

CALLINUS AND *MILITIA AMORIS* IN  
ACHILLES TATIUS' *LEUCIPPE AND CLEITOPHON*

μέχρις τεὺ κατάκεισθε; κότ' ἄλκιμον ἔξετε θυμόν,  
ὦ νέοι; οὐδ' αἰδεῖσθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας  
ὧδε λίην μεθιέντες;

(Callin. 1.1–3 *apud* Stob. 4.10.12 [ἔπαινος τόλμης])

In his commentary on the opening of Callinus 1, μέχρις τεὺ κατάκεισθε;, Campbell writes:

The construction with the present tense does not recur in Greek till Paulus Silentiarius resurrects it some twelve centuries after Callinus at the beginning of two poems in elegiac couplets (*A.P.* 5.220, 225). Homer has the future: *Il.* 24.128–9 τέο μέχρις . . . σὴν ἔδδει κραδίην;

Right so far as Homer is concerned, and Paulus, a poet of Justinian's court best known for his epic poem (modelled after Homer) composed on the occasion of the rededication of the Church of St Sophia, clearly evokes Callinus. But the commentators have overlooked the pointed use of μέχρι(ς) τίνος + the present indicative in Achilles Tattius' *Tὰ κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα*. Examination of the examples there suggests that Achilles Tattius could make greater demands on his readers than is sometimes generally assumed for the Greek novelists.

At 2.4 Cleitophon relates how he was urged by his slave Satyrus to pursue Leucippe more actively. As Cleitophon wavers, Satyrus attempts to steel his master's resolve with the assertion that Eros has no patience for laggards (2.4.5): Ἔρως . . . δειλίας οὐκ ἀνέχεται. Ὅρας αὐτοῦ τὸ σχῆμα ὡς ἔστι στρατιωτικόν· τόξα καὶ φαρέτρα καὶ βέλη καὶ πῦρ, ἀνδρεία πάντα καὶ τόλμης γέμοντα . . . Through his extravagant imagery Satyrus introduces the *topos* of *militia amoris*, most familiar from Roman love-elegy.<sup>2</sup> Cleitophon takes Satyrus' admonition to heart, and withdraws to plot his approach to Leucippe, an enterprise he now believes requires εὐτολμία (2.5.1). He then reports a dialogue held with himself: Μέχρι τίνος, ἄνανδρε, σιγᾶς; τί δὲ δειλὸς εἰ στρατιώτης ἀνδρείου θεοῦ; τὴν κόρην προσελθεῖν σοὶ περιμένεις; The highly unusual grammatical construction in Cleitophon's opening immediately recalls Callinus' ἔπαινος τόλμης, as probably also the overall shape of his self-exhortation: in each passage two brief direct questions introduced by interrogatives are followed by a third that serves as a rhetorical and psychological climax ('Are you not ashamed . . . ?' / 'Are you waiting for the girl . . . ?').

The intertextual allusion mobilizes various (mostly) humorous incongruities. Most significantly, whereas Callinus powerfully employs Homeric diction to exhort his fellow Ephesians<sup>3</sup> to military valour,<sup>4</sup> Cleitophon, in a most personal and private sphere, is merely mustering the courage to confess his passion aloud; and, far from being anything like the vigorous warriors Callinus' exhortation presupposes, Cleito-

<sup>1</sup> D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (London, 1967), 162–3. Campbell follows closely the note of T. Hudson-Williams, *Early Greek Elegy* (Cardiff, 1926), ad loc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford, 1980), 71–8.

<sup>3</sup> Specifically, the νέοι (2); some critics, e.g. C. M. Bowra, *Early Greek Elegists* (Cambridge, MA, 1938), 14, have suggested the exhortation was to be delivered at a symposium (cf. *κατάκεισθε*), but a more public setting is easily imaginable.

<sup>4</sup> Whether against the Magnesians (cf. Strabo 14.647), invading Cimmerians, or some other foe is uncertain.

phon is a conspicuously passive and unheroic figure.<sup>5</sup> Achilles uses the construction in an erotic context four more times, in each case turning some slight variation on the motif: when Cleitophon's amorous campaign makes only limited progress in its first few days, he asks Leucippe (2.19.1): *Μέχρι τίνος ἐπὶ τῶν φιλημάτων ἰστάμεθα, φιλάττη*; The sexually frustrated Melite similarly exhorts Cleitophon (5.21.3–4): . . . *Μέχρι τίνος με ἀπολλύεις*; . . . *Μέχρι τίνος ὡς ἐν ἱερῷ συγκαθεύδομεν*; and Leucippe angrily responds to Sosthenes' recommendation of Thersander as a lover thus (6.12.3): . . . *μέχρι τίνος μαινείς τὰ ὦτα*.

On another level, Achilles' redeployment of Callinus reflects the elasticity of elegiac poetry itself,<sup>6</sup> whose subjects included (among many others) both the military protreptics of Callinus and Tyrtæus and later erotic epigram.<sup>7</sup> Achilles' grammatical quotation of Callinus here thus assumes considerable literary sophistication on the part of his readers. Recent scholarship<sup>8</sup> has rightly sought to expunge the persistent notion that Greek novels were aimed at a poorly educated audience, and it is hoped that this note offers a concrete demonstration (*paucis*) of how much a Greek novelist expected his audience to bring to his text.

University of Arizona

DAVID CHRISTENSON  
christed@u.arizona.edu

<sup>5</sup> In the opening book he conceives of himself as love's δούλος (1.7.3), and the victim of love's all-out assault (δλος γάρ μοι προσέπεσεν ὁ ἔρως, 1.9.1). He in fact passively endures several physical assaults in the novel, in one instance ridiculously claiming victory when his assailant injures his hand on Cleitophon's teeth (καὶ οἱ δδόντες ἀμύνουσι τὴν τῶν ῥινῶν ὕβριν, 8.1.4). G. Anderson, *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Greco-Roman World* (London and Sydney, 1984), 63–4, captures his essential character: ' . . . Clitophon is indeed cast as a refined and slightly cynical opportunist. . . . He has some of the ineptitudes, and some of the duplicity, of the exquisitely over-educated, a *pepaideumenos* in love'.

<sup>6</sup> Of which, according to ancient tradition, Callinus was sometimes considered to be the 'father': cf. Hudson-Williams (n. 1), 9–12.

<sup>7</sup> Erotic elements are present already in the elegiacs of Mimnermus (fr. 1 W).

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, S. Stephens, 'Who read ancient novels?' and E. Bowie, 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore and London, 1994), 405–18 and 435–59, respectively.

#### JUSTIN ON TRIBUNATES AND GENERALSHIPS, CAESARES, AND AUGUSTI

Little, if anything, in Justin scholarship has been as controversial as the dating of the so-called *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Suggested dates have varied from the time of Antoninus Pius through the third century to the end of the fourth. The latter was proposed in 1988 by Sir Ronald Syme,<sup>1</sup> but has in fact received little support in subsequent literature on Justin, which has tended to accept the earlier dating (late second/early third centuries).<sup>2</sup> An exception is T. D. Barnes, who has

<sup>1</sup> Sir Ronald Syme, 'The date of Justin and the discovery of Trogus', *Historia* 37 (1988), 358–71. Restated by Syme in 'Trogus and the HA, some consequences', in Christol, Demougin, et al. (edd.), *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J-C* (Rome, 1992), 11–20.

<sup>2</sup> For the dating suggested by scholars before Syme's article, see Syme (n. 1, 1988), 359–62. Since Syme: G. B. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. J. B. Solodow (Baltimore/London, 1994), 551–2; R. Develin in J. C. Yardley and R. Develin, *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History*