But Cinna's use of an earlier Latin poem has been overlooked. In his translation of Aratus' weather signs Cicero devotes the following verses to the mournful cry of the *acredula* (*Prog.* frag. 4. 4–7 Soubiran):

> Saepe etiam pertriste canit de pectore carmen
> et matutinis acredula vocibus instat,
> vocibus instat et adsiduas iacit ore querelas,
> cum primum gelidos rores aurora remittit.

Two points of correspondence secure the connection. First, both poets present sounds of distress that are emphasized by anadiplosis: Cicero's *vocibus instat* forms both a semantic and structural parallel to *flentem* in Cinna. Second, the placement of *matutinus/-is* in each fragment is metrically identical. As the *Thesaurus* indicates (8:505–7), this adjective is not ordinary in republican poetry. There are two pre-Ciceronian examples in Accius: ". . . matutinum cursum . . ." (frag. 123 Ribbeck[3]) and ". . . matutinum lumen . . ." (frag. 183); more significant is the later occurrence of the word in Lucretius 5. 462 "matutina rubent radiati lumina solis" and Catullus 64. 269 "hic, qualis flatu placidum mare matutino." In republican hexameters, then, only the lines of Cicero and Cinna show *matutinus* in the same metrical position.

The change in poetic context from animal to human was no doubt suggested to Cinna by the personification of nature that characterizes our fragments of the *Prognostica;* his reminiscence is an apt compliment to several especially elegant verses from Cicero's youth.[2]

DAVID P. KUBIAK
Wabash College

2. I wish to thank the anonymous referee of *CP* for valuable criticism of an earlier draft of this note.

ACHELOUS IN *ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA* 12. 51 (CALLIMACHUS)

> Ἔγχει καὶ πάλιν εἰπέ "Διοκλέος"· οὐδ' Ἀχελῷος
> κείνου τῶν ἱερῶν αἰσθάνεται κυάθων.
> καλὸς ὁ παῖς, Ἀχελῷε, λίην καλός· εἰ δέ τις οὐχὶ
> φησίν—ἐπισταίμην μοῦνος ἐγὼ τὰ καλά.
>
> Pour the wine and say again, "To Diocles!" Achelous
> knows nothing of the cups sacred to him.[1]
> The boy is beautiful, Achelous, very beautiful . . .

Scholars concerned with the Greek epigram have found this use of Achelous unintelligible.[2] To understand it, we need to bear in mind the nature of the romantic toast and of Achelous himself. Every such toast is a pledge and an offering of sorts; the poet reinforces this sense of his toast by describing the cups as consecrated to

1. Κείνου is emphatic by its position in the verse; cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7. 519. 3, 9. 565. 4 (Callimachus).
2. W. Paton, *The Greek Anthology*, vol. 4 (London, 1918), p. 305: "I confess to not understanding the reference to Achelous in l. 2." Gow and Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1965), p. 160: "a very difficult quatrain . . . the use of the word [= Achelous] in the epigram is in fact very puzzling."

Diocles. According to the historian Ephorus (frag. 27 Müller) the river Achelous was especially invoked "in oaths, prayers, and sacrifices." But, says Callimachus, Achelous is not aware of the offerings consecrated to *this* divinity. The poet then informs Achelous, in an apostrophe, that Diocles is an exceedingly beautiful boy.

The use of Achelous in this epigram is in part an example of metonymy; but Callimachus presents Achelous in three aspects simultaneously: (1) Achelous is personified. He does not know that Diocles is worthy of offerings. He needs to be told that the boy is beautiful. He does not know Diocles, because (2) Achelous is the river invoked on solemn occasions; but he has never been invoked in the "worship" of Diocles. Hence, he does not know Diocles. He has not been invoked, because (3) Achelous is water in general (Soph. frag. 5; Eur. *Bacch.* 625; Ar. *Lys.* 381, frag. 351); but water is inappropriate in a cup pledged to an *eromenos* (Theoc. 2. 150–53 [and schol. Ambros./Vat. who quotes *Anth. Pal.* 12. 51. 1–2 in comparison], 4. 18; *Anth. Pal.* 5. 136–37 [Meleager], 12. 118 [Callimachus]). Hence, he has not been invoked.[3] The use of such a name in three aspects or dimensions, as it were, is admittedly unprecedented in this poet. Callimachus normally employs simple metonymy, for example, Tethys and Tithonus as types of longevity (frag. 194. 52–53 Pfeiffer), and no more. In this epigram Achelous must be understood as both the type of water and the river invoked in sacrifice; the use appears to be further complicated when the poet addresses Achelous conversationally.

What has actually distracted scholars in this epigram, however, is the complex use of the name of a river god. Three-dimensional metonymy is itself a commonplace in the erotic epigram, but we are accustomed to see it employed with the names of the gods of love. Consider, for example, *Anthologia Palatina* 12. 100 (anonymous):

> To what strange harbor of desire have you brought me, Cypris,
> and do not pity me, you who have experienced desire yourself?
> Do you wish me to suffer the unbearable, and to cry,
> "Only Cypris wounded the man wise in the Muses"?

Like Achelous in Callimachus' poem, Cypris/Aphrodite is here mentioned twice and without evident ambiguity. Note, however, that she is addressed in person (v. 1), that she is presented objectively as the powerful goddess of love (v. 4), and that she is love—the epigram "means" that the poet has fallen in love.[4] No one finds this, or other examples of this, difficult. If we accept that a deity, as here, can be addressed personally, be represented in propria persona, and simultaneously represent his realm or purview, then we are left only with the apparent peculiarity of Callimachus' choice of deity.

But the appearance of Achelous in an erotic epigram is not so startling as might

3. Gow and Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2:160, suggest that the Achelous in v. 3 may be the name of "a member of the party"; the latest editor, H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca*, vol. 4 (Munich, 1958), p. 514, says flatly that Achelous is "Diener des Dichters." There is no necessity for this, no evidence, and no precedent for citing a divinity and a mortal with the same name in the same work of this kind.

4. The animistic synonymy of a divine being and the realm for which he is responsible is an exceedingly ancient idea, retained in the imagery of many classical poets. Thus H. Fränkel, *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds* (Berkeley, 1945), pp. 88–89, was first to observe that Salmacis in Ovid's tale of Hermaphroditus (*Met.* 4. 285–388) is not only the guardian of her pool; she is the pool and can thus claim "vicimus et meus est" as soon as the boy enters the water.

at first appear, for he was a well-known amorist in antiquity. The Achelous as a major river flowing through Acarnania to the sea is regularly included in historical and geographical works (cf. Hdt. 2. 10; Thuc. 2. 102; Strabo 10. 458; Paus. 8. 38. 9–10). As river god, his place in myth is likewise persistent in both Greek and Roman literature beginning with Homer, who calls him "lord Achelous" (*Il.* 21. 194, interpreted by Paus. 8. 38. 9–10 to mean chief of all the rivers, though this idea is not in Homer's text), and in Hesiod, who lists him among the children of Tethys and Ocean (*Theog.* 340). But it is in Sophocles *Trachiniae* 9–17, 508–10 that he appears earliest in his most important mythical role—that of passionate competitor for the favors of Deianeira. In the oracular, Hellenistic *Alexandra* of Lycophron (671, 712) he has fathered the Sirens; but in the first century B.C. summaries of the tale of his battle with Heracles for Deianeira appear in virtually all the historian-mythographers (e.g., Diod. 4. 35; Strabo 10. 458; Apollod. 2. 7. 5). The story is, however, much older than any of the literary remains, judging from the cedar-wood group which pictured it, decorating the Megarian Treasury of the sixth century at Olympia and described by Pausanias (6. 19. 22; cf. 3. 18. 16 and the "figures and statues" of "the nymphs and Achelous" in Pl. *Phdr.* 230B, 263D). Callimachus himself mentions Achelous only once in extant works outside *Anthologia Palatina* 12. 51 (= *Ep.* 29 Pfeiffer). In the *Hymn to Demeter* (6. 13) the goddess in her travels "three times crossed Achelous of the silver eddies" (the epithet is taken directly from Hes. *Theog.* 340). But it can hardly be doubted that he knew the tradition of the river's size, strength, amorous nature, and resultant conflict with Heracles, for he also wrote a prose work, *The Rivers of the Inhabited World,* which would certainly have included Achelous.[5] The fullest extant literary account of the mythical Achelous occurs in Ovid's *Metamorphoses;* the Roman poet's reliance on Hellenistic sources, however, is well established, and we can assume that the picture he paints was in its outlines as well known to fourth-century readers of Greek as it was to first-century readers of Latin. In Ovid, Achelous provides a symposium of his own for Theseus and his companions and there tells first the story of his love for Perimele (8. 547–610) and later the story of his battle for Deianeira (9. 1–97). The latter is, as we have seen, Achelous' most popular myth in the tradition, but in both tales his principal concern is love; and this provides the final reason, along with his metonymical character as water and his role in invocations, that explains why Callimachus is justified in involving him in an erotic epigram such as *Anthologia Palatina* 12. 51.[6]

Finally, Gow and Page are puzzled by "the relation of the imperatives to the

5. For fragments, see R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus,* vol. 1: *Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1949), p. 351. This work, and the treatment of Achelous in Ovid which follows, were brought to my attention by an anonymous reader for *CP.*

6. Similarly, Callimachus discusses a love affair in *Anth. Pal.* 12. 230 with an even better known divine amorist, Zeus. It is probably too much, however, to argue that in 12. 51 Achelous' traditional inability to get or keep his loves is specifically significant: that Callimachus is twitting him with the spectacle of a beautiful boy he has overlooked and who has thus slipped through his (and into the poet's) hands. This would constitute an act of naive hubris, inviting retaliation (Achelous is not a temperate deity; cf. Ovid *Met.* 8. 579–89). There are also no grounds in Achelous' tradition (as there are in Zeus') for supposing that Achelous is himself susceptible to boys. If the epigram is meant to arouse a deity's envy, Apollo, that notorious loser of boy- as well as girl-loves, would make a likelier object. It is enough that Callimachus—and his readers—can expect from the experienced Achelous disinterested sympathy for the experience of a mortal amorist.

following sentence. One might have expected μηδ' αἰσθανέσθω." They then suggest that Διοκλέος . . . κνάθων may all depend upon εἰπέ. Presumably these scholars are perplexed by the abrupt transition from two imperatives to an indicative statement, especially since the latter is introduced by οὐδέ, normally a connective or responsive particle.[7] Callimachus, however, uses οὐδέ more than once in abrupt transitions between expressions of different moods, apparently in each case as no more than an emphatic negative.[8] In the context of Callimachus' own usage, then, there is no reason to read *Anthologia Palatina* 12. 51 in any sequence other than the traditionally accepted one: two commands addressed to his company, the second to repeat after the poet the name to be toasted; a statement of fact addressed to his company; an apostrophe to Achelous; a wish expressing the poet's willingness to be the sole judge of beauty.

W. M. CLARKE
Louisiana State University

7. See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 190–99.
8. Cf. *Anth. Pal.* 12. 150. 8–9 again with indicative immediately following imperative; 5. 23. 4 with indicative immediately following optative (wish).