school. By contrast upsilon and omicron-iota were seldom interpreted as an iota-equivalent. If similar findings resulted from a careful examination of other oral texts from the Alexandrian school, then this would be a good indication of the progress of vowel-assimilation within the educated Greek community at Alexandria.

University of NEWCASTLE, N.S.W. 2308, Australia

For Dan
Best wishes
Alison

SLENDER VERSE: ROMAN ELEGY AND ANCIENT RHETORICAL THEORY

BY

A.M. KEITH

Horace's famous criticism of Lucilius' hexameters, that if you were to remove the fixed rhythms and rearrange the words you would not find the limbs even of a dismembered poet (*non … invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae*, *Sat.* 1.4.60-63), draws on a conventional literary vocabulary that metaphorically figures texts and parts of texts as their authors' bodies and limbs[1]). This critical vocabulary developed in fifth-century Athens, perhaps in sophistic circles, and is so well established by the Hellenistic period that Callimachus need not refer specifically to either body or limbs to set in play a series of puns linking physical traits with literary goals (*Aet.* fr. 1.31-32, Pf.)[2]). Roman writers consciously adapt this vocabulary to expositions of Latin literary, especially rhetorical, style[3]). From their earliest appearance Roman rhetorical handbooks use *corpus*, *membra*, and other body parts metaphorically of literary texts and their component parts[4]). Cicero, for example, compares the movement of a speech without rhythmic cadences to the motion of a man untrained in the gymnasium (*Or.* 229), and regularly discusses rhetorical style in terms of

1) On this passage see most recently K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire* (Princeton 1993), 145-150 (hereafter cited as Freudenburg). On the metaphor see E. Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto 1972), 164-174 (hereafter cited as Fantham); and G. Most, *Disiecti membra poetae: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry*, in: R. Hexter, D. Selden (ed.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (New York and London 1992), 391-419; both with extensive bibliography.

2) See W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Hermes Einzelschriften 16; Wiesbaden 1960), 111-116 (hereafter cited as Wimmel); and A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (Heidelberg 1965), 82.

3) The translation of Greek terms into Latin is especially visible in the rhetorical treatises: see, e.g., Cic. *Brut.* 37, Quint. *Inst. Or.* 9.4.22, and cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.1.4.

4) See *TLL* 4.1020.62-1021.39, s.v. *corpus* IV.A, *quaeuis unitas uel totum, de libris*, and *TLL* 8.644.50-645.30, s.v. *membrum*. Other parts of the body that figure in Latin literary discussion include: *caput*, *color*, *candor* (cf. *candidus*, n. 20 below), *figura*, *forma*, *latus*, *lumen*, *manus*, *neruus*, *os* (*oris*), *os* (*ossis*), *pectus*, *pes*, *sanguis*, *uultus*. See further Fantham 164-174.

male physique. The younger Seneca cites a proverb that likens a man's life to his oratory as the preface to a detailed exploration of the analogy between anatomical and literary style (*talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis uita, Ep. Mor.* 114.1; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.54). Quintilian states that there are as many styles of rhetoric as there are forms of bodies (*in oratione uero si species intueri uelis, totidem paene reperias ingeniorum quot corporum formas, Inst. Or.* 12.10.10), while Tacitus develops a general comparison between human body and rhetorical text: *Oratio autem sicut corpus hominis ea demum pulchra est in qua non eminent uenae nec ossa numerantur, sed temperatus ac bonus sanguis implet membra et exurgit toris ipsosque neruos rubor tegit et decor commendat* (*Dial.* 21.8).

The analogy between human body and literary text is most highly developed in Roman rhetorical theory, but the metaphor is also found in Roman poetry, as the Horatian critique of Lucilius demonstrates. It is particularly well known in Latin elegy, where its presence has long been attributed to Callimachean stylistic principles[5]). This study re-examines the use of the anatomical metaphor in Latin elegy from the perspective of Roman rhetorical theory. I argue that Roman elaboration of the trope developed in the context of the Atticist-Asianist controversy in the final decade of the Republic and that it is closely associated with the stylistic innovations of Catullus' friend Calvus, a prominent orator and elegist whose work in both genres displays a concern for precise expression and refined presentation. The metaphorical vocabulary employed in the stylistic debate between Cicero and the Atticists received wide literary diffusion in the following generation, partly through the institutionalization of rhetorical training in the education of the Roman elite and partly through the newly popular practices of rhetorical declamation and poetry recital in the early principate. In this context I examine the Latin elegists' deployment of the anatomical metaphor and document their debt to the critical terminology of Atticism in their discussions of the stylistic simplicity and understated elegance of elegiac poetry.

1. Iudicium Calui [6])

In the late Republic the metaphor that shapes a literary text in the image of its author's body is especially concentrated in Cicero's

5) See Fantham 172-174.
6) Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.2.25.

discussions of the 'plain' oratorical style (*genus humile* or *tenue*) which he associates with the Roman 'Atticists'[7]). Commenting on the speeches of Lysias, Cicero concedes that they often display 'muscle' (*in Lysia sunt saepe etiam lacerti, Brut.* 64), but censures their 'rather shrivelled' style (*uerum est certe genere toto strigosior, Brut.* 64). Cicero exploits the metaphorical association of physique with style to deride Lysias' contemporary Roman admirers: *habet [Lysias] enim certos sui studiosos, qui non tamen habitus corporis opimos quam gracilitates consectentur, quos, ualetudo modo bona sit, tenuitas ipsa delectat* (*Brut.* 64). He suggests that if they aspire to emulate Attic style as exemplified by Lysias they should imitate not just its bones but also its blood (*Attico genere dicendi se gaudere dicunt; sapienter id quidem, atque utinam imitarentur nec ossa solum sed etiam sanguinem, Brut.* 68). Cicero especially censures the 'meagreness, dryness and impotence' (*ieiunitatem et siccitatem et inopiam, Brut.* 285) of the Roman Atticists' oratory, their excessive 'concision and thinness' (*si auguste et exiliter dicere est Atticorum, Brut.* 289), and a 'minute refinement' (*huic minutae subtilitati, Brut.* 291) that betrays only 'weakness' (*imbecillitate sua, Or.* 23) in its 'spareness' (*parcus* and related forms, *Or.* 81, 83) and 'restraint' (*summissus* and related forms, *Or.* 76, 81, 82).

Cicero identifies Calvus as the leading exponent of the Atticist movement at Rome, and consistently exploits the metaphor of stylistic 'weakness' in criticizing his younger rival's oratory. Although he praises Calvus' erudition (*eruditior*), exquisite diction (*accuratius quoddam dicendi et exquisitius genus*) and urbane polish (*eleganter*), Cicero faults his rhetorical style as bloodless (*sanguinem deperdebat*), attenuated (*oratio attenuata*) and ultimately ineffective (*<a> multitudine autem et a foro, cui nata eloquentia est, deuorabatur, Brut.* 283)[8]). Tacitus bears witness to the

7) On the Atticist movement in Roman oratory see especially Cic. *Brut.* 284-291 and *Or.* 28-32, 75-90. On the controversy between Cicero and the Atticists see further E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig 1898); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Asianismus und Atticismus*, Hermes 35 (1900), 1-52; and especially A.D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio*, 2 vols (Amsterdam 1963), 1.136-167 (hereafter cited as Leeman) and J. Fairweather, *Seneca the Elder* (Cambridge 1981), 243-303, both with full bibliography.

8) The elder Seneca (*Contr.* 7.4.6-8), Quintilian (*Inst.* 9.3.56, 10.1.115, 12.10.11) and Tacitus (*Dial.* 18.4-5, 25.4) assess Calvus' rhetorical style more positively. Indeed Seneca implicitly contests Cicero's evaluation of Calvus with his remark that Calvus was a passionate and vehement orator (*uiolentus actor et concitatus fuit, Contr.* 7.4.6) and Quintilian explicitly contradicts Cicero to describe Calvus' oratory using Ciceronian terms of approbation (*inueni qui Caluum praeferrent omnibus, inueni qui Ciceroni crederent eum nimia contra se calumnia uerum sanguinem perdidisse: sed est et sancta et grauis oratio et castigata et frequenter uehemens quoque, Inst. Or.* 10.1.115). Despite their disagreement with

lasting currency of the corporeal metaphor in this context. Remarking that Cicero's detractors deemed him too little Attic, he catalogues their criticisms of his style in a series of anatomical metaphors (*quibus inflatus et tumens nec satis pressus sed supra modum exultans et superfluens et parum Atticus uideretur, Dial.* 18.4), and preserves an exchange between Cicero and Calvus articulated in the same framework: *facile est deprehendere Calvum quidem Ciceroni visum exsanguem et attritum ... rursusque Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male audisse tamquam solutum et enervem* (*Dial.* 18.5)[9]).

The prominence of the anatomical metaphor in late Republican discussion of the plain or Attic style of oratory is significant for its elaboration in the poetry of the period because Roman rhetorical theory assumes close links between poetry and oratory[10]). Aulus Gellius records the application to both poetry and oratory of a tripartite classification system (*et in carmine et in soluta oratione genera dicendi probabilia sunt tria, NA* 6.14.1) which distinguished between the 'rich' (*uber*) style, the 'slender' (*gracile*) style and the 'middle' (*mediocre*) style (*NA* 6.14.2). A late Republican date for this classificatory schema, which bears a close resemblance to Cicero's *tria genera dicendi* (*subtile, modicum,* and *uehemens*, Cic. *Or.* 69), is suggested by Gellius' attribution to the polymath M. Terentius Varro, Cicero's contemporary, of a notice listing the exemplary verse practitioners of each style: *uera autem et propria huiuscemodi formarum exempla in Latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit ubertatis Pacuuium, gracilitatis Lucilium, mediocritatis Terentium* (*NA* 6.14.6). Although Aulus Gellius records the view that 'charm and refinement' characterize the slender style (*gracili uenustas et subtilitas, NA* 6.14.3), he notes with scrupulous fairness that each of the three styles of speaking had characteristic vices as well as virtues and he identifies the *uitia* of the slender style, echoing Cicero's critique of Attic style, as 'aridity and meagerness' (*squalentes et ieiuni dici pro gracilibus, NA* 6.14.5).

Calvus' literary career documents in practice the close links between oratory and poetry assumed in Roman theory. He challenged the pre-eminence of Cicero in oratory in his own lifetime and Quintilian knew in his day of admirers who still preferred Calvus (Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.1.115; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 7.4.6). His poetry, equally celebrated, was closely associated in style and accomplishment with that of Catullus (Prop. 2.25.4, 2.34.87-90; Ov. *Am.* 3.9.62, *Tr.* 2.427-432). Catullus himself praises the poetic talent (*c.* 50, 96) and rhetorical skill (*c.* 53, 14) of his friend in the same critical vocabulary that he employs elsewhere to describe both the sophisticated verse and urbane elegance of their set (*lepidus, uenustus, facetus, salsus, elegans,* and *urbanus*). Daniel Selden has shown that Catullan poetry is steeped in the techniques of rhetorical training newly prominent in late Republican Rome[11]), and it is significant that Catullus' literary critical vocabulary overlaps extensively with contemporary discussion of the slender or plain rhetorical style: Cicero offers muted endorsement of the Atticists' aspirations to rhetorical finish (*polita*), urbanity (*urbana*), elegance (*elegans, Brut.* 285), refinement (*subtile, Or.* 30), charm (*uenustissimus, Or.* 29; *uenuste, Or.* 87), humor (*facetiarum, Or.* 87), and wit (*sales, Or.* 87; *salsum, Or.* 90). Even Catullus' famous description of Calvus as an 'eloquent manikin' (*salaputium disertum*, Cat. 53.5) may participate in contemporary Atticist polemic. The elder Seneca reports that Calvus was of small stature and implies that the word *salaputium*, of unknown etymology, refers to Calvus' size (*erat enim paruolus statura, propter quod etiam Catullus in hendecasyllabis uocat illum 'salaputium disertum'*, *Contr.* 7.4.7). Seneca draws on the anatomical metaphor in which literary style was discussed in the late Republic in an interpretation of the Catullan phrase that seems to reflect Calvus' close association with the metaphor.

Calvus was dead by 46 BCE (and Brutus by 42), but other members of his set, which seems to have included the young Asinius Pollio (cf. Cat. 12), Messala (cf. Cic. *Ep. ad Brut.* 9.23) and Gallus (cf. Cic. *ad Fam.* 10.32.5, 31.6), survived the civil wars of the following decade to stand among the leading literary figures of the early Augustan age[12]). In this period the stylistic debate initiated by Calvus and exemplified in the oratory and poetry of his set received further diffusion in the literary culture of early imperial Rome through the formal institution of rhetorical training in elite education[13]). In the

Cicero, however, both Seneca and Quintilian articulate their assessments of Calvus' rhetorical style in the metaphorical vocabulary of the original debate.

9) Cf. Quint. *Inst. Or.* 12.10.14-26, 35-41.

10) On the close relations between poetry and oratory see, e.g., Cic. *De Orat.* 1.69-70, 109, *Brut.* 43, 177, *Or.* 152, Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 7.4.6-8, 9.5.17, Tac. *Dial.* 20.4-5, 21.6-7; for bibliography and further discussion, see S.F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1977), 250-276; and D.L. Selden, *Ceveat lector: Catullus and the Rhetoric of Performance*, in: R. Hexter, D. Selden (ed.), *Innovations of Antiquity* (New York and London 1992), 461-512 (hereafter cited as Selden): 490-492.

11) Selden 476-498.

12) On Asinius Pollio's Atticism, see Leeman 1.160-163; on Messala's, see Leeman 1.221-222.

13) Tacitus says that the schools of rhetoric in Rome were instituted 'a little

early 20s, for example, Gallus sheltered Q. Caecilius Epirota, the future grammarian who would both introduce Vergil and the new poets into the curriculum and also initiate the practice of holding extempore debates in Latin (Suet. *de gram.* 16). The elder Seneca credits Pollio with popularising the practice of recitation in the Augustan period (*Contr.* 4. *pr.* 2)[14]), and his reminiscences of the flourishing literary culture of the early principate repeatedly feature the critical judgments of Pollio and Messala, whose rhetorical prowess he viewed as outstripping that of the most popular speakers of the day (*Contr.* 3. *pr.* 14). Exposed by their education to the great flowering of Roman oratory under Cicero and immersed in the literary debates of the immediately preceding generation, the poets of the Augustan period inherit the stylistic vocabulary and the anatomical metaphors in which the Atticist-Asianist controversy was couched. The elegists engage contemporary Roman literary debate concerning rhetorical theory and practice in their pervasive use of the metaphor that equates the poet's body with his poetic *corpus*.

2. *Tersus atque elegans: auctor Tibullus*

Concerning Tibullus' education we have no information, but his high social rank and the learning on display in his poetry suggest that he received the standard rhetorical training of the elite[15]). Moreover, his close association with Augustus' general Messala, one of the foremost orators of the age, makes it likely that he was at least a spectator at, if not a participant in, the newly popular *recitationes* of the period. Messala played a leading role in the literary culture, both poetic and rhetorical, of the early Principate[16]). The dedicatee of two books of Tibullan elegy, Messala was a prominent patron of elegiac verse (associated also with Lygdamus, the young Ovid[17]), and Sulpicia) and intimately involved in the literary debates of the day. The elder Seneca characterizes him as a most exacting judge in every

before the time of Cicero' (*Dial.* 35.1), and other evidence confirms this date; see S.F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the late Republic and early Empire* (Liverpool 1949), 1-50. The immense popularity of the schools of declamation is a development of the early Principate, as the elder Seneca's works demonstrate.

14) On this attribution see A. Dalzell, *C. Asinius Pollio and the Early History of Public Recitation at Rome*, Hermathena 86 (1955), 20-28.

15) On Tibullus' erudition, see F. Cairns, *Tibullus. A Hellenistic poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979).

16) See P. White, *Promised Verse* (Cambridge Mass. 1993), 326, index s.v. Messala.

17) On Ovid's cultivation of Messala, cf. *Pont.* 1.7.28, 2.3.77-8.

aspect of rhetorical performance but especially in diction, and he repeatedly cites with approval Messala's judgments on declaimers' performances[18]). Seneca also records the views of Messala and Maecenas concerning the merits of Vergilian lines (Sen. *Suas.* 2.20), and Servius Auctus mentions a literary symposium composed by Maecenas which featured himself, Messala, Horace and Vergil as speakers (Serv. *ad Aen.* 8.310). In this literary milieu Tibullus, an intimate of both Messala and Horace, composed and performed his elegiac poetry.

Quintilian's well known discussion of Roman elegy—from which I have drawn my sub-headings—attests to the relevance of the metaphor in the interpretation of Latin elegy, since his descriptions of the elegists' poetry are in fact formulated as descriptions of the elegists: *Elegia quoque Graecos prouocamus, cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime uidetur auctor Tibullus* (*Inst.* 10.1.93). Horace is a contemporary witness to the metaphorical association of an elegist's appearance with the style of his poetic text and his use of the metaphor throughout *Epistle* 1.4, a poem addressed to Albius (i.e. Tibullus), is especially instructive[19]). The poem opens with a direct address to Albius which immediately establishes a literary context for the epistle as a whole: *Albi, nostrorum sermonum candide iudex* (*Epist.* 1.4.1). Horace's punning play between the poet's *nomen* Albius, derived from *albus*, and his compliment *candide iudex*, 'lucid critic', caps a Tibullan pun on *albus* and *candidus* (*quem Tuscula tellus | caudidaque antiquo detinet Alba Lare*, 1.7.57-58), and is particularly significant since *candidus*, like *nitidus* applied to the *persona* of Horace at the end of the epistle (1.4.15), belongs to the critical vocabulary of ancient rhetorical theory[20]). Indeed Quintilian uses both adjectives together in commenting on the rhetorical style of Tibullus' patron Messala (*Messala nitidus et candidus*, *Inst.* 10.1.113). A generation earlier these adjectives appear in rhetorical discussion of

18) Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 2.4.8-10; 3. *pr.* 14; *Suas.* 1.7; 2.17, 20; 3.6; 6.27. Seneca records Messala's reputation at his first appearance in the *Controuersiae*: *fuit autem Messala exactissimi ingenii quidem in omni studiorum parte, sed Latini utique sermonis obseruator diligentissimus* (2.4.8). Cf. Cic. *Ep. ad Brut.* 9.23.1, of the young Messala; Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.35, 4.1.8, 10.1.113, 10.5.2, 12.10.11, 12.11.28; Tac. *Dial.* 17-18.

19) For the basis of the identification, see R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I* (Oxford 1970), 368; and R.J. Ball, *Albi, ne doleas: Horace and Tibullus*, CW 87 (1994), 409-414 (hereafter cited as Ball); *contra* R.G. Mayer (ed.), *Horace, Epistles Book I* (Cambridge 1994), 133.

20) See *OLD* s.v. *candidus* 9 (of writers or writings) 'clear, lucid, unambiguous'; *TLL* 3.244.80-245.7 s.v. *candidus*; *OLD* s.v. *nitidus* 7, 'polished, elegant' of style; and cf. Cic. *Orat.* 53. See further Fantham 172. For a similar pun on Albucius and *albus* see Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 7 *pr.* 2, a reference I owe to C. Connors.

the plain style (*genus tenue* or *candidum*) championed by the self-proclaimed Roman Atticists. The epithet *candidus* in *Epistle* 1.4.1 thus functions as a pun on the name of Horace's addressee and also as a compliment to a friend on his exquisite literary taste. Horace's pun echoes the diction of Tibullan elegy in which this vocabulary is especially prominent: *candidus* and related forms pervade Tibullan poetry, with forms of *lucidus*, *nitidus* and *niueus* also common[21]).

Epistle 1.4 contains an elaborate description of Tibullus in which Horace develops the stylistic correspondences between elegist and elegy. Horace locates his friend in the region of Pedum, where he supposes him to be composing verse to rival that of Cassius of Parma: *scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula uincat | an tacitum siluas inter reptare salubris | curantem quidquid dignum sapiente bonoque est?* (*Epist.* 1.4. 3-5). Despite Horace's phrasing, elegiac composition and a stroll in the salubrious woods are not necessarily incompatible with one another. Greek ὕλη, 'wood', acquires the sense of 'literary material' in the classical period and Roman writers extend the sense of the Latin *silua* by analogy; moreover, a literary wood is the setting of the epiphany of *Elegia* to her devoté, the poet Ovid, in *Amores* 3.1. Thus Horace's picture of Albius strolling in the woods evokes Tibullus' metaphorical perusal of books in his retreat[22]). Even the reference to the health of the woods may have a critical resonance, for Cicero characterizes Attic oratory as *salubre* (*Or.* 90). Certainly Albius' silent gait as he walks in the woods is typical of the motion of lovers in Tibullan elegy (1.2.20, 1.2.35; cf. 1.7.62), where puns on *pes*, both physical and metrical 'feet', offer particularly fertile ground for metaphorical play between the lover's body and the poet's text[23]). Tibullus develops two types of *pes* puns in his elegiac verse. In one cluster of puns, the smooth motion of lovers and other characters (1.2.20, 35; 1.3.92; 1.5.24; 1.7.62) reflects the smooth rhythm of Tibullan elegy[24]). When his poetic *persona* stumbles (1.3.20), however, Tibullus exploits another dimension of elegiac rhythm—the uneven

21) Cf. [Tib.] 3.1.9, a patently programmatic context which describes Lygdamus' book of elegiac poetry: *lutea sed niueum inuoluat membrana libellum.*

22) For the metaphor, see *OLD* s.v. *silua* 5.

23) See B.H. Fineberg, *From a Sure Foot to Faltering Meters: The Dark Ladies of Tibullan Elegy*, in: M. DeForest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game.* Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King (Wauconda IL 1993), 249-256.

24) Cf. *mollem … uersum*, Prop. 1.7.19, and *molliter ire pedes*, Prop. 2.12.24, with M. Wyke, *Written Women: Propertius' Scripta Puella*, JRS 77 (1987), 47-61 (hereafter cited as Wyke 1987): 56.

alternation of hexameter and pentameter lines in the elegiac couplet[25]).

Horace's most explicit description of the elegist follows: *non tu corpus eras sine pectore: di tibi formam | … dederunt* (*Epist.* 1.4.6-7). The scholiast interprets the strange expression *non tu corpus eras sine pectore* as a compliment to Albius on his talent, glossing it with the phrase *id est non cares bono ingenio.* Since it is couched in the discourse of literary criticism, Horace's description of Albius' looks may also be read as an assessment of his friend's elegiac poetry. Albius' body, like Tibullus' poetry, displays physical, or stylistic, vigor[26]). Moreover the gods have graced Albius with *forma* in the sense not only of physical beauty but also of good literary style. Horace concludes the portrait of his friend by depicting him as a man of taste and eloquence (*qui sapere et fari possit quae sentiat*, *Epist.* 1.4.9) who enjoys influence and reputation (*et cui | gratia fama ualetudo contingat abunde*, *Epist.* 1.4.9-10), *in fine* a model of elegance (*et mundus uictus non deficiente crumina*, *Epist.* 1.4.11)[27]). Horace's diction displays numerous points of contact with Cicero's discussion of the ideal Attic orator whose oratory makes restrained use of *sententiae* (*Or.* 81) and displays both *ualetudo* (*Or.* 76; cf. *Brut.* 64) and *munditia* (*Or.* 79). Indeed Cicero's description of the ideal Attic orator corresponds in outline not only to the praise of Albius' person offered by Horace in *Epistle* 1.4 but also to the assessment of Tibullus' poetry recorded by Quintilian eighty years later: *Ergo ille tenuis orator, modo sit elegans, nec in faciendis uerbis erit audax et in transferendis uerecundus et parcus in priscis in reliquisque ornamentis et uerborum et sententiarum demissior* (*Or.* 81). The closing lines of Horace's epistle offer a metaphorical characterization of the prosperous author of the *Epistles* (*me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute uises, | cum ridere uoles, Epicuri de grege porcum*, *Epist.* 1.4.15-16) that confirms the invitation to interpret the description of Albius metaphorically[28]).

Tibullan elegy consistently displays the simplicity, elegance, and refinement that Horace and Quintilian praise in his exquisite literary style, and Tibullus' own portrait of the elegiac poet-lover exem-

25) Cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.7-10, with M. Wyke, *Reading Female Flesh: Amores 3.1*, in: A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text* (London 1989), 113-143.

26) A. Kiessling and R. Heinze (ed.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Dritter Teil: Briefe* (Berlin 1908), 46 (hereafter cited as Kiessling-Heinze), compare Quint. *Inst.* 10.7.15: *pectus est quod disertos facit*; cf. also V. Max. 8.12. ext. 1. and Tac. *Dial.* 31.1.

27) Kiessling-Heinze 47 bring out the literary nuances in these lines.

28) For another example of Horace's use of the anatomical metaphor see Hor. *Epist.* 1.20, on which see L.T. Percy, *The Personification of the Text and Augustan Poetics in Epistles 1.20*, CW 87 (1994), 457-464.

plifies this aesthetic ideal. In the opening poem of the collection, for example, the speaker outlines his modest goals in vocabulary drawn from the critical register: *satis est, requiescere lecto | si licet et solito membra leuare toro. | quam iuuat immites uentos audire cubantem | et dominam tenero continuisse sinu* (1.1.43-46). The simple enjoyment he finds in his mistress' company is described in sensual diction that simultaneously adumbrates an aesthetic program for his elegiac poetry. Resting in bed, he enjoys taking the weight off his limbs (or trimming his clauses), seeking refuge from the violent winds outside (perhaps avoiding the bombast of Asianist rhetoric)[29], and cuddling his mistress in an erotic embrace. In the final poem of Book One the speaker's appearance at the sacrificial altar evokes the stylistic attributes of his poetry: *hanc pura cum ueste sequar myrtoque canistra | uincta geram, myrto uinctus et ipse caput* (1.10.27-28). Simply but elegantly clothed, wreathed with the myrtle sacred to Venus' poets, the poet-lover embodies the simplicity and elegance of amatory elegy[30]. In Book Two, he reasserts the elegance of his figure even as he imagines enduring the ravages of hard work on a farm: *nec quererer quod sol graciles exureret artus, | laederet et teneras pussula rupta manus* (2.3.9-10). The slender limbs (*artus* is synonymous with *membra*) and soft hands of the lover metaphorically represent the elegant verse that the poet composes and align Tibullan elegy with the rhetorical *gracilitas* characteristic of the plain style[31]. Elsewhere, the elegiac speaker confesses that without his love-sickness he can find neither the words nor the feet, i.e. the content and rhythm, for his poetry: *usque cano Nemesim, sine qua uersus mihi nullus | uerba potest iustos aut reperire pedes* (2.5.111-112)[32]. The casual simplicity with which Tibullus deploys the metaphor testifies to the refinement and elegance so much admired in his

29) The poet-lover's avoidance of harsh winds may imply Tibullus' rejection of a more grandiloquent style, since Petronius later characterizes an 'Asianist's' rhetorical style as *uentosa istaec et enormis loquacitas* (Petr. 2.7): see G. Kennedy, *Encolpius and Agamemnon in Petronius*, AJP 99 (1978), 171-178.

30) On the association of the myrtle with Venus, see J.C. McKeown, *Ovid, Amores*: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes, vol. 2 (Leeds 1989), 29, on *Am.* 1.1.29 (hereafter cited as McKeown). On clothing in this stylistic metaphor, cf. e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 262, 274, and see further Fantham 171-172, and J.B. DeBrohun, *Redressing Elegy's Puella: Propertius IV and the Rhetoric of Fashion*, JRS 84 (1994), 41-63 (hereafter cited as DeBrohun).

31) Cic. *Brut.* 64, Quint. *Inst. Or.* 1.9.2, 12.10.24, Gell. 6.14. See McKeown 126, on the conventional slenderness of the elegiac lover.

32) For *pes* in the sense of rhetorical rhythm, see Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 1 *pr.* 22, Quint. *Inst. Or.* 9.4.134.

elegiac poetry by his contemporaries (*candide iudex*, Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.1) and by later generations of cultivated Romans (*culte Tibulle*, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.28, 3.9.66; *tersus atque elegans*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93).

The final poem of the second book brings the elegiac affair to a close and depicts the elegiac speaker pondering a variety of possible conclusions. Most spectacularly and uncharacteristically, the poet-lover imagines setting off for war with vigor: *castra peto ... | et mihi sunt uires, et mihi laeta tuba est* (2.6.9-10). Formerly so slender and elegant as to be ill-suited for farm labor (2.3.9-10, quoted above), the speaker now claims to possess the physical strength for military campaigns. The lover's new-found physical strength– which may signal a new interest in epic poetry[33]—metaphorically suggests the poet's rupture with elegiac composition in the critical vocabulary that contrasts the weakness (*imbecillitas*) of the plain style to the force (*vires*) of the grand[34]. The hint finds confirmation in the following lines, where the poet-lover remembers the great designs that he formulated in the past: *magna loquor, sed magnifice mihi magna locuto* (2.6.11). Tibullus' grandiloquence here recalls the claims made by other Augustan poets not when taking leave of a mistress but when leaving a humble poetic genre to essay such elevated verse as epic or tragedy[35]. The Tibullan speaker's boast is brought to nothing, however, when his mistress closes her door: *sed magnifice mihi magna locuto | excutiunt clausae fortia uerba fores* (2.6.11-12). Although the poet-lover repeatedly vows never to return to her threshold, or to the composition of elegiac paraclausithyra (*iurani quotiens rediturum ad limina numquam*, 2.6.13), he admits that his foot, i.e. the rhythm of elegiac verse, returns (*cum bene iurauí, pes tamen ipse redit*, 2.6.14).

Ovid develops the literary resonances implicit in this scene more fully in an explicitly programmatic passage that imitates and elaborates Tibullus' portrait of a lover attempting to leave his mistress in the picture of a poet undertaking to write epic rather than elegy (Ov.

33) Proposed by E.N. O'Neil, *Tibullus 2.6: A New Interpretation*, CP 62 (1967), 163-168 (hereafter cited as O'Neil); accepted by Ball 222-223; and D.F. Bright, *Haec mihi fingebam* (Leiden 1978), 217-219 (hereafter cited as Bright); *contra* P. Murgatroyd (ed.), *Tibullus, Elegies Book II* (Oxford 1994), 239-240 (hereafter cited as Murgatroyd).

34) Cic. *Or.* 20, 23; cf. *De Orat.* 3.199, *De Opt. Gen.* 8, *Brut.* 289, *Or.* 76. *Vires* occurs frequently in the sense of literary 'capabilities or powers' in poetic contexts: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.12-13, *Epist.* 2.1.259; Prop. 2.10.5, 11, and 3.3.4; Ov. *Ars* 1.463, *Tr.* 2.531-532, *Pont.* 3.4.79. It is also attested in this sense in the criticism of Horace and Quintilian: cf. Hor. *Ars* 39 and Quint. *Inst.* 2.6.5, 10.6.6, 12.1.32; and see further Fantham 173-174.

35) Cf. *magni nunc erit oris opus* (Prop. 2.10.12), discussed below; *iam nunc contracto magnus in ore sonus* (Ov. *Am.* 3.1.64).

Am. 2.1.11-22)[36]). Just as the Tibullan elegiac lover returns to his mistress when his mistress locks him out, so the Ovidian elegiac poet returns to elegiac composition (*blanditias elegosque leues, mea tela, resumpsi;* | *mollierunt duras lenia uerba fores*, 2.1.21-22) when his mistress too shuts her door to him (*clausit amica fores. ego cum Ioue fulmen ouisi.* | *excidit ingenio Iuppiter ipse meo*, 2.1.17-18). The Ovidian passage offers a poetic commentary on the stylistic consequences implicit in Tibullus' description of the end of the elegiac affair in 2.6, and confirms the availability to an ancient audience of a metaphorical interpretation of the passage. Indeed Ovid's imitation of Tibullus 2.6 suggests that he recognized stylistic principle in the anatomical detail of this passage.

3. *Sunt qui Propertium malint*

Ovid remarks that in his youth he often heard Propertius recite (*saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes*, Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.45), a claim that implies Propertius performed his poetry in the newly popular *recitationes* of the period. Propertius' social standing and long association with Maecenas, whose poetic and rhetorical interests we also know to have been extensive, lend credence to the Ovidian notice. In his writings, the elder Seneca depicts Maecenas in frequent attendance at declamations, where he figures as a knowledgeable critic of the techniques of declamation and a great admirer of Vergil's poetry[37]). The patron of Vergil and Horace as well as of Propertius, Maecenas himself composed both poetry and prose. The younger Seneca adduces Maecenas as his primary example of the correspondence between personal and literary style (*Ep. Mor.* 114.4-23), citing evidence not only from his oratory but also from his poetry to develop the analogy[38]). The extant fragments of Maecenas' verse reveal a particular fondness for the style and metres of Catullus[39]), whose style and subjects Propertius also emulates.

Propertius explicitly emphasizes the significance of the anatomical

36) O'Neil, Ball 222-223, Bright 217-219, and Murgatroyd 239-240, discuss Tib. 2.6 in connection with *Am.* 2.18. K.F. Smith (ed.), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (Baltimore 1918; repr. Darmstadt 1978), 480 and J. Booth (ed.), *Ovid, Amores 2* (Warminster 1991), 102, discuss links between Ov. *Am.* 2.1.11-22 and Tib. 2.6.9-12.

37) Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 2.4.13, 9.3.14, 10 *pr.* 8, *Suas.* 1.12, 2.20, 3.5.

38) Cf. Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 19.9-10, 92.35, 101.10-13, 120.19; and Tac. *Dial.* 26.

39) See E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993), 276-281. Suetonius reports that the preciosity of his diction was disdained by Augustus (*Aug.* 86.2).

metaphor for his poetry in the lengthy programmatic poems that articulate the overtly Callimachean poetics of the second and third books of his *amores*[40]). Propertius opens Book Two with a *recusatio* which gestures to the success of his first volume of slender verse (*mollis liber*, 2.1.2)[41]) before developing the conventional image of the elegiac poet-lover's inability to undertake epic composition on the grounds of physical weakness. Denying that he has 'hero-sized hands', Propertius expresses his rejection of epic poetry through literary metaphor: *quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent,* | *ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus,* | ... | *bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris* (2.1.17-25)[42]). The lofty verse of epic is simply too hard on his diaphragm (*nec mea conueniunt duro praecordia uersu* | *Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos*, 2.1.41-42), the muscle upon which a speaker's delivery depends used by metonymy for the organ of poetic composition (cf. *in ora*, 2.1.2). By implication the elegist's breast is as 'narrow' as that of his poetic model Callimachus (*sed neque Phlegraeos Iouis Enceladique tumultus* | *intonet angusto pectore Callimachus*, 2.1.39-40). Propertius signals his literary allegiance to the finely crafted poetry of Callimachus by drawing on the critical terminology developed at Rome in connection with Atticist oratory (*si anguste et exiliter dicere est Atticorum*, Cic. *Brut.* 289). As Cicero snidely observes, the orator who espouses the plain style will be subdued in both voice and style for his lungs are not strong (*ualentiorum haec laterum sunt nec ab hoc quem informamus aut exspectanda aut postulanda; erit enim ut uoce sic etiam oratione suppressior*, *Or.* 85).

In 2.10, however, the Propertian *persona* essays the elevated poetry rejected in 2.1. Recognizing the challenge that writing elevated poetry presents to his slender frame, the elegiac speaker envisions failure from the outset (*quod si deficiant uires, audacia certe* | *laus erit: in magnis et uoluisse sat est*, 2.10.5-6). In fact the change of genre requires a concomitant transformation of his physical appearance: *nunc uolo subducto grauior procedere cultu,* | *nunc aliam citharam me mea Musa docet* (2.10.9-10). Both the new heaviness of the speaker's walk and the

40) On Propertius' use of Callimachean literary metaphor in 2.1, 2.10, 2.34, 3.1 and 3.5, see Wimmel 13-12 and 193-265; Wyke 1987; and DeBrohun 51-53.

41) On the programmatic implications in *mollis*, see Wimmel *passim*; P. Fedeli (ed.), *Properzio, Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie* (Bari 1985), 69-70 (hereafter cited as Fedeli 1985); and DeBrohun. On rhetorical *mollitia* cf., e.g., Cic. *Brut.* 38, *Or.* 77, 85, and Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 1 *pr.* 6-9, 2 *pr.* 1-2; and see further C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993), 63-97; and M.W. Gleason, *Making Men* (Princeton 1995), 103-130.

42) DeBrohun 51-52.

new elevation of his demeanor exemplify the more serious poetry he will learn to compose. Even his mouth must be large in order to meet the demands of his new literary style (*magni nunc erit oris opus*, 2.10.12). Only in this way will he become a poet of truly epic proportions: *uates tua castra canendo | magnus ero* (2.10.19-20). The poet's new stature symbolizes the magniloquence of epic, and is sketched in the critical terminology associated with the grand style (*grauitas, uires*) that is antithetically opposed to the weakness (*imbecillitas*) of the plain style.

The symbolic congruence of the elegist's body and his elegiac poetry is easily recognizable in these poems and has often been discussed in relation to Callimachean poetics, but the metaphor has only rarely been explored outside this context or in connection with classical rhetorical theory. Yet even the well known passages we have just examined take on specifically Roman meaning when interpreted in the light of contemporary rhetorical debate. It therefore seems worthwhile to consider the use of the metaphor elsewhere in the Propertian *corpus*. In 1.5, for example, the speaker warns a rival named Gallus, presumably the elegist[43]), not to pursue his *puella*. He cautions Gallus about the physical toll devotion to elegiac pursuits has exacted from him: *nec iam pallorem totiens mirabere nostrum, | aut cur sim toto corpore nullus ego* (1.5.21-22). Commentators note that the expression *toto corpore nullus ego* gains resonance from the topos of Hellenistic amatory poetry that characterizes the lover as wasted by love[44]) but when, as here, the convention exploits the vocabulary of ancient literary criticism there is an additional level of significance: the Propertian lover's emaciated physique metaphorically embodies the poet's slender verse. Cicero had criticized the Atticists for enervating oratory, pejoratively substituting for their claims of rhetorical *exilitas* and *tenuitas* the negative but nearly synonymous qualities of *ieiunitas*, *siccitas* and *inopia* (*Brut.* 285), and attributing to them an *exsiccatum genus orationis* (*Brut.* 291). Propertius, however, a committed poetic minimalist, recuperates this very scrawniness as the hallmark of the plain style[45]).

43) I accept the identification of the Gallus of Prop. 1.5, 10, 13 and 20, as the equestrian elegist C. Cornelius Gallus, first proposed by F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig 1901), and now widely accepted.

44) P. Fedeli (ed.), *Sesto Properzio. Il Primo Libro delle Elegie* (Florence 1980), 163-164 (hereafter cited as Fedeli 1980); cf. McKeown 126.

45) Cicero explicitly acknowledges this element of contestation in *Orator*: *in eodem genere alii calidi, sed impoliti et consulto rudium similes et imperitorum, alii in eadem ieiunitate concinniores, idem faceti, florentes etiam et leuiter ornati* (20); cf. Gell. *NA.* 6.14.4-5. See further Fantham 172-174, and W. Fitzgerald, *Catullan Provocations* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1995), 87-113.

In this regard, it may also prove fruitful to bring the Propertian poet-lover's *pallor* (1.5.21) into connection with both Cicero's portrait of the Attic orator who rejects artificial *candor* (*Or.* 79) and his ascription of a 'bloodless' style to the Atticists (*Brut.* 283, quoted above; *Or.* 76)[46]). Propertius exploits the semantic range of the adjective *pallidus* —whose sense in the color register overlaps with that of the critical vocabulary Horace uses in connection with Tibullus—to connect the elegiac lover's pale complexion with the rhetorical terminology applied to the plain style of elegiac poetry. His extension of this technical sense to *pallor* (and related forms) has received attention only in connection with Cynthia, whom the poet-lover taunts with the threat that his verse will stand as testimony not to her radiance but to her pallor (*hic tibi pallori, Cynthia, uersus erit*, 2.5.30)[47]). Throughout the *Monobiblos*, however, Propertius transfers the literary-critical resonances of *candidus* to *pallor* in his descriptions of the elegiac poet-lover. Thus the elegiac speaker claims *pallor* as his distinguishing feature at 1.5.21 (cf. 1.1.22, 3.8.28); he mocks the epic poet Ponticus for his inexperience in love (and love poetry) with a form of *palleo* at 1.9.17 (*necdum etiam palles*); and in 1.13, also addressed to Gallus, the speaker grants his rival the same bloodless appearance, and by implication the same plain elegiac style, that he claims for himself in 1.5 (*perditus in quadam tardis pallescere curis | incipis*, 1.13.7-8; cf. 3.16.19). Introduced in the *Monobiblos*, the lover's pallid complexion (like the plain *color* of his poetry) remains an important element of Propertius' elegy: *odi ego quae numquam pungant suspiria somnos: | semper in irata pallidus esse uelim* (3.8.27-28).

The portrait of Gallus that emerges from 1.13 shows further points of contact with the metaphor developed in the programmatic poems in connection with the Propertian *persona*. Propertius describes Gallus stumbling on his course, *incipis et primo lapsus abire gradu* (1.13.8), in a phrase whose meaning has been much disputed[48]). Fol-

46) On Cicero's metaphorical use of *sanguis*, see Fantham 167-169, 172-173.

47) See K. McNamee, *Propertius, Poetry, and Love*, in: M. DeForest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game*. Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King (Wauconda IL 1993), 215-248 (hereafter cited as McNamee): 225, with n. 36. As early as the first poem in the collection, the poet-lover hopes that her complexion will grow paler than his (*facite illa meo palleat ore magis!*, 1.1.22).

48) See S. Commager, *A Prolegomenon to Propertius* (Norman OK 1974), 13 (hereafter cited as Commager); and Fedeli 1980, 304-305, for a variety of suggestions.

lowing immediately after the reference to the pallor of Gallus' *persona*, or his plain elegiac style (1.13.7-8), the familiar pun on *pes*, both 'foot' and 'meter', may lie behind Propertius' strained use in this line of *gradus*, 'footing, stance'. Punning references to the gait of elegiac poet and mistress are frequent in the work of contemporary elegists and provide a useful point of reference for interpreting the Propertian passage. Tibullus for example depicts the feet of the lover 'stumbling' (*offensum pedem*, 1.3.20), and Ovid's poetry contains an especially inventive series of *pes* puns. In the *Amores* the feet of a personified *Elegia* are of uneven length (*pes illi longior alter erat*, *Am.* 3.1.8) and the collection of *Amores* opens with *Amor*'s theft of one of the poet's metrical feet so as to transform his second hexameter into a pentameter (*par erat inferior uersus; risisse Cupido | dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem*, *Am.* 1.1.3-4; cf. 17-18, 27-30). Propertius himself puns on *pes* at 3.1.6, and the pun can be parallelled in the opening lines of the *Monobiblos* where *Amor* imposes his metre on the lover's head, i.e. at the 'head' of the poet's book of verse (*et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*, 1.1.4)[49]). The pervasive punning in Augustan elegy, and in earlier Latin poetry, between the rhythm of elegy and the motion of elegiac characters alerts us to Propertius' innovative use of *gradus* in 1.13. Propertius' description of the other poet's gait marks Gallus as an elegiac poet-lover who stumbles on a characteristically uneven elegiac course.

Propertius offers a particularly rich synthesis of this critical vocabulary in 2.22. The elegiac speaker boasts to a friend of his enthusiasm for many *puellae* at a time and reports the terms in which his interlocutor has characterized such enthusiasm: *quaeris, Demophoon, cur sim tam mollis in omnis* (2.22.13). The elegiac speaker is *mollis* because he embodies the *mollis uersus* of elegy (1.7.19; cf. *mollis liber*, 2.1.2), and he assures Demophoon that he is constitutionally well-suited to the life of love (and love-poetry) precisely because of his slender appearance: *sed tibi si exilis uideor tenuatus in artus, | falleris: haud umquam est culta labore Venus* (Prop. 2.22.21-22). The speaker's limbs, *artus* (synonymous with *membra*), metaphorically evoke the component parts of his text, their slenderness embodying the refined and delicate lines of his elegiac verse in language drawn from the critical register and associated with the Atticists' stylistic ideals (*exilis*, *tenuatus*). Yet the

49) For *caput* as the 'beginning' of a literary work, cf. Cic. *Fin.* 4.8, Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.10, and see further *OLD* s.v. 16-18, and *TLL* 3.423.79-424.9, 3.424.27-52. The pun on *pes* is noted by Commager 24.

speaker's slight physique does not impair his amatory performance: *saepe est experta puella | officium tota nocte ualere meum* (2.22.23-24)[50]). Indeed his boast that he devotes the whole night to this office suggests his concurrent devotion to literary pursuits through the equivalence between the life of the poet and the life of the lover set in play by Catullus in such phrases as *multa satis lusi* (Cat. 68.17; cf. *agitamus amores*, Prop. 1.7.5).

To Lynceus, the addressee of the final poem of the second book (as we have it), Propertius recommends that he abandon the Aeschylean buskin and relax his limbs (or break up his clauses) to the gentler rhythms of slender verse: *desine et Aeschyleo componere uerba coturno, | desine, et ad mollis membra resolue choros* (2.34.41-42). This phrasing is reminiscent of Cicero's advice to the aspiring Attic orator to use sparingly all but the gentlest of metaphors (*ceteris promiscue poterit uti, continuationem uerborum modo relaxet et diuidat utaturque uerbis quam usitatissimis, tralationibus quam mollissimis*, *Or.* 85). Offering himself as a model for imitation (*aspice me*, 2.34.55), Propertius invites Lynceus to admire the figure he cuts as he reclines amidst yesterday's garlands. The elegist's studied languor here is the product of *Amor*'s sure marksmanship for the god's dart has penetrated the poet's bones, i.e. the essence of his verse (*me iuuet hesternis positum languere corollis, | quem tetigit iactu certus ad ossa deus*, 2.34.59-60)[51]). The talent for which Lynceus belittles him makes the poet of gentle elegy the hit of the party (*ut reguem mixtas inter conuiua puellas | hoc ego, quo tibi nunc eleuor, ingenio!*, 2.34.57-78; cf. 2.34.75-76). Indeed it is the very slightness of this poetry that garners the elegist his fame (2.34.85-94).

4. Ouidius utroque lasciuior

Concerning Ovid's training in rhetoric we have considerably more evidence than for that of Tibullus and Propertius. Ovid himself says that he was educated for a career in law and the Senate, i.e. in rhetoric, but abandoned public life at an early age to devote himself to poetry (*Tr.* 4.10.15-40), and the elder Seneca supplements this pic-

50) The association of night with both the composition of poetry and the pursuit of its subject-matter goes back through Catullus 50 (love and love poetry), at least to Callimachus *Epigr.* 27 (Pf.) (astronomy and astronomical poetry). On the association, see Commager 4-12, and McNamee. D.F. Kennedy, *The Arts of Love* (Cambridge 1993), 46-63 (hereafter cited as Kennedy 1993), sketches the discursive operations of the metaphor.

51) For the literary metaphor, see Cic. *Brut.* 68, Quint. *Decl.* 270; Tac. *Dial.* 21.1.

ture. He preserves the information that Ovid studied declamation with the rhetorician Arellius Fuscus and that he also admired Latro (*Contr.* 2.2.8), many of whose epigrams he imitated in his poetry. Quoting the rhetorician Cestius, who quipped that Ovid filled the age with erotic epigrams (*Contr.* 3.7), Seneca includes several examples of celebrated Ovidian *sententiae* throughout the *Controversiae*[52]). Ovid also appears, like Messala and Maecenas, as a participant in literary debate concerning the merits of Vergilian lines (*Contr.* 7.1.27). According to Seneca, Ovid was considered a good declaimer as a student (*Contr.* 2.2.9) although he preferred to declaim *suasoriae*, display pieces offering advice to a public figure in a critical situation, rather than *controuersiae*, legal cases (*Contr.* 2.2.12). Seneca also reports the derogatory comparison of the orator Montanus to Ovid made by the declaimer Scaurus who found both orator and poet careless and self-indulgent (*Contr.* 9.5.17). Immersed in this rhetorical culture, Ovid exploits the techniques and critical terminology of declamation in his poetry.

From the outset of the *Amores*, Ovid's verse embodies a carnal physicality alien to both Tibullan and Propertian elegy: *cum bene surrexit uersu noua pagina primo, | attenuat neruos proximus ille meos* (1.1.17-18; cf. *sex mihi surgat opus numeris, in quinque residat*, 1.1.27). Ovid's description of the elegiac couplet combines the technical terminology of rhetoric, in which *attenuatum* characterizes the plain style[53]), with an evocation of the Callimachean ideal of λεπτότης (Latin *tenuitas*). In addition a sexual double-entendre underlies this description of the rhythm of the elegiac couplet in diction that recurs elsewhere in the *Amores* in descriptions of the elegiac speaker's sexual arousal[54]). Throughout the *Amores*, Ovid mischievously exploits for sexual innuendo the conflation of author and text so often assumed in ancient critical discussion, as for example at 2.4.19-20: *est quae Callimachi prae nostris rustica dicat | carmina: cui placeo, protinus ipsa placet.* Here an easy equivalence between the poetry and the poet underpins the movement in the couplet from text to lover.

52) *Contr.* 1.2.22, 2.2.9-11, 3.7, 10.4.25.

53) *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.11; Cic. *Brut.* 283, *Or.* 108.

54) Cf. *Am.* 2.15.25-26 (*sed, puto, te nuda mea membra libidine surgent, | et peragam partes anulus ille uiri*), with Booth 171 ad loc.; *Am.* 3.7.75 (*sed postquam nullas consurgere posse per artes*), and 3.7.35-36 (*quid uetat et neruos magicas torpere per artes? | forsitan impatiens sit latus inde meum),* discussed below. For *surgo* in a sexual sense, see *OLD* s.v. *surgo* 1d. On the double-entendre in *Am.* 1.1.17-18, see W. Marg and R. Harder (ed.), *P. Ovidius Naso, Liebesgedichte. Amores* (Munich 1956), ad loc., and Kennedy 1993, 57-63; *contra* McKeown 22.

At three points in the collection Ovid explores the metaphor that maps the anatomy of the elegiac text on to the physique of the elegiac poet-lover. In a paraclausithyron, the speaker asks his girlfriend's door-keeper to admit him, slyly observing that long service to Love has wasted his limbs (or attenuated his clauses) to such an extent that the narrowest opening will suffice: *quod precor exiguum est: aditu fac ianua paruo | obliquum capiat semiadaperta latus. | longus amor tales corpus tenuauit in usus | aptaque subducto pondere membra dedit* (*Am.* 1.6.3-6). The use of *membra*, both limbs and clauses, in conjunction with a series of adjectives drawn from the critical register, activates the play with literary metaphor. Implicitly *exigua*, *tenua* or *tenuata* (suggested by the verb *tenuare*) and *parua*, the poet-lover's limbs, *membra*, evoke the exquisite delicacy of the clauses, *membra*, of his elegiac poetry[55]). Moreover through an inherent ambiguity in the term *amor*, the long love that has made the lover's body slender may also be interpreted as the poet's lengthy period in the service of *Amor*, the deity who presides over the slender verse of the *Amores* (*Am.* 1.1.3-4; 2.1.3-4, 38; 2.18.3-4, 15-16; 3.15). The Ovidian speaker credits the god *Amor* with teaching him such useful skills for the practitioner of a love-affair as creeping silently past guards on unstumbling feet (*ille per excubias custodum leniter ire | monstrat, inoffensos derigit ille pedes*, *Am.* 1.6.7-8; cf. Tib. 1.7.62) in lines that recall the opening scene of the *Amores*, where *Amor* imposes his metrical feet on a would-be epic poet (*Am.* 1.1.3-4, quoted above). The lover's feet move smoothly, *leniter*, in the style of elegiac verse (cf. *blanditias elegosque leues … lenia uerba*, *Am.* 2.1.21-22) in which the poet's metrical feet move smoothly under the direction of *Amor* (cf. *carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor*, Prop. 1.9.12).

Ovid characterizes the poet-lover's body in similarly elegiac style throughout *Amores* 2.10, another poem replete with sexual and literary puns. Like the poet-lover of Tib. 2.3.9 and the elegiac speaker of Prop. 2.22.21, the Ovidian speaker lays claim to graceful limbs, or metaphorically to slender verse (*graciles, non sunt sine uiribus artus*, 2.10.23), and to sexual stamina, or elegiac staying power (*pondere, non neruis, corpora nostra carent*, 2.10.24). In addition to the familiar sexual connotations of *uires* and *nerui*, there is at play in this passage an

55) For *tenuare* hinting at the stylistic principle of Callimachean λεπτότης through its relation to the adjective *tenuis*, see Prop. 3.1.5 with Fedeli 1985, 54-55, and cf. Cic. *Or.* 29 and 81. On these adjectives in literary critical contexts, see Wimmel; Commager 8 n. 12 and 46 nn. 20-22; and H.J. Mette, *'genus tenue' und 'mensa tenuis' bei Horaz*, MH 18 (1961), 136-139.

undertone of literary potency (cf. Tib. 2.6.10, discussed above)[56]. Thus the speaker's boast that full nights are devoted to erotic pastimes (*saepe ego lasciue consumpsi tempora noctis, | utilis et forti corpore mane fui*, *Am.* 2.10.27-28) suggests the simultaneous devotion of those nights to literary pursuits (cf. Prop. 2.22.23-24, discussed above). Recognition of a literary nuance in *Amores* 2.10.27 is especially attractive since the line recalls the repeated refrain of *Amores* 1.6, *tempora noctis eunt; excute poste seram* (*Am.* 1.6.24, 32, 40, 48, 56, varied at 70), and the poet-lover's bitter observation there, *omnia consumpsi* (*Am.* 1.6.61).

Ovid's lengthy description of the poet-lover's impotent body in *Amores* 3.7 also repays inspection in this context, for the poem plays an important role in articulating the final book's program of disengagement from elegy. Despite the blandishments of a compliant elegiac *puella*, the poet-lover proves impotent in *Amores* 3.7: *tacta tamen neluti gelida mea membra cicuta | segnia propositum destituere meum* (*Am.* 3.7. 13-14). The lover's impotence characteristically evokes both the resourcelessness of the elegiac lover and the weakness of the Attic style he espouses, but here, paradoxically, it has the further function of metaphorically documenting the poet's flagging interest in elegiac verse. Indeed the *frigus* that afflicts the lover's loins corresponds in literary terms to the grandeur antithetical to the exquisite refinement of elegiac style[57]. The speaker's *corpus*, formerly well endowed for erotic encounters (cf. *Am.* 2.10.28, *Am.* 3.7.23-26), is now adapted to the task of disengagement from elegiac composition and so is figured as *truncus iners ... species et inutile pondus* (*Am.* 3.7.15). The adjective *iners* in this context signals a rupture with elegiac writing practices, for *ars* is a criterion of the utmost importance in defining the stylistic refinement of elegy. Even the poet-lover's insistence on his youth is phrased in such a way as to underline the propriety of prosecuting love-affairs and writing love-poetry during that period of life: *quae mihi nentura est, siquidem uentura, senectus, | cum desit numeris ipsa iuuenta suis?* (*Am.* 3.7.17-18). Ovid here exploits an ambiguity in the noun *numerus* to activate the latent sense of 'poetic measure, metre': the appropriate measures of youth are, of course, the alternation of

56) On *uires* in the sense of 'the virile forces or organs', see Lewis & Short s.v. *vis* I.B.3; on *nerui* in the sense of 'sexual power, virility', see *OLD* s.v. *neruus* 6b, and J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Baltimore 1982), 38 and 224. On literary *uires*, see n. 34 above.

57) For *frigus* in reference to the stylistic excess antithetical to the exquisite refinement of elegy, see Freudenberg 191-192.

hexameter and pentameter lines in the elegiac couplet (cf. Prop. 2.10.7-8; Ov. *Am.* 3.1.27-28)[58]. In 3.7, Ovid presses to its limits the metaphor that figures the elegiac text as the sexually dynamic or dysfunctional body of the elegiac speaker.

This study of the three Augustan elegists whose poetry Quintilian discusses has situated their use of the metaphor associating a poet's body with his poetic text in the context of Roman rhetorical theory, and has emphasized the correspondence to Attic style in the elegists' individual appropriations of the trope. Thus the graceful speaker of Tibullan elegy exemplifies the radiant bloom of the plain style. The simple elegance of Tibullus' verse is congruent with the stylistic principles of his patron Messala, whose oratory Quintilian describes as clear and polished though lacking in force (*Messala nitidus et candidus et quodam modo praeferens in dicendo nobilitatem suam, uiribus minor*, *Inst. Or.* 10.1.113)[59]. By contrast, the Propertian elegiac *persona* cuts a pale and scrawny figure in his slender verse. In his very resourcelessness, he recalls Cicero's strictures against the weakness of the *soi-disant* Atticists. Yet there is also a close correspondence between Propertius' application of the adjective *mollis* to elegiac verse (1.7.19, 2.1.2, 3.1.19, 3.3.18) and its practitioners (2.22.13) and the notoriously dissolute (*mollis*) life and oratory of his patron Maecenas[60]. Indeed it is tempting to speculate that one of the features of Propertian elegy that first attracted Maecenas' notice was the characterization of both elegist and elegy as *mollis*. Ovid acknowledges the programmatic force of this quality of Propertian elegy (*mollierunt duras lenia uerba fores*, *Am.* 2.1.22), though he prefers to describe his own elegiac verse with the nearly synonymous *tener* (*Am.* 2.1.4; 2.18.4, 19; 3.15.1) which better reflects the carnal physicality on display in the presentation of both elegiac lover and elegiac poetry in the *Amores*. The stylistic delicacy of Ovid's elegiac verse (and the physical delicacy of his elegiac speaker) mirrors the elegance of his rhetorical talent, which the elder Seneca characterized as 'polished, graceful, and delightful' (*habebat ille comptum et decens et amabile ingenium*, *Contr.* 2.2.8).

Despite the variation from one poet to another, all three elegists deploy the metaphor within the range delimited by the term 'Atticist' in Roman rhetorical debate, repeatedly testifying to the slenderness of their limbs, talent, and verse. At the height of their erotic (and

58) *OLD* s.v. *numerus* 14.

59) Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 18.2, *Cicerone mitior Corvinus et dulcior et in uerbis magis elaboratus.*

60) Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 114.4-8.

elegiac) powers, the elegiac poet-lovers (and their texts) are slender and elegant, their complexions (and literary *colores*) candid and smooth, their hands and limbs graceful and soft. Sometimes they appeal to their physical, or literary, strength (*pectus*, *uires*, *nerui*) in undertaking (literary) tasks greater than they can achieve (in elegy), but they are always in the end compelled to return to the narrow literary sphere for which their talents fit them (cf. *carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem*, Prop. 3.2.1). The thematic parallels in the elegists' use of bodily metaphor, along with Propertius' repeated invocation of Callimachus, announce the allegiance of the genre to the exquisite style of Callimachus' elegiac poetry, a style which is to be distinguished from contemporary Augustan poetry both more elevated (such as Vergilian epic or Horatian lyric) and less (such as Horatian satire and moralizing epistles). Recognizing the pervasive debt to Roman rhetorical terminology in the elegists' formulations of the Callimachean aesthetic deepens and complicates our enjoyment of their sophisticated poetry, and helps us to appreciate more fully the Roman cultural context in which Latin elegy was composed and performed[61].

University of TORONTO, Victoria College, Ontario, M5S 1K7, Canada

61) I am grateful to C.M. Connors, S.E. Hinds, M.B. Skinner, and S.J. Rupp for their comments on earlier versions of this article.

PARTHENIUS *GRAMMATICUS*

BY

CHRISTOPHER FRANCESE

Parthenius of Nicaea is mainly known as a poet, a follower of Callimachus and, since an influential article by Wendell Clausen in 1964, as the most important Greek poet active in Rome in the late republic. Only fragments of his verses remain; but Roman poetry changes radically in its orientation during his residence in Italy, and Parthenius has been seen by some as an important catalyst in those changes[1]. I propose to deal here not with Parthenius' poetry or with any possible echoes of it in Roman literature, but instead with the concrete practicalities of how Parthenius and his Roman friends interacted, a topic that has received much less attention. In particular I want to understand the statement of Macrobius (5,17,18) that Parthenius served as Vergil's *grammaticus in Graecis*, his 'teacher in Greek things'. What does the word *grammaticus* mean in this context, and what does it suggest about Parthenius' relationship with Vergil?

Normally we think of a *grammaticus* as a primary teacher of language and literature. Roman boys visited the school of a *grammaticus* after they learned to read, but before pursuing the study of rhetoric. The *grammaticus* introduced his pupils to authors such as Homer and Ennius, forced them to memorize some passages, and taught them the rules of correct writing and speaking. Those who progressed that far in education would begin their study at around twelve or thirteen, and continue for two or three years[2]. Thus most

1) See *Suppl. Hell.* 605-666 (testimonia and poetic fragments). W. Clausen, *Callimachus and Latin Poetry*, GRBS 5 (1964), 181-196. L. Alfonsi, *Poetae Novi* (Como 1945), 56-72. A. Rostagni, *Partenio di Nicea, Elvio Cinna ed i poeti novi*, AAT 68,2 (1932-33), 497-545. Lindsay Watson, *Cinna and Euphorion*, SIFC 54 (1982), 93-110. N.B. Crowther, *Parthenius and Roman Poetry*, Mnemosyne 29 (1976), 65-71. E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (=*FLP*), (Oxford 1993), 212-214.

2) On the grammatical curriculum: Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (Berkeley 1977), 189 ff.; R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley 1988), 11-14 with earlier literature; Alan D. Booth, *The Appearance of the Schola Grammatici*, Hermes 106 (1978), 117-125.