

CALLIMACHUS AND THE *ARS AMATORIA*

JOHN F. MILLER

THE literary playfulness of Ovid's *Ars amatoria* ranges widely in its comic imitations of Greek and Roman authors. Students of the poem have frequently discussed its numerous parodies of passages or motifs from Hesiod, Lucretius, and Virgil's *Georgics*, to which one may add the many echoes of nondidactic works such as the *Aeneid* and *Eclogues*, Catullan lyric and Propertian love elegy.¹ Ovid apparently knows no bounds in his self-ironic attempt to relate his poem to the great works of his predecessors. One such masterwork whose reminiscences in the *Ars* have not been fully understood is the *Aitia* of Callimachus, a poem well known to Ovid and his Augustan colleagues as both the classic aetiological poem and a major model for poetry written in the neoteric-Hellenistic tradition.

The *Aitia* was a unique didactic elegy² in which Callimachus set forth in a series of narratives the origins or *aitia* of various local customs. Sometimes the scholar-poet addresses these to the reader in his own person; often he pictures himself receiving antiquarian information from interlocutors—from the Muses in an extended dialogue in the first two books, elsewhere from Delian Apollo³ and an acquaintance at a banquet in Alexandria (frag. 178). The literary prologue to the work, as is well known, had a monumental impact on Augustan programmatic poetry, including that of Ovid, most conspicuous perhaps in the Roman imitations of Lycian Apollo's epiphany to Callimachus (frag. 1. 21–28) and of the poet's consecration by the Muses on Helicon before they began to dispense *aitia*, a scene that Callimachus himself had imitated from Hesiod.⁴ On the elegists the entire work was influential in a number of ways, not the least of which was its inspiration of some Roman aetiological poems.

1. Echoes of Roman predecessors are collected by A. Zingerle, *Ovidius und sein Verhältnis zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern* (Innsbruck, 1869–71); for discussions, see E. J. Kenney, "Nequitiae Poeta," *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*, ed. N. I. Herescu (Paris, 1958), pp. 201–9; E. Leach, "Georgic Imagery in the *Ars amatoria*," *TAPA* 95 (1964): 142–54; J. Krókowski, "Ars amatoria—poème didactique," *Eos* 53 (1963): 143–56; J. B. Solodow, "Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: The Lover as Cultural Ideal," *WS* 90 (1977): 106–9; J. Shulman, "Te Quoque Falle Tamen: Ovid's Anti-Lucretian Didactics," *CJ* 76 (1981): 242–53.

2. On the *Aitia* as a didactic poem, see T. M. Klein, "The Role of Callimachus in the Development of the Concept of the Counter-Genre," *Latomus* 33 (1974): 219, 227; A. Świderek, "La structure des *Aitia* de Callimaque à la lumière des nouvelles découvertes papyrologiques," *J. Jur. Pap.* 5 (1951): 229; and W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5 (1964): 184.

3. Frag. 114. The human interlocutor of this fragment is not identified but is almost certainly Callimachus himself, in the light of his other aetiological conversations in the poem and the special relationship that he claimed for himself with Apollo (frag. 1. 21–28, *Hy.* 2. 105–13).

4. For a full study of Callimachus' impact on Augustan apologetics, see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom: Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit* (Wiesbaden, 1960).

Propertius introduced the group of aetiological elegies in his fourth book with an explicit mention of his long-time mentor Callimachus (4. 1. 64), and the influence of the *Aitia* and Callimachus' other works is detectable at several points in these poems.⁵ In *Amores* 3. 13 Ovid himself treated *aitia* of a local festival very much in the manner of Callimachus' poem; later he would imitate the *Aitia* on a larger scale in his *Fasti*, a didactic poem which presented numerous *causae* or *aitia* of Roman cults.⁶

What has not been sufficiently appreciated is the extent to which Ovid in the *Ars* calls to mind motifs from the *Aitia* as motifs of a didactic aetiological poem rather than simply as emblems of poetry composed in the Hellenistic manner. He does so even when evoking the prologue of the *Aitia*, which usually signaled a declaration of stylistic allegiance in earlier Roman poetry. The earlier Callimachean tradition in Roman poetry, however, is important for understanding Ovid's comic imitations of Callimachus in the *Ars*, for it is to a large extent through this tradition that Ovid responds to Callimachus. Ovid certainly knew the *Aitia* and at times he echoes the poem directly,⁷ but often his allusions to Callimachus' poem are mediated by echoes of his Roman predecessors' versions of Callimachean motifs.⁸

The first allusions to the *Aitia* occur in the prologue to the *Ars*, in Ovid's notorious disclaimer of divine inspiration in favor of his own experience (1. 25–30):

non ego, Phoebe, datas a te mihi mentiar artes,
nec nos aeriae voce monemur avis,
nec mihi sunt visae Clio Clisque sorores
servanti pecudes vallibus, Ascra, tuis;
usus opus movet hoc: vati parete perito;
vera canam. coeptis, mater Amoris, ades.

5. See H. Pillinger, "Some Callimachean Influences on Propertius, Book 4," *HSCP* 73 (1969): 171–99.

6. On Callimachus and the Roman aetiological poems, see most recently J. F. Miller, "Callimachus and the Augustan Aetiological Elegy," forthcoming in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* pt. 2.30, to which the present paper is a supplement. Virgil's *aitia* have been treated with reference to Callimachus by S. Shechter, "The Hellenistic *Aition* in Virgil's *Georgics*," *TAPA* 105 (1975): 347–91, and E. V. George, "*Aeneid* VIII and the '*Aitia*' of Callimachus (Leyden, 1974). Before Propertius and Ovid, Gallus may have written a poem on the origin (i.e., *aition*) of Apollo's Grynean grove that was an important representative of Roman Callimacheanism, as Virg. *Ecl.* 6. 64–73 seems to imply. Servius ad *Ecl.* 6. 72 mentions Euphorion as a source for Gallus; the *Delos* of Parthenius, another great Callimachean and a friend of Gallus, may also have exerted an influence (see Clausen, "Callimachus," p. 192). If Virgil's text at all reflects that of Gallus (which is likely but far from certain), the latter will most probably also have been in some way directly influenced by Callimachus: the initiation scene is clearly a variation of that in the poem of the *Aitia*; the pastoral role of Linus (67) seems to derive from another section of the *Aitia* (cf. frag. 27 and D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* [Cambridge, 1975], pp. 21–23); line 73 definitely echoes Callim. *Hy.* 4. 268–70. Whether a prominent Gallan passage or an entire poem by Gallus lies behind Virgil's lines and whether the alleged poem was an "epyllion" or an elegy will perhaps never be known for certain. We should add that earlier still Catullus had translated a section of the *Aitia* into Latin elegiacs (c. 66).

7. Besides the echoes discussed below, note especially Ovid's linking of the stories of Busiris and Phalaris at 1. 647–56, which follow Callim. *Aet.* frags. 44–46; see now the discussion in A. S. Hollis, *Ovid: "Ars amatoria" Book 1* (Oxford, 1977), ad loc. and appendix 4. On this and other possible Callimachean reminiscences, see also M. De Cola, *Callimaco e Ovidio* (Palermo, 1937), pp. 23–28.

8. On this point, see J. K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Brussels, 1967), pp. 397–402, who speaks of Ovid's "muffled dialogue" with Callimachus.

Instead of conventionally invoking the gods, the *praeceptor amoris* boldly asserts that he receives no guidance from divine authorities such as Apollo (who visited Callimachus) or the birds of augury or the Muses who appeared to Hesiod (and to Callimachus). Practical experience (*usus*) moves his work, as will later be illustrated by his various appeals to his own erotic past.⁹

Though ingenious, Ovid's rejection of conventional inspiration is not without precedent. Lucretius in his proem had more obliquely repudiated inspiration and revelation as pictured in the prologue to Ennius' *Annales*.¹⁰ It is Propertius, however, rather than Lucretius, who furnishes the immediate model for Ovid's passage,¹¹ a couplet from the program-poem of his second book in which the elegist expresses his relationship to the Callimachean tradition (2. 1. 3–4):

non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo.
ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.

Not gods, but his girl inspires the poet.¹² Propertius' juxtaposition of Apollo and one of the Muses—Calliope is his favorite—immediately calls the prologue of the *Aitia* to mind,¹³ but his scornful tone does not mean that he is rejecting the inspiration of Callimachus. For he goes on in the poem to justify his choice of topic, love, by citing Callimachus himself as a precedent.¹⁴ By playing off one Callimachean motif against another, then, Propertius emphatically delimits himself within the Callimachean tradition. His sphere must remain that of love elegy only rather than some more impressive work like "epyllion" or aetiological elegy or a fuller realization of the variegated Callimachean tradition.¹⁵

9. E.g., 2. 169–72, 2. 551–54, 3. 511, 3. 663–64; also *Rem.* 311–22, 499–502, 663–68.

10. See *Lucr.* 1. 112–26 in context and the convincing argument of E. J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne* 23 (1970): 372–80.

11. See H. Tränkle, "Textkritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Ovids *Ars amatoria*," *Hermes* 100 (1972): 390, and W. Suerbaum, "Ovid über seine Inspiration (Zur *Ars amatoria* 1, 26)," *Hermes* 93 (1965): 494–95.

12. Cf. also Persius' later rejection of conventional inspiration in his choliambic prologue. Commentators usually note that Persius is here taking up the Horatian theme of the satirist's lowly poetic standing (*Sat.* 1. 4. 39–44), but the choliambics are also related to the branch of the apologetic tradition represented by the passages that we are considering (cf. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," pp. 379–80; on Persius' prologue and the apologetic tradition in general, see Wimmel, *Callimachos in Rom*, pp. 309–11). Like Lucretius, Persius emphasizes Ennius' dream in his rejection. The structure of the passage closely resembles that of Ovid's and Prop. 2. 1. 3–4 and may be indebted to one or both of them. All three open with a straightforward disclaimer (Pers. 1–3 "Nec fonte labra prolii caballino / nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnasso / memini, ut repente sic poeta prodirem. . ."; cf. Ovid *non . . . nec . . . nec* and Propertius *non . . . non*), followed by an alternative source of "inspiration" (*venter, usus, puella*). Both rejection and alternative are of course more elaborate in Persius and Ovid.

13. See Wimmel, *Callimachos in Rom*, p. 41. Cf. later Prop. 3. 3, a full-scale Callimachean *recusatio* in which Apollo and Calliope advise and initiate the poet, as did Apollo and the Muses in the *Aitia*. Recently Ross, *Backgrounds*, index s.v. "Apollo and Calliope," noted the linking of Apollo and Calliope earlier at Virg. *Ecl.* 4. 57 and Prop. 1. 2. 27–28, which he suggests is Gallan in origin. That the prologue to the *Aitia* is not just incidentally or distantly evoked at 2. 1. 3–4 is supported by the echoes of that prologue later in the poem (cf. 39–40 "sed neque Phlegraeos Iovis Enceladique tumultus / intonet angusto pectore Callimachus" and frag. 1. 20 βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός and 1. 28 στεινότερην).

14. 39–46. For similar justifications of love elegy which invoke Callimachus' name, cf. later 3. 1. 1–20, 3. 9. 43–46.

15. For a somewhat similar view, and one to which the interpretation expressed here is indebted, see

In Ovid's lines the disdain of the angry young elegist under love's power is replaced by the mock solemnity of the didactic poet whose erotic experience will provide truth (30 *vera canam*). Ovid makes this programmatic declaration even more outrageous with parodic echoes of other literary proems. The claim for experience (29 *usus opus movet hoc*) seems to play on a line from Virgil's solemn invocation at the opening of the Iliadic *Aeneid*, *maius opus moveo* (7. 45). The contrast between *mentiar* (25) and *vera* (30) which frames the passage mocks the speech by Hesiod's Muses in the prologue of the *Theogony* (26–28), a scene explicitly mentioned here. The Muses can speak both truth and falsehood. Ovid will not lie, but will speak the truth. The dominant allusions in these lines, however, are to the *Aitia*, just as in the Propertian model. We again find both Apollo and the Muses, here in their order of appearance in the *Aitia*.¹⁶ The reference to Hesiod's encounter on Helicon would also evoke the prologue of the *Aitia*, as it does elsewhere in Augustan poetry.¹⁷ In the present instance the text of Callimachus' poem would no doubt come to the Augustan reader's mind. One recalls Callimachus' own mention of Hesiod in the prologue of the *Aitia* (frag. 2) and in the epilogue (frag. 112. 5–6), where two lines show a striking similarity of word order with Ovid's couplet on the Muses (1. 27–28):¹⁸

κείν . . . τῷ Μοῦσαι πολλὰ νέμονται βοτὰ
σὺν μύθους ἐβάλλοντο παρ' ἱχνί[ι]ον ὀξέος ἵππου

nec mihi sunt visae Clio Clisque sorores
servanti pecudes vallibus, Ascra, tuis;

Excepting the verbs, we note in both the sequence dative pronoun,¹⁹ Muses in the nominative, equivalent dative participles with object, and concluding locative expressions. It is also significant that Ovid refers to the Muses as "Clio and Clio's sisters" (27). We know from the scholia that Clio was the first Muse to explain aetiology to Callimachus, followed by some or all of her sisters.²⁰

Ross, *Backgrounds*, pp. 115–17. In lines 3–4, however, Ross sees Propertius defining himself within the Callimachean tradition specifically exemplified by his Roman mentor Gallus.

16. The apparition of Apollo is part of the polemical address to the Telchines apparently added for a second edition of the poem; see R. Pfeiffer, "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos," *Hermes* 63 (1928): 339 = *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Munich, 1960), p. 131. On the possible connection between the encounter with Apollo and the meeting with the Muses in a dream, see A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg, 1965), pp. 89–98.

17. See Clausen, "Callimachus," p. 196: "References to Hesiod in Virgil and Propertius are really references to Callimachus or his conception of Hesiod." Cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 6. 69–70; Prop. 2. 10. 25–26, 2. 13. 3–4; Ovid *Fasti* 6. 13–14.

18. On this reminiscence, De Cola, *Callimaco e Ovidio*, p. 24, remarks "un preciso ricordo dell' epilogo degli Aitia." Cf. frag. 2 and Hes. *Theog.* 22–23.

19. If A. S. Hunt's reading of the demonstrative as dative, *P. Oxy.* 7. 28, 7. 69 (1011. 85), is correct, then τῷ may be the article instead of the relative. Pfeiffer was doubtful and suggested κείνοισι.

20. Schol. Flor. ad frags. 3–7, line 30 (Pfeiffer 1. 13). Muses represented in other fragments of the long conversation are Calliope (frag. 7. 22), Clio again (frag. 43.56), and Erato (Antinoop. Pap. 113 frag. 1 (a). 8). It may be significant that an epiphany of Clio ends the final book of Ovid's *Fasti* (6. 799–812). This comparison with Callimachus, made by Hollis, "Ars amatoria," ad loc., is much more relevant

The gods whom Ovid does not meet, then, are those featured prominently in the *Aitia*, both in the prologue and the body of the poem. But Ovid's fun does not stop even here. In place of the divine sources of inspiration, "experience" moves his work. Propertius once said that his sufferings made him an expert (*peritum*) at predicting a lover's future grief,²¹ but much more seems to lie behind Ovid's boastful programmatic claim. Here *usus* is nearly personified,²² raised to the level of the gods²³ both by the contrast with the conventional inspirers and by the use of a verb (*movet*) found elsewhere of divine inspiration.²⁴ This august position may also owe something to the proverbial expression "Experience is the best teacher"²⁵ (the experienced *praeceptor amoris* would thus have impressive credentials) or perhaps even to the philosophers' idea that experience was largely responsible for the development of the arts²⁶ (among which would now be included the art of love). The latter notion had been parodied in Greek comedy;²⁷ a play on the former would have effectively teased the sensibilities of the practically oriented Romans.

Above all else, however, must be placed the strong likelihood that Ovid's punchline, *usus opus movet hoc*, continues the playful allusions in the previous lines to other didactic poems. In Book 3 Ovid makes a similar assertion about his experience with an allusion that suggests it corresponds to the *ratio* of Lucretius;²⁸ but in the passage before us, as we remarked above, Lucretius does not most readily come to mind. Looking to another branch of the didactic tradition, Hollis proposes that Ovid is here humorously contrasting himself with poets like Nicander and Aratus, both of whom were notorious for a lack of personal acquaintance with the subject matter of their poems.²⁹ In the light of the echoes that we noted in the first four lines, however, and of the Callimachean alter-

than E. Paratore's reference to Hor. *Odes* 1. 12.1–12 ("L'evoluzione della sphragis dalle prime alle ultime opere di Ovidio," *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano*, vol. 1 [Rome, 1959], p. 187, n. 13). But Ovid may again be simultaneously evoking both the *Aitia* and the *Theogony*. F. Lenz, "Das Proömium von Ovids *Ars amatoria*," *Maia* 13 (1961): 136, offers the not unattractive suggestion that *Clio Clisusque sorores* parodies Hesiod's catalog of the Muses (*Theog.* 77–79), which begins with Clio.

21. Prop. 1. 9. 7 "me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum," which Suerbaum, "Ovid über seine Inspiration," p. 495, sees as Ovid's probable model here.

22. See Hollis, "Ars amatoria," ad loc.

23. See Lenz, "Das Proömium," pp. 138–39.

24. E.g., Virg. *Aen.* 10. 163; Ovid *Am.* 3. 1. 6, *Met.* 10. 149.

25. E.g., Caes. *BC* 2. 8. 3; Columella 4. 11. 2; Pliny *Epist.* 1. 20. 12; further examples are listed by A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), p. 359, in some of which *usus* = "practice."

26. E.g., Diod. Sic. 1. 8. 7; Virg. *G.* 1. 33; Manil. 1. 61; Vitruv. 2. 1. 6; cf. W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter* (Basel, 1959), pp. 144–48. I am indebted to CP's anonymous referee for drawing my attention to this concept and for the references in the following note.

27. Cf. Athenion frag. 1. 14–16 K., on which see J. Carrière, *Le carnaval et la politique* (Paris, 1979), p. 315.

28. Cf. 3. 789–92 "sed neque Phoebei tripodes nec corniger Ammon / vera magis vobis quam mea Musa canet; / si qua fides, arti, quam longo fecimus usu, / credite: praestabunt carmina nostra fidem" and Lucr. 5. 110–12 "Qua prius adgrediar quam de re fundere fata / sanctius et multo certa ratione magis quam / Pythia quae tripode a Phoebi lauroque profatur. . . ."

29. "Ars amatoria," ad 25–30, citing Cic. *De or.* 1. 69.

native to Callimachus in Propertius 2. 1. 3–4,³⁰ one is more apt to recall a prominent feature of Aratus and Nicander's great Hellenistic counterpart in didactic, the *Aitia*. Though Callimachus' work exists today only in disconnected fragments, it is clear that the persona of the *Aitia* was that of a scholar whose immense learning is based on personal experience, one who, in Callimachus' own words, "sings nothing unattested."³¹ We are often in the fragments made aware of the scholar-poet's firsthand consultation of authorities, whether literary (frag. 75. 53–77) or human (like Theogenes at the banquet, frag. 178) or divine (like the Muses,³² e.g., frags. 3, 7. 19–21, and Delian Apollo, frag. 114). So important is experience in validating the content of his narrative that at one point Callimachus even humorously notes that his judgment about the great joy of Acontius' wedding night would be "attested" by "those not unexperienced" in love!³³ The Callimachean persona of a scholar-poet who frequently refers to or recreates his alleged personal experiences will be imitated in great detail in Ovid's full-scale Latinization of the *Aitia*, the *Fasti*, where the *peritus vates* has become the *vates operosus dierum* (1. 101, 3. 177). And already "experience moved" *Amores* 3. 13, in which Ovid based his account of a Falerian festival and its *aitia* on a visit that he supposedly made to the town. In the text before us, then, Ovid's claim to be an expert who will sing the truth seems to offer an ironic equivalent of the scholarly Callimachean persona.³⁴ Ovid suggests that he will be like Callimachus in insuring the truth through his personal experience, only he will do so without the gods. Like Propertius, he plays off one Callimachean motif against another. If this interpretation is correct, he in a sense corrects Callimachus with an ironically applied Callimachean motif—ironically applied, of course, because Ovid's experience is that of the bedroom. What Callimachus himself had on one occasion ironically appealed to becomes the entire "method" for Ovid, as the self-proclaimed eminence of those experienced in love. It is typically Ovidian, too, that this elaborate parody is immediately undercut³⁵ by an invocation to Venus:

30. See above p. 28. As K. Morgan, *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the "Amores"* (Leyden, 1977), p. 107, has shown of Ovid's imitations of Propertius in the *Amores*, "Ovid assumed that his readers possessed a knowledge of Propertius, a knowledge of enough depth that an imitation would bring to mind a specific Propertian context."

31. Frag. 612 ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἰδῶ. Often read as a motto of all Callimachus' work, this unplaced fragment is particularly applicable to Callimachus' persona in the *Aitia*.

32. That the dialogue with the Muses occurred in a dream makes it no less important an instance of the theme. Callimachus' antiquarian Muses breathe the air of Alexandria's Library, not Hesiod's Helicon.

33. Frag. 75. 48–49: . . . ψήφου δ' ἂν ἐμῆς ἐπιμάρτυρες εἴεν / οἷτινες οὐ χαλεποῦ νηδὺς εἰσι θεοῦ. On the interpretation of this passage, see R. Heinze, "Ovids elegische Erzählung," *Sitz. Akad. Leipzig, phil.-hist. Kl.* 71 (1919): 92–93 (Heft 7) = *Vom Geist des Römeriums*³ (Darmstadt, 1960), pp. 375–76.

34. Callimachus' ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἰδῶ and Ovid's couplet are compared by Paratore, "L'evoluzione," p. 187. Ovid's expressed concern for verifiability is also reminiscent of frag. 612 at 1. 297–98 "nota cano; non hoc, centum quae sustinet urbes, / quamvis sit mendax, Creta negare potest," a couplet which perhaps also recalls Callim. *Hy.* 1. 8–9, another application of the proverbial "Cretans are always liars" to a story set in Crete.

35. Suerbaum's distinction, "Ovid über seine Inspiration," p. 494, n. 1, "zwischen einer belehrenden Inspiration und einer sonstigen Einflussnahme eines Gottes," the latter of which would be exemplified by line 30, does not really explain away the incongruity of any call to a divinity as the crowning sentence

coeptis, mater Amoris, ades (30). As others have observed,³⁶ much of the parody in the *Ars* is ultimately directed at Ovid's own pretensions.

Ovid's disclaimer is even more strikingly undercut in Book 2 by the actual epiphany of Apollo (2. 493–510), one of the gods explicitly rejected in the prologue. The god approaches Ovid to impart an up-to-date version of the famous phrase inscribed on his temple at Delphi, *gnothi seauton*. "Only he who knows himself," the god announces, "will love with wisdom" (501 *sapienter amabit*). So let the handsome one accentuate his beauty, let the artful singer sing, and so forth. The solemn "know thyself" is reduced to "let each lover accent his natural abilities."

This parody of the Delphic *gnome* is at the same time a parody of the Callimachean Apollo. From the opening couplet it is clear that Ovid is playfully evoking the apparition of Lycian Apollo to Callimachus in the prologue of the *Aitia*, again primarily by echoing his Roman predecessors' versions of the scene.³⁷ "Haec ego cum canerem, subito manifestus Apollo" (493). The god interrupts the poet, as at the opening of Virgil's Sixth *Eclogue* and in Propertius 3. 3, two *recusationes* in which Apollo turns the poets away from epics they were supposedly contemplating.³⁸ Ovid's Apollo also comes sounding his golden lyre: "movit inauratae pollice fila lyrae" (494), a line echoing the Callimachean Apollo's admonitory visit to Propertius, "sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra."³⁹ Near the close of the passage, too, the final injunctions of Apollo, who is here styled a *vates* (496), recall the literary advice offered by the god to Callimachus, Virgil, and Propertius: "But neither let the eloquent ones declaim in the midst of a conversation, nor let the insane poet recite his verses" (507–8). The reference to the *non sanus poeta* (508) in particular takes up a motif regularly developed by the (usually divine) warning figures of the Roman *recusatio*. Propertius, for example, is called *demens* by Apollo for daring to write epic.⁴⁰ Here Apollo is no doubt obliquely pointing to Ovid himself, who in the previous section (467–92) discoursed at some length on cosmogony and natural history, topics more appropriate for a philosophical epic, it is perhaps implied, than for the erotodidactic mission at hand.⁴¹

of Ovid's carefully crafted six-line disclaimer of divine inspiration. The incongruous effect was certainly designed by Ovid. On the irony of Ovid's addresses to divinities in the *Ars*, see J.-M. Frécaut, *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide* (Grenoble, 1972), pp. 224–25.

36. See Kenney, "Nequitiae Poeta," p. 201, and Solodow, "The Lover as Cultural Ideal," p. 109.

37. See Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry*, pp. 400–402.

38. The closest verbally is *Ecl.* 6. 3–4 "cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem / vellit et admonuit." For further examples of the motif, see Wimmel, *Callimachos in Rom*, pp. 135–39.

39. 3. 3. 14, noted by Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry*, p. 401. For Apollo's sounding of the lyre in this context, cf. also Hor. *Odes* 4. 15. 1–2 "Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui / victas et urbis increpuit lyra."

40. Prop. 3. 3. 15–16 "Quid tibi tum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te / carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?" Cf. Prop. 4. 1. 71 (Horos) "Quo ruis imprudens, vage, dicere fata, Properti?"; 4. 1. 133–34 "tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo / et vetat insano verba tonare Foro"; Hor. *Sat.* 1. 10. 32–35 "... vetuit me tali voce Quirinus . . . : in silvam non ligna feras insanis ac si / magnas Graecorum malis implere catervas."

41. The incongruous application of the high-sounding "philosophical" digression (467–88) itself mocks serious poetry. Ovid's own epic cosmogony at the opening of the *Metamorphoses* is an adaptation of

The more immediate context, though, of both this line and the entire passage is mock-serious advice for the would-be lover. The great god of Delphi and the impressive literary advisor who appeared to Callimachus and the Augustans are both refashioned and conflated to serve this end.

The Callimachean orientation of this passage, however, is not restricted to the parody of Callimachus' Lycian Apollo. In his version of Delphic Apollo Ovid is also exploiting the other distinctive use of the speaking deity in the *Aitia*, and one not developed in elegy outside of the aetiological poem. Unlike Lycian Apollo and the many programmatic epiphanies in Roman elegy (including several in Ovid's own elegies),⁴² Apollo here offers detailed information on an aspect of the poem's content, in this case the art of love. As such, he corresponds to the Muses and Delian Apollo in the *Aitia* and the various deities in the *Fasti*, all of whom instruct their poets on antiquarian matters, mostly concerning cults. The Callimachean deities respond to questions, unlike Ovid's Apollo, but both address the poet in much the same way that he himself addresses the reader.⁴³ Indeed, with minor changes Apollo's speech could easily have been spoken by Ovid in *propria persona*.

More important, Ovid's Apollo follows these Callimachean deities in discussing an aspect of a cult. The parallel with Delian Apollo (frag. 114) is especially close, since both gods explain features of their own respective cults. Delian Apollo elucidates the meaning of his representation on Delos, why he holds the bow and the Graces in his hands there.⁴⁴ Ovid's Apollo explicitly mentions his own temple (498) and its famous inscription (499–500), which he then proceeds to explain (501–8). Ovid is not directly echoing the scene with Delian Apollo, but developing a motif regularly associated with the *Aitia* or more generally with Callimachus. Two other such aetiological explanations by deities are found in his *Iambi* (7 and 9; frags. 197 and 199). In the Roman aetiological elegies inspired by Cal-

these lines (see F. W. Lenz, *Ovid: "Die Liebeskunst"* [Berlin, 1969], ad loc., on the question of priority); the lines on human civilization echo Lucretius (cf. esp. 476–78 and Lucr. 5. 1011–14). That the poet then (in the Apollo scene) obliquely undercuts his own mockery of the "greater" genre, as is here suggested, is not uncharacteristic of Ovid (cf. above p. 31). For the contrast of love and *rerum natura* (instead of, or along with, heroic and tragic topics), see Prop. 2. 34B. 28, 3. 5. 23–48; perhaps related is Virgil's "Angst vor der Kosmologie" (see Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom*, index s.v.) at G. 2. 475–86.

42. *Am.* 1. 1, 2. 18. 3–4, 2. 18. 15–18, 3. 1, *Ars* 3. 43–56, *Rem.* 1–40.

43. One mark of the *Aitia*'s greater sophistication in comparison with other Hellenistic didactics (and with the *Ars* and *Fasti*) is that Callimachus' persona, so far as we can judge from the fragments, is not overtly didactic. Yet the aetiological narratives spoken in *propria persona* correspond to those presented by the Muses to Callimachus, just as Apollo's instructions in the *Ars* correspond to those of the poet himself. Note that both Ovid and Apollo are admonitory *vates* deserving of obedience (cf. 1. 29 *vati parete perito* and 2. 509 *Phoebo parete monenti*).

44. Frag. 114. 8–11. See C. A. Trypanis, *Callimachus: Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1968), p. 88, for a text of frag. 114 which reflects the supplements made since Pfeiffer's edition. Though the text is extremely fragmentary, it is likely that lines 10–11 are only the beginning of a longer speech by Apollo, one perhaps including a story or stories exemplifying his use of the bow and Graces, or the origin of their present function. Pfeiffer perceived in the speech a remark touching on the value of *metanoia* for the sinner (cf. 16 ἵπ' ἢ μετὰ καὶ τι νοῆσαι), a concept with important ramifications in the cult of the god of purification; see "The Image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline Ethics," *J. Warb. Inst.* 25 (1952):30–32 = *Ausgewählte Schriften*, pp. 69–71.

limachus, besides the numerous explanatory divinities in the *Fasti*, we find Vertumnus in Propertius 4. 2, a god who discourses on his ancestry, name, and nature.⁴⁵ All of the aforementioned examples are handled in a humorous fashion, so that Ovid can be said to be developing the comic potential of the form. Vertumnus, for example, numbers among his transformations a *non dura puella* (4. 2. 23), while Delian Apollo humorously swears by himself (frag. 114. 5). What is most striking about Ovid's passage is the linking of this playful explanatory deity with the more serious programmatic Apollo. A similar *contaminatio* of Callimachus with Callimachus will later occur in the *Fasti*, where the god Janus' appearance is described with a clear echo of the Lycian Apollo scene,⁴⁶ but the god offers no literary advice, only several aetiological explanations concerning his nature and his cult (1. 101–282). In the *Ars amatoria* the combination of these same two Callimachean motifs involves the parody of one by means of the other.

In these two passages, then, Ovid evokes the *Aitia* prologue along with other features of Callimachus' poem, the dialogue with the Muses, Callimachus' persona, and the deity who explains his cult. The complex parody is in part aimed at the Roman Callimacheans, partly at Callimachus himself. In Book 1 Ovid likewise mocks both the *Aitia* and Propertius 4 with an aetiological narrative that describes the Rape of the Sabines as the *aition* of the venerable custom of picking up girls at the theater (1. 101–34). As I have discussed elsewhere, echoes there of the more serious aetiological poems of the Callimachus Romanus mock their Augustan primitivism,⁴⁷ while the didactic orientation of the narrative seems to mimic the *Aitia*. In the *Ars*, the playful spirit of Ovid which is often called "Callimachean"⁴⁸ does not spare the master himself.⁴⁹

University of Minnesota

45. On the importance of the Callimachean deities as precedents for the Roman aetiological elegies, see Pfeiffer, "Delian Apollo," p. 27 = *Ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 64; Pillinger, "Some Callimachean Influences," pp. 178–81; J. F. Miller, "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*," forthcoming in *Latomus*. Before the more recent papyrological discoveries, K. Prinz, "Untersuchungen zu Ovids Remedia amoris," *WS* 36 (1914): 43, recognized that Ovid's Delphic Apollo followed the Greek "Kunstgriff, irgendeine Gottheit über bestimmte Dinge berichten oder belehren zu lassen," a device that he distinguished from the programmatic epiphany now known to descend from Callimachus' Lycian Apollo (38). Among the examples that Prinz cites for the former (Hesiod, Callimachus' Muses, Parmenides, Alexander Aetolus, Eratosthenes' *Hermes*), most relevant to Augustan poetry are Callimachus' Muses, the importance of which he notes in his reference to Prop. 4. 2 and the *Fasti*. At *Rem.* 549–78 Amor's epiphany is a further variation of the device which is also reminiscent of Callimachus: here the cult is that of "Lethaeus Amor" (551), located at the temple of Venus Erycina (549–50); Ovid playfully suggests that the experience may have been a dream (555–56, 575–76), as was Callimachus' meeting with the Muses (*Anth. Pal.* 7. 49; Prinz, p. 44).

46. Cf. *Fasti* 1. 93–95 "haec ego cum sumptis agitare[m] mente tabellis, / . . . Ianus . . ." and Callim. frag. 1. 21–22 *καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρῶτιστον ἑμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα / γούνασιν*. Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκος.

47. See n. 6. Cf. 1. 101 and Prop. 4. 10. 5–6, 1. 103–4 and Prop. 4. 1. 15–16.

48. E. g., D. Lateiner, "Ovid's Homage to Callimachus and Alexandrian Poetic Theory (Am. 2, 19)," *Hermes* 106 (1978): 190; J. M. Fyler, "Omnia Vincit Amor: Incongruity and the Limitations of Structure in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry," *CJ* 66 (1971): 196; L. P. Wilkinson, "Greek Influence on the Poetry of Ovid," *L'influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide* (Geneva, 1956), p. 237.

49. I wish to thank Professor G. A. Sheets and CP's anonymous referee for helpful criticism and advice, and the University of Minnesota for the single quarter leave during which this paper was completed.