John F. Miller

Ovidian Allusion and the Vocabulary of Memory

Three recent discussions of the self-referential quality of Ovidian poetry draw attention to a technique that deserves to be recognized more clearly in its own right. I refer to Ovid's habit of signalling, or glossing, literary allusions with the vocabulary of memory (*memor*, *memini*, *recordor* and the like). The explicit notation of a character's, or the Ovidian narrative persona's, reminiscences is designed to correspond with, and therefore to comment upon, the text's recall of earlier literature in various interesting ways. In his anatomy of «poetic memory» in Latin poetry, Gian Biagio Conte adduces two Ovidian texts that exhibit the phenomenon in order to illustrate what he calls «reflective allusion»[1]. At *Fasti* 3, 473-75, when Ariadne, lamenting her desertion by Bacchus, calls to mind (*memini*) her grieving words on the earlier occasion when Theseus abandoned her, the quoted words pointedly call to our minds through direct echoes the depiction of that latter lament in Catullus 64 (lines 132-33 and 143-44). Likewise, when, in Book 14 of the *Metamorphoses*, the concerned father Mars reminds Jupiter of his promise to elevate Romulus to divine status (14, 812-15), recollected speech dovetails perfectly with literary reminiscence: Mars' quotation of Jupiter is at the same time a quotation of Ennius' *Annales* (frag. 54 Skutsch)[2]. And once again the allusion is highlighted by the speaker's parenthetical reference to his memory (*nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi*, 14, 813).

Conte draws both of these examples from some brief remarks by Moritz Haupt in 1855 that first identified the Ovidian technique in question[3]. In turn, both examples recur in other recent studies which further enhance our appreciation of this technique in Ovid's poetry.

1. *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, Ithaca, N.Y. 1986, pp. 57-63 (= *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario*, Turin 1985², pp. 35-41).

2. Actually, it is a virtual quotation. Ovid repeats an entire hexameter from Ennius, but treats the latter's adjective *caerula* (modifying *templa* in the next line) as a noun. Even in the very unusual practice of borrowing an entire verse, Ovid characteristically changes something in the original.

3. *Index lectionum aestivarum 1855*, in *Opuscula*, Leipzig 1876 (reprint Hildesheim 1967), II, pp. 71-72: «hoc autem artificium, ut eorum quae apud antiquiorem poetam aliqua carminis persona dixerat eandem aut aliam personam recordari fing-

Joseph Solodow independently points to the latter text in his discussion of literary self-consciousness in the *Metamorphoses*[4]. He then adds two other instances where mention of memory cleverly alerts us to poetic *imitatio*, both from the long speech of Pythagoras. The philosopher recalls – *nam memini* (15, 160; again a parenthetical remark) – that during the Trojan War he was the hero Euphorbus, slain by Menelaus, in lines imitating Homer's description of that action (*Iliad* 17, 43-60). Some verses later Pythagoras notes his reminiscence (15, 436 *quantum recordor*) of another experience from his earlier life – hearing the seer Helenus' speech to Aeneas –, which is at the same time a creative reformulation of the event as told in Virgil's *Aeneid* 3, 374-462. As in the two aforementioned examples, the speaker here allegedly quotes an earlier utterance. Finally, in a useful reevaluation of Ovidian literariness, Stephen Hinds puts forth Conte's Ariadne example as «an especially clear instance of self-referential elaboration of allusion»[5]. A few pages later (pp. 20-21), he evinces another example of (parenthetical) *memini* as a gloss on literary memory: in the opening verses of *Tristia* 5, 3, when Ovid nostalgically recollects his participation in poetic symposia at the Liberalia in Rome, he is also recalling (and playing upon) his own extended celebration of that festival in an earlier poem, the *Fasti*.

In discussing the memory of Ovid's Ariadne, Hinds remarks that the word *memini* in that passage is a refinement of what David Ross has termed the «Alexandrian footnote», the use of words and phrases appealing to tradition and report (e.g. *dicitur, ferunt*) as means of signalling poetic allusion[6]. We may now add that all of the aforementioned references to memory demonstrate the same footnoting func-

---

eret nobilisque poesis memoriam excitaret». Haupt illustrates his point with the aforementioned examples.

4. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Chapel Hill and London 1988, pp. 227-28.

5. *Generalising about Ovid*, «Ramus» 16, 1987, p. 17. On the importance of Conte's discussion for the study of Ovidian allusion in particular see also D. Feeney's review, «Jour. of Rom. Stud.» 79, 1989, p. 206. J. F. Miller's characterization of Conte's two Ovidian examples of allusion as «unusual» is somewhat misleading («Vergilius» 33, 1988, p. 118). The suggestively titled collection of essays, *Ovidio. Poeta della memoria*, ed. G. Papponetti, Sulmona 1991, does not intersect significantly with the present topic.

6. Hinds, art cit., p. 17; David O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge 1975, p. 78. See also Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge 1987, pp. 8-9, 40, and 58. For many perceptive comments on the self-reflexive quality in Ovidian narrative of words associated with speech and the like, see recently A. M. Keith, *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2*, Ann Arbor 1992.

tion. Furthermore, we may note that this lexical phenomenon is even more widespread in Ovidian poetry than even my collection here of these five examples might suggest. In what follows I discuss four other instances, which have not to my knowledge been pointed out by other scholars. Like Hinds's example, these four all involve allusion to Ovid's own earlier poetry.

Let us begin with a direct mention of earlier poetry which is enriched and complicated through an intertextual reference, once again signalled by parenthetical *memini*. In the programmatic introduction to *Fasti* 2, Ovid announces that this elegy on the Roman calendar is a «greater» enterprise – in size, in theme, in stature – than the «slender work» that characterized the genre in even the recent past (2, 3-8):

> nunc primum velis, elegi, maioribus itis:
>   exiguum, memini, nuper eratis opus.
> ipse ego vos habui faciles in amore ministros,
>   cum lusit numeris prima iuventa suis.
> idem sacra cano signataque tempora fastis:
>   ecquis ad haec illinc crederet esse viam?

The poet's memory of that past (*memini*) of course includes his own love elegies, a point which he makes explicit in the second couplet quoted. That point is further underscored by the accompanying allusion to one of his *Amores* – not coincidentally, to another introductory, programmatic text (3, 1, 21-28):

> fabula, nec sentis, tota iactaris in Urbe,
>   dum tua praeterito facta pudore refers.
> tempus erat thyrso pulsum graviore moveri;
>   cessatum satis est: incipe maius opus.
> materia premis ingenium; cane facta virorum:
>   'haec animo' dices 'area digna meo est.'
> quod tenerae cantent *lusit* tua Musa puellae,
>   *prima*que *per numeros* acta *iuventa suos*.

Ovid's present address to elegiac couplets refers to the earlier occasion when he himself was addressed by Elegia and her rival Tragoedia. In that *recusatio*-scenario, the latter goddess had urged Ovid to «begin a greater work» and had accused him of scandalizing himself and suppressing his talent by concentrating on love poetry. «Your Muse has (thus far) played at poetry for tender girls to sing, and your early youth has been spent with verses appropriate to youth». In *Fasti* 2 Ovid takes up these very words in his own characterization of his youthful poetic endeavors: *cum lusit numeris prima iuventa suis*. Now that, as the *vates* of the Roman calendar, Ovid is writing not a tragedy but a *maius opus* nonetheless, when he is, in other words, obeying the

goddess who berated him, he pointedly adopts her critical perspective on his past.

However, this adoption of Tragoedia's perspective, this declared break with his poetic past, is tinged with a delicate irony. And that irony emerges not only against the background of the body of the *Fasti*, which, despite its nobler theme than love, does share much with Ovid's erotic elegy in the way of literary personality, techniques, and occasionally even topic. As others have noted[7], an ironic perspective also arises from these verses themselves. The closing question about the wondrous movement from past to present is playfully extravagant. The word *idem* seems to hint at a continuity of spirit as well as of style and genre from his earlier elegies to the present «greater» work. And the word that signalled the coming allusion, *memini*, also evokes the same lighthearted tone. For Ovid to say that he «remembers» the recent history of Roman elegy is to draw such attention to the obvious as to be downright silly.

One of the most famous examples of Ovidian self-imitation is the story of Procris' death, told in both *Ars amatoria* 3 and *Metamorphoses* 7. The earlier, third person narrative is poignantly retold in the *Metamorphoses* by the recollecting Cephalus[8], the husband falsely

7. Dietmar Korzeniewski, *Ovids elegisches Proömium*, «Hermes» 92, 1964, pp. 196 and 198; Henri Le Bonniec, *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum Liber Secundus*, Paris 1969, on 2, 7 f.; Jean-Marc Frécaut, *L'Esprit et l'humour chez Ovide*, Grenoble 1972, p. 272. For a full discussion of the ironic dimensions of the entire proem see John F. Miller, *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals: Studies in the Fasti*, Frankfurt and N.Y. 1991, pp. 23-28.

8. William S. Anderson has recently challenged this, the traditional, chronology of the two versions (*The Example of Procris in the Ars amatoria*, in *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, edd. M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde, Atlanta 1990, pp. 131-45). He entertains the idea that the simpler account in *Ars* 3 aims in part to improve upon the expansive narrative in *Metamorphoses* 7 – actually three narratives told by Cephalus – by correcting certain of the latter's inconsistencies and other deficiencies. Anderson's paper has advanced our understanding of the relatively underrated exemplum in the *Ars* and has sharpened awareness of certain differences with the hexameter version. But his overall argument is unconvincing. It seems to me that Ovidian imitation, including self-imitation, is typically motivated by a desire to strike out in new direction – here the fuller, more ambitious, story in the *Metamorphoses* –, less so by the wish to tie up loose details into a neater package. Ovidian self-imitation no doubt has a significant measure of *aemulatio sui*, but 'improvement' could in the present instance be seen in the greater complexity and depth of the *Metamorphoses* version, in spite of a few inconsistencies of the sort found elsewhere in the poem. Moreover, some of the 'problems' in the hexameter version pointed to by Anderson are not as troublesome as he claims. For instance, on the passage discussed just below, he notes (p. 136) that «the odd way of tenta-

suspected of adultery who accidentally killed his eavesdropping wife. In the many studies of these two versions of the tale, there has been almost no attention to Ovid's subtle but unmistakable comments on his *imitatio sui*[9]. Perhaps the most striking instance[10] involves yet again a parenthetical reference to memory. Cephalus' report of his fateful idle song to the breeze follows closely the version in the *Ars amatoria*:

'*aura*' (recordor enim) '*venias*' cantare solebam,
'meque iuves intresque *sinus*, gratissima, nostros,

tively adding three more hexameters in *Met. 7* [i.e. 7, 818-20] ... would be a dubious poetic decision after the functional spareness of the other account». But – quite apart from the metaliterary pointers for which I argue below – what of Ovid's well known penchant for elaboration? Anderson (p. 135) correctly remarks on the oddity of Cephalus' lack of assurance about his own earlier words (816 *forsitan*) in contrast with his confident insistence on fate's power over him on the same occasion (816 *sic me mea fata trahebant*). Yet this logical lapse need not be interpreted as an artistic defect; it is not inconsistent with Cephalus' character as narrator and the histrionic quality of his reminiscence.

9. Although several scholars see Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* narrative alluding to another (non-Ovidian) version of the tale: specifically, to the pederastic episode edited out by Ovid (or by Cephalus): e.g., Brooks Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge 1966, pp. 179-180 and 383-84; W. S. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses. Books 6-10*, Norman, Okla. 1972, on 7, 751 («probably»); Sara Mack, *Ovid*, New Haven and London 1988, pp. 131-34; cf. Gregson Davis, *The Death of Procris. «Amor» and the Hunt in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Rome 1983, p. 138, note 141. Major studies of the Ovidian versions: A. Rohde, *De Ovidi arte epica capita duo*, Berlin 1929, pp. 30-51, especially pp. 46-51; Viktor Pöschl, *Kephalos und Procris in Ovids Metamorphosen*, «Hermes» 87, 1959, pp. 328-43; Antonio Ruiz de Elvira, *Céfalo y Procris: Élegia y épica*, «Cuadernos de Filologia clásica» 2, 1972, pp. 97-123; Mario Labate, *Amore coniugale e amore 'elegiaco' nell'episodio di Cefalo e Procri*, «Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa» Ser. III 5, 1975, pp. 103-28; Charles Segal, *Ovid's Cephalus and Procris: Myth and Tragedy*, «Grazer Beiträge» 7, 1978, pp. 175-205; and Anderson, art. cit., with additional references p. 144, note 2.

10. For another see the critical juncture when Procris hears from a busybody the false report of her husband's infidelity. Cephalus begins to describe his wife's reaction thus: *subito conlapsa dolore, / ut mihi narratur, cecidit...* (826-27). The phrase *ut mihi narratur*, besides contributing a measure of verisimilitude to Cephalus' narrative, functions also as a footnote or metaliterary pointer to the text from *Ars* 3, which is at this point emphatically echoed: *excidit et subito muta dolore fuit* (3, 702). The immediately following verses then diverge sharply from their 'model': Ovid's continued physical description of Procris' agitation – paleness, tearing of clothes and cheeks, Bacchic raving – is replaced by Cephalus' meditation on her mental state and her words, now lamenting, now trustfully denying the report. *Ut mihi narratur* is not a deflating suggestion that Cephalus heard this part of the story from Ovid, but the phrase does draw attention to the process of imitation, in this

utque facis, *relevare* velis, quibus urimur, *aestus.*'
                                    (*Metamorph.* 7, 813-15)

'quae' que 'meos *releves aestus*', cantare solebat
'accipienda *sinu*, mobilis *aura, veni*'.
                                    (*Ars* 3, 697-98)

This is imitation, not repetition. Note the elegantly reversed order of the two commands verbally echoed, which is a common mark of Ovidian imitative artistry[11]. At the same time, the echoes of course evoke the earlier context – this is, in fact, the first cluster of strong echoes of the elegiac version. What is more, the narrator's explicit reference to his memory insists on that evocation of the previous context. To some extent, the voice of Cephalus as recollecting narrator has been virtually superimposed on Ovid's own narrative voice in the *Ars*. For even the distinctive phrase of citation (*cantare solebat*) has been adapted. On the other hand, Cephalus here recollects what he himself has lived some time ago – in another Ovidian poem. The parenthetical remark points up the relationship of the two poetic worlds to one another. And lest we miss the point, there follows immediately another gloss on the process of imitation. Cephalus expands his account of his customary words to the breeze by next 'quoting' a hymnic praise of the *aura* (7, 816-20):

'forsitan addiderim (sic me mea fata trahebant)
blanditias plures et 'tu mihi magna voluptas'
dicere sim solitus, 'tu me reficisque fovesque,
tu facis, ut silvas, ut amem loca sola, meoque
spiritus iste tuus semper capiatur ab ore'.

But he is careful to qualify this quotation from the start: *forsitan addiderim* («perhaps I added...»). Since readers of *Ars* 3 know that the tired huntsman did not in that version add such *blanditiae*, there is perhaps a playful comment here on the old man's overactive imagination. Be that as it may, on another level Cephalus' qualification of his

case self-imitation. Occurring as it does in the company of strong echoes which are not sustained in the following verses, the phrase nearly makes the echoing words a kind of literary 'tag' like those opening some Horatian odes. As in the example discussed below, our attention is directed both to a literary model and to a rather sharp deviation from that model.

11.   E.g. *Fasti* 5, 665-68 and the characteristics of the god Mercury verbally echoed from Horace, *Odes* 1, 10 (see note 16 below): the latter's sequence *cultus ... palaestrae ... lyrae ... superis deorum ... et imis* becomes in Ovid *superis imisque deorum ... lyrae ... palaestra ... culte*; and *Fasti* 1, 663-68, which inverts the Tibullan model's order of ideas (Tib. 2, 1, 1-8): the latter's *lustramus ... requiescat humus, requiescat*

second quoted speech surely glosses that speech as an elaboration of Ovid's earlier version of the event. This further underscores the self-referential force of *recordor enim* just above. Confidence in memory coincides with, and points to, allusion to an earlier text; the lesser surety of *forsitan addiderim* points to an elaboration of the same text. Overall in Cephalus' long narrative, the theme of recollection adds a depth and poignancy that are absent from the version of *Ars* 3[12]. At least in the present instance, however, reference to the old man's memories has as well a metaliterary dimension.

All of the seven aforementioned examples somehow play upon a speaker's recollection. Nearly all of them feature parenthetical references. But two further instances from the *Fasti* show that neither of these aspects is necessary in the Ovidian footnoting of allusion with the vocabulary of memory. In the first instance the word expressing memory has multiple associations. On the occasion of the Megalensia in April, the curious antiquarian poet wishes to interrogate Cybele, as he does so many other deities in the *Fasti*, but he is intimidated by her procession's frightful din – the crashing cymbals, the tambourines and shrill flute. Understanding Ovid's discomfort, the Magna Mater sends her granddaughters, the Muses, to help him out. He then addresses them in what would not inaccurately be called a mock invocation (4, 193-94):

pandite mandati memores, Heliconis alumnae,
     gaudeat assiduo cur dea Magna sono.

The words framing the hexameter («Reveal, nurslings of Helicon») are in grand epic style and in fact resemble a Virgilian epic invocation[13]. But the object of Ovid's query to the Muses, arising as it does from the immediate (and comic) situation before Cybele, hardly fits the lofty introduction: «O unfold to me, Muses, why the Great Goddess

arator ... suspenso vomere cesset opus ... ad praesepia ... plena coronato stare boves capite becomes in Ovid *state coronati plenum ad praesepe ... opus ... suspendat ... aratrum ... da requiem terrae ... da requiem ... viris ... lustrate.* The technique is not peculiar to Ovid; see, for example, the echoing frame of *Aeneid* 2-3: cf. 2, 1-2 *conticuere omnes intentique ... pater Aeneas sic* and 3, 716-18 *sic pater Aeneas intentis omnibus ... conticuit.*

12.   On motifs of recollection deepening the tale see Segal, art. cit. *passim*, especially pp. 178 and 181. In the text note especially, in the introduction to the tale of Procris' death, 7, 797-98 *iuvat o meminisse beati / temporis.* Here, too, there is an element of 'poetic memory'; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1, 203 *forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit*, pointed out by Segal p. 187. Note further that the echo of Virgil involves, as usual, a response as well. To the model's idea of a possible future delight in remembering Ovid seems to say 'yes, in this instance it is a delight to remember'.

13.   Virg. *Aen.* 7, 641 (= 10, 163) *Pandite nunc Helicona, deae, cantusque movete.* Cf. Ov. *Met.* 15, 622 *pandite nunc, Musae, praesentia numina vatum.*

enjoys this constant racket». The deflation is already underway, how-
ever, in the hexameter's phrase *mandati memores*. As the daughters of
Mnemosyne, the Muses themselves are said to remember things and to
remind their poets. Thus Virgil explains why he invokes them before
his catalog of warriors: *et meministis enim, divae, et memorare potestis*
(7, 645)[14]. In Ovid's invocation, the Muses' association with memory
has been mischievously twisted into a cheeky injunction to remember
what Cybele commanded them to do, i.e. to assist the frightened anti-
quarian. As if the daughters of Memory might forget!

By now we should also expect that the word *memores* is alerting us
to a poetic allusion. When the respondent to Ovid's speech, Erato,
steps forth in the following couplet, our expectation is straightaway
fulfilled (4, 195-96):

> sic ego. sic *Erato* (mensis *Cythereius* illi
> cessit, *quod* teneri *nomen amoris habet*):

For the explanation of this Muse's appearance here – the connection
between Erato's name and the tutelary goddess of April – echoes the
justification of her mention in the introduction to *Ars amatoria* 2
(lines 15-16):

> nunc mihi, si quando, puer et *Cytherea*, favete;
> nunc *Erato, nam tu nomen Amoris habes*.

Since that mention was, not coincidentally, in an invocation, the refer-
ence involves an elegant *oppositio in imitando*. Ovid's justification for
invoking Erato becomes a justification for Erato's response to his in-
vocation, or rather to his aetiological question closely resembling an
invocation. Moreover, our recall of the inspirational role of Erato in
Ovid's earlier elegy, and perhaps of the fact that she was the only
named Muse invoked in the *Ars amatoria*, suggests that her appear-
ance to the aetiological elegist has an additional relevance. Of all the
Muses, she is the one with whom this poet, currently in need of help,
would feel the most comfortable[15].

My final example involves a double reference, the simultaneous
allusion to two separate and unrelated poetic texts. Ovid's entry on
the merchants' festival in May (*Fasti* 5, 663-92), which constitutes a
carefully crafted elegy, opens with a hymnic address to the deity being
honored, Mercury, that is shot through with echoes of Horace's hymn
to the same god (*Odes* 1, 10)[16]. Although Ovid's aretalogy of Mercury

---

14.   Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1, 8 *Musa, mihi causas memora*; 7, 41 *tu vatem, tu diva mone*
(and Fordyce ad loc.), and Horace's parody at *Sat.* 1, 5, 53.
15.   Cf. Frécaut, op. cit. p. 276.
16.   5, 663 *Clare nepos Atlantis* (cf. *Odes* 1, 10, 1 *Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis*);

allusively ranges over the whole ode, he studiously – and noticeably to
the informed reader – avoids any reference to that aspect of the god to
which Horace devotes half of his poem, viz. Mercury's deceptiveness
and thievery. In introducing an old Roman feast, the *vates sacrorum*
wishes to strike a solemn note. That solemnity quickly dissolves,
however, when, in the ensuing description of a merchant's purifica-
tory ritual, we hear the worshiper utter a rather outrageous prayer to
Mercury: he asks not only for cleansing and (as usual) for profit, but
also for the joy of cheating his customers and for permissible perjuries
in the future. The god himself then provides the crowning moment – a
sort of punch line for the whole elegy – by favorably responding to
this prayer (5, 691-92):

> talia Mercurius poscenti ridet ab alto,
> se memor Ortygias subripuisse boves.

Not the least significant aspect of this couplet's closural force is the
renewed allusion to Horace's hymn. Ovid refers to the famous event
featured in the central stanza of *Odes* 1, 10, Mercury's theft of his
brother Apollo's cattle. On the purely aural level, the hexameter's
close (*ridet ab alto*) perhaps recalls the cliching phrase of the Horatian
stanza (1, 10, 12 *risit Apollo*). This reference completes the pattern of
allusion to *Odes* 1, 10 in a climatic fashion. For we here finally find
mention of the god's thievishness and guile, which were felt to be
missing from the extensive imitation of the ode at the elegy's outset.
And, once again, poetic allusion coincides with a reference to memory
(*memor*): here the smiling reminiscence of the trickster god points to
Horace's humorous lines commemorating his trickery.

At the same time that this distich alludes to Horace, it echoes as well
an earlier Ovidian text. Mercury's response to the tradesman evokes
a precedent of sorts set by the knavish god's father in his roguish
aspect (*Ars amatoria* 1, 633-36):

> Iuppiter *ex alto* periuria *ridet* amantum
> et iubet Aeolios inrita ferre Notos.
> per Styga Iunoni falsum iurare solebat
> Iuppiter: exemplo nunc favet ipse suo.

Since the verbal echo is in this case slight, one might argue that the
similarity is purely coincidental and should rather be classed with paral-

---

665-66 *pacis et armorum superis imisque deorum / arbiter, alato qui pede carpis iter*
(cf. 1, 10, 5-6 *magni Iovis et deorum nuntium* and 19-20 *superis deorum gratus et
imis*); 667-68 *laete lyrae pulsu, nitida quoque laete palaestra, / quo didicit culte
lingua docente loqui* (cf. 1, 10, 6 *lyrae parentem* and 1-4 *facunde .. qui feros cultus ...
voce formasti ... et more palaestrae*).

lels or repetitions – of which there are surely many in Ovid with no particular resonance – than with (self-)allusions, which demand an evocation of the previous context. Is Ovid not here simply recycling a passage from his earlier work rather than referring to it?

The rareness of the verbal echo should give us pause: the collocation *alto ... ridet* occurs in Ovidian poetry only in the two verses under discussion. So, too, should another striking similarity, which emerges when the two passages are considered against a generic background. The idea that the gods sweep away, or should sweep away, lover's perjuries with the winds is a topos of love elegy[17]. We have already been put in mind of this motif in the merchant's prayer just above (5, 686-88). Thus we are in a sense prepared for the reminiscence at the entry's close of a specific elegiac text containing the topos, which is the only other instance where the god's action is motivated by his own past behavior.

What clinches bona fide allusion here are two other aspects of the passage in question vis à vis its predecessor. First of all, in the verbal echo itself there is a significant difference from the passage in the *Ars*. We do not have here simply two male deities from on high making light of false oaths in memory of their own deceptive behavior. Literally, only Jupiter does this, i.e. «treats human perjuries as a laughing matter» (*ridere* + accusative in the *OLD*'s sense 5b) or, we might say, «laughs them off». Although the new situation in the *Fasti* resembles the earlier one closely, Ovid varies rather than exactly repeats the expression: Mercury «laughs (or smiles) upon» the petitioner benevolently (*ridere* + dative; see *OLD* 2)[18]. But that petitioner, the merchant, has asked, above all else, that the god overlook his perjuries, both those of the past and those of the future (5, 681-82, 687-88):

> 'ablue praeteriti periuria temporis', inquit
>   ablue praeteritae perfida verba die.
> ...
> et pateant veniente die periuria nobis,
>   nec curent superi siqua locutus ero'.

---

17. Prop. 2, 16, 47-48; Tib. 1, 4, 21-26; Ov. Am. 1, 8, 86; 2, 8, 17-20; [Tib.] 3, 6, 49-50. Cf. R. J. Littlewood, *Two Elegiac Hymns: Propertius 3.17 and Ovid, Fasti, 5.663-692*, «Latomus» 34, 1975, pp. 672-73.

18. Some MSS have *poscentes*, which some editors have accepted – others print the singular *poscentem*. But the recent editors (Le Bonniec, Pighi, Alton-Wormell-Courtney) who adopt the reading *poscenti* are certainly correct. The meaning yielded by the dative, «laughs as a sign of good will upon the petitioner», is what the context demands. Moreover, although *ridere* + accusative of the person with the meaning «make light of» appears at Propertius 2, 16, 47 (*periuros ridet amantis*), the model for Ovid's verse *Ars* 1, 633, the construction appears nowhere in Ovidian

Thus, by smiling upon the tradesman and answering his requests, Mercury too, just like Jupiter, makes light of false oaths. The meaning of *ridet* in the earlier passage is reflected in the new situation at the same time that the word itself undergoes a transformation. The echo – and this is the second point in favor of allusion here – plays upon the earlier context. All in all, then, Mercury's memory parallels (and glosses) two distinct poetic memories or intertextual strands.

This paper hardly exhausts all instances of the vocabulary of memory in Ovid with a metaliterary force. A comprehensive study would carefully consider, for example, the more direct sort of footnoting found at *Ars amatoria* 3, 659 *questus eram, memini, metuendos esse sodales. / non tangit solos ista querella viros.* As he addresses his erotic instruction to women, the teacher's *memini* reinforces an already emphatic cross-reference[19] to the admonitory lament of false friendship that he directed to the male pupils in Book 1 (739-54). Similarly, when the professor of love notes his «memory» of having himself once angrily mussed his girl's hair (2, 169 *me memini iratum dominae turbasse capillos*), not only do we behold the *praeceptor* illustrating the programmatic principle that his erotodidaxis derives from his own personal experience (1, 29 *usus opus movet hoc*); Ovid is also here pointing to an 'event' recorded in another of his poems, *Amores* 1, 7. In both of these examples the literary self-reference is relatively simple and much closer to the surface of the text than in the passages explicated earlier.

The phenomenon to which I have drawn attention in this paper is, I think, larger in another sense as well. Sometimes, just a gesture of reminding or an appeal to memory, without any explicit reference to recollection, may similarly alert the reader to poetic allusion. There is another Ovidian occasion, at *Fasti* 2, 487, when Mars quotes (from Ennius' *Annales*) Jupiter's promise to make Romulus a god. We noted above that the identical situation in *Metamorphoses* 14 was marked by Mars's emphatic reference to the fact that he recollected his father's words (14, 813 *nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi*). Although such a comment is lacking in the *Fasti*'s version of the scene, one might argue that the remindful thrust of the act of quotation itself serves as a formal trigger – albeit a more subtle one – of poetic allusion. Likewise, if even more subtle, in *Metamorphoses* 1, Daphne's plaintive reminder to her father of Diana's perpetual virginity alludes to that goddess's request for perpetual virginity from her father, Zeus,

---

poetry. On the other hand, the construction with the dative occurs, as the recent Teubner edition notes in the apparatus, at *Ars* 3, 513 (*ridenti mollia ride*).

19. The reference is verbal as well as conceptual – with *questus eram ... querella* compare the first word of the lesson to men in Book 1 (739 *conquerar an moneam mixtum fas omne nefasque*).

in Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*[20]. In the light of Ovid's practice with explicit references to memory, it is difficult to deny the bare appeal to memory itself here the function of a metaliterary cue.

On the other hand, of course not all words and situations involving memory signal poetic reference. And even when they do, we should be alert to other associations as well. On one memorable occasion, such a word actually has the paradoxical effect of both confirming literary allusion and undercutting a direct statement about Ovid's poetic past. *Ausus eram, memini, caelestia dicere bella (Amores* 2, 1, 11). Ovid says that he had attempted a poetic Gigantomachy but was forced by his girlfriend to abandon the project. The situation immediately calls to mind the traditional scenario of the *recusatio* and Propertius 3, 3 in particular. Again, Ovid's alleged memory awakens ours of earlier literature. Yet Ovid's version of the *recusatio* is to a large extent a spoof, which draws out the comic potential of the topos already present in Propertius 3, 3 and heightens the motif's fictionality. In other words, Ovid strongly suggests, just as in *Amores* 1,1, that he never really made such an attempt at epic. And not the least of his winks at the reader is the parenthetical reference to his memory[21]. Here, after the movement's grandiloquent opening *ausus eram*, with its associations of originality[22], the breezy informality of the colloquial sounding paratactic *memini*[23] comes as something of a jolt. As usual, Ovid's permutations on a technique are numerous[24].

University of Virginia

---

20. *Met.* 1, 481-87 and Call. *H.* 3, 4-8. See, besides the commentators, Frederick Williams, *Augustus and Daphne: Ovid Metamorphoses 1, 560-63 and Phylarchus FGrH 81 F 32 (b),* «Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar» 3, 1981, p. 250.

21. See O. S. Due, *Changing Forms. Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid,* Copenhagen 1974, p. 45. Matthew Santirocco, *Metamorphosis in Ovid's Amores,* «Class. Bull.» 45, 1969, pp. 83-84 and 95 examines the irony here in the context of similar parenthetical phrases in the *Amores.*

22. Enn. *Ann.* frag. 210 Skutsch, Lucr. 1, 67, Hor. *Sat.* 2, 1, 62, Ov. *Fast.* 6, 22; cf. Vinzenz Buchheit, *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils Georgika,* Darmstadt 1972, pp. 22-23.

23. On such expressions see Peter E. Knox, *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry,* Cambridge 1986, p. 61.

24. I am grateful to the anonymous readers of «MD» for several useful suggestions.

Mario Martina

Marziale 3, 33, 4

> Ingenuam malo, sed si tamen illa negetur,
>   Libertina mihi proxuma condicio est:
> Extremo est ancilla loco: sed vincet utramque,
>   Si facie nobis haec erit ingenua.

Il poeta vuole una donna: gli piacerebbe una nata libera, sarebbe il massimo, in subordine sarebbe disposto a ripiegare su una liberta. Nella peggiore delle ipotesi, però, si accontenterebbe anche di una schiava. Gran parte dell'efficacia dell'epigramma sta nella resa, sul piano formale, di questo esilarante progressivo ridimensionamento di pretese (un esametro per l'*ingenua*, un pentametro per la *libertina*, un *hemiepes* per la serva).

A questo punto, però, l'epigramma si sfilaccia, perde la sua compattezza, come se l'autore non riuscisse a 'chiuderlo' con una *pointe* adeguata. Nel finale, infatti, si affaccia un motivo assolutamente non congruente, quello dell'«aspetto fisico» (*facie*). Che c'entra il motivo della bellezza? *ingenua* deve essere la fanciulla, non la sua *facies*.

Ho il sospetto che in origine Marziale abbia scritto così:

> sed vincet utramque
> si faciet: nobis haec erit ingenua.

Cioè: «Se è disposta a fare (l'amore)[1], lei passa davanti a tutte le altre: la proclamo subito di nascita libera». A questo modo l'epigramma diventa compatto, coerente, e tutto in esso si salda; il gioco della inversione dei ruoli è pienamente realizzato: l'*ancilla* disponibile, *ex infimo loco*, sale sul piedistallo più alto, e a porvela è il poeta stesso, il quale dopo l'umiliazione delle ripulse, una volta soddisfatte le sue esigenze, riguadagna le prerogative perdute, e anzi diventa «pretore», anzi «censore», in grado non solo di affrancare, ma addirittura di decidere della genuinità della condizione di *civis*.

L'epigramma trova così una sua struttura chiusa ed equilibrata: il poeta era partito dalla fanciulla *ingenua*, e dopo alcune rinunce, imparando ad accontentarsi, è finalmente approdato ad un'*ingenua*. In

---

1. Per *facio* in senso erotico cfr. Lucr. 4, 1112 e 1195; Catull. 110, 2 e 5; Ov. *am.* 3, 4; Petr. 9, 9; 45, 8; 87, 5 e 9; Mart. 1, 46, 1; Iuv. 7, 240.; vedi anche J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary,* London 1982, p. 204.

Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici

30