As an example, consider the very beginning of *Eclogue* 4, *Sicelides Musae*, *paulo* ***maiora*** *canamus*: Virgil begs the Muses of Sicily to help him make the woods 'worthy of a consul's ear'; indeed, the epithet *magnus* is very frequent in the poem (1, 5, 12, 22, 36, 48, 49). Compare also Horace's description of Pindar's style, *Carm*. 4.2.7–8 (*feruet* ***inmensus****que ruit profundo* | *Pindarus ore*) and his *recusatio* (33–4 *concines* ***maiore*** *poeta plectro* | *Caesarem*).

Thus, the poet's main aim is to praise the child's deeds, and his wish for greater inspiration to recount them properly is simply a complimentary way to glorify their excellence.

Indeed, this is the positive reversal of the Homeric cliché of the ten mouths (*Il*. 2.488–90; cf. Verg. *G*. 2.42–4; *Aen*. 6.625–7), where the poet, apart from the number of mouths, points out the quality of voice and breast, that is, inspiration (φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη). That allows Virgil to go on with the hyperbole in what follows, *non me carminibus uincet nec Thracius Orpheus, nec Linus*: if his wish to possess such a huge inspiration is made real, nobody will be able to equal his verse. Cf. Sen. *Suas*. 1.15.3 *nemo illorum potuit* ***tanto spiritu*** *dicere* ***quanto*** *Pedo*. We find the same emphasis in Verg. *Aen*. 1.752 *quantus Achilles* ('how strong Achilles was', cf. Verg. *Ecl*. 4.36 *magnus … Achilles*).

The homoeoteleuton *spiritus et quantus* is unproblematic, as it involves a metrically short vowel;[7] as for the succession of two words ending with *-us* in Virgil, there are at least three other certain instances in the first half of a line: *G*. 3.113 *primus Ericthonius*; *Aen*. 3.667 *primus et Ascanius*; 10.459 *uiribus imparibus*. Moreover, the corruption of *quantus* before *sat*, brought about by the simplification of double *s*, could easily have led to *quantum*.

I do not think anyone else had ever proposed the conjecture *quantus* before Kovacs suggested it: given that it was not approved by Kovacs himself, I found it slightly problematic to report it in the critical apparatus of my *Bucolica* edition;[8] but, as R.G.M. Nisbet showed,[9] this is how conjectures are often made, and, after all, whatever works is good enough.

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa (IT) SILVIA OTTAVIANO
s.ottaviano@sns.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838813000396

[7] D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse.* Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 31 (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1994), 1 n. 2.
[8] S. Ottaviano and G.B. Conte (edd.), *P. Vergilius Maro, Bucolica et Georgica* (Berlin, 2013).
[9] 'How textual conjectures are made', *MD* 26 (1991), 91.

OVID'S EPIC FOREST: A NOTE ON *AMORES* 3.1.1–6[1]

As the first poem of the last book of Ovid's *Amores*, 3.1 parallels the programmatic *recusatio* of the first two books, which present the traditional opposition of elegy to

[1] I would like to thank Cillian O'Hogan, Alison Keith, Kevin Lawson, Jarrett Welsh, *CQ*'s anonymous referee and its editor, Bruce Gibson, for their helpful comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to James C. McKeown and Brian Walters for generously sharing their unpublished work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000402 Published online by Cambridge University Press

epic.[2] In *Amores* 3.1, the personified Elegy and Tragedy compete for Ovid's poetic attention, and scholars have accordingly scrutinized the generic tension between elegy and tragedy in this poem.[3] My study, by contrast, focusses on the import of the metapoetic *locus* in which Ovid sets his contest between the two genres, by considering the linguistic and allusive play in the opening lines. Ovid exploits the metaphor of literary tradition as an ancient and sacred forest to transform an author's choice of poetic genre into a walk in the woods. Moreover, allusions to Virgil's *Aeneid* 6.179 and Ennius' *Annales* 175 (Sk.) in the first line guide Ovid's audience to expect the more traditional opposition of elegy and epic. The less conventional contest between the genres of elegy and tragedy soon overturns this expectation; nevertheless, elegy's customary opposite, epic, maintains a presence in the form of a woodland context for Ovid's innovative generic opposition.

The poem begins with the narrator strolling through an ancient, uncut forest (*Am.* 3.1.1–6):[4]

> stat uetus et multos incaedua silua per annos;
> credibile est illi numen inesse loco.
> fons sacer in medio speluncaque pumice pendens,
> et latere ex omni dulce queruntur aues.
> hic ego dum spatior tectus nemoralibus umbris,
> quod mea quaerebam Musa moueret opus.

Hinds has noted that the word *silua* was used metaphorically in Roman literature (following the figurative use of the Greek ὕλη, 'matter', 'raw material') to mean rhetorical or poetic material.[5] Hinds points to Cicero's use of the term in this sense at *Orat.* 3.12: *omnis enim ubertas et quasi silua dicendi ducta ab illis est.*[6] So Virgil's *antiquam siluam* at the funeral of Misenus (*Aen.* 6.179–82) has been read as a reference to the literary *materia* he reworks, Ennius' *Annales* and Homer's *Iliad*, as well to the specific forest, whose literary antecedents can be found in Latin at *Ann.* 175–9 (Sk.) and, more distantly, in Greek at *Il.* 23.114–20.[7]

[2] See J. Farrell, 'Ovid's generic transformations', in P. Knox (ed.), *A Companion to Ovid* (Malden, MA, 2009), 370–80 for a recent discussion of the *recusatio* in Roman erotic elegy with further bibliography.

[3] See e.g. G. Bretzigheimer, *Ovid's Amores: Poetik in der Erotik* (Tübingen, 2001), 61–76; J.T. Davis, *Fictus Adulter: Poet as Actor in the* Amores (Amsterdam, 1989), 108–13; M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress* (Oxford, 2002), 115–54.

[4] I quote the text of Ovid's amatory poetry from E.J. Kenney (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores Medicamina Faciei Femineae Ars Amatoria Remedia Amoris* (Oxford, 1995).

[5] S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), 12. See *OLD*, s.v. *silua,* 5b; A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, histoire des mots* (Paris, 1959), s.v. *silva*; R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), s.v. *silva*. See also Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.34; Gell. praef. 5–6.; Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.17; Tert. *De anim.* 2.6. See D. Petrain, 'Hylas and *silva*', *HSPh* 100 (2000), 409–21 and A.M. Keith, *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure* (London, 2008), 125 for the play of ὕλη as *materia* in Prop. 1.20; with respect to Statius' title, *Silvae* (*Silv.* 3 pr. 7, 4. pr. 25), see e.g. D.F. Bright, *Elaborate Disarray: The Nature of Statius'* Silvae (Meisenheim am Glan, 1980), 20–49; C. Newlands, *Statius Silvae II* (Cambridge, 2011), 6–7; and D. Wray, 'Wood: Statius' *Silvae* and the poetics of genius', *Arethusa* 40 (2007), 127–43.

[6] I quote the text of Cicero's *Orator* from A.S. Wilkins (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica, Tomus II* (Oxford, 1903).

[7] Hinds (n. 5), 11–14; for a comparison of all three passages and bibliography, see e.g. G. Jackson, 'Commentario al Libro VI', in E. Flores, P. Esposito, G. Jackson and D. Tomasco (edd.), *Quinto Ennio Annali (Libri I–VIII), Vol. II* (Naples, 2002), 122–8; O. Skutsch, *The Annales of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), 340–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000402 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Horace and Cicero appear to exploit this metaphor in their own representations of literary composition. Horace represents Albius [Tibullus] walking slowly through the woods while composing poetry: *scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula uincat, | an tacitum* ***siluas*** *inter* ***reptare*** *salubris* (*Epist.* 1.4.3–5).[8] Cicero, too, describes himself as 'hiding in the forest' during a period of intense philosophical thought and composition: *cumque mane* ***me in siluam abstrusi*** *densam et asperam, non exeo inde ante uesperum*, *Att.* 12.15.[9] Like the *siluae* of Horace and Cicero, Ovid's *uetus … silua* is both a shady place for a walk (*Am*. 3.1.5) and the 'forest' of work belonging to his literary predecessors. The metaphorical resonance of *silua* is underlined by the ostensible purpose of his walk, to find poetic inspiration (3.1.6), and by the epiphany there of two personified poetic genres: Elegy (7) and Tragedy (11).[10]

Ovid characterizes this *silua* as *uetus* (3.1.1), a descriptor which echoes Virgil's *antiquam siluam* (*Aen.* 6.179) and speaks to the age of the literary tradition and his own sense of belatedness. He also characterizes this forest as *multos incaedua … per annos*. Its untouched character could indicate the purity and sanctity of his literary inheritance, for groves belonging to gods are commonly uncultivated.[11] Moreover, Hinds, following Richard Thomas, suggests that Virgil's *antiquam siluam* may have a divine aspect based on the common conception of archaic literature as sacred.[12] The poet-narrator explicitly comments on this possibility: *credibile est illi numen inesse loco* (3.1.2). As Newlands notes, however, *incaedua* may have another metapoetic connotation. The singular *silua* is used to describe 'a certain randomness and lack of literary refinement'.[13] The forest in which Ovid finds himself has been uncultivated for many years, suggesting a long and sacred tradition, but one which is unsophisticated and in need of improvement.

By strolling through a forest of literary tradition, Ovid's poet-narrator is, in a sense, browsing for a genre: *hic ego dum spatior tectus nemoralibus umbris, | quod mea quaerebam Musa moueret opus* (*Am.* 3.1.5–6).[14] It is entirely fitting, therefore, that

[8] See A.M. Keith, 'Slender verse: Roman elegy and ancient rhetorical theory', *Mnemosyne* 52 (1999), 41–62, at 48, on the resonance of *siluae* in Hor. *Epist.* 1.4 (with a comparison to *Am.* 3.1). I quote the text of Horace's *Epistulae* from E.C. Wickham (ed.), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Oxford, 1901).

[9] See B. Walters, 'Cicero's *silva* (a note on *Ad Atticum* 12.15)' *CQ* 63 (2013), 426–30, who argues that Cicero is metaphorically describing the writing process in this letter. I quote the text of Cicero's *Ad Atticum* from D.R. Shackleton-Bailey (ed.), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, vol. 5 (Cambridge, 1966).

[10] Bretzigheimer (n. 3), 62, R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus* (Cambridge, 2006), 29, Keith (n. 8), 48, and J.C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes* (n.d.), *Vol. 4*, on 3.1 briefly mention but do not elaborate on the metapoetic connotation of *silua* at *Am.* 3.1.

[11] Cf. e.g. the description of Diana's sacred grove in Ov. *Met.* 3.155–64 (*arte laboratum nulla*, 3.158) and Erysichthon's violation of Ceres' sacred grove at *Met.* 8.738–878 (*ille etiam Cereale nemus uiolasse securi | dicitur et lucos ferro temerasse uetustos*, 741–2); and see further McKeown (n. 10), on *Am*. 3.1; R.F. Thomas, 'Tree violation and ambivalence', *TAPhA* 118 (1988), 261–73, at 263–5.

[12] Hinds (n. 5), 14; Thomas (n. 11), 261–73. Hinds cites Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.88: *Ennium, sicut sacros uetustate lucos, adoremus*, and Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.54: *adeo sanctum est uetus omne poema*.

[13] C. Newlands, *Statius'* Silvae *and the Poetics of Empire* (Cambridge, 2002), 36 cites Serv. Auct. *Aen.* 1.310, who defines *silua* as an uncultivated grove (*silua diffusa et inculta*; cf. *OLD* s.v. *silua*, 2), and Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.17, where *silua* is a hasty literary production (*diuersum est huic eorum uitium qui primo decurrere per materiam stilo quam uelocissimo uolunt, et sequentes calorem atque impetum ex tempore scribunt: hanc siluam uocant*). Walters (n. 9) traces this connotation of *silua* back to Cicero.

[14] We may find another instance of *spatior* in the sense of browsing at *Ars am*. 1.67, where the poet-teacher directs his pupils to 'stroll' down the Portico of Pompey as they search for a *puella*:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000402 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he should find himself confronted by Elegy and Tragedy, appropriately costumed, and advertising their distinct generic codes: *uenit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos, | et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat … uenit et ingenti uiolenta Tragoedia passu: | fronte comae torua, palla iacebat humi* (3.1.7–8, 11–12).[15] In the end the poet-narrator asks Tragedy to be patient while he finishes his *breue* elegiac *opus* (68). Tragedy relents but her *grandius opus* (70) pursues him.

Among the literary predecessors which *Am*. 3.1 evokes, the most contemporary is Propertius 3.1 and 3.3. Along with its location in the collection, the *incipit* of Ovid's third book mirrors that of Propertius 3.1 in its context and subject matter.[16] In this poem, Propertius begs Callimachus' ghost and Philitas' *sacra* (Prop. 3.1.1) for permission to enter their grove (*nemus*, 3.1.2) – a sacred and natural setting. Prop. 3.3, in which Apollo and Calliope turn the poet's attention from dreams of epic back to elegy, has also been identified as a model for Ovid *Am.* 3.1.[17] Ovid's twofold allusion creates an association with Propertius' Callimachean aesthetics which informs 3.1, if not the entire collection.

Ovid's *uetus silua*, however, adds a third generic dimension to his poem which Propertius' lacks.[18] For *multos … per annos* (*Am.* 3.1.1) could suggest Ennius' title, *Annales*, signalled by similar alliteration, assonance and vocabulary in both the Ennian forest (***inced****unt arbust****a per a****lt****a***, *securibus* ***caed****unt*, *Ann.* 175 Sk.) and Ovid's own (*stat uetus et multos* ***incaed****ua silu****a per a****nnos*, *Am.* 3.1.1). As Skutsch has noted, 'each colon [in Ennius' passage] is held together by alliteration and assonance'.[19] And indeed the opening lines of both passages share a similar unifying acoustical structure. Nor is Virgil forgotten, however, for Ovid has placed the description of the forest's venerable age (*uetus*) in the first half of the opening line, precisely where it is found in Virgil's passage (*antiquam*, *Aen.* 6.179), and Ovid has added the sibilant 's' in the second colon, which connects Virgil's two cola at the caesura (*itur in* ***antiqu****am* *silu****am***, *st****a****bul****a a****lt****a*** *fer****a****rum*, *Aen.* 6.179)[20] while retaining the assonantal 'a' also found in Ennius (quoted above): *st****a****t uetus et multos incaedu****a*** *silu****a*** *per* ***a****nnos*, *Am.* 3.1.1.

In the first line of the book, and in a programmatic *recusatio*, allusions to the revered Latin epics of Ennius and Virgil would not be surprising. It would in fact be

tu modo Pompeia lentus ***spatiare*** *sub umbra.* The narrator of *Am.* 3.1 will indeed come upon *puellae* – the embodiments of the poetic choices available for his *ars.* I am grateful to B. Gibson for drawing this to my attention. See further A.M. Keith, '*Corpus eroticum:* elegiac poetics and elegiac *puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*', *CW* 88 (1994), 27–40 and Wyke (n. 3), 115–54 for the construction of the *puella* as the subject and the *corpus* of the elegiac poet in the *Amores*.

[15] See e.g. C.A. Perkins, 'The figure of Elegy in *Amores* 3.1: Elegy as *puella,* Elegy as *poeta, puella* as *poeta*', *CW* 104 (2011), 313–31, at 313–17, for a recent discussion of their traits with further bibliography.

[16] B.W. Boyd, *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the* Amores (Ann Arbor, 1997), 196; Hunter (n. 10), 28–30; W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 296; Wyke (n. 3), 122.

[17] K.E. Berman, 'Ovid, Propertius and the elegiac genre: some imitations in the *Amores*', *Rivista di Studi Classici* 23 (1975), 14–22, at 15–16; A. De Caro, *Si qua fides: gli Amores di Ovidio e la persuasione elegiaca* (Palermo, 2003), 140; G. Luck, 'The cave and the source', *CQ* 7 (1957), 175–9, at 179 n. 3; McKeown (n. 10); K. Morgan, *Ovid's Art of Imitation* (Leiden, 1977), 17–20; and Wimmel (n. 16), 296. Boyd (n. 16), 196–8, moreover, points to Prop. 4.1 for a model of a generic ἀγών closer to the one faced by the Ovidian narrator.

[18] Contra: R.K. Gibson, *Excess and Restraint: Propertius, Horace, and Ovid's* Ars Amatoria (London, 2007), 74, who argues that *Am.* 3.1 relies on the 'binary polarities' characteristic of elegy.

[19] Skutsch (n. 7), 342.

[20] I quote the text of Virgil from R.A.B. Mynors (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1969).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000402 Published online by Cambridge University Press

familiar, for the first line of the first book of *Amores* begins with an allusion to the first line of Virgil's *Aeneid* (***arma*** *uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris*, *Aen.* 1.1; ***arma*** *graui numero uiolentaque bella parabam*, *Am.* 1.1.1). Prop. 3.3.6, moreover, names Ennius as a potential model before the poet's loyalty to the elegiac genre is restored. Such allusion in *Am.* 3.1 to both epic poems, *Annales* and *Aeneid*, introduces direct engagement with the topos of the literary forest that goes back to Homer's *Iliad* and sets up the expectation of the usual generic opposition of epic to elegy. Although epic has ostensibly been replaced by the other grand genre of tragedy, it maintains a presence, embodied by the forest itself. Far from being superseded, epic, in fact, serves as the context for this new generic rivalry – a reminder, perhaps, that the epic genre provides the material from which all other genres draw.

University of Tennessee, Knoxville JESSICA WESTERHOLD
jwester3@utk.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838813000402

FORGETTING THE *ARS MEMORIAE*: OVID, *REMEDIA AMORIS* 579–84

During his encounter with Lethaeus Amor in the *Remedia amoris*, in which he discusses techniques to forget a former lover, Ovid writes the following:

> quisquis amas, loca sola nocent: loca sola caveto;
> quo fugis? in populo tutior esse potes.
> non tibi secretis (augent secreta furores)
> est opus; auxilio turba futura tibi est.
> tristis eris, si solus eris, dominaeque relictae
> ante oculos facies stabit, ut ipsa, tuos.

This passage has been discussed in Hardie's treatment of Lethaeus Amor, and, while he directly addresses Ovid's use of *loci* in this passage as I shall below, his focus is on the rich intertextuality – textual remembrances – within the *Remedia* rather than the use of *loci* in the *ars memoriae* proper.[1] Hardie points out numerous intertexts in the *Remedia*, using the character of Lethaeus Amor to highlight the paradox of a learned reader of love poetry being unable to forget the poetry he has read, despite this specific oblivion being a precondition for curing oneself of love (as clearly directed at *Rem. am.* 755–66). In this case, the *loca sola* Ovid warns against are 'topics of solitude' which 'conjure up

[1] P. Hardie, 'Lethaeus Amor: the art of forgetting', in R. Gibson, S. Green and A. Sharrock (edd.), *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria *and* Remedia Amoris (Oxford, 2006). For Simonides' 'invention' of mnemotechnics, see Plut. *Mor.* 346F. Aside from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (3.28–40), the *ars memoriae* is discussed by Cicero (*De or.* 2.351–60) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 11.2.1–51). See also F. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago, 1966), 1–49 and C. Baroin, 'Techniques, arts et pratiques de la mémoire en Grèce et à Rome', *Mètis* 5 (2007), 135–60. *Loci* and vivid description, a topic also represented in this passage from the *Rem.* and which will be discussed below, are discussed by A. Vasaly, *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley, 1993), 100–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838813000402 Published online by Cambridge University Press