

**Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 4.1263-87**

et quibus ipsa modis tractetur blanda voluptas,  
id quoque permagni refert; nam more ferarum  
quadrupedumque magis ritu plerumque putantur 1265  
concupere uxores, quia sic loca sumere possunt  
pectoribus positis sublatis semina lumbis.  
nec molles opus sunt motus uxoribus hilum.  
nam mulier prohibet se concipere atque repugnat,  
clunibus ipsa viri Venerem si lacta retractat 1270  
atque exossato ciet omni pectore fluctus;  
eicit enim sulcum recta regione viaque  
vomereis atque locis avertit seminis ictum.  
idque sua causa consuerunt scorta moveri,  
ne complerentur crebro gravidaeque iacerent, 1275  
et simul ipsa viris Venus ut concinnior esset;  
coniugibus quod nil nostris opus esse videtur.  
nec divinitus interdum Venerisque sagittis  
deteriore fit ut forma muliercula ametur.  
nam facit ipsa suis interdum femina factis 1280  
morigerisque modis et munde corpore culto,  
ut facile insuescat <te> secum degere vitam.  
quod superest, consuetudo concinnat amorem;  
nam leviter quamvis quod crebro tunditur ictu,  
vincitur in longo spatio tamen atque labascit. 1285  
nonne vides etiam guttas in saxa cadentis  
umoris longo in spatio pertundere saxa?

## *Commentary*

Meter: dactylic hexameter

Commentaries:

Bailey, C. T. *Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura*. Oxford, 1947.

\*Brown, R.D. *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura IV.1030-1287*. Leiden and New York, 1987.

Catto, B.A. *Lucretius: Selections from De Rerum Natura*. Wauconda, 2007.

Godwin, J. *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura IV*. Warminster, 1986.

Leonard, W.E., and S.B. Smith. *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri VI*. Madison, 1965.

### Introduction

For a general introduction to Lucretius see <http://homepage.usask.ca/~jrp638/CourseNotes/LucNotes.html>; on Book 4 of *DRN*, see the introduction to §Lucretius 4.1037-1120.

The sections of Book 4 that precede our selection deal with the nature of erotic infatuation from the male's point of view. Lucretius is then led to cast a brief glance at the question of *women's* experience of sexual desire and, from there, to consider the processes by which conception operates. Here the focus shifts from passionate sex with prostitutes to procreative sex with wives — a shift that marks the poet, for all of his Epicurean fervor, as a traditional Roman male.

In the opening lines of our passage, Lucretius considers which sexual position is most conducive to procreation and determines that it is the position which allows the semen most direct access to its proper seat within the woman's uterus. The writhing about of a woman in the throes of sexual passion — or (in the case of a prostitute) of a woman who feigns such passion — can actually divert the seed from its course and frustrate the act of procreation. Such writhings serve the ends of the prostitute, since they keep her from being laid up with child while at the same time pleasing her customers, but wives “obviously” have no need for them.

The set of contrasts that the poet establishes here reveals a great deal about traditional views of marriage and of wives. The prostitute, as well as the overly passionate wife, is active and assertive (*Venerem laeta retractat*, 1270), but, by that very token, resistant: she frustrates conception (*prohibet*, 1269) and struggles against the man (*repugnant*). She is also twisty and devious (*molles motus*, 1268; *fluctus*, 1271; *eicit sulcum recta regione*, 1272). These actions make her exciting and alluring (1276) but also barren. The proper wife, by contrast, is passive and submissive — literally so, since she conceives most readily by positioning herself prone on all fours, lowering her head and chest toward the ground (*pectoribus positis*, 1267), and remaining motionless while her husband impregnates her. By presenting herself to her husband without moving, she provides a straight path for his seed and is thereby productive. — Useful advice for those seeking to have children, perhaps, but, along the way, the poet seems to dismiss the idea that any pleasure could, or should, attend procreative sex.

The Romans have a lengthy tradition of belittling or outright condemning the notion of sexual passion between married couples, from the husbands of Roman New Comedy who regard the prospect of sex with their wives as anathema (e.g., Plautus, *Mostellaria* 690-99);<sup>2</sup> to the mockery or censuring of prominent men who are overly

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kamen/Levin-Richardson on the figure of the *fututrix* (esp. pp. 244-48).

<sup>2</sup> *melius anno hoc mihi non fuit domi / nec quod una esca me iuuerit magis. / prandium uxor mihi perbonum dedit, / nunc dormitum iubet me ire: minime. / non mihi forte uisum ilico fuit, / melius quom prandium quam solet dedit: / uoluit in cubiculum abducere me anus. / non bonust somnus de prandio. apage. / clanculum ex aedibus me edidi foras. / tota turget mihi uxor, scio, domi.* [“My wife has just given me a capital lunch, and told me to go and have a sleep. Huh! I don't think! There's more to it than that. It isn't just by accident that she gives me a better lunch than usual. She wants to get me into bed, that's what the old lady wants. I don't think I care for bed just after lunch; no, thank you; so I've slipped out quietly. I know she's waiting for me, in a high old temper.” (E.F. Watling, tr.)]

uxorious (e.g., Cato's treatment of Manilius: Plutarch, *Cato Maior* 17.7); to treating the very notion of a man's desire for his spouse as absurd or sinful (e.g., St. Augustine, *Ser.* 51.22).<sup>4</sup>

Consider, for example, the casual dismissal inherent in the following passage from the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*:

*idem uxori conquerenti de extraneis voluptatibus dixisse fertur: "Patere me per alias exercere cupiditates meas; uxor enim dignitatis nomen est, non voluptatis."* (Aelius 5.11)

And when his wife complained about his amours with others, [Aelius] said to her, it is reported: "Let me indulge my desires with others; for wife is a term of honor, not of pleasure." (D. Magie, tr.)

The best examples come from the early Christians, but these often cite classical authors — as, for example, Jerome in *Against Jovinian* 1.49:

*refert praeterea Seneca cognovisse se quondam ornatum hominem qui, exiturus in publicum, fascia uxoris pectus colligabat et ne puncto quidem horae praesentia eius carere poterat ... origo quidem amoris honesta erat, sed magnitudo deformis. nihil autem interest quam ex honesta causa quis insaniat. unde et Xystus in sententiis: Adulter est, inquit, in suam uxorem amator ardentior. in aliena quippe uxore omnis amor turpis est, in sua nimius.*

Moreover, Seneca mentions that he knew a certain celebrated individual who, when he was about to go out into public, used to bind his chest with his wife's breast-band and was unable to do without her presence for even a few minutes. ... The source of their love was noble, but its excessiveness was unseemly. Moreover, it makes no difference just how noble the source of one's insane behavior might be. Whence Xystus observes in his sayings that, "That man is an adulterer who is too passionate a lover toward his own wife." For any passion is disgraceful in regard to another man's wife, and *de trop* in regard to one's own.

Most wonderfully, one can consider Nicolaus of Myra's sceptical response to Herodotus' account of Gyges and Candaules (Walz 1.288):

How again could Candaules be in love with his own wife? For either he did not live with her or else he did live with her and therefore did not desire her; for intercourse destroys passion (*ἔρως*), and the impulse of desire is killed by marriage. (K.F. Smith, tr.)

Lucretius lacks something of the misogynistic zeal of these later authors, but his account fits quite cosily into a persistent tradition that associates marriage principally with the duty to produce legitimate children rather than sexual or emotional intimacy.

But Lucretius' account does not end there. In the closing sections of Book 4 he takes on the question of the emotional relationship between husband and wife, providing an Epicurean/atomistic conceptual model for what is, in the end, a very Roman outlook. It often happens, he notes, that even a woman of lesser beauty wins a man's affection over time through her supportive and accommodating ways (*morigeris modis*, 1281) and mere companionship.<sup>5</sup> If we set aside the association *wife = unattractive female* — which Lucretius seems to introduce simply to develop an argument *e fortiori* — the notion of marriage presented here likely would have been supported by many in the poet's audience: a congenial union between man and wife wherein the husband takes the leading role (as in the excerpt from Plutarch quoted ad §Martial 11.104) but as part of a loving and respectful relationship between two life-partners (cf. the picture presented in the §Funerary Stele of Aurelius Hermia and his Wife, Aurelia Philematium).

<sup>3</sup> "Cato expelled another senator who was thought to have good prospects for the consulship, namely, Manilius, because he embraced his wife in open day before the eyes of his daughter." (B. Perrin, tr.)

<sup>4</sup> See ad §Martial 11.104.17.

<sup>5</sup> Re the idealization of the wife who is *morigera* (accommodating), see §Martial 11.104.

Text

**line 1263:** *quibus ... modis* — abl. of manner [Brown notes that this common expression has a particular aptness here, since *modus* recalls ancient accounts of the various “figures” or “schemes” (*schemata*) in which copulation might be enjoyed. (Cf. the Hindu *Kama Sutra*.) The most famous of these was a 4<sup>th</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup>-century work attributed to the (fictional) female author Philaenis.<sup>6</sup> A similar set of figures is reflected in the erotic art of Pompeii, the models for which were provided by sets of pattern-books.]

*tractetur* — subj. in indir. question introduced by *permagni refert* in 1264 (“is managed/conducted”)

*blanda* — pleasant, sweet, charming, gentle

*voluptas* — i.e., the act of sex (abstract for concrete) [with *ipsa*: the discussion just prior to this dealt with physiological considerations that affect conception, such as the thickness of the semen. Luc. now considers ways in which the manner of coupling itself might also be relevant.]

**line 1264:** *id* — resumptive use of the demons.: the antecedent consists of the indir. question in 1263

*permagni* — gen. of value (impersonal neut.): with *refert*, this has the force of an adv. (“a good deal,” “greatly”)

*refert* — here employed with a personal subject (*id*): “it matters, is of importance”

*more* — abl. of manner

**line 1265:** *quadrupedum* — usually of domestic draught-animals (vs. *ferarum*). The contrast is heightened by the chiasmic word-order: *more ferarum — quadrupedum ritu*. [Cf. the image of animals mating at 4.1197-1205.]

*ritu* — abl. of manner

*plerumque (uxores) putantur magis (concupere)*

*magis* — i.e., more readily

*plerumque* — adv. (“generally”)

**line 1266:** *uxores* — it is mainly here, in the discussion of conception in the latter sections of Bk. 4, that Luc. has occasion to employ this term. The only other passage in which the term *uxor* appears is the sentimental set-piece at 3.894ff. [See Brown ad 1277 on the more dignified and poetic *coniunx*.]

*loca sumere* — assume their (due) place/position (see ad 1267) [For this use of *loca*, Leonard/Smith compare 4.1242; Cicero, *De natura deorum* 2.51.128]

**line 1267:** *pectoribus positis <et> sublatis ... lumbis* — abl. abs.

*pono* — to set, put, or lay down (here: to lower) [*positis* = *pronis*]

*suffero* — to offer, proffer, hold up [Once again, the contrast is emphasized via chiasmus: *pectoribus positis — sublatis lumbis*]

*semina* — provides the subject of *possunt* in 1266. [Here of semen. The numerous earlier discussions in this work of the motions of the *semina rerum* (atoms) helps the reader to understand and accept the poet’s account here of the mechanism of conception.] [Brown ad 1266 argues that *loca* (“womb”) should be the subject of *possunt*. This seems at odds with the consistent focus in Luc.’s poem on the movements of the *semina* (atoms) and the particular emphasis, in this passage, on the semen being allowed to take its proper course (1273). Cf. as well the parallels cited at 1266. It is true, however, that *loca sumere* suggests something along the lines of “select their place.”]

*lumbis* — loins, genitals

**line 1268:** *nec ... opus sunt motus* — “nor is there a need for movements” [*mōtūs* — nom. pl.] [scan: *opu’ sunt*]

<sup>6</sup> Parker; McClure 84; Boehringer.

<sup>7</sup> Ling 217-20, 235 (entry 11.5.e); Fredrick 276-78; Richardson 10-13, 15-16. On the use of pattern-books in the composition of erotic scenes, see Myerowitz Levine 148; Guzzo 85-88.

*molles* — “supple,” “flexible” — but also “seductive”

*uxoribus* — dat. of ref. (“so far as wives are concerned”)

*hilum* — adv. (limiting acc.): “a bit,” “at all”

**line 1269:** *prohibet ... repugnat* — note how this violation of gendered norms (the assertive and combative female) here also serves to frustrate the work of nature

**line 1270:** *si ipsa laeta Venerem viri clunibus retractat*

*clunibus* — abl. of instr.

*ipsa* — again, stressing the undue agency on the part of the woman

*virī Venerem* — i.e., her lover’s penis (abstract for concrete)

*laeta* — pred. nom. (“in her delight”)

*retracto* — to draw back into oneself (in this case, by taking too assertive a role in intercourse) [See Brown ad 4.1200, where the same expression is employed of intercourse between animals.]

**line 1271:** *exossato ... omni pectore* — abl. abs. (“with her whole chest heaving” [*lit.* “de-boned, rendered sinuous” — see Brown ad loc. who notes the boldness of this metaphor, which is culinary in origin]) [Brown follows Clausen in reading *corpore* here, which provides readier sense. (*pectore* — a fussy “correction” based on 1267?) Brown also notes, however, the way in which *clunibus ... pectore* in 1270-71 echoes 1267 (with chiasmus). If the poet is imagining the *mulier equitans* position (below), *pectore* can in fact be defended: the woman rides the man as if seated on a bucking bronco.]

*cio* — to set in motion, stir up, rouse, stimulate

*fluctus* — “writhings”

[Lines 1268-71 are replete with language that elsewhere is employed to describe not only wild sex but, e.g., seductive female dancers from Cadiz and effeminate males: *molles, motus, clunibus, exossato, ciet, fluctus* (cf. Adams 194).]

[Leonard/Smith are likely correct to assume that the position being described here involves the woman seated astride her supine partner (*mulier equitans*). This position was thought to be particularly exciting and risqué (cf. Horace, *Satires* 2.7.47-50; §Martial 11.104.13-14 [q.v.]) and is popular in the erotic art of Pompeii; it also provides a perfect contrast to the sedate and submissive position adopted by the “proper” wife (1264-67).]

**line 1272:** *eicit* — scan as disyllable (*eicit*) [synizesis]

*sulcum* — furrow (i.e., course): to be taken with *vomeris* in 1273. [The use of this agricultural metaphor in reference to marital sex has deep roots. Cf. the formula by which the Athenian father betrothed his daughter to a prospective groom: ἐγγυῶ τῆν θυγατέρα σοι παίδων ἐπ’ ἀρότῳ γνησίῳ (“I betroth my daughter to you for the sake of sowing legitimate children”). The metaphor suggests productive labor (vs. profligacy), undertaken as part of one’s duty to one’s family]

*recta regione viaque* — abl. of sep.

*rectus* — straight, “true” [contrast *motus* and *fluctus* above]

*regio* — direction, line

**line 1273:** *vomeris ... seminis* — subjective gens. (with *sulcum* and *ictum* respectively, again with chiasmus)

*vomeris* — i.e., the penis (Adams 24-25)

*locis* — abl. of sep. (“from its proper place”) [cf. 1266-67]

[Brown takes *vomeris* with *regione/via*: “... throws the furrow from the straight direction and path of the ploughshare.” This makes better literal sense in this context (*sulcum* = “vagina”), but the challenge in ploughing is to direct the ploughshare along its proper course.]

*seminis ictum* — *ictum* = stroke, thrust, blow (here, the equivalent of “spurting” — of the course taken by the ejaculated semen) [cf. 4.1245 and, e.g., Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.123-24 (of jets of water): (*fistula*) *longe / eiaculatur aquas atque ictibus aëra rumpit*]

**line 1274:** *id ... moveri* — to move themselves in such a fashion (*moveor* is a reflexive/middle use) (*id* — limiting acc. with adv. force: “in this way”) [A&G 390c]

*sua causa* — (abl.) to their own ends, to serve their own purposes (A&G 404c). [Again, the assertive independence of the woman is underlined.]

*consuesco* — the pfct. is used idiomatically to indicate a habitual action or behavior (“they are accustomed”) [cf. *novi, memini*, etc.] [*consuerunt* — syncopated form of *consueverunt*]

*scorta* — a crude term (vs., e.g., *meretrix*)

**line 1275:** *ne complerentur ... iacerent* — purpose clauses [Note: the pfct. *consuerunt* in 1274 leads the poet to employ secondary sequence here even though the vb. has the force of a present]

*complerentur* — i.e., be made pregnant

*crebro* — adv. (“frequently”)

*gravidae* — pred. [The fem. pl. is employed as opposed to the expected neut. (with *scorta*), *metri causa*. As Brown notes, the *constructio ad sensum* is particularly apt here.]

*iacerent* — i.e., be bedridden in the later stages of a pregnancy

**line 1276:** *et simul* — and, at the same time, ...

*ipsa ... Venus* — the act of sex itself (as opposed to the consequences of that act)

*viris* — dat. of advantage or of perspective of the person judging

*ut ... esset* — another purpose clause in secondary sequence (cf. ad 1275)

*concinnus* — pleasant (selected in part to set up the echo at 1283)

[An ironic contrast to Luc.’s claim in 1274-76 is provided by §CIL IV.794 (with the accompanying illustration).]

**line 1277:** *quod nostris coniugibus nil opus esse videtur* — “it is clear that there is no need at all for this, so far as our wives are concerned”

*coniugibus* — dat. of ref. (See Brown ad loc. on the dignified, poetic nature of this term.)

*quod ... opus esse* — cf. above ad 1268

*quod* — a connecting relative, referring back to the notion of intercourse being made more pleasing through the use of gyrations (“this”)

*nil* — adv. (“not at all”) [a limiting acc. — A&G 390c]

*nostris* — this provides no grounds for pronouncing on the poet’s marital status. Luc. is speaking as a Roman and reaffirming the dignity of the Roman *matrona* (in contrast to slaves and prostitutes, but also to freeborn women in other cultures): “wives in our society” (Brown). Contrast the bare *uxoribus* in 1268.

*videtur* — to appear after due consideration, be deemed, be seen (in fact)

[In concluding the preceding discussion, this line also lays the ground for that which follows, where (without overtly proclaiming the fact) the poet turns to the traditional Roman view of marital love.]

**line 1278:** *divinitus* — adv.

*interdum* — [The use of this adv. is clearly ironic (Brown), but its force is ambiguous. A type of affection — as opposed to raw, passionate lust — can occasionally arise, we are told, if a woman who is deficient in beauty makes a point of being suitably accommodating. (Here we seem to hear the misogynistic bachelor presented by the later biographical tradition, a man for whom women are either dangerous temptresses or, at best, docile subordinates whose presence is to be tolerated.) Such an argument is problematic in terms of Epicurean doctrine, whether one considers Epicurus’ attitude toward women or his views on friendship. But there is reason to think that Lucretius is being consciously ironic in this final section of the book. As we have seen, the poet has provided an overt signal (*nostris*, 1277) that his focus here has shifted from Epicurean doctrine to the Roman view of marriage, which he sets out for us wonderfully in the scope of only four lines (1280-83). Despite the claims of comedy and satire, Romans viewed marriage as a source of happiness for both partners: *interdum*, in such a context, must be humorously ironic (esp. when it is repeated once again only two lines later). That this is so is confirmed by the final lines (1284-87), where a mock Epicurean/atomistic explanation is provided for this

phenomenon: the poet more or less openly admits that there is no accounting for this type of affection according to the atomistic principles that he has set out. (See, further, ad 1280 and 1282.)]

*sagittis* — causal abl. [The *-que* here is epexegetic: it allows the poet to tease out the implications of *divinitus* by drawing on a rich mythological/literary tradition (esp. Roman love elegy)]

**line 1279:** *deteriore ... forma* — abl. of description (Lucretius focuses on women of lesser beauty in order to develop an argument *a fortiori*: if the process he describes can occur in the case of such women, then surely, according to the poet's earlier arguments [§4.1037-1120], it will happen if the woman is both attractive *and* accommodating.) [Brown compares 4.1155-69, where the besotted lover is obsessed with a woman *despite* her physical shortcomings. According to Epicurean theories of perception, traditional notions of physical beauty are utterly subjective: the poet here falls back on Roman convention in order to account for received views of the proper marriage, which provided little space for erotic passion.]

*fit ut* — “it happens that” (introducing a result clause) [A&G 569.2]

*muliercula* — this dimin. is often employed in a dismissive sense, or of women of low status. It would appear to have a similar force here (esp. given *interdum* in 1278): despite her “naturally” subordinate position, a woman can in fact win the affection of a man even if she is unattractive. (Again, the poet is betraying his Roman affiliations.)

**line 1280:** *suis ... factis* — abl. of instr. (“by means of her own actions”)

*interdum* — [the repetition of this adv. so soon after 1278 supports the notion that the poet is being consciously ironic]

**line 1281:** *modis et ... corpore* — abl. of instr.

*morigeris ... modis* — “her accommodating ways” [For this notion, see the introduction to §Martial 11.104] [The *-que* here is epexegetic: it allows the poet to explain the implications of *suis factis*] [On the strained use of *modis* here, see Brown ad loc.]

[Vs. above, here we find feminine agency (*facit ipsa suis ... factis*, 1280) employed *in support of* the woman's partner (*morigeris modis*). This combination of virtues is regularly celebrated in epitaphs, where modest wives are presented as actively contributing to the well-being and tranquility of the household: *modestia probitate pudicitia opsequio lanificio diligentia fide par similisque ceteris probeis feminis fuit* (CIL VI.10230); *lanifica pia pudica frugi casta domiseda* (CIL VI.11602); *domum servavit lanam fecit* (CIL I<sup>2</sup>.1211; VI.15346). See as well Columella, *De Re Rustica* 12 *praef.* 7-8 (cited ad §CIL I<sup>2</sup>.1221.13: Funerary Stele of Aurelius Hermia and his Wife, Aurelia Philematium).]

*munde ... culto* — pred. (circumstantial ptple.) [*munde corpore culto* = “by keeping herself tidily groomed” (concrete for abstract: in prose we would want a gerundive in place of the pass. ptple: A&G 507)]

[It is striking to note how here as well Luc. recalls a theme from (later) Roman epitaphs — e.g., CIL VI.37965.9 (*munda domi, sat munda foras*) and the so-called *mundus muliebris* commemorations, where depictions of hand-mirrors, makeup- and jewelry boxes, combs, perfume-containers, and the like are employed to celebrate “small acts of personal care” (Shumka 91) on the part of women of various ranks (freeborn elite, freedwomen, slaves).]

**line 1282:** *ut ... insuescat* — result clause (introduced by *facit* in 1280) [A&G 568 and n. 1] [*insuescat* — trans.]

*facile* — this adv. seems to undercut the force of *interdum* in 1278 and 1280.

<*te*> — added by editors to complete the meter and provide an acc. subj. for *degere*. [Butterfield (WS 122 [2009] 118-19) argues for *nos*, echoing *nostris* in 1277. On this reading, the poet presents the situation described in 1278-87 as something much closer to an expected norm. Luc. commonly employs the 1<sup>st</sup>-person plural pron. in a bid to engage his (male) audience in the argument; the use of the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *te* — apart from direct addresses, overt exhortations, and emotional vignettes — is much more limited in the poem.]

**line 1283:** *quod superest* — “as for what remains,” “for the rest” (*quod* — limiting acc.) [A&G 572a]

*consuetudo* — custom, habit, usage, companionship, familiarity [The word is often employed to indicate an intimate relationship — non-erotic or erotic, licit or illicit]

*concinнат* — note that the same compliant accommodation that allows a woman to achieve conception also yields a harmonious marriage [Contrast 1276 (Godwin)]

**line 1284:** *leviter quamvis* — howsoever lightly (*quamvis* adv.)

<id> *quod ... tunditur* — that which is struck [suppressed antecedent]

*crebro ... ictu* — abl. of instr.

**line 1285:** *vincitur* — is overcome

*in longo spatio* — i.e., over a long expanse of time

*tamen* — answering *leviter quamvis* in 1284

**line 1287:** *umoris* — gen. of material (with *guttas* in 1286) [*umor* — poetic for *aqua*]

*longo in spatio* — the repetition (with metrical variation) of the phrase in 1285 generates a sense of the repeated drip ... drip ... drip of the water (Catto)

*pertundere* — with *guttas* in 1286: acc. + inf. following vb. of perception [As here, the acc. + inf. tends to introduce a perceived *fact*, whereas the acc. + ptple. introduces the action itself in process: “I see that you have been out in the rain” vs. “I saw you leaving the store”]

[I.e., soft and yielding though water might be — as is the compliant wife — it still can alter stone. Again the poet invokes a traditional dichotomy — here between the soft, damp, permeable female vs. the hard, dry, impregnable male. The latter, as a good Roman, is unmoved by the empty *simulacra* that torment the male lover of 4.1073-1120 but can still be won over by his wife’s devotion. See, further, Brown 87-91 and 122-27.]

#### Metrical Features

The lines feature only six instances of elision (all simple), with one elision of final *-s* (1268). One instance of synzesis (1272). Few heavy multisyllabic words (1265). Effective use of alliteration here and there (1267, 1274) but never intrusive. Line 1275 makes effective use of a heavily spondaic opening, leading up to the hephthemimeral caesura. (Other interesting uses of this caesura at 1264, 1278, 1283, 1287.)

#### Bibliography

- Adams, J.N. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore, 1982.
- Boehrer, S. “What is named by the name ‘Philaenis’? Gender, function, and authority of an antonomastic figure,” in Masterson, M., N. Sorkin Rabinowitz, and J. Robson, eds., *Sex in Antiquity. Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World* (London and New York, 2015) 374-92.
- Fredrick, D. “Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House,” *ClassAnt* 14 (1995) 266-303.
- \*Gordon, P. “Some Unseen Monster: Rereading Lucretius on Sex,” in D. Fredrick, ed., *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body* (Baltimore and London, 2002) 86-109.
- Guzzo, P.G., and V. Scarano Ussani. *Veneris figurae: immagini di prostituzione e sfruttamento a Pompei*. Naples, 2000.
- Kamen, D., and S. Levin-Richardson. “Lusty Ladies in the Roman Imaginary,” in R. Blondell and K. Ormand, eds., *Ancient Sex: New Essays* (Columbus, 2015) 231-52.
- Ling, R. *Roman Painting*. Cambridge, 1991.
- McClure, L.K. *Courtesans at Table: Gender and Greek Literary Culture in Athenaeus*. New York and London, 2003.
- Myerowitz Levine, M. “The Domestication of Desire: Ovid’s *parva tabella* and the Theater of Love,” in A. Richlin, ed., *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (New York and Oxford, 1992) 131-57.
- Parker, H. “Love’s Body Anatomized: The Ancient Erotic Manuals and the Rhetoric of Sexuality,” in A. Richlin, ed., *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 1992) 90-111.
- Richardson, L., Jr. *A Catalogue of Identifiable Figure Painters of Ancient Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Stabiae*. Baltimore and London, 2000.

Shumka, L. "Inscribing Agency? The *Mundus Muliebris* Commemorations from Roman Italy," *Phoenix* 70 (2016) 77-103.

\*Smith, W.S. "'The Cold Cares of Venus': Lucretius and Anti-Marriage Literature," in W.S. Smith, ed., *Satiric Advice on Women and Marriage: From Plautus to Chaucer* (Ann Arbor, 2005) 71-91.