virgiliana si avvicini di più alla regina di Cartagine nell'identificare esclusivamente con una prospettiva di terrore l'ipotesi di fuggire con Giasone: accade così che un tormentato sogno d'amore si trasformi nell'esclusiva visione del castigo.

Università di Pisa

S.J. Heyworth

Some allusions to Callimachus in Latin poetry

At «Class. Quart.» 43, 1993, 255-7 I explored Vergil's creative allusion at *Aen*, 3, 84 ff. to a couple of passages from Callimachus's Hymns[1]. Here I wish to pursue some more allusions to Callimachus in the Latin poets, most of them familiar but not explored as fully as they might be. Interest in the exploitation of Callimachus has centred, reasonably enough, on his poetics and the motifs through which he expressed them; in this area the seminal works are W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* («Hermes Einzelschriften» 16, Wiesbaden 1960), and W. Clausen, *Callimachus & Roman poetry*, «Gr. Rom. Byz. Stud.» 5, 1964, 181-96. To this research I hope my article will make some contribution; but first I wish to explore another field in which the Alexandrian served as a model to Romans: poetic encomium[2].

We may start with two passages where echoes of the Hymn to Apollo raise the woman addressed to divine status: firstly **Catullus 61, 76-8**[3]:

> claustra pandite ianuae.
> uirgo adest. uiden ut faces
> splendidas quatiunt comas?[4]

This article has been much improved by the helpful criticisms and comments of Stephen Hinds, Bruce Gibson, Kannon Shanmugam, and the journal's editorial team, to whom I owe a debt of gratitude.

1. For further exploration of Vergil's exploitation of Callimachus (esp. *H.* 4), see A. Barchiesi, *Immovable Delos: Aeneid 3.73-98 and the hymns of Callimachus*, «Class. Quart.» 44, 1994, 438-443.

2. R.H.A. Jenkyns has recently drawn attention to this as a major element in the attraction of Callimachus for the Augustan poets: «Am. Journ. Philol.» 114, 1993, 117.

3. A fair number of the details are mentioned by P. Fedeli, *Il carme 61 di Catullo*, Freiburg 1972, 55-6; on pp. 13-14 he usefully elaborates Wilamowitz's observation that the mimetic technique of the whole poem is indebted to the hymns of Callimachus.

4. A four-line lacuna follows.

The previous fifteen stanzas have been concerned with the invocation of Hymen, and the god has been bidden to dress like the bride (6-10). Suddenly we have an epiphany; but though it is the bride who appears, her dress, and the rhetorical structure equate her with Hymen (as seems appropriate: without the bride there will be no wedding), and the expression draws heavily on Apollo's epiphany at Callimachus *Hymn* 2, 4-7[5]:

> οὐχ ὁράᾳς; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δήλιος ἡδύ τι φοῖνιξ
> ἐξαπίνης, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἠέρι καλὸν ἀείδει.
> αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων,
> αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακράν.

The instruction that the doors be opened is followed, as in the Hymn, by an explanation that the bride/deity is at hand[6]; *uiden ut*[7] reproduces οὐχ ὁράᾳς; and even the torches imitate Callimachus's palm in the shaking of their *comas* (a word more commonly used of leaves). The phrasing of *claustra pandite ianuae*[8] mimics precisely κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων; and the echo might be taken as implying that *ianuae* is genitive. On the other hand, Catullus has left open the possibility that it is vocative plural, and that as in the model it is the inanimate objects that are addressed and not human attendants.

Propertius 3, 10 begins with an epiphany: at dawn (the coming of Phoebus) the Camenae announce Cynthia's birthday; it continues with instructions for the appropriate ritual for this festival day (5-10):

5. All that I say on this poem is indebted to the commentary of F. Williams (Oxford 1978).

6. For this reason I should reject the *ades* of Schrader (adopted by Fedeli and Goold). The lacuna would provide plenty of room for a *tu* or a vocative to lead into the second persons of 82 ff. (and presumably then, with Goold, *fles* in 81); but better, I suspect, is to have the address of Aurunculeia begin at 82, where the presence of her name in the vocative suggests just such a turn from description to exhortation.

7. This may also represent a motif of archaic Greek epithalamium, as suggested by A. Griffiths, «Quad. Urb. Cult. Class.» 14, 1972, 13, with a reference to Alcman 1, 50.

8. There is a neat closural echo of this at 224: *claudite ostia, uirgines: claudite* collapses *claustra pandite*; *ostia* varies *ianuae*; and *uirgines* draws attention to the change of status being enjoyed at this moment by the earlier *uirgo*.

> transeat hic sine nube dies, stent aere uenti,
> ponat et in sicco molliter unda minas.
> aspiciam nullos hodierna luce dolentis,
> et Niobae lacrimas supprimat ipse lapis;
> Alcyonum positis requiescant ora querelis,
> increpet absumptum nec sua mater Itym.

Cynthia, who derives her name from the Callimachean Apollo[9], is treated as a divinity; she is to have her day marked with the universal silence and absence of grief that marks the epiphany of Apollo in Callimachus's hymn (2, 18-24)[10]

> εὐφημεῖ καὶ πόντος, ὅτε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί
> ἢ κίθαριν ἢ τόξα, Λυκωρέος ἔντεα Φοίβου.
> οὐδὲ Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα κινύρεται αἴλινα μήτηρ,
> ὁππoθ' ἰὴ παιῆον ἰὴ παιῆον ἀκούσῃ.
> καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,
> ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,
> μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς ὀϊζυρόν τι χανούσης.

The stillness of the sea is broadened to include fair weather in general (*aere*[11], 5, echoing ἠέρι, 2, 5). Thetis, a mythological doublet of the sea in the model, is omitted; and replaced by a general rejection of grieving. Niobe is retained, and in this briefer version named; *et* reproduces the καί of the original. Whereas Callimachus limited the images of constant grief to these two, the mothers whose woe was caused by Apollo himself, Propertius adds two new figures; halcyons are to lay aside their complaints (*querelae*) for Ceyx, and the mother of Itys is not to utter her song of lamentation. The stress here is on the singing to be abandoned: no elegiac grief in this birthday elegy (contrast Ov. *Am.* 3, 9, 1; *Cons. Liv.* 105 ff, 427 ff). This programmatic point seems to be Propertius's substitute for the fascinating, but as yet unexplained, link between H. 2, 18-24 with

9. fr. 114, 8, and especially 67, 6. The opening of 1, 1 (where Cynthia is of course first named) draws on 67, 1-6 in other respects: *Amor ... me docuit* (4-5) > Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν Ἀκόντιον (so M. Puelma, «Mus. Helv.» 39, 1982, 288); *artes* (17) > τέχνην. Some aspects of Cynthia's descent from Cynthius are drawn out by S. Hinds, «Ramus» 16, 1987, 12-13. On Κύνθιος of Apollo in Callimachus, see W. Clausen, «Am. Journ. Philol.» 97, 1976, 245-7, and 98, 1977, 362.

10. The reworking is commonly picked up the commentaries.

11. So also at 4, 6, 9.

its Thetis (= πόντος) and Niobe as weeping rock (= a spring) and the poetic symbolism of verses 105-12, where πόντος (and Euphrates) and pure spring are strikingly contrasted. Callimachus seems to expect all other poetry to be hushed[12] whilst Apollo is hymned (indicating the whole by mentioning the extremes); Propertius makes a more limited point, defining his poem within its genre. Though, by speaking of halcyons and nightingales, he has contaminated the water-images of his model, he has introduced the Camenae, not only sources of inspiration from the time of Livius Andronicus, but also Italian water-nymphs[13].

More commonly Callimachean encomium, whether of a god or a Ptolemy, is used as background for praise of the *princeps*. So at **Horace *Carm.* 3, 1, 1-8.**

> Odi profanum uulgus et arceo.
> fauete linguis. carmina non prius
> audita Musarum sacerdos
> uirginibus puerisque canto.

The opening stanza of the Roman Ode[14] begins with a sentiment derived from an epigram of Callimachus (28, 1-4 Pfeiffer):

> Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
> χαίρω τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει,
> μισῶ καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
> πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.

and a pose (that of priest/poet/master-of-ceremonies) found in the Hymns, especially the Second (2, 2: ἑκάς, ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός; 2, 17: εὐφημεῖτ' ἀίοντες ἐπ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἀοιδῇ). The opening allusions give weight to that found in the second stanza:

12. On the silence for song here, see P. Bing, *Improvisation of voice in Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo*, «Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.» 123, 1993, 181-98, esp. 186. Kannon Shanmugam points out that χανούσης contributes vividly to the picture of silence.

13. As Bruce Gibson reminds me.

14. I take it that Porphyrio's evidence that 3, 1-6 is a single poem is correct. I deal with some aspects of the question in a forthcoming paper, *Dividing poems*, to be published in the Proceedings of the 1993 Erice conference on *Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by O. Pecere and M.D. Reeve.

> regum timendorum in proprios greges,
> reges in ipsos imperium est Iouis,
> clari giganteo triumpho
> cuncta supercilio mouentis.

The commentary of Gordon Williams (Oxford 1969) usefully brings out the way this encapsulates the thought of a passage from Callimachus's First Hymn, to Zeus[15], and in his Appendix (p. 155) he cites *Hymn* 1, 70-85. However, by choosing those limits for his quotation he obscures a further point.

> εἵλεο δ' αἰζηῶν ὅ τι φέρτατον· οὐ σύ γε νηῶν
> ἐμπεράμους, οὐκ ἄνδρα σακέσπαλον, οὐ μὲν ἀοιδόν·
> ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μακάρεσσιν ὀλίζοσιν αὐθι παρῆκας
> ἄλλα μέλειν ἑτέροισι, σὺ δ' ἐξέλεο πτολιάρχους
> αὐτούς, ὧν ὑπὸ χεῖρα γεωμόρος, ὧν ἴδρις αἰχμῆς,
> ὧν ἐρέτης, ὧν πάντα· τί δ' οὐ κρατέοντος ὑπ' ἰσχύν;
> αὐτίκα χαλκῆας μὲν ὑδείομεν Ἡφαίστοιο,
> τευχηστὰς δ' Ἄρηος, ἐπακτῆρας δὲ Χιτώνης
> Ἀρτέμιδος, Φοίβου δὲ λύρης εὖ εἰδότας οἴμους·
> ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες, ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων
> θειότερον· τῷ καί σφε τεὴν ἐκρίναο λάξιν.
> δῶκας δὲ πτολίεθρα φυλασσέμεν, ἴζεο δ' αὐτὸς
> ἄκρῃσ' ἐν πολίεσσιν, ἐπόψιος οἵ τε δίκῃσι
> λαὸν ὑπὸ σκολιῇσ' οἵ τ' ἐμπαλιν ἰθύνουσιν·
> ἐν δὲ ῥυηφενίην ἔβαλές σφισιν, ἐν δ' ἄλις ὄλβον·
> πᾶσι μέν, οὐ μάλα δ' ἴσον. ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι
> ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι· περιπρὸ γὰρ εὐρὺ βέβηκεν.
> ἐσπέριος κεῖνός γε τελεῖ τά κεν ἦρι νοήσῃ·
> ἐσπέριος τὰ μέγιστα, τὰ μείονα δ', εὖτε νοήσῃ.
> οἱ δὲ τὰ μὲν πλειῶνι, τὰ δ' οὐχ ἑνί, τῶν δ' ἀπὸ πάμπαν
> αὐτὸς ἄνην ἐκόλουσας, ἐνέκλασσας δὲ μενοινήν.

Zeus chose as his special responsibility kings, under whose power live all other men in their various functions. Even amongst kings there is inequality: at the climax of the passage (85-90), Ptolemy (ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι) is set above other rulers, and through the announcement of the efficacy of his will is implicitly compared to Zeus himself (cf. 57, ἀλλ' ἔτι παιδνὸς ἐὼν

15. Verse 6 reproduces 79 (ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες), and the previous verse's stress on the power kings have over others establishes that Callimachus, not Hesiod *Theog.* 96, is in Horace's mind.

ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια). There is a sense of a natural hierarchy, with Zeus at the summit (and Ptolemy as his earthly equivalent); so in the Horatian stanza Jove is to kings as kings are to their 'flocks'. Anaphora with polyptoton (*regum ... / reges*) and jingles like *greges/ reges* are very frequent in the Hymns (cf. for the former, e.g., 2, 1-2, 6-7, 17-18; for the latter 1, 58 τῶ τοι καὶ γνωτοί; 2, 101-2 ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ/ βάλλων): the occurrence here reinforces the sense that Horace is adopting a Callimachean pose. Within the passage cited parallelism of phrasing is most marked in 87-8, ἐσπέριος... νοήσῃ (repeated). And note that Jupiter does everything with ease (*supercilio*) – like Ptolemy (87-8). But Horace has nothing about the place of his master within the hierarchy. One purpose of the allusion is, I believe, to suggest panegyric without actually indulging in it. The Augustan poets are not afraid to write open encomium, but they also like to provide it subtly. Manifest praise of Augustus will follow later in the poem – he is given an immortal future at 3, 3, 12 and 3, 5, 2, for example; and the conjecture that we are to associate Jove and Augustus at this point is confirmed by the equation of the two in 3, 4, 42 ff.[16], where the battle of gods and giants is recounted, an episode foreshadowed by *giganteo triumpho* here.

A similarly covert piece of eulogy, suggesting the equivalence of Augustus and Apollo through allusion to Callimachus, can be found in **Propertius 2, 31, 1-6.** Awareness of this will help in consideration of a textual difficulty.

> QVAERIS cur ueniam tibi tardior? aurea Phoebi
> porticus a magno Caesare aperta fuit.
> tota erat in spatium Poenis digesta columnis,
> inter quas Danai femina turba senis.
> hic equidem Phoebo uisus mihi pulchrior ipso, 5
> marmoreus tacita carmen hiare lyra.

3 tota ς: tanta Ω spatium *Heinsius*: speciem Ω 5-6 *post* 16 *Dousa f.* equidem] Phoebus *Hoeufft* Phoebus ς

16. All three passages themselves have Hellenistic precedents, as Kannon Shanmugam shows me: 3, 3, 12 > Theoc. 17, 17-33, esp. 28-9; 3, 5, 2 > Hermocles 174, 17 Powell; 3, 4, 42 ff. > Call. *H.* 4, 174. For gigantomachy in the representation of Actium, see P. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1986, 97 ff.

The transmitted text cannot stand in 5-6, unless we change the context, for example by placing the couplet after 15-16 (with the younger Dousa): *hic* can refer only to Caesar, who is not marble, or Danaus, who would not be holding a lyre. The transposition itself leads to an odd superfluity: *carmina sonat* (16) and *carmen hiare lyra* (6) both specify that the statue represents Apollo *citharoedus*; it may therefore be disregarded.

There are a number of considerations to be borne in mind if we try to emend the couplet *in situ*:

(a) *equidem* is rarely employed where *ego* is not the subject, but it is used a few times (see *OLD* 1f) when, as here, the first person is the notional and not the actual subject. The use of a correct but rare construction makes it unlikely that *equidem* is an interpolation filling the gap left by the omission of *Phoebus* before *Phoebo*. The sense will be 'it seemed to my eyes at least', and Propertius is presumably making a controversial aesthetic judgement.

(b) The double construction after *uisus* finds an adequate parallel in 1, 3, 7-8 *talis uisa mihi mollem spirare quietem/ Cynthia*: the infinitive is equivalent in sense to an independent sentence.

(c) Verse 6 is a specific allusion to Callimachus *H.* 2, 24:

> καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,
> ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,
> μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς ὀϊζυρόν τι χανούσης.
> ἰὴ ἰὴ φθέγγεσθε· κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν. 25
> ὃς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο·
> ὅστις ἐμῷ βασιλῆι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο.

In his account of the opening of the portico of Apollo on the Palatine Propertius has taken from a Greek hymn to the same god the unusual construction *hiare* (= χάσκειν) + internal accusative[17], and then confirmed the allusion by placing *marmoreus* at the start of his line to echo μάρμαρον[18]. Niobe herself appears in verse 14, and the destruction of her children is paired on the doors of the temple with that of others who suffered

17. So J.P. Postgate, *Select elegies of Propertius*, London 1881, p. 145.

18. Itself perhaps suggestive of a statue: see B.H. Fowler, *The Hellenistic aesthetic*, Bristol 1989, 40-2.

through opposing the god – the Galli destroyed at Delphi (cf. Call. *H.* 4, 171-85)[19]. I suspect there is some purpose underlying these allusions. Callimachus flatters an unspecified Ptolemy in the following verses of his hymn (quoted above), and equates the ruler with Apollo[20]. Now Caesar regarded Apollo as one of his patron deities[21]. He dedicated the Palatine temple as early as 36 B.C., and the god, who had a temple overlooking the bay at Actium, was celebrated as having aided the victory there (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8, 704, 720; and Prop. 4, 6). Even more significant than this is the information provided by Servius ad *Ecl.* 4, 10 *Augustum, cui simulacrum factum est cum Apollinis cunctis imaginibus* and pseudo-Acro ad Hor. *ep.* 1, 3, 17 *Caesar in bibliotheca statuam sibi posuerat habitu ac statu Apollinis*[22]. It seems very likely that Propertius has in mind a statue of Apollo with the features of Octavian. Allusion to the Callimachean context helps confirm the panegyric, and implicitly compares the overt flattery of the model with Propertius's indirectness.

But what is the intended comparison? It can hardly be that Caesar is thought more beautiful than a statue of Phoebus: *hic* does not naturally refer to *Caesare* in 2, and we would need to make changes in the pentameter, writing *marmoreum* (or *marmoreo*) and *hiante* (and these would sit awkwardly with *ipso* – 'the god himself'). A pointed comparison would be between the new Phoebus modelled on Caesar and the famous *citharoedus* of Scopas in the temple itself (Plin. *Nat.* 36, 25); and this sense

19. As an anonymous reader suggests, *patria Phoebo carius Ortygia* (10) is a humorous reversal of *H.* 4, 269-73.

20. On this passage, see R.L. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius*, Cambridge 1993, 157-8; n. 22 suggests some further possible links between Callimachus's Hymns and Propertius 2, 31-2.

21. See, for example, Lily Ross Taylor, *The divinity of the Roman emperor*, Middletown, Connecticut 1931, 118-20, 131-4; and, for ancient association of the pair, Suetonius *Aug.* 70; 94, 4. A general discussion of the ways in which Callimachus's Apollo (and his association with Ptolemy) influences the Augustans' Apollo (and his association with Caesar) is offered by A. Gosling, «Mnemosyne» 45, 1992, 501-12.

22. Commentators claim this statue was bronze, but I have been unable to find any ancient evidence for this. Of course there may well have been more than one such statue.

might be obtained by replacing *ipso* with *illo*, and *Phoebo* with *Phoebus*: 'the statue of Phoebus here seemed to my eyes at least more beautiful than the other, famous one'. To the flattering poet a statue made in the image of Caesar would seem greater than one of the classic sculptures of the ancient world. But *illo* would be very vague. More likely is that Propertius finds the statue more beautiful than the god himself. But Hoeufft's conjecture removes the idiomatic *equidem*, as we have noted, and even with this change the description of the statue begins abruptly. It therefore seems preferable to posit a lacuna before verse 5, in which Propertius[23] introduces the Augustan Apollo which is compared so favourably with the god himself in verses 5-6.

More thorough-going in its imitation of the Hymn to Apollo is **Propertius 4, 6.** The relationship of these poems has been explored a number of times, e.g. by A. Rostagni, *Poeti alessandrini*, Torino 1916, 375-82; J.-P. Boucher, *Études sur Properce*, Paris 1965, 198-201; H.E. Pillinger, *Some Callimachean influences on Propertius Book IV*, «Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.» 73, 1969, 171-99, esp. 189-99; and in P. Fedeli's commentary on book 4 (Bari 1965); but there are threads still to be teased out.

The construction of the poem has similarities to that of Callimachus's hymn (as also to the Demeter hymn, but that does not have the additional points of contact): each (*H.* 2, 1-31; 4, 6, 1-14) begins with ritual announcements, the poet/priest/master-of-ceremonies giving orders for the proper celebration of Apollo's divinity; the formal hymn follows in each (*H.* 2, 32-104[24]; 4, 6, 15-68), and here is found the narrative element; both end with a comparatively informal passage (*H.* 2, 105-13: the encounter of Apollo and Phthonos; 4, 6, 69-86: a party for poets).

A major difference is that Propertius concentrates on one myth, the battle of Actium, whereas the keynote of Callimach-

23. Perhaps he pops his head into the library or perhaps he sees a statue outside. Archaeological speculations have been published by H. Last, «Journ. Rom. Stud.» 43, 1953, 27-9, and H. Jucker, «Mus. Helv.» 39, 1982, 93-5.

24. P. Bing, «Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.» 123, 1993, 187 rightly stresses the uncertainties facing a reader trying to mark the limits of the choral hymn; the beginning of the Propertian hymn is similarly unmarked.

us's poem is its variety; in describing the many[25] qualities and powers of the god he touches on Apollo and Admetus, Phoebus aged four founding an altar on Delos, the oracle guiding Battus to Cyrene, the slaying of the Python at Delphi. But Apollo as founder of cities dominates (55-96), and this Propertius reflects in a number of ways in his battle narrative: *Teucro ... Quirino* at 21 combines both parts of Rome's aetiology, and we then have the Trojan origin brought out at 37-8

> o Longa mundi seruator ab Alba,
> Auguste, Hectoreis cognite maior auis;

and at 43-4 Augustus's victory is presented as equivalent to the foundation by Romulus:

> quam nisi defendes, murorum Romulus augur
> ire Palatinas non bene uidit aues.

To this may be compared *H.* 2, 65-8:

> Φοῖβος καὶ βαθύγειον ἐμὴν πόλιν ἔφρασε Βάττῳ
> καὶ Λιβύην ἐσιόντι κόραξ ἡγήσατο λαῷ,
> δεξιὸς οἰκιστῆρι, καὶ ὤμοσε τείχεα δώσειν
> ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν· ἀεὶ δ' εὔορκος Ἀπόλλων[26].

Note in particular the significant bird, the mention of walls, and the sense that the original foundation was one that looked ahead to the future that is to the poet contemporary[27]. Apollo's words at 4, 6, 43-4 also develop an observation (that the continued existence of the city depends on what is done now) made at *H.* 2, 15:

> μήτε σιωπηλὴν κίθαριν μήτ' ἄψοφον ἴχνος
> τοῦ Φοίβου τοὺς παῖδας ἔχειν ἐπιδημήσαντος,
> εἰ τελέειν μέλλουσι γάμον πολιήν τε κερεῖσθαι,
> ἑστήξειν δὲ τὸ τεῖχος ἐπ' ἀρχαίοισι θεμέθλοις. 15

25. Cf. 34-5; 69-70.

26. εὔορκος Ἀπόλλων is matched by the *fides Phoebi* of 57 (so already Rostagni, loc. cit.).

27. Despite Williams *ad loc.*, it seems pointless to exclude the Ptolemies from the phrase ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν. The line is rather sardonic: 'Apollo swore to grant the walls to our kings: he always keeps his oaths' – of course, when they are couched in oracular ambiguity: it was likely that the kings of Cyrene would always be the kings of Cyrene.

Here we may notice a significant contrast: for Callimachus, lyre-playing and dancing are what the city's future depends upon; in Propertius's text it is military victory.

The Latin poet introduces other points of contact into his narrative. He includes an even briefer version of the Python myth (35-6). Callimachus (*H.* 2, 20-4) had evoked *Iliad* 24 through the mourning of Thetis (24, 84-6) and the story of Niobe (24, 602-17); Propertius, in this imitation, ignores this pair, but instead has a couplet (33-4) that recalls *Iliad* 1 (esp. 43-52). The arrival of Apollo (27-8[28]) is heralded by an echo of the other Apolline hymn, that to Delos, and in particular verses 192-4:

> πόδες δέ οἱ οὐχ ἑνὶ χώρῳ,
> ἀλλὰ παλιρροίῃ ἐπινήχεται ἀνθέρικος ὥς,
> ἔνθα νότος, ἔνθ' εὖρος, ὅπῃ φορέῃσι[29] θάλασσα.

In the prefatory lines too, Propertius provides not only the reference to Callimachus in 4 (*Cyrenaeas ... aquas*), but also some details drawn from the hymn: *sint ora fauentia* (1) > εὐφημεῖτε (17); the dismissal of mischief (9) > ἑκάς, ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός (2); *pura* (10) > 111 καθαρή; *laurea* (10) > δάφνινος ὄρπηξ (1). Some of the most interesting play with the model comes in verses 11-14:

> Musa, Palatini referemus Apollinis aedem:
> res est, Calliope, digna fauore tuo.
> Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina: Caesar
> dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse uaces.

In Callimachus the hymn is to be sung by a chorus of young men; here it is Calliope who is called on to assist the poet. But whereas Callimachus asks for noise (12) and congratulates the chorus when it begins (16), Propertius uses a word (*fauore*) for

28. R.J. Baker («Rhein. Mus.» 126, 1983, 159 n. 41) has a neat observation on how this couplet responds to another model: Propertius sets his fixed Delos in a context where Vergil had imagined the Cyclades sailing (*Aen.* 8, 691-2).

29. This could be related to the Propertian *tulit*; so one might be tempted to keep the transmitted *unda* as equivalent to θάλασσα; but that would require changing *nam ... iratos ... Notos* to *quam ... irato* (or *-is*) ... *Noto* (or *-is*), and Lipsius's *ante* (for *unda*) marks the alteration of Delos's state in an attractive way.

which context (*sint ora fauentia*, 1) offers the redefinition 'silence'; are we then to see Calliope as Propertius's equivalent of the audience, the sea, Thetis, Niobe (*H.* 2, 17-24)? There would be some satisfaction in that, for the poem is immediately 'led to Caesar's name' (13), and it is just after the passage on silence in the Hymn (2, 17-24) that we turn to the passage equating Apollo and Ptolemy (2, 25-27): the predecessor leads. Verses 4, 6, 11-13 in themselves suggest the intertwining of Caesar and Apollo (especially Palatine Apollo): mention of one leads to mention of the other. But here it is actually Caesar who is to be sung; and when verses 13-14 return us to verse 17 of the model (εὐφημεῖτ' ἀίοντες ἐπ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἀοιδῇ), Propertius thinks it appropriate to ask not just anyone who happens to be listening to be silent, but Jupiter himself. In Callimachus's Hymn, verse 29 (δύναται γάρ, ἐπεὶ Διὶ δεξιὸς ἧσται) attributes Apollo's power to Zeus; Propertius gives his subject superiority to the king of the gods. In the Hymn political eulogy enters only briefly, at 27-8 and 68; for the Augustan poet it is the subject that dominates, persisting even beyond the public ceremony into the symposium at the close.

The final section of 4, 6 has been neglected in discussions of Propertius's debt to Callimachus: even Cairns in his thorough examination of the poem[30] does no more than note that both end with «a passage of literary significance» (159). The run of thought is extraordinary in itself. *bella satis cecini* the poet announces at verse 69; Apollo demands the lyre, and disarms for peaceful choruses. But within ten lines we meet drunken poets singing of contemporary wars – the Sygambri, Ethiopia, the Parthian threat. Awareness of Propertius's debt to Callimachus heightens the sense that something odd is happening here. For Callimachus is the source of much of the language used by Latin poets in their rejections of epic, including (for example[31]) the seminal passage at the start of the Sixth Eclogue:

> cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
> uellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis

30. In A.J. Woodman & D.A. West (edd.), *Poetry & Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge 1984, 129-68 (229-36).

31. Cf. also Prop. 2, 1, 1-42; 3, 9, 35-46; and, for brief discussion, N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology*, Cambridge 1988, 98-101.

> pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen.' 5
> nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
> Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
> agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam.
>
> (Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 3-8)

which draws on Callimachus *Aetia* fr. 1, 3-4 and 21-4:

> εἵνεκεν οὐχ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[ήων
> πρήξι]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν ...
> καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα 21
> γούνασιν, 'Απόλλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος·
> .....] ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
> θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·

It is therefore startling to find such uncontrolled military panegyric evoked at the end of so Callimachean a poem.

A further surprise is the emphasis on wine, and the idea that drunkenness aids composition. It will need careful argumentation to show that this is to be associated with Propertius's exploitation of the Hymn to Apollo: an article by P.E.Knox[32] has cast doubt on the widespread belief that Callimachus was commonly regarded as a 'water-drinker', arguing that the equation comes first in an epigram of Antipater (*A.P.* 11, 20[33]), writing in the later Augustan or the Tiberian era:

> Φεύγεθ' ὅσοι λόκκας ἢ λοφνίδας[34] ἢ καμασῆνας
> ᾄδετε, ποιητῶν φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων[35],
> οἵ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες
> κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς[36] πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.

32. *Wine, water, and Callimachean poetics*, «Harv. Stud. Class. Philol.» 89, 1985, 107-19. When Knox claims that water was not seen as a source of poetry before the Alexandrians (109), he cites, but ignores the argument of M. Poliakoff, *Nectar, springs and the sea: critical terminology in Pindar and Callimachus*, «Zeitschr. Pap. Epig.» 39, 1980, 41-7.

33. = A.S.F. Gow & D.L. Page, *The Garland of Philip*, Cambridge 1968, 185-90; see vol. 2, pp. 18-20 for their discussion of his date.

34. A word found at Call. fr. 755.

35. Followers of Callimachus are called σῆτες ἀκανθολόγοι at *A.P.* 11, 347 (= *Garland of Philip* 3042); cf. also 11, 322, 2 (= 772), and 11, 321, 1 (= 3033).

36. Knox compares Call. *H.* 2, 112: κρήνης neatly replaces the more recherché πίδακος.

σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος ἦμαρ Ὁμήρου
σπένδομεν· ὁ κρητὴρ οὐ δέχεθ' ὑδροπότας.

However, the manner in which Propertius links Callimachus (and his programmatic colleague, Philitas) with water shows that for him at any rate the association is conventional: 3, 1, 1-6; 3, 3, 52; and, most significantly for our purposes, 4, 6, 4. Moreover, fr. 178 (the conversation with a like-minded man from Icos) depicts a Callimachus who rejects deep drinking of wine[37], and fr. 544 (τοῦ μεθυπλῆγος φροίμιον Ἀρχιλόχου[38]) demonstrates his willingness to use drunkenness as a defining characteristic of other poets. Opposition between the two sources of poetic inspiration is an old one, going back at least to the *Pytine* of Cratinus: cf. *A.P.* 13, 29, 1-4[39]:

Οἶνός τοι χαρίεντι πέλει ταχὺς ἵππος ἀοιδῷ,
ὕδωρ δὲ πίνων οὐδὲν ἂν τέκοις σοφόν[40].
τοῦτ' ἔλεγεν, Διόνυσε, καὶ ἔπνεεν οὐχ ἑνὸς ἀσκοῦ
Κρατῖνος ἀλλὰ παντὸς ὠδώδει πίθου.

The revival of the gnome by one of Meleager's epigrammatists shows that it was available to Propertius, as does the development of the motif by Horace in the opening lines of *Ep.* 1, 19:

Prisco si credis, Maecenas docte, Cratino,
nulla placere diu nec uiuere carmina possunt
quae scribuntur aquae potoribus. ut male sanos
adscripsit Liber Satyris Faunisque poetas,
uina fere dulces oluerunt mane Camenae.
laudibus arguitur uini uinosus Homerus;
Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma
prosiluit dicenda. forum putealque Libonis

37. See R. Scodel, «Zeitschr. Pap. Epig.» 39, 1980, 37-40, for a discussion of this fragment.

38. Catullus 27 perhaps draws on this picture of the drunken iambist: the poet asks for unadulterated wine, *calices amariores*, and dismisses water; T.P. Wiseman, *Catullan Questions*, Leicester 1969, 7-8, finds a programmatic note in this (taking the brief poem as one fit to introduce a sequence of committed invective), and various details in Mart. 11, 6 suggest that Martial did as well. Ovid has a possible echo of the phrase at *Ars* 3, 330, where *uinosi Teia Musa senis* follows mention of the (water-drinking?) Callimachus and Philitas in the hexameter.

39. Nicaenetus (= *Hellenistic Epigrams* 2711-14).

40. *PCG* Cratinus 203; cf. the comparative material there assembled.

mandabo siccis, adimam cantare seueris.
hoc simul edixi, non cessauere poetae
nocturno certare mero, putere diurno.

This is a particularly important piece for our purposes, as it links drunken composition so explicitly with military epic: Homer, and Ennius. The phrase *potus ad arma* (7) is inverted by Propertius in 4, 6, 70/75; and there is further indication that Propertius has Horace in mind when verses 85-6 combine echoes of *Ep.* 1, 19, 11, and *carm.* 3, 21, 21-4.

We have seen then that Propertius associates Callimachus with water, and we can be sure he was familiar with polemic on the alternative sources of poetic inspiration. And a key point has as yet gone unmentioned: the last few lines of the Hymn to Apollo form one of the passages[41] that provoked the association of Callimachus and the drinking of water; for it is surely as drinking water that the god compares the Euphrates and Demeter's spring:

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὔατα λάθριος εἶπεν·
οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει.
τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδε τ' ἔειπεν·
Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει.
Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.

[Envy said secretly in the ear of Apollo: 'I do not admire the poet who does not sing even as much as the sea <never mind as well>[42].' Apollo spurned Envy with his foot and said: 'The stream of the Assyrian river (Euphrates) is great, but it carries down much filth of the earth and much rubbish in its water. But to Demeter the bees (*or* priestesses) do not bring water

41. The diet of dew-drops at fr. 1, 33 and the Hesiodic waters of fr. 2 (+ 696) must also have contributed to this image. For scholarly discussion see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom*, «Hermes Einzelschriften» 16, Wiesbaden 1960, 222-33; A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*, Heidelberg 1965; and N.B. Crowther, *Water and wine as symbols of inspiration*, «Mnemosyne» 32, 1979, 1-11.

42. I do not think the text of 106 corrupt, and interpret the context rather as Williams does: πόντος must suggest Homer – hence the gloss.

from every source, but the little stream that springs up pure and undefiled from a holy fountain, the most perfect of waters.'] Callimachus closes his poem by having his god observe the difference between «the huge but polluted Euphrates (length, unity, magnitude, access for all and sundry; cf. ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές) and individual droplets from the purest spring (polish, refinement, exclusivity, discontinuity)»[43]: Apollo's preference is manifest. Propertius at verse 69-70 gestures towards a similar rejection of epic; we may well be reminded of 3, 1, 7; 15-22. Mention of the Euphrates (84) will confirm that the Hymn to Apollo continues to be in the poet's mind[44]. But the intervening lines overturn our expectation: the elegiac poet does not hope to find love at his symposium, and the poets who attend are not to sip the Callimachean water of verse 4, but to carouse like so many Horaces (compare how the party in *Carm.* 3, 14 completes the public celebration of Augustus's return). The content of their singing is determined by their source of inspiration, and marked by mention of the dirty[45] Euphrates: just the sort of panegyrical military poetry that is abhorred by the water-drinking Callimachus, and by Propertius himself.

What is the tone of this passage, in which water has been replaced by wine, the Callimachean by epic? Should we see it as a polemical correction of the poet's earlier aesthetic? Hardly: this is a book where he has described himself as *Callimachus Romanus* (4, 1, 64) and the poem itself is one of his most thorough imitations of his Greek master. Nor does the book in general accept epic material, at least not in any straightforward way: it elegiacizes all it touches – aristocratic marriages, the ghost of Patroclus, Tarpeia, the *spolia opima*. More sensible would be to see an announcement that Propertius now sees Augustan panegyric as an appropriate response to the times, indeed as the only possible response. Stahl presents the poet as here signing »the terms of the *pax Augusta*«[46]; of course, by writing a poem so panegyrical in form he does much to confirm the power of the *princeps*, but it is always open to the writer to leave gaps within the structure of his work through which ironies become visible to the reader[47]. And so it is here. The poem offers a condemnation of its own content: the discrepancy between the poet's aesthetic throughout his career and that apparently adopted here invites us to see irony in one or the other. *bella satis cecini* he says; but under the Augustan regime military poetry, like war itself, is unending. Actium is a triumph to end all triumphs – but then there are still the Sygambri, the Ethiopians, the Parthians to conquer; the dynasty needs new enemies to prove the manliness of its coming generations, and new victories to stimulate the inebriated wits of its pet poets. Propertius himself is no wine-drinking poet, but (85-6) he needs to indulge so he can endure through the dark night of the Augustan era till a new day dawns beyond.

43. I quote N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology*, Cambridge 1988, 87.

44. For the river as a marker of Callimachean passages in Vergil, see R.S. Scodel and R.F. Thomas, «Am. Journ. Philol.» 105, 1984, 339: they observe that each occurrence of the name Euphrates occurs, like Callimachus's 'Ασσυρίου ποταμοῖο, six lines from the end of a poem or book. For a different approach, see R.H.A. Jenkyns, «Am. Journ. Philol.» 114, 1993, 115-21; mention of the Euphrates at Ov. *Ars* 1, 223 (6 lines from the end of the triumph passage) might just be coincidental: Tigris and Euphrates are paired at Prop. 3, 4, 4, in a poem that Ovid's triumph repeatedly echoes (177-80 > 3, 4, 1-6; 179-80 > 3, 4, 9, and 3, 5, 48; 203 > 3, 4, 11; 213 > 3, 4, 12-13; 217 > 3, 4, 15; it also echoes 4, 6, in foreseeing the triumph of young Caesars). But it is perhaps more likely that Ovid is showing his awareness of the Vergilian detail, like Callimachus using λεπτός at *Ep.* 27, 3 to point his observation of Aratus's acrostic (*Phaen.* 783-7).

45. Note *nigras ... harenas*, 83. A referee draws my attention to the pun *Crasse, ... si sapis*: the vocative negates the condition, and thus the imperative *gaude*. And, in any case, the destination is a stupid one: cf. the play at 3, 5, 48, where the warmongerers against whom Propertius sets himself are described as *crassi*.

A third piece that uses echoes of the Hymn to Apollo for political panegyric belongs in an age when writers were more careful to keep hidden any ironies they may have felt: **Statius *Siluae* 5, 1, 32 ff.:**

> habentne pios etiamnum haec lumina fletus?
> mira fides! citius genetrix Sipylea feretur
> exhausisse genas, citius Tithonida maesti
> deficient rores aut exsatiata fatiscet
> mater Achilleis hiemes adfrangere bustis.

46. H.P. Stahl, *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'*, Berkeley 1985, 250-4.

47. Indeed, one should say that it is impossible for the writer to preclude ironies; but here the discrepancies and surprises are so great that the reader has to work hard to avoid them.

The poet consoles Abascantus for the death of his wife: a year has already passed since her death, but the lapse of time makes the offer of a consolatory poem appropriate, as it would not have been in the depths of the husband's grief. Even now mourning continues. With this assertion Statius emphasises Abascantus's sorrow: the description becomes so exaggerated as to seem critical, for a moment, before verses 37-42 correct that impression, by giving the emotion divine approval. He also provides a purpose for his rhetoric: to stem the flow of tears.

Mythological exempla stress the extraordinary persistence of Abascantus's grief: more quickly will the mother who came from (and returned to) Mount Sipylus be said to have worn out her cheeks (i.e. with weeping), more quickly will the dewdrops her sorrow produces fail the wife of Tithonus, or <more quickly> will the mother of Achilles grow sated and tired of breaking her storms on the tomb of her son. This is another artful version of the Callimachean Thetis and Niobe. In the Hymn to Apollo they are used to bring out the respect for the god felt even by those with most reason to hate him: the cessation of their continual lamentation stresses the delight of the god's festal day. Here the cessation of their lamentation stresses the continuing pain of Abascantus. Statius combines mention of Thetis with her identification as the sea (suggested by juxtaposition in the Hymn), and ingeniously associates the sea's storms with the position of Achilles' tomb on the headland at Sigeum (*Odyssey* 24, 80-4). *mater Achilleis* reproduces aspects of the Callimachean phrasing Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα ... μήτηρ. Only in the third case is there any indication of the person mourned; similarly in the Callimachus passage the children of Niobe go unmentioned. However, by calling Aurora *Tithonis* Statius posits another source of grief – the state of her husband. Not a word touches on the stony form of Niobe transmuted, and yet the idea of the eternity of her weeping depends upon the hardness of her features (cf. the description of the metamorphosis at Ov. *Met.* 6, 304-12). Each of the exempla is equivalent to a comparison from nature: sooner would stone be worn away by water, sooner the dawn cease to be dewy or the sea stormy. The addition of Aurora might be compared to that of the halcyons and Philomela at Propertius 3, 10, 9-10; but there is a delicate complexity to the additional colour it offers: to the spring and the sea are added another Callimachean source of water (cf. fr. 1, 33-4); to the two mothers of Apollo's victims is added the mother of Achilles' victim.

An artistic reworking of the familiar passage of Callimachus, then; but the following verses give the allusion even greater depth, for like the Hellenistic poet, and like Propertius in 2, 31, Statius goes on to eulogize his ruler (37-42):

> macte animi! notat ista deus qui flectit habenas
> orbis et humanos propior Ioue digerit actus,
> maerentemque uidet, lectique arcana ministri
> hinc etiam documenta capit, quod diligis umbram 40
> et colis exsequias. hic est castissimus ardor,
> hic amor a domino meritus censore probari.

These lines are commonly, and rightly, taken to refer to Domitian, who had chosen Abascantus as an assistant (39) and was *censor perpetuus* (42)[48]. But the terms used also evoke Apollo, seen as charioteer already in verse 17 (*altera cum uolucris Phoebi rota torqueat annum*): the sun-god 'controls the reins of a sphere[49]' (37-8) and has a closer involvement with human affairs than does Jupiter (certainly in astronomical terms); he moreover is 'all-seeing' (cf. *uidet*, 39), able to spy on even the man who loves the shade (40)[50]. Until we read *lecti ... ministri* not a word suits Domitian better than Apollo: Statius uses his allusion to Call. *H.* 2, 20-4 to introduce a passage that, like Call. *H.* 2, 26-7, equates an earthly ruler with the god[51].

Time to change tack, before the reader, with Nemesianus (*Cynegetica* 15-16) begins to ask *quis non Nioben numeroso funere maestam/ iam cecinit?* I turn to some passages where

48. *domino* (42) seems to become common of the emperor first with Domitian (see F. Bömer [Heidelberg 1958] on *Ov. Fast.* 2, 142; K.M. Coleman [Oxford 1988] on Stat. *Silu.* 4, *pr.* 27); it looks like a play on his name. For a review of the evidence that Domitian was regularly addressed as 'dominus et deus', see B.W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian*, London 1992, 108-9.

49. *orbis* might also be taken as 'wheel' (= 'chariot', by metonymy). The frequency of the word's use in astronomical contexts (*OLD* 6, 15) suggests the sun at least as strongly as the earth, and especially so in combination with *habenas*.

50. *ardor* (41) continues the imagery.

51. Apollo and Caesar are joined as the poet's patrons already at verses 13-15. The equation is continued, as a referee persuades me, at 76-83: *uidit ... uidit qui cuncta .... nec mirum: uidet ille ortus obitusque ...*

Callimachus's programmatic statements are the model and encomium plays no part. **Catullus 5 and 7** constitute perhaps the most notable of his separated pairs. Poem 7 brings Callimachus to mind when using grains of sand as an image for infinity, mentioning Cyrene (his home-town) and Battus (his 'ancestor'):

> Quaeris quot mihi basiationes
> tuae, Lesbia, sint satis superque.
> quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenae
> lasarpiciferis iacet Cyrenis
> oraclum Iouis inter aestuosi
> et Batti ueteris sacrum sepulchrum;
> aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox,
> furtiuos hominum uident amores:
> tam te basia multa basiare
> uesano satis et super Catullo est;
> quae nec pernumerare curiosi
> possint nec mala fascinare lingua.

The second image of infinity (the stars in the night sky) is one that Callimachus himself had used, *H.* 4, 175-6 (in Apollo's prophecy that Celts will attack Delphi):

> ῥώσωνται νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότες ἢ ἰσάριθμοι
> τείρεσιν, ἠνίκα πλεῖστα κατ' ἠέρα βουκολέονται.

Catullus has his own temporal clause in *cum tacet nox*[52]. These markers draw attention to a series of allusions to key motifs from Callimachus's progammatic statements that are to be found elsewhere in 7, and in 5:

> Viuamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus,
> rumoresque senum seueriorum
> omnes unius aestimemus assis.
> soles occidere et redire possunt;
> nobis cum semel occidit breuis lux,
> nox est perpetua una dormienda.
> da mi basia mille, deinde centum,
> dein mille altera, dein secunda centum,
> deinde usque altera mille, deinde centum.
> dein, cum milia multa fecerimus,

52. So C. Segal, «Mnemosyne» 27, 1974, 139-43, esp. 142.

> conturbabimus illa, ne sciamus,
> aut ne quis malus inuidere possit,
> cum tantum sciat esse basiorum.

Thus *perpetua una* (5, 6) echoes Call. fr. 1, 3 ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές; the disregarded *rumores senum* (5, 2) recall the pointless grumbling of the Telchines; probably to be included here is *con**turba**bimus* (5, 11), for later Callimacheans use *turba* as an image of all that is epic, pompous and unartistic: so Prop. 3, 1, 11-12

> et mecum in curru parui uectantur Amores
> scriptorumque meas **turba** secuta meas

and Prop. 3, 3, 23-4

> alter remus aquas, alter tibi radat harenas;
> tutus eris; medio maxima **turba** mari est.

However, it is hard to see where in the (extant) Callimachean corpus this idea originates; σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια (*Ep.* 28, 4 Pfeiffer) is the closest expression; abhorrence of the crowd seems also to underlie fr. 1, 25-8. More certain is the indebtedness of *inuidere* (5, 12) and *fascinare* (7, 12) to Call. *H.* 2, 105 (Φθόνος), to fr. 1 (the Telchines in general) and esp. fr. 1, 17-18[53]

> ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὅλοὸν γένος· αὖθι δὲ τέχνη
> κρίνετε,] μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην·

In this couplet, as elsewhere in the *Aetia* prologue, Callimachus argues that quality not quantity should be the criterion for judging art. The emphasis in the Catullian epigrams is entirely on number, described in 5 by the abacus-like summation of thousands and hundreds[54], and in 7 by the Callimachean comparisons. Is the denial of his master in aesthetics a means of

53. As was brought out by F. Cairns, «Mnemosyne» 26, 1973, 15-22, esp. 19.

54. Bruce Gibson reminds me that precision in high numbers recurs in the case of the unCallimachean poet opposed to Cinna at 95, 3; one might also compare 22, 3, of the output of Suffenus, rustic as a versifier. See J. Henderson, *Who's counting? Catullus by numbers* in H.D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Tria lustra (Festschrift Pinsent)*, Liverpool 1993, 243-54.

evincing the depth of his love? is the pairing a demonstration of unCallimachean and then Callimachean ways of treating the same idea? or is something more complex going on?

Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1, 1-4 is a very brief but tightly knit prologue for so long a poem. Many strands were unravelled by E.J. Kenney in «Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.» 22, 1976, 46-53; let us tease away at a few more.

> In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
> corpora: di, coeptis (nam uos mutastis et illa)
> adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi
> ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen.

2 uos ς: di ς illa ς: illas ω

perpetuum carmen (4) is commonly taken as a claim of either thematic or temporal continuity or both. One sense is forced on the reader by the words *prima ... ab origine mundi/ ad mea ... tempora* (in fact temporal continuity is broken, glaringly at 15, 745, between the arrival of Aesculapius in Rome and the deification of Julius Caesar). The other nuance is regularly linked with recognition of the echo of the Callimachean phrase ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές (*Aetia* fr. 1, 3); before turning to that other prologue, let me press the claims of a third connotation: a *perpetuum carmen* is a 'permanent poem', which will last unchanging, a work (*Met.* 15, 871-2)

> quod nec Iouis ira nec ignes
> nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas,

perenne, indelebile, uiuax. Thus Ovid's opening prayer concerns not only style and content but also achievement.

If a *carmen* is to last forever, what of an ἄεισμα? Is Ovid's epithet a fresh etymological gloss on his model's noun, or is the implication present in διηνεκές? Whilst (δι)ηνεκές is not equivalent in sense to ἀεί, it is certainly adjacent; we may note the phrase ἠνεκὲς αἰέν used by Empedocles (17, 35 D-K). Nor can it be denied that Callimachus is alive to the play between ἀεί and ἀείδω: see especially *H.* 1, 1-9, and Neil Hopkinson's comments at «Class. Quart.» 34, 1984, 139. Song confirms the immortality of the gods, and through its own permanence confers it on others. Moreover, the combination found in the prologue

is repeated, in a slightly different form, in a fragmentary line from the *Linus et Coreobus* aetion (fr. 26, 8): ἠνεκὲς ἀείδω δειδεγμένος. It is odd that commentators, who make much of Ovid's allusion to the *Aetia* prologue, do not notice this phrase too[55]; for the object of the verb, if we can trust the Pindaric scholia (on *Nem.* 2, 1), is τὸν ἐπὶ ῥάβδῳ μῦθον ὑφαινόμενον (fr. 26, 5). This phrase suggests two etymologies of ῥαψῳδός: from ῥάβδος, the staff the reciter carried as a badge of office; and from ῥάπτω, 'to stitch or string together', ὑφαινόμενον ('woven') being used metonymically. Callimachus (or the speaker) has heard the story put together by a rhapsode and sings it himself from beginning to end (thus imitating and varying the phrases διηνεκέως ἀγορεύσω and διηνεκέως κατέλεξε used by Homer *Od.* 4, 836; 7, 241; 12, 56, and Hesiod *Theog.* 627). His *carmen* is thus both *perpetuum* and *deductum* (to use the Latin version[56] of ὑφαινόμενος created by Vergil at *Ecl.* 6, 5[57]). In other words Ovid's apparent paradox, the poem that is

55. An exception is Hans Herter, *Ovids Kunstprinzip in den Metamorphosen*, «Am. Journ. Philol.» 69, 1948, 129-48, esp. 142; he argues that ἠνεκὲς ἀείδω refers to its own particular aetion and has no wider programmatic point.

56. The Latin means 'spun', of course, and is linked to the Greek ('woven') by metonymy not synonymy. Stephen Hinds draws my attention, however, to Ov., *Met.* 6, 69 *uetus in tela deducitur argumentum* (in a passage packed with neoteric diction: see D. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford, 1991, 190-4); he ingeniously explains the extension in the verb's meaning there by seeing it as an anticipation of Arachne's metamorphosis into a spider – which alone amongst weavers spins as it weaves.

57. That *deducite* has 'anything to do with Callimachean ideals of slightness' has been denied by D. Kovacs, «Class. Quart.» 37, 1987, 462; his argument is vitiated by an unwillingness to see that a limitation of the word's meaning to 'compose' or 'draw the thread down' does not preclude the word's having a further connotation.

To clinch the matter, he quotes *Tristia* 2, 557-60:

> atque utinam reuoces animum **paulisper** ab ira,
> et uacuo iubeas hinc tibi **pauca** legi,
> **pauca**, quibus prima surgens ab origine mundi
> in tua **deduxi** tempora, Caesar, opus.

This context, we are told, «seems to exclude any notion of 'making slender or slight'»! It is the word itself that carries the programmatic charge, and not the particular sense it is given on any occasion: even in what is surely its first occurrence as an equivalent to λεπτός (despite Cornificius, fr. 1), that at Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 5, *deductum* is apparently transmuted in sense and application from an earlier pro-

both Callimachean and anti-Callimachean, echoes the phrasing of Callimachus himself.

Further evidence for a link or an opposition in Greek thought between διηνεκές and ῥάπτω/ὑφαίνω might conceivably be found in the Homeric phrase ῥάψε ... ῥάβδοισι διηνεκέσιν (*Iliad* 12, 296-7); the object there is a shield. More likely to be significant is Callimachus's reworking of lines from the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (254-5 = 294-5):

> ὣς εἰπὼν διέθηκε θεμείλια Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
> εὐρέα καὶ μάλα μακρὰ διηνεκές.

In his own Hymn to Apollo we read (57): αὐτὸς δὲ θεμείλια Φοῖβος ὑφαίνει. If a contrast between the terms is already implicit, then the point seems to be that Callimachus's work is put together with craft, but lacks the epic sweep of the Homeric Hymn[58].

It must be stressed that Callimachus is repeating a supposed charge made by his enemies in verses 3-8 of the *Aetia* prologue; he is not necessarily conceding everything implied by the charge. Thus he had written a poem of several thousand lines (the *Aetia* itself), he had sung of kings and heroes (e.g. Heracles, and Theseus in the *Hecale*), he had produced poems that *could* be seen as unified and continuous; it is only when the elements are lumped together that the charge sticks[59]. Given fr. 26, 8, there seems a fair probability that he would have regarded the *Aetia* itself as διηνεκές in certain respects, e.g. thematic continuity, artistic unity and potential for immortality. The unity he rejects is perhaps Aristotelian unity[60], or at any rate the idea

logue: see «Mnemosyne» 45, 1992, 48-52. One may add that as we have one acknowledged allusion to the *Aetia* prologue (in *carmen perpetuum*), it is hardly farfetched to see another, through Vergil's *deductum carmen*, to Callimachus's Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην.

58. This would confirm (against Williams) the contention that the word ὑφαίνει is used because of its applicability to literary composition, as was argued by W. Wimmel (*Kallimachos in Rom*, cit. 67).

59. I am assuming that the ἤ of verse 3 introduces the first limb of a pair suggesting alternative subjects: the lacunae in these fraught lines are most frustrating.

60. For discussion of this complex subject, see e.g. K.O. Brink, *Callimachus & Aristotle: an inquiry into Callimachus* Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην, «Class. Quart.» 40, 1946, 11-26; M. Heath, *Unity in Greek Poetics*, Oxford 1989, 56-9; R.L. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius*, Cambridge 1993, 190-5.

that literature unlike life should have a single point, tone, or thread.

Can we then regard Ovid as unCallimachean in using the word *perpetuum* of his *carmen*? The paradox (if there is any) was already present in his model. Of course, the phrasing is thoroughly Callimachean: Ovid reactivates the etymological gloss, introduces an allusion to a separate passage of his model, and provides his adjective with an additional sense.

Other artistic aspects of the four line proem can usefully be brought out here. P.E. Knox[61] has pointed out that the non-elegiac form of the poem is first revealed by the parenthesis (*nam uos mutastis et illa*). One can be more precise; it is the word *uos* (=*di*) that changes the metre of the Ovidian corpus. These transforming gods include not only, thanks to the word *uos* itself, the whole pantheon, but in particular Cupid, who had turned the young Ovid's incipient epic into the elegiac *Amores*[62] (and who will at *Met.* 1, 452 ff. have a similar effect on the current poem)[63]. Thus Ovid briefly hints at love, the prime theme of his earlier work, and of the *Metamorphoses* too, as some believe. The word *coeptis* also deserves attention; it is the beginnings of Ovid's works that the gods have transformed. This introduction is itself metamorphosed into a record of metamorphoses of introductions.

One key element of Callimachus's prologue that Ovid ignores in his first four lines is ἕν; but read on (*Met.* 1, 5ff):

> ante mare et terras et, quod tegit omnia, caelum
> **unus** erat toto naturae uultus in orbe,
> quem dixere[64] Chaos, rudis indigestaque moles

61. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* («Camb. Philol. Soc. Suppl.» 11, 1986), 9.

62. *Am.* 1, 1.

63. The suggestion of Kovacs, «Class. Quart.» 37, 1987, 458-65, that the change to epic has been brought about by the wrath of Caesar is not tenable: the *Metamorphoses* is not created by the exile, but left unfinished (but undamaged) by it, and so Ovid presents the case at the end of book 15 and in the *Tristia* (e.g. 1, 7, 13-14). Of course, once Ovid is relegated, another *deus* may rightly be said to have changed the poet's *coepta* (and thus inspired the *Tristia*), but that does not affect the internal resonance of *Met.* 1, 2.

64. Amongst many others, Callimachus (fr. 2, 3: the imitation continues), and

nec quicquam nisi pondus iners congestaque eodem
non bene iunctarum discordia semina rerum.
nullus ...
nec ...

Unity is the dominant characteristic of Chaos, the state that can be described only by means of negatives, that has the qualities of a badly written book (*rudis indigestaque moles etc.*), that lacks any distinction of place and so precludes movement (and any possibility of narrative); Ovid destroys it as soon as possible[65], and wends his varied way through a world of instability and difference, one that is far from the Horatian conservatism of *Odes* 3, 1, or the historicism of the *Aeneid*, but owes much to those wholeheartedly Callimachean creations, Vergil's Sixth Eclogue and Propertius's Vertumnus[66].

Appendix

An appendix not only to this article but also to Gareth Williams, *Conversing after sunset: a Callimachean echo in Ovid's Exile poetry*, «Class. Quart.» 41, 1991, 169-77, which explores in the *Tristia* and *ex Ponto* Ovidian echoes of Callimachus's Heraclitus epigram (*Ep.* 2 Pfeiffer[67]):

Εἰπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον ἐς δέ με δάκρυ
ἤγαγεν, ἐμνήσθην δ' ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
ἠέλιον[68] λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν. ἀλλὰ σὺ μέν που,

Ovid himself (*Fast.* 1, 103, where Janus claims to have been called Chaos by the ancients).

65. So too in the *Fasti* (1, 103-14), though there, as befits the elegiac poem, the transformation is into the duality that is Janus (on which see A. Barchiesi, «Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc.» 37, 1991, 16-17, and P. Hardie, *The Janus episode in Ovid's Fasti*, «MD» 26, 1991, 47-64).

66. For an attractive discussion of the destabilising function of mutability in Augustan poetry, see P. Hardie, in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus*, London 1992, 59-82.

67. Besides Gow-Page (*H.E.* 1203-8), see the commentary by N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology*, Cambridge 1988, 248-9, and the studies by J.G. MacQueen, «Ramus» 11, 1982, 48-56, and R.L. Hunter, «MD» 28, 1992, 113-23.

68. Bentley: ἥλιον ἐν codd. The Ovidian allusions stand by Verg. *Ecl.* 9, 52 in supporting the conjecture.

ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδιή,
αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ἧσιν ὁ πάντων
ἁρπακτὴς Ἀΐδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ.

My concern is firstly with the interpretation of the epigram, and then with some implications for Ovid's responses. Williams, like every other commentator I am aware of, assumes that Callimachus and Heraclitus are friends in the usual sense. Thus Gow says (*Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965, vol. 2, p. 192): «Apparently C. has learnt long after the event of the death of a friend not seen for many years». Verses 1-3 certainly create an image of personal closeness. But που suggests an indifference to the factual details of death that would be surprising in a personal friend[69]; ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ shows geographical separation, and τετράπαλαι σποδιή demonstratres that the addressee is not just recent dust and ashes, but has been so long since: he and Callimachus, it appears, have not lived in the same generation[70]. This makes for a puzzle: how have the two conversed? And the answer is given in the final couplet: Heraclitus's poetry lives on. This enables us to reinterpret the opening: conversation between the two has consisted in Callimachus's reading Heraclitus's poems; for him they have the vividness of friendly talk[71]. It has saddened him to find (or to be reminded, for there is nothing to indicate that C. now discovers Heraclitus's death for the first time[72]) that the poet he regards as a friend is dead; consolation comes quickly, when he remembers that the poems live on.

Such a reading brings out the importance of the poem to Ovid in exile. He is separated from human contact with his

69. We may contrast που in the passages cited by Hunter, «MD» 28, 1992, 120-1, where it reflects the uncertainties of death at sea, here ruled out by σποδιή.

70. W. Swinnen, «Ancient Society» 1, 1970, 39-52, identifies the poet with an Heraclitus of Halicarnassus, son of Asclepiades, who appears as proxenos of Histiaea and Chios and as the subject of statue at Oropus (all inscriptions that may belong to the second quarter of the third century). If this is correct, my observations on τετράπαλαι cannot be right; but the inscriptions may refer to, say, a grandson of the poet.

71. I note that Λέσχαι was the title of a poetry book by Heraclides (!) Ponticus the Younger (*RE* 49); conceivably this was used by Heraclitus too.

72. So J.A.K. Thomson, «Class. Rev.» 55, 1941, 28.

friends, but can communicate with them as Heraclitus does with Callimachus – by what is written, by poetry. Underlying all the passages[73] that allude to the epigram is the uncertainty as to which role is played by Ovid and which by his interlocutor: a point brought to the fore at *Ex P.* 1, 9, 56, where Ovid expresses his willingness to be categorised amongst the dead. So too in *Ex P.* 2, 4: Atticus is asked to play the part of Callimachus, the man who remembers (vv. 3; 6); but he is also seen as a potential drinker of Lethe (23), potentially dying himself. Ovid the exile is a man who has changed his state; thus he seems closer to the dead Heraclitus; and he is the one who continues to live through his poetry. But the tables are turned as he exposes the dumbness of his past friends, in *Tr.* 5, 13, for example, where he reveals that he himself lives and speaks in Tomi whilst the friend is reduced to a death-like silence in Rome. In this case the past conversation is presumably real enough (there are no clues that the, suitably unnamed, addressee is a poet[74]); but at 27-30

> utque solebamus consumere longa loquendo
> tempora, sermoni deficiente die,
> sic ferat ac referat tacitas nunc littera uoces,
> et peragant linguae charta manusque uices

in working out an image for the communication he now desires, he provides a gloss on Callimachus's metaphorical λέσχη in the third line of the epigram[75].

In *Ex P.* 2, 10, on the other hand, a sense that the Callimachus poem alluded to evokes as real an imaginary friendship brought about by reading, will contribute to doubt over the historicity[76] of the journey(s)[77] described.

73. Williams (loc. cit.) discusses *Tr.* 5, 13; *Ex P.* 1, 9; 2, 4; 2, 10.

74. Or even a philosopher; though *liquet* and *mutabile* in 19 do prompt thoughts of another Heraclitus.

75. Similarly *colloquium* at *Ex P.* 2, 4, 1.

76. Tib. 2, 6 (which opens *Castra Macer sequitur: tenero quid fiet Amori?*) poses a similar problem involving (apparently) the same individual: has Macer gone overseas on official business, or merely started writing epic? Ovid's ascription to Macer of a *Hyper-Iliad* (*Am.* 2, 18, 1-2; *Ex P.* 2, 10, 13-14) would suggest the latter – but the one does not rule out the other.

77. Nothing that Ovid says shows that Macer's guidance in Asia and Sicily belongs to a single journey, as is assumed by Williams (and others) – or a single poem.

Verses 19-20, 43, 49-52 stress conjunction of a mental rather than a physical kind; but just as it is possible to be with-someone many miles away, so a poet can get his reader to see what is not present: has Macer been Ovid's preceptor in geographical evocation, his model making pleasant Ovid's 'travels'. White has recently shown that it is unlikely that Macer was the son of Theophanes of Mytilene[78]; this would have given him good reason to know the *magnificae Asiae urbes* (21). But these would also find a place in the early parts of his Iliadic epic (cf. *Am.* 2, 18, 1-2, *Ex P.* 2, 10, 13-14). The little we know of Pompeius Macer reveals no poem in which he is likely to have descibed the sights of Sicily, but we can recognise all the places mentioned in 23-8 elsewhere in Ovid's corpus (especially the Persephone and Demeter narratives of *Met.* 5 and *Fast.* 4, as Williams shows). As poets they share *communia sacra* (17, and hence *conuictus*, 9), and their poetical progress is conventionally seen as a voyage (39 ff.). However, the details of 35-6

> saepe breuis nobis uicibus uia uisa loquendi,
> pluraque si numeres uerba fuere gradu

make it very likely that Ovid has shared real as well as poetic journeys with Macer: *uicibus* suits conversation, but not reading.

Wadham College, Oxford

78. P. White, «*Pompeius Macer*» *and Ovid*, «Class. Quart.» 42, 1992, 210-18.

RIVISTA SEMESTRALE

DIRETTORE: Gian Biagio Conte (*Università di Pisa*).

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO: Alessandro Barchiesi (*Università di Verona*), Maurizio Bettini (*Università di Siena*), Marco Fantuzzi (*Università di Firenze*), Don P. Fowler (*Jesus College, Oxford*), Richard L. Hunter (*Pembroke College, Cambridge*), Mario Labate (*Università di Firenze*), R. O. A. M. Lyne (*Balliol College, Oxford*), Glenn W. Most (*Universität Heidelberg*), Alessandro Perutelli (*Università di Pisa*), Michael Reeve (*University of Cambridge*), Gianpiero Rosati (*Università di Udine*), Luigi Enrico Rossi (*Università di Roma*), Alessandro Schiesaro (*Princeton University*), Charles Segal (*Harvard University*).

SEGRETARI DI REDAZIONE: Maria Luisa Delvigo, Rolando Ferri.

Sede della redazione: Dipartimento di Filologia Classica, Università degli Studi di Pisa, 56100 Pisa, Via Galvani 1, telefono 050 911473; posta elettronica (E-mail) VERGIL @ ICNUCEVM.

Si pregano gli autori di inviare i dattiloscritti in forma definitiva, e di attenersi rigorosamente alle norme grafiche e ai criteri di citazione elencati nelle ultime due pagine di ogni fascicolo della rivista.

Abbonamento annuo (1994): Italia L. 35.000; estero L. 45.000 (a richiesta, spedizione per posta aerea: L. 50.000). Un fascicolo: Italia L. 20.000; estero L. 33.000.

Gli abbonamenti non disdetti entro il 30 novembre si intendono rinnovati per l'anno successivo.

Per gli abbonamenti rivolgersi direttamente alla Casa *Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa*, 56010 Agnano Pisano, Via delle Sorgenti 23, telefono +39 50 934242 (5 linee r.a.), fax +39 50 934200, c/c postale n. 12777561 (ufficio di Roma: Via Ruggero Bonghi 11 b, telefono +39 6 70493456, fax +39 6 70476605).

Registrazione presso il Tribunale di Pisa n. 7/78 del 17/1/78

Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici

33

1994
Giardini editori e stampatori
in Pisa