretius intended to villainize love, or at least the kind disruptive to one's peace of mind.⁹⁴ When the Ovidian instructor of love follows Lucretius' didactic path and history of the world, love cannot but become problematic. The history of love in the *Ars Amatoria* once again demonstrates the speaker's incomplete consideration of his images.

The long mythological digression at the end of Book 3 serves as a fitting conclusion to the problems of hunting raised throughout, as it effectively demonstrates that despite the instructor's best efforts, the skills of hunting are not transferable to love and the goal of didactic poetry is unattainable. Just as men are encouraged by the myth of Mars, Venus, and Vulcan in Book 2 not to pursue their mistress' lovers, women are encouraged by the myth of Cephalus and Procris not to believe rumors about rivals too quickly.⁹⁵ In this myth, Cephalus, an expert hunter, used to pray to Aura to come to him after his hunts, and the innocent plea for a breeze was interpreted as an affair. Procris spied on him to learn the truth, but when she rushed to meet him, he killed her, mistaken for a wild animal. The characterization of Procris is important: it is her behavior from which the addressee is supposed to learn. She is depicted as an average Roman woman,

⁹³ Lucr. 5.1249-1251.

⁹⁴ Lucr. 4.1146-1150.

⁹⁵ *Nec cito credideris: quantum cito credere laedat, / exemplum vobis non leve Procris erit* / "And don't believe quickly: Procris will be a not light example to you of how much harm believing quickly does" Ov. *AA* 3.685-686.

frightened by the idea of a mistress. She pales and fears the worst. Her death is depicted emotionally by the narrator, who interjects *me miserum*, as if he himself were pained to tell the story.⁹⁶ The tragic ending makes the danger of jealousy clear to women.

The myth of Cephalus and Procris brings two issues to a head. First of all, the instructor's attitude towards women as hunters is revealed fully. Since the establishment of men as hunters and women as prey in Book 1, he has never let women be human hunters in metaphors. The *Medicamina Faciei Femineae* gives us a different perspective and allows women to hunt men: *quos venentur amores* (27).⁹⁷ The difference demonstrates both that Ovid himself is not objecting to women as hunters, but different speakers in different works have different perspectives, and that the three books of the *Ars Amatoria* form a unity and have their own internal logic separate from the *Medicamina Faciei Femineae* and the *Remedia Amoris*. The speaker in the *Ars* does call women Amazons and can explore the image of violent, warring women, but the only mortal huntress is the mythical Atalanta, who is not used as a model for women.⁹⁸ Women are allowed to be fisherwomen, but hunting, fishing and fowling, while related, were not equal in the ancient world.⁹⁹ Even the goddess Diana in Book 1 was only said

⁹⁶ "Miserable me!" Ov. *AA* 3.736, cf. n. 10.

⁹⁷ "which loves they hunt" Ov. *Med* 27.

⁹⁸ Cf. his fear of women at Ov. *AA* 3.1-5 and *AA* 3.667-672, and Atalanta at Ov. *AA* 2.185-196, cf. n. 53.

⁹⁹ Ov. *AA* 3.425-426; cf. Introduction Part II: hunting, fishing and fowling are often seen in relation to one another in a series, as they each deal with human domination over one sphere of animal life, but attitudes towards the three activities are very different in terms of the respectability of the activity, with hunting as the most respectable. Cf. Plato *Laws* 822D-824C and Oppian *Cynegetica* 1.47-80. Murgatroyd 1984 furthermore observes that fishing and fowling amatory imagery developed after hunting amatory imagery, which indicates a cultural preference for the latter. The ability to be fisherwomen does not make women true hunters (contrary to Steudel 1992 and Wildberger 1998).

to be a virgin, not a huntress.¹⁰⁰ When Diana is referred to as a huntress in Book 3.144-145, she is to serve as a model not for her hunting style but for her hairstyle.¹⁰¹

Contrary to what the *exemplum* in Book 3 portrays, Procris had been a talented hunter as well: other details of the myth, found in the accounts of Apollonius, Antoninus Liberalis, Hyginus and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, make the warning of infidelity more complicated but just as strong.¹⁰² Procris gave Cephalus the very javelin that killed her after she took time away from him because of his infidelity and deceit: Cephalus had been unfaithful before the event in this *exemplum*. The instructor reminds the reader about this fact at the beginning of Book 3: *Nec Cephalus roseae praeda pudenda deae*.¹⁰³ Longing for the hunter, Aurora abducts Cephalus, but eventually he returns to Procris. Upon his return, however, he tests her for unfaithfulness by taking a disguise and seducing her. When she succumbs to his advances, he reveals himself, and she flees to the woods, feeling hurt and shamed. Eventually she returns, but the damage was done. Procris has reason to believe the rumor of an affair during his hunt. Doubting one another's affections and concern about a rival cause the couple repeated misery. The attentive reader finds her death that much more tragic and would not fail to notice the eclipse of Procris' personality: she does not appear as a huntress, Diana's favorite, who had already forgiven her husband's flaws before. In the *Ars Amatoria* version, Cephalus is entirely innocent, and Procris' reaction, while understandable, lacks a more sympathetic context. The instructor, after all, does not want the reader to be too

¹⁰⁰ Ov. *AA* 1.259-262, cf. n. 52.

¹⁰¹ *Huic decet inflatos laxe iacuisse capillos*, "It is fitting that this one's flowing hair lie loosely" Ov. *AA* 3.145.

¹⁰² Apollonius 1.9.4, 2.4.7.2, 3.15.1.2; Antoninus Liberalis 41, Hyginus 199, Ov. *Met.* 7.661-865.

¹⁰³ "nor is Cephalus a shameful prize for the rosy goddess" Ov. *AA* 3.84. "Questa particolarità del mito non ricompare nell'episodio di Cefalo e Procri di III 687-746," for obvious didactic reasons (Cristante 2007: 360).

understanding of Procris' situation: his argument is that women should not react in the way she does. Procris is not even allowed to hunt. Hunting is worthless for women, especially in the way that the instructor portrays women. Nevertheless, the instructor continues to use hunting metaphors. The more he tries to use hunting, the less it seems to work.

The stark removal of agency from women is clarified further by a possible source for this episode, namely the fragmentary *Cynegetica* of Sostratus Phanagorita. Sostratus' *Cynegetica* is the only hunting poem known before Grattius, and we cannot know the extent of the influence it had on Ovid, but the one fragment that remains may hold a possible connection between the works. In Stobaeus, it is recorded:

Σωστράτου ἐν β' Κυνηγετικῶν· Κυάνιππος τῷ γένει Θεσσαλὸς γήμας
Λευκῶνην τὰ πολλὰ διὰ φιλοκύνηγον ἐνέργειαν ἐν ὕλαις διέτριβεν. ἡ δὲ
νεόνυμφος ὑπολαμβάνουσα συνήθειαν αὐτὸν ἔχειν μεθ' ἑτέρας γυναικὸς
κατ' ἔχνος ἠκολούθησε τῷ προειρημένῳ καὶ ἐν τινι κατακρυβεῖσα
συνδένδρῳ τὸ μέλλον ἀπεκαραδόκει. τῶν δὲ πέριξ κλάδων αἰφνιδίως
σεισθέντων, οἱ στιβευταὶ κύνες δόξαντες καὶ αὐτὴν ἀλόγου ζώου
δίκην διεσπάραξαν. τῆς δὲ πράξεως αὐτόπτης γενόμενος Κυάνιππος
ἑαυτὸν ἐπικατέσφαξεν.¹⁰⁴

The story of Kuanippos and Leukone is clearly a double for the story of Cephalus and Procris, but as opposed to Procris, Leukone seems to have no concept of what it means to hunt.¹⁰⁵ The traditional Procris was fully aware of what happens in the hunt. Kuanippos is also innocent in this version, and his dogs kill Leukone of their own volition. Despite

¹⁰⁴ "In the second book of the *Cynegetica* of Sostratus: Kuanippos, Thessalian by birth, after he married Leukone, spent much of his time in the woods because of his loved hunting activity. And the new bride, suspecting that he had an affair with another woman, followed him, going ahead along the path. Hiding in some wooded area, she awaited what was going to happen. When the branches were shaken around suddenly, the dogs tracked her...seeming [...] and they tore her apart in the manner of a dumb beast. Becoming a witness to this deed, Kuanippos killed himself" Stob. IV 20 B. 70.

¹⁰⁵ However, Leukone does manage to follow his tracks (κατ' ἔχνος ἠκολούθησε), so perhaps she was not unfamiliar with how to hunt. This excerpt does not answer the question either way, and like the version of Cephalus and Procris in the *Ars Amatoria*, perhaps the story of Kuanippos and Leukone in Sostratus—or rather Stobaeus' summary—lacks important details. Unfortunately, arguments comparing these two stories are limited by what has survived from the mythological tradition.

not having a hand in the murder, he kills himself for being a witness. Kuanippos is more sympathetic and innocent than Cephalus, and Leukone is more ignorant than Procris. Stobaeus uses this passage in his discussion of love and the madness that it causes. If this context relates at all to the context in Sostratus, Ovid found a perfect allusion to undercut his teacher persona: instead of a warning about love and hunting, the instructor uses a hunting myth to warn about jealousy in love.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, it cannot be said conclusively whether Sosianus was known to Ovid, but the potential for the allusion is worth noting.

Women are not well served by Book 3, but the image of hunting is also problematic for men. Throughout the first book, hunters were established as models for lovers. They know where to put nets and proper hunting technique. In the end, however, the skills of an actual hunter, Cephalus, do not transfer into the world of love. Cephalus is presented as a hunter here, but whereas hunting and capturing the beloved was previously seen as appropriate, here the literal hunting of a beloved kills her. The instructor tries to remind Cephalus that Procris is a woman, not a wild animal, but too late.¹⁰⁷ Using hunting metaphors to raise the didactic credibility was logical on the level of genre, but the situation at the end of the poem cannot be seen as successful for the male hunter-lover. It rather seems to indicate how out of place the conceit of hunting is. As mentioned earlier, hunting for love is a common image, but hunting is also at times opposed to erotic pursuits or associated with failure in love. Love as a hunt in the *Ars*

¹⁰⁶ The context in Sostratus is unknown. It is difficult to say whether such a digression would be considered appropriate or inappropriate to a *cynegetica*, as most information presented focuses on the animals, but Xenophon allows time to discuss the benefits of hunting for a man (*Cyn.* 12-13), so it is not impossible that a didactic hunting work may discuss other gains or losses from the pursuit.

¹⁰⁷ *Non est fera*, "she is not a wild animal" Ov. *AA* 3.735.

Amatoria is ultimately suspect because of misapplied imagery no matter how precisely the teacher displays his hunting knowledge.

III. Conclusion

By undercutting the teacher's expertise, Ovid also problematizes the use of imagery and the possibility of successful education in poetry. The use of imagery, moreover, correlates directly with the conception of knowledge. What is captured in the hunting metaphors in the *Ars Amatoria* is not concrete knowledge or unitary truth, but something that can change depending upon the perspective. Is this a woman or an animal? The narrator's education does not make this clear. Ovid does not offer any answer other than to warn the reader to read and think about texts critically. A poet's words are not necessarily honest, whether or not they are divine (3.547-548):

*Vatibus Aoniis faciles estote, puellae!
Numen inest illis Pieridesque favent.*¹⁰⁸

A reader seduced by the text will accept the words of the author without determining for himself what this image or poem means, and the knowledge gained will be superficial. Knowledge is not taught; it is interpreted. Poets like Lucretius use hunting to represent the quest for truth, some poets like Ibycus to represent the quest for love, and some like Horace in *Odes* 1.1 the rejection of love. An author's genre can help guide the interpretation of the image, but Ovid does not allow his reader to rely on tradition and instead blurs genres to increase the number of possible interpretations of each image.

Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* encourages a smart readership by its abundant and contradictory hunting imagery. Hunting is one of the texts' unifying features: despite

¹⁰⁸ "Be obedient to Aonian bards, girls! There is divine power in them, and the Pierian ones favor them" Ov. *AA* 3.547-548. Hesiod's Muses (*Th.* 26-28) make explicit that they are capable of both truths and lies, so Ovid's statement might be a warning as well.

belonging to the male sphere, hunting similes also appear in the book addressed to women. The content of the similes, however, where women are never given active roles as hunters, indicates an essential difference between the sexes. Hunting imagery therefore touches upon Ovid's interest in gender and politics, but Ovid's work exposes problems instead of solving them; furthermore, I view the failure of the text's romantic instruction foremost as commentary on the nature of knowledge. In other words, the didactic persona uses imagery uncritically and estranges part of his readership, but that is only a sign of the deeper instability of the text's instruction. The instructor shows the tension between hunting and love at the same time as he also emphatically seems to equate hunting with love. His instructions fail, but Ovid succeeds in opening a discussion about imagery.¹⁰⁹ Ovid is using conventional didactic imagery to point out its fluidity, especially when it is combined with another genre. Didactic poets need to establish authority more than other poets to teach their readers, but they are not infallible. The author may use many metaphors to express some scientific proof, but the reader cannot blindly accept them. A pupil must not be seduced by a text, even when it is about love.

This analysis of Ovid's work fits in the larger trend of Latin didactic poetry's use of hunting imagery for self-reflection on the attainability of knowledge. Lucretius fashions his readers as dogs successfully hunting philosophy. Vergil problematizes the idea of such concrete knowledge, and instead presents an uncertainty about hunting as a fitting description of the human relationship to knowledge: humans may be able to see tracks, but they may not be able to have a successful hunt. Ovid takes Vergil's

¹⁰⁹ Blodgett 1973 provides several scenes complementary to my focus on hunting, such as Icarus and Daedalus (*AA* 2.21-98), to demonstrate that art and imagery are elusive but also the only things that can give form to life. While there might be safety in thoughtlessly living in the illusion, is it really possible to ignore reality? If we can be critical of the world and the so-called truths presented to us, we can learn to be in control, such as the man who learned to create false tracks to get what he wanted (cf. n. 36).

uncertainty further: Aristaeus had to contend with Proteus in the *Georgics*, but in the *Ars Amatoria*, all men are Proteus who change their appearance to suit the situation.¹¹⁰ There is no greater understanding possible about the world. Ovid in the *Ars Amatoria* demonstrates that the reader needs to be prepared to deconstruct poetry and instruction itself, as nothing can simply be hunted—not women, not love, and certainly not knowledge. Any statement on absolute truth is too problematic for a truly intelligent reader. Ovid creates instead an open discussion on knowledge and imagery.

¹¹⁰ Cf. n. 37.

Chapter 4: Grattius' *Cynegetica* and the Appeal to Experience

I. Introduction

The speaker of Grattius' *Cynegetica*, an Augustan hunting poem, offers instructions tied closely to moral lessons such as moderation and piety. These cultural values give Grattius' text a sense of sincere instruction and religious fervor. However, the work is not only instructional, but it also has an implicit continual interest in the role of poets in the acquisition of true understanding from the gods. The poet has a strong connection to the divine, and as he shares his hunting tips, he also prepares the audience to learn cultural lessons. Hunting in Grattius is foundational to culture, and hunting serves as a positive parallel to education in general because the two processes work hand-in-hand. The praise of hunting and the positive view of acquisition of knowledge develop in two ways. First, the lessons of the *Cynegetica* come straight from the gods, so the speaker creates a hierarchy of knowledge that is transparent. Second, hunting preparation is parallel to cultural indoctrination, so as the reader prepares for the hunt, the Roman way of life is reinforced. The concrete benefits offered by the text demonstrate a positive view of knowledge and understanding.

Grattius' *Cynegetica* has had scholarly attention paid to its relationships to other Latin didactic texts and its themes; in this chapter, I will argue that Grattius' work on hunting responds to Lucretius' and Vergil's views of knowledge and to their use of hunting to express these views.¹ Like Lucretius, Grattius has an optimistic view on the possibility of obtaining certain knowledge through human experience, but unlike his Epicurean predecessor, Grattius reinstates the gods into the universe as an active force

¹ I have chosen not to focus on Grattius' possible allusions to Ovid for reasons discussed in Chapter 3. In brief, the chronology is too uncertain to determine the nature of the relationship between Grattius and Ovid.

from which human knowledge derives.² Vergil and Grattius both figure humans as hunters, but unlike Vergil's, Grattius' hunter gains complete access to the natural world and knowledge without a boundary.

Information about Grattius' life is scarce and debatable. The one testimony that is discussed ubiquitously is Ovid's mention of Grattius in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.16.34: *aptaque uenanti Grattius arma daret*.³ Ovid, complaining about his metaphorical death in exile, remembers when he was alive and which other poets were active in those days. Being alive is equated with being in Rome, and so the poets mentioned must have been active and known in Rome around 8 CE. This testimony establishes Grattius as an Augustan poet and, although he might not be the most frequently read or recognized author, he was known to at least some portion of the educated public. Due to Grattius' obscurity, in this chapter I will start with discussion of general scholarship. After a brief review of the text itself and the scholarly tradition on Grattius, I will then turn to the main argument of the chapter.

The surviving *Cynegetica* is 541 lines from a text of indeterminable length not well preserved in the manuscript tradition. Book 1 is more than likely near its end, as Enk notes that the work is almost complete because of the phrasing *restat equos finire notis* (497).⁴ Volk notes that *restat* does mark the end of Book 6 of Lucretius.⁵ I would hypothesize the previous existence of at least one more book of comparable length.⁶ Enk

² Cf. Chapter 1, and in particular DeWitt 1943 and Asmis 2009 on the role of perception in Epicureanism: it is a philosophy that relies on sense observation and analogy to sense observation for things unseen.

³ "And Grattius gave arms suitable for the one hunting" Ov. *Pont.* 4.16.34. The passage is quoted on the first page of Enk 1918, Duff 1935, Baligan 1968, De Vivo 1992, and others.

⁴ Enk 1918: 2.136. "It remains to conclude with the horses in our writing" Grat. 497.

⁵ Volk 2000: 75-76.

⁶ The full *cynegetica* which remain from Xenophon (thirteen chapters) and Oppian (four books) indicate that other subjects to be discussed might have included a description of the hunt itself and a discussion of the types of prey (cf. Xen. *Cyn.*, especially chapters 5-6, 8-11, and Op. *Cyn.*, especially Books 2-4). Of

divides the text into twenty-two sections, which I will use in my summary.⁷ The proem (1-23, 61-73) contains the standard appeal to the gods and claims for authority.⁸ The instructor interrupts the proem with a discussion of nets, their uses, and what they are made of (24-60). After the proem, he discusses other hunting equipment including the scare (74-88) and foot-snares (89-94). He interrupts a discussion of spears and their component materials (108-149) to praise the mythical hunting founder Dercylon (95-107) who first fashioned spears. Dogs are discussed from lines 150-496, and the discussion includes praise for the breeder of dogs known as *metagontes*, Hagnon (213-219, 249-252). There is also a digression against luxury (310-325), a discussion of the puppies' trainer (328-336), and a description of the hunter's clothing (337-344). The fragment of this first book ends with a discussion of horses (497-535) before turning to what promises to become a discussion of the hunt itself (536-541).

When scholars worked on the text in the 19th and 20th centuries, debate ensued about Grattius and his influences, with Bücheler questioning what his name was and Curcio and Herter investigating Grattius' sources.⁹ Aymard made an early connection between Grattius and his contemporaries. In "A propos de Grattius," he focuses upon Grattius and Horace and explores the connection between hunting and Augustan moral

course, we can only interpret what survives, but it is necessary to note that the survival of certain parts is an accident of fate. Henderson 2001: 3 makes a point of the hunting poem's lack of hunting. The manuscript tradition is presented in Enk 1918: 1.33-35. In brief, the oldest known manuscript is A from the 8th-9th century (*cod. Vindob. lat. 277*), but this disappeared only to reappear seven centuries later when used by Sannazarius. There is also a manuscript B, which is from the 9th-10th century (*cod. Thuaneus*, or *Paris. Lat. 8071*). Sannazarius made two copies of A during the sixteenth century (*cod. Vindob. lat. 277* and *3261*), although his copies include emendations and are more in the family of our modern editions. There is also a manuscript *mu* (*codex Ambrosianus S 81*). Sannazarius' manuscripts became the basis for modern editions, and his emendations and notes are invaluable for clarifying many obscure words and difficult passages.

⁷ Enk 1918: 1.25.

⁸ Ever since the invocation of the Muses in the *Iliad*, it has been common to appeal to divinities for inspiration. In the didactic tradition specifically, Grattius follows the pattern of Hesiod and the Muses (cf. n.33 below) but also Lucretius and Venus as well as Vergil and the agricultural gods.

⁹ Bücheler 1880, Curcio 1898, and Herter 1929, contrary to early modern audiences who used it as a technical treatise (Wase 1654).

reforms as seen in Grattius' passage against luxury.¹⁰ Müller examines the relation between hunting and warfare in Grattius, a topic further explored by later authors.¹¹ Among these critics, Grattius' poetry is considered "forgettable," in Pierleoni's words, but his many allusions to Vergil did draw attention.¹² As Enk argues, however, the relationship to Vergil is not as straightforward as many scholars believe. It is commonplace to say that Grattius relied upon the *Georgics*, especially Book 3, and that Grattius must have written the *Cynegetica* after the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, but when the Latin is examined, the relationship is not simple reliance in the sense that Grattius does not merely mimic Vergil and take entire lines, but is highly polemical and tends to edit word choice.¹³ The influence of the older Latin poet is clear, but Grattius seems to intentionally stray from Vergil's exact words rather than repeat phrases from the *Georgics*.¹⁴

While Grattius' reliance on Vergil is sometimes overstated, as the *Cynegetica* is more than just a repetition of *Georgics* Book 3, his influence on later Latin literature is understated and overlooked. Scholars have found several references to Grattius in Manilius, and it is generally recognized now that Nemesianus, writing three centuries later, had indeed read Grattius.¹⁵ I will discuss Nemesianus' sources later, but for now let

¹⁰ Aymard 1938; Grat. 308-327.

¹¹ Müller 1908, Green 1996b.

¹² Pierleoni 1906: 597; cf. Enk 1918: 1.10-20 for a list of Vergilian allusions.

¹³ Enk 1918: 1.19, "Nam fere semper et ubique, ubi Grattius easdem res tractat, alia eligit verba atque exemplum eius", "For nearly always and everywhere where Grattius covers the same matters, he chooses others words and his example".

¹⁴ Pace Henderson 2001: 14: the "*Cynegetica* may fairly be said to recapitulate, not just the entire domain of the *Georgics* in general, but specifically the ensemble of the third book, whose content-list he follows, in a sense, even more faithfully than does his master, its author."

¹⁵ For Manilius, cf. Enk 1918: 2.4, Paschalis 2000: 215-218, and Luiselli 1958 for Nemesianus.

it suffice to say that Grattius was not immediately forgotten after he wrote his *Cynegetica*, and Ovid at least gave him his due.¹⁶

After the general interpretive articles by Aymard and Müller appeared, most scholarly attention was focused on minute details. Textual problems did not help the early attempts at *Quellenforschung*, and emendations have been a major part of Grattian scholarship.¹⁷ Arguments often hinge upon matters of punctuation and emendations of single words, and analysis of Grattius' diction and source material has led to an argument that Grattius was not a real person and that the *Cynegetica* is actually a work of Ovid.¹⁸ Orlandi has argued that Grattius' word choice indicates that the author is actually post-Augustan and that we should disregard what is normally considered the one ancient testimony of Grattius in Ovid's *Epistulae Ex Ponto*. Orlandi bases his argument on the similarities between Grattius' vocabulary and the vocabulary of post-Augustan writers.¹⁹ However, as noted above, several scholars have also found references to Grattius in Manilius; these allusions combined with Ovid's comment leads me to date the *Cynegetica* to somewhere between 30 BCE and 8 CE.²⁰

Very recently, scholarly attention has returned to broader issues of interpretation and Grattius' cultural role in the Augustan world as a voice of religious and moral conservatism. A very influential work is Henderson's "Going to the dogs / Grattius (&) the Augustan subject." It examines Grattius' relationship with his Latin predecessors

¹⁶ Cf. Epilogue for Nemesianus' sources.

¹⁷ Notably in the works of Kenney 1965, Shackleton Bailey 1978, Formicola 1985, Verdière 1987a and Verdière 1987b.

¹⁸ Baligan 1968.

¹⁹ Orlandi 1976.

²⁰ This is a significantly wide date-range still, and it leaves the question open about the exact relationship between Grattius and other authors, especially Ovid, cf. Chapter 3, n.82. Enk 1918: 1.30 originally suggested 30 BC – 8 AD. While I would prefer to date the work earlier rather than later, there is no evidence beyond what has been provided.

Lucretius and Vergil and notes the frequent allusions between the texts for political purposes: “The ultimate subject here, then, is the production of the Augustan subject”.²¹ However, the article has a limited focus, and many of the connections that Henderson mentions need to be expanded for a better appreciation of Grattius, particularly in regard to his views on knowledge. The religious and political contexts mentioned in Henderson’s article are supported by the argument in Green’s “The Slayer and the King: *Rex Nemorensis* and the Sanctuary of Diana.” She argues that the grove mentioned by Grattius at line 484 is the grove of the King of the Woods, and if one accepts the reference, the question of its relationship to Augustus and to Vergil’s *Aeneid* 6 becomes significant.²²

Modern scholarship on Grattius has come to a consensus about the close allusions between Lucretius and Grattius, particularly regarding Epicurus and Dercylon as founders, and recognizes Grattius’ Stoic leanings.²³ Given the lack of evidence about Grattius’ life, it can be difficult if not impossible to provide details about his moral perspective in terms of a specific philosophical school. A Stoic viewpoint, however, may be seen in the twin emphasis upon reason (*ratio*/Dercylon) and religion (Hagnon), and it may even be implied in his use of *exempla*.²⁴ Zeno gives the four cardinal virtues of Stoicism (courage, justice, moderation, and self-control or wisdom), which we will see fit the speaker’s emphasis on moderation and piety.²⁵ Many textual connections between

²¹ Henderson 2001: 5.

²² Green 2000.

²³ Essential reading on this subject, in addition to Henderson 2001, is Paschalis 2000 and Gavaille 2007. For more on his Stoic leanings, cf. Enk 1918: 2.4-5, Verdière 1963: 61, Vessey 1973: 151, and De Vivo 1992: 757.

²⁴ Turpin 2008 discusses the background for Stoic use of *exempla*. Cf. Cicero *DND* 2.7 on *ratio* and 2.23-28 particularly for a Stoic view of supporting traditional religion through allegory.

²⁵ Zeno frag. 134 (Pearson 1891).

didactic poems interpreted in this chapter have been noted by other scholars; however, I want to discuss the text's attitude towards knowledge rather than Augustan politics.

Grattius is beginning to become better recognized as a poet of the Augustan age involved in his literary tradition.²⁶ It is my goal in this chapter to integrate him further into the corpus of Augustan poetry and the didactic tradition. On its own, the *Cynegetica* has an educational model that is derived from the gods, and knowledge is spread top-down through a hierarchy in which the poet is essential. I will first discuss Grattius' view of knowledge as divine and transmittable (Part II), as seen in the proem (A) and hunting's foundational figures (B). Then I will discuss the role of the audience in the preparation (Part III), who on the one hand are fashioned parallel to dogs (A), but on the other hand are also training dogs and can have direct access to divine knowledge (B). The preparations and lessons in hunting overall complement human understanding at large. While the *Cynegetica* may lack a hunt, the rearing of dogs and preparation demonstrate what education can do. Ultimately, the culture taught by Grattius indicates his belief in attainable knowledge.

II. The Dissemination of Knowledge

A successful education implies the transfer of knowledge from at least one party to another. In previous chapters we have seen different dynamics between the instructor and the audience, and Grattius' *Cynegetica* uses hunting figures to describe ways that knowledge is spread. In the proem (Part A), the speaker is given divine direction to write in verse and demonstrates its effectiveness. In Part B, I will then look to other educators in the text to see how they serve to model and highlight the characteristics of an instructor. Gavaille outlines a three-tier system of gods, then heroes like Hercules, and

²⁶ Although he is not necessarily a better poet, qualitatively, cf. Slater 2007.

then legendary figures like Dercylon and Hagnon, and this system demonstrates levels of mastery.²⁷ I interpret Hercules, Dercylon and Hagnon to all be on the same level as instructors right beneath the gods, and I will be focusing in particular on the educational ramifications of this system instead of general generic, political or philosophical themes.

A. Proem

The proem provides a space for the author to discuss the parameters of a work, and Gavaille has discussed the important role of the proem in didactic works, particularly Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and Grattius' *Cynegetica*.²⁸ The thematic and mythological passages of the *Cynegetica* (1-23, 61-74) are interrupted by a discussion of nets (24-60). By line 23, the instructor has introduced his text and accepted his mission: *iussus [...]* *arma dabo et venandi persequar artis*.²⁹ The proem culminates with this line, and the reader expects instruction: the creation of nets, in this case. The description of nets and the challenges of their upkeep (24-60) are followed by a digression on mythological hunters (61-74). One could argue that the justification by this mythological digression of his work belongs more appropriately to the proem, and many editors including Enk and Formicola transpose lines 61-74 to after line 23, following the example of Vollmer.³⁰ I would argue, however, that the original line arrangement is important for the tone of the work, namely that the poem is a project that establishes a hierarchy of gods, poet and audience.³¹ The proem focuses on hunting's divine origins and Diana's orders to her

²⁷ Gavaille 2007.

²⁸ Gavaille 2007.

²⁹ "Having been ordered, I will give the weapons and I will pursue the arts of hunting" Grat. 23.

³⁰ Enk 1918: 2.11-12, Formicola 1988a.

³¹ De Vivo 1992 also argues that Grattius' structure is related to his motive, although he focuses in particular on the connections between Hercules, Aeneas and Augustus. On the placement of lines 61-74 in particular, also see Schubert 2004, who discusses several different arrangements of the lines but ultimately approves the original order. There are, of course, no strict rules for the organization of poetic texts, and digressions from the main narrative are not an uncommon feature. This is not, however, to say that

poet: *auspicio, Diana, tuo* (2) and *his [comitibus] ego praesidibus* (21).³² Diana and her companions are to Grattius as the Muses are to Hesiod.³³ Once the poet's authority has been established in the proem, the poet begins his instruction.³⁴ After this first lesson, he advertises its effectiveness through the examples of those who could have benefited from it—giants, Venus, Adonis, and Ancaeus—if only the instructor had written early enough for Adonis and others to have learned from it.³⁵ The appeal to the gods and mythology creates a sense of privilege and perhaps arrogance about his own work: he even boasts that his work would have saved mythological figures so much trouble:

*nonne vides [...] quam magna mercede meo sine munere silvas
impulerint* (62-68)?³⁶

The sentiment can be seen as playful, but there may be some serious poetic ramifications. The text moves from the divine orders to the poet's instructions and finally to the potential readers, just as knowledge itself should be disseminated from gods to the human populace, with the poet as a mediator.

The arrangement of the lines sets the tone for the emphasis on gods and the speaker's poetic heritage. The progression from divinity (Diana) to the teachings (on

organization means nothing. On the contrary, organization is an important consideration for poets, e.g. articles on the order of the books of the *De Rerum Natura* and *Georgics* (Drew 1929, Bright 1971, Leach, 1981, Jope 1989, Stover 1999, and Fowler 2000). As one example of the relationship between organization and meaning, in a sort of literary one-upmanship, consider how Grattius states his poetry's priority in the discussion of dogs. Vergil reminds his reader that the care of dogs is important to the farmer: *nec tibi cura canum fuerit postrema*. ("Nor let your care for dogs be last," Verg. *G.* 3.404). Grattius takes this recommendation to heart when he ceases his discussion of trees in favor of dogs: *sed cur exiguis tantos in partibus orbes / lustramus? prima illa canum, non ulla per artis / cura prior* ("But why do we wander over such great circles in small parts? That first care is of dogs, and not any is before throughout our arts..." Grat. 150-152). Trees, incidentally, were the subject matter of Book 2 of the *Georgics*, which preceded Book 3's interest in livestock and dogs. Grattius turns the litotes "not least" in Vergil into the extremely positive "first" and "not any before." The priority that Vergil suggests is insisted upon in Grattius.

³² "Under your auspice, Diana," Grat. 2, and "I with these [companions] as guards," Grat. 21. Cf. Grat. 13-23 for a full description of Diana and her followers.

³³ Hes. *Th.* 22-35.

³⁴ The instruction is the creation of nets, Grat. 24-60.

³⁵ Grat. 62-72. Note how Hercules is also in this mythological list, but he managed to earn hunting honor even without Grattius' text.

³⁶ "Do you not see how they pushed forth into the woods at a great cost without my gift?" Grat. 62-66.

nets) to examples of who could benefit (the mythological hunters) indicates the overall structure of the *Cynegetica*'s worldview: Olympus and the gods govern the world, he, as the poet, comes next, and then the rest of humanity learns from him. This idea is later reflected in the ultimate appeal to Olympus for veterinary help (480-482). The structure has a firm literary heritage, as the poet/*vates* frequently serves as an intermediary between the gods and the earth.³⁷ The speaker in the proem seems to place real belief in the action of the gods, and mentions of gods are more frequent in the digressions than the instructional text on nets: 7 references in lines 1-23, 0 in lines 24-60, and 3 in lines 61-74. There is particular emphasis at 22-23 on the poetic nature of this education, both from the gods and from the speaker:

...non sine carmine iussus
carmine et arma dabo...³⁸

The interpretation of the nets passage may also relate to his view of his own work towards his predecessors: he is taking part in a tradition and superceding their work as his poem is essentially the most important work on the subject. This observation supports Henderson's reading of the nets in lines 24-60: the poem requires the weaving together of many different sources into something effective.³⁹ The rustic work in the *Georgics*, for example, is but a precursor to the greater work in the *Cynegetica*.⁴⁰ When the Vergilian speaker is discussing the process of grafting, the new tree is said to bear fruit in short time: *exiit ad caelum ramis felicibus arbos*.⁴¹ These fertile branches are necessary for the

³⁷ E.g. Hes. *Th.* 22-35. The word *vates* (*OLD* s.v. § "vates") famously means both seer and poet, speaking to the semi-divine figure of the poet.

³⁸ "Having been ordered not without song, even with song I will give arms" Grat. 22-23.

³⁹ Henderson 2001: 7-8.

⁴⁰ Grattius considers his work a *magnum opus* (61), and the active presence of the divine in the human world is seen throughout, especially in the help of Vulcan during the plague (430-466), cf. Part III.B.

⁴¹ "The tree goes out towards heaven with fertile branches" Verg. *G.* 2.81. This line alone, and the trees in general in the *Georgics*, can be read metapoetically (Henkel 2012).

sacrifice to Vulcan in Grattius: *struitur ramis felicibus ara*.⁴² The trees of Vergil are used to perform the important rituals in Grattius. The *Georgics* metapoetically come to fruition in the *Cynegetica*. In Vergil, grafting is already marked as poetically referencing the combination of two source texts. The speaker in the *Cynegetica* cleverly uses this marked passage and metapoetic nets to alert the reader to his use of other sources. He has command of poetry and is well-chosen for Diana's work of spreading knowledge. Specifically, he supports a tradition that embraces the active role of the gods and traditional Roman culture, both of which contribute to a successful attainment of knowledge.

B. Foundational Figures

The theme found in the proem, that Grattius is placed between gods and his audience, is seen again when Grattius discusses the two foundational figures of hunting: Dercylon and Hagnon.⁴³ These foundational figures reflect Grattius' role and support his claim for privileged divine knowledge that comes through hunting. Despite Grattius' emphasis on *exempla* elsewhere, the two foundational figures appear to be his own invention.⁴⁴ Formicola has entertained the idea that Dercylon was a historical figure, but no other record survives about Dercylon.⁴⁵ Other hunting founders are named in other texts: Xenophon appeals to more well-known figures such as Achilles, Cheiron, and even Aeneas, who would have been fitting for a Roman poet.⁴⁶ It has been noted that the name "Dercylon" appears to be Greek, meaning "clear gaze".⁴⁷ Formicola is unsure where the

⁴² "The altar is arranged with favorable branches" Grat. 442. Formicola 1988a: 86 notes the allusion.

⁴³ Dercylon at Grat. 95-113, Hagnon at Grat. 207-222, 249-252.

⁴⁴ On Grattius' preference for *exempla* and experience, cf. Grat. 116, 307-327, and 427-429.

⁴⁵ Formicola 1988a: 139.

⁴⁶ Xen. *Cyn.* 1.

⁴⁷ Paschalis 2000: 210, n. 23.

name “Hagnon” originated, but Kronenberg has suggested its relation to the Greek for “holy,” and so Dercylon and Hagnon may serve as reminders of Stoic virtues of *ratio* and *religio* respectively.⁴⁸ Enk and Formicola note that Hagnon’s patronymic *Astylides* may mean son of Astylos, a centaur mentioned in Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* 12.308 who argued against the vain fight of the Lapiths and the Centaurs.⁴⁹ However, this connection provides no details about his son, if he had one. The obscure figures serve as a useful blank slate for Grattius’ larger themes and as precedents for him as a divinely inspired hunting instructor. They demonstrate what values Grattius assumes for his instructor and give priority to hunting. Teachers are hunters, and the audience can derive much benefit from their instruction.

After the discussion of snares and scares, Grattius has a digression about Dercylon, the founder of hunting himself (100-103):

*Arcadium stat fama senem, quem Maenalus auctor
et Lacedaemoniae primum vidistis Amyclae
per non adsuetas metantem retia valles
Dercylon... .*⁵⁰

Diana showed Dercylon his mission (105-107):

*ergo illum primis nemorum dea finxit in arvis
auctoremque operi dignata inscribere magno
iussit adire suas et pandere gentibus artes.*⁵¹

The clearest English translation does not capture the very literary root of several of these words: Diana deemed this unknown person worthy and literally wrote him in (*inscribere*)

⁴⁸ Formicola 1988a: 154 and Kronenberg in person on ἄγνός, “pure, chaste, holy.”

⁴⁹ Enk 1918: 2.72-73 and Formicola 1988a: 154.

⁵⁰ “The story claims [that the founder of the arts was] Dercylon, the old man of Arcadia, whom first you, Maenalian originator, and you, Spartan Amyclae, saw measuring out nets through unaccustomed valleys” Grat. 100-103.

⁵¹ “Therefore the goddess of the groves groomed that one in the first fields, and, deeming it worthy to recruit him as the author for the great work, she ordered him to approach her arts and reveal them to the people” Grat. 105-107.

as the author (*auctorem*) for her great work (*operi magno*). Diana is an author, Dercylon is an author, and there is a conflation between hunting, poetry and teaching.

Dercylon was chosen because of his piety and his innovative hunting knowledge. He is called the most religious man: *hau fuit in terris divom observantior alter* (104).⁵² Dercylon is also afforded a great degree of priority. Dercylon is using nets when he is discovered (*metantem retia*, 102), and perhaps others knew how to use them, but he is called first here (*primum*, 102) and explores unknown areas (*non adsuetas...valles*, 102).⁵³ Twice the word first (*primus*) is used to describe Dercylon.⁵⁴ *Primis...arvis* (105) also demonstrates Dercylon's priority.⁵⁵ He also adds to our knowledge by refashioning spears (108-109):

*ille etiam valido primus venabula dente
induit.*⁵⁶

The discussion of spears shows the progression of hunting knowledge, but his discoveries would be useless if Diana did not tell him to share them. Dercylon is foremost an educator for others and a part of the hunting traditions.

The words that enlist Dercylon into Diana's service are related to writing in general and to the writing of the *Cynegetica* specifically. The instructor's role is related to Dercylon as an educator and Diana's chosen: Dercylon "prefigure[s] our unheeded guru Grattius".⁵⁷ A relatively unknown author is writing about hunting, which is a great

⁵² "Not at all was another more observant of the gods on earth" Grat 104.

⁵³ Grat. 102. To take a literary path formerly unknown is a Callimachean trope as well. cf. Call. *Aetia* fr. 1.25-28, Lucr. 1.922-928, and Epilogue on Nemesianus' use of metapoetic hunting ground.

⁵⁴ Grat. 101, 108.

⁵⁵ "In the first fields" Grat. 105.

⁵⁶ "That one, in fact, first put a strong tooth on spears" Grat. 108-109. Bergmann 2012 has argued that these spears in particular are part of the iconography for the Italian Diana (as opposed to the Greek Artemis), which would indicate another close bond between Dercylon and Grattius' Italian *Cynegetica*.

⁵⁷ Henderson 2001: 8.

work: *magnum opus et tangi, nisi cura vincitur, inpar* (61).⁵⁸ He was ordered to undertake this work, presumably by Diana and the other hunting deities, after Diana deemed it worthy to give her help (13-15, 21-23):

*tu trepidam bello vitam, Diana, ferino
qua primam quaerebat opem, dignata repertis
protegere auxiliis orbemque hac solvere noxa. [...]
his ego praesidibus nostram defendere sortem
contra mille feras et non sine carmine iussus
carmine et arma dabo et venandi persequar artis.*⁵⁹

The verbal parallels create a connection between the instructor and Dercylon as both the chosen stewards of Diana who spread forth her message.⁶⁰ The message is particularly appropriate to poetic instruction (*carmine*). The project's self-defense combines the importance of poetry, piety and hunting for the safety of humankind.

In addition to Dercylon, the speaker praises Hagnon in the history of hunting.⁶¹ Like Dercylon, Hagnon seems to be a creation of Grattius. The praise for the perfect breed of dog, the *metagon*, which both Sparta and Crete wish to claim for its own (211-212), turns to praise for Hagnon, who first used them in the hunt. Hagnon is given an impressive introduction, with his name repeated three times within as many lines, as well as his homeland, his parentage, and his immortality promised through the instructor's praise (214-216):

*te silvis egit Boeotius Hagnon,
Hagnon Astylides, Hagnon, quem plurima semper
gratia per nostros unum testabitur usus.*⁶²

⁵⁸ "It is a great work and incapable of being attempted, unless anxiety is conquered" Grat. 61.

⁵⁹ "Deeming it worthy to protect the life trembling from savage war with the discovered help, and to loosen the world from this pain, you, Diana, you found where it sought the first help. [...] With these guards, I, having been ordered to defend our fate against a million beasts and not without song, even with song I will give the weapons and I will pursue the arts of hunting" Grat. 13-23.

⁶⁰ *pandere gentibus artes*, "To reveal the arts to the peoples" Grat. 107.

⁶¹ Grat. 207-222, 249-252.

⁶² "You [*metagontes*] Boeotian Hagnon drove through the woods, Hagnon son of Astylis, Hagnon, whom alone through our experiences very much gratitude will always bear witness" Grat. 214-216.

The choice of *gratia* could also be a pun on Grattius' name: *gratia* (praise/Grattius) will bear witness.⁶³ The pun would once again tie together another instructor and the poetic project.

The accomplishments of Hagnon relate to the proem, as he fulfills the role of a Diana-figure who sees the state of hunting and decides to help humankind (217-219):

*hic trepidas artis et vix novitate sedentes
vidit qua propior peteret via nec sibi turbam
contraxit comitem nec vasa tenentia longe.*⁶⁴

Diana herself earlier saw the *trepidam vitam* (13) of humans, and Hagnon's attempt to find the new road for hunting complements Diana's work to raise humankind from its humble beginnings to reason (5-6):

*post alia, propiore, via meliusque profecti
te sociam, Ratio, rebus sumpsere gerendis.*⁶⁵

The praise of Hagnon concludes with the rewards he has earned (249-252):

*hoc ingens meritum, haec ultima palma tropaei,
Hagnon magne, tibi divom concessa favore:
ergo semper eris, dum carmina dumque manebunt
silvarum dotes atque arma Diana terris.*⁶⁶

The first line is ambiguous in its use of the deictic pronouns: are the service and the final palm of victory referring to the work of the hunt which precedes or the eternal song granted to Hagnon? Due to the placement of *ergo*, however, lines 251-252 are slightly

⁶³ Formicola 1988a: 154-155 and Paschalis 2000 note this pun.

⁶⁴ "This one saw the arts trembling and scarcely settled with novelty, in which way a more appropriate road was seeking, and neither did he draw a crowd for his companion nor equipment holding from long off" Grat. 217-219.

⁶⁵ "trembling life" Grat. 13, "Afterwards, being rather successful on another, more appropriate road, they took up you for an ally in doing things, Reason" Grat. 5-6. Formicola 1988a: 114 notes that the imitation of the proem of Book 5 of the *De Rerum Natura* is most evident, and Enk 1918: 2.6 among others have noted the relation to the Hymn to Venus, *De Rerum Natura* 1.24.

⁶⁶ "This is the great service, this is the ultimate victory palm, o great Hagnon, which was yielded to you by the favor of the gods: therefore you will always be, as long as the songs will remain and the gifts of the woods and the arms of Diana are on the earth." Grat. 249-252.

separated from what precedes. Therefore the victory of Hagnon is the victory of the hunt, which is granted through the grace of the gods (*divom concessa favore*): piety and hunting are related. Because of Hagnon's prowess and victory over nature, he will always remain while songs, the gifts of the woods, and the arms of Diana remain: poetry and hunting are related. The speaker, like many poets, gives much credit to the ability of his own work to confer immortality.⁶⁷ However, it may be surprising to see that he also connects the survival of his work with the art of hunting itself implicitly, because if praise lasts as long as both the poem and hunting (*-que*), one would hope they would last for the same length of time. Still, given his attitude in the proem, it is a natural connection.⁶⁸ The *Cynegetica* is divinely ordained and a necessary link in the relationship between the gods and humanity. Hunting would not be the same without the instructor, and his work is necessary because of the difficulty of hunting.

The relationship between Diana, the hunting founders and the instructor is a reflection of the relationship in the *De Rerum Natura* between Epicurus and Lucretius. These allusions have been frequently noted, but for my purposes, the relationship speaks specifically to the dissemination of knowledge from leaders to pupils. Grattius challenges Lucretius by relating and subordinating Epicurus to Dercylon as well as Hercules. Epicurus is introduced with praise (5.8-12):

...deus ille fuit, deus, inclyte Memmi,
qui princeps vitae rationem invenit eam quae
nunc appellatur sapientia, quique per artem
fluctibus et tantis vitam tantisque tenebris

⁶⁷ One of the most obvious examples, and a close contemporary to Grattius' *Cynegetica*, is the end of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (15.871-879), inspired by Horace *Odes* 3.30, but the tradition has a long heritage from the Greek lyric poets, including Pindar's famous poem-as-statue (*Nem.* 5) and, of course, the Homeric concept of *kleos*.

⁶⁸ Furthermore, Enk 1918: 2.80 refers to Ov. *Amores* 1.15.16, and it also ties Aratus' work to the sun and the moon, features of the *Phaenomena*, indicating that it is not unheard of to unite the subject matter with the figures who sing of it.

*in tam tranquillo et tam clara luce locavit.*⁶⁹

Grattius echoes this impressive praise with the figure of Dercylon (95-99):

*o felix, tantis quem primum industria rebus
prodidit auctorem! deus ille an proxuma divos
mens fuit, in caecas aciem quae magna tenebras
egit et ignarum perfudit lumine volgus?
dic age Pierio (fas est) Diana, ministro.*⁷⁰

Epicurus is not the only so-called god who has helped humankind, and the speaker's piety is once more clear when he stops himself from bestowing divinity with certainty: it was a god or a mind closest to a god (*proxuma divos mens*). He will not elevate an individual to the level of god on his own, and he ultimately allows the gods, in this case Diana acting as a muse, to describe the character of Dercylon (*dic...Diana*). Hunting, with the help of the gods, can accomplish exactly what Epicurus is said to have done through philosophy; even *Ratio*, an important basis of Epicureanism as well as Stoicism, was claimed at the beginning of the *Cynegetica* as a vital part of the hunt.⁷¹ Dercylon's deeds also eliminated that which, according to Lucretius, only reason can clear (2.55-56):

*nam veluti pueri trepidant atque omnia caecis
in tenebris metuunt.*⁷²

The release from empty fears might be something that philosophy can accomplish, but Dercylon can lessen fears by teaching hunting alone. The hunt in the *Cynegetica*

⁶⁹ "That man was a god, a god, famed Memmius, who first found that reason of life which now is called wisdom, and who through skill placed life from such great swells and such great shadows in so tranquil and clear a light." Lucr. 5.8-12.

⁷⁰ "O happy, whom first hard work gave forth as a founder in such great matters! Was that a god or a mind closest to the gods, which, being great, drove a keen vision into blind shadows and imbued light on the ignorant crowd? C'mon speak (it is right), Diana, to your Pierian minister." Grat. 95-99. This line, of course, also echoes Vergil's famous reference to Lucretius: *felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas* (*G.* 2.490). Formicola 1988a: 139 notes that the inventor of the *pedica* is Aristaeus according to Plut. *Amat.* 14, and therefore we should equate Dercylon with Aristaeus from the *Georgics*. Aristaeus is also important to the *Cynegetica* during the plague, cf. Part III.B below.

⁷¹ Cf. Chapter 1 on *ratio*, especially n. 28; *Ratio* in the *Cynegetica* first appears in Grat. 6; this trait along with *usus* are important in Gavaille 2007's Stoic reading of Grattius.

⁷² "For just as boys tremble and fear all things in blind shadows" Lucr. 2.55-56. Fear, one of the evils of the Lucretian world, is linguistically tied to hunting, with *metus* being a type of net.

becomes something of a theodicy, where a god's plan brings order to humanity. In Vergil's *Georgics*, the plan of Jupiter was meant to lead humanity to better arts through necessity (*G.* 1.118-146). In the *Cynegetica*, Diana offers the first steps to humans (7-9), and hunting takes first place to lead humanity to security (13-15) and praise (72).

The *Cynegetica*'s favoring of traditional over philosophical heroism is more clearly shown in the figure of Hercules. We must note that Hercules is a prominent philosophical figure, so there may be particular claims put upon him by Lucretius' Epicureanism and Grattius' possible Stoicism.⁷³ His presentation, however, in both Lucretius and Grattius explicitly deals with his labors and his role of traditional hunter foremost. Lucretius introduces this hero in order to lower the significance of his deeds in relation to Epicurus' philosophical works.⁷⁴ As discussed in the chapter on Lucretius, the beginning of Book 5 is pivotal in reinforcing the reader's duty and offering support to the pupil.⁷⁵ But details omitted from Lucretius' passage leave an opening for critique. Lucretius' Hercules kills the beasts of the world: the Nemean lion, the Arcadian boar, the Cretan bull, the Lernaean hydra, Geryon, the Stymphalian birds, the mares of Thracian Diomedes, the dragon with the apples of the Hesperides, and others. One of the three omitted canonical labors is the capture of Cerberus.⁷⁶ Although Lucretius does not agree with the mythological stories he discusses, he here focuses on the terrestrial labors as

⁷³ Cf. Chapter 1, n. 53.

⁷⁴ *Lucr.* 5.22-54.

⁷⁵ Cf. Chapter 1 Part III.

⁷⁶ Cf. Apollodorus 2.5 for one source, albeit later, of Hercules' labors. Munro posits a lacuna in this passage that may have included these labors.

Hercules could not really conquer the underworld.⁷⁷ When Grattius discusses Hercules during the second proem, the god is given the highest praise (69-72):

*ipse deus cultorque feri Tirynthius orbis,
quem mare, quem tellus, quem praeceps ianua Ditis
omnia temptantem, qua laus erat obvia, passa
hinc decus et famae primum inpetravit honorem.*⁷⁸

The focus is not on the beasts he conquered but the great lengths he went to for glory, including the overpowering of death itself. Death is something that troubles the mind of mortals, and Lucretius attempts to alleviate the fear by a new understanding of death and by Epicurean philosophy, the only true ways to conquer fear of death.⁷⁹ Grattius' emphasis on the underworld, placing it at the end of a line and in the final position of a tricolon crescendo, corrects Lucretius' view. Hercules accomplished more than a simple destruction of beasts on land; he is a civilizer (*cultorque feri ... orbis*, 69) who began his deeds by hunting in literal hunts.⁸⁰ One cannot overcome death, heroically or philosophically, without first having the proper foundation for education, which Grattius argues is hunting.

III. Audience Roles

The foundational figures in Grattius serve as a reflection of the instructor himself, just as Epicurus served not only as the founder of Epicurean philosophy but also the model for the proper hunting of knowledge that Lucretius carefully followed. Like Epicurus, Dercylon and Hagnon are models for our behavior, and Grattius is, as well. If

⁷⁷ Cf., for example, Lucr. 2.700-717 on the impossibility of mythological monsters. He did not try to allegorize Hercules in the underworld as he did for other underworld residents such as Tantalus and Sisyphus (Lucr. 3. 978-1023).

⁷⁸ "That god and the Tirynthian tamer of the wild world, whom the sea, whom the earth, whom the sheer door of Death suffered as he tried all things where praise was to be met; from here [hunting] he obtained his glory and the first honor of his fame" Grat. 69-72.

⁷⁹ Cf. Lucr. 3.830-1094 on death.

⁸⁰ Grat. 69.

foundational hunters are educators, how does the hunt itself serve in the model for the acquisition of knowledge or society? The hunt in the *Cynegetica* becomes the foundational action for successful civilization, and the way to hunt comes from Diana to her chosen ministers. The instructors share the lessons learned, and Grattius continues to assure his readers that this is the right path. There is no hunt in Grattius, so we cannot speak extensively on the outcome of the hunt. However, we can see that the preparation for the hunt taught to us is aimed to help the reader with preparation for life. In Part III, I want to address the role of the reader. First, Roman culture becomes a double for successful hunting preparation, and the audience is encouraged to use the lessons from one in the other. Second, the reader, as a human responsible for the care of dogs, is allowed to climb the hierarchy of knowledge and have direct access to knowledge. As people grow as hunters, they will also have greater understanding about the Roman world.

A. The Superiority of Roman Culture

The *Cynegetica* establishes that Roman culture is the proper culture, and that hunting preparation relates to traditional Roman values, so hunting is related to proper education for culture. Hunting is the first activity that brought culture and order to humankind (13-14):

*tu trepidam bello vitam, Diana, ferino
qua primam quaerebat opem.*⁸¹

The lessons we learn from successful hunting can help us in life generally, such as the importance of moderation. Dercylon and Hagnon both are noted for their moderate style of hunting. When Dercylon creates the spear, he does not indulge in overweight

⁸¹ “You, Diana, you found where the life trembling in war sought the first help” Grat. 13-14.

weapons, but instead is moderate (*moderatus*).⁸² Hagnon rejects large weapons as well as the crowd and novelty.⁸³ The reader is also encouraged to be moderate and to avoid novelty (114-115):

*blandimenta vagae fugies novitatis: ibidem
exiguo nimiove nocent.*⁸⁴

Something new, *novitas*, is equated with danger, as it has not been tested and perfected through experience (115-116):

*...sed lubricus errat
mos et ab expertis festinant usibus omnes.*⁸⁵

Lubricus [...] *mos*, inconstant behavior, which errs and has not been tried with time, contrasts with the Roman concept of *mos maiorum*.⁸⁶ Novelty is unsafe and contrary to what was already established. Experience is the best guide to hunting, a lesson he repeats during the description of the Cult of Vulcan.⁸⁷ The golden mean, something that is neither too little (*exiguo*) nor too much (*nimio*), is contrasted with the habits of places beyond Rome, namely the Macedonians in Northern Greece and Lucania in Southern Italy.⁸⁸ These places have either weighted the spears too much or too little. Their weapons are ridiculous. The moral of this passage is brief and straightforward: *omnia*

⁸² Grat. 109

⁸³ Grat. 218-219.

⁸⁴ "You will flee the pleasures of fickle novelty: they injure whether too great or too small at the very instant" Grat. 114-115.

⁸⁵ "But inconstant behavior goes astray and all men rush away from tried experiences" Grat. 115-116.

⁸⁶ Grat. 115-116. Roman Republican education, as recently argued by Corbeill 2001, is steeped in the idea of precedents and *mos maiorum*, the custom of the forefathers. Despite writing in the Augustan era, we will see that Grattius sees himself as a part of the continuing Republican tradition.

⁸⁷ Grat. 427-466, cf. Part III.B below.

⁸⁸ Grat. 117-120.

tela modi melius finxere salubres (121).⁸⁹ The Romans (“we”) explicitly in the next line use weapons properly: *quocirca et iaculis habilem perpendimus usum* (122).⁹⁰

Hunting contributes to human improvement, and in turn Roman culture can explain proper hunting preparation. This comparison is witnessed in the digression on luxury (307-327).⁹¹ The passage begins with a simple comparison between dogs and humans (307-310):

*lacte novam pubem facillique tuebere maza,
nec luxus alios avidaeque impendia vitae
noscant: haec magno redit indulgentia damno.
nec mirum: humanos non est magis altera sensus.*⁹²

The comparison at first is simple: indulgence comes at a price, and we can apply lessons from history to raising dogs. The instructor ends the digression with the same idea (326-327):

*scilicet exiguis magna sub imagine rebus
prospicies, quae sit ratio, et quo fine regendae.*⁹³

It is through large events that we can understand how best to prepare our animals. An attack against luxury is not surprising for a Roman audience. For something to be costly (*damno*) is understandably damaging, both financially and morally.⁹⁴ The instructor supports his claim with evidence from history, a practice that contrasts with his use of fictional mythological figures for his earlier *exempla*: the Pharaohs (312-314), Lydia

⁸⁹ “Healthy measures make all weapons better” Grat. 121.

⁹⁰ “Therefore we have hung a manageable use even for spears” Grat. 122.

⁹¹ These lines are also potentially the middle of the first book, if we agree that the book as we have it is almost complete (cf. n. 4 above). The midway point would be around line 300.

⁹² “Care for the new youth with milk and tender barley cakes, and let them know not other luxuries nor the costs of a greedy life: this indulgence comes at a great loss. It’s not surprising: no other indulgence eats more at human sense” Grat. 307-310.

⁹³ “Of course you will look out for small matters with a great comparison--what reason is and by what limit things must be governed” Grat. 326-327.

⁹⁴ It is morally bad because of the common relation between wealth and corruption. For simply a few examples, Enk 1918: 2.93 provides Propertius 3.5.4, Cic. *Verr.* 4.62, and Pliny *NH* 33.5 as discussions on jeweled cups, cf. Edwards 1993, especially Chapter 5, “Prodigal pleasures”.

(315-316), Greece (317-320), Camillus (321) and Serranus (322). The list shows a general, if imprecise, progression from East to West, earliest to most recent in time, and greatest vice to virtue.⁹⁵ Eastern luxury is a common trope, a fact exploited in propaganda against the concurrent figure of Cleopatra, and here we see it discussed in relation to the Egyptian Pharaohs, which royal line incidentally includes Cleopatra and Antony.⁹⁶ They nurtured their vices to their own demise: *quae fregit noxia reges* (312).⁹⁷ It is a clear picture of the weakness of the non-Roman Other. Lydia fell to similar vices despite its great wealth: *sic et [...] cecidisti* (315).⁹⁸ The lesson is that wealth or other riches will not save someone from hard work to ensure his success, but only lead to his downfall.

Most tragic for the instructor is the fall of Greece, which is a cautionary tale for the Romans. He shows to his reader a country that was not always luxurious and soft, and their ancestors had had glory: *o quantum et quotiens decoris frustrata paterni* (320).⁹⁹ Greece, as opposed to the Egyptians and the Lydians, was led astray and fell to a foreign defect (*alienam [...] culpam*, 319).¹⁰⁰ Unlike these foreign countries that fell under their own vices, Rome is not tempted by luxury. Camillus and Serranus serve as examples of good Roman nature, with simple tastes and power uncorrupted, whose behaviors explain the greatness of Rome (323-324):

⁹⁵ The digression may also reflect the theory of environmental influence on people as recorded in *Airs Waters Places*, especially 12-24. Nations have certain characteristics because of their climate, but the *Cynegetica* also demonstrates a fear of bad *exempla* spreading.

⁹⁶ E.g., Hor. *Ep.* 1.37 and Verg. *Aen.* 8. 671-713 provide two complex contemporary views on the character of Cleopatra.

⁹⁷ “Which fault broke kings” Grat. 312.

⁹⁸ “Thus also you fell” Grat. 315.

⁹⁹ “O how much and how often disappointing your ancestral glory!” Grat. 320. I follow Duff and Duff 1935 in understanding this verb in an active sense. One may recall here Polybius’ argument that the fall of Greece was much worse than the fall of Carthage (38.1).

¹⁰⁰ Grat. 319. *Culpam* has also referred to the plague (Verg. *G.* 4.468), and a plague would adequately reflect Grattius’ concern about luxury spreading from the East.

*ergo illi ex habitu virtutisque indole priscae
inposuere orbi Romam caput.*¹⁰¹

But while the speaker is proud of his heritage, Greece's example reminds the reader that native virtue and foreign vice are not wholly separate. The vice from the East can spread and corrupt, and the reader must beware abandoning the *mos maiorum* for modern luxury. This digression against luxury therefore relates to the appeal for moderation against new, impractical technology.¹⁰² Roman *cultus*, which remained for Serranus (*tibi cultus erat*, 322), teaches us how to train our dogs, and its reference here reminds the reader in turn of his own cultural expectations.¹⁰³

The speaker is particularly interested in the culture as it can be taught and passed down through experience rather than spontaneously created by the glory of the Italian landscape. The distinction becomes clearer when the passage is read against the *Georgics*. As mentioned in the introduction, the relationship between Vergil and Grattius has in some respects been overstated; however, Vergil served as one model for Grattius.¹⁰⁴ Vergil's praise of Italy in some ways is echoed in Grattius' digression against luxury, notably the praise of Roman men like Camillus.¹⁰⁵ However, the speaker in Vergil ends his parade of Roman heroes with Caesar and maintains a less critical view towards wealth in the Praise of Italy (2.165-166):

*haec [Italia] eadem argenti rivos aerisque metalla
ostendit venis atque auro plurima fluxit.*¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ "Therefore from their character and natural trait of ancient virtue, those men put Rome as the head over the world" Grat. 323-324.

¹⁰² Cf. n. 89 above.

¹⁰³ "You had culture" Grat. 322.

¹⁰⁴ Pierleoni 1906, Enk 1918, Zurli 1988, Henderson 2001, cf. Part I.

¹⁰⁵ Verg. *G.* 2.136-176. Damschen 2004: 108-110 connects this passage to Grattius also through an acrostic of the word *ASCRA* at Grat. 494-498 as a reference to Vergil's Ascrean song, *G.* 2.176. Camillus is mentioned in Verg. *G.* 2.169.

¹⁰⁶ "This same land [Italy] has shown rivers with silver and mines of copper in its veins and has flowed very much with gold" Verg. *G.* 2.165-166. Other parts of the *Georgics* are less embracing of materialism

What the Vergilian speaker sees as a strength was of no avail to Lydia in Grattius: *atqui dives eras ac fluminis aurea venis* (316).¹⁰⁷ When we view the *Cynegetica* in relation to the *Georgics*, it is clear that Grattius challenges Vergil's worldview and offers a much less ambiguous means of dealing with the world and a much greater chance of success in education. The *Georgics* and the *Cynegetica* may both be Ascræan songs, but Grattius has a different goal in his poem, and like Lucretius, he favors the belief in concrete concepts that can be discovered and taught through *ratio*. The moral views present in the works of Lucretius and Grattius are closer to one another than Grattius' moral views are to Vergil's.¹⁰⁸ Lucretius condemns the vain interest in wealth which leads to suffering and war because people do not know their limits (5.1432-1433):

*quia non cognovit quae sit habendi
finis...*¹⁰⁹

Grattius repeats the relative pronoun with a gerund when he introduces the mistake of the Greeks: *ne quid restaret habendi* (317).¹¹⁰ As opposed to the speaker's praise of the glories of Italian wealth, both Grattius and Lucretius recognize that any sort of desire for possession leads to disaster. The examples of Roman culture teach the reader, like his

(e.g. the Praise of the Farmer 2.458-474 which praises the ease, if not wealth, of the farmer's life), and therefore one could read pessimism into this passage also (cf. Ross 1987).

¹⁰⁷ "And you were rich and golden in the veins of your river" Grat. 316. This comparison is not meant to insinuate that Vergil's *Georgics* is only optimistic either about Italy in terms of politics or about the acquisition of knowledge; as I demonstrate in the Vergil chapter, Vergil has a very complicated attitude towards knowledge that is not completely positive.

¹⁰⁸ In general, Grattius' language seems to echo Lucretius more, as, for example, in the description of the dogs' hunts. Lucretius assumes that hunting dogs, when sleeping, dream of the hunt: *...crebro reducunt naribus auras, / ut vestigia si teneant inventa ferarum*. "They lead back the breezes often with their noses, as if they held the discovered tracks of beasts" Lucr. 4.992-993. Grattius describes a dog in the hunt similarly: *sed permit inventas, non inventura latentis illa feras*. "But she pursues the found beasts, not about to discover the hiding beasts" Grat. 205-206. The opening proem to *De Rerum Natura* Book 2, which contains Nature-as-dog barking at the reader to avoid luxury, also pairs nicely with Grattius.

¹⁰⁹ "Because he does not know what is the limit for possessing" Lucr. 5.1432-1433.

¹¹⁰ "Lest anything for possessing remain" Grat. 317. Ovid's *AA* 3.541 also condemns the human *amor habendi*. Only Vergil (*G.* 4.177) attempts to make this desire positive with bees. What we can possess, and what we should want to possess, subtly combines the four texts.

dog, to spurn luxury and seek moderation. Humans and dogs are both susceptible to the same flaws and in need of proper education. Diana's help to hunters puts humanity on the first steps towards civilization, and from there Roman culture becomes superior.

B. Climbing the Hierarchy of Knowledge

Although human life is comparable to the life of dogs, humans are still the audience and in control of dogs. With proper indoctrination, the audience can attain understanding of life beyond the hunt (494-496):

...*seu vincere silvas*
seu tibi fatorum labes exire minasque
*cura prior, tua magna fides tutelaque virgo.*¹¹¹

The hunt itself in the *Cynegetica* has not survived, so someone might argue against this interpretation, but Experience and the emphasis on personal accountability even in something like a deadly disease grant a degree of autonomy to the reader. The gods are always at the top of the hierarchy of knowledge, but once the instructions have been given, people can gain benefits and can even appeal to the gods directly. One location with particular emphasis on the gods and the individual is the section on cures. Scabies, a deadly parasite, can infect the entire pack quickly and is a great concern, but there are cures. One possible cure comes from Vulcan at his grotto in Sicily.¹¹² The narrator tells the reader about the ritual at this grotto, including the proper prayers and sacrifices. The priest of Vulcan will dismiss those with guilty hands, and the god will visit the innocent and cure their animals. The priest's prayer is brief (447-449):

'procul hinc extorribus ire

¹¹¹ "Whether your foremost concern is to conquer the woods or to escape the slips and threats of your fates, your great faith and safeguard is the virgin" Grat. 494-496.

¹¹² Grat. 430-466. Curcio 1898 notes that this cult is also found in Aelian *De nat. anim.* 11.3, and that Pliny *NH* 35.51.179 provides ancillary evidence about bitumen in Sicily that may aid in healing sick animals. Athenaeus 2.17.42, also provided as evidence by Curcio, describes the quality of the water in Sicily.

*edico praesente deo, praesentibus aris,
quis scelus aut manibus sumptum aut in pectore
motum est'.¹¹³*

The speaker then describes the crimes of the men who are rejected from the shrine (451-454):

*o quisquis misero fas umquam in supplice fregit,
quis pretio fratrum meliorisque ausus amici
sollicitare caput patriosve lacessere divos,
illum agat infandae comes huc audacia culpae.¹¹⁴*

On the other side of things, the innocent man is the one who, above all else, is obedient (456-458):

*sed cui bona pectore mens est
obsequiturque deo, deus illum molliter aram
lambit et ipse.¹¹⁵*

Vulcan cures the innocent men's animals. This cure is guaranteed if the hunter notices the sickness early enough.¹¹⁶ Piety is valued, and physical health is recovered.

After mentions of help from Paean, Vulcan, and Liber, Grattius recognizes that not every cure for every disease of dogs can be discussed in this poem.¹¹⁷ He therefore

¹¹³ "I proclaim to the exiles, with the god present, with the altars present, go far away from here, they who have either taken in hand a wicked deed or begun one in their heart" Grat. 447-449. Formicola 1988a: 189 relates this passage particularly to Aelian's account (11.3, cf. above), which discusses the dogs who guard the cult and injure or chase away the unworthy: 'Εν Αἴτνῃ δὲ ἄρα τῇ Σικελικῇ Ἡφαίστου τιμᾶται νεώς, καὶ ἔστι περίβολος καὶ δένδρα ἱερὰ καὶ πῦρ ἀσβεστόν τε καὶ ἀκοίμητον. εἰσὶ δὲ κύνες περὶ τὸν νεῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλσος ἱεροί, καὶ τοὺς μὲν σωφρόνως καὶ ὡς πρέπει τε ἅμα καὶ χρηὴ παριόντας ἔς τὸν νεῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλσος οἱ δὲ σαίνουσι καὶ αἰκάλλουσιν, οἷα φιλοφρονούμενοί τε καὶ γνωρίζοντες δήπου· ἐὰν δέ τις ἢ τὰς χεῖρας ἐναγής, τοῦτον μὲν καὶ δάκνουσι καὶ ἀμύσσουσι, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλως ἕκ τινος ὁμιλίας ἤκοντας ἀκολάστου μόνον διώκουσιν, "In Etna in Sicily, a temple of Hephaestus is venerated, and there is an encircling grove and sacred trees and fire that is both unquenchable and untiring. There are sacred dogs around the temple and the grove, and they fawn over and flatter those coming soundly to the temple and the grove as is fitting and also necessary, as if well-disposed and perhaps recognizing them; but if ever someone with a curse upon their hands should come, this one they bite and rend, but the ones coming from some debauchery they only chase away."

¹¹⁴ "O whoever has ever broken what is lawful in the case of a miserable suppliant, who dared to trouble the head of his brothers or a rather good friend for a price, or to injure the paternal gods, let daring, companion of unspeakable injury, drive this one out" Grat. 451-454.

¹¹⁵ "But for him whoever has a good mind and is obedient to god, the god himself softly bathes the altar" Grat. 456-458.

¹¹⁶ Grat. 467-469.

ends the section on dogs by appealing to Olympus in general (*numen Olympo*, 481) and the grove of Diana in particular.¹¹⁸ To end the discussion of divine aid with Diana is fitting, and the speaker admits that his work is not as great as the gods' powers: *non opibus tanta est fiducia nostris* (480).¹¹⁹ Grattius is only the poetic link between the divine and human worlds; the reader must ultimately rely on the gods. The image of the celebratory worship of Diana in the glen is surreal: hunters and dogs cast away their arms to perform a more peaceful sacrifice.¹²⁰ From this proper devotion to the gods, the man will get whatever favor he wants (494-496):

...seu vincere silvas
 seu tibi fatorum labes exire minasque
 cura prior, tua magna fides tutelaque virgo.¹²¹

Here is another connection between the lessons of hunting and greater Roman life at large: the same sacrifice to Diana aids the hunter in any aspect of his life.¹²² The importance of proper morality has been discussed repeatedly, and that interest is refocused here to proper community under divine guidance. This scene is in many ways an ideal, and the instructor is in the middle between the divine world and humankind. His works may not be great (*non...tanta*, 480), but what is above him are the gods, and he must teach the proper relations between god and human. The peace of the gods will offer

¹¹⁷ Grat. 477-479. Paeon is invoked at 426, Vulcan at 427-466, and Liber in the form of wine at 475-476.

¹¹⁸ "Power from Olympus" Grat. 481. Green 2000 considers the grove at Grat. 480-496 to be the Cult of Diana Nemorensis.

¹¹⁹ "Our trust in our own resources is not so great" Grat. 480. This ironically seems to soften his didactic credentials to something closer to Vergil's *aporia*. Grattius, however, does not let his work get so critical.

¹²⁰ Grat. 483-496.

¹²¹ "Whether your foremost concern is to conquer the woods or to escape the slips and threats of your fates, your great faith and safeguard is the virgin" Grat. 494-496.

¹²² Green 2000 provides insightful commentary on this passage, relating the sacred grove here to the King of the Wood and the cult of Diana Nemorensis. Diana was a goddess of the Italian alliance in Nemi as well as hunting, as is implied in this passage. Moreover, she provides inspiration for the *Cynegetica* in general.

solace: *vicit tutela pax impetrata deorum* (407).¹²³ The proper relationship between men and gods is once again central and perhaps in opposition to Lucretius: the gods do not intervene in Lucretius (*non divom pacem votis adit [...] nequiquam*, 5.1229-1231).¹²⁴ The *Cynegetica* rejects this distant view of the gods and encourages its readers to return to a traditional religion, and even primitive arts (*artes...simplicis aevi*, 399) can seem reasonable.¹²⁵ The instructor envisions a world full of active gods, and these gods help the pious consistently: all knowledge, even divine knowledge, is attainable through reason and experience.

When we compare Grattius to his predecessors, we can see once again that Grattius places a different stress on disease: not on the confusion, destruction and *aporia*, but on the help granted to humankind, both to the god-priest-poet and to the audience. In Vergil, the sacrifices fail and chaos descends upon the farmland.¹²⁶ The entire flock is in jeopardy should one fall ill (3.468-469):

*continuo culpam ferro compesce, prius quam
dira per incautum serpent contagia volgus.*¹²⁷

¹²³ "The safe procured peace of the gods has conquered" Grat. 407.

¹²⁴ "Does he not approach the peace of the gods with prayers [...] in vain?" Lucr. 5.1229-1231.

¹²⁵ Grat. 399. The full passage is: *quid, priscas artes inventaque simplicis aevi, / si referam? non illa metus solacia falsi / tam longam traxere fidem*, "But what if I should report the early arts and the discoveries of a simple age? That solace of not false fear drew such long faith" Grat. 399-401. Formicola 1988a: 183 gives Varro (*De re r.* 2.9.15) as a possible source. Grattius is sympathetic and offers a defense of superstitious practices, but he neither confirms nor denies the validity of the charms. He only supports that the fear of disease was not false, taking *non [...] metus [...] falsi* together, and it is therefore natural that the earliest solutions to sickness had longevity. Parroni 1973 hypothesizes an almost Epicurean philosophical stance through changing the word modified by *non*: "that solace of false fear did not draw so long a faith," i.e., superstition did not last long. Grattius' list of charms, however, indicates that people believed in these remedies (Grat. 401-405). He also does not indicate at which point in history this belief ended. Grattius may sarcastically be referencing the *De Rerum Natura*: Lucretius sees cruelty and civil war arising because of the false fear of death: *unde homines dum se falso terrore coacti / effugisse volunt longe longeque remosse*, "From where men, while stirred up by a false fear, want to flee afar and to remove themselves afar" Lucr. 3.68-69. Grattius, however, defends an understandable anxiety about death and disease. Anxiety in Grattius does not lead people to greed and destruction, but to faith.

¹²⁶ Verg. *G.* 3.531-566.

¹²⁷ "...Contain the fault immediately with a knife before the ominous contagion should creep through the heedless herd" Verg. *G.* 3.468-469.

The *Cynegetica* echoes these words when the situation also becomes most harrowing (412):

*perniciēs redimenda anima, quae prima sequaci
sparsa malost, ne dira trahant contagia volgus.*¹²⁸

In the *Cynegetica*, however, there is help from the gods either through the healing cult of Vulcan or through other gods.

But the Grattian instructor does not draw only from the plague against livestock in Book 3 of the *Georgics*: the optimistic tone and the structure of the narrative in Grattius relate more to the plague and resurrection of bees in the *bougonia* in Book 4 of Vergil.¹²⁹ The *aition* of this practice is the myth of Aristaeus, who caused the death of Eurydice and was cursed by Eurydice's nymph friends, as Aristaeus eventually learns from the combined reports of the prophetic sea god Proteus and Aristaeus' mother Cyrene. After one cause is revealed by Proteus, Aristaeus' mother Cyrene tells him about the nymphs and the necessary expiations so his bees can be restored.¹³⁰ As scholars have pointed out, this myth and the practice of slaughtering a bull to spontaneously produce bees are not physically practical, but the *bougonia* is nevertheless presented as having the desired outcome, which is of use to the optimistic tone of the *Cynegetica*.¹³¹

Grattius establishes the relation with *Georgics* Book 4 through several verbal parallels. First, in the general discussion of the cures for bees, the Vergilian narrator recommends a plant-wine mixture: *huius odorato radices incoque Baccho* (4.279).¹³²

¹²⁸ "The sickness must be remedied through the soul [i.e. animal] which first was stained by the close evil, lest the ominous contagion should carry off the herd" Grat. 412.

¹²⁹ Verg. *G.* 4.281-558. Cf. Chapter 2, Part III.B.

¹³⁰ Proteus' cause is the revenge of Orpheus, Verg. *G.* 4.453-527, and then Cyrene explains what to do at *G.* 4.528-558.

¹³¹ Richter 1957 calls it a "komplett gestalteten Mythos," cf. Thomas 1988: 2.196. However, it was an accepted practice in ancient texts (Mynors 1990: 293-296, Thibodeau 2011: 191-192).

¹³² "Boil the roots of this [plant] in fragrant Bacchus" Verg. *G.* 4.279.

Grattius recommends the same wine for his dogs, although mixed with the more effective bitumen/tar: *tunc et odorato medicata bitumina vino* (415).¹³³ The spontaneous generation of bees and the healing cult of Vulcan are both marvels. In the *bougonia* in the *Georgics*, when bees rush forth from the broken body of a bull, it is miraculous (4.554-556):

*hic vero subitum ac dictu mirabile monstrum[...]
stridere apes utero et ruptis effervere costis.*¹³⁴

The Cult of Vulcan is supernatural, too, and the wind rushes forth from the broken chest of the mountain (443-445):

*...dictu mirum atque alias ignobile monstrum
adversis specibus ruptoque e pectore montis
venit ovans Austris....*¹³⁵

Third, Proteus and the Cult abide in similar dwellings. Vergil introduces Proteus and his cave in two separate lines: *est in Carpathio Neptuni gurgite vates* (4.387) and *...est specus ingens* (4.418).¹³⁶ Grattius shortens these lines: *est in Trinacria specus ingens* (430).¹³⁷ While the verbal similarities may be a coincidence due to situation, because of the other Vergilian references, a reader may recall the fictional location when Vulcan's grotto is described.

Grattius uses these verbal similarities to conjure the image of an optimistic situation, but there are two key differences between the *bougonia* and the Cult of Vulcan: the speakers' personal experiences and the treatments of guilty parties, either Aristaeus or

¹³³ "Then also medicate the bitumen in fragrant wine" Grat. 415. The use of wine was not uncommon for sterilization, but there is an echo in these two passages in the metrical position.

¹³⁴ "But here [is] a wonder, sudden and miraculous to say [...] bees buzz in the belly [of the bull] and swarm from the broken ribs" Verg. *G.* 4.554-556.

¹³⁵ "...miraculous to say and a wonder obscure in other ways, the rejoicing Austris came through the opposing cave and out from the broken chest of the mountain..." Grat. 443-445.

¹³⁶ "There is a seer of Neptune in the Carpathian whirlpool," Verg. *G.* 4.387, and "there is a great cave," Verg. *G.* 4.418.

¹³⁷ "There is a great cave in Sicily" Grat. 430.

the guilty hunters. The speaker's personal experience is namely the difference between Vergil's report (*fama*) and Grattius' eyewitness account. The mythic origin of the *bougonia* already sets the event in a different framework, but the speaker in the *Georgics* presents the practice as if factual even though he has not seen it. He makes a point of its fictionality. Vergil only has a report (*fama*) of the *bougonia*: *expediam prima repetens ab origine famam* (4.286).¹³⁸ In Grattius, Hercules has a *fama*, the mythological hunting founder Dercylon has a *fama*, but the healing cult is reported through experience.¹³⁹ The depiction of the healing cult of Vulcan begins with an appeal to Experience, one of Grattius' favored guidelines (427-429):

*rerum prudens quantam experientia volgo
materiem largita boni, si vincere curent
desidiam et gratos agitando prendere finis!*¹⁴⁰

Good Roman discipline and hard work will help the reader, and religious devotion is not built upon blind faith but built upon prudent reasoning and active experience. The grotto of Vulcan is real, which the speaker claims to have seen often, and he uses personal experience to corroborate its effectiveness (435-436):

*huc defecta mala vidi pecuaria tabe
saepe trahi.*¹⁴¹

The Cult of Vulcan is part of his defense of experience. The reader is encouraged to rely on the poet-instructor and his personal experience during the difficult time: he is an ultimate source of knowledge, and the knowledge comes from the divine.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ "I will obtain the report, seeking it from its first beginning" Verg. *G.* 4.286. The speaker in the *Georgics* does provide eyewitness accounts for other events (e.g. Verg. *G.* 1.193-199, 1.316-320).

¹³⁹ Grat. 72 and 100. *Fama* is also used in the reputation of two dog breeds, the Petronian (Grat. 202) and *thoes* (Grat. 256).

¹⁴⁰ "O experience, prudent in matters, bestowing how much material for good to the populace, if only they would care to conquer sloth and attain pleasing ends by action!" Grat. 427-429. Experience is also praised at Grat. 116.

¹⁴¹ "I often saw flocks taken here as they wasted away from a destructive plague" Grat. 435-436.

The difference between Grattius' eyewitness account and Vergil's report becomes more pronounced in the treatment of the guilty. In Vergil, Aristaeus seeks the advice of Proteus on the loss of his bees. In Grattius, hunters seek the advice of the Priest of Vulcan on the sickness of their dogs. Both Proteus and the Priest provide the information, and a positive result follows, although Proteus does omit the most important information for resurrecting the bees. When Aristaeus confronts the god, his crime against Orpheus is made clear to him, and then his mother is able to tell him the necessary expiations. The priest of Vulcan can fulfill both needs, mediating the divine and human worlds much like the prophetic Proteus, and makes clear both the crime and the path to the god's cure. He, however, is unwilling to help the guilty. Guilty men are called to suffer as opposed to the worthy person who upholds all the virtues that the instructor has encouraged throughout his *Cynegetica*: moderation, piety, and reason. The direct access to the divine is for the pious only. But the *Cynegetica* itself is reliable: *nec me pignoribus, nec te mea carmina fallent* (300).¹⁴³ Any reader can access and benefit from this information already. The added cult information, however, allows the reader a direct relationship. The proper education has a hierarchy of knowledge, and if one strives to the levels of piety and dedication seen in the hunting founders, he can become an expert.

IV. Conclusion

The *Cynegetica* is not just about hunting. On its own, the text makes statements about personal accountability, moderation, and piety, but it is also a part of a tradition that uses hunting to explore the nature of knowledge itself. In Lucretius' *De Rerum*

¹⁴² This event is a reflection of the hierarchy established in the proem, cf. Part II.A above.

¹⁴³ "My songs do not deceive me with these pledges, nor do they deceive you" Grat. 300.

Natura and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, the reader is like a hunter, and in Vergil's *Georgics* and Grattius' *Cynegetica*, the reader is a hunter. The rewards in these hunts, however, are much greater than animals. Grattius' readers are taught important lessons about religious and social mores through the preparations for hunting. In many ways, Grattius' optimistic direction and consistent viewpoint is like Lucretius': hard work allows the hunters to obtain necessary knowledge. The faith in Epicureanism, however, is replaced with traditional Roman systems or Stoicism. The praise of Hercules may be a Stoic motif, but the lessons that hunting teaches are suitable to any resident of the Roman state. Knowledge comes from the gods, and we learn it from chosen teachers or Experience itself.

The positive message can further be interpreted as a step away from Vergilian uncertainty. We saw with Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* that Ovid increases Vergil's doubts and makes clear that there is no certainty in a hunt. Our prey deceives us, and even knowledgeable poets cannot guarantee success—a fact corroborated by the existence of the *Remedia Amoris* to accompany the *Ars Amatoria*. Grattius takes the opposite position and assures the reader that as hunters and as humans, we have access to answers. The *Georgics* presents a boundary of knowledge, reliant upon signs that humans may be able to decipher correctly. In the *Cynegetica*, humans can have direct access to the gods and the hierarchy of knowledge. Answers require work, reason and experience—and reading the *Cynegetica*—but success is possible.

Epilogue: Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* and Hunting as Leisure

I. Introduction

Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* from the third century CE covers much the same material as Grattius' *Cynegetica*: dogs, horses, and nets with the hunt itself missing. His proem is over 100 lines and contains metapoetic commentary, as the creation of poetry is like hunting (Part II). However, the majority of the text is free from any digressions. The analysis of the relation between proem and body demonstrates Nemesianus' unique place in the literary tradition as something of a control sample for previous texts. He focuses not on abstract questions about knowledge and morality, but on effective hunting knowledge (Part III). Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Grattius have all put hunting in a frame to view knowledge in general, but Nemesianus focuses on the art of hunting. In this epilogue, after further introduction to the text (Part I.A) and literature review (Part I.B), I will discuss first, briefly, how he establishes the parallel between poetic and hunting goals (Part II) and, second, how his goals are presented as practical application rather than metacommentary on knowledge (Part III).

A. About the *Cynegetica*

Nemesianus is a Latin poet from the late third century, and evidence from both his own poetry and from the *Historia Augusta* date his floruit to the reigns of Carus, Carinus and Numerian: *nam et cum Olympio Nemesiano contendit, qui Ἀλιευτικά, Κυνηγετικά et Ναυτικά scripsit quique in omnibus coloniis inlustratus emicuit*.¹ The proem of the

¹ "For also he [Numerian] competed with Olympius Nemesianus, who wrote the *Halieutica*, *Cynegetica*, and *Nautica* and also shone forth illustrious among all the colonials," *HA Carus, Carinus, and Numerian* 11. The *Historia Augusta* is here providing proof for the emperor Numerian's excellent oratorical and writing skills. As the first named poet who competed with the emperor, Nemesianus must have had a good reputation in so far as we can trust the *Historia Augusta*. See Momigliano 1954, Syme 1968, and Conte 1994b: 652 for several perspectives on the relative value of these histories. Of Nemesianus' other works, we know nothing of the *Halieutica* and *Nautica*, but Nemesianus had written four eclogues before the

Cynegetica corroborates this chronology and records a time after the death of Carus but before the death of Numerian, placing the date of composition firmly in 283-284 CE.² Due to a geographical reference in the text as well as manuscript headings, it is assumed that Nemesianus is a Carthaginian.³ The North African origin is not insignificant: McGill has noted that Vergilian centos often are produced in North Africa, and so the educational climate of that province seems to encourage authors to engage with Vergil.⁴ Nemesianus' *Cynegetica*, unlike the Vergilian centos, is not composed entirely in Vergil's lines, but it is a counter to the *Georgics* Book 3 and it reuses Vergil's structure to make an original contribution to the didactic genre. Nemesianus' project can be understood in this cultural environment of Vergilian centos.

The chronological and spatial distance between Nemesianus and the earlier didactic writers had an effect on his poetic style and perspective.⁵ The structure of the poem is straightforward because the instructional text, as much as has survived, lacks the many digressions and changes of topics that mark other didactic poems, and the manuscripts are legible and consistent.⁶ The proem occupies lines 1-102, including a

composition of the *Cynegetica*, heavily modeled on Vergil's. The chronological priority of the *Eclogues* and the *Cynegetica* is assumed, following Vergil's career path (Küppers 1987: 492-495). Some may even doubt the *Eclogues* are by Nemesianus, but rather by Calpurnius Siculus, although most scholars have accepted Nemesianus as the author (Williams 1986: 3-8). There are also fragments of an *Aucipia* that are given under his name. Duff and Duff 1935 and Volpilhac 1975 provide these fragments, but Volpilhac 1998: 3176 does not discuss the work.

² Nem. *Cyn.* 63-85 and Williams 1986: 166 n. 64, see Luiselli 1958: 73-76 and Volpilhac 1975: 73-92 for general introductions to the text, which are much condensed in this introduction.

³ *Gens ampla iacet trans ardua Calpes culmina*... "An important race lies beyond the high peaks of Calpes," i.e. Spain, Nem. *Cyn.* 251-252, interpreted by Volpilhac 1998: 3175 among others as geographical evidence.

⁴ McGill 2005: xviii-xxi.

⁵ Dunbabin 1978: 63-64 argues that hunting did not have the same—or any—symbolic meaning in North Africa as it did in Rome, citing hunting's absence in funerary art but its presence in mosaic. This difference may underline some of Nemesianus' choices, although hunting was still very popular in North Africa (Küppers 1987: 497-498).

⁶ According to Volpilhac 1975: 89-91 and Williams 1986: 25-26 and 64-74, the earliest manuscripts of the *Cynegetica*, A (*Parisinus* 7561) and B (*Parisinus Lat.* 4839), are from the ninth and the fifteenth century, respectively. Sannazaro's manuscript, C (*Vindobonensis* 3261), is from the early sixteenth century. The

statement of purpose (1-14), a mythological digression (15-47), hunting scenes (48-62), an address to the emperors (63-85), and an invocation to Diana (86-102). Dogs are the subject of the majority of the poem (103-239). Horses are then discussed (240-298). The last fully treated subject is nets (299-320) before the poem breaks off at the beginning of the hunting excursion (321-325).

B. Literature Review

At 325 lines, this fragmentary *Cynegetica* has received even less scholarly attention than Grattius' work. Volphilac's "État présent des recherches sur Némésien" offers a seven item bibliography, of which four items deal with the *Cynegetica*.⁷ Volphilac 1975 and Williams 1986 are invaluable editions and commentaries of the text, although the former is more comprehensive and the latter deals primarily with textual issues. For the *Cynegetica*, there are two areas of scholarly interest: one is the proem and Nemesianus' literary aims within it, while the other is Nemesianus' practical goals.

Because of its length, the proem has received relatively much scholarly attention. Studies of the proem have focused on its obvious debt to Vergil and the uncertainty regarding Nemesianus' use of other sources.⁸ Nemesianus asserts that he treads on untouched moss, and some scholars take this statement to mean that Nemesianus is

Sannazaro edition also includes the *Cynegetica* of Grattius. Scholarly consensus argues that only a portion of the work has been passed down; arguments include the excessive length of the proem and the unfulfilled promise in lines 237 – 238 to describe the minds, the customs and the wise noses of the dogs (Williams 1986: 193, Luiselli 1958: 73). It is unclear how long the original text might have been, but, as with Grattius' work (cf. Chapter 4, n. 6), it more than likely discussed the hunt itself and was more than one book (cf. Volphilac 1975: 78-79, Williams 1986: 161 and 193). For examples of digressions in didactic poetry, cf. the description of the Magna Mater in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* 2.597-660, the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice in Vergil's *Georgics* 4.315-558, the myth of Cephalus and Procris in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 3.687-746, or the digression against luxury in Grattius' *Cynegetica* 310-325. The exception that proves the rule in Nemesianus is the Boreas simile, cf. n. 68 below.

⁷ Volphilac 1998: 3178.

⁸ Cf. Luiselli 1958, Orlandi 1979, Küppers 1987, Walter 1988, Di Stefano 1998, and Paschalis 2000: 209, 221-232. The clear allusions to Vergil will be noted in more detail in Part II.

actually unaware of any previous *Cynegetica*.⁹ Luiselli's thorough article well summarizes the progression of thought on the matter, but he himself argues convincingly that Nemesianus' claim to a new work is rhetorical and meant to establish the superiority of his project.¹⁰ In Part II, I will retread some of this scholarly ground and attempt to highlight Nemesianus' polemics against Grattius in the proem.

Luiselli's general skepticism regarding poets' claims to priority and novelty in their literary endeavors is persuasive, and while I agree with that interpretation, Nemesianus does fashion his *Cynegetica* differently from his predecessors. Gitton, Mastrorosa, and Orlandi have each discussed differences between Grattius and Nemesianus, and a debate has formed over which of the two *cynegetica* aims at utility and which at pleasure.¹¹ Gitton and Mastrorosa focus on the utility of Nemesianus, especially in comparison with the religious focus of Grattius, while Orlandi argues on the contrary that Grattius is focused on real didacticism, while Nemesianus is interested more in the pleasure of the hunt. Orlandi is right that Nemesianus' tone does lend itself to this interpretation, but Nemesianus' portrayal of the hunt as a leisure activity does not entail a lack of interest in practical information about the hunt or of serious didactic intent.¹² His information is as accurate as that found in any other didactic work on hunting, and the *Cynegetica* reflects his social and cultural education.¹³ The cultural differences reflected in Nemesianus' work move hunting in a different, non-symbolic direction from the

⁹ Nem. *Cyn.* 10-14, e.g. Paschalis 2000: 209.

¹⁰ Luiselli 1958; 93-94 provides a history of the problem.

¹¹ Orlandi 1979, Mastrorosa 1994, and Gitton 2001.

¹² Orlandi 1979 notes Grattius' religious inspiration and use of *ratio* against Nemesianus' emphasis on pleasure and lack of interest in real life, cf. Nem. *Cyn.* 1-3.

¹³ Küppers 1987 is particularly interested in considering Nemesianus' culture. Hutchinson 2009 argues in general for the equality of prose and verse didactic works. Gitton 2001 looks particularly at Nemesianus' relationship to ancient medical texts, as does Mastrorosa 1994, mostly in the subject of the plague.

interest of his predecessors. As Volpilhac notes, Grattius is philosophical, and Nemesianus is entirely different.¹⁴

Nemesianus establishes similarities with earlier texts but asserts his poetic and didactic dominance through thoughtful imitation and word choice. My contribution in the Epilogue is to unite the two veins of scholarship and relate the metapoetic proem to the effectiveness of the didactic lessons. I favor those who find utility in Nemesianus, and the instructor's intention for practical use of the *Cynegetica* is foreshadowed by his literary polemic found in the proem. The poetics in the proem establish his opinion of his own work for the reader. Although he symbolically relates hunting and literature (Part II), he ignores the broader questions about knowledge his predecessors ask in favor of fashioning his work as a practical didactic text (Part III).

II. Poetry as Hunting

The proem establishes that Nemesianus considers himself an author steeped in a literary tradition.¹⁵ The equivalence between hunting and writing poetry marks Nemesianus' work as an attack against his predecessors. One common trope that he uses

¹⁴ Volpilhac 1975: 84-85, which includes a similar distinction from Aymard 1951 between Grattius' militant poem and Nemesianus' evasive relaxation. Cf. n. 5 above on Nemesianus' culture. While I agree that Grattius' and Nemesianus' poetics are very different, I am particularly interested on how they view knowledge, the one in the abstract and the other in the concrete.

¹⁵ The choice particularly of Vergil's *Georgics* 3 as a literary interlocutor may speak not only of a desire to outdo Vergil popular in literary culture, but also a desire that the Roman Empire may find the stability Vergil himself hoped for at the end of the civil war. The obvious debt is not just for purposes of mimicry; as Volpilhac 1975: 86 says, the influence is more in the form than in the information. The similarities between Nemesianus' and Vergil's proems are both verbal and structural, and they have been well recorded by scholars (Luiselli 1958: 76-88, Volpilhac 1975: 77-78 and 79-84, Küppers 1987: 492-495). To give a brief overview, the praise of emperors is marked by the words *mox* (soon) and *accingar* (I will be girded), as both Nemesianus and Vergil prepare to write an epic for their respective emperors (Verg. *G.* 3.46, *Nem. Cyn.* 63-64). Whether Nemesianus intended to write an epic for the battles of Carinus and Numerian, or was simply repeating the *Georgics*, or was referring to the *Cynegetica*, is unknown (cf. Luiselli 1958: 84-86, Volpilhac 1975: 12-13, Paschalis 2000: 225-226). In the earlier part of the proem, both works also share a distaste for common topics and mythological subjects. Vergil briefly mentions a few anecdotes: Eurystheus, Busiris, and Hylas (all connected with Hercules), Delos (the birthplace of Apollo), and Hippodame and Pelops (Verg. *G.* 3.3-8). Nemesianus takes this brief list and expands it to a level of excessive *recusatio* of over thirty lines (*Nem. Cyn.* 15-47).

to establish his superiority is the untrodden path. Through the Callimachean-Lucretian reference to the untrodden path, he is marking his poetic tradition as he repeats their image for innovation.¹⁶ Nemesianus marks his creativity in his use of language, as he goes through green grass (*virides per herbas*, 10) where Vergil's flocks were feeding: *cetera pascuntur uiridis armenta per herbas* (3.162).¹⁷ Despite the similarity of the landscape, Nemesianus rejects Vergil's approach. Vergil asks Augustus for an easy path (*facilem cursum*, 1.40-41), but Nemesianus rejects the easy paths that Calliope offers (*cursus...faciles*, 12-13).¹⁸ He is not only accepting of difficult work but seeks it out himself.¹⁹

This path from Calliope is as much about poetry as it is about hunting, and the tracks of earlier authors are used by and can be found in Nemesianus. The blend of hunting ground with metapoetic ground, one point of Paschalis' article, is a concern for both Grattius and Nemesianus because they choose hunting, a common poetic image, as the subject of their poetry.²⁰ The appearance of Apollo, a hunter and an artist, before the appearance of his twin sister, the huntress Diana, puts particular emphasis on the literary nature of the work. The poet imagines the creation of poetry as a hunt through literature particularly with the description of Apollo yoking the poet for their journey into the wilds: *iubet ire per agros* (4).²¹ Apollo is marked as a hunter through his actions, in particular *late campos metatus apertos* (6), which was the activity of Dercylon in

¹⁶ Nem. *Cyn.* 3-9, cf. Call. *Aetia* fr. 1.25-28, Lucr. 1.922-928, Verg. *G.* 3.291-293, and others (Luiselli 1958: 91-95, Volpilhac 1975: 111, n.7, Küppers 1987: 483-484).

¹⁷ Nem. 10, "the other flocks are driven to pasture through the green grass," Verg. *G.* 3.162. Küppers 1987: 486 n.58 notes this as one of Nemesianus' many uses of Vergil's *Georgics*.

¹⁸ Verg. *G.* 1.40-41, Nem. *Cyn.* 12-13.

¹⁹ Lucretius, as well, recognizes that his work may be overwhelming for the reader (1.32-33).

²⁰ Paschalis 2000, especially 222, Section a.: "Hunting ground and metapoetic ground".

²¹ "He orders [me] to go through the fields" Nem. *Cyn.* 4, cf. Nem. *Cyn.* 5-11 for Apollo's handling of the poet.

Grattius' *Cynegetica*: *per non adsuetas metantem retia valles* (102).²² Whether or not the verbal repetition is intentional, Apollo does act like a hunter in Nemesianus. Whether Nemesianus was alluding to Grattius here, Nemesianus clearly wants to combine literary and hunting space. Nemesianus himself is also like Dercylon, who was charged by Diana with revealing (*pandere*, 107) her arts to people, which Nemesianus does as well (*pandimus*, 3).²³ Both Grattius and Nemesianus also use *cano* in line 1 of their poems, a reference to Vergil's *Aeneid* and the lofty goals of their own poems.²⁴ The first word of the poem also reflects their very different poetics: Grattius opens with the words *dona cano divom*, with an emphasis on the divine, while Nemesianus remains focused on hunting: *venandi cano mille vias*.²⁵ To Grattius, poetic creation was also a great work (*magnum opus*) that could cause anxiety (*cura*, 61).²⁶ To Nemesianus, writing poetry means hunting out and overpowering his predecessors, and the anxiety is an exciting opportunity: *talique placet dare lintea curae*.²⁷

The close relationship between poetry and hunting is less emphasized in the rest of the poem, but this proem has prepared the reader to expect literary polemic. With this mindset, the reader is encouraged to find allusions, particularly in terms of the instructor's attitude towards work. In Part III, then, we will see the speaker's continued focus against his predecessors in the way that he fashions his work as more useful than theirs. In the proem, he makes his work seem both easy and difficult, as it is a

²² "marking off the open camps far and wide" Nem. *Cyn.* 6, "measuring out nets in unaccustomed valleys" Grat. 102.

²³ Grat. 107, Nem. *Cyn.* 3. Küppers 1987: 479 notes the use of *pandere* in other didactic works, including Lucretius 1.55 and Manilius 1.12.

²⁴ Volpilhac 1975: 94, n.1.

²⁵ "I sing the gifts of the gods" Grat. 1, "I sing the thousand ways for hunting" Nem. *Cyn.* 1. The *venandi* also corrects the other authors' interests in *habendi* (cf. Chapter 4, n. 110, Paschalis 2000: 229-232).

²⁶ *magnum opus et tangi, nisi cura vincitur, inpar*, "It is a great work and unworthy to be undertaken unless concern is conquered" Grat. 61.

²⁷ "And it is pleasing to set sail for such a great care" Nem. *Cyn.* 58.

challenging leisure activity in which he wants to engage. The main text bears witness to this desire.

III. Practical Handbook

There is an apparent division in the *Cynegetica* between the idyllic leisure in the proem and the realism of his instruction, but the two parts do form a coherent project. In the proem, the poet is Apollo's animal that hunts out a worthy topic of discussion. Once found, his poetic project is presented as instruction superior to his predecessors' projects because it is more useful. Hunting is leisure in Nemesianus, but that does not mean that it is simple fun.²⁸

The treatment of dogs, a traditional topic in *cynegetica*, is central to the display of Nemesianus' superiority. After the proem, and as the instructor begins the material proper, he introduces dogs first in a clear reference to both Vergil and Grattius. Vergil claims that the care of dogs should not be last: *nec...cura canum fuerit postrema* (3.404).²⁹ Grattius turns this litotes into a positive statement that the care of dogs is first despite the fact that he has been distracted by the lesser matter of nets: *prima illa canum...cura* (151-152).³⁰ Nemesianus does better than both poets and actually discusses dogs first (103-104):

principio tibi cura canum non segnis ab anno

²⁸ Nemesianus' orders, after all, can be very violent. For example, when a litter of dogs is born, the owner must raise only the most promising pups so that neither his resources nor the mother is overtaxed. Grattius discusses the problem of choosing which puppies will be best, but Grattius' test relies more on the physical traits of the puppies themselves (Grat. 286-300). Nemesianus, on the other hand, urges the owner to put the young puppies in the middle of a ring of fire so that their mother will rescue them one at a time according to merit (Nem. *Cyn.* 144-150, cf. Volpilhac 1975: 117, n.85 and Mastroianni 1994: 453-455). Hard work does not conflict with Nemesianus' idea of leisure. Play is serious. Despite key phrases such as *hilarisque labores* (Nem. *Cyn.* 1), we should not equate our idea of fun and leisure with Nemesianus'. Toohey 2004: 222-257 considers the concept of leisure in particular vis-à-vis didactic poetry itself. When modern audiences think of leisure, we might think of peaceful activities that rest the mind, but Toohey discusses the relationship between leisure and identity, and the activities people pursue to protect their self-identification.

²⁹ "Nor should care of dogs be last," Verg. *G.* 3.404.

³⁰ "That care of dogs is first," Grat. 151-152.

*incipiat primo.*³¹

His rivalry with his predecessors continues in his discussion of other dog breeds. The initial focus on two breeds of dogs reflects Vergil's and even Xenophon's focus on the two main breeds of dogs in the ancient Greek world.³² As Arrian explicitly corrects Xenophon's work by discussing Celtic dogs, so Nemesianus implicitly references Vergil's focus and then updates his poem with the other breeds to be found in the wider Roman world.³³ Grattius, on the other hand, immediately discusses the variety of breeds and does not focus especially on Spartan or Molossian.³⁴ This structure demonstrates that Nemesianus is more concerned with establishing Vergil as his biggest literary rival.

The meaning of *virtus* as literal physical strength in Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* contributes to our understanding of his practical mindset. *Virtus*, occurring five times in the remaining lines of the *Cynegetica*, indicates physical strength each time.³⁵ The phrase *virtutis amore* appears once in the testing of puppies, and the mother judges her puppies based on their future prowess in hunting.³⁶ The phrase is echoed less than forty lines later in the training of dogs: when the owner is training his dogs, they should be compelled to love the praise of earned strength (*emeritae laudem virtutis amare*, 188).³⁷ The owner should praise them based on their performance. During training, *virtus* is used precisely to mean strength when a weak rabbit is selected to train the puppies (183-184):

³¹ "Let your care for dogs start not slothful from the first beginning of the year" Nem. 103-104. Volpilhac 1975: 115 n. 60 notes the practicality of this advice based on Xenophon *Cyn.* 7.

³² Verg. *G.* 3.405 and Xen. *Cyn.* 3.1; cf. Introduction, Part II.A.

³³ Arrian *Cyn.* 1. The multiple breeds of dogs may be part of a Roman desire to show the expanse of their control. There may also be an Ovidian allusion with the phrase *venatibus aptos* (Nem. *Cyn.* 226, Ov. *AA* 1.253), which are locations of women.

³⁴ Grat. 154-155.

³⁵ Nem. *Cyn.* 150, 183, 188, 250, 251. The word *virtus* is difficult to render fully into English. McDonnell 2006 shows that originally *virtus* was not essentially moral virtue, but strength displayed in the public arena as part of defining manliness, a definition which seems to fit Nemesianus' uses.

³⁶ Nem. *Cyn.* 144-150.

³⁷ Nem. *Cyn.* 188.

*nec cursus virtute parem, sed tarda trahentem
membra.*³⁸

In the discussion about horses, as well, *virtus* is what spurs the horses onwards:

virtus...animosa (250) and *virtus bene floruit* (281).³⁹ Thus, *virtus* is not an abstract moral quality in Nemesianus, but an assessment of physical strength. The equation of *virtus* with strength, particularly military prowess, is standard in Latin.⁴⁰ Grattius uses the word *virtus* eleven times, and he does make an explicit connection between *virtus* and war (179-180):

*at magnum cum venit opus promendaque virtus
et vocat extremo praeceptis discrimine mavors.*⁴¹

In another instance, the best breed of dog is praised for his strength (254-255):

*non alio maior sub pectore virtus,
sive in lora voces seu nudi ad pignora martis.*⁴²

Within the *cynetica* tradition, therefore, there is a direct correlation between *virtus* and martial strength. Given the strong ties between hunting and training for warfare, the focus on this sort of strength as *virtus* is unsurprising in Grattius.⁴³ Grattius, however, does have a wider view of *virtus*: he recognizes that there are non-martial and non-physical characteristics that are considered *virtus* (*ex omni florem virtute capessunt*).⁴⁴

Virtues in the sense of positive traits extend beyond the word *virtus* and into concepts of

³⁸ “Nor one equal in strength of the course, but one dragging slow limbs” Nem. *Cyn.* 183-184.

³⁹ “heady virtue” and “virtue has flourished well” Nem. *Cyn.* 250 and 281. For their strength to be returned, the horses need rest. Everyone can benefit from a leisure activity.

⁴⁰ OLD s.v. “virtus” §1.b.

⁴¹ “But when a great work comes, and virtue must be produced and heedless Mars calls at the final turning point” Grat. 179-180. The other passages are Grat. 3, 167, 173, 198, 210, 254, 323, 325, 500, and 506. The *magnum opus* may also signal a connection between the call to poetry and the call to hunt, cf. n. 26 above.

⁴² “Virtue is not greater in another heart, whether you call them into the reins or to the promises of open war” Grat. 254-255.

⁴³ Cf. Introduction, Part II.B.

⁴⁴ “They took the flower from every virtue” Grat. 198, speaking of dog breeders who crossbreed to eliminate flaws in specific breeds. The allusion to Pindar *Olympian* 1.13 adds to the wider scope that Grattius attempts to reach in his poetry.

moderation and piety in Grattius.⁴⁵ In Nemesianus, virtue seems to be defined solely as physical excellence.

Nemesianus' preference for concrete over symbolic hunting also appears in the description of the contagious diseases. In the case of Nemesianus, as in Grattius, the diseases are scabies and rabies.⁴⁶ Nemesianus' account of medical cures lacks both the pessimism of Vergil and the religious fervor of Grattius.⁴⁷ Instead, his short account only discusses the two diseases and brief cures for each, displaying an economy of poetry and purpose and also a lack of interest in the metaphysical possibilities and philosophical questions arising from the plague as explored in other works.⁴⁸

Nemesianus discusses scabies first, probably as the lesser of two evils.⁴⁹ Nemesianus' cures, however, are more reminiscent of Grattius' advice for rabies, which he discusses first.⁵⁰ The medicine for scabies in Nemesianus is a bath and blood-letting (199-202):

*...tu sollicitos impende labores
et sortire gregem suffecta prole quotannis.
quin acidos Bacchi latices Tritonide oliva
admiscere decet catulosque canesque maritas
unguere profuerit tepidoque ostendere soli,
auribus et tineas candenti pellere cultro.*⁵¹

Nemesianus' language here is Vergilian, although the allusions come from Vergil on the breeding of cows and horses rather than his passage on disease, which is fitting given

⁴⁵ Cf. Chapter 4.

⁴⁶ Rabies at Grat. 383-398. and Nem. Cyn. 203-223, scabies at Grat. 408-476. and Nem. Cyn. 195-202.

⁴⁷ Cf. Chapter 2 Part III and Chapter 4 Part III.B.

⁴⁸ Cf. Chapter 4 Part III.B for more background on each author's attitude towards diseases.

⁴⁹ Nem. Cyn. 195-202. On general medical practices, cf. Volpilhac 1975: 118-119 n.98-102 and 121n.115, Williams 1986: 178-179, Mastroianni 1994, and Gitton 2001 and her bibliography.

⁵⁰ Grat. 383-398.

⁵¹ "You hang onto the accustomed labors and sort the flock each year with qualified offspring. But also it is fitting to mix the sharp dregs of Bacchus with Tritonian olive, and it profits to anoint puppies and married dogs and to show them to the tepid sun, and to cut the mites from their ears with a shining knife" Nem. Cyn. 199-202.

Nemesianus' preference for breeding as the solution. Points of context between the two texts are the devotion to work (*impende labores*), the selection (*sortire*), and the alert to do it each year (*quotannis*).⁵² Nemesianus' medical advice also matches Grattius' advice on rabies: the worm (*vermiculum*, 387) which is the cause, the wash with olive oil (*tenui...olivo*, 395), and the cut with a knife (*ferro....recidunt*, 392-393).⁵³ In his allusions to Grattius, it is unclear why Nemesianus would switch diseases from rabies to scabies. However, since Grattius discussed rabies first, perhaps the simple priority of it provided Nemesianus with inspiration. The switch should make the reader more alert to the speaker's instruction, and cutting a mite from a dog infected by scabies may be more useful than attempting to cut out rabies: scholars have argued that Nemesianus' advice represents contemporary medical practice.⁵⁴ Disease for Nemesianus represents neither a breakdown of society, nor the saving power of Epicureanism, nor the failure of divine aid, nor the success of the divine. It is simply another event to deal with on the estate.

Even rabies, the worst disease, does not bring Nemesianus to distraction from his straightforward instruction, like the *Georgics*' unfortunate ending. Rabies is discussed second, and rabies is called *letale periculum* (204), wording similar to Grattius' *letale malum* (385).⁵⁵ Grattius wonders about its origins.⁵⁶ Nemesianus, as well, provides some of the common beliefs about the origins of diseases: the sun's heat, the time of year as told by the constellation, air quality, and dryness.⁵⁷ His language is chosen so that the causes reflect the symptoms of the disease itself: Leo shakes (*quatit*, 208) his back to

⁵² Cf. *Nem. Cyn.* 197-198 with Verg. *G.* 3.71-74: *impende labores, sortire, quotannis*.

⁵³ *Grat.* 387; 395; 392-393.

⁵⁴ Mastroianni 1994 and Gitton 2001.

⁵⁵ "fatal danger" *Nem. Cyn.* 204; *Grat.* 385: "deadly evil".

⁵⁶ *Grat.* 373-377.

⁵⁷ *Nem. Cyn.* 204-211. Volpilhac 1975: 120 n.112 and Williams 1986: 179-180 note that the causes are standard.

cause the disease, just as a cough shakes pigs in Vergil (*et quatit aegros tussis anhela sues*, 3.497).⁵⁸ In both poems, the fawning puppies (*canibus blandis*, 208 and Verg. *G.* 3.496) are the victims.⁵⁹ However, in Nemesianus, there is no way to know the cause; nothing can be done about its origins and there is no great angst over the situation. The dismissive transition “whatever it is” (*quicquid id est*, 212) moves the discussion from the unknown and unimportant causes to the symptoms and how to heal them.⁶⁰

The cure for rabies also reflects Vergil’s treatment, where medicine is mixed and administered to dogs by pouring it down their throats via funnel. But whereas the medicine administered by a funnel was the one hope for the sick in the *Georgics*, a hope that eventually fails and leads to death, in Nemesianus, all treatments are successful against rabies.⁶¹ In Vergil, the Furies return to their attack (*furiisque refecti ardebant*, 3.511-512) but these Furies of disease are wholly overcome in Nemesianus (222-223):

*possis Furiasque repellere tristes
atque iterum blandas canibus componere mentes.*⁶²

The language lessens the anxiety felt in Vergil and also returns the dogs to their pleasing minds (*blandas...mentes*), their original attitudes in Vergil (*canibus blandis*, 3.496).⁶³ Nemesianus’ straightforward attitude towards medicine is more reminiscent of Grattius’ optimism than Vergil’s *aporia*, but Nemesianus lacks Grattius’ divinely-ordered world.⁶⁴

⁵⁸ Nem. *Cyn.* 208, “a racking cough shakes the sick pigs” Verg. *G.* 3.497.

⁵⁹ Nem. *Cyn.* 208, Verg. *G.* 3.496.

⁶⁰ Nem. *Cyn.* 212.

⁶¹ Verg. *G.* 3.509-514. On rabies, cf. Nem. 215. With scabies, failure is tempered by success, cf. Nem. *Cyn.* 195-198.

⁶² “And refreshed, they were burning with madness,” Verg. *G.* 3.511-512; “And you are able to repel the sad Furies and again to put pleasing minds in the dogs” Nem. *Cyn.* 222-223.

⁶³ *canibus blandis*, “pleasing dogs” Verg. *G.* 3.496, cf. n. 59 above. Williams 1986: 182 notes that the proleptic use of *blandas* is acceptable in Nemesianus, but it is also extremely logical in light of the Vergilian allusion.

⁶⁴ The middle route of Nemesianus may be witnessed in the use of divinities in antonomasia throughout, as he frequently chooses to refer to the sun, wheat, wine and olive oil by their divine doubles (i.e. “Ceres” for

This attitude gives Nemesianus a particular place in the didactic tradition.

Paschalis breaks didactic poetry into two types, Aratean and Lucretian; the former is detached while the latter is characterized by didactic fervor. Vergil and other Roman didactic poets tend to fall somewhere between these two poles.⁶⁵ Regarding Nemesianus, Paschalis argues that Nemesianus calls the reader to an escapist, peaceful countryside by using very benign vocabulary for hunting.⁶⁶ Once the reader leaves the proem, however, Nemesianus sounds much more detached and cold, to use Paschalis' terms for Aratean didactic.⁶⁷ For the majority of the poem, Nemesianus provides information on hunting without recourse to mythology or broader goals, following a more Aratean didactic model.⁶⁸ Although Grattius' *Cynegetica* also mentions constellations and seasons, and Orlandi specifically argues for Grattius' scientific side, its frequent invocations to gods and moral lessons display a more Lucretian-style fervor.⁶⁹ Nemesianus lacks "grandiose intonation" in what is left of his hunting manual and distances himself from previous *Cynegetica* writers.⁷⁰ Whether or not Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* is useful for the practical hunter, Nemesianus uses less poetic language and more straightforward instructions in

wheat). It may be mere poetic flourish, but the lip service to gods places him as it were in the middle of the spectrum established by Grattius' serious piety and Vergil's doubt.

⁶⁵ Paschalis 2000: 205.

⁶⁶ Cf. Paschalis 2000: 224-225 and 231-232. He notes that Nemesianus is part of a new, escapist didactic poetry, but I disagree with the latter adjective.

⁶⁷ Paschalis 2000: 205.

⁶⁸ The exception to this absence is the simile in Nemesianus (*Cyn.* 272-278), which uses Vergilian and Aratean language. Any wind could have been chosen by Nemesianus, but when *Threicius Boreas* disturbs the sea god, the mythical world of Vergil (especially *Aeneid* 1.124-127, 10.350) is blended with the didactic world of Aratus (*Aratea* 241-243). The mythical world is allowed in Nemesianus, but only as a simile and not as something that affects or is affected by his work; Volpilhac 1975: 88 notes that this intrusion into the text has been criticized in terms of style.

⁶⁹ Orlandi 1979.

⁷⁰ Paschalis 2000: 205. It is worth noting that Xenophon's discussion of moral value in hunting is limited to the last few books, which leads me to admit that the end of Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* may have included something moralistic.

the style of Aratus.⁷¹ Nemesianus would prefer to seem to be the useful one rather than the one who offers mere mythological delight.

IV. Conclusion

In the final analysis, if Nemesianus intends to comment upon poetry as well as upon hunting, his message is serious. The allusions, especially to Vergil, draw the reader's attention, but even as Nemesianus displays his knowledge of so-called Golden Age Latin poetry, he rejects the paradigmatic questions we have seen earlier authors explore in their didactic poems. Hunting is leisure and an escape from the world's disorder, but it is not an escape from hard labor. Nemesianus' proem sets the expectations for literary polemic against earlier authors and serious interest in hunting. Writing poetry is like hunting in that it takes a learned effort and the goal is to capture worthy prey, which is to say worthy predecessors, in order to sustain and enjoy oneself at their expense. The obvious reliance on Vergil demonstrates Nemesianus' aim for the highest poetry, but rather than exploring questions of knowledge and hunting, Nemesianus focuses on the attainment of a concrete goal. His knowledge is the concrete knowledge of hunting lessons, and he puts faith in straightforward human instruction to attain its goals. Nemesianus teaches one leisure activity to his audience, and so offers to the modern audience a contrast from earlier Latin didactic authors. Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Grattius explore ways that hunting parallels the growth of human understanding. Nemesianus provides lessons about poetry and society, but ultimately he focuses on his chosen lesson of hunting. In a genre like didactic poetry, where in theory

⁷¹ And, in fact, the *Cynegetica* is in the style of much didactic poetry before Lucretius, cf. Bartley 2003. Aratus's work, however, does contain religious mentions and Stoic training (e.g. Aratus *Phae.* 1-18 invokes Zeus, Hunter 1995).

the text's purpose is to teach an audience about a particular subject, to make the instruction central is perhaps the best way to demonstrate superiority.

Conclusion

I. Summary of Argument

Hunting was adopted by Lucretius in his *De Rerum Natura* as a philosophical model for the capture of knowledge. Inspired by images of hunting in Greek philosophy, Lucretius compares his readers to dogs so that they can learn to effectively hunt out knowledge for themselves. The key example is Book 1.402-411:

*verum animo satis haec vestigia parva sagaci
sunt per quae possis cognoscere cetera tute.
namque canes ut montivagae persaepe ferarum
naribus inveniunt intactas fronde quietes,
cum semel institerunt vestigia certa viai,
sic alid ex alio per te tute ipse videre
talibus in rebus poteris caecasque latebras
insinuare omnis et verum protrahere inde.
quod si pigraris paulumve recesseris ab re,
hoc tibi de plano possum promittere, Memmi:¹*

The dog-like readers hunt out philosophical proofs, but as Lucretius tracks Epicurus and leaves his own tracks in turn (*DRN* 3.3-4, 5.55-56), the audience can also leave their own prints behind for future generations to follow.

Lucretius' use of hunting helps us to contextualize later accounts: as the founder of Latin didactic, Lucretius was a model for later authors. By using hunting as a sign for perception, Lucretius established a language with which the other poets could discuss knowledge. Hunting is often connected to knowledge in Latin didactic poetry, but the relationship grows and becomes problematic in later periods. The success of hunting knowledge is not agreed upon by all ancient authors. Vergil, Ovid, and Grattius

¹ "But these small tracks, through which you are able to know the rest safely, are enough for the wise spirit. For indeed as mountain-treading dogs with their noses often come upon the quiet places of wild animals covered with foliage, when at once they set upon the certain tracks of the road, thus with one thing here from another thing there, you yourself through your own ability are able to see safely in such things and to curve through the dark hidden places and to draw out the truth from there. But if you are slow or you recede a little from the matter, I am able to provide this to you clearly, Memmius:..." *Lucr.* 1.402-411.

manipulate the parallel between education and a successful hunt. In the *Georgics*, the hunt at times seems successful, but at other times it cannot attain what the farmer wants. On the one hand, it should be one of the positive *artes* of the theodicy (*G.* 1.118-146). On the other hand, the farmer can fail or be deceived. The *Georgics* dramatizes this struggle when Aristaeus hunts Proteus for information: he asks not to be deceived (*G.* 4.447-448), but he is only given partial answers. The *Georgics* displays a human limit for knowledge. In the *Ars Amatoria*, the hunt for love initially appears foolproof, and the male hunter-lover captures prey while the female nets capture their lovers. The dynamics are appropriate to the Roman world, but the speaker occasionally exposes a conflict between the message and the imagery. This conflict is dramatized by the myth of Cephalus and Procris (*AA* 3.685-746), when the lover kills his beloved like an animal. The hunt fails even though it literally succeeds: the prey is captured. The prey, however, is not what the audience believed it to be. These two works both make the reader question whether he can obtain secure knowledge or whether knowledge is malleable.

The security of knowledge and true understanding is obtainable in Grattius' *Cynegetica*. Through a connection between Roman *exempla* and hunting preparation, Grattius offers life advice to his audience, and his poetry is affirmed by a connection to the divine that even the audience can foster. He offers a hierarchy of knowledge scalable in a way that Vergil's boundary of knowledge is not. Nemesianus, the author of the other *Cynegetica*, seems to avoid questions of knowledge and to focus instead on the lesson itself. In this way, he diverges from the use of hunting witnessed in earlier Latin didactic authors and serves as a counterbalance. Not every didactic poet may be interested in the

philosophical question of whether or not knowledge can be certain: some authors simply accept that it is.

II. Metacommentary on Knowledge

Didactic poetry is about education, not in the sense of classroom instruction but in the sense of an instructor leading a pupil to greater knowledge. Both ancient and modern literary theorists have had problems defining didactic poetry and understanding the relative seriousness of different poems. No matter how diverse the subject matter, however, the poems could not be considered didactic without some interest in knowledge. From Lucretius to the others, we see an engagement with this concept. The metaphors in each text contribute to the author's subject as well as our ability, as modern readers, to understand the interests and associations of the ancient reader. The many associated implications of hunting inform our reading of these five didactic poems and keep us on the search for knowledge and meaning in the texts.

Bibliography

- Aicher, P. "Lucretian Revisions of Homer." *CJ* 87 (1992): 139-158.
- Alföldi, A. "Diana Nemorensis." *AJA* 64 (1960): 137-44.
- Algra, K., M. Koenen and P. Schrijvers, eds. *Lucretius and his Intellectual Background*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1997.
- Amden, B. et al., ed. *Noctae Atticae: Articles on Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Its Nachleben*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.
- Amyx, D.A. "A 'Pontic' oinochoe in Seattle." In *Hommages à A. Grenier*, edited by Marcel Renard, 121-134. Berchem-Bruxelles: Latomus, 1962.
- Anderson, J. K. *Hunting in the Ancient World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Anderson, W.S. "The Example of Procris in the *Ars Amatoria*." In *Cabinet of the Muses*, edited by M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde, 131-146. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 6-10*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.
- Arkins, B. "Epicurus and Lucretius on sex, love, and marriage." *Apeiron* 18 (1984): 141-143.
- Armisen-Marchetti, M. "Le miel de Lucrece: poetique, rhetorique et psychologie de la persuasion dans le *De rerum natura*." *VL* 134 (1994): 9-17.
- Armstrong, D., J. Fish, P. Johnston, and M. Skinner, eds. *Vergil, Philodemus and the Augustans*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.
- Armstrong, R. *Ovid and His Love Poetry*. London: Duckworth Publishers, 2005.
- Asmis, E. "Epicurean empiricism." In *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism*, edited by J. Warren, 84-104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . "Epicurean Poetics." In *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus and Horace*, edited by D. Obbink, 15-34. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Atherton, C., ed. *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry*. Bari: Levante, 1998.
- Auguet, R. *Cruelty and Civilization: The Roman Games*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1972.
- Aymard, J. *Essai sur les Chasses Romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins*. Paris: Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et Rome, 1951.
- . "A propos de Grattius." *RPh* 12 (1938): 325-9.
- Baehrens, A. *Poetae Latini Minores*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1879.
- Baligan, G. "Il poeta Grattius (?)." *Vichiana* 5 (1968): 21-48.
- Bailey, C, ed. *De Rerum Natura*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947.
- . "Virgil and Lucretius." *PCA* 28 (1931): 21-39.
- , ed. *De Rerum Natura*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Baldo, G. "Libro secondo." In *L'Arte Di Amare*, edited by E. Pianezzola, 271-347. Segrate: Mandadori, 2007.
- Baratte, F. "Un Témoignage sur les *venatores* en Afrique: la Statue de Sidi Ghrib (Tunisie)." *Antiquités Africaines* 34 (1998): 215-225.
- Barker, A. "Shifting Frontiers in Ancient Theories of Metaphor." *PCPhS* 45 (1999): 1-16.
- Barringer, J. *The Hunt in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University

- Press, 2001.
- Bartley, A. *Stories from the mountains, stories from the sea : the digressions and similes of Oppian's « Halieutica » and the « Cynegetica »*. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2003.
- Batstone, W. "Virgilian Didaxis: Value and Meaning in the *Georgics*." In *Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by C. Martindale, 125-144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . "Introduction: On How Virgil's Pastoral Makes a Difference." *Arethusa* 23:1 (1990): 5-17.
- Beacham, R. *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Beall, E. F. "The Plow that Broke the Plain Epic Tradition: Hesiod *Work and Days* vv. 414-503." *CA* 23.1 (2004): 1-31.
- Bérard, C., et al., eds. *A City of Images*, translated by D. Lyons. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Bergmann, B. "Apollo and Diana in Roman Art." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Philological Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 5-8, 2012.
- Bertrand, F. "Remarques sur le commerce des bêtes sauvages entre l'Afrique du nord et l'Italie." *MEFRA* 99.1 (1987): 211-241.
- Beschaouch, A. "Nouvelles recherches sur les sodalités de l'Afrique romaine." *CRAI* 121.3 (1977): 486-503.
- . "La mosaïque de chasse à l'amphithéâtre découverte à Smirat en Tunisie." *CRAI* 110.1 (1966): 134-157.
- Betensky, A. "Lucretius and Love." *CW* 73.5 (1980): 291-299.
- . "The Literary Use of Animals in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Virgil's *Georgics*." PhD diss., Yale University, 1972.
- Beye, C. R. "Lucretius and Progress." *CJ* 58 (1963): 160-169.
- Black, M. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.
- Blagg, T. F. C. "The Cult and Sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis." In *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*, edited by M. Henig and A. King, 211-20. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1986.
- Blickman, D. "Lucretius, Epicurus, and Prehistory." *HSCP* 92 (1989): 157-91.
- Blodgett, E.D. "The Well Wrought Void: Reflections on the *Ars Amatoria*." *CJ* 68.4 (1973): 322-333.
- Binnicker, C.M. "Didactic Qualities of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 1967.
- Bodson, L. "Attitudes towards animals in Greco-Roman antiquity." *International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems* 4 (1983): 312-320.
- Bomgardner, D. L. "Putting on a Show in The Magerius Mosaic." *Current World Archaeology* 3 (2007): 12-21.
- . *The Story of the Roman Amphitheatre*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- . "The Trade in Wild Beasts for Roman Spectacles: A Green Perspective." *Anthropozoologica* 16 (1992): 161-166.
- Bonnefoy, Y., ed. *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago

- Press, 1992.
- Bonner, C. "Eros and the Wounded Lion." *AJA* 49.4 (1945): 441-444.
- Boyd, B. W. "Remedia Amoris." In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by P. Knox, 104-119. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- , ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Boyle, A. J, ed. *Virgil's Ascrean Song*. Victoria, Aureal Publications, 1979.
- Boys-Stones, G.R. *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Bradley, K. "Animalizing the Slave: The Truth of Fiction." *JRS* 90 (2000): 110-125.
- Brenk, F. O. "Tumulo solacia or foedera lecti: The Myth of Cephalus and Procris in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Augustan Age* 2 (1982-3): 9-22.
- Brennan, T. "Epicurus on Sex, Marriage, and Children." *Classical Philology* 91.4 (1996): 346-352.
- Briggs, W. W. *Narrative and Simile from the Georgics in the Aeneid*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Bright, D. F. "The Plague and the Structure of *De Rerum Natura*." *Latomus* 30 (1971): 607-632.
- Bright, D and E. Ramage, eds. *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C.R. Trahman*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Brown, R. D. *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura IV, 1030-1287*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Buchheit, V. "Epikurs Triumph des Geistes." *Hermes* 99 (1971): 303-323.
- Buchholz, H.G., G. Jöhrens, and I. Maull. *Jagd und Fischfang*. Göttingen: Archaeologica Homerica, 1973.
- Bureau, B. and Chr. Nicolas, eds. *Commencer et Finir. Débuts et fins dans les littératures grecque, latine et néolatine* (Lyon3/ENS-LSH, 29-30 sept. 2006). Lyon: Collection du CEROR, 2007.
- Burkert, W. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Trans. Peter Bing. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Bücheler, F. "Coniectanea." *RhM* 35 (1880): 407.
- Burnett, A. P. "Hunt and Hearth in *Hippolytus*." In *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy*, edited by M. Cropp, E. Fantham, and S. E. Scully, 167-186. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986.
- Butler, A. J. *Sport in Classic Times*. New York: Dutton, 1930.
- Cacciaglia M., ed. *Il Cinegetico*. Roma: Tip. dei Monasteri, 1970.
- Campbell, J.S. "The Ambiguity of Progress: Georgics I, 118-159." *Latomus* 41 (1982): 566-576.
- Capdeville, G. "Substitution de victimes dans les sacrifices d'animaux à Rome." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome Antiquité* 83 (1971): 283-323.
- Capponi, F. *Ovidius Cynegeticus*. Genova: Fac. Di Lettere dell'Univ. di Genova, 1988.
- . "Cynegetica Ouidiana (Her., V, 19-20)." *Latomus* 41 (1982): 597-601.
- . "Cynegetica. Il cane da "ferma" di Eliano." *Latomus* 27 (1968): 421-424.
- . "Il cassis ed i suoi poeti." *Latomus* 17 (1958): 669-686.
- Carter, J. G. *Quintilian's Didactic Metaphors*. PhD diss., New York University, New York, 1910.
- Catto, B. A. "Lucretian Labor and Vergil's Labor Improbis." *CJ* 81.4 (1986): 305-318.

- . "The Concept of *Natura* in the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius and the *Georgics* of Vergil." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981.
- Cazeaux, C. *Metaphor and Continental Philosophy: From Kant to Derrida*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Cazzaniga, I. "Grattio (Cyneg. 68) ed Ovidio (M. VIII. 397)." *PP* 17 (1962): 296-299.
- Cèbe, J-P, ed. *Varron, Satires Ménippées*. Vol. 8. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1987.
- Charles-Picard, G. *La Civilisation de L'Afrique Romaine*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1959.
- . *Les Religions de L'Afrique Antique*. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1954.
- Clare, R. "Chiron, Melampus and Tisiphone: myth and meaning in Virgil's plague of Noricum." *Hermathena* 158 (1995): 95-108.
- Classen, C.J. *Untersuchungen zu Platons Jagdbildern*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- Clay, D. *Lucretius and Epicurus*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Coleman, K. M. "Ptolemy Philadelphus and the Roman Amphitheater." In *Roman Theater and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I*, edited by W. Slater, 49-68. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Conte, G. B. *Genres and Readers*. Trans. Glenn Most. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994a.
- . *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994b.
- Corbeill, A. "Education in the Roman Republic: Creating Traditions." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, edited by Y. L. Too, 261-288. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Costa, C.D.N., ed. *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura V*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Courtney, E. "Vergil, *Georgics* 3.44" *AJPh* 110.3 (1989): 488.
- Cox, A. S. "Didactic Poetry: Lucretius." In *Probleme der Lukrezforschung*, edited by C. J. von Classen, 221-232. Hildesheim: Olms, 1986.
- . "Lucretius and His Message: A Study in the Prologues of the *De Rerum Natura*." *G&R* 18 (1971): 1-16.
- Cristante, L. "Libro terzo." In *L'Arte Di Amare*, edited by E. Pianezzola, 348-442. Segrate: Mandadori, 2007.
- Cropp, M., E. Fantham, and S. E. Scully, eds. *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986.
- Cupane, C. "La contesa d'amore. Cod. Marc. Gr. 479, f. 33." *Hellenica* 31 (1979): 174-183.
- Curcio, G. "Grazio poeta didattico." *RFIC* 26 (1898): 55-69.
- Dalzell, A. *The Criticism of Didactic Poetry: Essays on Lucretius, Vergil, and Ovid*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Damschen, G. "Das lateinische Akrostichon : neue Funde bei Ovid sowie Vergil, Grattius, Manilius und Silius Italicus." *Philologus* 148:1 (2004): 88-115.
- David, E. "Hunting in Spartan Society and Consciousness." *EchCL* 37 (1993): 393-413.
- Davidson, D. "What Metaphors Mean." In *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, edited by M. Johnson, 200-220. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- Davis, G. *The Death of Procris: 'Amor' and the Hunt in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Rome, Edizioni dell'Ateneo: 1983.
- Davis, P. "Praeceptor Amoris: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and the Augustan idea of Rome."

- Ramus* 24.2 (1995): 181-195.
- Davis, P. J. "Unity and Meaning in Vergil's *Georgics*." In *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, edited by C. Deroux, 138-156. Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1980.
- . "Vergil's *Georgics* and the Pastoral Ideal." *Ramus* 8 (1979): 22-33.
- Debru, A., N. Palmieri, and B. Jacquinod, eds. *Docente natura: mélanges de médecine ancienne et médiévale offerts à Guy Sabbah*. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 2001.
- Dehon, P.-J. "Horace et la chasse." *Latomus* 47 (1988): 830-3.
- de Lacy, P. H. "The Imagery of Lucretius 2." *CJ* 60:2 (1964): 49-55.
- . "Lucretius and the History of Epicureanism." *TAPA* 79 (1948a): 12-23.
- . "Stoic Views of Poetry." *AJPh* 69.3 (1948b): 241-271.
- Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Denieux, E. "L'importation d'animaux d'Afrique à l'époque républicaine et les relations de clientèle." *L'Africa romana* 13 (1998): 1299-1307.
- Depew, M. and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Deroux, C., ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*. Brussels: Collection Latomus, 1980.
- Descœudres, J.-P. "An Augustan Hunting Cup." *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 4 (1979): 513-523.
- DeWitt, N. "Epicurus: All Sensations are True." *TAPA* 74 (1943): 19-32.
- De Vivo, A. "Il proemio del *Cynegeticon* liber di Grattio, II." In *Prefazioni, Prologhi, Proemi di opere tecnico-scientifiche latine*, edited by C. Santini and N. Scivoletto, 749-765. Roma: Herder editrice e libreria, 1992.
- Di Stefano, A. "Su alcuni aspetti metrico-prosodici dei *Cynegetica* di Nemesiano." *BStudLat* 28:1 (1998): 57-77.
- Dominik, W., ed. *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Donohue, H. *The Song of the Swan. Lucretius and the Influence of Callimachus*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1993.
- Downing, E. "Anti-Pygmalion: The *Praeceptor* in *Ars Amatoria*, Book 3." In *Constructions of the Classical Body*, edited by J. Porter, 235-251. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Drew, D. L. "The Structure of Vergil's *Georgics*." *AJPh* 50 (1929): 242-254.
- Duckworth, G. *Vergil and classical hexameter poetry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969.
- Duff, J.W. and A. Duff. *Minor Latin Poets*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Dunbabin, K.M.D. *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa: Studies in Iconography and Patronage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Dunkle, R. J. "The Hunter and Hunting in the *Aeneid*." *Ramus* 2 (1973): 127-142.
- Dunn, H. D. "The Hunt as an Image of Love and War in Classical Literature." PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1980.
- Durand, J.-L. and A. Schnapp. "Sacrificial Slaughter and Initiatory Hunt." In *A City of Images*, edited by C. Bérard et al., translated by D. Lyons, 53-70. Princeton:

- Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Dyson, J. *King of the Wood: The Sacrificial Victor in Virgil's Aeneid*. Oklahoma City: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.
- Eden, P. T. "Nemesianus, Cynegetica 240-2." *CR* 20 (1970): 142.
- Edwards, C. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Edwards, R. "Hunting for Boars with Pliny and Tacitus." *CA* 27.1 (2008): 35-58.
- Effe, B. "Typologie und Literarhistorischer Kontext." In *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*, edited by M. Horster and C. Reitz, 27-44. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- . *Dichtung und Lehre: Untersuchungen zur Typologie des antiken Lehrgedichts*. Munich: Beck, 1977.
- Eidinow, J.S.C. "A Note on Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 1.117-19." *AJPh* 114.3 (1993): 413-417.
- Enk, P.J., ed. *Gratti Cynegeticon quae supersunt*. Zutphen: Thieme, 1918.
- Euben, J. Peter, ed. *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Fagan, G. *The Lure of the Arena: Social Psychology and the Crowd at the Roman Games*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Farney, G. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2007.
- Farrell, J. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- . *Thematic Allusions to Lucretius in Vergil's Georgics*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1983.
- Farrington, B. "Polemical Allusions to the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius in the Works of Vergil." In *Geras: Studies Presented to G. Thomson on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, edited by L. Varcl and R. F. Willetts, 87-94. Prague: Charles University, 1963.
- . "Vergil and Lucretius." *AClass* 1 (1958): 45-50.
- Ferrua, A. "Nouve *tabulae lusoriae* iscritte." *Epigraphica* 26 (1964): 3-44.
- Fleckeisen, A. ed. *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1898.
- Fish, J. and K. Sanders, eds. *Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Focardi, G. "Nemesiano : un africano del III secolo, fra poesia e tecnica: (Cyn. vv. 238-298 : la cura dei cavalli)." *L'Africa romana*. 11:1 (1994): 437-445.
- Foley, J.M., ed. *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005.
- Fontenrose, J.E. *Orion: The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Formicola, C. *Studi sull'esametro del Cynegeticon di Grattio*. Naples: Loffredo, 1995a.
- . "Il pirrichio nel « Cynegeticon » di Grattio." *Orpheus* 16:2 (1995b): 397-416.
- . "Rassegna di studi grattiani." *BStudLat* 24:1 (1994): 155-186.
- . *Il Cynegeticon di Grattio. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1988a.
- . *Gratti Cynegeticon concordantia*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1988b.
- . "Note al testo del Cynegeticon di Grattio." *Vichiana* 14 (1985): 131-165.
- Foucher, L. "Venationes à Hadrumète." *Oud. Med.* 45 (1964): 87-114.

- Fowler, D. P. "The Didactic Plot." In *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*, edited by M. Depew and D. Obbink, 205-219. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Frischer, B. *The Sculpted Word: Epicureanism and Philosophical Recruitment in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Furley, D.J. "Lucretius the Epicurean. On the History of Man." *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 24 (1977): 1-27.
- Futrell, A. *Blood in the Arena: The Spectacle of Roman Power*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.
- Gale, M, ed. *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura V*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2009.
- , ed. *Oxford Readings in Lucretius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . "Avia Pieridum Loca: Tradition and Innovation in Lucretius." In *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*, edited by M. Horster and C. Reitz, 175-192. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- , ed. *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2004.
- . *Lucretius and the Didactic Epic*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2001.
- . *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . "War and Peace in Lucretius and the *Georgics*." *PVS* 23 (1998): 101-128.
- . *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . "Man and Beast in Lucretius and the *Georgics*." *CQ* 61 (1991): 414-426.
- Garani, M. *Empedocles Redivivus: Poetry and Analogy in Lucretius*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Gavoille, E. "La présentation liminaire de l'art dans les poèmes didactiques d'Ovide et de Grattius : tradition poétique, normes rhétoriques et échos philosophiques." In *Commencer et Finir. Débuts et fins dans les littératures grecque, latine et néolatine* (Lyon3/ENS-LSH, 29-30 sept. 2006), edited by B. Bureau and Chr. Nicolas, 83-96. Lyon: Collection du CEROR, 2007.
- Ghedini, F. "Cassia e banchetto: Un rapporto difficile." *RdA* 16 (1992): 72-88.
- Gibbs, Jr., R. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Gibson, R. "The *Ars Amatoria*." In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by P. Knox, 90-103. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- . *Ars Amatoria Book 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . "Didactic Poetry as 'popular' form?" In *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry*, edited by C. Atherton, 67-98. Bari: Levante, 1998.
- Gibson, R., S. Green and A. Sharrock, eds. *The art of love : bimillennial essays on Ovid's Ars amatoria and Remedia amoris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Giebel, M. *Tiere in der Antike: von Fabelwesen, Opfertieren, und treuen Begleitern*. Stuttgart: Theiss, 2003.
- Giesecke, A. *Atoms, Ataraxy and Allusion: Cross-generic Imitation of the De Rerum Natura in Early Augustan Poetry*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2000.
- . "Lucretius and Virgil's Pastoral Dream." *Utopian Studies* 10.2 (1999): 1-15.
- . "The Influence of Lucretius on the Bucolic, Heroic Epic, Satiric and Lyric Poetry of

- the Early Augustan Period." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1992.
- Gillespie, S. and P. Hardie, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Ginzburg, C. "Morelli, Freud, and Sherlock Holmes." Trans. Anna Davin. *History Workshop* 9 (1980): 5-36.
- Girard, R. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. London: Continuum, 1979.
- Gitton, V. "La médecine vétérinaire de Némésien, Cynegeticon, vv. 283-289: la saignée de printemps des chevaux." In *Docente natura: mélanges de médecine ancienne et médiévale offerts à Guy Sabbah*, edited by A. Debru, N. Palmieri, and B. Jacquinod, 133-155. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 2001.
- Gocel, V. "De rerum natura, v. 102-173: la coherence poetique de l'expose de Lucrece." *VL* 148 (1997): 57-64.
- Goldberg, S. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Gray, V.J. "Xenophon's 'Cynegeticus'." *Hermes* 113 (1985): 156-172.
- Green, C.M.C. *Roman Religion and the Cult of Diana at Aricia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . "The Slayer and the King: *Rex Nemorensis* and the Sanctuary of Diana." *Arion* 7.3 (2000): 24-63.
- . "Did the Romans Hunt?" *CA* 15 (1996a): 222-60.
- . "Terms of Venery: *Ars Amatoria* I." *TAPA* 126 (1996b): 221-263.
- Green, P. "The Innocence of Procris. Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 3.687-746." *CJ* 75 (1979-80): 15-24.
- Green, S. "Lessons in Love: Fifty Years of Scholarship on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*." In *The art of love : bimillennial essays on Ovid's Ars amatoria and Remedia amoris*, edited by R. Gibson, S. Green and A. Sharrock, 1-20. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Griffith, M. "'Public' and 'Private' in Early Greek Institutions of Education." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, edited by Y. L. Too, 23-84. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Griffith, M. and D. Mastronarde, eds. *Cabinet of the Muses*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Gumpert, M. "Metaphor as Illness: Hypersemiosis in *Oedipus Tyrannus*." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Philological Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 5-8, 2012.
- Habinek, T. "Situating Literacy at Rome." In *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, edited by W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, 114-142. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- . "Sacrifice, Society, and Vergil's Ox-Born Bees." In *Cabinet of the Muses*, edited by M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde, 209-223. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Habinek, T., and A. Schiesaro, eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1997.
- Hadzsits, G. D. *Lucretius and His Influence*. New York: Longmans Green, 1935.
- Halperin, D. "Pastoral Violence in the *Georgics*: Commentary on Ross." *Arethusa* 23:1 (1990): 77-93.

- Harder, A. "To Teach or not to Teach...? Some Aspects of the Genre of Didactic Poetry in Antiquity." In *Calliope's Classroom: Studies in Didactic Poetry From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by A. Harder, A. MacDonald and G. Reinink, 23-48. Paris: Peeters, 2007.
- Harder, A., A. MacDonald and G. Reinink, eds. *Calliope's Classroom: Studies in Didactic Poetry From Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Paris: Peeters, 2007.
- Hardie, P. "Political Education in Virgil's *Georgics*." *SIFC* 2.1 (2004): 83-111.
- Harrison, S. J. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Haskell, Y. and P. Hardie, eds. *Poets and Teachers: Latin Didactic Poetry and the Didactic Authority of the Latin Poet from the Renaissance to the Present*. Bari: Levante, 1999.
- Haskins, C. H. "The Latin literature of sport." *Speculum* 11 (1929): 235-52.
- Haye, T. "Schluss mit der Jagd! Die Lehrgedichte des Elias Corrigarius an Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada (Erzbischof von Toledo 1209-1247)." In *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*, edited by M. Horster and C. Reitz, 313-330. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- Heath, J. "Disentangling the Beast: Humans and Other Animals in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*." *JHS* 119 (1999): 17-47.
- Heckel, H. *Das Widerspenstige zähmen: Die Funktion der militärischen und politischen Sprache in Vergils Georgica*. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 1998.
- Hejduk, J. "Death by Elegy: Ovid's Cephalus and Procris." *TAPA* 141 (2011): 285-314.
- Heldmann, K. *Dichtkunst oder Liebeskunst? Die mythologischen Erzählungen in Ovids Ars Amatoria*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Henderson, J. "Going to the dogs / Grattius & the Augustan subject." *PCPhS* 47 (2001): 1-22.
- Hendry, M. "Epidaurus, Epirus,... Epidamnus? Vergil *Georgics* 3.44." *HSPH* 99 (1999): 295-300.
- Henig, M. and A. King, eds. *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1986.
- Henkel, J. "Vergil Talks Technique: Metapoetic Trees in the *Georgics*." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Philological Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 5-8, 2012.
- Herter, H. "Grattianum." *RhM* 78 (1929): 361-8.
- Hohler, R. C. "Lucretius' Use of the Simile." *CJ* 21 (1926): 281-3.
- Hollis, A. S. *Ars Amatoria, Book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Holloway, R. R. "The Tomb of the Diver." *AJA* 110 (2006): 365-388.
- . "Conventions of Etruscan Painting in the Tomb of Hunting and Fishing at Tarquinii." *AJA* 69.4 (1965): 341-347.
- Holtmark, E. "On Lucretius 2.1-19." *TAPA* 98 (1967): 193-204.
- Holzberg, N. *Ovid: The Poet and His Work*. trans. G.M. Goshgarian. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- . "Ovids erotische Lehrgedichte and und die römische Liebeselegie." *WS* 15 (1981): 185-204.
- Hornsby, R. A. "The Pastor in the Poetry of Vergil." *CJ* 63 (1968): 145-152.
- Horsfall, N. "An edition of Grattius." *CR* 39 (1989): 213-14.

- Horster, M. and C. Reitz, eds. *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- Housman, A. E. "Notes on Grattius." *CQ* 28 (1934): 127-33.
- Hull, D. B. *Hounds and Hunting in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Hume, D. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. 1739.
- Hunter, R. "Written in the Stars: Poetry and Philosophy in the *Phaenomena* of Aratus." *Arachnion* 2 (1995): <http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num2/hunter.html>.
- Hutchinson, G. O. "Read the Instructions: Didactic Poetry and Didactic Prose." *CQ* 59 (2009): 196-211.
- Innes, D. "Metaphor, Simile, and Allegory as Ornaments of Style." In *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*, edited by G. R. Boys-Stones, 7-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Innes, D., H. Hine and C. Pelling, eds. *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Isenberg, M. W. "Plato's *Sophist* and the Five Stages of Knowing." *CP* 46.4 (1951): 201-211.
- Jacobson, H. "Lucretius' hunting souls (3,726-728)." *MH* 56(1): 33.
- James, A. W. "The honey on the cup in Oppian and others." *PCPS* 12 (1966): 24-26.
- James, S. "Women reading men: the female audience of the *Ars amatoria*." *CCJ* 54 (2008): 136-159.
- Jeffreys, R. "Barking Nature: a Note on *De rerum natura*, 2, 17." *Latomus* 42 (1983): 126-128.
- Jenkyns, R. "Epic and Other Genres in the Roman World." In *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, edited by J. M. Foley, 562-573. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005.
- Jennison, G. *Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient Rome*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1937.
- Johannes, R. "De Studio Venandi Apud Graecos et Romanos." Ph.D. diss, University of Gottingen, 1907.
- Johnson, M. "Introduction: Metaphor in the Philosophical Tradition." In *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, edited by M. Johnson, 3-47. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981a.
- , ed. *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981b.
- Johnson, W.A. and H. N. Parker, eds. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Johnson, W. R. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Johnstone, S. "Virtuous Toil, Vicious Work: Xenophon on Aristocratic Style." *CP* 89.3 (1994): 219-240.
- Jope, J. "The Didactic Unity and Emotional Import of Book 6 of *De rerum natura*." *Phoenix* 43.1 (1989): 16-32.
- Kampen, N. "Biographical Narration and Roman Funerary Art." *AJA* 85:1 (1981): 47-58.
- Keen, R. "Lucretius and his Reader." *Apeiron* 19 (1985): 1-10.
- Keller, A. C. "Lucretius and the Idea of Progress." *CJ* 46 (1951): 185-188.

- Keller, O. *Die Antike Tierwelt*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1909.
- Kennedy, D. F. "Bluff your way in didactic: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*." *Arethusa* 33 (2000): 159-86.
- Kenney, E. J., ed. *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, Book 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- . "Doctus Lucretius." *Mnemosyne* 4.23 (1970) 366-391.
- . "Grattiana." *CR* 15 (1965): 13-16.
- , ed. *Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Kleijwegt, M. *Ancient Youth*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1991.
- Knowles, M. and R. Moon. *Introducing Metaphor*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Knox, P. ed. *A Companion to Ovid*. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009a.
- . "Lost and Spurious Works." In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by P. Knox, 207-216. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009b.
- . "Lucretius on the Narrow Road." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 99 (1999): 275-287.
- . "Love and Horses in Virgil's *Georgics*." *Eranos* 90 (1992): 43-53.
- Korzeniewski, D. *Hirtengedichte aus spatromischer und karolingischer Zeit*. Darmstadt: Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- Kovecses, Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Krenkel, W. *Marcus Terentius Varro Saturae Menippeae*. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae, 2002.
- Krókowski, J. "Ars amatoria, poème didactique." *Eos* 53 (1963): 143-156.
- Kromer, G. "The Didactic Tradition in Vergil's *Georgics*." *Ramus* 8 (1979): 7-21.
- Kronenberg, L. *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome: Philosophical Satire in Xenophon, Varro, and Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . "Mezentius the Epicurean." *TAPA* 135.2 (2005): 403-431.
- Küppers, J. "Das Proömium der 'Cynegetica' Nemesians. Ein Exemplum spätlateinischer Klassikerrezeption." *Hermes* 115 (1987): 473-498.
- Kyle, D. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- . *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Labate, M. "Amore coniugale e amore 'elegiaco' nell' episodio di Cefalo e Procri (Ovidio *Met.* 7.661-865)." *ASNP* 5 (1975): 103-28.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. "Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language." In *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, edited by M. Johnson, 286-325. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- La Penna, A. "Esiòdo nella Cultura e nella Poesia di Virgilio." In *Hésiode et son influence (Entretiens Hardt 7)*, edited by O. Reverdin, 213-270. Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 1962.
- Lavin, I. "The Hunting Mosaics of Antioch and Their Sources: A Study of Compositional Principles in the Development of Early Mediaeval Style." *DOP* 17 (1963): 179-286.
- Leach, E. W. "Georgics II and the Poem." *Arethusa* 14 (1981): 35-48.
- . "Georgic Imagery in the *Ars Amatoria*." *TAPhA* 95 (1964): 142-154.
- Leatherdale, W. H. *The Role of Analogy, Model and Metaphor in Science*. Amsterdam:

- North-Holland, 1974.
- Leen, A. "The Rhetorical Value of the Similes in Lucretius." In *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C.R. Trahman*, edited by D. Bright and E. Ramage, 107-123. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
- . "Didactic Uses of Rhetoric in Lucretius." PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 1980.
- Leidl, C. "The Harlot's Art: Metaphor and Literary Criticism." In *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*, edited by G. R. Boys-Stones, 31-54. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Lenz, F. W. "Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids *Ars Amatoria*." *Maia* 14 (1962): 177-186.
- . "Das Proömium von Ovids *Ars Amatoria*." *Maia* 13 (1961): 131-142.
- Leonard, W. E. and S. B. Smith, eds. *De Rerum Natura*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1942.
- Liebeschuetz, W. "Beast and Man in the Third Book of Vergil's *Georgics*." *G&R* 12 (1965): 64-77.
- Lindsay, W. M. "On Some Lines of Plautus and Terence." *CQ* 23:2 (1929): 112-113.
- Lonsdale, S. H. *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1990.
- . "Attitudes towards Animals in Ancient Greece." *G&R* 26:2 (1979): 146-159.
- Low, G. "Metaphor and Education." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, edited by R. Gibbs, Jr., 212-231. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Luiselli, B. "Il proemio del Cynegeticon di Olimpio Nemesiano." *SIFC* 30 (1958): 73-95.
- MacKinnon, M. "Supplying Exotic Animals For the Roman Amphitheatre Games: New Reconstructions Combining Archaeological, Ancient Textual, Historical and Ethnographic Data." *Mouseion* III.6 (2006): 1-25.
- Mahjoubi, A. "Découverte d'une nouvelle mosaïque de chasse à Carthage." *CRAI* 111.2 (1967): 264-278.
- Mainoldi, C. *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grece ancienne: d'Homere a Platon*. Paris: Ophrys, 1984.
- Manns, O. *Über die Jagd bei den Griechen*. Kassel: Baier and Lewalter, 1888.
- Marruzzino, S. "Grattio, v. 75-80." *Orpheus* 13 (1992): 132-138.
- Marsili, A, ed. *Cynegeticon*. Pisa: Pacini Mariotti, 1958.
- Martin, D. "The Cynegetica of Nemesianus." PhD diss., Cornell University, 1917.
- Martindale, C., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Martinez, S. "Los 'Cynegetica' fragmentarios y el fracaso del cazador." *Myrtia* 15 (2000): 177-185.
- Mask, J. "Xenophon bei Kallimachos." *Philologische Wochenschrift* 47 (1927): 412-415.
- Mastrorosa, I. "Dal « Cynegeticon » alla cinofilia : Nemesiano, Cyn. v. 103 ss." *L'Africa romana*. 11:1 (1994): 447-470.
- McCall, M. H. *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- McDonnell, M. *Roman Manliness: "Virtus" and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- McDonough, S. "Of Beasts and Bees: the View of the Natural World in Virgil's

- Georgics* and John's *Apocalypse*." *NTS* 46:2 (2000): 227-244.
- McDougall, I., J. C. Yardley and M. Joyal, eds. *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- McGill, S. *Vergil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . "Other *Aeneids*: rewriting three passages of the *Aeneid* in the *Codex Salmasianus*." *Vergilius* 49 (2003): 84-113.
- McKay, K. L. "Animals in War and Isonomia." *AJP* 85:2 (1964): 124-135.
- McLaughlin, J. D. "The Relevancy of the Mythological Episodes to Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1975.
- Merlan, P. "Lucretius, Primitivist or Progressivist?" *JHI* 11 (1950): 364-368.
- Miles, G. *Virgil's Georgics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Miller, J. F. "Apostrophe, Aside and the Didactic Addressee: Poetic Strategies in *Ars Amatoria* III." *MD* 31 (1993): 231-241.
- Minadeo, R. "The Lyre of Science: Form and Meaning in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*." PhD diss., Wayne State University, 1969.
- Mitsis, P. "Committing Philosophy on the Reader: Didactic Coercion and Reader Autonomy in *De Rerum Natura*." *MD* 31 (1993): 111-128.
- Momigliano, A. "An Unresolved Problem of Historical Forgery: The Scriptorum *Historiae Augustae*." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 17.1/2 (1954): 22-46.
- Morgan, L. *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Morgan, L., ed. *Aegean Wall Painting: A Tribute to Mark Cameron*. London: British School at Athens, 2005.
- Morgan, T. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Muecke, F. "Poetic Self-consciousness in *Georgics* II." *Ramus* 8 (1979): 87-107.
- Müller, B. A. "Zu Grattius." *WS* 30 (1908): 165-7.
- Murgatroyd, P. "Amatory Hunting, Fishing and Fowling." *Latomus* 43 (1984): 362-68.
- Murley, C. "Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, Viewed as Epic." *TAPA* 78 (1947): 336-346.
- Myerowitz, M. *Ovid's Games of Love*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1985.
- Myerowitz-Levine, M. "The Women of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: Nature or Culture?" *SCI* 6 (1981-1982): 30-56.
- Mynors, R. A. B. *Virgil Georgics*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990.
- . *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Nappa, C. *Reading After Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, and Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.
- . "Experiens Laborum: Ovid Reads the *Georgics*." *Vergilius* 48 (2002): 71-87.
- Nelson, S. *God and the Land: The Metaphysics of Farming in Hesiod and Vergil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Nichols, J. *Epicurean Political Philosophy: The De Rerum Natura of Lucretius*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1976.
- Obbink, D., ed. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Orlandi, G. "Contesti culturali e letterari del *Cynegeticon* di Nemesiano." In *Scritti*

- Riposati*, 325-330. Milan: Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1979.
- . "Sulla discussa cronologia del Cynegeticon di Grattio." *RIL* 110 (1976): 212-221.
- Orth, F. *RE*, s.v. "Jagd," vol. 9: 558-604, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1916.
- Otis, B. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Owen, S. G. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1915.
- Packman, Z. M. "Ethics and Allegory in the Proem of the Fifth Book of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*." *CJ* 71.3 (1976): 206-212.
- Parker, D. S. "Epicurean Imagery in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1952.
- Parroni P. "Gratt. Cyn. 399-401." *RFIC* 101 (1973): 203-206.
- Paschalis, M. "Generic Affiliations in Roman and Greek *Cynegetica*." In *Mélanges I. Kambitsis*, edited by G. N. Sifakis et al., 201-232. Herakleion: Crete University Press, 2000.
- Patin, H. *Études sur la poésie latine*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1883.
- Payne, M. *The Animal Part: Human and Other Animals in the Poetic Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Pearson, A. C., ed. *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes*. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1891.
- Pellicer, J. C. "Reception, wit, and the unity of Virgil's *Georgics*." *SO* 82 (2007): 90-115.
- Perkell, C. *The Poet's Truth: A Story of the Poet in Vergil's Georgics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Phillips, A.A. and M.M. Willcock. *Xenophon and Arrian On Hunting*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1999.
- Pianezzola, E, ed. *L'Arte Di Amare*. Segrate: Mandadori, 2007a.
- . "Libro primo." In *L'Arte Di Amare*, edited by E. Pianezzola, 185-270. Segrate: Mandadori, 2007b.
- Pierleoni, G. "Fu poeta Grattius?" *RFIC* 34 (1906): 580-97.
- Poinssot, L. and P. Quoniam. "Bêtes d'amphitheatre sur trios mosaïques du Bado." *Karthago* 3 (1952): 129-65.
- Pope, S. R. "The Imagery of Lucretius." *G&R* 18 (1949): 70-79.
- Porter, J., ed. *Constructions of the Classical Body*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Pöschl, V. "Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids *Metamorphosen*." *Hermes* 87 (1959): 328-43.
- Postgate, J.P. *New Light Upon Lucretius*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1926.
- Powell, A. *Virgil the Partisan: A study in the re-integration of Classics*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2008.
- Punter, D. *Metaphor*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Purcell, N. "Roman Urban Society and the Game of *Alea*." *P&P* 147 (1995): 3-37.
- Putnam, M. C. J. *Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the Georgics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Quinn, K. *Texts and Contexts*. London: Routledge, 1979.
- Quoniam, P. "Une mosaïque à scènes de chasse récemment découverte à Henchir-Toungar (Tunisie)." *Karthago* 2 (1951): 109-22.
- Ramírez de Verger, A.-A., ed. *Ovidius: Carmina Amatoria*. Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2003.

- Rasmussen, K. G. "Lukrez, *De Rerum Natura* 5, 1440-1447 – Versuch Einer Interpretation." In *Noctae Atticae: Articles on Graeco-Roman Antiquity and Its Nachleben*, edited by B. Amden et als., 234-240. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.
- Reay, B. "Some Addressees of Virgil's *Georgics* and their Audience." *Vergilius* 49 (2003): 17-41.
- Reilly, L. "The Hunting Frieze from Vergina." *JHS* 113 (1993): 160-162.
- Renard, M., ed. *Hommages à A. Grenier*. Berchem-Bruxelles: Latomus, 1962.
- Reverdin, O., ed. *Hésiode et son influence (Entretiens Hardt 7)*. Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 1962.
- Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Richmond J. A. "Ancient rope. Grattius 24-7." *CQ* 18 (1968): 380-381.
- Richter, W. *Georgica*. Munich: M. Hueber, 1957.
- Riedl, R. *Mars Ultor in Ovids Fasten*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner, 1989.
- Roller, D. W. "The Sources of Lucretius." *LCM* 13 (1988): 51-55.
- Romano, A.C. "Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* or the Art of Outmaneuvering the Partner." *Latomus* 31 (1972): 814-819.
- Ross, D. "The Pastoral in the *Georgics*: *si numquam fallit imago*." *Arethusa* 23 (1990): 59-75.
- . *Virgil's Elements: Physics and Poetry in the Georgics*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Roy, B., ed. *L'Art D'Amours*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Royds, T. F. *The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1914.
- Rutherford, R. "Authorial Rhetoric in Virgil's *Georgics*." In *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, edited by D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling, 19-29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Sabot, A. "Heur et malheur d'un amour conjugal: Céphale et Procris (Ovide, *Mét.* vii, 661-862)." *Collection Latomus* 189 (1985): 199-214.
- Salvatore, M. "Grattio, v. 75-80." *Orpheus* 13 (1992): 132-138.
- Santini, C. and N. Scivoletto, eds. *Prefazioni, Prologhi, Proemi di opere tecnico-scientifiche latine*. Roma: Herder editrice e libreria, 1992.
- Saylor, C. F. "Man, Animal and the Bestial in Lucretius." *CJ* 67 (1972): 306-316.
- Schenkl, H. "Zur Kritik und Überlieferungsgeschichte des Grattius und anderer lateinischer Dichter." In *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*, edited by A. Fleckeisen, 383-480. Leipzig: Teubner, 1898.
- Schott, J. "Hesiod's *Eris* and Vergil's *Labor* in the *Georgics*." PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1994.
- Schiesaro, A. "The Boundaries of Knowledge in Virgil's *Georgics*: The Roman Cultural Revolution." In *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, edited by T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, 63-89. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1997.
- . *Simulacrum et imago: gli argomenti analogici nel De Rerum Natura*. Pisa: Giardini, 1990.
- Schiesaro, A., Mitsis, P. and J. Strauss Clay, eds. *Mega Nepios. Il destinatario nell'opus didascalico. The addressee in didactic epic*. Pisa: Giardini, 1994.
- Schindler, C. "Vom Kochrezept zu den Sternen: Aspekte der Gattungsgenese und

- Gattungsentwicklung in Roemischen Lehrgedicht." In *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*, edited by M. Horster and C. Reitz, 193-210. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- Schnapp, A. *Le Chasseur et la cité: Chasse et érotique dans la Grèce ancienne*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1997.
- . "Heroes and Myths of Hunting in Ancient Greece." In *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies*, edited by Y. Bonnefoy, 119-122. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . "Eros the Hunter." In *A City of Images*, edited by C. Bérard et al., translated by D. Lyons, 71-87. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. *Lions, héros, masques: Les Représentations de l'animal chez Homère*. Paris: Maspero, 1981.
- Schrijvers, P. "Propagandistic Strategies in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*." In *Calliope's Classroom: Studies in Didactic Poetry From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by A. Harder, A. MacDonald and G. Reinink, 49-70. Paris: Peeters, 2007a.
- . "Seeing the Invisible: A Study of Lucretius' Use of Analogy in *De Rerum Natura*." In *Oxford Readings in Lucretius*, edited by M. Gale, 255-288. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007b.
- . "L'homme et l'animal dans le *De Rerum Natura*: Lucrèce et la science de la vie." In *Lucretius and his Intellectual Background*, edited by K. Algra, M. Koenen and P. Schrijvers, 151-161. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1997.
- Schubert, C. "Bemerkungen zum Proöm der « Cynegetica » des Grattius." *WJA* 28b (2004): 91-104.
- Scott Garner, R. "Epic and Other Genres in the Ancient Greek World." In *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, edited by J. M. Foley, 386-396. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005.
- Seager, R. "Xenophon and Athenian Democratic Ideology." *CQ* 51.2 (2001): 382-397.
- Sedley, D. N. *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Segal, C. "Greek Tragedy and Society: A Structuralist Perspective." In *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory*, edited J. Peter Euben, 43-75. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- . "War, Death and Savagery in Lucretius: The Beasts of Battle in 5.1308-49." *Ramus* 15 (1986): 1-34.
- . "Ovid's Cephalus and Procris: Myth and Tragedy." *Grazer Beiträge* 7 (1978): 175-205.
- Segal, R. *Myth: A Very Sort Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Semino, E. *Metaphors in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Serra, F, ed. *Grattius Faliscus, Cynegeticon. Priapeorum poetae*. Pisa: Giardini, 1976.
- Seymour, T. D. "On the Composition of the *Cynegeticus* of Xenophon." *TAPA* 9 (1878): 69-83.
- Shackleton-Bailey, D. R. "Notes on minor Latin poetry." *Phoenix* 32 (1978): 311-15.
- Sharrock, A. "Those who can, teach: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and contemporary instructional writing." In *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*, edited by M. Horster and C. Reitz, 243-264. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- . "Response to Roy Gibson." in *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry*, edited by C.

- Atherton, 99-115. Bari: Levante, 1998.
- . "Ovid and the Politics of Reading." *MD* 33 (1994): 97-122.
- Shelton, J. "Lucretius on the Use and Abuse of Animals." *Eranos* 94:1 (1996): 48-64.
- Short, W. "Getting to the Truth: Spatial Metaphors of 'Trueness' and 'Falseness' in Latin." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Philological Association, Seattle, Washington, January 3-6, 2013.
- Sifakis, G. N., et al., eds. *Mélanges I. Kambitsis*. Herakleion: Crete University Press, 2000.
- Sikes, E. E. *Lucretius Poet and Philosopher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Slater, N. "Eumolpus and the Dead Rat: Good Grattius Hunting." *New England Classical Journal* 34.4 (2007): 299-309.
- Slater, W, ed. *Roman Theater and Society: E. Togo Salmon Papers I*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Smart, J. D. and A. J. Woodman, eds. *Past Perspectives, Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Solomon, D. "Lucretius' Progressive Revelation of Nature in *DRN* 1.149-152." *Phoenix* 58 (2004): 260-283.
- Sorabji, R. *Animal Minds and Human Morals: The Origins of the Western Debate*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Squire, F., W. Blane and W. Somerville. *Cynegetica; or, Essays on Sporting*. London: Published for John Stockdale, 1788.
- Steindl, E. "Die Jagd in der antiken Dichtung." *Das Altertum* 17 (1971): 208-224.
- Steudel, M. *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids Ars Amatoria*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1992.
- Stover, T. J. "Placata posse omnia mente tueri: 'Demythologizing' the Plague in *Lucretius*." *Latomus* 58.1 (1999): 70-76.
- Sullwold, G. J. "Lucretius' Imagery: A Poetic Reading of the *De Rerum Natura*." PhD diss., University of Washington, 1957.
- Syme, R. *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Tarrant, R. "Ovid and the Failure of Rhetoric." In *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, edited by D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling, 63-74. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Taylor, L. R. "Seviri Equitum Romanorum and Municipal Seviri: A Study in Pre-Military Training among the Romans." *JRS* 14 (1924): 158-171.
- Taylor, M. "Progress and Primitivism in Lucretius." *AJPh* 68 (1947): 180-194.
- Thibodeau, P. *Playing the Farmer: Representations of Rural Life in Vergil's Georgics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- Thomas, R. F. "Didaxis and Aesthetics in the *Georgics* Tradition." In *Calliope's Classroom: Studies in Didactic Poetry From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by A. Harder, A. MacDonald and G. Reinink, 71-102. Paris: Peeters, 2007.
- . *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- . *Virgil Georgics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Too, Y. L. "Introduction: Writing the History of Ancient Education." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, edited by Y. L. Too, 1-22. Leiden: Brill, 2001a.

- , ed. *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 2001b.
- Toohy, P. "Periodization and Didactic Poetry." In *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt (Palingenesia Vol. 85)*, edited by M. Horster and C. Reitz, 15-26. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- . *Melancholy, love, and time: boundaries of the self in ancient literature*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- . "Eros and Eloquence: Modes of Amatory Persuasion in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." In *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, edited by W. Dominik, 198-211. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Torre, C. "La Concezione Senecana del *Sapiens*: Le Metamorfosi Animali." *Maia* 47 (1995): 349-369.
- Tovar, A. "The Literary Background of Virgil." *ICS* 8 (1983): 60-64.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. *Animals in Roman Life and Art*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.
- Tuck, S. "The Origins of Roman Imperial Hunting Imagery: Domitian and the Redefinition of *Virtus* Under the Principate." *Greece & Rome* 52:2 (2005): 221-245.
- Turpin, W. "Tacitus, Stoic *exempla*, and the *praecipuum munus annalium*." *CA* 27.2 (2008): 359-404.
- Vallillee, G. "Lucretius, Vergil and the Didactic Method." *EMC* 12 (1968): 8-12.
- Van Gennep, A. *The Rites of Passage*. Trans. Monika Vizedom and Gabrielle Caffee. London: Routledge, 1960.
- Varcl, L. and R. F. Willetts, eds. *Geras: Studies Presented to G. Thomson on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Prague: Charles University, 1963.
- Verdière, R. "Grattius, Cyn., 25-29 (Note de lecture. 338)." *Latomus* 46 (1987a): 850-851.
- . "Grattius, Cyn., 415-417 (Note de lecture. 339)." *Latomus* 46 (1987b): 851.
- . *Cynegeticon libri I quae supersunt, I: Texte et traduction*. Wetteren: Ed. Universa, 1963.
- Vermeule, C. "Greek Funerary Animals, 450-300 B.C." *AJA* 76:1 (1972): 49-59.
- Vernant, J-P. and P. Vidal-Naquet, eds. *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988.
- Vessey, D. *Statius and the Thebaid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. "Hunting and Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*." In *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*, edited by J-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, 141-160. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988.
- . *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*. Trans. Andrew Szegedy-Maszak. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Ville, G. "La Maison et la mosaïque de la chasse à Utica." *Karthago* 11 (1961-62): 18-76.
- Volk, K, ed. *Vergil's Georgics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Volpillac, P. "État présent des recherches sur Némésien." In *ANRW* 2, 34, 4, edited by

- W. Haase, 3175-3178. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1998.
- . *Némésien Œuvres*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975.
- von Classen, C. J., ed. *Probleme der Lukrezforschung*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1986.
- Von Hendy, A. *The Modern Construction of Myth*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Walcot, P. *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff: Wales University Press, 1966.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. "The Golden Age and Sin in Augustan Ideology." *P&P* 95 (1982): 19-36.
- Walter, F. "Zu lateinischen Dichtern." *WS* 45 (1927): 109-116.
- Walter, H. *Studien zur Hirtendichtung Nemesians*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1988.
- Warren, J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Wase, C., trans. *Grattius, Faliscus. Cynegeticon; Or, A Poem of Hunting*. London: Charles Adams, 1654.
- Watson, L. "The Bogus Teacher and His Relevance for Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." *RhM* 150 (2007): 337-374.
- Watson, P. "*Praecepta amoris*: Ovid's Didactic Elegy." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by B. W. Boyd, 141-166. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "Love as Civilizer: Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, 2.467-92." *Latomus* 43 (1984): 389-395.
- . "Mythological Exempla in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*." *CPh* 78.2 (1983): 117-126.
- West, D. A. *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1969.
- West, M. L., ed. *Theogony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- White, P. "Ovid and the Augustan Milieu." In *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by B. W. Boyd, 1-26. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- White, R. *The Structure of Metaphor: The Way the Language of Metaphor Works*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1996.
- Wiedemann, T.E.J. "Between Men and Beasts: Barbarians in Ammianus Marcellinus." In *Past Perspectives, Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*, edited by J. D. Smart and A. J. Woodman, 189-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Wigodsky, M. "The Alleged Impossibility of Philosophical Poetry." In *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus and Horace*, edited by D. Obbink, 58-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Wiik, M. "The Excursus in the First Song of the *Georgics* and Vergil's Didactic Technique." *SO* 77 (2002): 114-127.
- Wildberger, J. *Ovids Schule der 'elegischen' Liebe: Erotodidaxe und Psychagogie in der Ars Amatoria*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998.
- Wilkinson, L. P. *The Georgics of Virgil: A Critical Survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- . "Virgil's Theodicy." *CQ* 13.1 (1963): 75-84.
- . "The Intention of Vergil's *Georgics*." *G&R* 19 (1950): 19-28.
- Williams, F. "Cercidas Fr. 3 Liv.: Canine Language in a Cynic Poet?" *ZPE* 139 (2002): 40-42.
- Williams, H., ed. *The Eclogues and Cynegetica of Nemesianus*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Wistrand, M. *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome: The Attitudes of Roman*

writers of the first century A.D. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1992.

Wondrich, F. D. B. "On the Borders of Poetry: Genre and the European Didactic Poem from Antiquity to the Renaissance." PhD diss., New York University, 1997.

Zurli, L. "Grattio, Virgilio e il sandyx Libycus." *GIF* 40 (1988): 231-236.