Classical Quarterly **41** (i) 169–177 (1991) *Printed in Great Britain*

CONVERSING AFTER SUNSET: A CALLIMACHEAN ECHO IN OVID'S EXILE POETRY*

> utque solebamus consumere longa loquendo
> tempora, sermoni deficiente die,
> sic ferat ac referat tacitas nunc littera voces,
> et peragant linguae charta manusque vices. (*Tr.* 5.13.27–30)

In his note on lines 27–8 Luck gives two Ovidian parallels for conversation outlasting the day, *P.* 2.4.11–12 and *P.* 2.10.37–8,[1] but he makes no reference to lines 2–3 of Callimachus' epigram on Heraclitus of Halicarnassus (*Epigr.* 2[Pf.] = *A.P.* 7.80):

> ἐμνήσθην δ' ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
> ἠέλιον λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν.[2]

Virgil, of course, knew and drew on these lines at *Ecl.* 9.51–2 ('saepe ego longos | cantando puerum memini me condere soles'),[3] as did Horace (*C.* 2.7.6–7 'cum quo morantem saepe diem mero | fregi'), but Ovid's acquaintance with the epigram has scarcely been recognized,[4] perhaps because 'sermoni deficiente die' and its cognate constructions at *P.* 2.4.11–12 and *P.* 2.10.37–8 render Callimachus' 'laying the sun to rest in conversation' more obliquely than does Virgil.[5] Once the allusion is admitted at *Tr.* 5.13.27–8, Ovid can be seen to be modelling his relationship with his unnamed addressee on a famous precedent. Before his exile the two were as intimate as Callimachus and Heraclitus had been, and at *Tr.* 5.13.27–30 Ovid strives to rekindle that intimacy by recalling how things were and how he would wish them to

* I am grateful to Dr N. Wright, Dr N. Hopkinson and the Editors of *CQ* for criticism and comments.

[1] G. Luck, *P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia* (Heidelberg, 1977), ii.325 ad loc.

[2] With A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), ii.191, I read Bentley's ἠέλιον λέσχῃ for ἦλιον ἐν λέσχῃ, taking λέσχῃ to mean 'conversation' (cf. Call. fr. 178.16 [Pf.]) rather than 'a place where people converse' (cf. Hes. *Op.* 493). For full discussion of the problem, see Gow and Page, loc. cit., J. G. MacQueen, 'Death and Immortality; a Study of the Heraclitus Epigram of Callimachus', *Ramus* 11(1982), 54 n.15 and my note 3 below. In later usage the phrase τὸν ἥλιον καταδύειν assumes the proverbial connotation of tedium; cf. D. Chry. 10.20, καταδύεις τὸν ἥλιον περὶ πάντων ἐπερωτῶν, Aristaenet. 1.24, τοιαῦτα ... ἅπερ εἰ βουληθείην ἐξῆς ἀπαγγεῖλαι, καταδύσειν μοι δοκῶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐπὶ τῷ μήκει τοῦ λόγου.

[3] 'Cantando' indicates that Virgil understood λέσχῃ in the sense of 'conversation'. Note also a point of irony in the Virgilian allusion; Moeris claims to have forgotten all his boyhood songs ('nunc oblita mihi tot carmina', 53), but in the previous line one particular 'carmen', Callimachus' epigram, is only too vividly recalled. Perhaps Moeris' memory is not as frail as his self-deprecation suggests.

[4] Cf. J.-M. Claassen, *Poeta, Exsul, Vates: a Stylistic and Literary Analysis of Ovid's Tristia and Epistolae ex Ponto* (diss. Stellenbosch, 1986), p. 282 on *P.* 2.10.37–8: 'the road was shortened, and the day condensed, by pleasant converse, in the usual Callimachean mode [i.e. *Epigram* 2]'. I know of no other reference to the epigram in modern scholarship on the exile poetry.

[5] A later parallel in Persius ('tecum etenim longos memini consumere soles', 5.41) suggests acquaintance with Virgil rather than Callimachus. Cf. Tennyson's 'We drank the Libyan sun to sleep' (*A Dream of Fair Women*, 145) and Edward Young's 'How often we talked down the summer's sun', *Night Thoughts* ii, both cited by W. P. Mustard, *Classical Echoes in Tennyson* (New York, 1904), p. 141.

be – with his addressee continuing to be a second Heraclitus, as forthcoming in correspondence as he used to be in intimate conversation. The same allusion at *P.* 2.4.11–12 and *P.* 2.10.37–8 creates the same mood of shared intimacy between poet and addressee as at *Tr.* 5.13.27–8, but its ramifications are more complex. For this reason the major part of this study is devoted to *P.* 2.4 and *P.* 2.10; in a concluding section I add briefer comments on a different type of allusion to Callimachus' epigram in *P.* 1.9.

I

Ovid's friendship with the Atticus addressed in *P.* 2.4 is reinforced by the shared commitment to literary pursuits.[6] Hence the transition from 'iudicio ... meo' (2) to 'iudicio ... tuo' (14): both poet and addressee share a common critical faculty, which enables Ovid to regard Atticus as a committed and trustworthy friend ('non dubitande', 2) whose literary judgement is also to be trusted ('nova iudicio subdita Musa tuo est', 14). The ultimate accolade for Atticus is to be cast in the mould of Quintilius, portrayed by Horace as a stern and uncompromising literary critic who will not overlook the defects in a friend's verse even at the cost of annoying that friend (*Ars* 438–52). Equipped with such literary credentials and so obviously familiar with the Ovidian 'ingenium', Atticus is ideally placed to recognize the various subtleties which underlie Ovid's address to him in *P.* 2.4. It is important that this point should be stressed at the outset, for Ovid's portrayal of Atticus' powers of judgement and literary sensibility provides initial confirmation that the poetic epistle will be artistically contrived and structured to match the qualities which its addressee will bring to reading it.

Atticus might therefore be expected to detect the provenance of lines 11–12 in Callimachus' recollection of 'laying the sun to rest' in conversation with Heraclitus, and once the basic point of allusion is detected a further correspondence then emerges between the two poems. By addressing Heraclitus in the second person Callimachus 'converses' with his departed friend as if he were a living presence; so, too, Ovid overcomes his physical detachment from Atticus by 'conversing' with him in verse as if he were addressing him in person (cf. 'accipe conloquium', 1).[7] The initial significance of these evocations is the same as in *Tr.* 5.13, for Ovid again shapes his relationship with his addressee on the model of Callimachus' relationship with Heraclitus. But a further development in *P.* 2.4 is that now, more obviously than in *Tr.* 5.13, the kinds of conversation which Callimachus remembers sharing with Heraclitus prefigure the nature of Ovid's own conversations with Atticus. Little of biographical substance is known about Heraclitus,[8] but he was certainly a poet of some merit.[9] A probable example of his work survives in the form of an epigram, *A.P.*

[6] This Atticus, the addressee of *P.* 2.7 and possibly also *Am.* 1.9, cannot be identified; R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), p. 72 lists various candidates.

[7] 'Conloquium' is rare in the sense of 'conversation' or 'talk' in a written form; see *OLD* s.v. 1d with A. P. Vega, ed. *Ovidio: Epistulae ex Ponto II* (Seville, 1989), p. 167 on *P.* 2.4.1. For Ovid's portrayal of letters as a substitute for conversation, cf. *Tr.* 3.7.1–2, 5.13.29–30, *P.* 1.2.5–6, 1.7.1, 2.6.1–4, 4.9.11–12.

[8] Strabo (14.656) cites Heraclitus as one of the celebrities of Halicarnassus. W. Swinnen, 'Herakleitos of Halikarnassos, an Alexandrian Poet and Diplomat', *Ancient Society* 1 (1970), 39–52 argues on the basis of inscriptional evidence from Euboea, Chios and Argos that Heraclitus had a distinguished career in public service either in the Ptolemaic court or as a representative of Halicarnassus.

[9] Cf. D.L. 4.17, where Heraclitus is described as ἐλεγείας ποιητής and Callimachus' epigram in his honour is quoted.

7.465,[10] and Callimachus' elegant portrait of Heraclitus' 'nightingales' defying the hand of death anticipates the lasting stature of his poetry, possibly in a collection which was itself termed *Ἀηδόνες*.[11] On the strength of their common commitment to the Muses, the natural supposition is that the conversations of Callimachus and Heraclitus embraced literary matters. By alluding to these conversations at *P.* 2.4.11–12 and subsequently picturing his shared literary activity with Atticus (13–18), Ovid allows the same inference to be drawn about the general orientation of his own 'longi sermones' with Atticus.

The shaping process in operation here banishes the notion that Ovid's Callimachean echo is merely ornamental. The echo is functional, and in more ways than one, for in addition it plays an integral part in what will emerge as the artistic 'point' of *P.* 2.4. Central to this aspect of the poem are lines 7–8, and Ovid's claim that despite his physical separation from Atticus he retains a constant mental image of his friend:

> ante oculos nostros posita est tua semper imago,
> et videor vultus mente videre tuos.

Since the motif of mental vision occurs on a number of occasions in the exile poetry to describe Ovid's vivid memory of his wife (e.g. *Tr.* 3.4.59), his friends (e.g. *P.* 1.9.7–8) and the city he has left behind (e.g. *Tr.* 3.4.57, *P.* 1.8.33–8), it might at first appear that in *P.* 2.4 he simply redeploys a tried and tested formula to express his fond remembrance of Atticus.[12] On closer scrutiny, however, the words 'ante oculos... imago' prove to be far from a staid repetition of a trite motif. The decisive factor is the very status of *P.* 2.4 itself as a poetic assembly of different 'imagines' which complement the 'imago' or mental picture Ovid has of Atticus. Firstly, Ovid paints a verbal picture of his shared involvement with Atticus in lines 9–20, a picture which adds substance to the bare mental 'imago' of line 7;[13] like the voyeurs of line 19 (cf. 'viderunt'), the reader 'sees' the relationship unfold as a public vision in a supposedly private epistle. Secondly, Ovid's allusion to Callimachus makes *P.* 2.4 in part a creative literary reflection or 'imago' of a poetic model which lies behind it. The word 'imago' often carries the sense of 'duplicate', 'copy' or 'likeness', as at *Tr.* 4.4.3,

[10] In their apparatus criticus Gow and Page, op. cit., i.106, record the epigram's ascription to one *Ἡράκλητος* or *Ἡρακλείδης*, presumably simple corruptions of *Ἡράκλειτος*. But for reservations on the point, see G. Hirst, 'Professor Gildersleeve on Cory's Version of Callimachus', *CW* 25 (1932), 127 and Swinnen, op. cit. 42.

[11] But Callimachus may term Heraclitus' poetry 'nightingales' for symbolic reasons. Firstly, Swinnen, op. cit. 42 takes *ἀηδόνες* to be typological on the analogy of *ἀ[ηδονίδες]* (*Aet.* fr. 1.16 [Pf.]). The latter term characterizes Callimachus' own poetry in contrast to the poetic ideal of the Telchines; so, by terming Heraclitus' poetry *ἀηδόνες*, Callimachus gives it an aesthetic value based on his own ideals. Secondly, nightingales sing after dark, so that in the words of MacQueen, op. cit. 52–3, 'the voice of Heraclitus has in his nightingales conquered darkness and death'. Thirdly, as noted by N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 249, 'the nightingale's song was proverbially a lament; Heraclitus' *ἀηδόνες* can be imagined as bewailing their own poet's death'.

[12] On the motif of mental vision in the exile poetry see B. R. Nagle, *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Exile Poetry of Ovid. Coll. Latomus* 170 (Brussels, 1980), pp. 92–8. On Ovid's use of 'imago', in the basic sense of 'reflection', 'likeness', see S. Viarre, 'L'image et le symbole dans la poésie d'Ovide. Recherches sur l'imaginaire', *REL* 52 (1974), 275–6. Cicero also employs the motif of mental vision in certain of his letters from exile (e.g. *ad fam.* 14.2.3 [to Tarentia], 'mihi ante oculos dies noctesque versaris', cited with *ad fam.* 14.3.2 by Nagle, op. cit. p. 35). The possible influence of his exilic letters on Ovid's exile poetry has long been recognized (see, e.g., L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* [Cambridge, 1955], p. 312, S. D'Elia, *Ovidio* [Naples, 1959], pp. 386–91, Nagle, op. cit., pp. 33–5 etc.), and it may extend to Ovid's use of the motif of mental vision.

[13] For 'imago' as a representation or description in words see *OLD* s.v. 7a with examples.

where Ovid writes of his addressee 'inest animo patrii candoris imago';[14] the son mirrors or reflects his father's benign disposition, and in a parallel manner Ovid creates a poetic 'imago' in *P.* 2.4 which mirrors his literary ancestor.[15] A third 'imago' is present in the poem, though I raise it more tentatively for a reason which will immediately become apparent. Even if the allusive hint in lines 11–12 is not taken and Callimachus' relationship with Heraclitus is not seen as a model for Ovid's own relationship with Atticus, Achilles and Antilochus drive home the same illustrative point in lines 21–2. Ovid often adduces legendary examples of this sort elsewhere in the exile poetry to portray the strength of his ties with loyal friends,[16] and so it may be dangerous to place too much emphasis on a point at *P.* 2.4.21–2 which is not self-evident in parallel instances of the phenomenon. The point is that Achilles and Antilochus themselves form an 'imago' in the well attested sense that they are a personification, the very 'picture' of the special binding quality – true 'amor' – which Ovid claims for his special relationship with Atticus.[17]

The mental 'imago' of Atticus himself, the pictorial 'imago' which Ovid paints of his happy association with Atticus, the allusive 'imago' which makes the poem a reflection of Callimachus' epigram on Heraclitus, possibly also the paradigmatic 'imago' of Achilles and Antilochus – each is part of a nexus of complementary 'imagines'. This design gives artistic purpose to a poem which is ostensibly a simple appeal to Atticus not to betray Ovid's longstanding trust in him; and basic to this design is Ovid's Callimachean allusion, for in the fusion of personal reminiscence and literary reminiscence in lines 11–12 the poem's different 'imagines' first begin to merge.[18]

The ramifications of lines 11–12 also extend to the series of adynata which Ovid lists in lines 25–30 to demonstrate his faith in Atticus. Of course, such adynata recur throughout the exile poetry, and here they repeat a familiar sentiment.[19] Ovid would sooner believe that the impossible was possible, that the ordered workings of the seasons (25–6), climate (27) and nature (28) could all change their normal pattern, before he would countenance the possibility of a change in his friend's loyalties. For

[14] For further examples of 'imago' in this sense see *OLD* s.v. 9.

[15] A loose structural similarity with Catullus 50 may suggest a further literary 'reflection' in *P.* 2.4, though mere resemblance is no proof of direct Catullan influence. Catullus contrasts the memory of happy hours spent in Calvus' company (1–6) with his anguished present at the time of writing (7–17); he is fearful of rejection and warns Calvus to that effect (18–21). Ovid, too, recalls the hours he spent with Atticus and is equally fearful of rejection – hence his muted warning in lines 25–8. If the parallel is pressed, Catullus' playful, neoteric reverie with Calvus (cf. 'lusimus', 2, 'uterque... ludebat', 4–5, 'reddens mutua per iocum et vinum', 6) may prefigure the nature of Ovid's own 'ioci' (cf. 10) with Atticus.

[16] E.g. Theseus/Pirithous, *Tr.* 1.5.19–20, 1.9.31–2, 5.4.26, *P.* 2.3.43; Orestes/Pylades, *Tr.* 1.5.21–2, 1.9.27–8, 5.4.25, *P.* 2.3.45; Euryalus/Nisus, *Tr.* 1.5.23–4, 1.9.33–4, 5.4.26, Achilles/Patroclus, *Tr.* 1.9.29–30, 5.4.25, *P.* 2.3.41–2.

[17] For 'imago' in this sense, see *OLD* s.v. 11 with examples.

[18] This poetic representation of different kinds of picture is not an Ovidian response to the theory encapsulated in Horace's 'ut pictura poesis' (*Ars* 367). In Horatian terms, which C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry II: the 'ars poetica'* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 370, relates to Hellenistic literary theory, poetry resembles visual art in that a finely crafted poem, like a finely crafted painting, bears repeated inspection; see Brink, op. cit., pp. 368–71. Earlier (1–41) Horace also relates the notion of artistic 'wholeness' in poetry to 'wholeness' in pictorial art; a poem, like a picture, will be defective if it lacks stylistic or thematic integrity. While the concept of artistic 'wholeness' may be applicable to *P.* 2.4, in the sense that Ovid creates a configuration of complementary 'imagines', the poem is hardly a theoretical manifesto on the relation between poetic and pictorial art.

[19] On Ovid's use of adynata see M. H. Thomsen Davisson, 'Omnia naturae praepostera legibus ibunt. Adynata in Ovid's Exile Poems', *CJ* 76 (1980), 124–8.

present purposes the significant lines are 25–6. Davisson catches the psychological mood of this couplet ('it seems possible that a failure in friendship will make summer nights and winter days unpleasantly long'),[20] but the interplay between these lines and 11–12 furnishes a more telling point. Recalling how the hours passed all too quickly and the day seemed all too short for his conversations with Atticus (11–12), Ovid portrays a relationship in which time is of no consequence. Far from marking time meticulously, he and Atticus enjoy each other's company in leisurely ease, as free from the distractions of 'negotium' as Catullus and Calvus are in poem 50. But the neglect which devoted friends show towards the pressure of time differs from the reversal of the temporal order which Ovid associates with the disintegration of friendship in lines 25–6. The ordering principle of 'fides' (cf. 33) supports the self-regulating conversations between Ovid and Atticus. If that ordering principle is lost, chaos is the consequence; and Ovid portrays the ensuing disorder by replacing the casual disregard for time in cultivating an intimate relationship (11–12) with the anarchic dissolution of time in the seasonal sequence (25–6). Hence the interplay between the two couplets, for their different perceptions of time only become fully meaningful if the lines are read in association with each other.[21]

The adynata of lines 24–30 culminate in a tacit warning to Atticus:

> ne tamen haec dici possit fiducia mendax
> stultaque credulitas nostra fuisse, cave,
> constantique fide veterem tutare sodalem,
> qua licet et quantum non onerosus ero. (31–4)

If Atticus were to prove disloyal, the expectations which long years of friendship have bred in Ovid (cf. 'veterem ... sodalem', 33) would be rudely shattered. And on the basis of their long literary association, one might suggest that Atticus' failure to detect the finer points of *P.* 2.4.11–12 – the Callimachean echo, the modelling of his relationship with Ovid on Callimachus' with Heraclitus, the conflation of different kinds of 'imago' which begins here, the delicate interplay between lines 11–12 and the adynata of 25–6 – would equally disappoint Ovid's expectations of him.

II

In *P.* 2.10 Ovid describes a journey which he made with the epic poet Macer from Asia to Sicily (21–42).[22] Conversation eases the burden of travelling:

> saepe brevis nobis vicibus via visa loquendi,
> pluraque, si numeres, verba fuere gradu,
> saepe dies sermone minor fuit, inque loquendum
> tarda per aestivos defuit hora dies. (35–8)

The lingering conversations of Callimachus and Heraclitus are emulated by Ovid and Macer; and the latter's shared devotion to the Muses (cf. 17) is subtly reinforced in lines 37–8 by the resurrection of what I take to be Callimachus' similarly orientated

[20] Op. cit. 126.

[21] For a broader discussion of the concept of time in the exile poetry, with special emphasis on the 'timeless now' of Ovid's sojourn in Tomis, see Claassen, op. cit., pp. 293–8.

[22] Macer is generally assumed to be Pompeius Macer, son of Theophanes of Mitylene. Mentioned by Strabo as procurator of Asia (13.618), presumably around 20 B.C., he was later made director of libraries by Augustus (cf. Suet. *Jul.* 56.7); see further Syme, op. cit., pp. 73–4. Macer may also have been related to Ovid by marriage; see *P.* 2.10.10 with J. Schwartz, 'Pompeius Macer et la jeunesse d'Ovide', *RPh* 25 (1951), 193, who takes Macer to be the father of Ovid's second wife.

relationship with Heraclitus. This much should by now be self-evident; but the full significance of Ovid's Callimachean allusion here will only emerge after the broader thematic issues of the poem have been addressed.

The Macer addressed in *P.* 2.10 is presumed to be the addressee of *Am.* 2.18 as well,[23] and in both poems generic differentiation provides a central theme of comparison and contrast between Ovid and Macer. While, in *Am.* 2.18, Macer is engaged in writing an epic prelude to the *Iliad* (1–2),[24] Ovid marks out the lighter genre of love elegy for himself:

> nos, Macer, ignava Veneris cessamus in umbra,
> et tener ausuros grandia frangit Amor. (3–4)

A formal 'recusatio' (11) diverts him from the world of martial epic to the domestic wars he wages as soldier of love. Again, in *P.* 2.10 these different poetic identities are affirmed in accordance with the earlier differentiation. Macer perseveres with the epic cycle (13–14), while Ovid continues as an elegist in exile, paying the penalty for his ill-fated *Ars Amatoria* (cf. 15–16). This generic distinction is further marked by 'diversum ... iter' (18), which denotes more than the different courses which the lives of Macer and Ovid have taken, with the latter's downfall and long journey into exile. The phrase also embraces the contrasting paths which Ovid and Macer follow as practitioners of different genres,[25] while still sharing common literary interests (cf. 'communia sacra', 17). It is significant that despite their poetic differences, Ovid should draw attention to the common ground that lies between himself and Macer, for when he then describes an 'iter' in the concrete sense of the journey he made with Macer from Asia Minor to Sicily, the route they follow together reflects features of the literary path each follows independently.

Consider the literary associations of lines 21–4. It is no surprise that Macer is cast as Ovid's guide on this stage of the journey (cf. 'te duce', 21, 22), and not just because of his post as procurator of Asia Minor: Macer is travelling to his literary home, the setting for the war which supplies the theme of his poetry both here (13–14) and in *Am.* 2.18. When he subsequently conducts Ovid from Asia Minor to Sicily, the two repeat the journey which Aeneas had made, and they witness the fiery splendour of Etna (23) as Aeneas and his men had before them (*Aen.* 3.554, cf. 574). With Etna comes its famous giant (24), named Enceladus by Virgil (*Aen.* 3.578–80) but Typhon in the more common tradition.[26] In view of Ovid's choice at *M.* 5.346–8 and *F.* 1.573–4, it is likely that he means us to think of Typhon when he writes 'subpositus monti ... Gigans' (24); but it may also be that 'Gigans' is left undefined as a deliberate ploy to facilitate the Virgilian association. Even if this is not so, the basic parallel with the scene which confronted Aeneas on his approach to Sicily remains; and the spectre of the Gigantomachy, a topic ritually abandoned in Augustan 'recusationes',[27] also appears, consolidating the epic associations of the couplet.

[23] So Syme, op. cit., p. 73, Schwartz, op. cit. 182, Vega, op. cit., p. 221.

[24] Cf. *P.* 4.16.6, where Macer is termed 'Iliacus'.

[25] The Callimachean κέλευθοι of *Aet.* fr.1.27 (Pf.) are suggestive here. For 'iter' in the sense of 'poetic path', cf. *P.* 4.16.32: '[cum] Callimachi Proculus molle teneret iter'.

[26] For Typhon buried under Etna, cf. [Aesch.] *P.V.* 363–5, Pi. *P.* 1.19–20, *Ol.* 4.6–7, Ovid, *M.* 5.346–8, *F.* 1.573–4, 4.491–2, Sil. 14.196, V.Fl. 2.24. For Enceladus buried under Etna, cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.36(Pf.), Luc. 6.293–5, Stat. *Theb.* 3.595–7, 11.8, 12.275, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 1.153–4; these Latin examples all follow Virgil. The punishments of Typhon and Enceladus are reversed at *Aen.* 9.716 as well as at 3.578–80.

[27] A list of supporting examples with bibliography is given by P. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), p. 87 n. 6.

If the use of material usually associated with an epic context is clear and unproblematic in lines 21–4, the literary associations of lines 25–8 are more complex. In these lines Ovid creates points of contact with two sources – his own accounts of the rape of Persephone at *F.* 4.417–620 and *M.* 5.341–571. Henna (25) is the scene of the rape in *Fasti* 4 (422, 455, 462), and Cyane and Anapus, conjoined in line 26, are combined in one line also at *F.* 4.469 as places passed by Ceres in searching for her daughter. The evocations of *Fasti* 4 end here, but echoes of *Metamorphoses* 5 take up the story. At *M.* 5.346ff. Ovid introduces the episode of the rape by describing Typhon's restlessness, which first brings Pluto to Sicily. In *P.* 2.10 Ovid creates a parallel narrative sequence by making an initial reference to the giant (24) and then following it with specific evocations of both rape scenes; as Hinds has seen,[28] 'vomit ore Typhoeus' (*M.* 5.353) appears at *P.* 2.10.24 as 'vomit ore Gigans'. After raping Persephone in a lakeside glade at Henna, Pluto carries off his prize over the waters, 'per ... lacus altos et olentia ... stagna Palicorum' (405–6). Ovid and Macer visit both places, 'Hennaeos ... lacus et olentis stagna Palici' (25). On returning to Sicily after her fruitless search, Ceres visits Cyane (465) and finds Persephone's girdle (470); Arethusa eventually reveals her whereabouts (504–5). Ovid's narrative sequence in *P.* 2.10 again bears comparison, for first he mentions Cyane (26) and then introduces Arethusa with nymphe (27). Further, the story which Arethusa tells, at the end of the Persephone episode in *Metamorphoses* 5, of her pursuit and rape by Alpheus is matched by Ovid's allusion to this same story at the end of his account of his travels with Macer (27–8).

These associations with the rape of Persephone may indicate that Ovid's early journey with Macer inspired the Sicilian topography of *Fasti* 4 and *Metamorphoses* 5.[29] But whatever may have been the biographical facts which are now irrecoverable, the allusive technique which Ovid uses to describe his travels allows a more definite conclusion to be drawn from lines 21–8. We have seen how the generic differentiations of lines 13–16, which distinguish Ovid and Macer in the familiar framework of the distinction between epic and elegy, are fused in the 'communia sacra' (17) which both poets share jointly. Similarly, the figurative 'itinera' which divide Ovid and Macer in line 18 are merged in the single concrete 'iter' of lines 21–8, and the shared itinerary mirrors the distinctive poetic identities of both Ovid and Macer. The strong epic associations of lines 21–4 reflect Macer's preferred interests, while lines 25–8 reflect Ovid's own poetic character by drawing heavily on those unique hybrids, the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. In bringing together these different elements – epic, elegiac and the generic ambivalence of the *Metamorphoses*, all of which retain their individual identity within the context they share – Ovid's journey proves to be a reflection of the relationship between the two poets themselves. Even if, as there is no reason to doubt, historical fact lies behind the journey to Asia and Sicily, Ovid is not merely reporting it; he describes the journey in such a way that its symbolic significance outweighs its biographical interest.

Viewed in the light of these findings, the Callimachean evocation in lines 37–8 can be seen from a new perspective. Whereas the literary echoes of lines 21–8 are essentially separative, in that they serve to delineate the two poets' distinctive generic allegiances, this echo is essentially unifying: firstly, by forging the link between Ovid and Macer on the precedent of Callimachus and Heraclitus, it gives implicit support to the picture of oneness which is explicitly drawn in lines 35–42 (cf. 'pariter', 39, 'iuncta ... vota', 40, 'simul', 41); and, secondly, it reinforces the symbolism of the

[28] S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 141 n. 1. [29] So Hinds, loc. cit.

journey described in lines 21–8. If that journey symbolically integrates the independent poetic 'journeys' of Ovid and Macer, the success of the integration is reflected in the harmonious poetic 'convictus' which underlies lines 37–8 in the friendship of Callimachus and Heraclitus.

III

P. 2.10 is the last exilic elegy in which the lingering conversations of Callimachus and Heraclitus are invoked, but other features of the epigram are quarried in one further poem. Some brief remarks on *P.* 1.9 will conclude this survey of Ovid's debt to Callimachus' epigram in the exile poetry.

P. 1.9 commemorates the death of Celsus, an intimate friend who stood resolutely by Ovid after his downfall.[30] Informed of Celsus' death by Cotta Maximus, the poem's addressee, Ovid portrays his fond memories of his friend in lines 7–10:

> ante meos oculos tamquam praesentis imago
> haeret, et extinctum vivere fingit amor.
> saepe refert animus lusus gravitate carentes,
> seria cum liquida saepe peracta fide.

This passage bears obvious comparison with *P.* 2.4.7–10. The phrase 'ante oculos... imago' occurs in both cases, as does Ovid's recollection of the solemn and lighthearted moments – 'seria' and 'ioci'/'lusus' – which he had once shared with his respective addressees. The Callimachean presence in both poems reinforces these linguistic similarities, but the evocation in *P.* 1.9 is more oblique than at *P.* 2.4.11–12. In the first couplet of the epigram Callimachus recalls how someone had told him of Heraclitus' death (εἶπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον) and moved him to tears (ἐς δέ με δάκρυ | ἤγαγεν), and then he remembers (ἐμνήσθην, 2) the conversations he used to share with his friend. Ovid repeats the Callimachean sequence, for Cotta assumes the role of the τις of the epigram by reporting Celsus' death (1) and moving the poet to tears (2); and Callimachus' ἐμνήσθην is emulated by Ovid's own reflection on the past expressed in 'saepe refert animus' (9). Moreover, both Ovid and Callimachus exploit the notion of life in death by conferring the gift of poetic celebration on their departed friends. Addressing Celsus in apostrophe as if he were still alive, Ovid assures him of his lasting renown:

> carmina iure damus raros testantia mores,
> ut tua venturi nomina, Celse, legant. (43–4)

Callimachus does Heraclitus the same honour; the very epigram which assures Heraclitus of his lasting fame as a poet (cf. αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, 5) is itself an immortalizing monument to the deceased.

Callimachus' epigram on Heraclitus lends itself ideally to Ovid's lament for Celsus in *P.* 1.9. It is not just the parallel situation – both poets unexpectedly told of a friend's death – which makes the Callimachean evocation so effective here: from the very outset of the elegy Ovid deepens his profound sense of loss by echoing Callimachus' lament for Heraclitus. The one surprise, perhaps, is that Ovid chooses not to complete the Callimachean credentials of *P.* 1.9 by recalling endless conversations with as intimate a friend as Celsus. This omission distinguishes the poem from *Tr.* 5.13, *P.* 2.4 and *P.* 2.10, but *P.* 1.9 nevertheless stands with them in

[30] Nothing is known of this Celsus. A. Scholte, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Ex Ponto Liber Primus Commentario Exegetico Instructus* (diss. Amersfurt, 1933), pp. 165–6 on *P.* 1.9.1 and Syme, op. cit., p. 90 suggest that he may be Albinovanus Celsus, Horace's addressee in *Ep.* 1.8, but this identification is far from certain.

forming a singular group of exilic elegies which share a common debt to the same key point of literary reference. If that debt is not recognized, *P.* 1.9 and its cognate elegies are severely impoverished, since they are stripped of the essential characteristic which makes them so distinctive in the exilic corpus.

Churchill College, Cambridge GARETH D. WILLIAMS