



Band 20 (2017)

Herausgegeben von:

Johannes Bergemann
Armin Eich
Peter Eich
Ralf von den Hoff
Gerrit Kloss (Schriftleitung)
Felix Pirson
Jan Radicke
Thomas Riesenweber

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat:

Barbara Borg
Gustav Adolf Lehmann
Heinz-Günther Nesselrath
Ulrich Schindel

ISSN 1437-9074

Ov. fast. 1,162-164 between *dialogische Form* and *concosa brevitatis*

von ORAZIO PORTUESE, Catania

One of the peculiar features of the aetiological poetry of Hellenistic period is the poet's role as mediator between the inspiring deity, consulted on murky and doubtful matters, and the readers, namely the addressees of the divine *praecepta*. This rhetorical expedient is ascribable to the general archetype of Homeric proems, where the poet harangues in *Du-Stil* the Muses (*invocatio – precatio*) to ensure their support in producing the poem (*narratio*)¹. Such an expedient had been extensively developed in the Archaic Lyric (e.g. Pind. fr. 150 Maehler μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ, 'Give me an oracle, Muse, and I will prophesy thy saying'), in the ἔπος (Apoll. Rhod. 4,1381f. Μουσάων ὄδε μῦθος, ἐγὼ δ' ὑπακουὸς ἀεῖδω / Πιερίδων, 'This is a Muses' story, and I sing it as servitor of the Pierides') and in the Bucolic Poetry of Hellenistic period (Theocr. 22,115ff. Πῶς γὰρ δὴ Διὸς υἱὸς ἀδηφάγον ἄνδρα καθεῖλεν; / εἰπέ, θεά, σὺ γὰρ οἶσθα· ἐγὼ δ' ἑτέρων ὑποφήτης / φθέγγομαι ὅσσ' ἐθέλεις σὺ καὶ ὅπως τοι φίλον αὐτῇ, 'And how did the son of Zeus strike down that voracious man? Tell me; goddess; you know; and I, vates for others, / I will sing what you wish and what you care about')²: in all these instances, built on the standard monologic pattern, it is always the poet who consults the deity and reports the erudite revelations accordingly.

In this regard, also Callimachus adopts the same pattern, as we learn from *hymn. 3,186 Pf.*² εἰπέ, θεή, σὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐγὼ δ' ἑτέροισιν ἀείω ('Goddess, tell us, and I shall sing thy saying to others'). Nonetheless, for the first time, there seems to be a remarkable change: Callimachus turns the pattern into a dialogic form that includes, in a number of examples, the diegetic response of the deity preceded by his personal *invocatio*:

¹ See Hom. *Il.* 1,1f. Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος / οὐλομένην... and *Od.* 1,1 Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον. For an in-depth analysis of the above-mentioned rhetorical structures (*apostrophe, invocatio, precatio, narratio*), also shared by the hymnal poetry, see H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, Stuttgart 1990³, p. 377f., § 762 (part. 1 and 2) and G. La Bua, *L'inno nella letteratura poetica latina*, San Severo 1999, pp. 63-83.

² All translations are mine. On Apoll. Rhod. 4,1381f., see Apollonii Rhodii *Argonauticon liber IV*, a c. di E. Livrea, Firenze 1973, pp. 388-390, *comm. ad v.* 1381, where further *comparanda* and related bibliography are provided; on Theocr. 22,115ff., see *Theocritus*, Ed. with a Transl. and Comm. by A.S.F. Gow, II. *Commentary, Appendix, Indexes, and Plates*, Cambridge 1952², p. 397f., *comm. ad v.* 116 sq.

Aet. 1, fr. 1,21f. Pf.² (= 1,1,21f. Mass.) καὶ γὰρ ὄτ' ἐπὶ πρῶτις ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα / γούνασι, Ἄ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος... ('As I first placed the tablet / on the knees, thus Lycian Apollo said to me:...')³;

Aet. 1, fr. 7,19ff. Pf.² (= 1,9,19ff. Mass.) κῶς δέ, θεαί, [...] μὲν ἀνὴρ Ἀναφαῖος ἐπ' αἰς[χροῖς / ἢ δ' ἐπὶ δὺ[ρφήμοις] Λίνδος ἄγει θυσίην, / η...τηνε[.....] τὸν Ἡρακλῆα σεβίζῃ; / ...επικ[....]ως ἦρχετο Καλλιόπη / 'Αἰγλήτην Ἀνάφην τε, Λακωνίδι γείτονα Θήρη, / π[ρῶτ]ον ἐνὶ μ[ν]ήμη κάτθεο καὶ Μινύαα ('And why, O goddesses, (...) a man of Anaphe with scorns, / and blasphemies Lindus celebrates the sacrifice / [21] (...) honours Heracles? (...) [22] Calliope commenced: / «The Radiant and Anaphe, neighbour to the Laconian Thera, / first remember, and the Minyans...»');

Aet. 1, fr. 31b Pf.² (= 1,35 Mass.) τὸ]ς μὲν ἔφη· τὰς δ' εἶθαρ ἐμὸς πάλιν εἶρετο θυμὸς ('Thus she said [*scil.* the Muse]. And forthwith my soul enquired again');

Aet. 2, fr. 43,56ff. Pf.² (= 2,50,56ff. Mass.) ὡς ἐφάμην· Κλειὸν δὲ τὸ [δ]εύτερον ἦρχ[ετο μ]ύθ[ου] / χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἀδελφειῆς ὤμον ἐρεικαμένη· / 'λαὸς ὁ μὲν Κύμησ' ὁ δὲ Χαλκίδος ('Thus I spoke. And Clio commenced again the story / resting her hand upon her sister's shoulder: / «People of Cyme and Chalcis...»')⁴.

This is certainly an innovative *dialogische Form*⁵, which also flows in the Latin aetiological literature, where it first occurs as a «one-sided dialogue» or «dramatic soliloquy»: for instance, in Prop. 4,2, the living statue of *Vertumnus* converses with an anonymous interlocutor who remains in the shadows⁶. Se-

³ A copy of this passage can be found in the Pseudo-Homeric *Batr.* 2f. ...ἀοιδῆς / ἦν νέον ἐν δέλτοις ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα; see Callimaco, *Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*, Introd., testo crit., trad. e comm. a c. di G. Massimilla, Pisa 1996, pp. 57 and 217f., *comm. ad v.* 21 sq.

⁴ For a comment on the above-mentioned passages, see Massimilla, *Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*, qn., pp. 217 (*comm. ad v.* 21 sq.), 257 (*comm. ad v.* 19), 308 (*comm. ad loc.*), 341 (*comm. ad v.* 56) and Callimachus. *Aetia*, Intr., Text, Transl. and Comm. by A. Harder, II. *Commentary*, Oxford 2012, *ad loc.*

⁵ Apart from the isolated and 'embryonic' incident of Hes. *Th.* 22-34.

⁶ For a definition of «one-sided dialogue» and «dramatic soliloquy», see respectively F. Boldrer, *L'elegia di Vertumno [Properzio 4.2]*, Intr., testo crit., trad. e comm., Amsterdam 1999, p. 37 and G.P. Goold, *Noctes Propertianae*, «HSP» 71, 1967, pp. 59-106: 77; for an in-depth analysis of Prop. 4,2, see Properzio. *Elegie. Libro IV*, Intr. di P. Fedeli, comm. di P. Fedeli, R. Dimundo, I. Ciccarelli, Nordhausen 2015, p. 398ff. In Prop. 3,3, a non-aetiological elegy, the deity's speeches are not included in a well-developed dialogic structure: the poet only acts as a listener of the long monologues uttered by Phoebus (vv. 15-24) and Calliope (vv. 39-50); see comments in P. Fedeli, *Properzio. Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie*, Intr., testo e comm., Bari 1985, pp. 111, 129 (*ad v.* 15) and 146 (*ad v.* 39 sq.).

cond, in Ovid's *Fasti*, where it appears as a more explicit *interview* between the poet and the invoked deity⁷:

in *fast.* 3,167-170, the poet enquires Mars why the *Matronalia* are celebrated in the kalends of March ("*Si licet occultos monitus audire deorum / vatibus, ut certe fama licere putat, / cum sis officii, Gradive, virilibus aptus, / dic mihi, matronae cur tua festa colant*"); a long and direct response provided by Janus follows the *interrogatio* (171 *Sic ego. Sic posita dixit mihi casside Mavors, / (sed tamen in dextra missilis hasta fuit): / "nunc primum studiis pacis, deus utilis armis / advocor..."*)⁸;

in *fast.* 4,189ff., the poet establishes a direct dialogue with Erato on the reasons of using kettledrums and bronze cymbals during the *Megalensia*, celebrated on April 4th in honour of Cybele, and also inquires about the origins of this cult (189-195 *quaerere multa libet, sed me sonus aeris acuti / terret et horrendo lotos adunca sono. / "Da, dea, quam sciter." doctas Cybeleia neptes / vidit et has curae iussit adesse meae. / "Pandite, mandati memores, Heliconis alumnae, / gaudeat assiduo cur dea Magna sono." / Sic ego. sic Erato...; 247ff. "Hoc quoque, dux operis, moneas precor, unde petita / venerit. an nostra semper in urbe fuit?" / "Dindymion et Cybelen et amoenam fontibus Iden..."*)⁹;

in *fast.* 5,5ff., Ovid inquires the Muses about the origins of the name May, entering into dialogue with Polymnia (*Sic, quia posse datur diversas reddere causa / qua ferar ignoro, copiaque ipsa nocet. / Dicite, quae fontes Aganippidos Hippocrenes, / grata Medusaei signa, tenetis, equi. / Dissensere deae; quarum Polyhymnia coepit / prima...*)¹⁰;

in *fast.* 5,191ff., the poet directly asks Chloris about the origins of her name, receiving an explanation that is both erudite and articulate (*Ipsa doce quae sis: hominum sententia fallax; / optima tu proprii nominis auctor eris. / Sic ego; sic nostris respondit diva rogatis*);

⁷ Besides the texts I quote, further examples of use of the *interview style* in *Fasti* can be found in Ovid, *Fasti 1. A Commentary*, by S.J. Green, Leiden-Boston 2004, p. 69; see also E.S. Rutledge, *Ovid's Informants in the Fasti*, in C. Deroux (Ed. by), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, II, Bruxelles 1980, pp. 322-331 and J.F. Miller, *Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the Fasti*, *ibid.*, III, Bruxelles 1983, pp. 156-192: 164-174. For a more comprehensive exam, see J.F. Miller, *Callimachus and the Augustan Aetiological Elegy*, «ANRW» II, 30.1, 1982, pp. 371-417: 400-413; for a few additional remarks, see C.E. Newlands, *Playing with Time. Ovid and the Fasti*, Ithaca and London 1995, p. 65.

⁸ See P. Ovidius Naso, *Die Fasten*, hrsg., übersetzt und komm. von F. Bömer, II. *Kommentar*, Heidelberg 1958, p. 154f.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 223f., *comm. ad v.* 191.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 291, *comm. ad v.* 9.

in *fast.* 5,693ff., the poet learns from Mercury about the moment in which Phoebus passes through the Gemini constellation (*At mihi pande, precor, tanto meliora petenti, / in Geminos ex quo tempore Phoebus eat. / "Cum totidem de mense dies superesse videbis / quot sunt Herculei facta laboris" ait*);

in *fast.* 6,213f., Ovid wonders whether he should inform Sancus, Fidius or Semo about the Nones of June; the reply will be given directly by Sancus (*Quaerebam Nonas Sanco Fidione referrem / an tibi, Semo pater; tum mihi Sancus ait...*).

This is a series of examples ascribable to the rhetorical class of the *sermocinatio*, with which Ovid, exceeding Propertius, develops the dialogic model of Callimachus and deepens the *ethopoeia* of the invoked deities¹¹: an emphasising of the *fictio personae*, which Ovid himself overtly declares in *fast.* 6,253ff. referring to the sudden appearance of Vesta (*Non equidem vidi (valeant mendacia vatum) / te, dea...*, 'And indeed I did not see you, O Goddess – far from me be the lies of poets').

Now, among the uses of the *sermocinatio*, a single instance appears to be remarkable for its rhetorical complexity, and seems to me to have been neglected so far: *fast.* 1,162-164. This is a short pericope in which Janus concisely replies to Ovid's question (vv. 149-160) as to why the year begins with cold rather than with the spring-like warmth:

*Contulit in versus sic sua verba duos:
"Bruma novi prima est veterisque novissima solis:
principium capiunt Phoebus et annus idem."*

'Janus put few words into twain verses:
«Winter is the first day of the new sun and the last of the old one:
Phoebus and the year begin at once»'.

The distinctive trait of this passage, which has gone unnoticed, can be seen in v. 162, where the poet informs us to have received from Janus a response in the form of a couplet (*contulit in versus sic sua verba duos*), which is then included in the following vv. 163-164 (*"Bruma novi prima est veterisque novissima solis: / principium capiunt Phoebus et annus idem"*). It certainly represents an *unicum* in the ovidian production, because *versus* – as can be evidenced by the lexical survey I propose – is always employed by the poet with a meta-lite-

¹¹ See Lausberg, *Handbuch*, qn., p. 407f., § 820, p. 408f., § 821.1-2, p. 409, § 823.1, p. 411f., § 826.

rarity significance, namely to designate either poet's own compositions¹² or short fictitious self-epigraphs¹³. In this environment, the verses must not be understood, perhaps, as representing a 'quotation' of an unknown text. It is rather likely that the poet recasts, with *doctrina*, the popular concept stemming from the antique and late-antique scientific culture, which asserts that the beginning of the astronomical year (winter solstice) coincides with the civil one. It will suffice to remind a few meaningful evidence: Varro *ling.* 6,8 *alter motus solis est, quod movetur a bruma ad solstitium. Dicta bruma, quod brevissimus tunc dies est; [...] tempus a bruma ad brumam dum sol redit, vocatur annus*; Plut. *Aet. Rom.* 268d ἄριστα δ'οἱ τὴν μετὰ τροπὰς χειμερίας λαμβάνοντες, ὀπηνίκα τοῦ πρόσω βαδίζειν πεπαυμένους ὁ ἥλιος ἐπιστρέφει καὶ ἀνακάμπτει πάλιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· γίνεται γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρόπον τινὰ καὶ φύσει, τὸν μὲν τοῦ φωτὸς αὐξοῦσα χρόνον ἡμῖν, μειοῦσα δὲ τὸν τοῦ σκότους, ἐγγυτέρω δὲ ποιοῦσα τὸν κύριον καὶ ἡγεμόνα τῆς ῥευστῆς οὐσίας ἀπάσης, Auson. *ecl.* 3,23f. *Concludens numerum genialia festa December / promit, ut a bruma mox novus annus eat* and Cens. 21,13 *a novo sole, id est a bruma [...] incipere annus naturalis videtur*¹⁴.

¹² Ov. *am.* 1,1,17 *Cum bene surrexit versu nova pagina primo*; *am.* 3,1,66 *ergo ades et longis versibus adde breves!*; *trist.* 1,7,33f. *hos quoque sex versus, in prima fronte libelli / si praeponendos esse putabis, habe*; *trist.* 1,11,7 *quod facerem versus inter fera murmura ponti*; *trist.* 2,10 *acceptum refero versibus esse nocens, 246 quattuor hos versus e tribus unus habet, 307 Nec tamen est facinus versus evolvere mollis and 564 nec meus ullius crimina versus habet*; *trist.* 3,1,4 *nullus in hac charta versus amare docet*; *trist.* 3,4,67f. and 71f. *Ante volebatis, gratique erat instar honoris, / versibus in nostris nomina vestra legi [...] Nec meus indicio latitantes versus amicos / protrahit*; *trist.* 3,7,25 *aut ego praebebam factis modo versibus aures*; *trist.* 4,4,31 *deque meis illo referebat versibus ore*; *trist.* 4,10,26 *et quod temptabam dicere versus erat*; *trist.* 5,7,25f. *Carmina quod pleno saltari nostra teatro, / versibus et plaudi scribis, amice, meis*; *trist.* 5,12,49 *Nil mihi debebat cum versibus amplius esse and 63 Nec possum et cupio non nullos ducere versus*; *trist.* 5,13,31f. *...sitque / versibus hoc paucis admonuisse satis*; *Pont.* 1,1,8 *ite, patet castis versibus ille locus!*; *Pont.* 1,5,13 *Ut tamen ipse vides, luctor deducere versum*; *Pont.* 2,2,8 *urbe licet vestra versibus esse meis*; *Pont.* 2,5,19 *Tu tamen hic structos inter fera proelia versus*; *Pont.* 2,7,33f. *Quae tibi si memori coner perscribere versu, / Ilias est fati longa futura mei*; *Pont.* 4,8,13f. *Ei mihi, si lectis vultum tu versibus istis / ducis et adfinem te pudet esse meum!*; *Pont.* 4,12,7 *Nam pudet in geminos ita nomen scindere versus and 11 Et potes in versum Tuticani more venire*; *Ibis* 43 *Prima quidem coepto committam proelia versu and 61 Utque mei versus aliquantum noctis habebunt.*

¹³ Ov. *epist.* 15,182-184 *et sub ea versus unus et alter erunt: / «Grata lyram posui tibi, Phoebе, poetria Sappho; / convenit illa mihi, convenit illa tibi»*; *epist.* 20,240-242 *causaque versiculis scripta duobus erit: / «Effigie pomi testatur Acontius huius, / quae fuerint in eo scripta, fuisse rata»*; *trist.* 3,3,71-76 *quosque legat versus oculo properante viator, / grandibus in tituli marmore caede notis: / HIC EGO QVIIACEO TENERORVM LVSOR AMORVM / INGENIO PERII NASO POETA MEO / AT TIBI QVI TRANSIS NE SIT GRAVE QVISQVIS AMASTI / DICERE NASONIS MOLLITER OSSA CVBENT.*

¹⁴ See O.E. Hartmann, *Der römische Kalender*, hrsg. von L. Lange, Leipzig 1882, p. 94; J.R. Crawford, *De Bruma et brumalibus festis*, «ByZ» 23, 1914-1919 [1920], pp. 365-396; Publii Ovidii Nasonis *Fastorum libri sex. The Fasti of Ovid*, Ed. with a Transl. and Comm. by J.G. Frazer, II. *Commentary on Books I and II*, London 1929, p. 109, *comm. ad* 1,163; P. Grimal, *Le dieu Janus et les origines de Rome*, «Lettres d'Humanité» 4, 1945, pp. 15-121: 120; R. Pfeiffer,

From a literary perspective this implies that vv. 163-164 if, on the one hand, suggest a reworking of the scientific sources¹⁵, on the other, they constitute a peremptory divine *responsum* in *verses*, expressed by a pseudo-quotation or a pseudo-γνώμη. A rhetorical ploy which conveys greater *evidentia* to the *ethopoeia* of Janus, to whom the poet does not only bestow his own thought (i.e. the above-mentioned systematisation of the astronomical beliefs), but also his own versifying *ars*¹⁶, by means of a stylistic pattern eminently solemn and appropriate for the *fictio* of the divine character. The latter is particularly evidenced by the aulic and didactic tone of the couplet, further emphasised by the chiasitic *ordo verborum* of v. 163 (*Bruma...solis, novi...novissima, prima...veterisque*), by the paronomastic games and the homoeoteleuton figures of v. 164 (*principium capiunt, Phoebus et annus*). This is clearly the structure of a *sermocinatio/ethopoeia*¹⁷, which would not have caught my attention if I did not notice a parallel in Callim. *hymn.* 4,82-85 Pf.² Here, in fact, the poet addresses directly to the Muses the question regarding the relationship between nymphs and oaks:

...ἐμαὶ θεαὶ εἶπατε Μοῦσαι,
ἦ ῥ' ἐτεὸν ἐγένοντο τότε δρῦες ἠνίκα Νύμφαι; 83
'Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρῦαζ ὄμβρος ἀέξει,
Νύμφαι δ' αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυὶς μὴκέτι φύλλα.'

'...Tell me, Muses mine,
did oaks and Nymphs come into the world at once?
«The Nymphs rejoice when the rain nourishes the oaks,
the Nymphs weep when oaks lack leaf».

Untersuchungen zur Komposition und Erzählungstechnik von Ovids Fasten, diss., Tübingen 1952, pp. 7-12; Bömer, *Die Fasten*, qn., p. 25, *comm. ad* 1,163; L. van Johnson, *Natalis urbis and Principium anni*, «TAPhA» 91, 1960, pp. 109-120; Green, *Fasti* 1, qn., p. 90f., *comm. ad* 1,163f.; D. Porte, *L'étiologie religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*, Paris 1985, pp. 54f. and 344f. and P.-J. Dehon, *Hiems latina. Études sur l'hiver dans la poésie latine, des origines à l'époque de Néron*, Bruxelles 1993, p. 194f.

¹⁵ Concerning the complex issue of the scientific sources of the *Fasti*, see a E. Gee, *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus. Astronomy in Ovid's Fasti*, Cambridge 2000, p. 9ff.

¹⁶ Ovid praises his own *ars*, for instance, in *trist.* 4,10,26 *et quod temptabam dicere versus erat* (quoted above n. 12).

¹⁷ The terms were both used by the ancient writers of rhetoric treatises as either synonyms or technical different terms (see Lausberg, *Handbuch*, qn., p. 407f. and *Consulti Fortunatiani Ars rhetorica*, Intr., ed. crit., trad. it. e comm. a c. di L. Calboli Montefusco, Bologna 1979, p. 460ff.). This ambiguity mostly stems from the fact that they designate two complementary rhetorical figures which, together, build the *prosopopoeia*: the simulation of a dialogue with a fictitious character, who deputises for the poet in the production of his thought (*sermocinatio*) and the behavioural description of the interlocutor as the 'doubling' of the poet (*ethopoeia*).

To the poet's request, which interrupts the discourse flow (82f. ...ἔμαί θεαὶ εἶπατε Μοῦσαι, / ἦ ῥ' ἔτεδὸν ἐγένοντο τότε δρύες ἠνίκα Νύμφαι), follows – without adverbs nor introductive *verba dicendi* – the immediate response of the Muses¹⁸, expressed by a didactic tone, an archaistic style, and attentive internal anaphors and symmetries (84 Νύμφαι...85 Νύμφαι..., 84...χαίρουσιν ...85 κλαίουσιν, 84 ... ὅτε δρύας ...85 ὅτε δρυσί)¹⁹. The couplet has been interpreted as either *quotation* inferred from a hypothetical short poem Δρῦς of Philitas of Cos²⁰, or conceptual compendium of a Περὶ νυμφῶν of Callimachus²¹, or reorganization of mythical-popular informations²². Nonetheless, although these readings appear rather doubtful and contrasting, they do not question the peculiar structure of the couplet: it is a solemn and concise *responsum*, whose proverbial character is mainly signified by μηκέτι in v. 85, a word that usually occurs as negation in proverbial expressions²³.

Now, the rhetorical construction of Callim. *hymn.* 4,82-85 and Ov. *fast.* 1,162-164 shows remarkable analogies. Firstly, in both contexts, the *fictio* of deities is expressed by a twofold ethopeic realism, which aims at relating the poet's thought with that of the interlocutor and ascribing to the latter an aulic tone, as shown by the rhetorical-stylistic structure characterised by an amount of sound figures, lexical *lusus* and syntactic symmetries. Secondly, both in Callimachus and Ovid, the *concosa brevitatis* of Muses' and Janus's responses swings

¹⁸ Because of the lack of transition formulae between the question and the response, É. Cahen, *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique*, Paris 1929, p. 166 suspected that vv. 84-85 expressed the Muses' speeches, suggesting that they were rather the continuation of poet's observations (p. 395); instead, A. Körte-P.J. Händel, *Hellenistische Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1960², p. 36 proposed a 'popular' viewpoint. However, the expedient is certainly Homeric (see e.g. *Il.* 2,761 τίς τ' ἄρ τῶν ὄχ' ἄριστος ἔην σύ μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα) and the attribution of Callim. *hymn.* 4,84-85 to the Muses can be regarded as correct: in this respect, see F. Heichelheim, s.v. *Nymphai*, *RE* XVII.2, 1937, col. 1542, 7-11; R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, München 1967, p. 58 n. 82 and Callimachus. *Hymn to Delos*, Intr. and Comm. by W.H. Mineur, Leiden 1984, pp. 30f. and 117, *comm. ad v.* 82.

¹⁹ See *Erysichthon. A Callimachean Comedy*, by K.J. Mc Kay, Leiden 1962, p. 177 and Callimachus. *The Hymns*, Ed. with Intr., Transl., and Comm. by S.A. Stephens, Oxford 2015, p. 195, *comm. ad v.* 84 sq. As for the anaphor, see D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen von Gorgias*, Berlin 1969, p. 322.

²⁰ See G. Coppola, *Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco*, Bologna 1935, p. 139f.

²¹ See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, Berlin 1962², p. 67 n. 2; Mineur, *Hymn to Delos*, qn., p. 118, *comm. ad v.* 82.

²² See P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Göttingen 1988, pp. 40-44 and Callimachus. *Inni, epigrammi, Ecclae*, I, a c. di G.B. D'Alessio, Milano 2007, p. 142 n. 31.

²³ See Mineur, *Hymn to Delos*, qn., p. 119, *comm. ad v.* 85; Stephens, *Hymns*, qn., p. 195, *comm. ad v.* 84 sq. underlines also the 'magical-charming' aspect of the couplet, referring to Theocr. 8,33-40, as Marco Fantuzzi (*apud comm.*) also indicates.

between the brevity of erudite quotations, the wisdom tenor of the γνῶμαι, and the apodictic laconicism of the divine *responsa*: a desired *ambiguitas* that intersects different literary frameworks conforming to the typical alexandrine taste for the *Kreuzung der Gattungen*²⁴.

In conclusion, both Callim. *hymn.* 4,82-85 and Ov. *fast.* 1,162-164 do show a refined rhetorical-stylistic *contaminatio*: in the former, as innovative element, in the second, as development of the Hellenistic aetiological pattern, in line with the general Callimachism of the Augustan Age.

Orazio Portuese

Università di Catania

Via dei lillà 46

I-97018 Scicli (RG)

E-Mail: letteraturalatinaportuese@unict.it / orazio.portuese@unict.it

²⁴ For this rhetorical practice, see the basic study of W. Kroll, *Die Kreuzung der Gattungen*, in Id., *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1924, pp. 202-224, followed by the observations of A. Barchiesi, *The Crossing*, in S.J. Harrison (Ed. by), *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics. Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, Oxford 2001, pp. 142-163.