



Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics

Peter E. Knox

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. 89. (1985), pp. 107-119.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0688%281985%2989%3C107%3AWWWACP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology is currently published by Department of the Classics, Harvard University.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/dchu.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WINE, WATER, AND CALLIMACHEAN POLEMICS

PETER E. KNOX

WE know very little about the details of the celebrated dream in which Callimachus was transported to Helicon and received by the Muses. Most of what we do know comes from the late anonymous epigram, *AP* 7.42. For the rest we are left with a few fragmentary lines (fr. 2 Pf.) and the scattered and often confusing references to the scene in later literature. That ignorance and the obvious importance which the Roman poets attached to this missing portion of the *Aetia* have provoked a flood of speculative comment by scholars on the significance of the critical terminology that developed out of this scene. Among the most important problems in the interpretation of the poetry of Callimachus's adherents at Rome are the source of his inspiration in the dream and the specific poetic associations of the streams and fountains mentioned there. A closely related problem lies in the symbolism of wine and water as sources of poetic inspiration. What follows constitutes an attempt to sort out a few of the lines of evidence, and in the case of certain later Hellenistic epigrams to reassign some of the polemical characteristics of this symbolism to the epigrammatists themselves, whose contributions in these matters are more original than is generally credited. A subsidiary argument is that Callimachus's contemporaries shared a great deal more of the Callimachean creed than one might expect, given the hostility apparent in the polemical pronouncements of the *Aetia* and the *Hymn to Apollo*. A case in point is found in the intensely Callimachean setting of Vergil's *Sixth Eclogue* where the initiation of Gallus finds a compelling parallel in a reference to the poet most closely identified with anti-Callimachean poetry, Antimachus of Colophon.

I. *Numquam nisi potus*

The epigrammatist Antipater of Thessalonica is firmly dated to the Augustan period by references in his verse to his relationship with L. Calpurnius Piso, apparently his patron. Antipater is represented in

the *Palatine Anthology* by some 100 epigrams.¹ In general, he adopts a light-hearted tone suitable to the occasional nature of his verse. His active dislike of pedantic poetry is documented in a particularly caustic and allusive piece:

Φεύγεθ' ὄσοι λόκκας ἢ λοφνίδας ἢ καμασῆνας
 ἄδετε, ποιητῶν φύλον ἀκανθολόγων,
 οἳ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες
 κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.
 σήμερον Ἀρχιλόχοιο καὶ ἄρσενος ἤμαρ Ὀμήρου
 σπένδομεν· ὁ κρητῆρ οὐδέχθε' ὕδροπότας.
 (AP 11.20 = XX G-P)

Although Callimachus is not specifically named, the allusion in line 4 (cf. Call. *H.* 2.112 *πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς*) makes it clear that he is its principal target.² Attacks on Callimachus and Callimachean poetry are not uncommon in epigrams of the Augustan period or after.³ An attractive feature of Antipater's poem is his combination of the attack on pedantic poetry with the motif of water drinking, playing on the familiar imagery of Callimachus and holy springs. Antipater's piece has often been used in other contexts to argue that the distinction between wine and water as symbols for different sorts of poetic inspiration was widely recognized in antiquity and, in particular, that it was familiar to Callimachus. So, for example, the following epigram by Antigonus is commonly described as an allegorical attack on Callimachus:⁴

¹See A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Garland of Philip II* (Cambridge 1968) 20–21, on the difficulties involved in distributing epigrams between the Thessalonian and the earlier poet of the same name from Sidon.

²Gow-Page on line 1: "There is no indication who used any of these words but the sneers are evidently directed, if not at Callimachus himself, at his followers and admirers." It is surely worth mentioning the attribution to Callimachus of a fragmentary hexameter in *Et. Gen.* containing the word by K. Diltthey, *De Callimachi Cydippa* (Leipzig 1863) 14; cf. Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 755. Elsewhere the word is found only at Lyc. 48.

³In much the same vein are the anti-Callimachean epigrams of Philip, AP 11.321, 11.347 (= LX–LXI G-P) and Antiphanes, AP 11.322 (= IX G-P). Callimachus, of course, has also his defenders, e.g., Crinagoras, AP 9.545.

⁴Thus Gow-Page (above n.1) 17; M. Rubensohn, "Gegen die Wassertrinker," *Hermes* 26 (1891) 153–156; E. Reitzenstein, "Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos," *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein* (Leipzig 1931) 56.

ἀργυρέη κρηνίς με τὸν οὐκέτι μακρὰ βοῶντα
 βάτραχον οἰνηραῖς ἔσχειν ὑπὸ σταγόσιν·
 κείμαι δ' ἐν Νύμφαις, κείναις φίλος, οὐδὲ Λυαίω
 ἔχθρός, ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων λουόμενος σταγόσιν.
 ὀψέ ποτ' εἰς Διόνυσον ἐκώμασα. φεῦ τίνες ὕδωρ
 πίνουσιν μανίην σῶφρονα μαινόμενοι.
 (AP 9.406 = I G-P)

A simpler interpretation is possible, one that assumes the frog to be a frog and not a poet,⁵ but only likely if it can be shown that the polemical associations of wine and water were not commonplace.

It has been asserted that the use of wine and water to represent different approaches to poetry is found as early as the fifth century B.C.⁶ The only passage to support this contention is a trimeter of Cratinus incorporated into a later epigram, and the evidence it provides is far from clear:

οἴνός τοι χαρίεντι πέλει ταχὺς ἵππος ἀοιδῶ
 ὕδωρ δὲ πίνων οὐδὲν ἄν τέκοις σοφόν.
 (Nicaen. AP 13.29.1–2 = fr. 199 K)

Wine as an aid to composition is attested as early as Archilochus,⁷ and the association of this practice with early poets is apparently traditional.⁸ On the other hand, we have no evidence that any pre-Alexandrian poet espoused the virtues of water as a source of inspiration.⁹ If Cratinus is making a polemical point, then all that can be

⁵ The epigram, as Gow-Page note, is related to “Plato” AP 6.43 on another frog-shaped item.

⁶ E.g., A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (Heidelberg 1965) 119; J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge 1974) 48–49; N. B. Crowther, “Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration,” *Mnem.* 32 (1979) 5 n.20.

⁷ Fr. 120 W (= Ath. 628a) ὡς Διωνύσου ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος | οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴῳ συγκεραννωθεὶς φρένας. Cf. also Ar. *Ran.* 354ff.

⁸ E.g., Homer (Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.6), Alcaeus (Ath. 10.429a), Aristophanes (Ath. 10.429a), Anacreon (Ath. 10.429b), Aeschylus (Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 622e; Ath. 10.428f.).

⁹ The argument that Pindar’s references to springs (e.g., *O.* 6.84–87, *I.* 6.74–75) are not relevant seems to me well taken. He is not concerned with drinking from springs for inspiration: cf. W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924) 29 n.13; Kambylis (above n.6) 113–115. Of course, Pindar’s references to springs could be interpreted differently by later poets; cf. M. Poliakoff, “Nectar, Springs, and the Sea,” *ZPE* 39 (1980)

extracted from these lines is a distinction between the inspired composition of good poetry (*σοφόν*) associated with wine and all the rest, that is, bad poetry. It is after all more than likely that he is making use of his well-known fondness for the grape for humorous purposes.¹⁰ In any event, in the absence of supporting evidence we cannot take this fragment as confirmation of the fifth-century polemical associations of wine and water.

For our purposes it is obviously of less importance to determine whether a recognizable set of poetic associations for wine and water did exist in the fifth century than it is to ascertain whether this symbolism was important for Callimachus himself.¹¹ There is only one reference in the fragments to the traditional association of poetry and wine in a vague allusion to Archilochus: τοῦ <ν> μεθυπλήγος φροῖμιον Ἀρχιλόχου, fr. 544 Pf. However, this is apparently only a reference to Archilochus's own statement and tells us nothing about Callimachus's attitude toward his work.¹² But taken together with another fragment on Archilochus, it has suggested to some that his assessment of the earlier poet was negative:

εἴλκυσε δὲ δριμύν τε χόλον κυνὸς ὄξυ τε κέντρον
σφηκός, ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἰὸν ἔχει στόματος
(fr. 380 Pf.)

The passage perhaps suggests that Callimachus had reservations about the content of Archilochus's poetry, but this by no means rules out approval of his style. The example of Horace is instructive: *numeros*

41–47. Phrynichus fr. 69 K (= Ath. 2.44d), which is adduced by Crowther (above n.6) 5 n.20, does mention a certain Lampsacus (the musician?) as a water drinker, but the context is obscure, and this is a slender thread on which to hang a school.

¹⁰The fragment is from Cratinus' Πυτίη (cf. fr. 203 K-A); and Cratinus's fondness for drink was also a target for Aristophanes: e.g., *Pax* 700–703. Compare also the similar phrasing of Nicias's protest at *Eq.* 88 πῶς δ' ἀν μεθύων χρηστόν τι βουλεύσαιτ' ἀνὴρ, which meets with immediate rejection. Similarly, Horace's tone in the opening lines of *Epist.* 1.19 is ironic and his criticism is directed not at a particular school of poetry but at those who slavishly imitate even the mannerisms of their literary betters (*o imitatores, seruum pecus*, 1.19.19); cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 340.

¹¹So Kambylis (above n.6) 118ff., but the more sober assessment of Crowther (above n.6) 5 points to the opposite conclusion.

¹²See above n.7.

animosque secutus | *Archilochi, non res et agentia uerba Lycamben, Epist.* 1.19.24–25.¹³

In short, the single reference to the association of wine and poetry conveys no hint of polemic. Indeed, it is difficult to see how Callimachus could use wine and water in and of themselves to designate opposing concepts of poetry. It is surely relevant that the Augustan poets appeal to Bacchus as a poet's god.¹⁴ So far as we know (or may suspect), water derives its symbolic importance for Callimachus from the initiation scene in the first book of the *Aetia*.¹⁵ Water, in fact, has significance as a symbol of inspiration only if it comes from a sacred fountain (*πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς*, *H.* 2.112) to which Callimachus has special access. It is only Callimachus's enemies who extend the significance of this metaphor by turning Callimachus into a teetotaler for the sake of ridicule. In particular, it appears to have been the novel contribution of the epigram which served as the starting point for this discussion. Antipater's attack on water drinking poets draws on the same themes deployed by the same poet in a nonliterary piece in which he takes issue with abstinence and its adherents on moral grounds.¹⁶

οὐ μοι Πληϊάδων φοβερὴ δύσις οὐδὲ θαλάσσης
 ὠρῶν στυφελῶ κύμα περὶ σκοπέλω,
 οὐδ' ὅταν ἀστράπτῃ μέγας οὐρανὸς ὡς κακὸν ἄνδρα

¹³ In fact Callimachus's reference elsewhere to *ἡδὺν . . . Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον* (fr. 384.37–39 Pf.) may reflect not only epinician convention but also a positive assessment of Archilochus in at least some respects.

¹⁴ Cf. esp. Prop. 2.30.37–40, 3.2.9, 4.1.62, 4.6.75; and see Nisbet and Hubbard's introductory note to Hor. *C.* 2.19. Callimachus, however, does not associate Dionysus with poetry in general: fr. 191.7 is suggestive rather than conclusive and *Ep.* 8 refers to a dramatic contest where the reference to Dionysus is conventional.

¹⁵ In fr. 178.15–20 Pf., the conversation between Callimachus and the stranger from Icus, the poet urges the moderate consumption of wine, tempered with conversation as well as water. In an interesting discussion, Ruth Scodel, "Wine, Water, and the Anthesteria in Callimachus Fr. 178 Pf.," *ZPE* 39 (1980) 37–40, shows how Callimachus evokes the myth of Erigone to suggest the dangers of wine. But it is unlikely that a literary point is being made here or that the passage plays upon the alleged polemical associations of wine and water, as Scodel seems to suggest (39 n.9). The learned reference is in Callimachus's best manner, but, to me at least, the context seems exclusively aetiological.

¹⁶ For the theme compare Plut. *Mor.* 612d; Mart. 1.27; 10.48.21–24.

ταρβῶ καὶ μύθων μνήμονας ὑδροπότας.
(*AP* 11.31 = XXXVII G-P)

It is only possible to find a literary point in this or other epigrams on the same theme if we accept that the identification of Callimachus as a water drinker was commonplace by the end of the first century B.C.—an unlikely assumption, as we have seen.¹⁷ That Callimachus did not view himself in this light is attested by his own epitaph:

Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εἶ μὲν ἀοιδὴν
εἰδότης, εἶ δ' οἴνω καίρια συγγελάσαι.
(*Ep.* 35 Pf.)

But his innovative use of water imagery in the initiation scene on Helicon provided a handle for Antipater, whose epigram is apparently a clever innovation. Out of the ancient association of wine and poetry and the conventional criticism of water drinkers, he has seized upon a novel means of participating in the contemporary fashion of attacking Callimachus.

II. Παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν

The evidence from Callimachus and later epigrammatists surveyed above seems to suggest that the literary associations of wine and water were not fixed until a much later date. It is not difficult to discover the origins of the misconceptions surrounding the metaphorical significance of Callimachus's dream. In the surviving work of the third-century epigrammatists, Asclepiades, Posidippus, and Hedyllus, we can at least partially trace the outlines of a significant literary dispute. One major aspect of this dispute involved the evaluation of the *Lyde* of Antimachus of Colophon. In assessing the polemical content of this dispute, we will once again need to avoid importing the biases of hostile epigrammatists of a later period into the analysis of our Alexandrian sources.

¹⁷ Antipater has one other epigram on the evils of sobriety, *AP* 9.305 (= XXXVI G-P). Literary significance is assigned to all these epigrams by Reitzenstein (above n.4) 56. *AP* 11.24 does in fact play upon the Hellenistic attribution to Hesiod of drinking from inspirational streams, for which see Asclepiades, *AP* 9.64 (= XLV G-P) and Alcaeus, *AP* 7.55 (= XII G-P). Antipater appears to have extended his criticism of Callimachus, however illegitimately, to his model.

The literary reputation of Antimachus, such as it is, depends for the most part on the surviving fragments of his work, a few scattered references, and the notorious verdict of Callimachus: *Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν*, fr. 398 Pf.¹⁸ It is not difficult to guess what Callimachus might have objected to in Antimachus's *Thebaid*, but given what we know of its subject matter and style, it is less easy to understand his criticism of the *Lyde*. As a collection of mythological narratives in elegiacs composed in honor of his mistress, the construction of the *Lyde* may well have borne some resemblance to that of the *Aetia*.¹⁹ The poem does not appear to have exercised any lasting influence,²⁰ but it did attract considerable attention in the third century, and the evidence suggests that Callimachus's opinion was isolated.

Callimachus's older contemporary, Asclepiades,²¹ praises the *Lyde* in two couplets whose conceit is that the woman who provides the title of the poem is made to speak for herself:

¹⁸ B. Wyss, *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae* (Berlin 1936), is still the only complete edition of the fragments, together with introduction and testimonia. For more recent additions, see now Parsons and Lloyd-Jones, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983) nos. 52–79. For a general assessment of Antimachus, see D. W. T. C. Vessey, "The Reputation of Antimachus of Colophon," *Hermes* 99 (1971) 1–10; also R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship I* (Oxford 1968) 93–95.

¹⁹ Wyss (above n.18) xxiv: "fore ut nostri quidem aevi hominibus magnae partes Aetiorum, id carmen si servatum esset, a Lyde vix distare viderentur, mihi paene persuasum habeo." Cf. also D. Del Corno, "Ricerche intorno alla Lyde di Antimaco," *Acme* 15 (1962) 58.

²⁰ In poetry after the third century B.C. there is only an uninformative reference in Ovid *Tr.* 1.6.1. The notion that Antimachus's *Lyde* and similar works such as the *Leontion* of Hermesianax served as models for the Roman elegists, until recently believed extinct, has been revived by F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979) 214–230. It is worth recalling a more cautious assessment of Antimachus's survival by A. Henrichs, "Towards a New Edition of Philodemus' *On Piety*," *GRBS* 13 (1972) 77: "Although copies of Antimachus' epic poetry must have been available to the Roman reading public until well after the middle of the first century B.C., there is no evidence of the survival of the *Lyde* into late Republican times." Ovid's lines in the *Tristia* imply only that he knew of the *Lyde*, not that he had read it. For Catullus 95 and Prop. 2.34.45, which refer to the *Thebaid*, see D. Del Corno (above n.19) 62 and Vessey (above n.18) 3.

²¹ For his possible influence on Callimachus, see R. Reitzenstein, *RE* 2.1627.15ff.; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria I* (Oxford 1972) 719.

Λυδὴ καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὖνομα, τῶν δ' ἀπὸ Κόδρου
 σεμνοτέρη πασῶν εἰμι δι' Ἀντίμαχον·
 τίς γὰρ ἔμ' οὐκ ἤεισε; τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λυδὴν,
 τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου;
 (AP 13.23 = XXXII G-P)

It is, of course, the final line of this epigram that Callimachus stands on its head in his negative judgment of Antimachus.²² Asclepiades' positive verdict is echoed in an epigram by another contemporary, Posidippus,²³ which takes the form of a toast:

Ναυνοῦς καὶ Λύδης ἐπίχει δύο καὶ φιλεράστου
 Μιμνέρμου καὶ τοῦ σώφρονος Ἀντιμάχου·
 (AP 12.168.1–2 = IX G-P)

It is clear that Asclepiades and Posidippus differed from Callimachus in their judgment of the *Lyde*. This relatively straightforward disagreement over the evaluation of a predecessor is complicated by the inclusion of Asclepiades and Posidippus in the list of Telchines in the Florentine Scholia on Call. fr. 1 Pf. Our best evidence as to the reason for their inclusion in the list of Callimachus's enemies is their favorable assessment of the *Lyde*.²⁴ What we must consider is whether the proponents of the *Lyde* asserted a different set of literary values at odds with Callimachean aesthetics or whether the disagreement amounted to interpretation based on the same generally accepted stylistic standards.

²² Wilamowitz, "Die Thukydidislegende," *Hermes* 12 (1877) 357 n.42.

²³ On the evidence for a connection between these two epigrammatists, see conveniently, Gow and Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* II (Cambridge 1965) 115–118.

²⁴ This would be considerably easier to assert if ἡ μεγάλη γυνή (Call. fr. 1.12 Pf.) could in fact refer to the *Lyde*, but in view of the testimony of the Florentine Scholia that seems impossible. The bibliography on this line is prodigious. For recent discussion, see V. J. Matthews, "Antimachus in the Aitia Prologue," *Mnem.* 32 (1979) 128–137 and A. S. Hollis, "Callimachus, Aetia fr. 1.9–12," *CQ* 28 (1978) 402–406. Both propose (independently) the supplement θεῖν at the beginning of line 10, but Matthews takes this to refer to the *Artemis* of Antimachus, while Hollis, following Pfeiffer, prefers to have the short works of Philetas and Mimnermus contrasted with their own longer works. This passage is still not understood. Alternatively, one must consider the very real possibility that any dispute with Asclepiades and the other Telchines may have been purely personal; cf. Del Corno (above n.19) 59.

Certainly the objections voiced by Callimachus in fr. 398 seem to have been stylistic; specifically he faults the poem for an absence of λεπτότης. Nevertheless, Callimachus's disapproval of the *Lyde* did not prevent him from making use of it in the *Delian Hymn*, as is attested by Philodemus, *De Pietate*: Κ]αλλιμάχο[ς δὲ τὰ παρ' Ἄντιμάχῳ με]ταλαβὼν ἔγρ[αψε]ν [ὧ]ς οὐδὲ [τῆς] Ἡρ[ας] δ[ιέφν]γε τὸ [μῦθος].²⁵ And he probably imitated Antimachus on other points of subject matter, meter, or diction.²⁶ Still, his antipathy toward the style of the *Lyde* might have been sufficient to alienate him from his contemporaries who did not share his opinion. This does not mean that they disagreed in principle. There is nothing in the surviving epigrams of Asclepiades or Posidippus that conflicts with what we know of Callimachus's stylistic standards. It is perhaps worth noting here the association of Asclepiades/Sicelidas with Callimachean poetics depicted in Theocritus's *Thalysia* (39–48). And Hedylus, who is often connected with Asclepiades and Posidippus, makes a claim for λεπτότης, associating this quality with inspiration from wine:

πίνωμεν, καὶ γάρ τι νέον, καὶ γάρ τι παρ' οἶνον
 εὔροιμ' ἄν λεπτὸν καὶ τι μελιχρὸν ἔπος.
 ἀλλὰ κάδοις Χίου με κατάβρεχε καὶ λέγε "παῖζε,
 Ἡδύλε"· μισῶ ζῆν ἐς κενὸν οὐ μεθύων.
 (Ath. 11.472F = V G-P)

In the absence of evidence that Callimachus identified wine with a specific school of poetry, we should be cautious in assuming there to be any irony intended here.²⁷ The qualities which Callimachus claimed for his own poetry seem also to have been claimed by his contemporaries, and not surprisingly, they expressed themselves in similar terms.²⁸

Significantly, there is no evidence of disagreement between Callimachus and this circle of epigrammatists over Antimachus's other major work, the *Thebaid*. Probably there was none. Callimachus's aesthetic principles seem not to have come under attack. Rather,

²⁵ So reconstructed by Henrichs (above n.20) 72–77, now available as *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 78. For a different interpretation of μεταλαβὼν, see G. Giangrande, "Kallimachos und Antimachos," *Hermes* 102 (1974) 117–119.

²⁶ Cf. Wyss (above n.17) *xlvii*; Del Corno (above n.19) 85 n.89.

²⁷ Pace Kambylis (above n.6) 121–122; cf. also Crowther (above n.6) 4–5.

²⁸ Compare Hedylus, Ath. 11.473a (= VI G-P) in a compliment to an otherwise unknown poet, ἀλλὰ παρ' οἶνον | Σικελίδεω παίζει πολλὴ μελιχρότερον with Call. fr. 1.16 Pf. ἀηδουίδες δ' ὦδε μελιχρότεραι and Pfeiffer's note ad loc.

there was a difference over the assessment of the *Lyde*, but in succeeding generations the climate of opinion shifted. Toward the end of the second century B.C. another epigrammatist, Antipater of Sidon, stands the aesthetic terminology of the earlier Alexandrians on its head in praise of the *Thebaid*:

ὄβριμον ἀκαμάτου στίχον αἶνεσον Ἄντιμάχοιο,
 ἄξιον ἀρχαίων ὄφρνος ἡμθέων,
 Πιερίδων χαλκευτὸν ἐπ' ἄκμοσιν, εἰ τορὸν οὐδας
 ἔλλαχες, εἰ ζαλοῖς τὰν ἀγέλαστον ὄπα,
 εἰ τὰν ἄτριπτον καὶ ἀνέμβατον ἀτραπὸν ἄλλοις
 μαίεαι.

(*AP* 7.409.1–6)

That it is the *Thebaid*, and not the *Lyde*, which is meant here is clearly indicated by ὄβριμον στίχον in the opening line and the epithet ἀκαμάτου.²⁹ The clear allusion to the prologue of the *Aetia* in lines 5 and 6, as well as the inversion of Callimachus's criticism of the *Lyde* in line 3, reveal the anti-Callimachean focus.³⁰ Praise of Antimachus's epic does not resurface after Callimachus until relatively late,³¹ and in this regard Antipater seems to anticipate later sentiment. But in associating specifically Callimachean values with Antimachus's *Thebaid*, the Sidonian makes a connection that might have surprised even the fiercest among the Telchines.

²⁹ For ὄβριμον στίχον, cf. Hor. *S.* 1.10.43 *forte epos*. Gow-Page express puzzlement at ἀκαμάτου, but the reference is probably to a familiar Homeric *topos* at *Il.* 2.488–492. Alternatively, one might consider that Antipater is attributing Callimachean ἀγρυπνίη to Antimachus.

³⁰ The phrase τορὸν οὐδας recalls not only Call. fr. 398 Pf. but also a phrase employed by Callimachean poets in expressing their standards of critical judgment, e.g., Prop. 2.13.11–12:

me iuuet in gremio doctae legisse puellae
 auribus et puris scripta probasse mea.

And Posidippus, *Tab. Berol.* 14283 (l. 2) καθαροῖς οὐασιν with the commentary of H. Lloyd-Jones, "The Seal of Posidippus," *JHS* 83 (1963) 81–82. See now also *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 705.

³¹ Cf. Del Corno (above n.19) 63 .16; G. Serrao, "La *Lide* di Antimaco e la critica callimachea," *QUCC* 32 (1979) 98; Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 398.

III. On the Banks of the Permessus

Water, in and of itself, is not a literary symbol for Callimachus; what matters is its source, and what distinguishes his poetry is that he drinks directly from the sacred fountains of Helicon.³² The further argument that out of Hesiod's initiation in the *Theogony* Callimachus constructed a hierarchic arrangement of inspirational streams rests largely on a couplet of Propertius:

nondum etiam Ascraeos norunt mea carmina fontis,
sed modo Permessi flumine lauit Amor.
(2.10.25–26)

If we accept the designation of Hippocrene as the source for serious epic verse and the Permessus as the stream of love elegy,³³ then, the standard interpretation runs,³⁴ Propertius pronounces himself still unfit to attempt the higher strain. But the attribution of such a dichotomy to Callimachus is unlikely and cannot be inferred from this couplet or the other key passages in Propertius.³⁵ The consequences for the interpretation of this couplet, though significant, need not be considered here. The crucial point, argued convincingly by David Ross, is that the Ascraean fountains and the Permessus represent the same poetic tradition: Propertius has not yet written serious Hesiodic verse, but his love poetry draws on the same tradition.³⁶ The issue is important not only for the interpretation of Propertius but for the history of the development of Latin elegy.

³² So much, at any rate, can be reconstructed of the initiation scene; see, e.g., Reitzenstein (above n.4) 52–69 and Kambylis (above n.6) 89–123 with further references.

³³ E.g., E. Maass, "Untersuchungen zu Properz," *Hermes* 31 (1896) 375–434; Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung* II (Berlin 1924) 93–95; W. Kroll (above n.9) 29; W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960) 233–238.

³⁴ For which see the commentators ad loc. and M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (London 1975) 74–75; S. Commager, *A Prolegomenon to Propertius* (Cincinnati 1974) 60; G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* (London 1969) 139–141.

³⁵ Cf. Reitzenstein (above n.4) 58–59; Kambylis (above n.6) 184–185; Z. Stewart, "The Song of Silenus," *HSCP* 64 (1959) 203 n.65.

³⁶ *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge 1975) 119–120. Propertius makes a contrast between the two verbs, *norit* and *lauit*, not the *Ascraeos fontis* and *Permessi flumine*. See also the review of Ross by J. E. G. Zetzel in *CP* 72 (1977) 251–252 and Crowther (above n.6) 7–9.

tum canit, errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum
 Aonas in montis ut duxerit una sororum,
 utque uiro Phoebi chorus adsurrexerit omnis.
 (Verg. *Ecl.* 6.64–66)

This difficult passage appears to portray a change in the career of Cornelius Gallus from love elegy to epyllion in the Alexandrian manner.³⁷ But Ross, after arguing that the Permessus and the Aonian fountains signify the same sort of inspiration, suggests that Vergil is not concerned with Gallus's love poetry here: Gallus is being rewarded for earlier compositions in the Hesiodic vein.³⁸ That is almost surely not the case. Vergil means to represent a shift from Gallus's preoccupation with love poetry, and to do so, he draws on the poetic associations of Orpheus. The figure of Orpheus as a representative of his poetic inspiration is a particularly powerful and peculiarly personal development of Vergil's. In Gallus's initiation into the ranks of semi-divine poets in *Eclogue* 6, the imagery draws heavily on associations with Orpheus, with whose characteristics even Hesiod is endowed.³⁹

hos tibi dant calamos—en accipe—Musae,
 Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
 cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.
 (*Ecl.* 6.69–71)

Why was Gallus wandering by the Permessus? The situation certainly has erotic overtones: *errantem*, like Pasiphae in line 52.⁴⁰ And the lover who consoles himself by water is perhaps conventional. But in poetry this scene is specifically connected with Orpheus consoling himself on the loss of Eurydice, a scene portrayed by Vergil in the *Georgics*:

ipse caua solans aegrum testudine amorem
 te, dulcis coniunx, te solo in litore secum,

³⁷ Again, see the commentators ad loc. and F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig 1901) 36–38; Luck (above n.33) 53.

³⁸ Ross (above n.35) 32–34.

³⁹ *Ille* (70) must refer to Hesiod as a representative of scientific poetry, *pace* Ross (above n.35) 23.

⁴⁰ For the suggestiveness of *errare* in this passage, see R. F. Thomas, "Theocritus, Calvus, and *Eclogue* 6," *CP* 74 (1979) 337–339.

te ueniente die, te decedente canebat.

(4.464–466)

No earlier representation of this episode survives, but it is likely to have formed part of the tradition associated with Orpheus.⁴¹ Vergil, in presenting Gallus as similarly afflicted, is not the first to portray another poet in this situation. Hermesianax of Colophon included in his elegiac *Leontion* a catalogue of poets overcome by love. The list begins with Orpheus, singing alone by the river Cocytus,⁴² and includes Antimachus:

Λυδῆς δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος
πληγείς Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμ' ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ·
(fr. 7.41–42 P)

The Lydian river, Pactolus, is an appropriate point of reference if Antimachus is to be portrayed as a love poet in the tradition of Orpheus.⁴³ In Vergil's symbolism the association of the river Permessus with Gallus's love poetry implies that it is also composed in the Hesiodic-Callimachean manner. His removal to another Hellenic locale does not then involve a change in the aesthetic foundations of his poetry but only a shift in thematic interests, the same shift which Propertius in 2.10 proclaims himself unable to make.

Vergil's source for his material on Orpheus is not known. It is unlikely that he recalls this passage of Hermesianax directly, but the parallel is suggestive. That another Hellenistic poet not identified with Callimachus should make use of the same imagery as Vergil is consistent with the evidence presented above. It may well be that the first reaction among the targets of Callimachus's polemical verse was one of astonishment.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

⁴¹ Cf. O. Gruppe in Roscher *Lex.* 3.1159.

⁴² Hermesianax fr. 7.7 ἀλλ' ἔτλη παρὰ κῦμα μονόζωστος κιθαρίζων. Ovid perhaps draws on the same material in portraying his Orpheus mourning by the Styx: *squalidus in ripa Cereris sine munere sedit*, *Met.* 10.74.

⁴³ Cf. Antimachus fr. 191 West (= *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 79), formerly Call. fr. 814 Pf., Πακτωλοῦ χρυσόοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδήροισι θάασσον.

I am grateful to Professors D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Richard Tarrant, and Richard Thomas for helpful comments on this article.