Ovidian influences in Seneca's *Phaedra*

Alin Mocanu

Classics Department
McGill University, Montréal, Canada
July 2013

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts.

© Alin Mocanu 2013

Abstract

The following thesis is an examination of the way Seneca constructs Phaedra, the main character of an eponymous tragedy. It aims to prove that the tragedian uses a mixing of mainly two literary genres, tragedy and elegy, and it analyzes the way the elegiac genre is transformed so it can fit this new generic hybrid. Seneca finds inspiration for the elegiac *topoi* in Ovid's love poems. The author uses the recurrent elegiac convention involving a soft man, the lover, and a dominant woman, the beloved, but he reverses this literary tradition: Phaedra becomes the lover while Hippolytus becomes the beloved. Besides a series of elegiac *topoi* such as fiery love metaphors, *servitium amoris* or symptoms of love, Seneca also deals with the erotic hunting. Roman love elegy often associates the lover, the feeble man, with a hunter, while it represents the beloved, the dominant woman, as his prey. In *Phaedra*, Hippolytus, a true hunter, becomes an erotic prey, while the female character takes on the role of the erotic predator, which causes the young man's tragic death.

Résumé

Dans ce mémoire de maîtrise on examine la manière dont Sénèque construit Phèdre dans la tragédie portant le même nom. On prouve que pour créer son personnage, le tragédien romain mélange deux genres littéraires : la tragédie et l'élégie. On analyse aussi la façon dont Sénèque altère le genre élégiaque afin qu'il puisse créer un nouveau genre littéraire hybride. L'auteur trouve son inspiration pour les *topoi* élégiaques dans les poèmes érotiques ovidiens. En dépit de l'utilisation d'une convention élégiaque par excellence qui concerne la relation entre un amoureux, un homme faible, et une bien-aimée, une femme forte et dominante, Sénèque inverse ces éléments et Phèdre devient l'amoureux, tandis qu'Hyppolite se voit attribué le rôle du bien-aimé. À part une série de *topoi* élégiaques comme les métaphores érotiques du feu, le *servitium amoris* ou les symptômes de l'amour, le tragédien emploie aussi le lieu commun de la chasse érotique. L'élégie romaine associait très souvent l'homme faible à un chasseur et la femme forte à sa proie. Dans *Phèdre*, Hippolyte, un vrai chasseur, devient une proie érotique, tandis que le personnage féminin prend le rôle du prédateur, ce qui mène le jeune homme à une fin tragique.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank to:

Dr. Charles Gladhill for his support, insightful comments and guidance as a supervisor.

Mr. William Milnes for his proofreading and for his tremendous help in correcting my English.

J'aimerais aussi remercier mon épouse, Rym, pour sa patience et pour tout le support et l'amour dont elle a fait preuve durant mon année de rédaction.

Despite the help the advisors offered me, any mistakes are my responsibility.

Table of Contents

Introduction……………………………………………………………………..…………5

1. She or He? An Elegiac Character in an Eponymous Tragedy: Phaedra…..……..…...10

1.1 The Inversion of Roles: When the *Dura* Starts to Love.……….….……………11

1.2 Phaedra Burns with Love: Vocabulary and Style……………………...……..18

1.3 Sexual and Bodily Imagery, *Amor* and Passion..………..………...…………24

1.4 *Servitium Amoris*: Love's Servitude..…………………..…..…………...…….32

1.5 Phaedra, a Multiple Natures Character..……………...………………………39

1.6 *Symptoms of Love*, an Elegiac *Topos*...………….…..………….………...……..42

1.7 When did Phaedra Read the *Ars Amatoria*? The Elegiac Devices of Seduction……………………………………………………………………45

2. Hunting her Dear. Phaedra Predator of Woods……...…………..……………………52

2.1 The Prologue: Sexual Connotation or Not?………...………………………55

2.2 Phaedra the Sexual Hunter ………………..……………..………………..65

Conclusion………………………………………………………………………..79

Annex……………………………………………………………………….....84

Bibliography..…..……………………………………………………...……88

Introduction

Seneca was one of the most prestigious Latin tragedians. He took his inspiration for his plays not only from Greek tragedies, but also from other Latin poets such as Ovid and Virgil, generating mixed-genre tragedies.

In Ovid's work, the mixing of genres created what is often described as a new idea of literature. Highly influential, his elegiac and epic poetry became a model for later authors, including Seneca who, especially in his tragedies, drew stylistic and thematic inspiration from Ovid's poetry.

The myth of Phaedra was a rich source for Greco-Roman literature. Euripides, Sophocles, and other Greek tragedians (Lycophron)[1] used this myth as a main theme in their plays.[2] Ovid adopted it and transposed it into an elegiac context in *Heroides* 4. Seneca, following Ovid, achieved an interesting mix by inserting a highly elegiac Phaedra into a tragic context, which engaged thoroughly not only with *Heroides* 4, but also with *Amores* 3.1, a poem highlighting Ovid's views about mixing genres, especially tragedy and elegy.

During the last few decades, new interpretative perspectives on classical literature have emerged, and in particular, the themes of intertextuality and genre mixing have come to the fore. Intertextuality refers to the complex relationships between diverse texts and the effects of these relationships on meaning in different textual contexts. Such influences are multidirectional, so that texts can impact on other texts while being subject to the influence of these other texts at the same time (Barcheisi 2001: 142). Although less

[1] Lycophron was an Alexandrian tragic poet from the 3rd century B.C. He wrote a tragedy with the title *Hippolytus*, but nothing further is known about the play (OCD 2012).

[2] I will not dwell upon the Greek authors. The main focus will be the Roman texts, especially Ovid, Seneca's main source.

well defined, genre mixing involves the way different topoi circle from one genre to another, making it possible for the same text to contain topoi from two or more different literary genres.

At first, scholars approached intertextuality mainly as a question of specifying the direct influences of particular classical authors on other classical authors, but more recently, scholars such as Hinds and Barchiesi have developed intertextual interpretations that focus on the ways cross-textual allusions are structurally and thematically deployed in the works of authors from antiquity. Another important question addressed by scholars is the impact of this type of emulation on genre itself and the various effects of deploying topoi from one genre in works from another genre, an intertextual strategy that occurs frequently in Seneca.[3] In *Phaedra* the topoi adapted from other literary genres are not mere borrowings that impact on vocabulary or style, for they penetrate deep into the most profound spheres of Seneca's literary art. Genre mixing is one of Seneca's greatest achievements and one of the ways in which he improved Roman tragedy.[4] As he himself states, it is possible to make something new out of something old.[5] It is just a matter of

---

[3] Lately there has been greater interest in the relations between non-tragic genres and Seneca. In the past scholars have mainly studied the parallels between Euripides and Seneca (see notes 7 and 9).

[4] I am referring to both literary meanings of the word *genre*: form, as in epic, lyric, elegiac, etc., and content, as in *syntaktikon*, *komos*, *renuntiatio amoris*, *propemtikon*, *servitium amoris*, etc.

[5] *Quid tibi do ne Aetnam describas in tuo carmine, ne hunc sollemnem omnibus poetis locum adtingas? Quem quominus Ouidius tractaret, nihil obstitit quod iam Vergilius impleuerat; ne Seuerum quidem Cornelium uterque deterruit. Omnibus praeterea feliciter hic locus se dedit, et qui praecesserant non praeripuisse mihi uidentur quae dici poterant, sed aperuisse. Multum interest utrum ad consumptam materiam an ad subactam accedas: crescit in dies, et inuenturis inuenta non obstant. Praeterea condicio optima est ultimi: parata uerba inuenit, quae aliter instructa nouam faciem habent. Nec illis manus inicit tamquam alienis; sunt enim publica*.
[Am I not offering to describe Etna in your poem and to portray this place praised by all poets? Nothing could forbid Ovid from approaching the same subject as Virgil. And neither of them could scare Severus and Cornelius. In addition, the topic gave them satisfaction, and I do not believe that those who previously approached the subject said everything that could have been said about it. There is a great difference between a topic that has been exhausted and one that has been merely approached. In the latter case, the matter develops day by day and the [old] discoveries do not obstruct the new ones. Furthermore, the one who writes on the basis of the latter is in a better position because he finds a vocabulary already in place,

finding the right means to do so. He points to vocabulary and style in this respect, but he has little to say about the specificities of his own art. As we will see later, in the second chapter of the first part of the thesis, vocabulary and style are merely the building blocks for his mixed-genre constructions. They represent the most manifest components, but Seneca succeeded in pushing genre mixing to another level, and this is one of the reasons that his plays are true masterpieces. It is undeniable that Euripides' *Hippolytus Kalyptomenos* and *Hippolytus Stephanophoros* (and perhaps even Sophocles' *Hippolytus*[6]) constitute important models[7] for Seneca, but the genre mixing in *Phaedra* extends beyond the limits of tragedy and reaches other literary genres, such as comedy[8] and elegy.

Intertextuality and genre mixing (especially with regard to Ovid) play a very important role in Seneca's literary art, and scholars have begun to pay greater attention to the ways that he uses these techniques and to their importance for his drama. They have approached the question from various angles.[9] Jakobi (1988) indexes numerous instances where Seneca makes textual references to Ovid, but his book is mainly a catalogue of these references with little attention given to their analysis. Markus (2004) goes further by specifying the structural links between Ovid's elegiac and epic poetry, and Seneca's

---

which, forged differently, can create new ideas. And he does not steal this vocabulary, for it is a public possession.] (Sen. *Epist*. 79. 5-6).

[6] See Banuls (2008).

[7] See Grimal (1963), Barrett (1964), Heldmann (1968), Osho (1970), Herter (1971), Paratore (1972), Tarrant (1978), Zwierlein (1987), Mayer (2002), and Roisman (2005).

[8] I will not discuss the question of genre mixing in Seneca's *Phaedra* with elements from comedy. It is important to note, however, that the *servus callidus* is one of the most significant features of Roman *palliata* and that, in *Phaedra*, the *nutrix* may be reminiscent of this traditional role. For further details, see Frangoulidis (2009).

[9] For more on intertextuality in general and in Seneca in particular, see Genette (1962), Segal (1984), Conte (1986), Boyle (1988), Jakobi (1988), Hinds (1993), Conte (1994), Barchiesi (2001), Edmunds (2001), Schiesaro (2003), Littlewood (2004), Boyle (2006), and Trinacty (2007a).

tragedies. Morelli (2004) takes another step forward by developing an inter-genre reading of Seneca, although in his article he mainly talks about Seneca's reasons for using elegiac and epic *aemulationes* (imitations). He himself admits that he has not done a systematic analysis of Seneca's *Phaedra* with respect to the question of the intertextual relationships to Ovid, but he does emphasize the importance of this question and he provides numerous useful examples. Another important contribution is the doctoral dissertation of Trinacty (2007a), who discusses the ways Seneca builds Phaedra's and Medea's *personae.* Trinacty shows, in particular, how they evolve over the course of their respective tragedies, and his analysis focuses on genre mixing. Thus he compares Phaedra with other female characters such as Byblis, Medea, and Hypsipyle, and he makes clear, in his discussion of these famous heroines, that elegy is a fertile ground for genre mixing (Trinacty 2007b: 64-65). These scholars have all made important contributions to our understanding of key aspects of the inter-genre relationship between Ovid and Seneca; however, none of them addresses the question of the transformation of elegiac topoi in Seneca's *Phaedra* extensively.

The aim of this thesis is to explore genre mixing in Seneca's *Phaedra*, genre mixing which goes well beyond the use of topoi. Indeed, it strikes at the core of elegy by inverting the fundamental relationships between the male character and the female character, the lover and the beloved, the dominator and the dominated. Focusing on genre mixing, I hope to show that Seneca uses literary themes in an innovative manner strongly influenced by Ovid, but that he transforms these themes to create a mix of elegy and tragedy. The goal is to improve understanding of the mechanisms underlying the sophisticated and highly original emulation of classical authors by other classical authors.

In the first part of the thesis, I comment on the topoi that define love elegy and I account for the way Phaedra fits into the play as an elegiac character. As a literary genre, elegy revolves around the theme of the weak, dominated man in love with a woman who is usually indifferent to his insistent courting. Seneca preserves these conventions, but he reverses them to fit his tragedy. Phaedra takes on the role of the elegiac man, becoming the lover, while Hippolytus takes on the role of the indifferent elegiac woman. Ovid, who was no stranger to this kind of literary reversal, had already used the same theme in *Amores*. Seneca, influenced by Ovid, creates a Phaedra who combines the features of both an elegiac and a tragic character. Indeed, Seneca maintains this inversion of conventional elegiac roles by deploying a series of elegiac topoi that structure his new literary hybrid, and this is why the theme of hunting has such fundamental importance in the play.

The various literary versions of the Phaedra myth form a chain: in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, Phaedra is a virtuous woman who commits suicide because of her impious love for her stepson. In *Heroides* 4, Ovid treats the character in an elegiac manner. Phaedra tries to seduce Hippolytus using the same device that she had used to incriminate him in the Greek tragedy: a letter (a device that is quite common in elegiac poetry)[10]. Ovid sets the path for a full transformation of the myth into a reversed elegiac story, which Seneca will complete. As its title suggests, the main character of Seneca's play is Phaedra. This is not a haphazard choice, for Seneca created Phaedra following certain well-defined patterns governed by omnipresent genre mixing with sources not only in tragedy, but also in comedy and especially in elegy. Phaedra's character originates in the merging of these genres.

---

[10] For the *Heroides* as letters, see Oppel (1968), Kierfel (1969), Jacobson (1974), Spoth (1992), Kennedy (2002), Fulkerson (2005), Drinkwater (2007).

The second part of the thesis deals with the erotic nature of Seneca's treatment of hunting and also with the strong intertextual relationship between hunting and the Phaedra myth, Hippolytus being both a hunter and Phaedra's prey. The prologue, in which Hippolytus exhorts his servant to go hunting, also deserves mention, for it defines, at the very beginning of the tragedy, Hippolytus' existential space, his world, which Phaedra will soon invade. Thus, there is also a fundamental reversal of the elegiac situation from a spatial perspective. In elegy, the male character strives desperately to enter the woman's world, but in Seneca's *Phaedra*, the female character strives to penetrate the male character's world. In the end, Seneca's Phaedra goes much further than Ovid's Phaedra, because she actually hunts down her stepson. Her doing so involves a high level of genre sophistication.

1. She or He? An Elegiac Character in an Eponymous Tragedy: Phaedra

Throughout Seneca's play, Phaedra has the role of the elegiac lover in conventional elegiac situations involving the themes of *servitium amoris* and *exclusus amator*, as well as the theme of the symptoms of love. In this first chapter, I comment on the topoi that define love elegy and I account for the way Phaedra fits into the play as an elegiac character.

We possess works by three ancient authors dealing with the Phaedra myth: Euripides, Ovid, and Seneca. The way these authors develop the character of Phaedra is of crucial importance (Davis 1995: 43). The beginning of the story is common to all three: Phaedra understands that she is a victim of passion and feels shame. But from then on the story takes a different turn in each author's version of the myth: in Euripides Phaedra commits suicide, in Ovid she writes to Hippolytus, and in Seneca she speaks to

him directly. These different story lines have to do with the way her character evolves. In Euripides she remains tragic until the end (tragic love, tragic life, tragic death), whereas in Ovid and Seneca she becomes an elegiac character.[11] In Ovid she uses numerous allusions to express her feelings and she seems rather hesitant, especially at the beginning, but in Seneca, she speaks to her stepson directly using deceitful devices and treachery to seduce him.

1.1. The Inversion of Roles: When the *Dura* Starts to Love

Spentzou (2003: 24-26) explains that in elegy genders are often interchangeable. In *Heroides* 4, Ovid reverses the elegiac roles: Phaedra becomes the lover and Hippolytus the beloved, whereas in a normal elegiac context, the male assumes the lover's role and the female the beloved's role. In the *Heroides*, the narrator's role is not attributed to the man anymore, as it would be in normal love elegy, but to the woman. Seneca uses the same strategy and amplifies it, making it central to his play: Phaedra, not Hippolytus, becomes the main character. Contrary to the action in Euripides' *Hippolytus* where Phaedra has a minor role and commits suicide as soon as her love is discovered, the action in Seneca's play moves forward as a result of Phaedra's desperate attempts to

[11] Pearson (1980: 113) refers to the elegiac convention of *dominatio Amoris*. When lovers are dominated by ardent passion, their reason disappears and they will do anything to achieve their goals. It is noteworthy that Euripides' Phaedra commits suicide as soon as she realizes that Hippolytus has learned by eavesdropping that she loves him. In contrast, Ovid's and Seneca's Phaedra's fight for their love, and this is what makes them, among other things, elegiac heroines. Moreover, after being refused, Phaedra wants to take revenge, which is another elegiac feature. Calabrese (2002-2003: 94-95) quotes Catullus' 85: *odi et amo. quare id faciam, fortasse requiris. nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior.* ("I hate and I love [at the same time]. Perhaps you're asking why? I don't know why, but I feel it, and it torments me"). Armstrong (2006: 147-148) notes that Seneca's Phaedra does not commit suicide right away. Instead, she tells Hippolytus face to face what her feelings are. In contrast, Euripides' heroine says nothing and commits suicide as soon as the young man finds out that she loves him. I believe that Seneca chooses this path in order to emphasize the elegiac nature of the relationship. Remaining alive until the end of the play, Phaedra desperately attempts to seduce the young man. At the same time, this face-to-face encounter heightens the dramatic effect and creates a more acute tension between the two characters.

conquer her stepson. This amplified inversion of the elegiac roles gives his play an intensely erotic atmosphere.

The theme of the woman in love is not exclusive to love elegy, and the main focus of the latter is not merely love affairs. However, the opposing ideas of *durus* and *mollis* are important clues that the situation in Seneca's *Phaedra* is in fact typical of love elegy.[12] Roman society had different patterns of conduct for the two sexes. Men were seen as naturally *duri*, with everything that that implies, and women, as *molles*. Roman love elegy inverts the poles of this opposition. The poet becomes a feeble, delicate being, often opposed to a soldier, and the woman, mainly because of her constant refusal to succumb to passion, becomes cruel or *dura*. At the same time, love elegy is a paradox in its own right. Although the beloved can subdue the man and play with his emotions however she likes, the man cannot do the same. Always rejected, the man considers himself frail and weak; nevertheless, he often compares himself to a hunter or a soldier (*militia amoris*) and sees the woman as his prey or his conquest. The same can be said of the didactic nature of elegiac poetry. Although the poet, acting like a *magister*, seems to be in charge when he explains to his beloved the secrets of love or how to cheat on her husband, in the end, all of his advice can be completely ignored by the capricious woman

[12] Coleman (1979: 58), followed by Cairns (2007: 218), asserts that the *mollis*/*durus* opposition was used to define style, long before the elegiacs employed it to outline the male/female antagonism. These two notions symbolize the antithetic genres of epic and elegy. The antithesis is obvious, for example, in Ovid *Tristia* 2.307, where he defines his elegiac poetry as *mollis versus*, while Propertius, in 2.1.42, says that he is incapable of writing *durus versus* like other poets such as Callimachus and Caesar. While *durus* is associated with epic and with masculine activities, such as war and hunting, *mollis* often refers to elegiac poetry, to softness and feebleness. These two notions have sexual connotations as well, the female genitalia being described as *mollia*, and the male genitalia, as *dura*. The elegiacs adopt this idea but perform an inversion: the feeble elegiac male poet (*mollis*) is often opposed to the soldier, whereas the female character becomes *dura*, showing her cruelness and lack of compassion towards the poet who is constantly tormented by love.

who always has the last word. In a word, sometimes the man may seem to be in control, but the woman always has the dominant role in an elegiac couple.

In Seneca, Phaedra remains *dura* with a feminine determination typical of Roman love elegy, but she takes on the role of the lover, the role normally assumed by the elegiac man. The episode of the Amazon is emblematic of the in-between status of Phaedra's role. She wants to dress as an Amazon, not only to seduce the young man, but also because the Amazons were very virile women, waging war and hating men. In fact, Phaedra assumes perhaps the best model for her inversed elegiac gender role because the Amazons, being both *molles* and *durae* at the same time, were biological females who acted like men, from the Roman social perspective at least. Phaedra lives her forbidden love for her stepson tragically, even though she tries (at least at the beginning of the play) to break away from him. Her desire to dress as an Amazon is also highly paradoxical. She wants to seduce Hippolytus by an Oedipal gesture (by dressing like his mother), and yet Amazons hated men. She becomes virile and tough, but she also wants to seduce him as a woman. In other words, she is caught in the middle and has to struggle between the antagonistic notions of *mollis* and *durus* or male and female, which in normal elegy are quite distinct. In fact, her in-between status represents one of the tragic aspects of the play because Phaedra moves back and forth between several oppositions: the literary opposition between elegy and tragedy, the social opposition between *mollis* and *dura* or between queen and slave, and the ethnic distinctions between Cretans, Greeks, and Amazons. Therefore, the Amazon scene gives ample evidence of the state of madness into which *Amor* has driven her, and it also reveals her dual nature.

Ardent passion characterizes love elegy in general, which centres on tormented, unrequited love, with one of the lovers always suffering deeply (Propertius 3.8.23 ff)

(Rosati 1992: 74), precisely the dramatic situation in which Phaedra finds herself. Love elegy presents love as a relationship between a mean, *dura* woman and a feeble (*mollis*), poverty-stricken man. The woman remains dominant, the man, browbeaten and defeated, and the relationship consists of a form of *servitium*. But Phaedra tells Hippolytus to call her *famula,* making him the *dominus*, so that in Seneca's play the dominant elegiac woman becomes the dominated lover.[13]

In the Phaedra myth, a woman suddenly falls in love with a man. From the perspective of love elegy, this means that the customary roles have been reversed, for in the myth it is the man who rejects the *puella* and not the other way around. Phaedra becomes the lover—the role played by the man in elegy—even though she is both *dura*[14] and *mollis* at the same time.[15] This is the result of a genre mutation in which an elegiac situation is transposed into a tragic context. In terms of genre, the characters are deformed. *Furor* sometimes takes the place of the elegiac lament.[16] The hunter is not the

[13] In Phaedra's case, the elegiac situation has tragic overtones because she is ready to renounce her status as queen and become a mere slave:

> *nostros humilius nomen affectus decet;*
> *me uel sororem, Hippolyte, uel famulam uoca,*
> *famulamque potius: omne seruitium feram.*
> [A humbler name would be more suited for what I feel;
> Hippolytus, call me your sister, or better, your servant!
> Yes, servant is better, because I shall do every service you ask of me!] (Sen. *Phae*. 610-613)

The rhetorical device is obvious. Phaedra first renounces her authority as stepmother and asks the young man to call her "sister." Then, considering this insufficient, she asks to be called "servant." Thus the queen, and mother, becomes sister and servant. Seneca exploits the potential tragic tone of this passage to the fullest. Phaedra is not sure at the beginning, but she invigorates herself with a short and powerful elliptic phrase: *"famulamque potius."* Copley (1947: 298-300) notes that *servitium amoris* was a Roman creation. The humble attitude of servile abasement being foreign to Greek literature, Seneca most likely followed the Roman elegiac poets here.

[14] See the Amazonian episode, and note that Phaedra wants to hunt Hippolytus.

[15] Phaedra pleads with Hippolytus and falls to her knees, she feels the pain of love (the symptoms of love), and she is desperate enough to give up everything for him (the servitude of love).

[16] Dangel (2009: 21) emphasizes that the elegiac *querela* (the lament) expresses the pain of a love that cannot be fulfilled because of numerous obstacles (the refusal of the *puella*, the closed door, the guardian,

feeble poet anymore, but a *dura puella*. The perspective has changed, but the background and the characters have remained the same. Seneca, highly influenced by Ovid, introduces this innovation and creates a new Phaedra. The classic Phaedra (in Euripides) commits suicide honourably when her love has been revealed. Seneca introduces an elegiac Phaedra who fights for her love using every possible means, just as Love Elegy recommends in *Amores* 3.1. She begs, she hunts, she feints, and she summons her allies (the *nutrix*)[17] in order to live out her passion.[18]

Seneca's *Phaedra* makes her first clear reference to the elegiac convention of *durus/mollis* at line 111: *iuvat excitatas consequi cursu feras / et rigida molli gaesa iaculari manu* ("I enjoy pursuing the frightened beasts as they run away and throwing stiff spears with my soft hands"). Hippolytus is a huntsman, and both the *nutrix* and Phaedra bestialize him throughout the play. The young man's transformation into a beast of prey is strongly connected to the elegiac convention of hunting. The next line gives

---

the husband). In fact, elegy means, as the French author puts it, *"dire hélas."* Vizzotti (2005-2006: 110) notes that Phaedra laments twice over Hippolytus' dead body during the play: first in front of her *famullae* and then in front of Theseus. It is noteworthy that the elegiac metre, the pentameter, was normally used in funeral lamentations before it began to be used in erotic elegiac poems. Poel (2006: 161-162) notes that Phaedra is unhappy (*querela*) and that she wants the audience to sympathize with her. Thus Phaedra's declaration of love to Hippolytus (609-671) is divided into three parts, each one ending with an expression containing the term *miserere* followed by other words that sum up the point of her lament (Poel 2006: 167):

a) 609-623 (*miserere viduuae*)
b) 623-636 (*miserere, tacitae mentis exaudi preces*)
c) 637-671 (*miserere amantis*)

This is clearly a means to impress the young man, but it is also a metapoetic device that reveals Phaedra's genre awareness: she uses an elegiac *querela* to seduce her beloved.

[17] The nutrix or the guardian convention is recurrent in love elegy. The elegiac poet often uses this *Trojan horse* to obtain information or even to convince the *puella*. This convention is not new in Ovid's time. Plautus and Terence often use the character of the slave who arranges sexual encounters and even marriages between his master and his beloved.

[18] Dangel (2008: 177-178) notes that jealousy and amorous treason are almost always a cause for complaint in elegy and that this can have tragic accents. Borrowing this idea from elegy, Seneca uses it in a more complex manner. Phaedra is ready to cheat on her husband, and this infidelity helps to bring about the reversal of elegiac roles: Hippolytus becomes the *dura puella*—for he is the one who refuses to succumb to his stepmother's attempts to seduce him—while Phaedra becomes the *servus amoris*, the tormented lover, ready to renounce her pride as a married woman in the name of passion.

credence to this conclusion: Phaedra, with her *molli manu,* throws *rigida gaesa* (stiff javelins). These two short phrases concentrate the expression of Phaedra's excessive sexuality and emphasize one of the central oppositions in elegy, the *durus/mollis* opposition. As J. Adams (1982: 19-21) remarks, the weapon metaphor is very common in sexual puns. Moreover, the word *gesatus* (a derivation of *gaesum*) has been found on an inscription with sexual connotations.[19] The erotic meaning is further reinforced by the adjective *rigida* and its opposite, *mollis*. The strong link between erotic elegy and hunting has great importance, not only to the extent that it constantly occurs in Roman literature, but also as a marker of the elegiac inversion in Seneca's play, where the male elegiac hunter, now the prey, changes places with a passionate woman who becomes the erotic hunter.

At line 653, Phaedra says of Theseus: *inerant lacertis mollibus fortes tori* ("His young arm was already announcing his strength"). She makes use of the elegiac convention of *durus/mollis* when she characterizes her future husband as having *lacertis mollibus* in his youth, adding immediately that the young Hippolytus now resembles his father. Just as the elegiac poet understands and recognizes his weakness, Phaedra acts here as "poet" and pinpoints the weakness of the man, because he is the one who is *mollis*.

This fundamental elegiac opposition receives further confirmation from Theseus in a passage that deserves attention. From outside the relationship, Theseus sees the same thing as Phaedra, a *mollis* Hippolytus:

> *pudor impudentem celat, audacem quies,*
> *pietas nefandum; uera fallaces probant*

[19] Hirschfield, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, XII*, (1996), 12.5695.3.

> *simulantque molles dura. siluarum incola*
> *ille efferatus castus intactus rudis,*
> *mihi te reseruas? a meo primum toro*
> *et scelere tanto placuit ordiri uirum?*
> [Timidity hides lack of respect, tranquility hides audacity,
> Piety hides crime;
> Softness simulates toughness. Savage, chaste, pure and rough
> Man of woods,
> You saved yourself for me? You enjoyed being a man in my bed
> By such a crime?] (Sen. *Phae*. 925-930)

That Theseus should oppose the terms *pudor* and *impudor*, *pietas* and *audax nefanda*, and *vera* and *fallaces* makes sense, but why does he use the terms *molles* and *dura*? It is normal for him to criticize his son for being shameless, disrespectful towards his father's honour, and mendacious, but why does he accuse his son—not of being weak (*mollis*)—but of being strong (*durus*)? What is the meaning of the *mollis/durus* opposition in this case? Doubtless it is a clear reference to the elegiac *mollis*/*durus* opposition. Theseus thinks that Hippolytus lacks libido, dare, or masculinity (*ordiri virum*), and yet, after the presumed rape, he feels that he is mistaken about this, for he believes that his son is no longer *mollis*. On the contrary, his son has taken control of the situation and raped Phaedra. Although Theseus is mistaken about Hippolytus' guilt and about his having become *durus* (the dominant one in the relationship), he assumes that the feeble young man is in fact the lover, and to explain this, he uses a notion borrowed from the vocabulary of elegy, a notion which is emblematic of the entire genre framework of the play.[20]

[20] At the same time, this passage is about seduction because Theseus sees Hippolytus as having seduced Phaedra. Hippolytus has supposedly done so using the very means suggested in the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid's manual on love: cheating, lying, audacity, and manliness.

1.2. Phaedra Burns with Love: Vocabulary and Style

I now want to show how Seneca uses vocabulary and certain stylistic devices to create an elegiac atmosphere. Yet a difficulty exists to the extent that—as is very often the case in Roman literature—the chain of influences goes back to Greek literature. In other words, the erotic vocabulary in Roman elegy is neither new, nor original. It originates in Alexandrian poetry, and through this channel, it enters pre-Augustan and Augustan Latin literature. Nonetheless, there are important differences in the ways this vocabulary is used in the two traditions, for it is not so much its form as its strategic implementation and especially its frequency that distinguish Roman elegy from Alexandrian poetry.

Ruch (1964) takes note of all of the types of erotic expressions in Seneca's *Phaedra*, but he fails to go much further than enumerating them. One of the most prevalent types that he identifies is the fiery imagery associated with love.[21] This metaphorical motif entered Latin literature from Greek literature (Ruch 1964: 358-359), but this does not mean Seneca that took his inspiration from there.[22] Indeed, Ovid and the elegiac poets were much closer in time than the Alexandrians. With examples like *Heroides* 4 that have an elegiac source, it seems reasonable to assume that Seneca's reading of authors closer in time like Ovid would influence his vocabulary. Furthermore, Latin elegiac love poetry used this kind of metaphor on a large scale, and it became one of the leitmotifs of poetical imagery. For example, the word *uror*, which is often used to

[21] Ruch (1963: 360) divides this fiery imagery into four types: Vulcan's fire, incendiary fire, internal fire, and the sacred fire associated with Cupid.

[22] See Spatafora (2006) and Spatafora (2007).

designate a burning passion, also means "to mark runaway slaves by burning." The expression contains the idea of slavery (*servitium amoris*) and that of burning love at the same time, and it is easy to understand why the elegiacs used it often.

But a problem arises: Lucretius, Virgil, and Horace also used this type of metaphor. Therefore, to strengthen the argument, it is important to clarify the differences between the elegiacs and the other Augustan poets, who are more or less indebted to the Alexandrians. In order to analyze the problem accurately, I have located the main metaphors involving the idea of fire or heat in the most important Latin poets. Annex 1 presents a table listing occurrences.[23]

The first thing that strikes the eye is the high frequency of these figures of speech in elegy.[24] This is normal if we keep in mind that these expressions are for erotic literature. Yet in *Phaedra*, which has only 1280 lines of verse, there are no less than 30 fiery metaphors (2.34 for every 100 lines), while for Virgil there are only 29 in the entire corpus of 12,913 lines of verse. Numbers can be tricky, but in this case there is no doubt that Seneca employs an abnormally high number of such expressions. At the same time, Virgil's poetry is not erotic, although there are many erotic fragments in the *Aeneid* and in the *Eclogues*, where bucolic *amor* prevails. However, even elegiac poets such as Propertius (21 fiery metaphors in 4,056 lines of verse) or Catullus (16 in 2,202 lines of

[23] I have used the entire corpus for every poet except for Ovid, for whom I have only taken into consideration the *Ars Amatoria*, *Amores*, *Heroides, Metamorphoses,* and *Remedia Amoris*. Of course, more metaphors may be discovered, and there are other kinds of fiery imagery that I have not considered. In general, the metaphors that I have chosen are the most recurrent, and although not exhaustive, the table provides a useful representative picture.

[24] The length of the corpus also has to be considered: Ovid has 21,506 lines of verse; Virgil, 12,913; Horace, 7,751; Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura* in its entirety), 7415; Propertius, 4,056; Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura* bks. 4 and 5), 2744; Catullus, 2,202; Tibullus, 1,923; Seneca's *Phaedra*, 1280. Seneca's *Phaedra* has 2.34 fiery metaphors for every 100 lines. The numbers for the other poets are as follows: Catullus, 1.13; Propertius, 0.76; Tibullus, 0.67; Ovid, 0.54; Horace, 0.36; Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura* bks. 4 and 5), 0,36; Virgil, 0.22; Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura* in its entirety), 0,13.

verse), who treat love at length, do not use such a high number of fiery metaphors. Lucretius provides a perfect example because he only employs fiery love metaphors in books 4 and 5, where he speaks about the senses and desire. Still, even if we consider only these two books, he uses far fewer erotic tropes based on fiery imagery than the elegiacs.

Note that although Virgil very often refers to fire metaphorically, especially in the *Aeneid*, it is in military, not in erotic contexts.[25] By Virgil's time, fiery imagery is well known and widely used.[26] The Elegiacs adopt this imagery, but they transform it so that they can use it for their own purposes. It appears that Seneca is aware of this, for he employs words like *ignis*, *flamma*, *aestus,* or *ardere* almost exclusively in erotic contexts.

However, frequency of use is not a sufficient proof. There is another important discrepancy between the elegiac poets and the other poets. Ruch (1964: 358) notes that very often in prose, after a word like *flamma*, another explanatory word, e.g. *amoris* or *Veneris*, is added.[27] In fact, it is not only prose writers who feel the need to strengthen expressions, but also non-elegiac poets.[28] In the same phrase, Virgil often places erotic

---

[25] Virgil also employs some of his fiery figures of speech with erotic connotations in homosexual contexts (*Eclogues*) and contexts involving cattle (*Georgics*).

[26] Plautus and Terence also provide examples of this type of expression, both in erotic and non-erotic contexts, but the importance that they give to these metaphors in no way compares to that given by the Augustan poets.

[27] Cicero *Verr*. 5.92.

[28] In Annex 1, I have not only considered the direct adjectives or genitives of words with fire-related meanings. If in the same phrase a specific mention of "love" is present, I take that expression as explanatory. Thus, in Catullus, 12% of the fiery metaphors are followed by an elucidating word; in Propertius, 19%; in Tibullus, 23%; in Seneca's *Phaedra*, 25%; in Ovid, 26%; in Horace, 46%; in Virgil, 69%; in Lucretius 80%. In any case, the non-elegiac poets feel a greater need to explain their metaphors. Horace's percentage is probably closer than the others to the percentages for love elegy because of the elegiac influences his poetry may have undergone.

explanatory words close to fiery metaphors.[29] I would like to discuss two examples where this elucidatory device is not as obvious: *Eclogues* 2.1[30] and *Eclogues* 5.10. Virgil starts his second Eclogue with these verses: *Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin, / delicias domini, nec quid speraret habebat* ("The shepherd Alexis was burning with love for the beautiful Corydon / one of his master's delights, that he could not hope to have"). The word *ardebat* in the first line means "he burned with love." At first glance, there is no erotic explanatory word nearby. However, Virgil used an etymological device, because Corydon can be interpreted as a name composed of two words: *cor* and *donum*, that is, "heart" and "offering." The second example contains the same type of figure of speech, except that here the etymology is more obvious: *Incipe, Mopse, prior, si quos aut Phyllidis ignis / aut Alconis habes laudes aut iurgia Codri* ("Start Mopsus, and sing to us what you know about Philidis' love, Alconis' praise and Codrus' quarrel") (*Ecl*. 5.10-11). *Ignis* means "the passion of love," and the explanatory expression is the name Phyllidis, because in ancient Greek *philein* means "to love." Of course, the rule of the clarifying expression is not absolute.[31] For example, in *Aeneid* 8.388-390,[32] there is no such expression, although there may be a reason for this. The scene depicts Venus trying to charm Vulcan, and Virgil does not consider it necessary to add the word *amor*. The general allegorical idea is self-explanatory: Venus "heats" Vulcan.[33]

---

[29] *Amor*, *amore,* or *amans* for *Aen*. 1.54, *Aen*. 1.330, *Aen*. 1.673, *Aen*. 4.101, *Aen*. 8.163, *Aen*. 11.782, *Ecl*. 8.81, *Georg*. 3.244, and *Georg*. 3.258.

[30] *Ecl*. 5.86 reproduces the same metaphor as *Ecl*. 2.1.

[31] There are some instances where a complementary word is missing: *Aen*. 4.66, *Ecl*. 3.66, *Geor*. 3.271, and *Geor*. 3.272.

[32] *Ille repente / accepit solitam flammam, notusque medullas / intrauit calor et labefacta per ossa cucurrit* ("And suddenly he felt the familiar flame; a known heat took possession of him, and shivers shook his limbs").

[33] The numerous words belonging to the semantic field of heat or brilliance in the passage heighten the allegory: *flammam* (389), *calor* (390), *corusco* (391), *ignea* (392), *micans* (392), and *lumine* (392).

Horace's case is also interesting, although he makes use of few fiery figures of speech (only 28, which means 0.36 metaphors per 100 lines).[34] Some contain an erotic word in the same phrase, but others do not. I have tried to identify a pattern because contrary to Virgil, who uses a great deal more metaphors with explanatory devices than metaphors without explanatory devices, Horace maintains a balance between the two categories (46% with, 54% without). Horace had an excellent knowledge of elegiac poetry, and he was well aware that elegiac influences on his poetry were inevitable.[35] As a result, in poems where the clarification is absent, there are many elegiac elements.[36] I will take as an example *Epode* 11, in order to briefly indicate some of the elegiac elements. The poet is complaining that he cannot write anymore because Love has burned him:

> *Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuuat*
> *scribere uersiculos amore percussum graui,*
> *amore, qui me praeter omnis expetit*
> *mollibus in pueris aut in puellis urere.*
> [Pettius, nothing helps me anymore
> To write small verses, as I am shaken by a violent love.
> A love that makes my entire body burn
> For little girls and little boys.] (Horace *Ep*. 11.1-4)

The first lines of verse play a programmatic role for the entire poem, so that they should provide obvious indicators of its genre. The word *amor* is repeated twice. Note also, at line 4, the verb *urere,* and at line 2, *percussum*, another metaphor for someone who falls in love. Two other key words are positioned symmetrically (*in . . . aut . . . in*): *pueris* and *puellis*, direct references to elegiac poetry. Moreover, the adjective *mollibus* and the

---

[34] See Annex 1.

[35] See Grant (1952), Poeschl (1980), and Alvar Ezquerra (1997).

[36] This is the case with respect to vocabulary: *puella*, *querela*, but also with respect to literary conventions such as Cupid and his arrows, Venus, the *servitium amoris*, jealousy, unshared love, etc.

diminutive *versiculos*[37] are both elegiac reminders. Other elegiac topoi found in the text such as the hatred of rivals (*inparibus certare* – 18) or the *komos* (*limina dura* – 22) make this case clear enough. Thus, when Horace uses the fire motif as a metaphor for love without any explanatory device, it means that his poem has enough elegiac elements in it to make any explanation unnecessary.[38]

As Annex 1 shows, elegiac poetry differs from other poetry in two main respects: the frequency of fire metaphors and the lack of explanatory devices. Seneca's *Phaedra* follows the same pattern, and the tragedian even improves this specific metaphorical field by employing the word *vapor* with the meaning "burning love" twice in *Phaedra*, a meaning for which there are no other occurrences in Latin literature (Ruch 1964: 359).

The way the elegiacs perceived the idea of love is another important question that I would like to discuss. According to Lilija (1965: 78-79), Propertius and Ovid differ from one another in the way that they imagine love. Propertius tends to see Venus as a tyrannical passion that cruelly enslaves both humans and gods, whereas Ovid usually depends on the Hellenistic idea of *Amor* (or Cupid), a *puer* who encourages lovemaking and light-hearted passion. Needless to say, in Euripides' play Venus is an actual character and the presence of the gods is much less allegorical than in Roman elegiac poetry. Seneca presents a more Roman conception of love, but he uses both Propertius' and Ovid's manners of envisioning it: Phaedra shares Propertius' conception of love,[39]

---

[37] This diminutive recalls the term *libellus* so often employed by the elegiac poets. In some of Ovid's poems, there are no less than 12 occurrences of this word: *Her.* 11.4, 17.145; *Rem. Am.* 1, 67, 361; *Am.* 2.11.31, 2.17.33, 3.8.5, 3.12.7; *Ars Am.* 1.167, 3.47, 3.206.

[38] I will not deal with Catullus because he is generally considered to be much closer to the elegiacs than Horace. Indeed, the way he uses fiery imagery argues for this (see Annex 1).

[39] *quid ratio possit? uicit ac regnat furor, / potensque tota mente dominatur deus*. ("What can reason do? Passion has won and now rules, while a powerful god dominates my entire soul") (Seneca *Phae*. 184-185).

whereas the nurse and the chorus seem to see love the way that Ovid does, that is to say, as something light-hearted not to be taken too seriously.[40]

Seneca follows the Roman tradition with respect to the use of the word "Venus." If in the Greek play, Venus is a real presence representing much more than an allegory, in *Phaedra*, she has more of a metaphorical role founded on vocabulary and stylistic devices. She is named quite often, but as a metaphor for physical or instinctual love, for sexual appetite. As Ruch (1964: 358) points out, in *Phaedra* Venus lies somewhere between myth and abstraction.

1.3. Sexual and Bodily Imagery, *Amor* and Passion

Sex and the body are recurrent themes in elegiac poetry, and they have a marked presence in Seneca's *Phaedra*. Nevertheless, in an attempt to defend Seneca's heroine and to criticize her counterpart in Euripides, Roisman (2005: 76) argues that the Latin Phaedra is much less passionate than the lustful Greek original. She also claims that "Seneca condenses this entire evocative scene into two dispassionate lines: *iuvat excitatas consequi cursu feras* / *et rigida molli gaesa iaculari manu* ('I take pleasure in pursuing the startled beasts / and with my soft hand hurling stiff javelins,' 110f.). All the sensuality of Euripides' character has been pared away" (Roisman 2005: 76). But Roisman is not only mistaken here, she also chooses an unsatisfactory example to prove her point. For the way that the two lines in question give concentrated expression to Phaedra's excessive sexuality is completely appropriate, and it highlights one of the central motifs of elegiac

[40] *impotens flammis simul et sagittis / iste lasciuus puer et renidens / tela quam certo moderatur arcu!* ("Violent because of his flames and arrows, this playful and shining kid fires such sure arrows from his bow!") (Seneca *Phae*. 276-278).

poetry: the antinomy *mollis*/*durus*. Indeed, as Adams (1982: 19-21) notes, the weapon metaphor is one of the most common figures of speech in sexual puns, and the word *gesatus* (a derivation of *gaesum*) has been found on an inscription employed in a sexual context (CILL 12.5695.3). The erotic meaning is reinforced by the adjective *rigida* and its opposite, *mollis*, two strong symbols of sexuality and love elegy.

Mantovanelli (2008: 970-971) notes that *Phaedra* contains many terms like *luxus*, *luxuria* (3 occurrences) and *libido* (4 occurrences). This is not a general tendency in Seneca's tragic corpus: there are only two other occurrences of such terms in *Thyestes* and *Troades*. *Octavia* also contains an important number of expressions with sexual connotations (3 occurrences of *luxus* and 2 of *libido*), but the play is only an imitation. Although the theme of *amor* recurs often in Seneca's tragedies, the notion of unrestrained sexual *libido* is particularly present in *Phaedra*. In Antiquity, Cretan women had a reputation for having anomalous relationships and for being quite receptive to sexual advances. Phaedra is no different in this respect (Armstrong 2006: 109). As Armstrong notes (2006: 112), Ovid states in the *Ars Amtoria*[41] that women are slaves to their libido. It is no wonder that Seneca plays with this convention, creating a very lustful heroine.

Contrary to Euripides, who is more of a rationalist, Seneca constantly uses metaphors and comparisons (Ruch 1963: 362). The fiery love imagery that we analyzed in the last section shows Seneca's concern with his heroine's state of mind. The senses play an important part in the tragedy. Love makes Phaedra feel the agonizing pain and the burning heat of Cupid's arrows and torches. Seneca is preoccupied with the "symptoms of love," another important elegiac topos. The love that his Phaedra feels is not

[41] *omnia feminea sunt ista libidine mota; acrior est nostra plusque furoris habet*. ("All women are dominated by their libido, / which is more pregnant than ours; they are also more passionate") (Ovid *Ars Am.* 1.341–2).

unidirectional; it is unrequited, violent, tormented, and carnal, and it is central to the play. Contrary to Euripides, who focuses more on the action of the play and on Phaedra's self-destructive destiny, Seneca is concerned with his heroine's passion (Roiseman 2005: 73); and this generates an abundance of erotic imagery to portray the ways that love affects her. The polyvalent nature of love and the almost clinical description of Phaedra's emotions represent two important elegiac features around which Seneca builds his play.

The purity of body and soul (*pura puella*) is another leitmotiv in Roman love elegy. The elegiac poet often perceives his beloved as pure or chaste, even though in the majority of cases this is not true. In *Heroides* 4, Phaedra tries to delude Hippolytus with respect to her chastity. Because she is a married woman, her purity has more to do with her soul than with her body, but even here, it is difficult for her to make her case while at the same time trying to seduce her husband's son. In elegy, the poet-lover always initiates the pure and innocent *puella* into the experience of love (Armstrong 2006: 270), but for Phaedra, things are much more complicated. She claims to be pure and innocent so that she can seduce Hippolytus; however, being married, she necessarily has experience of carnal love. This paradox defines Phaedra throughout the play: like the elegiac man, she is experienced in love, but like the elegiac *puella*, she is also pure and innocent. She even goes so far as to say that she will give up her purity to no one other than Hippolytus:[42]

> *respersa nulla labe et intacta, innocens*
> *tibi mutor uni*
> [Untouched by any vice, innocent and pure,
> I will change for you only] (Seneca *Phae*. 668-669).

Coffey and Mayer (1990: 150) maintain that *intacta* means "spotless reputation," but I do not necessarily agree, for it seems much more likely that this adjective refers back to

[42] At the same time, it has been a year since Hippolytus' departure to the Underworld, and it may be the case that in these verses Phaedra is alluding to this.

Phaedra's "virginity" in *Heroides* 4.[43] De Vito (1994: 316) insists that Phaedra is being neither comic, nor pathetic when she claims to be a virgin. She is simply in love, and she wants to seduce the young man. In other words, she claims to be pure and innocent in the context of her love for the young man. She is saying, "Love me Hippolytus; for you, I will be whatever you want." This not only recalls the elegiac *servitium amoris*, it also presents a comically absurd contrast between what is actually true and what Phaedra pretends to be true. She wants Hippolytus to see her as *intacta*. She wants him to see her as a *puella*, but she is not a *puella*.

Pudicitia, the equivalent of male *virtus*, is another key notion related to virginal purity in love elegy (Lilija 1965: 146). *Pudicitia* can mean *pudor*, and in *Phaedra*, Seneca attributes this feminine trait to Hippolytus, once again underscoring the notion of gender reversal. Ovid too is fascinated by the idea of *pudor*, and in *Heroides* 4, it is present from the very beginning (Lilija 1965: 153): *qua licet et sequitur, pudor est miscendus amori / dicere quae puduit, scribere iussit amor* ("As much as possible, *pudor* must be combined with love / I feel ashamed to tell you what love ordered me to write") (Ovid *Her*. 4.9-10).

In addition to a variety of other literary and linguistic resemblances, Jakobi (1998: 63) notes some similarities between two specific elements in Seneca's *Phaedra* and Ovid's *Heroides* 4. In all of Latin literature, the expression *ora tingere* (*de rubore*) only occurs in these two works. This strengthens the parallel between the two writers. Here are the lines in question:

> *flava verecundus tinxerat ora rubor*
> [A delicate shyness coloured his blond face] (Ovid *Her.* 4.72)
> (Phaedra about Hippolytus)

[43] See lines 30-34 from *Heroides* 4.

> *et ora flavus tenera tinguebat pudor*
> [And a blond shyness was touching his young face] (Seneca *Phae*. 652)
> (Phaedra about Hippolytus)
>
> *non ora tinguens nitida purpureus rubor*
> [A purple shyness is not touching her neat face] (Seneca *Phae*. 376)
> (the Nurse about Phaedra)

Jakobi (1998: 63-64) believes that Seneca took his inspiration from Ovid's text, rather than from another source. His main arguments are the similarity of the expressions and the word order in the verses, so that the assumption of mutual interference becomes inevitable. Yet Jakobi fails to push the analysis further. Doing so would provide another argument strengthening the idea of a highly elegiac *Phaedra*.

These three quotations are quite conclusive with respect to Hippolytus' feminization. Seneca's Phaedra makes this feminization much more obvious than her counterpart in Ovid, who shows a certain ambiguity when she characterizes the young man as *durus* at the end of the poem.[44] Note that in the first two examples, Phaedra is referring to Hippolytus, while in the last one the *nutrix* is referring to Phaedra. In other words, Phaedra and Hippolytus are described identically. By using almost the same syntax and the same expressions, Seneca clearly wants his readers to understand that Phaedra sees the young man as a woman.

We have already seen that in love elegy the highly important term *pudor* is the equivalent of *virtus*. Seneca (*Phae*. 652) employs it to signal the elegiac nature of his characters. Note, however, that in the same context Ovid (*Her*. 4.72) uses *rubor* instead of *pudor*. I believe that this is because Ovid feels no need to provide his poem with genre

[44] *Da ueniam fasse duraque corda doma*! ("Be merciful and soften your cruel heart!") (Ovid *Her*. 4.156).

markers: all of his readers are well aware that he writes elegy. But this is not true for Seneca, whose play is very ambiguous from the perspective of genre. Seneca's message seems quite clear: "I have read *Heroides* 4, and I understand that in the case of Hippolytus he is a she." If we consider the two above examples from *Phaedra*, it seems clear that it would be more appropriate to take the second description (*Phae*. 376) as characterizing Hippolytus (*rubor* being very close to *robor*, and *nitidus* being a manly adjective), and the first description (*Phae*. 652) as referring to Phaedra (*pudor* and *tener*). Note also that in their descriptions of women, Ovid and Tibullus very often use the adjective *tener* with reference to feminine beauty (Liljia 1965: 131). Moreover, both Propertius and Ovid are fascinated by the *puella's* complexion and by her hair (Lilia 1965: 129), whereas Tibullus only shows interest in her hair. In general, the elegiac poets praise *flavus* more than any other colour, and the presence of this epithet at lines 651-652 in *Phaedra* and at line 72 in *Heroides* 4 is noteworthy. It is remarkable that Seneca follows Ovid in attributing this hair colour, a very feminine trait in elegy, to Hippolytus. In Seneca's case, it is obviously a transferred epithet, because *rubor* cannot be characterized as *flavus* and the adjective refers directly to the young man.

We can conclude that following Ovid, Seneca accentuates the idea of gender reversal and that he clearly reveals his intentions by using attributes, such as *flava* and *pudor*, which normally belong to women in elegy. To reinforce this idea, it may be useful to quote two passages from Tibullus:

> *Virgineus teneras stat pudor ante genas*
> [His virginal *pudor* spread all over his tender cheeks] (Tibullus 1.4.14)
>
> *et color in niueo corpore purpureus,*
> *ut iuueni primum uirgo deducta marito*
> *inficitur teneras ore rubente genas*

> [A purple colour was spread on her pallid body
> as when we offer the virgin to her young spouse
> and a scarlet shyness colours her tender cheeks] (Tibullus 3.4.30-32).

In the first passage Tibullus is referring to a boy, but in the second one he is referring to a girl. The terms used to depict both the girl and the boy clearly recall the passages above, in which Phaedra describes Hippolytus. Phaedra uses expressions that the elegiacs normally employ to describe their *puella* or tender young boys. Thus it is absolutely clear that Phaedra effeminizes Hippolytus, and that by doing so, she assumes the elegiac male role.

Two other intertextual occurrences underscored by Jakobi deserve attention. In the first one Phaedra addresses her sister who is not present on stage. In the second one, she addresses Hippolytus directly:

> *domus sorores una corripuit duas,*
> *te genitor at me natus*
> [One family corrupted two sisters at the same time:
> the father seduced you and the son seduced me] (Seneca *Phae*. 665-666).
>
> *placuit domus una duabus*
> *me tua forma capit, capta parente soror.*
> *Thesides Theseusque duas rapuere sorores*
> [Two sisters loved this family at the same time,
> Your beauty seduced me, while my sister was seduced by your father;
> the son of Theseus and Theseus himself seduced two sisters]
> (Ovid *Her.* 4.63-65).

These lines are very important because they indicate the main elements of the entire story: the two sisters, Ariadne and Phaedra, the *domus*, i.e. the labyrinth, Hippolytus and Theseus, and the idea of seduction (*corripuit*). Every word has a powerful meaning for the global codification of the myth. Ovid is slightly more explicit, the idea of seduction (*capit*, *capta*, *rapuere*) being omnipresent in *Heroides* 4. Actually, as an elegiac author,

Ovid follows the story, and as a result, his perspective appears slightly different from Seneca's. In Ovid, "two sisters loved one family," but Seneca uses a passive construction: "One family was loved by two sisters." Ovid is quite clear about this mutual love. His Phaedra does not deny the truth, but Seneca's Phaedra seems to be declaring herself innocent of all guilt: it is Theseus' house that "seduced" the two sisters. Yet it is somehow normal for the heroine to act in this way, because she feels guilty and tries to hide the truth; and this sophisticated psychological lie that Seneca introduces fits very well with Phaedra's character. If at the beginning she hesitates about how to react and about expressing her feelings to Hippolytus, in the end she succumbs to desire and reveals everything to him. This is to be expected if we interpret Seneca's play as a tragedy. The dilemma of love must finally tear the heroine apart, but this tragic interpretation conflicts with the elegiac side of her character, the side that has no doubts about feelings. By using the passive construction, Seneca signals that Phaedra is indeed a tragic character, but that she is elegiac at the same time. The genius of Seneca's art reveals itself in this creation of a character with such a mixed nature.

The ambiguity of the verb *corripuit* is increased by the vagueness of the noun *domus* that Seneca uses to designate the labyrinth of the Minotaur (Seneca *Phae*. 122, 524 and 649) and Theseus' family. This ambiguity is marked by an ingenious use of the golden line. In verse 665, Seneca uses a crooked golden line (*domus sorores una corripuit duas* – Noun A / Noun B / Adjective A / Verb / Adjective B), which is perfectly appropriate, because we are in a maze where everything is "corrupted" and ambiguous. We still do not know what connotation to give to *corripuit*. After we leave the *domus* (line 666 - *te genitor at me natus*), everything becomes clear (Pronoun A / Noun A / Conjunction / Pronoun B / Noun B). Now we have the answer, and we understand that

Theseus seduced Ariadne and that his son Hippolytus seduced Phaedra. The idea of family represents one of the keys to the play, and Seneca accentuates it by his choice of vocabulary: *domus, sorores, genitor, natus*.

Gazing at the beauty of the beloved is another elegiac feature. When Phaedra describes Hippolytus, she assumes the male role once again (Davis 1995: 45). In addition, she only focuses on his physical appearance, and she tends to emphasize physical passion, using the male beauty canon from the *Ars Amatoria* (Davis 1995: 46).

1.4. *Servitium Amoris*: Love's Servitude

Highly appreciated by the elegiac poets, the topos of *servitium amoris* is present in both Greek and Latin literature. However, as Murgatroyd (1981: 596) points out, the Roman elegists are the first to make full use of it on a large scale. Murgatroyd (1981: 596-599) describes the new features that they added to the *servitium amoris* theme, such as the lover's voluntary acceptance of "slavery" and his self-degradation for the sake of love. In Seneca's play, these features become part and parcel of Phaedra's behaviour towards Hippolytus. We have already seen that she is ready to relinquish her status as queen and wife in exchange for Hippolytus' love, but it is also important to note that she frequently uses the words *servitium* and *famula*:

> a) *omne servitium feram* [I would do anything you ask of me]
> (Seneca *Phae*. 612);
>
> b) *mandata recipe sceptra, me famulam accipe*
> *te imperia regere, me decet iussa exequi*
> [Accept the sceptre I am offering you, accept me as your slave!
> You deserve the royal power, and I will follow you]
> (Seneca *Phae*. 617-618);
>
> c) *sinu receptam supplicem ac servam tege*
> *miserere uiduae*.

[Protect this suppliant in your arms,
This unfortunate widow] (Seneca *Phae*. 622-624).

For De Vito (1994: 325), Phaedra plays the role of Love's slave. Just as in erotic elegy, the painful suffering brought on by her love for Hippolytus becomes the focus of Seneca's play. Well aware of the abnormal character of her passion, Phaedra struggles without success to repress it, in the end succumbing to its enticements; however, her final defeat in no way indicates that at the beginning of the play her efforts to fight back the illicit temptations of her passion are somehow inauthentic. As De Vito points out, the incestuous nature of Phaedra's love constitutes the main difference between the *servitium* that she suffers and the elegiac *servitium amoris*. Although not actually incestuous—Hippolytus not being her biological son—Phaedra's love for him is guilt-ridden because, psychologically, she feels the full brunt of the stigma attaching to a woman's erotic desires for her husband's son. This aspect of her love may represent an effort on the part of Seneca to enrich its genre complexity, for it fits very well with the tragic context of his play. The standard elegiac lover has to deal with infidelity (feeling pangs of jealousy when he is unable to reach his beloved because of her husband or a rival lover), but in Phaedra's case, the incestuous character of her unrequited love intensifies her suffering, which finally becomes tragic.

In elegy, the lover often suffers, and Ruch (1964: 356) provides a list of conventional and general terms for the pains of love associated with *servitium amoris*: a) *dolor* is in-between moral and physical pain and does not necessarily have erotic connotations; b) *cura* refers much more specifically to the pain of love, designating, in normal language, the object of love, and in erotic language, *amor* itself; c) *venus* meaning physical, instinctual love, or sexual appetite is used by many poets before Seneca (by

Virgil and Lucretius, for example), and it has both mythological and abstract connotations, but Seneca tends to qualify it with an adjective or to use it as a genitive (e.g. *Venus non casta*, *impia Venus*, *nefas Veneris*), always in negative contexts, which is why he can associate it with *servitium*.

Calabrese (2002-2003: 67-68) gives another explanation for the accentuated presence of the theme of *servitium amoris* in Seneca. He thinks that it indicates Seneca's desire to introduce elegiac features into his play because they had once been revolutionary and subversive. During their time, the elegiac poets show no indication that they have a fixed system of values. They reverse gender roles by presenting weak male and dominate female characters, and they undermine important Roman values such as courage, wealth, and *virtus*. Personal freedom is a fundamental principle for a Roman citizen, who would see slavery seen as a terrifying condition (Liljia 1965: 820). It is against this cultural background that Seneca's introduction of elegiac features into his play must be interpreted, and this means that Phaedra's gestures of surrender as she falls to her knees (665 and 702), and her use of words like *jugum* (85), *iura* (84), *vincla* (85)*, catenae* (85), and *supplex* (666), which evoke the servile behaviour of slaves, are extremely significant.

In the *Ars Amatoria* (1.289-326) Pasiphae behaves like an elegiac lover. Armstrong (2006: 178, 182) notes that Phaedra's mother calls the bull *domino*: *Et dixit 'domino cur placet ista meo?* ("And she said: 'Why does my master love her?'") (Ovid *Ars Am*. 1.314). Seneca pursues the same theme. In his play, the relationship between Pasiphae and Phaedra goes beyond that of mother and daughter, for it also raises the question of genre. Seneca follows the tradition initiated by Ovid, portraying the entire family as doomed to live out the tragic consequences of unorthodox love. Pasiphae calls

the bull *domino*—just as Phaedra wants to be a *famulla* for Hippolytus—and she has a very active role, basically following the bull in the woods wherever he wants to go:

> *Siue uirum mauis fallere, falle uiro!*
> *In nemus et saltus*[45] *thalamo regina relicto*
> *Fertur, ut Aonio concita Baccha deo*
> [Cheat on your husband, but at least do it with a man!
> After leaving her spouse, the queen ran in the woods and the forests
> Like a Bacchant possessed by the Aonian god.] (Ovid *Ars Am*. 1.310-312).

Her daughter wants to do the same with Hippolytus, and she is well aware that her behaviour resembles closely her mother's (Armstrong 2006: 182):

> *Quo tendis, anime? quid furens saltus amas?*
> *fatale miserae matris agnosco malum:*
> *peccare noster nouit in siluis amor.*
> *genetrix, tui me miseret! infando malo*
> *correpta pecoris efferum saeui ducem*
> *audax amasti*
> [What do you want from me, heart? Fool! What do you want to do in the forest?
> I am aware of the cursed fatality that lost my mother:
> Our love knows how to sin in the woods.
> O mother, I feel so sorry for you! Because of an impious action
> You audaciously loved the beastly king of the ferocious flock]
> (Seneca *Phae*. 112-117).

In line 114, Phaedra is responding to Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, reminding us that her mother followed her lover into the woods too. By explicitly mentioning this, Phaedra not only emphasizes that she is linked to Pasiphae through being her daughter, she also refers allusively to the fact that she is linked to her through the genre of their respective stories. Phaedra and Pasiphae seem to merge into a hybrid female character assembled from elegiac and tragic leitmotivs, such as unfulfilled love, burning passion, the vengeance of

[45] The words *nemus* and *saltus* may designate not the woods per se, but perhaps the wooden heifer Daedalus constructed for Pasiphae.

the gods, and a tragic end. Phaedra's acknowledgement that she shares the fate of her mother encourages readers to think about the genre mixing that underlies the creation of both of these female characters.[46] Later, in the second chapter of the second part of the thesis, we shall see that the woods are very important as a setting because they symbolize the intimate existential space of the beloved, a space that is situated inside the house in normal elegy. Phaedra wants to penetrate Hippolytus's forest world, just as the elegiac lover wants to penetrate inside his *puella's domus*. For the moment, however, the main point is that Phaedra explicitly states that she will suffer because her love is consumed in the forest, just as her mother's was. By mentioning this fateful parallelism, she makes an intertextual allusion that crosses through the boundaries of genre to pursue the elegiac tradition set in place by Ovid.

Lines 612-613 deserve special attention:

> *me uel sororem, Hippolyte, uel famulam uoca,*
> *famulamque potius: omne seruitium feram*
> [Hippolytus, call me your sister, or better, your servant.
> Yes, servant is better, because I will perform every service that you ask of me!] (Seneca *Phae*. 612-613).

Jakobi (1998: 77) notes an instance where Ovid uses the word *soror* in the same context of incestuous love. In the *Metamorphoses*, Byblis speaks of her brother Caunus with whom she is in love:

> *iam dominum appellat, iam nomina sanguinis odit*
> *Byblida iam mavult quam se vocet ille sororem*
> [Now she calls him *dominus*, now she hates the names of blood,
> Now she likes it better when he calls her Byblis, and not *soror*]

[46] Pasiphae's luring the bull with a wooden heifer is highly symbolic. Just as her daughter is ready to become an Amazon in order to seduce "the Amazonian boy," Pasiphae metamorphoses into a heifer in order to seduce a bull. At the same time, the tricky wooden bull may allude to the wooden horse that the Greeks used to conquer Troy. If so, there may be a reference to the topos of *militia amoris*, which construes love and war as fundamentally similar, because Pasiphae uses well-known military strategies for her lascivious purposes.

(Ovid *Met*. 9.466-467).

Once again, it is a question of incestuous love. Byblis prefers that her brother Caunus call her by her name and not by the term "sister," so that she can ignore their blood ties. But, ironically, *soror* can also mean mistress. The play on words is very significant, because it suggests that there is no escape for her. If he calls her sister, it will remind her of her love for him. Seneca responds to this idea in lines 610-613. As already mentioned, these lines portray Phaedra's degradation: she wants to be Hippolytus' sister instead of his mother, but as we have just seen, the term *soror* can also mean lover. Basically she is saying, "Call me your lover, or better, call me your slave" (612). In this way, Seneca not only recalls the elegiac relationship in a very obvious manner, he also alludes to the couple Byblis/Caunus as an example of elegiac incestuous love in which the idea of *servitium amoris* is highly significant.[47] With respect to form, two lines from Tibullus may have inspired Seneca here:

> *sive sibi coniunx, sive futura soror,*
> *sed potius coniunx*
> [Either your wife or your future sister,
> But better your wife.] (Tibullus 3.1.26-27)

The resemblance between these verses and Seneca's is striking. In addition, Tibullus' poem concerns the same ambiguity: the poet does not know what to call Nerea (the *puella*) anymore. Is she his lover or his sister, or both? This analysis accounts for the complexity of Seneca's relation to elegy as a genre. He uses literary allusions to accentuate the elegiac topos of *servitium amoris* as well as the incestuous relations between lover and beloved. The passage from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is even more

[47] The word *dominus* strengthens this idea of *servitium amoris*.

significant because it refers to a love tormented by guilt, exactly like Phaedra's.[48] This also proves that certain conventions can cross through the boundaries of genre and become powerful markers of genre mixing.

I would like to discuss one last image related to the theme of *servitium amoris.* The image in question is in lines 666 and 667:

> *. . . supplex iacet*
> *adlapsa genibus regiae proles domus*
> [Suppliant, she lies
> Fallen on her knees, a descendant of a royal family] (Seneca *Phae.* 666-667).

Theses lines portray Phaedra as reduced to *servitium*: suppliant, on her knees, she asks for his mercy. At the same time, they may also be an allusion to Ovid:

> *non ego dedignor supplex humilisque precari.*
> *heu! ubi nunc fastus altaque uerba iacent?*
> *et pugnare diu nec me submittere culpae*
> *certa fui - certi siquid haberet amor;*
> *uicta precor genibusque tuis regalia tendo*
> *bracchia!*
> [I, suppliant and humble, am not ashamed to beg!
> Oh! Where are my pride and haughty words now?
> And I intended to continue the fighting and not to succumb to passion
> As if love would not dominate our will!
> Vanquished, I beg you and stretch my royal hands to your knees!]
> (Ovid *Her*. 4.149-154).

In both passages, but especially in the one from Ovid, the abundance of words referring to humiliation and servitude is noteworthy: *dedignor*, *supplex*, *humilis*, *precari*, *victa*, and *precor*. The image is very powerful and may be related to another recurrent topos in love elegy, the topos of *militia amoris*, which portrays love as war and lovers as soldiers.[49]

---

[48] At the beginning of the play, Phaedra still hesitates to seduce her stepson.

[49] See Cahoon (1988), McKeown (1995), and Gale (1997).

From this perspective, Seneca and Ovid may well be depicting a surrender scene in which a vanquished barbarian queen falls to her knees and begs for mercy. It is also important to note that Phaedra emphasizes that she comes from a royal *domus*, which means that her fall into servitude is that much more remarkable.

1.5. Phaedra, a Multiple Natures Character

Ovid mixes a great diversity of genres, including tragedy, comedy, epic, and didactic, but elegy nevertheless prevails in his oeuvre. In his tragic *Heroides*, then in his epic *Metamorphoses*, and finally in his comic *Amores*, Ovid constantly maintains an elegiac background. This genre diversity is reflected in the unstable character of Seneca's Phaedra as she goes through a whole array of emotional states and moods. For just like Ovid's work, she mixes tragic emotions, comic reactions, and elegiac passion.

Armstrong (2006: 278) calls attention to the difficulty of characterizing Phaedra from the perspective of genre: "Does she belong to elegy, hymeneal, or tragedy? Is she really seductive lover, or tender virgin, or wily *lena*, or victim of divine circumstance? Perhaps in a way she is all of these, and belongs to all these genres." Seneca's Phaedra is not only confused in her roles as a woman, torn between her ardent passion and her duties as wife and queen, she is also "mixed up" from the perspective of genre. In contrast, Ovid's Phaedra—because she no longer doubts—seems much more elegiac: she wants to convince her young beloved to enter a vile, adulterous, and incestuous relationship. And in addition to being elegiac, she is also "fragmentary, contradictory, moving through modes of seduction and surrender" (Armstrong 2006: 269). This feature of Seneca's and Ovid's Phaedras appears exclusively Roman, for Euripides' heroine decides not to seduce

Hippolytus. She fails even to speak to him, and as soon as she finds out that he has eavesdropped and learned the truth, she commits suicide. Seneca's Phaedra is emotionally perplexed. At the beginning of the play, she strives to escape her passion, but soon afterwards she fights to conquer the young man. Perhaps her attitude could be interpreted as a case of *renuntiatio amoris*, another elegiac topos, where the lover wants to renounce his beloved, but quickly changes his mind (Cairns 2007: 79-81).

Seneca's play presents a diversity of mixed imagery with powerful meta-poetic connotations. His Phaedra is an extraordinarily confused and emotionally mixed-up character in a play in which genre mixing structures the essential background to the story. As Veyne (1983: 79) points out, the essence of elegy is to present a series of portraits of one and the same character in a diversity of emotional states. Taken individually, the character portraits are convincing enough, but the veracity of the whole is doubtful, for one has the impression that disparate character traits have been glued together in one and the same person, especially at those points where the character's emotions and states of mind change in a flash (Veyne 1983: 12-13). Veyne maintains, therefore, that the portrayal of elegiac characters' emotions deliberately lacks realism.[50] Kennedy (1993: 5) arrived at the same conclusion before P. Veyne, adding that it is stylization and character trait refinement that transform elegiac poems into unrealistic composites of realistic portraits. This appears to be true, for as we have already seen, Seneca's Phaedra is a character who combines a whole host of roles: lover, wife, stepmother, adulteress, vengeful lover, deceiving seducer, Amazon, and queen. As she goes from role to role, she

[50] "*Les détails sont souvent vrais et l'ensemble faux. Ces cris de jalousie, de désespoir, qui s'interrompent au bout de deux vers, pour faire place à une voix sentencieuse, à laquelle succède bientôt une allusion mythologique galante . . . . L'élégie romaine ressemble à un montage de citations et de cris du cœur*" (Veyne 1983: 12).

generates literary topoi (*militia amoris*, *servitium amoris*, *renuntiatio amoris*, and *komos*), shifting from elegy (when she tries to seduce Hippolytus), to comedy (when she dresses as an Amazon), to bucolic (when she wants to join Hippolytus in the woods), and finally to tragedy (when she kills herself). Both from the perspective of genre (Délignon and Armstrong) and from that of formal composition (Veyne), Seneca presents a multi-layered Phaedra who criss-crosses back and forth from her "he" side to her "she" side, hunting down her beloved, yet falling to her knees to beg for his love.[51]

For Délignon, the *Heroides* are not standard love elegy. Each heroine in the poems presents a specific mélange of genres (bucolic, elegiac, epic, and tragic). In *Heroides* 4, Ovid's genre mixing generates a caricatured image of elegy, with the *puella* becoming the lover and the bucolic features fusing poetically with those of the town (Délignon 2006: 173-174). Here it is important to recall that Seneca's *Phaedra* opens with an epic hunting scene, continues with an meta-theatrical scene in which Phaedra wants to dress up as an Amazon in order to seduce Hippolytus, and ends with an elegiac lament: *placemus umbras: capitis exuvias cape / laceraeque frontis accipe abscisam comam* ("Let us appease the shadows. Receive these tresses / Ripped from my forehead marked by fury") (Seneca *Phae*. 1181-1182).[52]

At the same time, elegy gives lightness and softness to tragedy at the very moment the latter is expressing a heavy seriousness, as *Amores 3.1* very clearly shows (Délignon 2006: 175). This contrast between the light and the serious mainly results from the

[51] "Seneca's Phaedra is a character who constructs multiple versions of herself—the victim, the slave, the seductress, the respectable woman—but cannot decide which version best suits or downs her" (Fitch and McElduff 2002: 32).

[52] The numerous elegiac topoi present in the play transfer a part of their generically mixed force to *Phaedra*, but elegy is already a genre hybrid, so that Seneca's use of elegiac topoi to create his main character has fundamental consequences: Phaedra herself is a thickly layered mix, but so is the entire play.

omnipresent oppositions *amor*/*mors* and *eros*/*eris* (Dangel 2008: 178). Indeed, Paronomasia holds an important place in Seneca's *Phaedra* (and in the myth in general): Phaedra loves Hippolytus, but she takes revenge on him and causes her own death because *eros* becomes *eris*. This development runs contrary to standard love elegy, for although the *amor* is unrequited, the *eros* does not become an *eris*, but instead an elegiac *querela*. It is true that elegiac heroes sometimes swear to commit suicide; however, they never actually do. In Euripides the narrative focuses on Hippolytus' inner conflict after he has become aware of his mother's feelings, but in Seneca the problem is different. As we have already seen, Seneca gives the tragic dimension precedence, allowing the oppositions *amor/mors* and *eros/eris* to strengthen it, but his plot centres on the relationship between the two main characters or on the way Phaedra (the lover) tries to seduce the young man (the beloved). Bloch (2007: 113) calls this *dominatio amoris*, the idea that a lover with an all-powerful passion simply cannot stop loving. Although present in Euripides, this theme has much less weight than in Seneca because Euripides' Phaedra fails to fight for love, committing suicide instead. In Ovid and Seneca Phaedra fights tooth and nail for love, and this makes her an elegiac heroine, among other things.

1.6. Symptoms of Love, an Elegiac *Topos*

Another recurrent topos of love elegy has an important place in Seneca's *Phaedra*: the "symptoms of love." In lines 360-386, the nurse appears in front of the palace and describes the symptoms of Phaedra's illness. A very similar scene occurs in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (121-149), but the vocabulary and the structure of the passage in the Greek play are different. As Cairns (2007: 76) points out, in elegy the lover exposes the identity of his beloved and explains the physical and psychical torments that he suffers in the

name of his unrequited love. Normally this requires an addressee and an addresser; however, in erotic elegy, the "symptoms of love" topos becomes a marker of genre. Instead of addressing Corinna directly, Ovid often addresses his readers, which means that his questions are rhetorical—as are the questions of the *nutrix* in Seneca's *Phaedra* in her monologue in lines 360-386.

In Euripides, the scene in which the nutrix describes her mistress's symptoms is shorter: she goes outside and tells the chorus that her mistress is hiding in her palace and that she refuses to eat because she wants to die (121-145). Coffey and Mayer (2005: 123) maintain that the analogous scene in Seneca's play is an unsuccessful imitation. They assume that Seneca inserts this scene, which they claim makes no sense in his play, merely to imitate Euripides' narrative. Now it is true that at this point in the play Seneca's audience and readers already know about the symptoms of Phaedra's love, which is not the case for Euripides audience and readers at this point in *Hippolytus*. Coffey and Mayer fail to see, however, that Seneca uses this scene as a marker of genre, not as a narrative device. In *Hippolytus*, the nurse talks summarily about the symptoms of love, barely enumerating them. In the much longer scene in *Phaedra*, the nurse provides much more descriptive detail. Her monologue contains an abundance of terms evoking the fiery imagery that we have already identified as typical of love elegy: *flamis* ("flames"), *torretur* ("burns"), *aestu* ("heat") and *erumpit ignis* ("the fire bursts out"). In addition, it contains clinical, almost obsessive references to parts of the body, again a common feature of love elegy, where detailed descriptions of the beloved's arms and legs and hair and skin abound. In a word, the minute accuracy of the nurse's depiction of Phaedra's symptoms leaves no room for doubt about the intense love that her mistress feels for

Hippolytus.

Is the importance of insisting on certain elegiac topoi the only reason that Seneca inserts this scene at this point in his play? According to Jakobi (1998: 71), Seneca takes his inspiration for the scene from a "symptoms of love" scene in the Narcissus section of the *Metamorphoses*. Jacobi may be right about Seneca's inspiration, but he fails to analyze the similarities between the two scenes and to ask why Seneca compares Phaedra to Narcissus. What do these two characters have in common? To begin with, both are incapable of seducing their beloved. They also resemble each other as characters that must simultaneously play the role of both lover and beloved. The first figure of speech common to the two scenes is the zeugma with the noun *cura.* Moreover, the parallel passages are almost identical (*Cereris cura quietis – Cereris cura salutis*):

> *Non illum Cereris, non illum cura quietis*
> *abstrahere inde potest, sed opaca fusus in herba*
> *spectat inexpleto mendacem lumine formam*
> [Neither the need for food nor the need for peace
> Can drag him away from it; lying on the dense grass
> He looks without cease at the mendacious image] (Ovid *Met*. 3.437-439).
>
> *nulla iam Cereris subit*
> *cura aut salutis; uadit incerto pede,*
> *iam uiribus defecta: non idem uigor,*
> *non ora tinguens nitida purpureus rubor*
> [She neglects every care and food;
> She walks with a staggering step
> And her strength eludes her; she has no vigour left
> And her tender cheeks are now colourless] (Seneca *Phae*. 373-376).

The two zeugmatic expressions in Ovid's and Seneca's texts are parallel, and this may be more than a coincidence. In addition, both authors emphasize the word *cura*. In antiquity, it was believed that *cura* came from *cor urere*, to "burn" the "heart", and this would

explain the link between the two passages.

The comparison of Ovid's and Seneca's descriptions of the pallor of the two characters' faces appears to reveal another allusion:

> *et neque iam color est mixto candore rubori*
> *nec vigor et vires . . .*
> *nec corpus remanet . . .*
> [No more colour appears on her candid face anymore,
> And he has no vigour or strength left . . .
> No force whatsoever . . .] (Ovid *Met*. 3.491-493).
>
> *I am viribus defecta: non idem vigor,*
> *non ora tinguens nitida purpureus rubor*
> [Any strength has left her: no vigour
> No force whatsoever colours hers cheeks any more] (Seneca *Phae*. 375-376).

The vocabulary that Seneca uses here provides clear evidence of an allusion to the parallel scene in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. And note his use of the manly noun *rubor* to describe Phaedra. This masculine point of reference proves once again that Phaedra sometimes has the role of the elegiac lover, the weak man.

1.7. When did Phaedra Read the *Ars Amatoria*? The Elegiac Devices of Seduction

Contrary to her Greek counterpart, Seneca's Phaedra tries to seduce Hippolytus, thrusting herself on him from the beginning to the end of the play. Indeed, her constant effort to seduce him represents one of the most significant elegiac features of Seneca's play. This feature recalls Ovid's *Amores* 3.1, where Elegy says that she is the one who invented all the tricks that lovers use to cheat on their husbands, wives, and guardians, and to seduce their beloved. Ovid even wrote a manual for seduction, the *Ars Amatoria*, in which he gives advice both to men and to women. Book 3 of the *Ars Amatoria* is dedicated to women, and it begins with the following passage:

Arma dedi Danais in Amazonas; arma supersunt,
Quae tibi dem et turmae, Penthesilea, tuae
[I gave weapons to the Greeks against the Amazons; I still have to arm
You and your hordes, Panthesilea] (Ovid *Ars Am*. 3.1-2).

And this is the passage from Seneca's *Phaedra* in which the heroine wants to dress like an Amazon:

> . . . *laeua se pharetrae dabit,*
> *hastile uibret dextra Thessalicum manus*
> [. . . she took the quiver in her left hand,
> While the Thessalian spear was vibrating in her right hand]
> (Seneca *Phae*. 396-397).

In a way that recalls works like *Amores* 1.1, the passage from the *Ars Amatoria* seems to begin as an epic poem, but it is in fact typically elegiac. War being a recurrent metaphor in the militarist society of the Romans, the elegiac poets perceive love as a permanent struggle, and Ovid exploits the well-known theme of *militia amoris* at the beginning of the book. The topos is particularly appropriate because the poet gives advice to both "combatants," that is to say, to both men and women, and this reinforces the idea of the battle between the sexes. Of course, in keeping with this militarist metaphor, there could be no better example for women than the Amazons,[53] a fighting matriarchal race. But why does Ovid choose the Greeks (*Danais*)? His doing so is probably a way of referring to the epic genre.

Here it is important to note that the first two lines of *Heroides* 4 contain the same reference to epic poetry:

> *Quam nisi tu dederis, caritura est ipsa, salutem*
> *mittit Amazonio Cressa puella uiro*.
> [The Cretan girl sends to the Amazonian man her greetings,

[53] See Hardwick (1990).

> Whom she will miss, if you don't send them to her] (Ovid *Her.* 4.1-2).

This is a greeting from a Cretan woman to an Amazonian man. Crete is the epic setting par excellence, and the Amazons are a fighting matriarchal race. The intended reference to epic is obvious, with a whole host of associations: the Minotaur, the labyrinth, cruel kings, human sacrifice, war against the Greeks, the killing of men—and the list goes on, all of it very epic and to a certain extent foreshadowing the tragic end of heroes. For no character involved in the myths related to Crete or to the Amazons comes to a happy end. Ariadne is left behind, Pasiphae commits adultery with a bull, the Minotaur is slaughtered, Theseus kills Hippolyta, Phaedra and Hippolytus die, and Theseus kills his own son.

Even more interesting here is how the two elements, Crete and the Amazons, link together through deceit, lies, and death. Theseus, the man who kills the Minotaur, leaves behind Ariadne, the woman who loved and helped him. Afterwards he marries an Amazon, Hippolyta, with whom he has a boy, Hippolytus. After killing his first wife, Theseus marries Ariadne's sister, Phaedra, who falls in love with Hippolytus, his husband's son from the first marriage. This extremely complex system of relationships resembles a maze, but the labyrinth at Knossos is precisely where the entire story began. Thus the story unfolds in a way that parallels the form of a geographical place, and from a literary point of view, it could be seen as a case of reversed ecphrasis.

It is a question of choosing the right starting point. The beginning of the *Ars Amatoria* and especially that of *Heroides* 4 propel the reader (especially the reader in antiquity) into a world of epic terror and death, but a world where love, even though it is often lethal, is still present. Theseus loves in succession Ariadne, Hippolyta, and Phaedra;

Phaedra loves Hippolytus; and Pasiphae loves a bull. Love certainly finds a place in epic; however, it is nothing like the elegiac *amor* in Ovid. The reference to the Amazonian boy and Cretan girl, at the beginning of *Heroides* 4, is like an alarm bell. Ovid wants to draw attention to the genre abnormality of his poem, a poem that is not about a *poeta* and a *puella*, but about an Amazonian boy and a Cretan *puella*. This mélange, not only of races but also of genres, is quite eloquent, and it provides Seneca with an excellent starting place for the reversed elegiac love story that he tells in *Phaedra*.

In *Heroides* 4, Phaedra begins her letter to Hippolytus by recalling the same myth and by referring to him as an *Amazonio viro*. Besides the fact that it sets up the duality of *puella* and *vir*, an obvious elegiac device, her referring to him in this way appears strange. De Vito (1994: 313) thinks that she begins the letter in this way to avoid mentioning Hippolytus' father Theseus, her husband. One might argue that the same thing occurs in Seneca's play when she says that she wants to be Hippolytus' *famulla* (609) rather than his mother. However, she shows no hesitation about mentioning Theseus on many other occasions, so that the argument seems weak. It is much more likely that Phaedra uses the adjective *Amazonio* to evoke the myth and the abduction. In the end, the myth recounts a love story and Hippolytus is the child of the resulting marriage. Phaedra wants Hippolytus to begin believing that although it may seem so at first, no love is impossible, even the love of an Amazon and a Greek, and she chooses the most obvious example to make her point: Hippolytus' mother and father.

The scene in Seneca's *Phaedra* in which Phaedra wants her slaves to dress her as an Amazon provides an even more emblematic portrayal of her elegiac nature. De Vito (1994: 312) sees the scene as rather comic or at least tragicomic, and he claims that Phaedra makes a fool of herself. In contrast, Roisman (2005: 79) maintains that her

madness should be taken as authentic: Phaedra is in fact an honest woman, suffering because her husband is away "fornicating" in Tartarus (Roisman 2005: 76). However, it seems much more likely that this is merely an excuse giving her a supposedly moral justification for her adulterous acts. It is important to recall that Ovid's Phaedra makes no secret of her intention to seduce Hippolytus. Seneca's Phaedra tries to resist temptation on one occasion, but when she accepts the nurse's offer to help her in her erotic pursuit of Hippolytus, she too leaves no room for doubt about her intentions, which are completely different from those of Euripides' Phaedra (Ruiz de Elvira 1976: 10). The Amazon scene may be seen as purely theatrical. Her masquerading as an Amazon belongs to the set of cold-blooded strategies that she uses to hunt down Hippolytus: she wants to talk with him alone with no witnesses, she feigns her emotions to deceive him, and she tries to use sex, power, and pity to win him over. Thus Armstrong (2006: 141) is certainly right to describe her as a master of lies and deceit.

Much more needs to be said about Seneca's use of the Amazon scene as a device for elegiac deception. First, it is important to recall that in Euripides' *Hippolytus* there is no such scene. Euripides' Phaedra wants to stop wearing jewellery and make-up (200 ff.), but that does not amount to an explicit reference to the Amazons. Seneca's Phaedra not only dresses up as an Amazon, she also explicitly says that she wants to be an Amazon. Her saying this may be an allusion to the beginning of the third book of the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid's manual of seduction, for it constitutes her main strategy for seducing Hippolytus, and Seneca wants to indicate the origin of all her deceitful tactics. Having read the *Ars Amatoria*, Seneca's Phaedra wants to try out all the tricks that she has discovered in it, and she does in fact follow much of the advice given in the manual. For example, Ovid states that women should never wear fancy gold and purple dresses:

Nec prodite graues insuto uestibus auro,
Per quas nos petitis, saepe fugatis, opes.
Munditiis capimur . . .
[Do not wear these heavy garments made of gold
All these things you do to seduce us, often makes us run.
We prefer a decent simplicity . . .] (Ovid *Ars Am.* 3.131-133).

Seneca's Phaedra echoes this advice:

Remouete, famulae, purpura atque auro inlitas
uestes, procul sit muricis Tyrii rubor,
quae fila ramis ultimi Seres legunt
[Women, for me you must remove these dresses made of crimson and gold,
Throw away this purple cloth from Tyre
These threads the Chinese collect from their trees] (Seneca *Phae*. 387-389).

Ovid also advises women not to wear extravagant jewellery:

Vos quoque nec caris aures onerate lapillis,
Quos legit in uiridi decolor Indus aqua
[Do not let hang from your ears these expensive pearls
That the tanned Indian picked up from the green sea]
(Ovid *Ars Am*. 3.129-130).

Seneca's Phaedra echoes this advice too:

ceruix monili uacua, nec niueus lapis
deducat auris, Indici donum maris
[Take this necklace off my neck and remove from my ears
These pearls, gifts of the Indian sea] (Seneca *Phae*. 391-392).

Ovid refers to a woman's not having an overly sophisticated hairstyle, letting her hair fall naturally:

Alterius crines umero iactentur utroque
[And her hair will fall on one shoulder and then on the other]
(Ovid *Ars Am*. 141).

And Seneca's Phaedra orders that her slaves should heed this advice too when they are doing her hair:

odore crinis sparsus Assyrio uacet.

sic temere iactae colla perfundant comae
umerosque summos, cursibus motae citis
uentos sequantur
[Stop putting Assyrian perfume in my hair.
And let my tresses fall scattered on my shoulders; and when I run
Let them float, lifted up by the wind] (Seneca *Phae*. 393-396).

Thus, after choosing the Amazon costume in order to trick Hippolytus, Phaedra follows to a tee Ovid's elegiac advice on how women should dress to seduce.

Rosati (1992: 84-85) maintains that the elegiac poets are unable to provide a coherent system of values on their own and that they take much of their moral inspiration from the *mos maiorum*, adapting the latter to suit their own purposes. This is reflected in the moral ambiguity of Seneca's Phaedra who uses a whole array of deceitful tricks to seduce Hippolytus. She tells Hippolytus that she wants him to take care of her, suggesting that he see her as his mother, but her words contain a double entendre because she also means that he should take care of her erotically. She offers him royal power when his father dies, but she does so in order to subdue him sexually and has little compunction about the moral aspects of her offer. The numerous propositions that Phaedra makes to Hippolytus may seem to be in accordance with the family values of Roman society, but in reality they are just a mask for her erotic intentions. According to Calabrese (2002-2003: 68-69), the elegiac poet is always tormented by unrequited love and by the values of his society, which he cannot accept, and he always tries to turn the world upside down. Elegy gives voice to the crisis created by the conflict between new and old value systems (see for example *Amores* 3.8). As for Seneca's Phaedra, she is tormented by her love for Hippolytus, and like the elegiac poet, she proposes her own new value system. She lives the same moral crisis as the elegiac poet, a crisis generated by the confrontation between imaginary subjective values and the values of the real world. She knows that loving her

stepson is forbidden because of her marriage to his father, but the passion that she feels is too strong to resist. Like the elegiac poet, she tries to remake herself in accordance with her new system of values, and this involves attempting to penetrate into Hippolytus' world and becoming a hunter and an Amazon. *Militia amoris* and the poet's constant reference to warfare (even though in reality he is anything but a soldier) recall the violence of his inner need for change.

As Spentzou (2003: 28) notes, eventually the Heroines wake up from their literary trance, begin speaking about themselves, and take on the narrative role of the poet. In other words, women are given the permission to speak. Seneca follows the same principle, except that he has his heroine speak directly to Hippolytus. In Euripides, Hippolytus eavesdrops. In Ovid, Phaedra writes a letter. Only in Seneca does she speak to Hippolytus face to face, and this makes her even more daring and elegiac. From Euripides to Seneca, there is clearly an evolution in this sense, and the entire idea is meta-poetical. If Phaedra has read the *Ars Amatoria*, why would she not also have read the *Heroides*? She has a voice of her own now, and she fights for her love. The elegiac poet uses various means to communicate with his beloved, but Seneca chooses the direct approach. Euripides' Hippolytus learns of Phaedra's illicit desires through her servant, Ovid's Hippolytus, through a letter, but Seneca's Phaedra tells Hippolytus to his face.

2. Hunting her Dear: Phaedra, Predator of the Woods

In the Phaedra myth, the theme of hunting plays an important role, but every Greco-Roman author uses it differently (Davies 1995: 47-48). In Euripides' tragedy, Hippolytus, a hunter and a devotee of Diana, disdains Venus, and this creates the motif underlying the action. Ovid plays with the hunting convention in the elegiac context of

Heroides 4. Hunting becomes an erotic game, a game between lover and beloved, with Phaedra wanting to join Hippolytus in his wanderings: *iudicium subsequor ipsa tuum* ("I am, myself, adopting your tastes") (Ovid *Her*. 4.40). Seneca pushes the theme much further, using hunting as an important elegiac device (Armstrong 2006: 107). His Phaedra turns into an aggressive predator who wants much more than simply to join Hippolytus while he hunts in the woods: she wants to hunt the young man himself. The aim of this second chapter is to account for Seneca's extensive use of the theme of erotic elegiac hunting in his tragedy.

In the first section of the chapter, the prologue receives special attention, for it connects the play not only with Ovid, but also with elegiac poetry in general, through the venery description. It is also important from a spatial point of view because, from the very beginning of the play, Seneca sets up a clear differentiation in locale for his two main characters. Hippolytus is a man of the woods and the mountains, Phaedra, a sophisticated woman from Crete, a civilization known for its cities (Armstrong 2006: 107). Phaedra's attitude towards cynegetic activities adds another dimension to this differentiation in locale. In contrast to Ovid's *Heroides* 4, she becomes the hunter and the young Hippolytus, the prey. As will be shown, Seneca exploits the cynegetic theme fully, and it finally produces a fundamental antagonism between Hippolytus' virginal purity and Phaedra's excessive libido.

Although *Heroides* 4 presents an elegiac Phaedra, Ovid reverses the relationship between the lovers. Hippolytus becomes the beloved, Phaedra, the lover, thus inverting the gender roles of normal erotic elegy (Davies 1995: 44; Armstrong 2006: 261-262). Seneca effects the same reversal, but he amplifies it, making it the main theme of his play. However, the most significant difference between the two authors here is that Ovid

effects the gender-role reversal at the boundary between the two literary genres.[54] Although elegies contain tragic accents, they never end tragically. Phaedra is the leading character in *Heroides* 4, but nothing in the elegiac poem comes anywhere near to suggesting the fatal end awaiting her in Seneca's *Phaedra*. Everything seems to happen at a safe distance from the realm of real action. Instead of undertaking a full-fledged concrete action, she merely writes a letter. The elegiac poet and his heroes (in this case, his heroine) can say anything that they want because everything remains fictive, but the tragedian must force his characters "to act," and their actions have repercussions that are very often fatal. In *Phaedra*, the stage—the physical space of represented action—replaces the letter as the vehicle for plot development, and this allows concrete actions to replace written words. The tragic outcome is inevitable because the very physicality of the stage destroys any impediment that could restrain Phaedra. Seneca turns an elegiac Phaedra who writes a letter into a terrifyingly destructive figure who is swept away by the forces of tragedy, and thus the "representation" of her final actions has purely tragic overtones: she kills the one she loves, and she commits suicide.

Furthermore, in contrast to the Phaedra in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, who plays a minor role because she commits suicide at the beginning of the story, Seneca's Phaedra has a fundamental impact on the play's action through her desperate attempts to conquer her stepson. Naturally, Roman love elegy often associates the lover, the feeble man, with the hunter (even though he is not at all suited to a martial activity like hunting), while portraying the beloved, the cruel and dominant woman, as his prey. But Seneca goes further, because as Phaedra and Hippolytus exchange their roles in his play, another

[54] His doing so is further confirmation that elegy is the mixed genre par excellence.

switch occurs: the young man, the true hunter, becomes the erotic prey, while the female character takes on the role of the erotic predator. In this way, Seneca justifies the reversal of the male and the female characters' roles in his use of the elegiac theme of hunting.

2.1 The Prologue: Sexual Connotations or Not?

The prologue depicts Hippolytus coordinating his men as they prepare to go hunting,[55] which is why Seneca chooses vocabulary with strong cynegetic overtones: *aper* (boar), *canibus* (*Molossos*, *Cretes*, *Spartanos*) (dogs), *nare sagaci* (keen nostrils), *raras plagas*[56] (wide nets), *teretes laqueos*[57] (rounded snares), *picta rubentia linea pinna*[58] (rope with red painted feathers), *feras* (beasts), *missile telum* (weapon that is thrown), *ferro* (iron – sword), *subsessor* (person who lies in wait for game), *curuo cultro* (curved knife), *retia* (nets).[59] Coffey and Mayer (1990: 89-90) see this scene as proof of Seneca's interest in hunting and of the pleasure he takes in making lists[60] or imitating an Alexandrian literary technique: "the illusory enactment of a scene as related by an observer." Moreover, they do not accept as Seneca's literary models either Ovid (*Met*. 8.260-444) or Virgil (*Aen*. 4 and 7), claiming that the latter are merely literary antecedents (Coffey and Mayer 1990: 89).

---

[55] The entire passage could also be a metaphor for unrestrained passion, for bestialized love. It introduces the reader to the main theme of the play, with hunting serving as an intermediate theme (Lopez Cabrera 2004: 12).

[56] See also Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.131 and Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.270.

[57] See also Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, 1.647, 3.591; Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 502; Horace, *Odes* 1.1.28; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.9.46.

[58] Seneca, *De Ira*, 2.11.5-6; Virgil, *Geo*., 3.372.

[59] See also Propertius, *Elegies* 2.32.20; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.331.

[60] Indeed, the scene has the form of a list.

For Zoccali (1997), the entire prologue is an allegory of erotic furor. She provides a detailed list of all the words in the lexical field of *silva* and *ferus,* and argues that this lexical abundance engenders a powerful venery image throughout the prologue (Zoccali 1997: 444). She also notes that Seneca uses the idea of hunting with tragic effects when he has Hippolytus become the sea monster's prey. At the same time, she sees the cynegetic theme as an allegory of untamed erotic *furor*, as the latter comes to expression in Phaedra's unrequited love for Hippolytus (Zoccali 1997: 450-453). Unfortunately, Zoccali fails to push her analysis far enough, for the hunting metaphor in Seneca's play draws on more than Phaedra's untamed libido. It also alludes to the specific form of elegiac relation that exists between Hippolytus and Phaedra, and this is largely because she becomes an erotic predator, as will be shown in the second section of this chapter.

Gazich (1997: 360-361) offers another possible interpretation of the first scene of the play. He maintains that the hunting motif in the prologue refers to Virgil's tenth *Eclogue,* where it is a question of Gallus and his love for Lycoris. Rome's greatest elegiac poet escapes his lover's erotic *furor* by heading into the forest:

> *Certum est in siluis inter spelaea ferarum*
> *malle pati tenerisque meos incidere Amores*
> *arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, Amores*.
> [It is better in the woods among the haunts of beasts
> To suffer and to inscribe my Love on young trees;
> My Love will grow at the same time as they.] (Virgil *Ecl*. 10.52-54)

Gazich sees in Virgil's lines the same phenomenon as in the prologue to *Phaedra*, especially since, as he emphasizes, the word *silva* occurs in the very first line of the prologue to *Phaedra*: *Ite umbrosas cingite silvas* (1) ("Go! And surround the shadowy woods!"), as well as in its last line: *Vocor in silva* (82) ("I'm called into the forest"). Moreover, at the end of Hippolytus' dialogue with Phaedra, the disgusted young man

invokes the forests and the wild beasts again: *O silvae, o ferae* (718) ("O woods, O wild beast!"), just as Gallus does.

This brief discussion of the critical literature makes it clear that the beginning of the play allows for numerous interpretations.[61] However, these various readings are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The scholars cited above understand the prologue from different perspectives, but their views are complimentary and serve to create an interpretative framework for Hippolytus as a hunter, especially in his opposition to Phaedra.

This interpretative framework depends on a correct analysis of the central part of the prologue, where Hippolytus gives his hunting orders to his men:

At uos laxas canibus tacitis
mittite habenas;
teneant acres lora Molossos
et pugnaces tendant Cretes
fortia trito uincula collo.
at Spartanos (genus est audax
auidumque ferae) nodo cautus
propiore liga:
ueniet tempus, cum latratu
caua saxa sonent.
nunc demissi nare sagaci
captent auras lustraque presso
quaerant rostro, dum lux dubia est,
dum signa pedum roscida tellus
impressa tenet.
Alius raras ceruice graui
portare plagas,
alius teretes properet laqueos.
picta rubenti linea pinna
uano cludat terrore feras.
Tibi libretur missile telum,
tu graue dextra laeuaque simul

[61] Dupont (1991: 130-131) provides another possible interpretation: she sees Hippolytus as the metaphorical representation of a cruel barbarian king. The entire *canticum* revolves around the parallels between hunting and war, and is based on real life performance situations such as the Colosseum *venationes*, a sort of hunting spectacle where exotic animals were hunted in the arena.

robur lato derige ferro;
[And you, set free the silent dogs
From their leashes
But let the leather strip hold back the ferocious Molossians
And let the wild Cretans pull hard on
The chains around their necks, three times.
And hold in the Spartans (an untamed race, avid for hunting),
Carefully with a tighter knot.
The time will come when, because of their barking,
The hollow rocks will vibrate.
Now let the unleashed dogs with their keen nostrils
Sniff the air and look for
The haunts of the beasts, muzzles on the ground
While the light is still dim,
While the earth still holds the footsteps
Imprinted in the dew.
Let one of you hurry up
Bearing on his heavy neck wide nets.
Let another one bear rounded snares.
Let a rope with red painted feathers
Hedge in the beasts with empty frightening.
You, throw your spear
And you, from the right and left
Hurl the heavy club with the iron-head.] (Seneca *Phae*. 30-51)

This central part of the prologue, where Hippolytus addresses the hunters, can be schematized in terms of the main hunting methods:

a) lines 30 – 43 – hounds
b) lines 44 – 45 – *plagas*[62] and *laqueos*[63]
c) lines 46 – 47 – *picta rubenti linea pinna*[64]
d) lines 48 – 50 – *missile telum*[65]

Moreover, it seems clear that in this central part of the prologue Seneca intends to set in place an intertextual dialogue with a passage from Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*. In the passage in question, the poet offers advice on how to escape love's *curae* and pains. Among other things, he advises the following:

[62] Nets.

[63] Snares.

[64] Rope with red painted feather (*formido*).

[65] Spears.

> *Vel tu uenandi studium cole: saepe recessit*
> *Turpiter a Phoebi uicta sorore Venus.*
> *Nunc leporem pronum catulo sectare sagaci,*
> *Nunc tua frondosis retia tende iugis,*
> *Aut pauidos terre uaria formidine ceruos,*
> *Aut cadat aduersa cuspide fossus aper*.
> [Cultivate the art of hunting: often ashamed, Venus
> Retreats vanquished by Phoebus' sister.
> Now follow the headlong hare with keen dogs,
> Now spread your nets on the leafy hills,
> Fright the timid deer with the many-coloured *formido*,[66]
> Or hunt down the boar, stabbed with your harsh spear.] (Ovid *Rem*. 199-204)

In this passage, almost every verse refers to something to do with hunting: dogs, nets, crafty devices, and spears. Hence the order is exactly the same as in the prologue to *Phaedra*. Moreover, line 203: *Aut pauidos terre uaria formidine ceruos* ("Fright the timid deer with your many-coloured hunting rope"), recalls lines 46-47 in *Phaedra*: *picta rubenti linea pinna / uano cludat terrore feras* ("Using a rope with red-painted feathers / Hedge in the beasts with empty frightening"). In *De ira,* Seneca describes the hunting device in question, the *formido*.[67] In *Remedia Amoris,* Ovid uses the same term (*formidine*) as well as the term *terreo* (*terre*), which Seneca uses in *De ira* (*terrori*) and in *Phaedra* (*terrore vano*). Although his sharing certain vocabulary with Ovid does not prove that Seneca takes the poet as a model, the references to the *formido* device and the identical ordering of the hunting techniques suggests that they share at least a common source. Indeed, hunting as an art and a sexual paradigm was a highly praised theme that

---

[66] *Formido, - inis* = "A rope strung with feathers used by hunters to scare game" (*Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968), 723, 2b).

[67] Nec mirum est, cum maximos ferarum greges linea pinnis distincta contineat et in insidias agat, ab ipso adfectu dicta formido; uanis enim uana terrori sunt . . . [s]ic itaque ira metuitur quomodo umbra ab infantibus, a feris rubens pinna ("It is not astonishing that the distinct line adorned with feathers frightens big crowds of wild animals and sends them running towards the traps; because of this, the device is called a formido . . . and thus the fright is feared as the shadow is feared by children and red feathers by beasts") (Sen., *Ira*, 2.11.5-6).

appeared in epic, lyric, didactic, and philosophical texts starting in the 7th century B.C. (Green 1996a: 222). Ovid's friend Grattius, whose name appears in *Ex Ponto* (4.16.33), wrote a hunting manual,[68] and both Seneca and Ovid likely made use of such a manual. Perhaps Grattius is the common source. Or perhaps Ovid directly inspired Seneca, although the evidence for direct inspiration is insufficient.

Be that as it may, Seneca makes full use of the erotically charged theme of hunting. Far from being a true hunter, the elegiac poet is, paradoxically, an erotic predator. In *Phaedra* too, the erotic predator is not a real hunter, which means that Ovid and Seneca apply similar strategies. However, they do so in order to obtain different results. In Ovid's elegy, hunting is an erotic symbol used metaphorically, but in Seneca's tragedy, Phaedra's hunting is an actual activity, not merely a literary topos. This breaks the boundaries between genres and allows words to become actions. Phaedra stalks Hippolytus, she hunts him down as her prey, and uses treacherous tactics to have him killed.

Ovid's lines from *Remedia Amoris* propose ways of chasing away the torments of love. The poet advises the reader to replace Venus with Phoebus' sister, Diana, and then he pursues the venery imagery.[69] This reveals the intertextual connection between the two passages: Hippolytus is a chaste hunter, a devotee of Diana, and he regards Venus, a goddess and an allegory of love, with distaste. His rejection of Venus is central to the

[68] In his *Cynegetica* Grattius talks about the *formido* device (81-84) and all the other hunting techniques.

[69] In Virgil's tenth *Eclogue*, Gallus, the elegiac poet *par excellence*, tries the same remedy without success: *libet Partho torquere Cydonia cornu spicula; / tamquam haec sit nostri medicina furoris, / aut deus ille malis hominum mitescere discat!* ("Like a Parthian I'm now enjoying myself throwing the Cydonian arrow / As if I could find in that a remedy for my passion, / As if *Amor* feels compassion for human pains!") (Virgil, *Ecl.*, 10.59-61). Note also the use of the words *medicina* ("remedy") and *furoris* ("passion") that heighten the intertextual links with *Remedia Amoris* and *Phaedra*, where *furor* often designates the heroine's lust.

play, a key to its plot. Ovid and Seneca share in this case a common literary convention, for the idea that hunting provides an escape from the pains of love is not a new topos. At the same time, different characters have different perspectives on this urge to escape sexuality. Phaedra interprets Hippolytus' attitude not necessarily as a repulsive attitude towards libido as the young man himself does, but as a hopeless way to flee libido. Thus, because of its ambiguity, the prologue enhances all the tragic actions that follow, and hunting, seen from Hippolytus' and Phaedra's elegiac perspectives, is interpreted differently by the two characters.

The Diana/Venus antithesis is present throughout the tragedy, and not surprisingly, since these two goddesses embody the ideas of hunting and love respectively.[70] On the other hand, Diana seems to be the central deity in *Phaedra*. She is the one who has an altar on stage (whereas in Euripides' *Hippolytus* both Venus' and Diana's shrines are present), and she is the one to whom the nurse prays in order to make Hippolytus fall in love with Phaedra (Boyle 1985: 1290). Boyle notes that the shrine is important to the tragedy, appearing four times (54 ff., 406 ff., 424 ff., and 707 ff.). This suggests that hunting has a much more significant role in *Phaedra* than in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. Furthermore, when the nurse tries to obtain divine help to alleviate her mistress's suffering, she prays to Diana, not to Venus, even though her invocation concerns erotic matters.[71] In fact, the nurse asks Diana to make Hippolytus comply with

[70] In the *Aeneid* (1.311-321), Venus appears to Aeneas dressed like a hunter. Contrary to Seneca, whose main deity is Diana, Virgil chooses to merge the two goddesses. Does this merging imply that the two goddesses may be interchangeable in an erotic hunting context? Does Venus become the goddess of cynegetic activities in erotic elegy? This theory receives support from Euripides, who puts on stage the altars of both Aphrodite and Artemis. As for Seneca, he only uses Diana in *Phaedra*, which may indicate a decision to emphasize the violent side of the divine allegorical duality of hunting in order to strengthen the tragic context of his genre-mixed play.

[71] *O magna silvas inter et lucos dea / . . . / animum rigentem tristis Hippolyti doma / . . . / innecte mentem: torvus aversus ferox / in iura Veneris redeat* ("O great goddess of woods and grooves / Tame the inflexible heart of

Venus' laws, which raises a question: Why does the suppliant *nutrix* not address Venus directly? The explanation for this odd supplicatory strategy must be sought in Phaedra's complaint at line 125 ff., where she evokes an old quarrel between Venus and her family, after which Venus swore to take revenge, with the result that no woman in the family has had a normal love life since.[72] Thus, in contrast to *Heroides* 4, where Venus remains the main deity throughout, which is standard in erotic elegy, Diana, the goddess of hunting, becomes the main deity in Seneca's *Phaedra*. This proves once again that cynegetic activities are very important for the development of his play (Pearson 1980: 118).

Another essential feature of the prologue is the contrast of spaces or worlds.[73] Although there is no apparent connection between the beginning of the play and its further development—besides the intertextual device that engages with Ovid—the prologue sets the scene for an essential aspect of the plot as it presents Hippolytus' world, the world of hunting. Phaedra tries throughout the play to penetrate this world, to follow the man she loves into it and have him initiate her into all his activities (Spentzou 2003: 72-73). Highlighting an interesting idea, Vizzoti notes that the opposition between the two world spaces in the play underscores the fundamental opposition between the two main characters: the forests and mountains, described as arid and cold, are existentially symbolic of Hippolytus as a character who is *durus*, whereas the place of Phaedra's existential world, the palace, just like she herself as a character, is "*oppresivo, torrido,*

stern Hippolytus / Embrace his heart: harsh, hostile, savage / Push him into the arms of Love!") (Sen. *Phae.* 409, 413, 415-416).

[72] *Stirpem perosa solis invisi Venus / per nos catenas vindicat Martis sui / sauasque, probris omne Phoebum genus / onerat nefandis: nulla Minois levi / defuncta amore est, iungitur semper nefas* ("Venus, sworn enemy of Helios' children, / By our chains, takes revenge for herself and for Mars / And burdens with shame Phoebus' entire family. / No woman of Minos' house burned for an ordinary love; / They were always stigmatised by impious desire!") (Sen. *Phae.* 124-129).

[73] Charles Segal (1986: 32) understands the contrast of the different spaces to which Hippolytus and Phaedra belong as a psychological creation whose result is the language of desire.

pleno de llamas y vapor" ("oppressive, torrid, full of tears and heat") (Vizzotti 2005-2006: 101). By its dynamic social relations and its "heat" and passion, the palace becomes a representative space for Phaedra, a *mollis* woman. Thus in Seneca's play, the characters' places and worlds modulate the very essence of Roman love elegy: the opposition between man and woman or between *durus* and *mollis*. And once again, it is important to stress that Seneca inverts the gender roles when, contrary to the literary conventions of normal erotic elegy, Hippolytus become *durus* and Phaedra, *mollis*.

For De Trane (2009), the prologue sets up an opposition between Hippolytus' rusticity (the forests and the mountains) and the sophistication of the city-dweller Phaedra (the palace). Indeed, in his conversation with Phaedra's nurse, Hippolytus preaches in favour of a return to ancient values and to a rustic life exempt from treachery, greed, and other material vices. For him, the virtuous life in the wilderness stands opposed to the palace life advocated by the nurse and by Phaedra, which is full of the excessive sexuality promoted by Venus. There could very well be an intended parallel here with Roman love elegy, a literary genre that Ovid (*Amores* 3.1) describes as based on numerous romantic schemes that involve erotic deceiving, lying, and cheating.[74] The prologue serves, therefore, as an erotic marker, but also as a catalyst for the antinomy of *rusticitas* and *civitas*, which is an extension of the opposition between Hippolytus and Phaedra.

In their relation to the characters' identities, these spatial aspects also apply in an erotic elegiac context. In erotic elegy, the lover, outside the house, always tries to penetrate inside to see his beloved, who usually tries to oppose his efforts to do so. In

[74] *Amores* 3.1 is a programmatic allegorical poem in which Ovid has two formal literary genres confront each other: Love Elegy and Tragedy. Tragedy tries to recruit the poet for her own purposes and puts forward arguments such as her seriousness and *maiestas*, whereas Love Elegy tries to entice the poet with erotic playfulness and the prospect of an exciting love life.

Phaedra, the situation is reversed because the roles are switched. The beloved is not the woman anymore, but the man. Accordingly, the spatial aspects of the opposition undergo the same transformation. The lover, the woman this time, adopts the opposite behaviour: she tries to escape from the interior, the palace, to the exterior. She wants to invade her beloved's space, Hippolytus' world, the forests and the mountains. Thus hunting becomes an important component of the reversed elegiac situation that structures Seneca's play. This reversal replaces the role that the paraclausithyron plays in elegy.[75] But there is a difference: in contrast to elegy, which is rarely tragic as lovers are stopped at the door or blocked by cruel gatekeepers, Seneca's tragedy allows for no spatial barriers. Phaedra bursts violently into Hippolytus' world with nothing to stop her, and this provides the tragic tone as well as the tragic end: the young man's death.[76]

Therefore, the main role of the entire prologue is to emphasize Hippolytus' attitude towards love. Gazich (1997: 360-361) correctly argues that the forests represent a place of reclusion, a place to hide from frenetic passion. At the same time, we have seen that the prologue is in dialogue with Ovid who, in *Remedia Amoris,* prescribes hunting as a cure for love: the lovesick man should leave Venus and go hunting with Diana. Thus for Hippolytus, hunting is an allegory of purity and virginity. Can the same thing be said about Phaedra's views on hunting? The answer is no, because the heroine perceives Hippolytus' reclusion as an attempt to escape ardent desire, and this compels her to insist even more. Rooted in the paradoxical nature of elegiac hunting, her insistence results in the death of both characters.

---

[75] Paraclausithyron is a literary genre involving a male character who begs in front of the closed door of a house and seeks ways to enter inside and see his beloved. Normally, he does not succeed.

[76] As Rosati (1985: 79) emphasizes, the desire to commit suicide is portrayed in Roman love elegy, but it never materializes. In tragedy, characters actually kill themselves.

2.2 Phaedra the Sexual Hunter

Hippolytus is not the only hunter in the play. Phaedra becomes a hunter, too (Davies 1995: 47-48). She says so herself, although she does not mention directly what or who the prey is. Ovid provides the model here..[77] In *Heroides* 4, Phaedra manifests her desire to join Hippolytus in his cynegetic wanderings. The origin of this scene is Euripides' *Hippolytus*; however, contrary to the Greek playwright, Ovid does not use the motif for tragic purposes.[78] Instead, he relates it to the idea of erotic hunting, a very common convention in Roman elegiac poetry, where the beloved becomes the prey and the lover the hunter. Nevertheless, the Roman elegiac poet is not nearly as radical as the Roman playwright Seneca. Ovid's Phaedra does not say explicitly that she wants to "hunt" Hippolytus. As we have already seen, she merely says that she wants to learn the same skills and do the same things as Hippolytus**.** When she asks to join the young man, her request seems to involve a literary theme that is very common in Roman love elegy: *servitium amoris* (the slavery of Love) (Alvarez and Iglesias 2008: 186). This is no surprise because, as we have already seen, Ovid and Seneca both inverse the gender roles in the elegiac context of the relationship, and Phaedra comes to do what the man normally does: conquer her lover even though it leads to *servitium*. Contrary to her Ovidian twin in *Heroides* 4, Seneca's Phaedra is a true predator who wants very much to hunt Hippolytus himself. Although this involves behaving like a man, at least from the perspective of

[77] *iuuat excitatas consequi cursu feras / et rigida molli gaesa iaculari manu* ("I enjoy following the frightened beasts as they run away and throwing stiff spears with my soft hands") (Seneca *Phae.* 110-111).

[78] In the Greek play, the moment when Phaedra talks about her new desire to become a hunter is a moment of confusion because neither her nurse nor the chorus understands what she is referring to. The insertion of the scene is in fact a first clue to what is happening to Phaedra, but a first clue addressed to the audience only. It seems clear that Euripides uses this scene for narrative purposes, that is to say, to advance the action.

Roman elegiac poetry, Seneca's Phaedra pursues her desire and moulds her behaviour to suit her own purposes (Alvarez and Iglesias 2008: 186).

Phaedra and the *nutrix* refer to Hippolytus as a beast of prey. Indeed, Davis (1995: 48) and Lopez Cabrera (2004: 12) stress that Phaedra and her nurse continually bestialize Hippolytus through the epithets that they attach to his name: *ferus* ("ferocious") (240), *iuuenum ferum* ("young beast") (272), *mentem saevam* ("cruel soul") (273), *pectus ferum* ("cruel heart") (414), *toruus aversus ferox* ("wild enraged beast") (416), *truculentus silvester* ("rude rustic man") (461), or through the use of phrases with other connotations related to wild animals: *seque mulcendum dabit* ("he will let you caress him") (236), *animum rigentem tristis Hippolyti doma* ("tame the inflexible heart of sad Hippolytus") (413), *ipse poenis grauibus infestus domas* ("you impose on yourself an existence full of severe pain") (439), *obstinatis induit frenos amor* ("love takes a hold of those who oppose") (574).[79] The same device occurs in Ovid's *Heroides* 4 where, for example, Hippolytus and his horse are both *ferox* ("ferocious") (Pearsons 1980: 118). But Seneca uses this device much more insistently than Ovid. In Seneca's play, Phaedra's desire to hunt her young man is sustained by his being portrayed as a wild, untamed beast from the beginning to the tragic end.

Of course, venery imagery in an erotic context is an Alexandrian, not a Roman invention (Armstrong 2009: 104). However, Roman authors exploit this theme much more frequently. Ovid, in particular, uses it extensively, more so than Propertius or

[79] *Mulcendum* underscores the idea that Hippolytus is a wild animal that can be tamed with caresses (Coffey and Mayer 1990: 113). The verb *domo* occurs twice, and *frenos* refers to the taming of wild horses.

Tibullus (Lilija 1965: 182),[80] and Virgil makes use of it too, in a passage from the *Aeneid 11:*

> *uenatrix, unum ex omni certamine pugnae*
> *caeca sequebatur totumque incauta per agmen*
> *femineo praedae et spoliorum ardebat amore*
> [As a hunter, she was pursuing incautiously, recklessly in the middle of the battle,
> And all around the enemy lines, only one man from amongst all the others,
> And she was burning with a feminine love for prey and spoil] (Virgil *Aen*. 11.780-782).

Camilla, excited by battle and by a handsome young man with golden weapons, decides to hunt him down.[81] The fragment is ambiguous, and the Amazon's feelings are a mix of violent fury engendered by battle: *certamine pugnae* ("the middle of the battle"), *agmen* ("lines of battle"), *spoliorum* ("spoils of war"), and lustful desire: *femineo amore* ("feminine desire"), both expressed through the theme of hunting: *venatrix* ("hunter"), *sequebatur* ("follow," "hunt"), *praedae* ("prey").[82] In Latin, the words *praedae* and *spoliarum* are semantically related. Both may be used to refer to either the booty carried off by the soldier or to the prey killed by the hunter. This semantic relation is natural, because war and hunting both involve violent confrontation and the use of weapons. Moreover, in many ancient cultures hunting served as a type of military education for young men (Green 1996b).

---

[80] Dörfler (1905: 14) quotes 11 occurrences in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*: *Ars Am*. 1.89, 1.253-254, 1.270, 1.646-647, 1.765-766, 2.2, 3.553-554, 3.591-592, 3.661-662, 3.669-670, and *Rem. Am*. 501-502. For Tibullus, he cites two occurrences: 1.6.5 and 1.9.45-46, and for Propertius, just one: 2.32.19-20. To this list, I add the following: Ov., *Ars Am.,* 2.9.10, 3.2.31-32 and Ov., *Rem. Am*., 149, 200-209.

[81] Again, male weapons can be seen as metaphors for the male genitalia.

[82] Phaedra's nurse, in her second speech (Seneca *Phae.* 204-211), clearly links luxury and lust, suggesting that the first engenders the second.

It is also noteworthy that in her madness Phaedra hopes to delude Hippolytus by dressing as an Amazon (387-405). This is powerfully symbolic, for Phaedra wants to seduce the young man by taking on the attributes of his stepmother: *laeva se paretrae dabit / hastile vibret dextra Thessalicum manus / talis severi mater Hippolyti fuit* ("My left hand will bear the quiver / My right hand will throw the Thessalian spear / Such was cruel Hippolytus' mother") (Seneca Phae. 396-398). Thus her abrupt eruption into Hippolytus' life in the forest and the mountains involves another anomaly that changes the natural world order. The idea that Amazonians lack eroticism may underlie this anomaly. Paradoxically, in her *furor* Phaedra thinks that she can seduce Hippolytus by denying the erotic and emotional implications of their relationship. To do so, she uses a powerful symbol to remind the young man of the only woman for whom he has ever had any feelings. She ends her speech with a reference to the same obsession with the woods (Calabrese 2002-2003: 46-47): *talis in silvas ferar* ("Like this I would go into the woods") (Seneca Phae. 403). She mixes the two roles together, that of Amazon and that of hunter, in an effort to create a character who will seduce Hippolytus. The same duality of war and hunting occurs in the passage from Virgil quoted above.

The elegiacs link the topos of hunting with the idea of love: the hunter becomes a sexual predator in pursuit of his prey. Of course, in Roman love elegy this creates an opposition between hunting and town life, but the elegiac poets transform the activity of hunting to suit it to the urban setting (Winsor 1964). A change takes place in Seneca's *Phaedra* because, as we have already seen, the author reintegrates the hunting motif into the *rustica silva*, where it naturally belongs. This makes possible a shift from elegiac town love to elegiac rustic love, a shift that represents an anomaly in terms of literary genres, with the play ending in the tragic deaths of both Phaedra and Hippolytus. This

inversion engages directly with *Heroides* 4, where Ovid's Phaedra tries to situate her untamed love in a forest setting, citing three examples of pairs of hunter-lovers who, just like she and Hippolytus, came to a tragic end: Cephalus and Aurora (93-96), Venus and Adonis (97-98), and Meleager and Atalanta (99-100). Noting Phaedra's desire, in *Heroides* 4, to accompany Hippolytus into the forest (101-104) and her effort to convince the young man, Pearson (1980: 118) interprets these three examples of other pairs of hunter-lovers as follows:

> [P]resumably, the first is intended to depict the younger lover who submits to the advances of an older woman; the second, to identify the forest as the scene of erotic union; and the third, to portray lovers as companions in the hunt. The exempla, however, bear sinister import—as examples of (1) adultery; (2) incest: *Cinyra que creatum* is contrived to emphasize the manner of Adonis' conception; (3) death—note the telling reference to Meleager by his patronymic. He will meet death at the hands of his own mother after he has murdered his uncles.

As we have already seen, Phaedra is the one who destroys the elegiac hunting topos by relocating the action, moving it from the town into a rustic elegiac setting. As Pearson notes, her examples of other pairs of hunter-lovers are supposed to be convincing, but they are not, because they represent a corrupted, abnormal love that has tragic consequences. In terms of genre, Seneca's portrayal of Phaedra points to the conclusion that love elegy is a form of townish poetry not suitable for presenting a rustic character like Hippolytus.[83] Tragedy occurs because of Phaedra's intrusion into Hippolytus' life and because of her terrible destructiveness. She claims to want to become a hunter like him, but instead she wreaks havoc in his world. She tries to bring an intensely passionate love into an inappropriate place, and this generates the final catastrophe.

[83] *Amores* 3.1 heightens this conclusion. In this programmatic poem Ovid makes a fundamental distinction between rustic love and the townish love that is specific to Roman love elegy.

Seneca's Phaedra makes her first clear reference to the elegiac convention of hunting at line 111: *iuvat excitatas consequi cursu feras / et rigida molli gaesa iaculari manu* ("I enjoy pursuing the frightened beasts as they run away and throwing stiff spears with my soft hands") (Seneca Phae. 111). Hippolytus is a huntsman and, as we have already seen, both Phaedra and the *nutrix* bestialize him throughout the play. The young man's transformation into a beast of prey is strongly connected to the elegiac convention of hunting. Thus, *excitatats feras* (frightened beasts)—by way of a series of inversions often commented upon: huntsman/prey, human/beast, and lover/beloved—may very well refer to Hippolytus as he appears in elegiac hunting contexts. The next line makes this conclusion plausible: Phaedra, with her *molli manu,* throws *rigida gaesa* (stiff javelins). These two short phrases concentrate the expression of Phaedra's excessive sexuality and emphasize the *mollis*/*durus* opposition, one of the central oppositions in elegy. As Adams notes, the weapon metaphor is very common in sexual puns (Adams 1980: 19-21). Moreover, the word *gesatus* (a derivation of *gaesum*) has been found on an inscription with sexual connotations.[84] The erotic meaning is reinforced by the adjective *rigida* and its opposite, *mollis*. In an article analyzing the first elegy in Tibullus' first book, D. Wray (2003) emphasizes the importance of hands for Roman elegiac poets. An adjective such as *facilis* works well with the noun *manus* when it is a question of describing an "artistic hand"[85] or a poet's hand. As Wray insists, a farmer could not have *faciles manus*. This argument could also apply to the adjective *mollis* when it comes to describing a hunter's hands. Because Phaedra is a woman and because she embodies the elegiac lover, she has

[84] Otto Hirschfield, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. XII*, (1996), 12.5695.3.

[85] Wray (2003: 228) gives as an example Propertius 2.1.9, where Cynthia plucks the strings of the lyre with a *facilis manus*.

molles manus, well suited to poetry, not to hunting. Thus the strong link between erotic elegy and hunting should be noted here, not only to the extent that it constantly occurs in Roman literature, but also as a marker of the fundamental inversion effected in Seneca's play, where the elegiac man changes places with a passionate woman who hunts him erotically.

Seneca plays on the ambiguity of the verb *sequor,*[86][87] which Phaedra uses, on three occasions in the play, in a way clearly modeled on the use of *consequi* in *Heroides* 4, line 110. It is of course the normal verb for expressing the idea of following someone, but Hippolytus' use of *sequor* in lines 61-62 brings out another possible connotation: *tua Gaetulos dextra leones, / tua Cretaeas sequitur ceruas* ("Let your right hand hunt the Gaetulian lions and the Cretan deer"). In these two lines from the prologue, Hippolytus refers to Diana, the hunter goddess. Coffey and Mayer (1990: 95) give as a model for *Cretaeas ceruas* the following lines from *Aeneid* 4:

> *Uritur infelix Dido, totaque uagatur*
> *urbe furens, qualis coniecta cerua sagitta,*
> *quam procul incautam nemora inter Cresia fixit*
> *pastor agens telis, liquitque uolatile ferrum*
> *nescius; illa fuga siluas saltusque peragrat*
> *Dictaeos*
> [Miserable Dido burns, and mad, she wanders here and there
> Through the entire city, like a deer struck by thrown arrows,
> Which a shepherd, without knowing and from afar,
> Hits by surprise in the Cretan groves, with the winged iron.
> Then she runs away through the woods and forests of Dicte]
> (Virgil *Aen*. 4.68-73).

In this passage, Dido, who is in love with Aeneas, feels a frenzied distress, and the poet compares her to a deer being pursued by a hunter in the Cretan forests and mountains.

---

[86] The verb *sequor* means *to follow* but also *to hunt*.

[87] The verb *sequor* means *to follow* but also *to hunt*.

Virgil's portrayal of Crete as a savage place is strange, given that the island was especially known for its cities, but in the *Aeneid* the situation is more or less ambiguous.[88] Virgil describes Crete as the island of 100 cities, yet he also depicts it as a savage, mountainous land.[89] The recurring phrase *centum urbes* ("one hundred cities") contrasts revealingly with *nemora* ("woods"), *pastor* ("shepherd"), *silvas* ("forest") or *saltus* ("forest" or "pass in a forest"). Thus, by referring to this passage from Virgil, Seneca highlights Crete's dual nature. Although a civilized place, the island's mountainous wilderness landscape makes it favourable to hunters. Seneca transfers this dual nature to Phaedra's character.[90] As a Cretan[91] woman, Phaedra represents her native land's prosperity and the refinements of its great civilization,[92] but as the play goes on, she becomes an erotic hunter, mad with unbridled libido and obsessed with tracking down her

---

[88] *aut ille centum nobilem Cretam urbibus* (Horace *Car*. 9.29) (He [goes] to that noble Crete of 100 cities); *Quae simul centum tetigit potentem / oppidis Creten* (Horace *Carm.* 3.27.33-34) (Right away she reached that powerful Crete with its 100 cities); *Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto / mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae. / centum urbes habitant magnas, uberrima regna* ("Crete the island of Jupiter is set in the middle of the sea / Mount Ida is there and the cradle of our race / People live there in 100 great cities, a prosperous kingdom") (Virgil *Aen*. 3.104-106).

[89] ut quondam Creta fertur Labyrinthus in alta (Virgil Aen. 5.588) (When long ago in mountainous Crete the Labyrinth was built); Venus indigno nati concussa dolore / dictamnum genetrix Cretaea carpit ab Ida, / puberibus caulem foliis et flore comantem / purpureo; non illa feris incognita capris / gramina, cum tergo uolucres haesere sagittae ("Venus touched by the unmerited suffering of her son / As a true mother went to search for dittany on Mount Ida in Crete / Adorned with young leafs and purple flowers, this plant is well known by the savage goats / When the fast arrows hit their backs") (Virgil Aen. 12.411-415).

[90] Ovid does so also. *Heroides* 4 begins as follows: *Quam nisi tu dederis, caritura est ipsa, / salutem mittit Amazonio Cressa puella uiro* ("The Cretan girl sends her best wishes to the Amazonian boy / Wishes that she will miss if he refuses to grant them to her") (Ovid *Her.* 4.1-2).

[91] Crete, the birthplace of Phaedra, has great importance for her as a character. Also being the birthplace of Zeus and of civilization (Minos), the island has two antagonistic features. It is known for its cities as well as for its wilderness, and this is reflected in Phaedra's personality. Moreover, it has been the theatre of failed love affairs such as the one between Ariadne, Phaedra's sister, and Theseus, Phaedra's husband, and it has witnessed monstrous passions, e.g. that of Phaedra's own mother, Persiphae, who fell in love with a bull. Although this does not concern the present discussion directly, it is quite interesting that Crete should have such importance in the Phaedra myth.

[92] O magna uasti Creta dominatrix freti, / cuius per omne litus innumerae rates / tenuere pontum, quidquid Assyria tenus / tellure Nereus peruium rostris secat ("O powerful Crete, ruler of the vast sea, / Your innumerable ships hold the sea and every shore / And their beaks sailed across the plain of Nereus all the way to the land of Assyria") (Seneca Phae. 85-88).

lover. The reference to the passage from Virgil reinforces the description of her dual nature because the passage depicts Dido as burning with a frenzied love for Aeneas. Images of fire and madness are called forth by words like *uritur* ("burns"), *infelix* ("miserable"), *furens* ("maddened"), and *vagatur* ("wanders"). Cynegetic metaphors stand out in words and phrases like *coniecta cerba* ("struck deer") *sagitta* ("arrows"), *pastor agens telis* ("a shepherd throwing spears"), *volatile ferrum* ("flying iron"), and *peragrat* ("scour"); and the constantly recurring words referring to the forest: *nemora*, *silvas*, *saltus*—all three words mean *woods*—also link Seneca's Phaedra to the passage from Virgil.

Lines 61-62 from *Phaedra* provide, therefore, an intertextual marker that has an important role in the further development of the play. They refer not only to Crete, Phaedra's homeland, but also to the passage from Virgil where Dido, madly in love with Aeneas, runs about in a frenzied atmosphere full of fiery imagery and charged with the sexual tension of cynegetic eroticism. Taken together, these elements produce an erotic elegiac atmosphere that pervades Seneca's play from beginning to end. In addition, the use of the verb *sequor* with the meaning *to hunt* has important implications here.[93] For this meaning is not restricted to references to Diana. In three places in the play, Phaedra uses *sequor* to express her desire to follow Hippolytus.[94] The verb has an essential ambiguity on which Seneca plays, leaving the elegiac features of the story unclear at the

[93] The verb is also used with this cynegetic connotation by Ovid (*Rem. Am*. 208 and *Her.* 9.36 and 4.40).

[94] Ph. *Hunc in niuosi collis haerentem iugis, / et aspera agili saxa calcantem pede / sequi per alta nemora, per montes placet* ("I follow him wherever he likes to go: on these mountains full of snow, on these cliffs where he runs with agile foot through the high peaks and woods") (Seneca *Phae.* 233-235); Nvt. *Fugiet*. Ph. *Per ipsa maria si fugiat, sequar* ("Nvt. He'll run! Ph. If he runs, I will follow him even on the sea") (Seneca *Phae*. 241); Ph. *te uel per ignes, per mare insanum sequar / rupesque et amnes, unda quos torrens rapit* ("I will follow you through fire and on the sea, / Through mountains and torrential rivers") (Seneca *Phae*. 700-701).

same time. On a first reading, nothing seems unusual about Phaedra's wanting to follow her lover: her passion compels her to do so, but if the play is read from the point of view of love elegy, Phaedra's extraordinary desire, not just to follow her lover, but to hunt him, becomes evident. Again, both the internal and the intertextual chains are noteworthy: Phaedra continues to use the verb *sequor* long after its first occurrence (61-62) in a context that recalls the ambiguity of Crete and, implicitly, that of Phaedra herself. At the same time, the verb carries a reference to Dido's unrequited love, the latter involving a mismatch of lovers very similar to the one in which Phaedra finds herself, especially with respect to its elegiac character (61-62). Seneca's way of interpreting the words of Ovid's Phaedra is particularly interesting here: *iudicium subsequor ipsa tuum* ("I am, myself, adopting your tastes") (Ovid *Her.* 4.40). After this phrase, Ovid's Phaedra says that she has started to enjoy hunting and wandering in the woods, but Seneca takes the notion of following someone to another level. Not content to follow Hippolytus by simply adopting his outward tastes, his Phaedra pursues the young hero at the very core of his being.

These three examples involving the verb *sequor* bring another conclusive element to the fore, the spatial dimension, which is once again very marked.[95] Every time Phaedra speaks of following Hippolytus, she also mentions that she would not hesitate to hike through the highest mountains or to sail the roughest seas. Moreover, a shift in addressee occurs. The first time, she speaks to herself in interior monologue (233-235), the second time, she addresses the nurse (241), and finally, she speaks directly to Hippolytus himself (700-701). As she changes addressees, tension builds through her amplification of the

[95] The idea of following one's beloved wherever he or she wants to go is a topos of the *servitium amoris* genre (Cervellara 2008: 1427-1428). Other examples are Propertius, *Elegies*, 2. 26. 29-30; Ovid *Am.* 2.16.21-22; and Virgil, *Ecl.* 10.23, as well as several anonymous poets in *Minor Authors of the Corpus Tibullianum*, ed. John Yardley (Bryn Mawr: Thomas Library Bryn Mawr College, 1992), 3.11-14.

space that she would cover in order to join the young hero. The first passage (233-235) is in fact an intertextual marker recalling the prologue, and it shares the same elements: the inhospitableness of the landscape as they descend the mountain slopes, Hippolytus' role as *dux* and the inferiority of his followers, and of course, the hyperbole in Phaedra's descriptions (Cervellara 2008: 1427-1428). So that the first time that Phaedra speaks of following Hippolytus, she restricts the spatial reference to the mountainous landscape of Attica where the action takes place. The second time (241), she expands this reference, saying that she would follow or hunt her beloved even on the sea. Finally, when she speaks directly to Hippolytus (700-701), the paroxysm reaches its climax. She claims that she would follow him through blazing fire, and then she ends by enumerating every geographical space imaginable: she would pursue him across seas, through rivers, and up mountain slopes.

Phaedra's use of the verb *sequor* shows how Seneca transforms his mythical personage into an aggressive heroine who is prepared, not only to follow Hippolytus, but also to hunt him down. Seneca is not the only author who exploits the verb *sequor*, but he does so in a unique way that gives powerful expression to fundamental aspects of both elegy and tragedy. For he establishes strong intertextual links that serve to underscore the mixture of tragic and elegiac character traits in Phaedra, an effect also produced by the evocation of the dual nature of Crete, a civilized elegiac realm, which is savagely tragic at the same time. Finally, drawing a parallel between Phaedra and Dido accentuates this mixing of genres because the passage from Virgil introduces an elegiac atmosphere, even though Dido's tragic end—just like Phaedra's—would be well known to readers from the beginning.

Another text already quoted makes interesting use of the verb *sequor*: *Eclogue 10*. Scholars have noted the intertextual links between Virgil's poem and Seneca's *Phaedra*, but I would like to analyze further some particular aspects of the poem in light of the genre theme of hunting. The poem is dedicated to one of the greatest elegiac Latin poets, so that there should be no surprise that an elegiac atmosphere surrounds it, as in the lines below:

> *. . . Venit Apollo*
> *"Galle quid insanis?" inquit "tua cura Lycoris*
> *Perque nives allium perque horrida castra secuta est"*
> [Apollo came
> "Gallus! Why do you go crazy?" said he, "Out of concern for you, Lycoris followed you through snows and horrible military camps"] (Virgil *Ecl*. 10.21-23)

Although Virgil's use of the verb *sequor* does not clearly suggest a hunting metaphor here, there are some indicators that point in that direction. Phonetically speaking, the name "Lycoris" resembles λύκος, the word in Ancient Greek for *wolf*, an animal known for being a ferocious hunter, but also a metaphor for excessive lust. Furthermore, the same spatial aspect as in *Phaedra* occurs here: Lycoris is ready to follow her lover through snow or military camps.[96] The metaphor and this spatial aspect suggest that the use of the verb *sequor* resembles to one seen in Phaedra: to stalk a prey.

Although the present paper focuses on the idea of hunting as a genre marker in Ovid's erotic elegy and Seneca's tragedy, it is necessary to briefly discuss how the same idea is employed in epic texts. Even if the passage from *Aeneid* 4 previously quoted seems to have elegiac as opposed to epic connotations, Dido is *par excellence* the epic

[96] Compare the quotation in note 77 above: *Hunc in niuosi collis haerentem iugis, / et aspera agili saxa calcantem pede / sequi per alta nemora, per montes placet.* ("I'll follow him on these mountains covered with snow that he likes so much, / On these rough peaks where he swiftly runs, / In the middle of the woods and on high heights.) (Seneca *Phae.* 233-235).

character who comes to a tragic end. The entire venery metaphor, analyzed above, precedes a hunting expedition during which Aeneas and Dido become lost and end up in a secluded cave where they make love. Technically speaking, the hunting in *Aeneid 4* is no different from the hunting in *Heroides 4* or *Phaedra*. Both the hunters and their tools and equipment (dogs, spears, nets, and all sorts of crafty devices) are portrayed,[97] as well as game (wild boars, deer, goats) and the landscape (woods, mountains, plains). From a stylistic point of view, the discrepancies are not noteworthy. The same can be said for the hunting scene depicted in another epic context: the story of Cephalus and Procris in *Metamorphoses* 7. However, the difference between epic and erotic elegy (*Phaedra)* lies in the genre use of *venation.* In Seneca's tragedy and in Ovid's elegy, hunting is used as a metaphor for erotic activities, but in the two epic texts from Virgil quoted above, it functions more as a narrative device designed to make the story advance. In epic texts, hunting plays the role of a catalyst or it forms the background context where the action takes place. Likewise, *Metamorphoses* 7 presents some interesting aspects that may resemble elegy more closely from the perspective of genre. In the first venery scene, Aurora kidnaps Cephalus, who remains nevertheless faithful to his wife and refuses the goddess. Just as in *Phaedra*, a similar reversal of roles occurs.[98] The hunter becomes a woman's prey and decides at the same time to keep his vows at any cost (although in *Phaedra* the price is his own life, whereas here it is his wife's life):

[97] *It portis iubare exorto delecta iuventus / retia rara, plagae, lato venabula ferro / Massylique runt equites et odora canum vis.* (When the morning star rises a fine youth bursts out from the gates / With wide nets, snares and broad-headed iron spears / All along with the Massylian horsemen and with keen-scented dogs.) (Virgil *Aen*. 4.130-132).

[98] Another resemblance to the Phaedra myth can be found in Cephalus' intractability with respect to questions of love: *nec me quae caperet non si Venus ipsa veniret / ulla erat* . . . ("I will love no other woman, even if Venus herself tries to seduce me") (Ovid *Met.* 7.802-803). Just like Hippolytus, Cephalus preserves his integrity, and by refusing another woman, enhances the final tragedy that leads to Procris' death.

Cum me cornigeris tendem retia cervis
Vertice de summo semper florentis Hymetti
Lutea mane videt pulsis aurora tenebris
Invitumque rapit . . .
[I was spreading the nets for the horned stags
On the high peak of the eternal flowering Hymettus,
When, after the darkness has been chased away, the morning comes and bright Aurora sees me
And takes me away against my will . . .] (Ovid *Met*. 7.701-704).

Cephalus manages to escape free, but doubt has entered his heart and he wants to confirm Procris' loyalty in deceitful ways. She is offended when she discovers the ruse and decides to run away: *offensaque mei genus omne perosa virorum / montibus errabat studiis operata Dianae* ("Offended by me and angry against the entire race of men / She ran away into the mountains to devote herself to Diana's cult") (Ovid *Met.* 7.745-746). Just as in Virgil's *Eclogue 10*, here too, hunting, or voluntary seclusion in the mountains, appears to provide a cure for the pains of love. Although it is not specifically stated that Procris goes there to hunt, the reference to Diana is more than evocative of this idea. Moreover, *genus omne perosa virorum* could be referenced to *Ph: Meminimus matris simul* / Nut: *Genus omne profugit!* ("Ph: I shall remind him of his mother as well! / Nut: He runs away from our entire race!") (Seneca *Phae.* 242) and *Medea reddet feminas dirum genus* ("Medea caused the entire feminine race to be hated") (Seneca *Phae.* 564).

The story ends tragically. Cephalus kills his beloved wife in a hunting accident, and Aurora's predictions become true. The recurrent use of hunting in this epic episode is noteworthy. Cephalus is kidnapped by Aurora while he hunts and his confused wife runs away to become a devotee of Diana. In the end she is killed by her own husband in a hunting accident. Although venery activities are omnipresent, their impact on genre differs from their impact on genre in *Heroides* 4 or *Phaedra*. In treating hunting as the

background to the story, Ovid provides contextual elements that help to push the action forward. As a result, the implications of the erotic metaphors are much less obvious than in the other two texts.

Conclusion

The present thesis has focused on the way Seneca transforms elegiac topoi—especially Ovidian topoi—so that they fit into the tragic framework of *Phaedra*. His main means of doing so is to reverse the elegiac gender roles. Phaedra becomes the elegiac lover and adopts much of his behaviour, although she continues to be *dura*. In the first chapter of part one of the thesis we saw that Seneca plays with the central notions of elegy, and the omnipresent references to the *mollis/durus* opposition are a fundamental part of this process. He constructs an elegiac Phaedra for a tragic situation, so that it is normal for him to borrow elegiac elements to do so. In the second chapter we show how the heroine expresses her love for Hippolytus, we noted the frequent occurrence of fiery erotic metaphors,[99] and we saw that every character's conception of Love contributes to the elegiac nature of the tragedy.

Another elegiac element, this time directly related to Ovid's *Heroides* 4, is the idea of physical and moral purity. In the third chapter we noted that Phaedra uses every means possible to attract Hippolytus, even going so far as to assert her purity. At the same time, a reversed elegiac relationship materializes when Phaedra, instead of insisting upon her own purity, begins to focus on Hippolytus'. The analysis of some of the parallels between *Heroides* 4 and *Phaedra* identified by R. Jakobi has shown that Phaedra uses terms, elements, and expressions that the elegiac male uses in similar contexts to describe

[99] As shown in the table in the Annex, Seneca uses fiery metaphors even more than the elegiacs.

his female beloved. This makes the reversal even more obvious, and we see that Phaedra goes even further, assuming the male role itself.

In the fourth chapter of part one of the thesis we focused on the fact that, similar to elegy, Phaedra is dominated by the *servitium amoris*. This type of servitude pushes her to madness and makes her the slave of her own passion. From this point of view, modern scholars see parallels with her mother, Pasiphae, or Byblis from the *Metamorphoses*, two other elegiac characters. All of these parallels can be found in Ovid, and textual allusions make it clear that Seneca set them up consciously.

As seen in the fifth chapter of part one, the great diversity of roles that Phaedra assumes in the play makes her an even more elegiac *persona*,. She is mother, wife, lover, queen, sister, Cretan, Amazon, and Greek, and all of these roles turn by turn in a desperate attempt to conquer Hippolytus. Multi-dimensional characters are typical of love elegy, where the *puella* has a collection of books that tell the stories of numerous often contradictory personages. Moreover, in the sixth chapter of part one we observed that Phaedra is very similar to another from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Narcissus. Besides the intertextual allusions in *Metamorphoses* and *Phaedra*, the two characters are linked to one another through their suffering for love and through the use of the literary theme of the symptoms of love to describe this suffering.

In the final chapter of part one of the thesis *Phaedra* is compared with the *Ars Amatoria,* Ovid's manual on love and seduction. The series of textual similarities and intertextual allusions allows us to assume that Phaedra has read *Ars Amatoria*. She follows much of Ovid' advice on love and seduction, using many of his elegiac stratagems in her efforts to conquer Hippolytus. Here again, Seneca proves his skill in mixing very opposite literary genres in a highly sophisticated manner to create a new genre hybrid.

Finding direct references to Ovid in Seneca's play is not easy. Mere allusions serve as indicators of intertextuality, but the lack of pure intertextual elements does not prevent Seneca's style and his construction of Phaedra's character from revealing an obvious reference to *Heroides* 4, as well as to other elegiac works or fragments such as *Ars Amatoria*, *Amores*, *Heroides*, *Metamorphoses,* and even to the hunting scene from the fourth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. These clear references to elegiac works give strong support to the idea that Seneca consciously intends to mix elegy and tragedy. Perhaps his intention is to change the stereotypical vision of the myth of Phaedra in theatre. Or perhaps he wants to experiment with the esthetically challenging combination of two opposed literary genres in his creation of a character. Be that as it may, as a link between the myth itself and erotic elegy, hunting plays an essential role in Seneca's vision of the genre hybrid that he has created in *Phaedra*, and its strategic use reinforces the impression that he knows exactly what he is doing, when he combines elegiac elements in his tragedy, without losing verisimilitude by overly accentuating the natural discordance between the two genres.

The last part focused on revealing the elegiac topoi in Seneca's *Phaedra* through an analysis of the theme of hunting. The interpretation of the prologue to Seneca's play, which we dealt with in the fist chapter of part two, showed that it is a textual marker linked to *Remedia Amoris*, the text in which Ovid gives advice on how to escape the torments of love. Gazich (1997: 360-361) sees a more significant connection between the prologue and Virgil's tenth *Eclogue*, where Gallus, the elegiac poet par excellence, tries to escape from the perils of love by secluding himself in the forest, just as Hippolytus does in *Phaedra*. Vizzoti (2005-2006: 101) notes that opposed spatial identities define the two main characters in Seneca's play. Hippolytus, lacking in passion, feels at home in the

cold wilderness of the mountains, whereas Phaedra, full of heat and libido, thrives in the palace. The present paper has pushed the argument further in an effort to prove that in *Phaedra* the oppositions between cold and hot and between *durus* and *mollis* take on spatial connotations and recall the literary device of paraclausithyron. Yet there is an important difference: the forest replaces the elegiac house, and through Seneca's inversion of gender roles (an idea borrowed from Ovid), Phaedra becomes the elegiac lover and Hippolytus, the elegiac beloved. However, Phaedra's effort to force her way into Hippolytus' world leads to a tragic end for both of them. This tragic denouement generated by the mixing of two incompatible ideas may contain a moral involving the mixing of the two genres, erotic elegy and tragedy: once a townish elegiac love is shifted to a rustic setting, tragic destruction necessarily ensues. Moreover, this suggests the general conclusion that Hippolytus' hunting does not carry any sexual overtones. On the contrary, it is a source of purity and virginity.

In the last chapter of part two we saw, With Phaedra and her particular brand of erotic hunting, things are completely different. The analysis of this aspect of Seneca's play has mainly dealt with the use of the verb *sequor*. The intertextual links involving the theme of hunting reveal that through Phaedra Seneca effects a change in venery perspective. His lustful heroine, the elegiac lover, hunts down Hippolytus, her beloved, because the roles have been reversed, which is why it was necessary to establish the connection with the passage from the *Aeneid* 2 where Dido begins to feel the pangs of her love for Aeneas for the first time. However, the two heroines have much less in common than appearances might suggest. Virgil compares Dido to a deer, so that she becomes the prey, but Seneca transforms Phaedra into the hunter. Although Virgil and Seneca both give their heroines the lover's role, they give them completely different roles when it

comes to hunting itself. Dido is a victim, whereas Phaedra is a predator, so that in her case hunting becomes a symbol of her desperate attempt to come to terms with her own wild desires and untamed erotic furor, a symbol that reflects how fundamentally different she is from Hippolytus, the innocent hunter woodsman. Seneca succeeds by using intertextual devices to link his *Phaedra* to those of his predecessors. And by mixing literary genres, he creates a tragic context with elegiac overtones into which both the myth and the character of Phaedra fit perfectly.

Annex

	Lucretius	Catullus	Virgil	Horace	Tibullus	Propertius	Ovid	Seneca's *Phaedra*	Seneca's *Medea*
Aestus		68.108	Aen 4.532	Sat. 1.2.110		2.33.43 4.9.63	Ars 3.543 Ars 3.697 Am. 3.5.36 Her. 16.25 Met. 7.815 Met. 14.352 Met. 16.491 Met. 4.64 Met. 9.465 Met. 9.765 Met. 14.700	362 589 290	939
Ardere / Exardere	5.897 4.1199 4.1077 4.1206 4.1086 4.1116	64.197 64.124 68.53 45.16 62.29 2.8 64.93 62.23	Aen. 8.163 Aen. 11.782 Ecl. 2.1; Ecl. 5.86 (repet de 2.1) Aen 4.101	Epist. 11.27 Car. 2.8.15 Epist. 2.1.95 Ep. 14.9 Car. 2.4.7 Car. 3.9.6 Car. 4.9.13	3.18.6	1.3.13 1.7.24 1.10.10 1.13.28 1.20.6 2.13.31 2.28.7	Ars 1.284 Ars 2.354 Ars 3.481 Am. 1.9.33 Am. 2.16.12 (X2) Am. 2.9.27 Am. 2.8.11 Am. 3.2.33 Rem. 13 Rem. 533 Rem. 720 Rem. 53 Rem. 485 Her. 12.35 Her. 4.99 Her. 15.63 Her. 16.149 Her. 16.104	102 309	
Calor			Aen. 8.390 Geor. 3.272	Car. 4.9.11	3.17.2	1.12.17 3.8.9	Ars 1.237	292	
Flamma / Inflammo	4.1087	51.10 100.7	Geor. 3.271	Car 1.27.20		2.34.86	Ars 1.335	644 337	

		62.27 61.178 64.92	Aen. 4.66 Aen. 1.673 Aen. 8.389 Aen. 3.330 Aen. 4.54				Ars 1.282 Ars 1.526 Ars 1.80 Ars 3.29 Am. 1.2.46 Am. 2.1.8 Am. 3.2.34 Am. 3.10.27 Am. 3.6.41 Am. 3.2.34 Rem. 734 Rem. 105 Her. 20.16 Her. 16.124 Her. 18.180 Her. 16.164 Her. 12.40 Her. 20.59 Her. 16.3 Her. 16.231 Her. 19.94 Her. 19.129 Her. 12.168 Her. 16.27 Her. 18.75	131 165 120 291 359 361 276 187	
Focus									
Ignis	4.474 4.1138 5.1016	35.15 100.6 45.16	Ecl. 3.66 Ecl. 5.10 Ecl. 8.81 Geor. 3.244 Geor. 3.258 Aen. 1.688 Aen. 1.660 Aen. 4.2	Ep. 5.82 Ep. 14.13 Car. 1.27.16 Car. 1.13.8 Car 3.7.11	3.11.6	3.6.39 3.8.29 3.17.9 2.34.44 1.5.3 1.6.7 1.9.17 1.11.7	Ars 1.573 Ars. 1.244 (x2) Ars 3.597 Ars 3.573 Am. 1.2.9 Am. 2.16.11 Am. 2.19.15 Am. 3.9.56 Rem. 244	280 293 191 415 338 173 356 330 643	

							Rem. 453 Rem. 625 Rem. 732 Rem. 267 Rem. 649 Her. 4.15 Her. 16.232 Her. 5.154 Her. 15.170 Her. 19.5 Her. 15.12 Her. 16.6 Her. 16.125 Her. 12.167 Her. 16.49 Her. 4.33 Her. 18.45 Her. 15.163 Her. 12.35 Her. 20.173 Her. 8.58 Her. 16.104 Her. 18.88		
Incendere / Incendium / Incensum			Aen. 1.660 Aen. 6.689 Aen. 3.298 Aen. 2.343				Ars 2.301 Her. 20.122 Her. 16.123		
Torrere		68.52 100.7		Car. 1.33.6 Car. 3.19.28 Car. 3.9.13 Car. 4.1.12		3.24.13	Am. 3.2.40 Am. 3.1.20 Rem. 491	187 362 641	
Uro / Ustus / Adurere / Amburere / Comburere / Exurere / Perurere		61.177 72.5 77.3 83.6	Aen. 4.68 Ecl. 2.68 Georg. 3.215	Epist. 1.2.13 Ep. 11.4 Ep. 14.13 Car. 1.19.5	1.8.7 2.6.5 2.4.5 3.19.19 3.8.11 3.8.12 3.12.17 3.11.5	2.3.44 (x2) 2.30.30 3.9.43 (x2) 3.19.25 4.5.19	Ars 3.448 Ars. 3.573 Ars 3.543 Am. 1.2.43		

				Car. 1.19.7 Car. 1.27.15 Car. 3.7.11	(x2) 3.8.6		Am. 1.1.26 Am. 2.19.3 Am. 2.9.5 Am. 2.4.12 Rem. 267 Her. 19.15 Her. 3.128 Her. 15.164 Her. 4.20 Her. 19.5 Her. 4.19 Her. 4.52 Her. 18.170 Her. 8.58 Her. 4.33 Her. 12.182		
Vapor								640 102	
Cremare									
Flagrare / Conflagrare / Deflagrare		67.25 68.73		Ep. 5.81 Car. 1.25.13		1.13.23 2.3.33 3.19.13	Am. 1.13.31 Her. 16.126		

Red – with explanatory words in the same phrase (Cupid, amor, Venus, etc.)
Blue – without explanatory words in the same phrase

Tibullus – 1923 lines – 13 (0,67 metaphors for 100 lines) – 3 + 10 (23%)
Propertius – 4056 lines – 31 (0.76 metaphors for 100 lines) – 6 + 25 (19%)
Ovid – 21506 – 117 (0.54 metaphors for 100 lines) – 31 + 86 (26%)
Virgil – 12913 – 29 (0.22 metaphors for 100 lines) – 20 + 9 (69%)
Seneca – 1280 lines – 30 (2.34 metaphors for 100 lines) – 6 + 24 (25%)
Catullus – 2202 lines – 25 (1.13 metaphors for 100 lines) – 3 + 22 (12%)
Horace – 7751 lines – 28 (0.36 metaphors for 100 lines) – 13 + 15 (46%)
Lucretius – 7415 lines – 10 (0,13 metaphors for 100 lines) – 8 + 2 (80%)
Lucretius – 2744 (Bk. 4 and 5) – 10 (0,36 metaphors for 100 lines) – 8 + 2 (80%)

Bibliography

Ancient Works

Aeneid, Virgil.
Amores, Ovid.
Ars Amatoria, Ovid.
Eclogues, Virgil.
Elegies, Propertius.
Elegies, Tibullus.
Epistulae, Seneca.
Georgics, Virgil.
Heroides, Ovid.
Hippolytus, Euripides.
Phaedra, Seneca.
Poems, Catullus.

Modern Works

ADAMS, J. N. (1982). *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London: Duckworth.

ALVAR EZQUERRA, Antonio (1997). "Los epodos eróticos de Horacio y los inicios de la elegía Latina", *Estudios clásicos*, v. 111, n. 39, pp. 7-26.

ALVAREZ, Maria Consuelo and IGLESIAS, Rosa Maria (2008). "La Fedra de Ovidio". *Fedras de ayer y de hoy : teatro, poesía, narrativa y cine ante un mito classico*, texts presented by Andrés Pociña and Aurora López. Granada: Universidad de Granada, pp. 171-193.

ARMSTRONG, Rebecca (2006). *Cretan women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin poetry*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

BANULS, José Vicente (2008). "La Fedra de Sofocles". *Fedras de ayer y de hoy : teatro, poesía, narrativa y cine ante un mito classico*, texts presented by Andrés Pociña and Aurora López. Granada: Universidad de Granada, pp. 15-84.

BARCHIESI, Alessandro (2001). *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets*. Duckworth: London.

BARRETT, W. S. (1964). *Euripides' Hippolytus*. Oxford.

BLOCH, David J. (2007). "In defence of Seneca's Phaedra", *Classica et Mediaevalia*, v. 58, pp. 237-257.

BOYLE, A. J. (1985). "In Nature's Bonds: A Study of Seneca's Phaedra", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, v. 2, n. 32.2, pp. 1284–1347.

BOYLE, A. J. (1988). “Senecan tragedy: twelve propositions”. *The Imperial Muse. Ramus Essays on the Roman Literature of the Empire*, texts presented by A. J. Boyle. Victoria.

BOYLE, A. J. (2006). *An Introduction to Roman Tragedy*. London and New York: Routledge.

CAHOON, Leslie (1988). “The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*”, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, v. 118, pp. 293- 307.

CAIRNS, Francis (2007). *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press.

CALABRESE, E. (2002-2003). I*l sistema delle relazioni nella Fedra di Seneca : Una lettura pragmatica*. PhD thesis, Universita’ degli studi di Verona.

CERVELLARA, Maria Antonietta (2008). “Tempesta di passioni : le tragedie di Seneca”, *“Amicitiae templa serena”: studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò*, texts presented by Luigi Castagna and Chiara Riboldi. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, pp. 311-321.

COFFEY, Michael and MAYER, Roland (1990). *Seneca. Phaedra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COLEMAN, Dorothy (1979). *The Gallo Roman Muse*. Cambridge University Press.

CONTE, Gian Biagio (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation*. Translated by C. Segal. Ithaca.

CONTE, Gian Biagio (1994). *Genres and Readers. Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny’s Encyclopedia*. Translated by Glenn Most. Baltmore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

COPLEY, F.O. (1947). “Servitium amoris in the Roman Elegy”, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, v. 78, pp. 285-300.

DANGEL, Jacqueline (2008). “Sénèque ou la tragédie revisitée: dérivation des genres et tensions idéologiques en manifeste culturel”. *La riflessione sul teatro nella cultura romana, atti del congresso internazionale tenuto a Milano, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, nel maggio 2006*, texts presented by Giuseppe Aricò and Massimo Rivoltella. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, pp. 171-192.

DANGEL, Jacqueline (2009). “Tragédie et élégie en interface dans l'œuvre ovidienne: essai sur les frontières génériques”. *La théâtralité de l'œuvre ovidienne*, texts presented by Isabelle Jouteur. Paris: de Boccard, pp. 21-39.

DAVIS, Peter J. (1995). “Rewriting Euripides: Ovid, *Heroides* 4”, *Scholia*, v. 4, pp. 41-55.12.

DÉLIGNON, Bénédicte (2006). “Genres nobles et genres mineurs dans *Les Héroïdes* d'Ovide: la résolution d'un conflit”, *Bulletin de l’association Guillaume Budé*, n. 1, pp. 148-188.

DE TRANE, Ginetta (2009). “Spazi e scelte antitetiche nella Fedra di Seneca”. *Παλαια Φιλία: studi di topografia antica in onore di Giovanni Uggeri*, texts presented by Cesare Marangio e Giovanni Laudizi. Galatina: Congedo, pp. 107-120.

DE VITO, Ann F. (1994). “The essential seriousness of *Heroides* 4”, *Rheinisches Museum*, v. 137, n. 3-4, pp. 312-330.

DÖRFLER, Salo (1905). *Beiträge zu einer Topik der römischen Elegiker*. Nikolsburg: Rosenau.

DRINKWATER, Megan (2007). “Which letter ? text and subtext in Ovid's *Heroides*”, *American Journal of Philology*, v. 128, n. 3, pp. 367-387.

DUPONT, Florence (1991). “Le prologue de la *Phèdre* de Sénèque”, *Revue des études latines*, v. 69, pp. 124-135.

EDMUNDS, Lowell (2001). *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore.

FITCH, John and McELDUFF, Siobhan (2002). “Construction of the Self in Senecan Drama”, *Mnemosyne*, v. 55, n. 4, fasc. 1, pp. 18-40.

FRANGOULIDIS, Stavros A. (2009). “The nurse as a plot-maker in Seneca's *Phaedra*”, *Rivista di filologia e di instruzione classica*, v. 137, n. 3-4, pp. 402-423.

FULKERSON, Laurel (2005). *The Ovidian heroine as author : reading, writing, and community in the* Heroides. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

GALE, Monica (1997). “Propertius 2.7: Militia Amoris and the Ironies of Elegy”, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, v. 87, pp. 77-91.

GAZICH, Roberto (1997). “La Fedra di Seneca tra pathos ed elegia”, *Humanitas*, v. 52, n. 3, pp. 348-375.

GENETTE, G. (1962). *Palimpsestes*. Paris.

GRANT, W. L. (1952). “Elegiac themes in Horace's Odes”. *Studies in honour of G. Norwood*, texts edited by White M. E. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 194-202.

GREEN, C. M. C. (1996a). “Did the Romans Hunt?”, *Classical Antiquity*, v. 15, n. 2, pp. 222-260.

GREEN, C. M. C. (1996b). "Terms of Venery: *Ars Amatoria* I", *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, v. 126, pp. 221- 263.

GRIMAL, Pierre (1963). "L'originalité de Sénèque dans la tragédie de Phèdre", *Revue des études latines*, v. 41, pp. 297-314.

HARDWICK, Lorna (1990). "Ancient Amazons–heroes, outsiders or women?", *Greece and Rome*, v. 37, pp. 14-36.

HELDMANN, K. (1968). "Senecas Phaedra und ihre griechischen Vorbilder", *Hermes*, v. 96, pp. 88-117.

HERTER, H. (1971). "Phaidra in griechischer und römischer Gestalt", *Rheinische Museum für Philologie,* v. 114, pp. 44-77.

HINDS, Stephen (1993). "Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, v. 30, pp. 9-47.

HIRSCHFIELD, Otto (1996). *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. vol. XII.

HORNBLOWER, Simon and SPAWFORTH, Antony (2003). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford University Press.

JAKOBI, R. (1998). *Der Einfluss Ovids auf der Tragiker Seneca*. Berlin and New-York.

JACOBSON, Haword (1974). *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

JANKA, Markus (2004). "Seneca's *Phaedra*: core of the drama, and his elegiac epic frame". *Theater, Theaterpraxis, Theaterkritik im kaiserzeitlichen Rom: Kolloquium anlässlich des 70. Geburtstages von Prof. Dr. Peter Lebrecht Schmidt, 24./25. Juli 2003, Universität Konstanz*, texts presented by von Joachim Fugmann *et al*. München: Saur.

KENNEDY, Duncan (1993). *The arts of love*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KENNEDY, Duncan (2002). "Epistolarity: the Heroides". *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, texts presented by Philip Hardy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 217-232.

KIRFEL, E. A. (1969). *Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroides Ovids*. Bern: Haupt.

LILIJA, Saara (1965). *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*. New York: Garland Pub.

LITTLEWOOD, C. A. J. (2004). *Self-Representation and Illusion in Senecan Tragedy*. Oxford.
[http://m.oxfordscholarship.com.proxy1.library.mcgill.ca/mobile/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199267613.001.0001/acprof-9780199267613]

LOPEZ CABRERA, Isabel (2004). "Poesia y poetas en la monodia de Hipolito de la Phaedra de Seneca", *Analecta Malacitana Electronica*, v. 16, pp. 1-25, [http://www.anmal.uma.es/numero16/indice.htm].

MANTOVANELLI, Paolo (2008). "*Libido*/*luxuria* in Seneca tragico e nell' Octavia". *"Amicitiae templa serena": studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò*, texts presented by Luigi Castagna and Chiara Riboldi. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, pp. 969-985.

MAYER, Roland G. (2002). *Seneca,* Phaedra. London: Duckworth.

McKEOWN, J. C. (1995). "*Militat Omnis Amans*", *The Classical Journal*, v. 90, n. 3, pp. 295-304.

Minor Authors of the Corpus Tibullianum (1992). Edited by John Yardley. Bryn Mawr: Thomas Library Bryn Mawr College.

MORELLI, Alfredo M. (2004). "L'elegia e i suoi confini: Fedra e Medea tra Ovidio e Seneca". *Percorsi della memoria*, texts presented by Maria Pace Pieri. Firenze: Polistampa, pp. 37-82.

MURGATROYD, P. (1981). "*Seruitium amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus*, v. 40, pp. 589–606.

OPPEL, E. (1968). *Ovids* Heroides. *Studien zur inneren Form und zur Motivation*. Erlangen-Nürnberg.

OSHO, J. M. (1970). "Variations on the Phaedra Theme in Euripides, Seneca and Racine", *Nigeria and the Classics*, v. 12, p. 91f.

PARATORE, E. (1972). "Lo Ἱππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος di Euripide e la Phaedra di Seneca", *Studi Classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella*. Catania: Facolta din Lettere et Filosofia, pp. 303-46.

PEARSON, C. S. (1980). "Simile and imagery in Ovid *Heroides* 4 and 5", *Illinois Classical Studies*, v. 5, pp. 110-129.

POEL, Marc G. M. van der (2006). "Phaedra's declaration of love to Hippolytus (Seneca, *Phaedra* 589-719)". *Land of dreams: Greek and Latin studies in honour of A. H. M. Kessels*, texts presented by André Pierre M. H. Lardinois *et al*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 160-174.

POESCHL, V. (1980). "Horace et l'élégie". *L'élégie romaine. Enracinement. Thèmes. Diffusion. Actes du colloque international de Mulhouse, mars 1979*, texts presented by A. Thill. Paris: Orphys, pp. 157-161.

ROISMAN, Hanna M. (2005). "Women in Senecan tragedy", *Scholia*, v. 14, pp. 72-88.

ROSATI, Gianpiero (1985). “Forma elegiaca di un simbolo letterario. La Fedra di Ovidio”. *Atti delle giornate di studio su Fedra, Torino 7-8-9 maggio 1984*, texts presented by Uglione R. Torino: Delegazione dell'AICC, pp. 113-131.

ROSATI, Gianpiero (1992). “L'elegia al femminile: le *Heroides* di Ovidio (e altre heroides)”, *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici*, v. 29, pp. 71-94.

RUCH, M. (1964). “La langue de la psychologie amoureuse dans la *Phèdre* de Sénèque”, *Les études classiques*, v. 32, pp. 356-363.

RUIZ DE ELVIRA, A. (1976). “La ambigüedad de *Fedra*”, *Cuadernos de filologia clasica*, v. 10, pp. 9-16.

SCHIESARO, Alessandro (2003). “Forms of Senecan intertextuality”, *Vergilius*, v. 38, pp. 56-63.

SEGAL, Ch. (1984). “Senecan Baroque: the Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid and Euripides”, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, v. 114, pp. 311-326.

SEGAL, Ch. (1986). *Language and desire in Seneca's Phaedra*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SPATAFORA, Giuseppe (2006). “Il fuoco d'amore: storia di un topos dalla poesia greca arcaica al romanzo bizantino. Il successo del topos in Callimaco, Teocrito e Apollonio Rodio”, *Maia*, v. 58, n. 3, pp. 449-463.

SPATAFORA, Giuseppe (2007). “Il fuoco d'amore: storia di un topos dalla poesia greca arcaica al romanzo bizantino. L'immagine del fuoco nella poesia di età arcaica e classica”, *Myrtia*, v. 22, pp. 19-33.

SPENTZOU, Effrosini (2003). *Readers and writers in Ovid's Heroides: transgressions of genre and gender*. New York and Oxford: Oxfrod Classical Press.

SPOTH, Friedrich (1992). *Ovids Heroides als Elegien*. München: Beck.

TARRANT, R. J. (1978). “Senecan drama and its antecedents”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, v. 82, pp. 213-263.

TRINACTY, Christopher (2007a). *Character is destiny: Senecan tragedy and Ovid*. PhD thesis, Brown University.

TRINACTY, Christopher (2007b). “Seneca's *Heroides*: elegy in Seneca's *Medea*”, *Classical Journal*, v. 103, n. 1, pp. 63-78.

VEYNE, Paul (1983). *L’élégie érotique romaine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

VIZZOTTI, Martín (2005-2006). “Catástrofe e invasión discursiva en Phaedra de Séneca”, *Auster*, V. 10-11, pp. 101-117.

WINSOR LEACH, Eleanor (1964). “Georgic Imagery in the *Ars amatoria*”, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, v. 95, pp. 142-154.

WRAY, David (2003). “What poets do: Tibullus on “easy” hands”, *Classical Philology*, v. 98, n. 3, pp. 217-250.

ZOCCALI, Francesca (1997). “Il prologo allegorico della *Phaedra* di Seneca”, *Bolletinno di studi latini*, v. 27, n. 2, pp. 433-453.

ZWIERLAIN, Otto (1987). *Senecas Phaedra und ihre Vorbilder*. Stuttgart and Mainz.