

CALLIMACHUS AND ROMAN POETRY*

By

JERZY MANTEUFFEL

I. CALLIMACHUS' TEXTS DISCOVERED AND PUBLISHED IN RECENT YEARS

It has happened in the history of papyrus discoveries that one lucky strike brought about the recovery of long stretches of text by lost authors. Such was the case with Bacchylides, Herondas and Menander, to limit oneself to authors of absolutely highest rank in Greek poetry.

Callimachus, however, is among the authors whose poetry has only been returned to us by the sands of Egypt in small portions. In such cases the progress of knowledge is slow and at times only made possible by arduous inquiry. It is a test both for the efficiency of philological criticism, and for the strength of the method itself.

It is only in recent years that Callimachus has risen to a prominent place in research, a fact we owe to the work of English and Italian scholars.

*

The modern period of investigating Callimachus' work began in 1873, when O. SCHNEIDER published his *Callimachea*, excellent for his times, carefully collecting in it all of the poet's legacy that had reached us via the mediaeval tradition, whether directly or indirectly.

New papyrus discoveries from before 1923 were then published, with exhaustive critical apparatus, by R. PFEIFFER, *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, Bonn 1923. Apart from shorter fragments, his work contains the following items of significance:

P. Oxy. VII (1910) 1011, with longer passages from the *Aetia* (especially the famous elegy on Acontius and Cydippe), *Iambi* and trochaic poems;

* Originally published in Polish in "Eos" XLI 1940–1946, fasc. 1, pp. 73–108. Apart from the "Addendum", the paper was written in 1941.

P. Ber., with fragments of the *Songs*: in Archebulean metre for the death of Arsinoe, and the *Pannychis* in Euripidean metre;

P. Oxy. XI (1915) 1362, containing a passage (important from the point of view of its structure) from the *Aetia* describing a feast at Pollis;

P. Oxy. XV (1922) 1793, with some very short fragments of the *Coma Berenices*, a poem for a victory of Magas and Berenice, an elegiac epinician for Sosibius, and short fragments of scholia etc¹.

Again, a number of momentous texts by Callimachus has been published since PFEIFFER's book:

First of all, *P. Oxy.* XVII (1927) 2079 and 2080 with the so-called Telchines elegy and a longer excerpt from book II of the *Aetia*;

PSI IX (1929) 1092, which yielded 20 verses from the *Coma Berenices*;

PSI IX 1094 and XI 1216 with fragments of the *Iambi*.

Finally, there is the latest great find, the discovery of a largely preserved scroll containing so-called *Διηγήσεις*, or summaries of Callimachus' poems. Its first edition came out in 1934: *ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ di poemi di Callimaco in un papiro di Tebtynis*, ed. M. NORSI, G. VITELLI, Firenze 1934; then another one with one extra fragment, much commentary and many digressions in *Papiri della Reale Università di Milano*, ed. Achille VOGLIANO et al., vol. I, Milano 1937, no. 18.

In addition, there are important commentaries on Callimachus in *P. London Lit.* 181 (= H.I. MILNE, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, London 1927) = *P. Oxy.* XVII, pp. 55 f. and the so-called *Scholia Florentina* in *PSI XI* 1219.

Those *Διηγήσεις* from the Milan papyrus, already famous today, and the *Scholia Florentina*, are similarly arranged and probably come from the same source. They are summaries, or else narrative reports, of Callimachus' individual poems, sometimes resembling extracts or ἐπιτομαί. In both these texts after every indented line, so-called ἔκθεσις, which is at the same time the title of a poem or of a part of a poem, there follows a shorter or longer extract from its content, or part thereof; in the case of the *Aetia* the *Διηγήσεις* list only the core of the content, the custom or event described. The summaries generally observe the convention of mythological narrative, as do those for some of the *Iambi* and the *Hecale*. Moreover in the *Iambi*, especially in places where the poet's personality asserts itself as he mentions himself or people around him, the epitomist may add some information on those personal allusions.

As they have been preserved, and with the extra fragment included, the *Διηγήσεις* contain the summaries of the *Cydippe*, the last four elegies of book III, 17 *aitia* from book IV, the *Iambi*, including the epodic poems, the *Songs*, the *Hecale*, parts of *Hymn I* and half of *Hymn II*. The last column of the scroll is mostly empty, indicating that the epitomist was interrupted in his task.

¹ E. CAHEN, *Callimaque*, Paris 1922 is not sufficient for scholarly purposes.

The *Scholia Florentina* also supplement the Milan scroll, providing a fragmentary summary of the prologue to the *Aetia* and of elegies 1 and 2–4 from book I, and the British Museum papyrus (*P. London Lit.* 181) has a commentary on the prologue and selected *aitia*.

*

According to those new materials, Callimachus' poems come in the following order: first, the *Aetia*, preceded by the prologue, or the so-called Telchines elegy, starting with the line οἶδ' ὅτι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῆ. We currently have of this work one 40-verse column and fragments of another, both from *P. Oxy.* XVII 2079, which contains the famous literary-aesthetic debate between Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes and his followers, where he outlines his aesthetic view of poetry. Almost half of the debate had already been known previously from as many as 17 loose quotations in other authors. Next comes Callimachus' dream, the same whose echo rings out through Roman poetry in the times of Augustus and whose motif would inspire the epigrammatists of the *Anthologia Palatina*, followed by a many-coloured strand of aetiological stories of highly artful arrangement and motifs ever more varied, beginning with the cult of the Charites on Paros and ending with the braid of queen Berenice, spotted among the constellations in the sky. Among the *aitia* of book I there are, besides the one on the cult of the Charites, the story about the Argonauts at Anaphe, and about Heracles in Lindos and among the Dryopes; we still do not know the rest of the book. *P. Oxy.* XVII 2080 gives us some idea as to the ordering of book II: the poet lists a number of Sicilian cities, all of whose founders are known; the one exception is Drepanum, and he learns why from the Muse Clio, to then ask her more questions.

According to P. MAAS' calculation², book III consisted of 17 elegiac stories.

The beginning of the *Διηγῆσεις* for this book has been lost; in the preserved fragment there is an epitome of the *Cydippe*. The next two elegies are also missing and continuous text only begins with elegy 16 of this book: why women call on Artemis in childbirth. *Aition* 17 looks into the reasons for honouring the statue of Euthymus, a victor at Olympia.

Book IV, the only one summarised in the *Διηγῆσεις* with nothing missing, together with the Epilogue follows a strict pattern of composition, since it starts with an invocation to the Muses to sing Zeus: Μοῦσαί μοι βασιλῆ[α θεῶν ~ ~ ~ ἀεί]δειν (*Dieg.* col. II 10) and in the Epilogue ends with: χαῖρε, Ζεῦ, μέγα καὶ σύ, σάω δ' [ἔδον] οἶκον ἀνάκτων (fr. 9 PF., line 88; cf. my *Studia Callimachea*, *Eos* XLI 1940–1946, p. 100). The first elegy is about Pythian Apollo; in its wake come variegated aetiological stories: the *aition* of Abdera, the myth of Ino and

² In: *Papiri della Reale Università di Milano*, ed. A. VOGLIANO (et al.), vol. I, Milano 1937, pp. 155 f.

Melicertes, an Italic legend of the wrath of Artemis, a story of the Pelasgic wall in Athens, of Euthymus who was a victor at Olympia, the *aitia* of the statues of Hera in Argos and on Samos, then of the temple of Hera in Ephesus, of the port in Phalerum, a legend from Paros about fighting the inhabitants of Thasos, and a story about the sacrificial smoke splitting in two at the funeral of Oedipus' sons. Elegy 15, particularly characteristic, has an Italic legend about Gaius the Roman who lived at the time of a supposed siege of Rome by the tribe of Peucetii; number 16 is the *aition* of the temple of Athena in Cyzicus, and finally 17, the last one, is, much to our surprise, the story of Berenice's braid. The Epilogue treats of Cyrene, the home city of Berenice and Callimachus alike, and ends with an announcement of moving on to the *Iambi*: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν ἔπειμι νομόν (fr. 9 PF., line 89).

The *Iambi* are a collection of 13 poems of fairly varied metrical structure; 1–4, as well as 13 (the transition to the *Songs*), in choliambic trimeter; 11–12 in iambic trimeter catalectic; 6 in epodic metres (trimeter and ithyphallic); 9 in trimeter and Archilochian verse; 8 in trimeter and lecythion (?); 7 and 10 in trimeter combined with an epodic element unknown to us; finally 5 in choliambic trimeter with iambic dimeter acatalectic. Cf. MAAS, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 169.

Just like their metre, the subject matter of the *Iambi* is most varied. In 1, Hipponax, raised from the dead, addresses to philosophers (or philologists?) gathered in the Serapeion a speech on the subject of Bathycles' cup; 2 has a fable of the times when animals could speak but having offended Zeus lost the power, and the god granted it to various people; that poem has a strong ring of satire about it. 3 is aimed against striving for riches and advises virtue, so it is a protreptic poem; 4 introduces the reader to the rivalry among Alexandrian poets and is again satirical: after a personal introduction, the poet tells a vivid story of the conflict between the ivy and the olive; 5 turns against a teacher befouling his own disciples.

After those satirical *iambi* come aetiological ones: in 6 Callimachus explains to a relative the details regarding the throne of Zeus at Olympia; 7 is an *aition* of Hermes' cult in Thracian Aenus; 8–10 are *aitia* of the agon Ὑδροφόρεια, the statue of Hermes in a palaestra, and Castnian Aphrodite. 11 contains the explanation of a proverb, and 12–13 are personal. In 12, prompted by his granddaughter's birthday, the poet confesses that he was chosen for song by Apollo. Undoubtedly the last *iambus*, beginning with Μοῦσαι καλάι κάπολλον οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω, would be the most interesting; in it the poet defended himself from the charge that the poetic genres he practiced were too diverse. In response he said he trod in the footsteps of Ion the tragician, and the charges were unjust since nobody would reproach e.g. architects for introducing variety into their buildings. Unfortunately that poem has only reached us in the summary.

The above listing demonstrates how vastly important Callimachus' poetry is for history of literature, especially as it can be seen as an intermediate stage between Archilochus and Horace.

We further learn from the *Διηγήσεις* that Callimachus' *Songs* were four in number and fairly long, from which it follows that as early as the 2nd century AD, for that is the dating of the scroll, his shorter poems were counted among the *Epigrams*.

The first of the *Songs* begins with the words ἡ Λήμνος τὸ παλαιὸν εἶ τις ἄλλη, observes the Phalaecian metre and has a paraenetic tone; the subject is the old blessed Lemnos in the times before the killing of the men.

The second, in Euripidean metre, starts with the lines ἔνεστ' Ἀπόλλων τῶ χορῶ· τῆς λύρης ἀκούω· καὶ τῶν Ἐρώτων ἠσθόμην· ἔστι κάφροδίτη, and was already known fragmentarily before (fr. 2 Pf.). It addresses the Dioscuri and Helen, as well as banqueters, calling them to a vigil, or so-called παννυχίς.

The next, in Archebulean, reads Ἀγέτω θεός, οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ δίχα τῶνδ' αἰεῖδεν in a style that could be called baroque, it includes apotheosis of the dead queen Arsinoe. It, too, was known before in fragments (fr. 1 Pf.)

Finally, the last song applies choriambic pentameter: Δαίμονες εὐσυνότατοι Φοῖβέ τε καὶ Ζεῦ Διδύμων γενάρχα (*Dieg.* col. X 14 = fr. 36 SCHN.). It tells the story of the shepherd Branchus which was quite popular in antiquity.

Most of the *Songs* were until recently considered separate poems.

The *Διηγήσεις* continue with a very cursory summary of the *Hecale*, which adds nothing new to the previously known fragments and unfortunately does not indicate that the famous epyllion had highly artful composition.

Finally, selected parts of the *Hymn* I and II are summarised at the end.

We have given the Milan *Διηγήσεις* so much attention, because they are not as yet broadly available in Poland, and the wealth of material they contain makes them absolutely worth getting familiar with³.

Only now do we have a broader view of the diversity of subject matter and wealth of motifs in Callimachus, who with such virtuosity reconciles the erudition of Alexandrian poetry with the high art of composition and elegance of form – although the latter is rather attested to by the fragments themselves. Uninterrupted diversification of motifs and of ways of telling the story are without any doubt among the dominant features of his poetry.

II. CALLIMACHUS IN NEOTERIC POETRY

Before we investigate echoes of Callimachus in Neoteric poetry, it is fitting to note that the first to graft the Greek elegiac metre onto Roman ground was Ennius in his *Epigrams*. It is also Ennius who first drew on Callimachus (and Hesiod) in his dream motif in the *Annales*. It is however still a very general reminiscence.

³ Cf. also my *Studia Callimachea*, *Eos* XLI 1940–1946, pp. 81–103, where I propose a number of completions.

The first tangible trace of Callimachus in Latin poetry, indeed an adaptation of a poem of his, is to be found in Q. Lutatius Catulus. Catulus and his circle in Rome imitated the Alexandrian epigrammatists, and primarily, it seems, Callimachus, always considered in Rome the greatest of the Alexandrians. In the preserved fragment of Catulus, who flourished around the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st century BC, – *Aufugit mi animus*, one can clearly hear something of Callimachus' epigram 41:

Ἡμισὺ μὲν ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'
εἶτ' Ἔρος εἶτ' Ἀΐδης ἤρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.

Lutatius probably took the above poem from Meleager's *Garland*, since recently HUBAUX put forward the convincing hypothesis according to which that epigrammatic anthology was brought to Rome by the poet Archias, himself an imitator of Meleager, who then introduced Lutatius Catulus' poetic circle to it⁴.

While we do not know the exact date when the *Garland* was published, adopting HUBAUX's hypothesis does explain the somewhat sudden proliferation of the Alexandrian erotic epigram in the poetic circles of Rome at that time. During the same time, Laevius, a member of Lutatius Catulus' circle, writes an Alexandrian *πάγνιον* in Rome under the title *Erotopaegnia*.

We do not know either whether Callimachus' influence was present, or to what extent, in the work of the leader of the Neoterics in Rome, Valerius Cato. If the hypothesis is true that at least part of the *Dirae* from the *Appendix Vergiliana* is his, then we should rather guess that Cato professed the idyllic trend in Alexandrian poetry.

In Calvus' poems there might have been echoes of Alexandrian eroticism, and some have seen in them a reference to Callimachus' *Io*, but of course we cannot consider that proven. Varro Atacinus on the other hand more likely followed in the footsteps of Apollonius of Rhodes, well known as Callimachus' opponent⁵.

And so we are getting close to the most talented of the Neoterics, Valerius Catullus. Perhaps we should not take Cicero's scornful term for them, *cantores Euphorionis*, too literally. Possibly he wanted to emphasise that they were not yet a match for their Hellenistic models; after all it is common knowledge that it was Euphorion who mannerised Callimachus' style.

The works of Catullus to receive the most attention in recent years are *carmen* 66, a poetic translation of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*, and the dedication to Hortensius Hortalus contained in *carmen* 65, and to certain extent also *carmen* 63. The latter was written in elegiambic metre and supposedly modelled on

⁴ J. HUBAUX, *Les thèmes bucoliques dans la poésie latine*, Bruxelles 1930.

⁵ Cf. E.A. BARBER's introduction in the edition of Propertius by H.E. BUTLER and E.A. BARBER, Oxford 1933, pp. LV f.

Callimachus' *Attis*, of which however we hardly know anything. It could have formed part of the *Aetia*; cf. Ovid. *Ib.* 453 f.

In *carmen* 65 the poet reveals that, mourning his brother's death, he has neglected the Muses, or, as he calls them, *doctas sorores*, and proceeds to add that from now on, he will only compose threnodies. Even so, he continues (lines 15 f.):

Sed tamen in tantis maeroribus, Hortale, mitto
haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae,

meaning of course his *carmen* 66, and keeping his promise, so that Hortalus' exhortations should not scatter (lines 19 f.)

Ut missum sponsi furtivo munere malum
procurrit casto virginis e gremio...

which perhaps shows a reminiscence of Callimachus too, as indicated even by the close proximity of 66⁶.

Today we can compare this poem, and especially lines 45–64, with Callimachus' original, preserved in the papyrus scroll *PSI IX 1092*, originating in the 1st century BC⁷.

The technique and artistic value of Catullus' translation were analysed in detail by E. FRAENKEL, B. LAVAGNINI and R. HELM⁸. They demonstrated that in general Catullus aimed at faithful translation, even preserving the couplets of the original, although sometimes he would refrain from that, e.g. fr. 34 SCHN. is Catullus' lines 7 f. The faithfulness of his translation also shows in pairs of excerpts such as line 48, Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος: "ut Chalybon omne genus pereat"; or line 58, Κανωπίτου ναίετις αἰγιαλοῦ: "Canopeis incola litoribus".

Here and there he omitted words, and added others, e.g., line 47, τί πλόκαμοι ῥέξωμεν, ὄτ' οὔρεα τοῖα σιδήρω εἴκουσιν: "quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant?" The resulting word order is sometimes slightly artificial, e.g. lines 45 f.:

Βούπορος Ἀρσινόη[ς, ἐφύη]ς σέο καὶ διὰ μέ[σσου]
Μηδείων ὄλοαὶ νῆες ἔβησαν Ἄθω.

Cf.:

⁶ Cf. A. VOGLIANO in: *Papiri...* (n. 2), p. 73, n. 1 and U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, vol. II, Berlin 1924, pp. 304 f.

⁷ In addition, we have short parts of *Coma Berenices* in fr. 34 and 35 a–d SCHN., fr. 60 PF., and *Dieg.* (= *Papiri...* [n. 2]), col. V 40.

⁸ E. FRAENKEL, *Gnomon* V 1929, pp. 265 f.; B. LAVAGNINI, *Annuario 1928/29 del Liceo Ginnasio G. Carducci in Viareggio*, Pisa 1929; R. HELM, *Phil. Wochenschr.* L 1930, p. 234; cf. also M. LENCHANTIN DE GUBERNATIS, *SIFC* (n.s.) VII 1929, fasc. 2, pp. 113 f.; and F. AGENO, *Aegyptus* X 1929, p. 171, n. 1.

cum Medi peperere novom mare, cumque iuventus
per medium classi barbara navit Athon⁹.

Catullus often adds some artificiality of expression, as in line 51, “abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores luebant”:

[ἤδη ἀπ]οτμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφραί,

and introduces ornamentation, e.g. in line 62, [καὶ Βερ]ενίκειος καλὸς ἐγὼ πλόκαμος: “devotae flavi verticis exuviae” etc.

The recently recovered fragment of Callimachus proved helpful in the textual criticism of Catullus’ poem and amend some of the errors which slipped into its manuscripts. It has also demonstrated how mistaken certain modern interpretations of parts of the often quite convoluted *carmen* 66 were. That is especially true of lines 52 ff., as has already been proven by A. VITELLI, the distinguished editor of Callimachus’ new text. Lines 51 ff. of Catullus read

Abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores
luebant, cum se Memnonis Aethiopis
unigena impellens nutantibus aera pennis
obtulit Arsinoes Locricos alisequos,
isque per aetherias me tollens avolat umbras
et Veneris casto collocat in gremio.

Since MONTI, who referred here to a description in Pausanias of a painting depicting Arsinoe on Helicon riding an ostrich, Catullus’ enigmatic *unigena* has been thought to mean that bird. However, the original leaves no room for doubt that the poet intended Zephyrus:

[ἤδη ἀπ]οτμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφραί,
[καὶ] πρόκατε γνωτὸς Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπο[ς]
ἴ[ε]το κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερὰ θῆλυς ἀήτης
[πτηνὸς] ἰο[ζ]ώνου Λοκρικὸς Ἀρσινόης.
[κοῦφα δέ μ]ε πνοιῆ[σι δι’ ἥερος οὔτος αἰέρας]
[Κύπρ]ιδος εἰς κόλ[πον σεμνὸν ἔνεικε θεῆς].

In the article cited above (n. 8), E. FRAENKEL, based on line 53 (let me on my part add 45, and probably 59 too), reaches the conclusion that in his translation Catullus used some commented edition of Callimachus, equipped with encyclopaedic explanations and listing synonyms for the more difficult expressions.

As a courtly poet’s work, the *Coma Berenices* has, as I noted not long ago in my *Studia Callimachea*, much Hellenistic flavour. Let me illustrate:

In lines 45 f. quoted above, after complaining about the power of iron that nothing can resist, the Lock mentions the excavation of Mount Athos, according

⁹ Cf. my *Studia Callimachea* (n. 3), pp. 82 ff.

to legend, as we know, done at Xerxes' orders. Callimachus in a courtly manner calls the resulting channel "Arsinoe's straits", βούπυρος Ἀρσινόης, since she had a strong connection to Thrace, at whose shores Mount Athos stands. Before she married Ptolemy Philadelphus and became the queen of Egypt, Arsinoe had already been married twice, to Lysimachus of Thrace and Ptolemy Keraunos. After her death, Philadelphus erected a temple to her on Samothrace¹⁰. Now in Arsinoe's apotheosis (fr. 1 P.F.), when he mentions the smoke rising from sacrifices at her funeral, Callimachus adds that it spreads across the sea towards Thrace. Naturally the Romans of Catullus' time could no longer appreciate the subtle gesture without a commentary, so the translator poet was content with the general expression *novom mare*.

And another example: in lines 59 ff. the Lock describes the place in the sky where Aphrodite has put it, and according to my reconstruction that place is the vicinity of the constellation Hydra, near Corona Borealis (or Ariadne's Wreath). In the far reaching coils of that constellation the Egyptians saw a heavenly image of their Nile; thus in honouring his queen, Callimachus put her hair over the Nile of the heavens. And more examples could be adduced.

Comparing the Greek original and its Roman adaptation in general terms, one must note that the translation does not equal the original; Callimachus is more witty and lighter, but also clearer, subtler in its allusions and simpler of form. Catullus' version has a distinct Roman texture to it, with cruder features and artificial ornamentation. Moreover, the Roman poet was not able to hide the difficulties he was facing, resulting in a certain artificiality, and in some places even clumsiness of form.

Similar remarks could be made of Catullus' other Hellenistic adaptations.

III. CALLIMACHUS IN THE AUGUSTAN POETRY

A. GENERAL INFLUENCE

When browsing Roman poetry from the times of Augustus, one receives the impression that its authors were for the most part familiar with Callimachus, although the familiarity was in general superficial, based on a few selected poems interpreted in schools. Thus works written by poets in their youth are more reminiscent of the Alexandrian; in their later years and as their talents grow, they either become more independent, or conversely they bend to the currents and catchwords of their times and rather turn towards the literature of free Greece. Elegiac poets are the exception, particularly Propertius and, even more so, Ovid. In their case superficial knowledge of Callimachus, probably acquired at school, turns

¹⁰ Cf. S. WITKOWSKI, *Historia Egiptu w epoce Ptolemeuszów*, Lwów 1938, pp. 257 ff.

into an in-depth study of him as they consciously strive to improve the quality of their poetry and search for new inspiration and a broader range of motifs.

And so as regards that general influence, Callimachus' most popular poem in Rome was the Telchines elegy, or the prologue to the *Aetia*, written towards the end of the poet's life, perhaps when he was working on its second edition for the publication of his collected poems¹¹. The main reason was that it was in that famous elegy, for the most part only recently recovered, that Callimachus expressed his views on the aesthetics of poetry.

The poet says that the Telchines scold him for not writing a continuous poem (ἄεισμα διηνεκές) thousands of lines long to sing kings and heroes and instead spinning short works like a child: ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλίσσω παῖς ἄτε (lines 5 f.). In response to the accusations, he points to Philetas and Mimnermus, whose charm is to be found precisely in the short forms (αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν) and adds the famous sentence: poetry is to be measured by its art, and not with a Persian standard (lines 17 f.):

ἔλλετε, βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος, αὔθι δὲ τέχνη
κρίνετε, μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην,

and thunder is of Zeus and not a poet's doing. When he first started writing, Apollo told him that one ought to take care that the herd be fat, and the muse, subtle. He obeyed and followed the unfrequented path imitating the voice of the grasshopper and avoiding the braying of an ass (lines 21–30). Then Callimachus briefly characterises his work¹².

In the epilogue to the *Aetia*, after honouring his home city of Cyrene, and Berenice, who was celebrated in the final elegy of book IV, the author confesses that he has followed Hesiod, greets Zeus, and announces the upcoming transition to the *Iambi* (fr. 9 Pf., line 89):

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν ἔπειμι νομόν.

Certain expressions, whole turns of phrase and the Apollo motif are repeated in a number of Roman poets.

Let us start with the former. We encounter the Callimachean ἄεισμα διηνεκές in Horace (*Carm.* I 7, 6: “carminē perpetuo celebrare”) and Ovid (*Met.* I 4), and its opposite in Hor. *Epist.* II 1, 225 (“tenui deducta poemata filo”). There are similar phrases in Propertius (II 1, 5: *carmen tenuare*) and Vergil (*Ecl.* 6, 5: *deductum carmen*); cf. line 24 in Callimachus (μοῦσα λεπταλέα). The final words of the epilogue can be found in Horace (*Serm.* II 6, 17: “quid prius

¹¹ Cf. R. PFEIFFER, *Hermes* LXIII 1928, p. 39; H. HERTEN, *RE Suppl.* V (1931), col. 410.

¹² *P. Oxy.* XVII 2079; cf. E. LOBEL, *Hermes* LXX 1935, pp. 32 f.

inlustrem saturis musaque pedestri”). Reminiscences of the prologue are more frequent (lines 1 f.):

Οἶδ’ ὅτ]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῆ
[νήδε]ς οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι.

The prologue echoes through Hor. *Epist.* II 2. Having mentioned Callimachus and Mimnermus, Horace confesses:

(102) multa fero, ut placem genus irritabile vatum
(106) ridentur mala qui componunt carmina.

Cf. lines 17 f. of the prologue:

ἔλλετε, βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος, αὐθι δὲ τέχνη
κρίνετε, μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην.

Reminiscences of the Apollo scene are almost a standing motif in Roman poetry. *P. Oxy.* XVII 2079, lines 21 ff. has:

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρῶτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
[γούνασιν], Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·
ἦ δέον ἄμμιν ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
[βόσκειν, τή]ν μοῦσαν δ’ ὦ γαθέ, λεπταλέην.

Cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 3 ff.:

Cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
vellit et admonuit: pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen;

Hor. *Carm.* IV 15, 1 ff.:

Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui
victas et urbis increpuit lyra,
ne parva Tyrrenum per aequor
vela darem...

and *Serm.* II 6, 5 ff.:

Maiā nate [...] hac prece te oro:
pingue pecus domino facias et cetera praeter
ingenium...¹³

Cf. also Prop. IV 1, 131 ff.; III 3, 13; and Ov. *Ars am.* II 493; compare Callimachus’ prologue, lines 3 and 19 f. with Prop. II 1, 17 and IV 1, 133.

¹³ Cf. E. BIGNONE, RFIC (n.s.) VII 1929, pp. 473 ff.

General reminiscences of the prologue to the *Aetia* are also clear in Propertius III 1, 1 ff.:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae
 in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
 Primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
 Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.
 Dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro? (1–5)
 [...] scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas
 quid frustra missis in me certatis habenis?
 Non datur ad Musas currere lata via. (12–14)

A freer kind of literary discussion combined with a clear influence of Callimachus is found in Hor. *Serm.* I 10, 31 ff. As we know today thanks to the *Scholia Florentina*, the dream of Callimachus came directly after the prologue. Both it and the reminiscence of Hesiod's vision left a strong trace in Roman poets. Cf. Prop. III 3, 1 ff.:

Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra,
 Bellerophonteï qua fluit umor equi,
 reges, Alba, tuos et regum facta tuorum,
 tantum operis, nervis hiscere posse meis,

and II 34 b, 31:

et non inflati somnia Callimachi.

Finally there are softer echoes of the prologue in Virgil (*Georg.* III 291 ff.):

Sed me Parnasi deserta per ardua dulcis
 raptat amor: iuvat ire iugis, qua nulla priorum
 Castaliam molli devertitur orbita clivo;

cf. Callimachus' prologue, lines 25 ff.:

[πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι
 [τὰ στεῖβειν], ἐτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὄμα
 [δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἴμιον ἀνὰ πλατύν· ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
 [καινοτέρ]ας εἰ καὶ στε[ι]νοτέρην ἐλάσεις.

Cf. Hor. *Epist.* I 19, 21 ff. and Callim. fr. 293 SCHN.

The above list of examples demonstrates how many Roman poems contain traces of the prologue¹⁴.

¹⁴ For Callimachus' general influence on Roman poetry cf. also: fr. 114 SCHN. and Hor. *Carm.* I 3, 8; fr. 121 SCHN. and Hor. *Epist.* II 1, 268–270; fr. 52 SCHN. and [Verg.] *Ciris* 349–352; cf.

B. CALLIMACHUS IN ROMAN ELEGY

Of course that general influence of Callimachus on Augustan poetry is even more striking in elegiac poets, although here, too, there are two clear-cut tendencies: one represented by Tibullus and the circle of poets surrounding Messala, and the other by Propertius, who liked to call himself the Roman Callimachus, and even more so by Ovid, although his narrative style as such is often very different from that of the Alexandrian poet.

Tibullus

Tibullus is among the Roman elegiasts the foremost representative of the idyllic, which he additionally dyes with sentimentality; in his poems, eroticism is much less intertwined with mythology and erudition, so characteristic of Alexandrian poetry and its Roman followers. Tibullus' elegies, somehow soft, develop the themes of Greek epigrams, and very clearly contain so-called topical situations of Graeco-Roman erotic poetry. The poet is not in the habit of mentioning his sources of inspiration.

It seems that Callimachus' influence is not yet too strong in Tibullus, although here and there perceivable. WILAMOWITZ¹⁵ pointed out that there is an echo of Callimachus' narrative about Osiris (fr. 176 SCHN.; cf. fr. 241 with commentary, 445 and 182 SCHN.) in Tibullus' elegy I 7, 21 ff. Cf. especially line 28: (*pubes*) *barbara, Memphiten plangere docta bovem* and Callimachus' fr. 176: Εἰδυῖαν φάλιον ταῦρον ἠλεμίσαι. It is also possible that his tale of Busiris (fr. 182 SCHN.), which appears repeatedly in Ovid (*Ars am.* I 647 ff.; *Tr.* III 11, 39; *Pont.* III 6, 41) influenced Tibullus as well. However, that influence is clearer in elegy I 4, which deals with pederasty and is wholly based on reusable literary motifs, reminiscent of a passage in book I of the *Aetia*. In I 4, 79 f., Tibullus says:

Tempus erit, cum me Veneris praecepta ferentem
deducat iuvenum sedula turba senem,

to be found also in a Callimachus fragment preserved in Stobaeus, *Flor.* 115, 11 = fr. 11 SCHN.:

Γηράσκει δὲ γέρων κείνος ἐλαφρότερον
κοῦροι τὸν φιλέουσιν, ἐὼν δέ μιν οἷα γονῆα
χειρὸς ἐπ' οἰκείην ἄχρις ἄγουσι θύρην.

Besides, Tibullus' very principle of composition, i.e. casting the poem as a dialogue between himself and Priapus, vividly resembles certain stretches in

O. SCHNEIDER, *Callimachea*, vol. II, Lipsiae 1873, pp. 2 ff.; possibly also fr. 418 SCHN. and Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 62 f.

¹⁵ WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *op. cit.* (n. 6), vol. I, p. 238.

the *Aetia*, and taking into account how this elegy is motif-based throughout, one may suspect that Callimachus' influence runs deeper here. However, with almost all of book I of the *Aetia* lost, we must be content with hypotheses. As we know from the *Διηγῆσεις*, Callimachus' *Iambus* 9 also treated of παιδικὸς ἔρωσ.

Propertius

Here we have a more temperamental soul, with stronger individuality and more distinct features. He, too, begins his career with love elegy. In the *Monobiblos* his own feelings intertwine with literary motifs and mythological comparisons seasoned with erudition. Propertius also continues the erotic epigram of the Greeks and follows in Mimnermus' footsteps. Echoes of Callimachus are slight. Thus if some scholars relate the motif from his elegy I 18, and especially its lines 19–22, where he speaks of cutting his lover's name in the bark of trees, to Callimachus' fr. 101 SCHN. (and cf. his commentary), which runs:

Ἄλλ' ἐνὶ δῆ φλοιοῖσι κεκομμένα τόσσα φέροιτε
γράμματα, Κυδίππην ὅσος ἔρέουσι καλήν,

then, in my opinion, it is difficult to prove any direct influence of Callimachus. Rather, it is a trite erotic motif; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10, 52–54:

Certum est in silvis, inter spelaea ferarum
malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores
arboribus; crescent illae, crescetis, amores.

The shared source was probably Gallus. Prop. I 18, 19 ff. has:

Vos eritis testes, siquos habet arbor amores
fagus et Arcadio pinus amica deo,
a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras
scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus.

Beginning with book II of the elegies, direct following of Greek models becomes clearer. Propertius becomes *poeta doctus*, though as late as elegy II 1 he confesses that it is not Calliope or Apollo singing, but rather “ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit”. Still, that very poem is filled with literary reminiscences, with echoes of Callimachus' prologue in lines 17 and 39, while lines II 10, 25 f. (“Nondum etiam Ascræas norunt mea carmina fontes, sed modo Permessi flumine lavit Amor”) are only partly truthful. He will achieve his goal in full in the elegies of books III and IV.

Love elegies, those personal confessions with meandering erotic motifs, have more mythological comparisons and allusions in book II, and in particular in the final poems of this book some combinations of mythological associations point directly to Callimachus: Demophoon in II 22, Perillus in II 25, and especially the sick girl, whose sufferings the poet compares to the troubles of Io, Ino, Callisto

and Semele, all characters in the *Aetia*, thus clearly indicating their origin. He is especially fond of comparisons to Io (II 30 and II 33). Some even suspected that these comparisons were from a poem entitled *Ἰοῦς ἄφιξις*, but today we have some reason to hypothesise that it would have formed part of the *Aetia*, the same as the *Coma Berenices*. In particular, the extensive narrative about Io in II 33, further expanded by reminiscences of Icarus and Polyphemus, directs the reader with its associations to Callimachus.

From book III on, Propertius' lyre rings a more exalted note. That is partly because of Maecenas, who tried to persuade Propertius, as well as other poets of the time, into writing a historical epic. Not feeling up to the task, the poet gave up on the epic, but instead took up aetiological elegies, an undertaking already distinct in the opening poem of book III:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus,

while in elegy III 3 he referred to the famous dream of Callimachus. Just as the Muses appeared to the Greek poet on Helicon to instruct him on the origins of various customs, traditions and monuments, so various personages of Roman past appeared to Propertius, and his conversation with Phoebus and Calliope likewise has its model in the *Aetia*. And so Propertius transplants Callimachus' aetiological elegy to Roman ground quite consciously. And since his talent is too original for that and, too aware of its individual worth, he is not content with mere imitation of Greek poems and their motifs, but conversely feels in himself the power of independent creation and proudly claims to be the Callimachus of Rome. Namely in IV 1, 62 he calls on Bacchus to crown him, and says that his homeland ought to be proud of him, "Umbria Romani patria Callimachi". Possibly Roman pride and arrogance carried the poet a little too far here, but his elegies of book IV at least are indeed examples of great Roman poetry, reflect the character of Callimachus' mature art and quite consciously emulate his narrative technique: e.g. in elegies 1 and 2 we see the poet dialoguing with Horus and Vertumnus. Elegy IV 9 on Hercules and Cacus, which also contains digressions on Pallas bathing and blinding Teiresias (from Callimachus' *Hymn V*) is completely in Callimachus' style, as is the *aition* of Juppiter Feretrius in IV 10. Finally in IV 6 after a solemn introduction the poet himself takes on the role of a priest, referring again to Philetas and Callimachus, and addresses the muse Calliope.

The above brief outline makes it clear that while Propertius may introduce fewer of Callimachus motifs and less of his subject matter, with time fully masters his poetic style and technique, applying it in his elegies to motifs drawn from the Roman past.

And from that perspective he does deserve the name, "Roman Callimachus".

Ovid

Ovid is the most exemplary Roman emulator of the Alexandrians, and in particular of Callimachus, not so much in terms of poetic art, as in terms of motifs and external compositional form. However, he also needed time to appreciate Callimachus' art with its wealth of motifs and poetic invention. In a youthful poem (*Am.* I 15, 13 f.) he expressed a very superficial opinion of Callimachus, saying "Battiades [...] quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet". And so only as he evolved as a poet, ever aiming at richer and broader literary horizons, did he increasingly draw from Callimachus. In his search for new artistic incitement and fresh motifs Ovid did not limit himself to browsing the mythographers; on the contrary, he read widely in Greek poetry, as proven by his numerous and almost literal borrowings from Callimachus. Moreover, Callimachus' influence on Ovid always grew, and so steadily that I would not hesitate to claim that the doubtful and complex chronology of some of his works can be determined according to how much in them was borrowed from him.

The influence is so vast, and the reminiscences (closer or more distant) so many that they could not possibly all fit into this relatively modest space. At any rate that influence has already been largely investigated¹⁶ as new texts by Callimachus were rediscovered and then recently after the first edition of the Milan *Διηγρήσεις* were published, namely by the Italian scholar M. DE COLA¹⁷, who in my opinion is even somewhat too willing to see it in Ovid.

Thus my task here is not to exhaust the list of all of Ovid's possible borrowings and reminiscences from Callimachus, but to plot the line of his development in that regard in the three periods of his poetry.

*

In the *Amores* Callimachus' influence, if indeed it can already be called that, is very small. These elegies are usually reduced to a development of the erotic epigram. The echoes of the prologue to the *Aetia* in III 15, 15 could be directly from Callimachus, but the indirect path via Propertius is possible too. Only in the elegy III 10, 20 ff., perhaps only included in the second edition, is there apparently a direct reminiscence. Referring to the proverb Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψευσταί (cf. Callimachus' *Hymn* I 8 ff.), the poet says

Cretes erunt testes; nec fingunt omnia Cretes;
Crete nutrito terra superba Iove...

¹⁶ G. LAFAYE, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*, Paris 1904; R. HEINZE, *Ovids elegische Erzählungen*, Leipzig 1919; L. CASTIGLIONI, *Studi intorno alle Metamorfosi di Ovidio*, Pisa 1906; L. MALTEN, *Hermes* LIII 1918, pp. 148 ff.

¹⁷ M. DE COLA, *Callimaco e Ovidio*, Palermo 1937.

That is all the more likely with the subject matter of this poem, a festival of Ceres, itself bringing Callimachus to mind. Those reminiscences could come from a selection of Callimachus' works.

The *Heroides* were written in pathetic style with a large admixture of rhetoric, so they are far from Callimachus' narrative, subtle in its simplicity. The subject of the second in that collection of 15 letters, *Phyllis Demophoonti*, is today widely considered borrowed from Callimachus. But since the same subject will return in the *Ars Amatoria* (III 37 ff.) and *Remedia Amoris* (597 ff.), where it is based on the *aition* of ἐννέα ὁδοί or closely reflects Callimachus' turn of phrase, which cannot yet be said of the *Amores*, it spontaneously occurs to one that the poet had the theme for that letter from a mythographic handbook based in turn on Callimachus.

Ovid's other letters, written later in his life, will be discussed after the didactic poems.

Those didactic poems already fall in the intermediate period between Ovid's erotic elegies and his Alexandrian works. In that intermediate period the poet seems to be preparing for his exquisite, variegated *Metamorphoses* by reading widely, and not only in mythographies, but also Greek poetry, the only reading that could inspire his art. Thus in those intermediate works one can already spot traces of reading Callimachus, among others. As in *Ars am.* I 27 ff., where we find

Nec mihi sunt visae Clio eiusque sorores
servanti pecudes vallibus, Ascra, tuis...

Besides the allusion to Hesiod there is undoubtedly a reminiscence of the epilogue of *Aetia*, whereas in the *Ars Amatoria* II 493 ff. Ovid refers to its prologue directly. As for mythical digressions, Callimachus' influence is undeniable, e.g. in the story of Busiris, combined in *Ars am.* I 645 ff. with the legend of Phalaris of Sicily; cf. also *Tr.* III 11, 39, and fragments 25, 176, 182 and 194 SCHN. of Callimachus. Next we know that Ovid owes to Callimachus one of his most beautiful stories, namely that about Daedalus and Icarus from *Ars am.* II 21 ff., later recast in epic style in *Met.* VIII 183 ff.; here cf. fr. 5 SCHN., and scholia *AD* to Homer, *Il.* II 145.

Likewise the legend of Phyllis, presented as an extensive story in the *Heroides*, repeats itself in the form of brief mentions in various places in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*, of which some at least exactly match certain fragments from Callimachus. One such pair is fr. 505 SCHN.: Νύμφιε Δημοφώων, ἄδικε ξένε, and *Rem. am.* 597:

Perfide Demophoon! Surdas clamabat ad undas,

while *Ars am.* III 37 f.:

Quaere, novem cur una viae dicantur, et audi
depositis silvas Phyllida fesse comis

is even more closely related to the *aition* of the ἐννέα ὁδοί. Cf. also *Rem. am.* 55 f.:

Vixisset Phyllis, si me foret usa magistro,
et per quod novies, saepius isset iter¹⁸.

At last, there are reminiscences here of some of Callimachus' epigrams.
And so ends the first period of Ovid's poetry.

*

The second period brings with it full development of his poetic talent, as well as Ovid's best works – the *Metamorphoses*, probably the most Hellenistic of Roman poems, and the *Fasti*, Roman aetiological elegies in six books. Thus even the overall character of those works indicates Callimachus as a source of inspiration. In fact, as I will argue below, during that time Ovid became profoundly familiar with Callimachus' poetry, adapting not only his topics and motifs, but often also taking his composition technique for his model.

The other three pairs of letters exchanged by mythical characters are also from this period. The question of their authenticity has not yet been completely resolved, but just as it used to be answered for the most part in the negative, so recently more and more voices have been raised in defence of their authenticity¹⁹, supported by many arguments. The latter can be augmented with the following observation: two of those three pairs, as scholars suspect, draw their subject matter from Callimachus. Regarding the letters of Acontius and Cydippe, the matter is settled. Proving that the letters of Hero and Leander also come from Callimachus is still difficult at the present level of recovery of his works, and even the so-called *Scholia Florentina* have not confirmed certain attempts at reconstruction undertaken by KNAACK²⁰; even so, ROHDE and KNAACK's hypothesis that in his poem Musaeus drew on a Hellenistic source, which was probably Callimachus himself, remains very attractive. Still, we cannot draw any reliable conclusions regarding this²¹.

Those scholars who are of the opinion that these letters are not authentic bring up among other things the differences between the undoubtedly genuine original collection of 15 letters (I shall here ignore the problem of letter 15, as irrelevant)

¹⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 16 and 28 ff.

¹⁹ Cf. H. BORNECQUE's introduction in: *Ovide, Héroïdes*, Paris 1928, pp. XV ff.

²⁰ Cf. G. KNAACK, *Hero und Leander*, in: *Festgabe für F. Susemihl*, Leipzig 1898, pp. 46–82; E. ROHDE, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig ²1900, p. 142.

²¹ After writing this paper I undertook a more serious investigation into the Hellenistic original for *Hero and Leander*. The results were published when this paper was already in print, in *Sprawozdania Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności* [Proceedings of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences] XLIII 1946, fasc. 4, pp. 128 ff. They prove beyond any doubt that Musaeus' model was not an elegy but an Alexandrian epyllion. Therefore the hypothesis that the original was by Callimachus must be irrevocably abandoned.

and this later addition; the former are light and fresh in their narrative, whereas the latter are much longer, overly rhetoricised and for that reason paler and more trivial. Now there is no denying that differences between them do exist, especially in terms of style (as attempts to demonstrate marked lexical differences have failed). However, I am convinced that they are not enough to question the authenticity of those poems; instead, they are arguments for believing they were written already at the beginning of the Christian era, during the time when Ovid was switching from the elegiac to the epic note. In fact, their style is far from that of Callimachus', but that is the result of various factors, such as the specificity of Ovid's poetic talent, his amazing ease of versification, finally dividing the material each time into two complementary letters. It has also been noted that Acontius' argument in his letter that a promise ought to be kept is too long, but could that not follow from the very character of the Romans and does it not have the feel of their poetic texture? Which would undermine any suspicions of a late forgery. If further Acontius relies on the advice of the *Ars Amatoria* too much in his effort to win Cydippe's favour, let us not forget that these letters must have been written at about the same time when Ovid was occupied with that kind of amatory didactic, or right afterwards. Perhaps then Ovid decided to follow his friend the poet Sabinus, who according to *Am.* II 18, 27 composed replies to his heroines' letters, and to try such mutual correspondence himself²².

With the exception of Ovid it is impossible to find a poet writing at the beginning of the 1st century AD who was so strongly influenced by Callimachus. In my opinion the above argument tilts the scales in favour of the authenticity of this additional collection of love letters, and when combined with the general assumptions made in this paper it seems to indicate that he wrote them at some point close to the beginning of the second period of his poetry²³.

*

As has already been noted, the *Metamorphoses* reflect the character of an Alexandrian poem in the fullest. The idea itself was borrowed by Ovid from Nicander and his *Ἐτεροιούμενα*, and partly also from Parthenius. Still, theirs were probably poems of less literary value, and so in execution and composition Ovid modelled himself on the greatest artist among the Alexandrian poets, i.e. Callimachus, at the same time drawing on him for many ideas and themes he would use in his own poetry. The similarities are clear in spite of all the difference between Callimachus' style with its short and asymmetrical stories and Ovid's epic size and lush ornamentation. In terms of composition itself, Ovid owes to Callimachus the use of the so-called framework narrative, or binding

²² Cf. K. MORAWSKI, *Owidiusz i elegicy w epoce Augusta*, Kraków 1917, p. 109.

²³ Callimachus' *Cydippe* includes fr. 9 a–h Pf., partly overlapping with fr. 26, 101 f., 210 and 229 SCHN. and fr. 9 fol. I^v Pf.

very different tales into a single harmonious whole; and frequent changes in the form of the story, so as to avoid monotony and tediousness. Now, those are exactly the artistic and compositional virtues of the *Aetia*.

The sources of particular significance for understanding the composition of Callimachus' *Aetia* and comparing them to the *Metamorphoses* are: *P. Oxy.* XVII 2080 on the cities of Sicily, where the poet himself converses with Clio; *P. Oxy.* XI 1362 = fr. 9 PF. with the episode of Pollis' feast, the only preserved framework narrative of the *Aetia*; and finally the Milan $\Delta\iota\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, which make available to us, especially for book IV, the many-coloured and ever glittering strand of Callimachus' aetiological tales. Here, too, the poet modifies the form of his story all the time; now he speaks to himself; now he learns a mythical motif from the Muse; now he narrates it as its main character or even as the Pelasgic wall in Athens or as queen Berenice's lock.

Almost exactly the same figures come up in the tales told by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*²⁴. The *Metamorphoses*, so colourful and exquisite, so rich in poetic ingenuity, outdo the *Fasti* even as regards composition; there, the very form of a calendar greatly limits the poet's freedom and creative imagination.

As for motifs, Callimachus' are scattered throughout the *Metamorphoses*, being especially many at the end of book VIII and at the beginning of book IX. From the very start our poet owes to Callimachus many beautiful tales: he connects the beautiful myth about Daphne with another of the wanderings of Io, a borrowing from Callimachus, as we have seen, then he gives the story of Callisto, once in epic style in *Met.* II 410–530 and once in elegiac in *Fasti* II 153–190, also attested as Callimachean (fr. 385 SCHN.); perhaps one should also mention here certain motifs from the bath of Pallas (Callim. *Hymn* V).

In the story of Coronis (II 542 ff.) the poet displays complete independence in the way he uses Callimachus' motif, but lines 536 ff. indicate reminiscences of the *Hecale*: fr. 34 col. IV 47 f. PF.

The treatment of Actaeon (III 140 ff.) shows the influence of *Hymn* V. Comparing those two versions is all the more instructive because this is the only elegy by Callimachus that has been wholly preserved; Callimachus' version is quite devoid of pathos, and marked by discretion and moderation, two characteristics which Ovid loses in this scene. According to the *Suda*, the myth of Semele was there in Callimachus too. It is also to him, and some other sources besides, that the Roman poet owes the original descriptions of Tiresias, Ino and Athamas re-used in his book IV.

The rape of Proserpina is again there twice, in an epic version in *Met.* V 341–661, and in an elegiac one in *Fasti* IV 417–610. Callimachus' influence can

²⁴ On the compositional influence of the *Aetia* on Ovid, see MALTEN, *op. cit.* (n. 16), pp. 471 ff.

be seen in certain lines and expressions found in his *Hymn VI* and the *Aetia* as well as in Ovid²⁵.

The tale of Daedalus and Icarus has already been discussed above with the didactic poems.

The end of book VIII and the start of the next comprise a framework narrative of the same kind as Pollis' feast in Callimachus. This one is also a feast, served by Achelous to Theseus and his companions at the Calydonian hunt. Those gathered there tell various stories, including two of particularly strong connection to Callimachus: about Philemon and Baucis, and about Erysichthon.

These two stories perfectly illustrate the various ways in which Callimachus influenced Ovid. The first contains a Phrygian legend of the oak and the linden, so a theme absent from Callimachus, although Ovid is much in his debt as regards the way he presents it. It is the only strict genre tale in the *Metamorphoses*. Following Callimachus, Ovid applies in it the episodic technique: he describes the house of the old couple in detail, managing the realism so rare in his works, and the welcome they had for Jupiter, to skim over the end, that is the metamorphosis itself, in a few sentences.

Thus we have here Callimachus' style, and especially that of the *Hecale*, the epyllion famous in antiquity. Even comparing the details reveals a number of reminiscences from Callimachus, and some lines or expressions were almost literally quoted. Cf. e.g. *Met.* VIII 639, "Membra senexposito iussit relevare sedili", and Callim. fr. 237 SCHN.: Τὸν μὲν ἐπ' ἄσκάντα κάθισεν. Or lines 664 f.:

Ponitur hic bicolor sinceræ baca Minervæ
conditaque in liquida corna autumnalia faece,

and Callim. fr. 50 SCHN.: Γεργέριμον πίτυρίν τε καὶ ἦν ἀπεθήκατο λευκὴν εἰν ἄλι νήχεσθαι φθινοπωρίδα. That influence of the *Hecale* is further complemented by reminiscences of Callimachus' depiction of Heracles being made welcome by Molorchus in the *Aetia*, another prominent genre tale. That is especially true of the feast being meagre; just as Molorchus was going to offer Heracles the only lamb he had, so Baucis gave Jupiter the only cockerel. Cf. lines 684 ff. and Callim. fr. 6 SCHN., as well as Probus' commentary on Verg. *Georg.* III 19²⁶.

The tale of Erysichthon is altogether different. In Callimachus Erysichthon is guilty of offending the goddess Demeter, for which he is punished with devastating hunger; the narrative is simple and natural. Ovid expands it by introducing Erysichthon's daughter Mestra, whom he had to take over from some other source, or else the tale would have no metamorphosis to it. His version has the

²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 510.

²⁶ Cf. DE COLA, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 61 ff.

tone of a pompous Roman epic. He introduces more fantastic elements and more dramatism; cf. *Met.* VIII 738 ff. and Callim. *Hymn* VI 25 ff.²⁷.

The beginning of book IX of the *Metamorphoses* is devoted to Heracles, a frequent character in Callimachus' *Aetia*.

It is on purpose that I here omit certain episodes from the final books of the *Metamorphoses*, which are still too problematic.

In book XII, during the feast of Achaean commanders, Nestor tells of Caeneus (459 ff.), following the version attested for Callimachus by Phlegon (cf. fr. 416 SCHN.), that is, in connection with the fighting between the Centaurs and the Lapiths; hardly a coincidence.

One of the favourite themes of Hellenistic poetry, the tale of Polyphemus and Galatea, combines in Ovid (*Met.* XIII 750 ff.) material from several sources, the most important one being, according to one hypothesis, Callimachus' supposed epyllion entitled *Galatea*²⁸. That hypothesis seems justified in that in Ovid this tale is combined with a version of the story of Glaucus, who according to the *Suda* featured in Callimachus too, perhaps even in a separate poem: cf. SCHNEIDER, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 165.

Then in turn Glaucus, in love with Scylla (cf. fr. 184 SCHN.), tells his story in book XIII, again concatenated with a number of other myths, Callimachus-like, into one compositional framework.

Even in the story of Pythagoras in book XV, which is independent of Callimachus²⁹, there is a line containing a literal reminiscence from book III of the *Aetia*, from the elegy on Acontius and Cydippe, repeated again in the *Fasti*. Cf. *Met.* XV 134 f.: "percussaque sanguine cultros inficit in liquida praevisos forsitan unda"; *Fasti* I 329: "quia praevisos in aqua timet hostia cultros"; and Callim, fr. 9 PF., lines 10 f.:

ἡῶοι μὲν ἔμελλον ἐν ὕδατι θυμὸν ἀμύξειν
οἱ βόες ὄξειαν δερκόμενοι δορίδα.

The *Aetia*, as we today know, end with queen Berenice's lock being placed among the stars in the sky; the *Metamorphoses*, with Caesar's soul turning into a comet³⁰. Another similarity to Callimachus comes to mind here: Caesar's soul flees and rises above the moon (line 846): "Luna volat altius illa"; and in Callimachus' apotheosis of Arsinoe (fr. 1 PF., line 6) we read: κλεπτομέν]α· παρέθει σελάνα. And again in *Met.* XV 839 ff.:

²⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 67 ff.; and WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *op. cit.* (n. 6), vol. II, pp. 34 ff.

²⁸ Cf. DE COLA, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 73 ff.

²⁹ But cf. fr. 128 SCHN.

³⁰ *Dieg.* col. V 40 ff.; cf. also B. LAVAGNINI, SIFC (n.s.) XII 1935, p. 117; and MAAS, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 171.

Aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget.
 Hanc animam interea caeso de corpore raptam
 fac iubar, ut semper [...]
 divus ab excelsa prospectet Iulius aede.

That was done by *alma Venus*, as in the *Coma Berenices* (*PSI IX 1092*, lines 63 f.):

...με παρ' ἄθα[νάτους ἀνιόντα]
 [Κύπρι]ς ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον [ἔθηκε νέον.]

Therefore Callimachus' influence in the *Metamorphoses* is indubitable, even though its narrative epic style, ornamented and dramatised by Ovid, is far removed from Callimachus'. Still, Ovid was perfectly aware of the differences if already in the *Remedia Amoris* (381 f.) he said,

Callimachi numeris non est dicendus Achilles,
 Cydippe non est oris, Homere, tui...

Here cf. also fr. 165 SCHN.

*

In the aetiological elegies placed in the poetic calendar *Fasti*, Callimachus' influence is naturally even greater. It is especially so as regards composition and narrative technique; less so, in view of the topic the poet picked, as regards the plot.

Ovid's purpose in writing this work was patriotic: to bind various Roman institutions, customs and traditions within the framework of a poetic narrative. He was certainly affected in that by Propertius' Roman elegies as well as by Callimachus. The idea itself he could have taken from Simmias and his *Μῆνες*, and his material came primarily from Varro. The poet does not preserve compositional unity throughout the work, conversing instead with various deities. Callimachus in his *Aetia* has the habit of citing his sources, as in the elegy about Cydippe (fr. 9 PF., lines 54 ff.); Ovid also more than once refers to the authors behind a given piece of information (e.g. *Fasti* IV 377 ff. or 905 ff.). Some stories in the *Fasti* apply episodic style in which the plot is developed asymmetrically. Finally, some of Ovid's expressions in this poem are Callimachean.

Already in the first conversation, with the god Janus, there are reminiscences of Callimachus' *Hymn* I, cf. *Fasti* I 89: "Quem tamen esse deum te dicam, Iane biformis?" (cf. Callim. *Hymn* I 4: πῶς καὶ μιν Δικταῖον ἀείσομεν ἢ Ἐλυκαῖον), followed by a long talk in which the poet asks questions and Janus answers them, as in the dialogue with the Muse in book II of the *Aetia* (*P. Oxy.* XVII 2080, 58 ff.):

ὥς ἐφάμην· Κλειῶ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἤρχ[ετο μ]ύθ[ου]
 χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἀδελφείης ὤμον ἐρείσαμένη.

The tale of Callisto in *Fasti* II 153 ff. (also in the *Metamorphoses*) comes from Callimachus. Ovid's two versions differ in style, epic in the *Metamorphoses* and elegiac in the *Fasti*.

Book III contains a number of stories in Callimachus' Alexandrian style, that is asymmetrical in structure, with their several parts strung together after his manner (e.g. III 715 ff.) and finally demonstrating something of his specific take and version of some of the tales.

Ovid's treatment of the myth of Demeter and Kore in *Fasti* IV 393 ff. has already been mentioned above.

In the conversation between the Muses Polyhymnia, Urania and Calliope in book V of the *Fasti* there can again be heard echoes of the epilogue to the *Aetia*; cf. lines 7 f.:

Dicite, quae fontes Aganippidos Hippocrenes,
grata Medusaei signa tenetis equi...

and Callim. fr. 9 Pf., lines 84–86:

...εἶπον ὀκ[ώσπερ
κείνω τῶ Μοῦσαι πολλά νέμοντι βοτά
σὺν μύθους ἐβάλοντο παρ' ἵχνιον ὄξεος ἵππου,

cf. also the introduction to book VI of the *Fasti*, lines 14 ff.³¹

In *Fasti* VI 176, "quae Pygmaeo sanguine gaudet avis" is a copy of line 14 of the famous prologue (*P. Oxy.* XVII 2079; cf. the exact reconstruction of this line by R. PFEIFFER, *Hermes* LXIII 1928, pp. 302 ff.): αἵματ]ι Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη γέρα[νος.

Finally into the legend of Matuta and Portunus (*Fasti* VI 473 ff.) the poet weaves the myth of Ino and Melicertes from book IV of the *Aetia*; which today we can read in *Dieg.* col. II 41 ff.

The above list shows that Callimachus' influence on Ovid's *Fasti* is mostly about narrative techniques. Other than that, the Roman poet borrows some episodes, but dependence in this regard should not be overestimated. Lack of compositional unity in the adopted chronological system, on the other hand, is a weakness in the *Fasti* and affects the artistic arrangement of the whole.

*

In his exile works Ovid is overly monothematic and personal concerns make him forget the treasure trove of Alexandrian poetry. But in them too we sometimes encounter passages which testify to his undying interest in the works of

³¹ Cf. DE COLA, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 93 ff.

Callimachus, with the *Ibis* being even to an extent an adaptation and expansion of his poem of the same title.

For instance in elegy 5 of book V of the *Tristia*, when Ovid refers to smoke rising from a sacrificial pyre, he reminisces elegy 14 of book IV of Callimachus' *Aetia* (cf. *Dieg.* col. V 18 ff.). Its summary in the papyrus is very damaged, but I was able to reconstruct it using the Ovidian passage, with the addition of Ovid's *Ibis* 35 f.³²; namely, the poem refers to Eteocles' and Polynices' mutual hatred, which has not left them even after their death, so that even the smoke from their funeral sacrifices has split in two.

In the *Epistulae ex Ponto* IV 16, 32, when the poet says "Callimachi Proculus molle teneret iter", he must mean a passage from some poem by Callimachus that we do not today know.

Although there is not a single fragment left preserved from Callimachus' *Ibis*, we know that the title is a cryptonym for Apollonius of Rhodes, our poet's great antagonist, as it seems not only in their views on literature, but also in their careers at the Alexandrian court. In his epigram in the *Anthologia Palatina* (IX 275), Apollonius viciously attacked the author of the *Aetia*:

Καλλιμάχος τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παίγνιον, ὁ ξύλινος νοῦς,
αἴτιος ὁ γράψας Αἴτια Καλλιμάχος.

In response to this provocation, Callimachus composed his *Ibis*, a short poem (*exiguus libellus*, Ovid calls it). Without entering here into the complex and hypothetical problems of Ovid's *Ibis*, which at any rate considerably expands on Callimachus', it is fitting to note that the Milan *Διηγήσεις* have recently added a number of testimonies on the influence of the *Aetia* on the Roman adaptation to what we know of it from the scholia to Ovid's *Ibis*.

Those scholia, if they had any information on Callimachus' *Ibis* at any rate, have been listed by O. SCHNEIDER in fr. 100^a α-β. The *Διηγήσεις*, on the other hand, in the part that deals with book IV of the *Aetia*, have brought the explanation of a number of obscure allusions which the *Ibis* makes to Callimachus' various elegies.

This is the list of such allusions and other reminiscences:

Ibis 35 f., cf. *Tristia* V 5, 33–38, and *Dieg.* col. V 18–23.
Ibis 263 f., cf. fr. 415 SCHN., and *Met.* III 315 ff.
Ibis 265 f., cf. scholia for book II of the *Aetia*.
Ibis 273 f., cf. *P. Oxy.* XVII 2080, 70³³.
Ibis 287 f., cf. fr. 5 SCHN., and *P. Oxy.* XVII 2080, 50 f.
Ibis 329 f., cf. fr. 466 SCHN.
Ibis 333 f., cf. fr. 457 SCHN., and *Dieg.* col. III 25–33.

³² Cf. my *Studia Callimachea* (n. 3), pp. 93 ff.

³³ Cf. A. ROSTAGNI, *Ibis. Storia di un poemetto greco*, Firenze 1920.

- Ibis* 337 f., cf. fr. 13^d SCHN., and scholia *AD* for *Il.* XII 66.
Ibis 394, cf. *Dieg.* col. X 1–5.
Ibis 395 f., cf. fr. 182 SCHN., *Ars am.* I 647 ff., and *Tristia* III 11, 39.
Ibis 363 f., cf. *Dieg.* col. I 3–9³⁴.
Ibis 405 f., cf. fr. 378 SCHN., and scholia *Eur. Hip.* 979.
Ibis 425, cf. Callim. *Hymn* VI, and *Met.* VIII 738 ff.
Ibis 435 f., cf. fr. 25 SCHN.
Ibis 437 f., cf. fr. 25 and 194 SCHN.
Ibis 453 f., cf. Catullus 63, an imitation of Callimachus.
Ibis 463 f., cf. *Dieg.* col. III 12 ff.
Ibis 465 f., cf. *Dieg.* col. II 29–40.
Ibis 475 f., cf. *Dieg.* col. V 9–16.
Ibis 503 f., cf. *Dieg.* col. III 34–41.
Ibis 553 f., cf. O. SCHNEIDER, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 165.
Ibis 589 f., cf. fr. 74 SCHN.
Ibis 609 f., cf. fr. 5 SCHN., and scholia *AD* for *Il.* II 145.
Ibis 621–624, cf. *Dieg.* coll. IV 36–43 and V 1 f.³⁵.

Such, among others, sophisticated invectives were directed by Ovid at his enemy, today unknown, following Callimachus, of whom he says that Apollonius-Ibis (*Ibis* 447 f.):

...exiguo est volucris devota libello,
 corpora proiecta quae sua purgat aqua...

as well as another Alexandrian poet, perhaps Euphorion in his work entitled possibly *Χιλιάδες* or *Ἄραί*.

*

Callimachus' influence on Ovid, already observable in the first period of his poetry in erotic elegies, increases considerably in the second in the additional collection of love letters, and especially in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. There is little opportunity for reminiscences from Callimachus in Ovid's exile works, but the *Ibis* eloquently demonstrates how comprehensively and attentively Ovid read in the Alexandrian poet's works in that period of his life.

CONCLUSION

After Ovid, as we know, elegy fell silent in Rome, and with it came to an end the overwhelming influence of Callimachus, as Roman poetry headed off in other directions. However, that hardly means that from then on his poems were no longer known in Rome.

³⁴ Cf. my *Studia Callimachea* (n. 3), p. 91.

³⁵ Cf. also DE COLA, *op. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 101 ff.

Callimachus continued to be regarded as the master of Hellenistic elegy and it is as such that he was recommended by Quintilian in *Inst.* X 1, 58, where he says: “Tunc et elegiam vacabit in manus sumere, cuius princeps habetur Callimachus; secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit”. Pliny the Younger values him highly as well in his letter to Antoninus, in which he politely praises his friend’s poems to then add (*Ep.* IV 3, 3): “Callimachum me vel Heroden vel si quid his melius tenere credebam”, meaning primarily his *Iambi* of course, whereas in *Ep.* I 20, 4, writing “bonus liber melior est quisque, quo maior”, he on purpose inverts Callimachus’ famous saying, τὸ [γὰρ] μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ (fr. 359 SCHN.).

Neither do echoes of his poems vanish altogether from poetry. And so for instance Petronius, who in his *Saturae* is wont to intertwine prose and poetry, when describing a poor region in 135, 8, adds:

qualis in Actaea quondam fuit hospita terra,
digna sacris Hecales, quam Musa loquentibus annis
Baccineas veteres mirandam tradidit aevo.

Martial, recommending his poems, both smooth and light, contrasts them with Callimachus’ in X 4:

Non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
Sed non vis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi.

The later the times, the softer those echoes were of Callimachus’ Muse in Rome; his poetry, subtle and refined, but also difficult, was increasingly alien there.

To us as well were his works unknown for many centuries, discounting the *Hymns* and the *Epigrams*. Even today, despite the many discoveries in Egyptian papyri, we still cannot pride ourselves on knowing his poetic legacy fully, but let us hope that the sands so kindly today will in future prove even more generous.

We owe sincere and profound gratitude to the much deserved scholars whom the fate has lately allowed to make so many and such momentous discoveries of Callimachus’ texts.

ADDENDUM

As E. CAHEN has noted, among the images sporadically borrowed from Callimachus by Vergil there is the scene with Artemis in the forge of the Cyclopes; cf. Callim. *Hymn* III 46–86, and Verg. *Aen.* VIII 416 ff.

F. WEHRLI’s paper, *Horaz und Kallimachos*, MH I 1944, pp. 69 ff. brings nothing of importance and is based on overly subjective observations. J. COMAN’S

study, *L'art de Callimaque et de Catulle dans le poème La boucle de Bérénice*, Bucarest 1936, of which I know from Professor G. PRZYCHOCKI, is unfortunately unavailable to me.

The new Oxyrhynchus volume (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVIII*, ed. E. LOBEL, C.H. ROBERTS, E.P. WAGNER, London 1941) adds several short fragments by Callimachus: 2167 fr. 1 14 complements, from line 14 onwards, 2079, fr. 2 refers to the cult of the Charites on Paros and the return of the Argonauts; 2168 mentions the origins of a temple on Corcyra; both are from book I. 2169 supplements the story of Heracles and Molorchus in book III; 2170 is a very damaged fragment from book IV; 2171 refers to *Iambi* 6 and 7; finally, the most interesting of them, 2172, contains a passage from the *Songs* and refers to "Branchus".

AJPh LXVII 1946, fasc. 1, has C.M. DAWSON's article *An Alexandrian Prototype of Marathus?*, in which he attempts a reconstruction of *Iambus* 9 and shows a number of further cases of Callimachus influencing Tibullus in terms of pederastic motifs.