

a tragic playwright.<sup>9</sup> As Sutton has shown, the professions of tragic and comic poet appear to have run in certain Athenian families in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.<sup>10</sup> Thus Aeschylus' sons Euphorion (*TrGF* 12) and Euaeon (*TrGF* 13), as well as his nephew Philocles (*TrGF* 24), his great-nephew Morsimus (*TrGF* 29), and Morsimus' son Astydamos I (*TrGF* 59) and grandson Astydamos II (*TrGF* 60),<sup>11</sup> were tragic poets, as were Phrynichus' (*TrGF* 3) son Polyphresmon (*TrGF* 7), Pratinas' (*TrGF* 4) son Aristias (*TrGF* 9), Sophocles' son Iophon (*TrGF* 22) and grandson Sophocles II (*TrGF* 62), and Euripides' nephew Euripides II (*TrGF* 17). So too among the comic poets, Aristophanes' sons Philippus, Nicostratus, and Ararus all wrote comedies in their own right (Ar. test. 1 K.-A.; Arar. test. 1 K.-A. = S α 3737), as did Alexis' nephew Menander and his son Stephanus (Alex. test. 1 K.-A. = S α 1138),<sup>12</sup> while Hermippus and Myrtilus were brothers (Hermipp. test. 1a-b K.-A. = S ε 3044, μ 1460), and Damon was the father of Philemon I (Philem. test. 1 K.-A. = S φ 327) and grandfather of Philemon Junior (Philem. Jun. test. 1 K.-A. = S φ 329). Tragedians nowhere sire authors of comedies or vice versa, however, and while this cannot be treated as an absolute social law, the pattern is clear enough to deserve serious consideration in the case of Carcinus I: if Xenocles was a tragic poet, so too, most likely, was his father, particularly since the brothers as a group were well-known tragic dancers.

Rothwell's basic point, that we know very little about the career of Carcinus I, is thus well taken. The evidence as a whole nonetheless still supports the conclusion that he was a tragic rather than a comic poet.<sup>13</sup>

S. DOUGLAS OLSON  
*Center for Hellenic Studies,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

9. The tragedian Carcinus II (*TrGF* 70) is probably the son of Xenocles and thus another member of the family. I follow J. van Leeuwen, "Quaestiones ad Historiam Scenican Pertinentes," *Mnemosyne* II.16 (1888): 435-38, in believing that Xenocles I is the mysterious Datis (*TrGF* 34) whom Σ<sup>RV</sup> *Pax* 289 calls a υἱὸς Καρκίνου.

10. Dana Ferrin Sutton, "The Theatrical Families of Athens," *AJP* 108 (1987): 9-26, with the additions and corrections of Niall W. Slater, "Aristophanes' Apprenticeship Again," *GRBS* 30 (1989): p. 80, n. 25.

11. Ar. *Pax* 802-8 can be interpreted to mean that Morsimus and Melanthius (*TrGF* 23) were brothers, in which case Melanthius would also belong to the family of Aeschylus. If they were not brothers and if Melanthius' brother (*Pax* 807-8) is instead another, unidentified tragedian, we have evidence for an additional fifth-century family containing several tragic poets.

12. Alternatively, Stephanus is said to be the son of the comic poet Antiphanes (Alex. test. 1 K.-A. = S α 2735).

13. The remote possibility that Diogenes Laertius' claim that Polycritus Mendaus thought Carcinus II a comic poet (D.L. 2.63 = *FGrH* 559 F 1) reflects confusion with Carcinus I (thus Rothwell, "Carcinus," 244) can certainly not be taken to outweigh the evidence outlined above. Rothwell also notes (p. 244) that S κ 394, 396 never says unambiguously that Carcinus I was a tragic poet, but the more important point is that the *Suda* never hints at any connection between Carcinus or any of his namesakes and comedy.

## OVID'S ELEGY ON TIBULLUS AND ITS MODELS

Readers of *Amores* 3.9, the elegy on the death of Tibullus, have long noticed how Ovid recalls Tibullus' apprehensions of his own death (especially in Tibullus 1.3) and reshapes them in light of their fulfillment, pointing up the conceit with verbal

echoes.<sup>1</sup> Ovid is remaking Tibullus in Tibullus' own terms, after those terms have passed through the distorting lens of Ovidian love elegy. Ovid's elegy, in fact, turns out to reveal a more complex treatment of both the Latin and Greek literary traditions than has yet been noticed, and often shows greatest complexity precisely when it echoes Tibullus. The present essay seeks to demonstrate Ovid's debt to two late Hellenistic poems, Bion's *Epitaph on Adonis* and the anonymous *Epitaph on Bion*, and to show further how he alludes to the relationship between those two poems in order to construct his own relationship to Tibullus.

The first sign of this intertextual program comes at *Amores* 3.9.7–8, where Ovid envisions the grieving Cupid destroying his weaponry and placing it as a funeral offering on the bier:

ecce puer Veneris fert eversamque pharetram  
et fractos arcus, et sine luce facem.

Now that Tibullus is dead, it is as if love too had perished, and Cupid has no further need of his instruments.<sup>2</sup> This is a reworking of Tibullus 2.6.15–16, where Tibullus, in despair over the cruelty of love, says,

acer Amor, fractas utinam tua tela sagittas,  
si licet, extinctas aspiciamque faces.

The Tibullan elements in Ovid are plain: the broken weapons, the extinguished torch—tokens of Cupid's power, now useless. The premises of Tibullus' prayer, however, are belied by its fulfillment: Ovid makes Love's tyranny subsist on the very poetry in which Tibullus deplores it, so that it ceases only with the death of Tibullus. "Si licet" in retrospect acquires a most piquant irony. Ovid's revisionary treatment is part of his parodistic absorption of Tibullus into Ovidian poetics, but that is not its only source. His lines, in fact, constitute a double reference, to both Tibullus and Bion of Smyrna, *Epitaph on Adonis* 80–82:

ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν κλαίοντες ἀναστενάχουσιν Ἔρωτες  
κειράμενοι χαίτας ἐπ' Ἀδώνιδι· ᾧ μὲν οἰστώας,  
ὃς δ' ἐπὶ τόξον ἔβαλλ', ὃς δ' εὐπερον ἄγε φαρέτραν.<sup>3</sup>

The Loves are weeping and tearing their hair around the bier of Adonis;<sup>4</sup> each brings a different article of equipment to lay on the bier. These articles include bow and

1. On Ovid's use of Tibullus' poetry in *Am.* 3.9 see A. R. Zingerle, *Ovidius und sein Verhältniss zu den Vorgängern*, vol. 1 (Innsbruck, 1869), 55–56; F. Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig, 1901), 55; F. Munari, *P. Ovidi Nasonis: "Amores"* (Florence, 1951), 94–96; F. W. Lenz, *Ovid: Die Liebeselegien* (Berlin, 1965), 228–31; J. H. Taylor, "Amores 3.9: A Farewell to Elegy," *Latomus* 29 (1970): 474–77; G. A. Cornacchia, "Ovidio, *Am.* 3, 9, 58," in *Mnemosynum: Studi in onore di Alfredo Ghiselli* (Bologna, 1989), 101–2; C. A. Perkins, "Love's Arrows Lost: Tibullan Parody in *Amores* 3.9," *CW* 86 (1993): 459–66.

2. Cf. Ovid's return to the image in *Rem. Am.* 139–40: *otia si tollas, periery Cupidinis arcus / contemp-taque iacent et sine luce faces*.

3. On line 82 and its textual problems see J. D. Reed, *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the "Adonis"* (Cambridge, 1997), 241–43. Gow's 1952 Oxford text follows the Juntine edition (1516) in reading ὃ δὲ περὶον, ὃς δὲ φαρέτραν at line-end; I follow the second Aldine edition (1496 or later). Ovid's allusion was first noticed, to my knowledge, by Eritisco Pilanejo (L. A. Pagnini), *Teocrito, Mosco, Bione, Simmia greco-latini* (Parma, 1780); M. Fantuzzi, *Bionis Smyrnaei Adonidis Epitaphium* (Liverpool, 1985), 120 calls it a parallel, without positing influence. Bion seems to have flourished in the late second century B.C.: Reed, *Bion*, 1–3.

4. Pompeian wall-paintings show a similar theme, and may have been inspired by Bion; cf. B. Servais-Soyez, "Adonis," *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 1.1 (Zürich, 1981): 226, no. 35. Cf. Eros' antiphonal mourning for Lais in Antip. Sid. *Anth. Pal.* 7.218.11–12.

quiver, the same mentioned by Ovid (for whom they replace Tibullus' *sagittae*<sup>5</sup>); Ovid's *sine luce facem* combines Tibullus' image with *Epitaph on Adonis* 88, where the god of marriage extinguishes the nuptial torch at Aphrodite's doorsill and changes his wedding song into a lament. Moreover, the Ovidian motivation replicates the Bionean: Bion's Loves have no use for their weaponry now that Adonis is dead (just as Aphrodite's *κεστός* has lost its magic now that Adonis is dead and "desire has flown from her like a dream" at *Epitaph on Adonis* 58–60).

*Amores* 3.9.19–20 are to be identified as another fusion of Bion and Tibullus. The lines:

scilicet omne sacrum Mors importuna profanat;  
omnibus obscuras inicit illa manus,

are a wistful correction of Tibullus 1.3.4–5:

abstineas avidas Mors modo nigra manus.  
abstineas, Mors atra, precor.

Ovid answers Tibullus by echoing his fear as a sad verity. The gnomic center of Ovid's lines (*scilicet omne sacrum . . .*) is the pivot of his revision, and it is here (as with the bow and quiver wherein Ovid diverged from Tibullus in ll. 7–8) that one may detect a reference to Bion, specifically to *Epitaph on Adonis* 54–55 (Aphrodite speaking):

λάβανε, Περσεφόνα, τὸν ἑμὸν πόσιν· ἑσσί γὰρ αὐτὰ  
πολλὸν ἔμευ κρέσσω, τὸ δὲ πᾶν καλὸν ἐς σὲ καταρρεῖ.

"Everything fair," "everything holy": the two phrases could be independent variations on a commonplace, a cliché that must occur to anyone who notices and regrets the universality of death. But a similar phrase also occurs in an apostrophe to death at Catullus 3.14–15, on Lesbia's dead sparrow:

At vobis male sit, malae tenebrae  
Orci, quae omnia bella devoratis.

Catullus' poem is generally acknowledged to owe much to Bion's *Adonis*, from its opening line "lugete, o Veneres Cupidinesque" (recalling the antiphonal chorus of mourning Erotes in Bion's poem) to its declaration in lines 3–4 that *passer mortuus est meae puellae*, / *passer, deliciae meae puellae* (recalling Bion's reiterated cry ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις and his repetitions of Adonis' name).<sup>6</sup> Ovid's change of "beautiful" to "holy" is dictated by his appropriation of Tibullus' language: lines 19–20 enlarge upon (*scilicet*) the previous couplet's reference to the mortality of *sacri vates*, a Tibullan phrase with which we shall have other occasions to deal. Thus in

5. In this detail Ovid may also be alluding to Tibullus' possible model, Meleager *Anth. Pal.* 5.179.1–2 Ναὶ τὰν Κύπριν, Ἔρωος, φλέξω τὰ σὰ πάντα πυρώσας τόξα τε καὶ Σκυθικὴν ἰοδόκον *φαρέτρην*. On imitations that incorporate a model's model see R. F. Thomas, "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference," *HSCP* 90 (1986): 188–89, who discusses such "window references" as a subspecies of "correction"; cf. also E. J. Kenney, "Judicium transferendi: Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.469–505 and its antecedents," in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. D. West and T. Woodman (Cambridge, 1979), 106–12 and S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 56 and 151, n. 16.

6. On Bion's influence on Catull. 3 see Fantuzzi, *Adonidis Epitaphium*, 89; V. Casadio, "Catull. III 1 ss.," *MCR* 21–22 (1986–87): 337–38; R. Hunter, "Bion and Theocritus: a note on *Lament for Adonis* v. 55," *MD* 32 (1994): 167–68.

both *Amores* 3.9.7–8 and 19–20 Bion's verses may be considered the medium through which Ovid takes up the narrating persona of Tibullus' own work and re-makes him as a newly Ovidian Tibullus. In each passage Ovid's difference from his primary model (Tibullus) is a sort of keyhole, with Bion supplying Ovid's revisionary key.

The *Epitaph on Adonis* has left other traces in Ovid's elegy. Tibullus is explicitly likened to Adonis in lines 15–16:

nec minus est confusa Venus moriente Tibullo  
quam iuveni rupit cum ferus inguen aper.

The lines sketch a common version of the myth of Adonis with no specific reminiscence of Bion, unless *confusa* specifically recalls the emotional lament of Aphrodite in *Epitaph on Adonis* 43–62; nevertheless, a Roman who knew Hellenistic poetry would surely have connected this passage to the reference in 7–8.<sup>7</sup> In *Amores* 3.9.46 “some say” that Venus was unable to hold back her tears at the death of Tibullus (*sunt quoque qui lacrimas continuisse negant*), which is remarkable, since the gods traditionally do not shed tears.<sup>8</sup> But Aphrodite sheds tears for Adonis in one of Bion's most conspicuous tableaux (*Ad.* 64–66, where her tears produce the anemone as Adonis' blood produces the rose). Ovid's line is an interesting case of a type of learned allusion, coyly and pointedly phrased, that D. O. Ross has termed the “Alexandrian footnote,” whereby a particular precursor's version of a myth is disguised as general tradition.<sup>9</sup> Ovid's reference metaleptically identifies his Tibullus with Bion's Adonis.

Why are there pointers to Bion's *Adonis* in *Amores* 3.9? Why, in fact, does the poetic eye of Ovid see the dead Tibullus as the Adonis of Bion? Neither the myth nor the Greek author has any particular relevance to Tibullus' work. One might be tempted to say that the *Epitaph on Adonis* was simply a familiar—by now perhaps even canonical—treatment of a story that had a general connection to Ovid's subject. Both poems, after all, tell how *tangunt magnas tristia fata deas* (*Am.* 3.9.2); the casting of Tibullus as Adonis highlights his youth and charm and the poignancy of his early demise. By an “art of allusion” Ovid uses his readers' memory to import more of the model's sense than he actually borrows.<sup>10</sup> But I suggest that Ovid is doing

7. Elsewhere in love elegy Bion's version of the myth is clearly echoed by Prop. 2.13.53–56 (cf. T. D. Papanghelis, *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* [Cambridge, 1987], 65–70) and [Tib.] 3.9.7–8 (cf. F. Wilhelm, “Zu Augusteischen Dichtern,” *RhM* 61 [1906]: 96). Ovid's lengthier treatment of Adonis in *Met.* 10 shows influence from Bion: cf. *Met.* 10.720–24 ~ *Ad.* 40–41; *Met.* 10.726–27 ~ *Ad.* 98.

8. Such is the line Ovid takes in *Met.* 2.621–22, *Fast.* 4.521; cf. D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991), p. 156, n. 116.

9. D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge, 1975), 78, citing E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro: “Aeneis” Buch VI*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1934), 123–24 on *Aen.* 6.14 *ut fama est*. Compare how Prop. 2.13.56: *diceris effusa tu, Venus, isse coma* points to Aphrodite's dishevelled search for Adonis' body in *Ad.* 19–21. S. Hinds, “Reflexive Annotation in Poetic Allusion,” *Hermathena* 158 (1995): 41–57 discusses “more deeply encoded” examples of the “Alexandrian footnote,” especially in Ovid; cf. A. Barchiesi, “Future Reflexive,” *HSCP* 95 (1993): 333–65.

10. I refer to the technique that was seminally discussed by G. Pasquali, “Arte allusiva,” *L'Italia che scrive* 25 (1942): 185–87 = *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo*, vol. 2, ed. C. F. Russo (Florence, 1994), 275–82. An especially subtle and influential study of Ovid's use of his precursors is Hinds, *Metamorphosis*, which discusses the common models and reciprocal influence of the Persephone myths in *Met.* 5 and *Fast.* 4; see also Hinds's “Generalising about Ovid,” *Ramus* 16 (1987): 4–31. A. M. Keith, *The Play of Fictions* (Ann Arbor, 1992) focuses particularly on Ovid's appropriation of a narrative “voice” implicit in his models (for *Met.* 2.531–835), a subject relevant to our present concerns.

something else with Bion's poem, and that Bion himself is incidental to Ovid's main program. We are dealing with what we might call preliminary references; at least, Ovid's echoes of Bion here are meaningful as a conduit to a different model. The real Hellenistic influence, to which the Bionean allusions in turn allude, is the anonymous *Epitaph on Bion*, a bucolic epicedion on Bion, conventionally known to modern readers as [Moschus] 3.<sup>11</sup>

This poem is often paid lip service; once it gets a proper commentary it will surely open up wide new vistas on late Hellenistic poetry and its influence on the Romans.<sup>12</sup> The anonymous eulogist echoes Bion relentlessly. He lifts phrases and half-lines especially from the *Adonis*, perhaps because of the congeniality of that funereal poem to his own themes, or perhaps it is only that we can trace his echoes of the *Adonis* better than those of Bion's fragmentary works. His favorite conceit is to picture Bion as a character in Bion's own poems. So Bion is a herdsman (e.g., [Moschus] 3.11): not just a βουκολικὸς ποιητής, but an actual βουκόλος, like the speakers (apparently) in his fragments 2, 5, 9, 10, and 11, and no doubt in much of his lost poetry too. Bion had written on the Cyclops and Galatea (frag. 16): now Galatea mourns Bion and favors him more than she did the Cyclops ([Moschus] 3.58–63). Erotes busy themselves around Bion's bier as they had done over Adonis, and Aphrodite kisses the dead poet as she had kissed Adonis ([Moschus] 3.67–69 ~ *Ad.* 13–14, 81–85). In line 51 the dead poet is addressed as “thrice-desired,” τριπόθατε, as his own Adonis was by Aphrodite in *Epitaph on Adonis* 58.<sup>13</sup> He is said to have milked cows, irritated Aphrodite, nurtured Eros, and crafted panpipes ([Moschus] 3.83–85): we can be sure that characters in his poetry did all these things. This trope is a development of the habit, endemic to bucolic, of conflating the singer and his song; it goes back to Theocritus, but reaches a natural limit here.<sup>14</sup> The loss of most of Bion's work obscures with what fidelity his professed epigone preserves his spirit in these adaptations; for all we know the revisionary appropriation may be extensive, but the surface message is always one of homage.<sup>15</sup>

An explicit echo of the *Epitaph on Bion* will give an idea of Ovid's debt. The two passages at issue, marking turning points in their respective poems, are rhetorical questions directed at the subject and affecting incredulity at the death of a poet. Bion's eulogist laments the cause of death; Ovid excoriates the funeral pyre. [Moschus] 3.109–10 describes Bion's death by poison:

11. The ascription to Moschus, the mid-second-century B.C. bucolic poet, dates from the Renaissance and is certainly incorrect. The poem can be dated before the mid-first century: Catull. 3.5–6 imitate [Moschus] 3.103–4 (with possible slight influence from Asclepiades, *Anth. Pal.* 12.50.8).

12. Any future commentary will have to build on V. Mumprecht, *Epitaphios Bionos: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Zürich, 1964) and N. Henry, “Introduction to and Commentary on [Moschus] III” (B.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1975). M. Paschalis has explored the influence of [Moschus] 3 on Virgil in “Virgil's Sixth Eclogue and the *Lament for Bion*,” *AJP* 116 (1995): 617–21; cf. his “Γλυκερόν στόμα: Erotic Homer in the *Lament for Bion*,” *MD* 34 (1995): 179–85. H. J. Rose, *The Eclogues of Virgil* (Berkeley, 1942), 12 notes the value of [Moschus] 3 for self-consciously revealing the conventions of the bucolic of its time and teaching us “the grammar of the poetical language which Vergil learned and wrote in his earliest self-published work.”

13. Bion may have coined this adjective, which is attested first in the *Adonis* passage and in his frag. 2.15 (where it is applied to springtime).

14. K. Gutzwiller, *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies* (Madison, 1991) sees this trope as the generic essence of bucolic. More generally, one might recall how “ancient biographers took most of their information about poets from the poets' own works” on the fallacious (or creative?) assumption “that every creative act must have grounding in a particular experience” (M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* [London, 1981], viii).

15. On the poem's indifference to Bion's stylistic precedent cf. Reed, *Bion*, 59–60.

φάρμακον ἦλθε, Βίων, ποτὶ σὸν στόμα, φάρμακον ἦδες.  
τοιούτοις χεῖλεσσι ποτέδραμε κούκ ἐγλυκάνθη;

*Amores* 3.9.41–42 picks up the previous line's chagrin at the thought of the great Tibullus confined to a funereal urn and begins the poem's movement away from generalities to remarks about the deceased:

tene, sacer vates, flammae rapuere rogales,  
pectoribus pasci nec timuere tuis?

Each poem then proceeds to a σχετλιασμός of the impious culprit (the poisoner, the flames).<sup>16</sup> Different body parts are mentioned as desecrated, but both represent the source of poetry. With the "lips" in [Moschus] 3.110 compare lines 30–31: Ἀχὼ . . . οὐκέτι μιμεῖται τὰ σὰ (Bion's) χεῖλεα and 53: εἰσέτι γὰρ πνεῖει τὰ σὰ χεῖλεα καὶ τὸ σὸν ἄσθμα. Ovid's "breast" also represents the source of his subject's art, and the variation from his model is significant in personalizing the image to the *sacer vates* (which is what Tibullus had called himself at 2.5.114), since the breast is the site of the bard's divine *afflatus*.<sup>17</sup> But on top of the overt image (reinforced by the allusion) of Tibullus as dead poet, his person and talent ravaged by the pyre, the wording superimposes an image of Tibullus as ardent lover, if one remembers that the *pectus* is the seat of love, especially when it is aflame (both metaphors go back to the dawn of Latin love poetry<sup>18</sup>). Poet and lover, love poetry and the emotion it embodies are seen as one: we remember the revision in lines 7–8, where Tibullus' wish to be free of love becomes paradoxical and collapses under the terms of Ovidian love poetry. If one recalls *Amores* 1.1.26: *uror et in vacuo pectore regnat Amor*, concluding the poet's forced conversion to love elegy, the metaphors in 41–42 transform Tibullus into a love poet specifically in the Ovidian mold. Here the divergence from the Greek model is the keyhole through which Ovid absorbs his precursor into his own poetics.

Ovid's debt to the *Epitaph on Bion* is usually more general; he places himself in the role of Pseudo-Moschus and Tibullus in the role of Bion, and imitates the Greek poem in several ways. First, there is the governing form: *Amores* 3.9 is ostensibly an elegiac lament for Ovid's master in that strain of poetry, as [Moschus] 3 is a bucolic lament for the anonymous bucolic poet's teacher and model. Secondly, he uses motifs also used by [Moschus] 3, even if not directly traceable to the earlier poem. *Amores* 3.9.61–64 is a list of poets like that in [Moschus] 3.70–97, although Ovid confines himself to poets in Tibullus' own field (Calvus, Catullus, Gallus), while Pseudo-Moschus ranges far from bucolic (Hesiod, Alcaeus, Sappho, Pindar, Anacreon, and Archilochus as well as Theocritus). Ovid's passage there is a fantasy of Tibullus in the underworld which, like Pseudo-Moschus' fantasy of Bion in the underworld at 114–25, brings its poem to a close. *Amores* 3.9.28 *defugiunt avidos carmina sola rogos* reproduces, in a different metaphor, the sentiment of [Moschus] 3.53

16. See E. Thomas, "A Comparative Analysis of Ovid, *Amores* II, 6 and III, 9," *Latomus* 24 (1965) 602–5 on Ovid's use of the σχετλιασμός here.

17. Cf. Lucr. 1.731–33 (on Empedocles): *carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius / vociferantur et exponunt praeclara reperta, / ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus* (as commentators note, in Lucretius *pectus* also specially connotes the intellect). Ovid's *pasci* in 41 might hint at Tibullus' fondness for pastoral imagery and (like the *pectora* suggested by Tibullus' self-characterization as *sacer vates*) tailor the conceit to Tibullus' own persona.

18. Cf. Valerius Aedituus frag. 2.2 Morel, *lucet pectore flamma satius*.

(quoted above). The implicit comparison of Tibullus to Orpheus in *Amores* 3.9.21–22 recalls Pseudo-Moschus' explicit comparisons of Bion to Orpheus in 14–18 and 119–26 (which in turn may allude to one of Bion's lost poems),<sup>19</sup> and the implicit contrast between Homer's subject matter and Tibullus' love affairs in *Amores* 3.9.29–32 reproduces a contrast between Homer's war-poetry and Bion's pastoral poetry in [Moschus] 3.78–84. Thirdly, in the passages we discussed earlier Ovid echoes Bion in order to remind the reader of his model, who also echoes Bion, and thus confirm his project. Finally, Ovid imitates [Moschus] 3 by alluding to Tibullus as his model alludes to Bion, both by verbal echoes and by more elaborate tropes: when Ovid evokes the Tibullan characters Delia and Nemesis weeping over their dead creator (55–58) he is employing the method of Pseudo-Moschus, who has Bion's characters weep over Bion. By all of these modes of imitation, Ovid is projecting (how straightforwardly remains to be seen) the message of [Moschus] 3: "I too am a disciple of a great poet, and am carrying on his work after his death."

If, as is now clear, the imitations of Bion through which Ovid approaches and revises Tibullus are indirect imitations of Pseudo-Moschus, we are dealing with complex nodes of imitation involving linked chains of models. Moreover, this strategy is tightly bonded to the rhetorical stance Ovid adopts in *Amores* 3.9. Not only does [Moschus] 3 supply the lament-form and its various supporting motifs, but the passages where Thomas locates the very crux of Ovid's epicedic structure—lines 7–8, 15–20, and 41–46—contain the nodes of imitation that have most interested us.<sup>20</sup> The poet as mourner speaks with the same voice as he does as assimilator of his tradition; the poem's internal and external dynamics share the same fulcrum. And the same model transfigures the real life and death of Tibullus into highly tractable poetic stuff, for by treating Tibullus on a par with the characters in his poems (perhaps Ovid's most conspicuous Pseudo-Moschan conceit), Ovid treats Tibullus' poetry as not exactly by a love poet, but about a poetic lover. Ovid's use of the *Epitaph on Bion* does not simply add texture to this or that Ovidian passage; the imitation encompasses the whole poem, a poem about poetry, and is programmatic.

In theory, Ovid runs a risk by dividing the two functions of poetic imitation—let us call them mimetic and corrective—between two models. It is a commonplace of literary criticism that the ancients held the paradoxical (to a post-Romantic sensibility) notion that originality is best achieved through close imitation of a model; in recent years scholars have begun analyzing that strategy as the application of a panoply of revisionary tropes to precursors by their heirs.<sup>21</sup> Involved in the strategy are two stances toward the model, one of identification and one of confrontation;<sup>22</sup> in *Amores* 3.9 Ovid uses corrective tropes to subsume Tibullus into Ovidian poetics,

19. See Skutsch, *Frühzeit*, 59–60; G. Knaack, "Ein verlorenes Epyll des Bion von Smyrna," *Hermes* 40 (1905): 336–40; Reed, *Bion*, 27 and 152.

20. Thomas, "Comparative Analysis," 602–3.

21. Thomas, "Reference," 185–89 discusses this phenomenon as "correction"; cf. G. Giangrande's concept of *oppositio in imitando* at the lexical level ("Arte Allusiva" and Alexandrian Epic Poetry," *CQ* 17 [1967]: 85–97), adopted from K. Kuiper, *Studia Callimachea*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1896), 114. For a recent discussion of Ovid's correction of other poets (and of himself) to create meaning in the *Amores* see J. V. Morrison, "Literary Reference and Generic Transgression in Ovid, *Amores* 1.7: Lover, Poet, and *Furor*," *Latomus* 51 (1992): 571–89. On the treatment of these issues in ancient imitation theory see D. A. Russell, "De Imitatione," in West and Woodman, *Creative Imitation*, 1–16.

22. Ancient critics recognized a distinction between μίμησις (*imitatio*) and ζήλωσις (*aemulatio*) as two aspects of literary imitation, in some ways corresponding to the two aspects I am discussing. Cf. J. Farrell, Vergil's "Georgics" and the Traditions of Ancient Epic (Oxford, 1991), 5–6. On the ancient critical environment that demanded successful strife of a poet against his models see Russell, "De Imitatione."

while his imitation of [Moschus] 3 is the grand mimetic trope that enables the correction. By stepping into the shoes of Pseudo-Moschus and reenacting his epicedion for a revisionary attempt on Tibullus, Ovid invites us to see him as an epigone engaging a successful predecessor on his own ground. Yet signs of self-consciousness, of anxiety, of a contest between poet and precursor<sup>23</sup> are not conspicuous in the poem. Ovid's revisions of Tibullus are easy and playful rather than aggressive or urgent. In this poem about love elegy, the sentiments of Ovid the love elegist, let alone Ovid the grieving man, are scarcely to be heard; he approaches Tibullus not as a fellow poet, but virtually anonymously. His single self-reference is telling. *Amores* 3.9.17–18 is a vague couplet on how “we poets” are so beloved by the gods that they weep at our passing:

at sacri vates et divum cura vocamur,  
sunt etiam qui nos numen habere putent.

This couplet itself echoes Tibullus 2.5.113–14:

at tu (nam divum servat tutela poetas)  
praemoneo, vati parce, puella, sacro.

Without fuss or fanfare, the difference between Ovid and Tibullus is erased; what one said of himself is equally true of the other, and of the legendary *exempla*—Orpheus, Linus, Homer—who follow (ll. 21–28). In Ovid's one reference to himself as a poet he shows no hesitation to embrace anonymity and oneness with his precursor.

Ultimately this may be because Ovid was not anxious about confronting his precursor's achievement. Not only was Tibullus, whose influence must have presented a challenge of some kind when Ovid started writing, physically dead; Ovid had created his own style and persona, in which he doubtless felt well-earned confidence by the time he wrote *Amores* 3.9. But these are quasi-biographical speculations, of doubtful utility to our discussion. What is the artistic correlative of this self-confidence, and what is its artistic means? Surely it is the witty play with tradition that constitutes the surface of Ovid's poem and that takes the form of his reworking of the *Epitaph on Bion*. Look again at the sequence of couplets in which Ovid's single self-reference nests (*Am.* 3.9.15–20):

nec minus est confusa Venus moriente Tibullo  
quam iuveni rupit cum ferus inguen aper.  
at sacri vates et divum cura vocamur,  
sunt etiam qui nos numen habere putent.  
scilicet omne sacrum Mors importuna profanat;  
omnibus obscuras inicit illa manus

First, by a comparison to Adonis reminiscent of Pseudo-Moschus, Ovid transforms his subject into Bion. His phrasing (*nec minus est confusa Venus*) even recalls Pseudo-Moschus' measurement of Aphrodite's emotion at Bion's death against her emotion at the death of Bion's Adonis ([Moschus] 3.68–69; with an echo in 69 of *Ad.* 14): χαὶ Κύπρις φιλέει σε πολὺ πλεον ἢ τὸ φίλαμα / τὸ πρῶαν τὸν Ἀδωνιν ἀποθνήσκοντα φίλασεν. The reminiscence gives the following expression of empathy with Tibullus, expressed in Tibullus' own words, the force of a Pseudo-Moschan mimetic conceit; now the Ovid who becomes one with his precursor in voice and

23. See [Longinus] *Subl.* 13 for this metaphor.



sentiment is an Ovid masked as a Hellenistic Greek. Finally comes the explanatory couplet on how death profanes “all that is sacred,” in which we discovered a Bionean (that is, Pseudo-Moschan) echo enabling Ovid’s appropriation of another Tibullan passage. One might say that the self-reference in 17–18 is hedged about by other models providing a retreat outside of the Tibullan persona. Conte sees Ovid’s characteristic irony as “the telltale sign of a tension between the ‘nearsightedness’ of someone confined within the enclosed space of subjective elegy and the ‘farsightedness’ of someone who eludes that closure by recognizing its conventionality”;<sup>24</sup> here [Moschus] 3 offers a stance outside of (Tibullan) elegy and a point from which to manipulate its conventions.

If any self-consciousness is to be discerned in Ovid’s confrontation with Tibullus here, it will make itself known only by its silence, and there is some evidence that it does. Interestingly, *Amores* 3.9 is not the only poem we know of to use the motifs of [Moschus] 3 in connection with the death of Tibullus. The other is the epigram appended to manuscripts of the Tibullan corpus and, according to Scaliger, ascribed by one of them to Domitius Marsus:

Te quoque Vergilio comitem non aequa, Tibulle,  
Mors iuvenem campos misit ad Elysios,  
ne foret aut elegis molles qui fleret amores  
aut caneret forti regia bella pede.<sup>25</sup>

Also like *Amores* 3.9, this poem updates Tibullus’ own death-poetry, applying it to his actual demise: line 2 adapts Tibullus 1.3.57–58: *sed me, quod facilis tenero sum semper Amori, / ipsa Venus campos ducet in Elysios*, poignantly replacing Love with Death as the fulfiller of Tibullus’ prediction.<sup>26</sup> The Pseudo-Moschan element is the conceit that Virgil and Tibullus so predominated in their respective fields that they have wiped out the competition and left epic and elegy utterly without practitioners. Pseudo-Moschus repeatedly states, in various ways, that bucolic poetry has died with Bion (cf. especially ll. 11–12), although in 95–97 he seems to contradict this, proclaiming himself heir to Bion’s muse. Domitius (if he was the epigrammatist) could afford such claims, having nothing at stake in either genre. Ovid eschews the conceit for obvious reasons.<sup>27</sup> Another place where Ovid might be said to correct the Greek poem supports this *argumentum ex silentio*. Pseudo-Moschus imagines that Bion’s music lives on, echoing in his panpipe (53–54), and he declares himself the heir to Bion’s “Doric [i.e., bucolic] muse” (95–97); Ovid, although he stresses the contrast between a poet’s destructible body and the immortality of his song (27–30), makes no such claim explicitly for himself. The very selflessness of his approach to Tibullus elides questions about tradition and imitation.

In the end we are left with some ambiguity. In his elegy on the death of Tibullus, Ovid addresses himself both to Tibullus’ precedent and to the Hellenistic tradition that lies beyond the earlier Latin poet. Is he practicing an art of evasion, approaching

24. G. B. Conte, *Genres and Readers*, tr. G. Most (Baltimore, 1994), 49. He is especially thinking of the new, didactic stance that Ovid takes in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*.

25. On this poem see E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), 303–4. Its connection with [Moschus] 3 was first pointed out to me by A. S. Hollis.

26. The same lines are echoed in *Am.* 3.9.60.

27. He comes close to it in 7–8 (Cupid leaves his weapons as a funeral offering); but this is the very site of the correction of Tibullus with which we started our discussion.

his precursor only through a mediating poem more remote from his field, or is he submitting to a test of artistic strength, rewriting Tibullus while rewriting the Greek poem, simultaneously making all of it his own? Ovid's enterprise is especially daring in that the poem he is imitating is itself about the perils and rewards of imitation; but this fact could be interpreted as evidence of either bravado or a cagey and canny strategy of skimming even more lightly over the surface of Tibullus' corpus—of turning the poetic issues he must deal with into abstractions in order to face them. The polished, ironic surface of Ovid's poem deflects attempts to decide these questions, though not to trace his influences, which he has assuredly and ostentatiously mastered.

JOSEPH D. REED  
*Institute for Research in the  
 Humanities, Madison, WI*

#### MARTIAL 9.44 AND STATIUS

Martial 9.44, six lines on the Hercules statue belonging to Novius Vindex, has not, it seems to me, been fully appreciated, nor can it be without its full context, namely, Martial's previous poem, 9.43, and Statius *Silvae* 4.6, both on the same subject, and without a resolution of some textual problems. To the latter first. Martial 9.44:

Alcides modo Vindicem rogabam  
 esset cuius opus laborque felix.  
 risit, nam solet hoc, levique nutu  
 "Graece numquid" ait "poeta nescis?  
 inscripta est basis indicatque nomen."  
 Lysippum lego, Phidiae putavi.

1 Alcides . . . Vindicem *ed. Rom.* (cf. Housman<sup>9</sup>, 1103) : -en . . . -cem γ: -en . . . -cis β, *edd.* 6 Lysippum (lis-) βγ (cf. Housman<sup>3</sup> (ex Mart. ipso 5, 54, 2 Calpurnium afferre potuit)) : -ppu *Calderinus* : Λυσίππου *Aldus, edd. ceterum acumen, quod vix apparet, patefacere conatus est Henry, ingeniosius quam verius. sed tamen Phidiae ad gravitatem maiestatemque referendum videtur, quod ad lectionem in v. 1 pertinet* (cf. *Stat. Silv.* 4, 6, 36)

So Shackleton Bailey's recent Teubner edition.<sup>1</sup> The first line is crucial; to whom is Martial speaking? Friedlaender allowed *Alciden* . . . *Vindicem* into the text, but Martial uses the double accusative with *rogo* only in the sense of "ask for," never "ask about."<sup>2</sup> For the reading *Alcides* . . . *Vindicem* Shackleton Bailey refers us to Housman. In his review of Heraeus, who printed *Alciden* . . . *Vindicis* and on 1.3

1. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, ed., *Martialis Epigrammata* (Stuttgart, 1990). In the apparatus Housman<sup>9</sup> = *Classical Papers*, vol. 3, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), 1099–1104, a review of W. Heraeus, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri* (Leipzig, 1925); Housman<sup>3</sup> = *Classical Papers*, 2:711–39, 724–25; Henry = R. M. Henry, "On Martial IX, 44," *Hermathena* 71 (1948): 93–94.

2. Ludwig Friedlaender, ed., *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri* (Leipzig, 1886); for the double accusative with *rogo* cf. e.g., 4.77.1, 6.10.1, 11.68.1.