Classical Quarterly 59.1 196–211 (2009) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S00098388090000159

READ THE INSTRUCTIONS: DIDACTIC POETRY AND DIDACTIC PROSE*

If we survey classical literature as a whole, an obvious and fundamental question is how the two large categories of poetry and prose relate. The question has not, to understate, been accorded the centrality it merits. There are signs of a greater interest recently. The present piece considers what may seem a promising test case: didactic poetry after the second century B.C., and prose related to it. This poetry typically presents a direct transposition of prose; we can often compare either the original or the wider tradition on that subject. It will emerge, however, that even in this test case poetry and prose are less easily and sharply differentiated than has been thought. The piece does not seek to claim that there are no differences between poetry and prose. Nor is it forgotten that differentiation could be quantitative: that poetry and prose could have more or less of a given feature, rather than one possessing that feature, one lacking it. The aim is rather to show the difficulty of the question and the complexity of the relationship. It would be a very welcome outcome if this article prompted firmer attempts at differentiation, and still more welcome if it enhanced appreciation of what is here called didactic prose: prose with a subject matter comparable to that of didactic poems.[1]

Two common views on the transposition of prose into didactic poetry are: that the poets display their skill by transforming into elegant verse recalcitrant material from unassuming prose; and that the poets invest mundane subject matter from narrow prose treatises with metaphorical and wide-ranging significance. Both these views contain much truth on the poetry; but both underrate the prose, as if it were a colourless container for intrinsically base matter. Such a view of technical prose is rightly beginning to be challenged. As will be seen, works of didactic prose, like works of didactic poetry, show differing degrees of literary ambition; internally, works of didactic prose, like didactic poems, commonly contain more and less elevated passages. The traffic between poetry and prose is two-way: prose can draw on poetry as well as the reverse; poetry can seek to evoke or appropriate characteristics of prose.[2]

* Versions of this piece have been tried out in Cambridge, Manchester and Vercelli. I am grateful to my listeners, and especially to Professors L. Battezzato, P.R. Hardie, and D.R. Langslow. *CQ*'s referee has made many helpful suggestions on presentation.

[1] Interest in poetry and prose: e.g. D.R. Langslow, 'The language of poetry and the language of science: the Latin poets and "medical Latin"', in J.N. Adams and R.G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, PBA 93 (Oxford, 1999), 183–225; T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, J.N. Adams (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, PBA 129 (Oxford, 2005), including J.N. Adams, M. Lapidge, T. Reinhardt, 'Introduction', 1–36, at 2–4, and H.M. Hine, 'Poetic influence on prose: the case of the Younger Seneca', 211–37; earlier e.g. G.O. Hutchinson, *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: A Critical Study* (Oxford, 1993). For the relation of didactic poetry and prose see R.K. Gibson, 'Didactic poetry as "popular" form: a study of imperatival expressions in Latin didactic verse and prose', in C. Atherton (ed.), *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry* (Bari, 1998), 67–98; M. Horster and C. Reitz (edd.), *Antike Fachschriftsteller: Literarischer Diskurs und sozialer Kontext*, Palingenesia 80 (Stuttgart, 2003); M. Horster and C. Reitz (edd.), *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt*, Palingenesia 85 (Stuttgart, 2005).

[2] On the last point cf. n. 7 below. For general discussion of didactic poetry see W. Kroll,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A straightforward difference in pragmatics is frequently assumed (prose is for use, poetry not); but evidence on ancient readers should raise some doubts on its firmness: readers are as significant as authors' expertise and conjectured intentions. Various prose statements on didactic poetry have been taken as straightforward truths about authors, without thought for the intellectual context which they presuppose, and what this implies about readers. Even when Hipparchus presents Aratus as humbly following Eudoxus, it is apparent that many readers are using Aratus as a source of facts; Hipparchus' own work is a commentary on Aratus, not Eudoxus. His point that Aratus' poetic charm makes his assertions seem *more* worthy of credit (*ἡ γὰρ τῶν ποιημάτων χάρις ἀξιοπιστίαν τινὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις περιτίθησι*, 1.1.7) takes us back to the Pindaric idea of poetry conferring authority – often erroneously (*Ol.* 1.28-32).[3]

Even when Seneca tells us that Virgil wanted not to teach farmers but to delight readers (*nec agricolas docere uoluit | sed legentes delectare*, *Ep.* 86.15), his argument (16) clearly presupposes that many disagree on the negative part of the phrase, and take Virgil as a worthwhile source. Columella sees Virgil as teacher and authority, while eagerly admiring his poetic ornamentation (*Arb.* 26.1.1 *placet igitur sicut Vergilio nobis*).[4]

'Lehrgedicht', *RE* 12.1842–57; E. Pöhlmann, 'Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts', *ANRW* 1.3 (1973), 813–901; B. Effe, *Dichtung und Lehre. Untersuchungen zur Typologie des antiken Lehrgedichts* (Munich, 1977); A. Schiesaro, P. Mitsis, J. Strauss Clay (edd.), Mega nepios. *Il destinatario nell'epos didascalico* (Pisa, 1993) = *MD* 31 (1993); A. Dalzell, *The Criticism of Didactic Poetry: Essays on Lucretius, Virgil, and Ovid* (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1996); P. Toohey, *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry* (London, 1996); Atherton (n. 1); D.P. Fowler, 'The didactic plot', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (edd.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), 205–19; K. Volk, *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius* (Oxford, 2002), and '*Aetna* oder Wie man ein Lehrgedicht schreibt', in N. Holzberg (ed.), *Die* Appendix Vergiliana. *Pseudepigraphen im literarischen Kontext*, Classica Monacensia 30 (Munich, 2005), 68–90; M. Gale (ed.), *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality* (Swansea, 2004); P. Kruschwitz and M. Schumacher, *Das vorklassische Lehrgedicht der Römer* (Heidelberg, 2005); the implications of P.R. Hardie, 'Political education in Virgil's *Georgics*', *SIFC* 4th ser. 2 (2004), 83–111, could be extended. On didactic prose see M. Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike* (Göttingen, 1960); B. Meißner, *Die technologische Fachliteratur der Antike. Struktur, Überlieferung und Wirkung technischen Wissens in der Antike (ca. 400 v. Chr.—ca. 500 n. Chr.)* (Berlin, 1999); C. Nicolet (ed.), *Les Littératures techniques dans l'antiquité romaine. Statut, public et destination, tradition*, Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 42 (Geneva, 1996); W. Kullmann, J. Althoff, M. Asper (edd.), *Gattungen wissenschaftlicher Literatur in der Antike* (Tübingen, 1998); D.R. Langslow, *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2000); S. Goldhill, *The Invention of Prose*, Greece and Rome New Surveys 32 (Oxford, 2002), ch. 4; T. Fögen (ed.), *Antike Fachtexte* (Berlin, 2005); R.G. Mayer, 'The impractibility of Latin "Kunstprosa"', in Reinhardt, Lapidge, Adams (n. 1), 195–210; D. Paniagua Aguilar, *El panorama técnico-científico en Roma (siglos I–II d.C.). "Et docere et delectare"* (Salamanca, 2006).

[3] Philodemus, *De poematis* 5 is interesting for ancient debate on what differentiates poetry and prose (cf. C. Mangoni, 'Prosa e poesia nel V libro della *Poetica* di Filodemo', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 [1988], 127–38); important too is Strabo 1, esp. 1.2.3–6 (C 15–18). But the general ancient discussion cannot be investigated here; still less the modern, though the issues are visible from at least *La vita nuova* onwards.

[4] Cf. *RR* 2.9.12, 10.11, 21.2, 3.10.20, 12.5, 15.4, 9.9.4, 9.2.1, where Celsus stands between Virgil and Hyginus in his literary characteristics. For the seriousness with which later writers take the *Georgics* as a technical work, see E. Christmann, 'Zur antiken Georgica-Rezeption', *WJA* 8 (1982), 57–67; A. Doody, 'Virgil the farmer? Critiques of the *Georgics* in Columella and Pliny', *CP* 102 (2007), 180–97. On the passage of Seneca, see also M.S. Spurr, 'Agriculture and the *Georgics*', *G&R* 33 (1986), 164–87, at 164–6. On poetry and prose in Columella's own work, including his prose reworking of his poetic book, cf. 10 *pr.* 3, 11.1–2; see J. Henderson,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Even when Cicero dwells on Aratus' and Nicander's ignorance (*De Orat*. 1.69–70), his comparison with the orator indicates that they are agreed to present their subject matter effectively; this is confirmed by Balbus' use of Cicero's version of Aratus in *ND* 2.104–14. The alleged proximity of poet and orator (*est enim finitimus oratori poeta* |, *De Orat*. 1.70) is noteworthy for the larger question of poetry and prose.[5]

Vitruvius places Lucretius, Cicero and Varro on a level as exponents of their subjects: *plures post nostram memoriam nascentes cum Lucretio uidebuntur uelut coram de rerum natura disputare, de arte uero rhetorica cum Cicerone; multi posterorum cum Varrone conferent sermonem de lingua Latina* (9 *pr.* 17). Even the *Ars Amatoria*, however entertaining, is not self-evidently without use: books have, after all, been written on personal relationships. Ovid in exile does not point Augustus to generic rules excluding didactic poetry from practical application. In general, modern critics of poetry have not been inclined to question the standard assumptions: they have found aloofness from practicality and from a distasteful type of prose too plausible an attribute of Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic poetry. But the segregation of poetry and prose is not so simple.[6]

The present piece does not scrutinize the basic atoms of poetic and prose language; nor does it embrace the cosmos of whole works, and survey how the structures of didactic poetry and prose relate and interact. It merely considers a series of passages in various areas, with an emphasis on some aspects and features of style. None the less, these stylistic aspects will be seen to connect with wider questions of the writers' intellectual concerns, and the division of the world which is so important in didactic poetry and prose. The passages will also expose to view an involved intertextuality in both poetry and prose. This lowly approach may help to confront us with the entanglements that specific phenomena provide, and so complicate and challenge our own divisions of ancient writing.[7]

A considerable range of poetry will be discussed, in date and type, and a still more considerable range of prose. As will be seen, many factors affect the works besides their didactic 'genre', especially in prose, where any such genre will be less cohesive than in didactic poetry. The factors include stylistic fashion, intellectual allegiance and language (Greek or Latin). But all this only strengthens the argument. Neither the poetry nor the prose can be viewed as forming a body of material which is simply defined and contained by its genre; their interaction is the more complex.

'Columella's living hedge: the Roman gardening book', *JRS* 92 (2002), 110–33 (and *The Roman Book of Gardening* [London, 2004]); S. Diederich, *Römische Agrarhandbücher zwischen Fachwissenschaft, Literatur und Ideologie*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 88 (Berlin and New York, 2007), 221–58. For the vertical lines in some prose quotations see section I below.

[5] Cicero is presumably drawing on a tradition for his assertions about Aratus' and Nicander's expertise (cf. Arat. *Vit*. I pp. 8.25–9.1 Martin, II pp. 11.14–12.3, but not on the *Georgica*). With *praeclare* at *De Orat*. 1.69 cf. Col. *RR* 2.9.12.

[6] For the pragmatics of the *Ars Amatoria* cf., among other works, A. Sharrock, 'Ovid and the politics of reading', in P.E. Knox (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ovid* (Oxford, 2006), 238–61, and R.K. Gibson, S.J. Green, A. Sharrock, *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria *and* Remedia Amoris (Oxford, 2006).

[7] The structure of Latin didactic poems in relation to prose, and its intellectual implications, are considered in G.O. Hutchinson, *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry* (Oxford, 2008), ch. 10; that piece and this have to be read together to see the full scope of the argument.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I. ASTROLOGY

Astrology presents a rewarding area (for our purposes). Both prose and verse show a large span of stylistic pretensions. The many horoscopes on papyrus are so plain as to raise the question of what we allow to reach the level of prose: cf. e.g. P. Mich. 152 (second century A.D.; no. 184 Neugebauer and van Hoesen[8]) *(ἔτους) κδ΄, ἐπαγο(μένης) ε΄ τῆς | εἰς τὴν α΄ νέου ἔτους· | ὥρα η΄ νυκτός. | Ἡλι⟨ο⟩ς Παρθ[έν]ωι· | Κρόνος Παρθένωι· | Ἑρμῆς Παρθένωι· | Ζε[ὺς] Κρειῶι· | Ἀφρ[οδ]είτ(η) Ζυγῶι· | Σελήνη Σκορπίωι* ('In year 24, on the fifth intercalary day added to the first of the new year; the eighth hour of the night. The Sun in Virgo; Saturn in Virgo; Mercury in Virgo; Jupiter in Aries; Venus in Libra; the Moon in Scorpio'). But the list form, marked here in the arrangement of the papyrus lines, will prove as we proceed to have elaborate affinities with both prose and verse; it is a basic form of instruction and of classical poetry alike.

Vettius Valens, whose nine-book *Anthologies* were written in Greek in the second half of the second century A.D., presents horoscopes with little narrative explications which are to arrest the reader. Despite the many types of writing in his work, he claims in a peroration that he has not written poetically (*ποιητικῶς*, 6.9.7 Pingree) – unlike some. These 'poetic' writers are divided into actual poets and those who produce an attractive performance by the arrangement of words (*ἐπακτικὴν ἀκρόασιν πράσσουσι τῆι τῶν λόγων συνθήκηι*).[9] Valens just labours hard and is truthful. The ornamental words of others (*λόγοις κεκαλλωπισμένοις*, 5.8.110) adulterate knowledge and lead people astray. For all Valens' posing, writers are here perceived to vary in style; style and even poetry do not necessarily diminish credit with readers.[10]

The most ambitious and elaborate writers are Firmicus Maternus in prose and Manilius in poetry. Firmicus' eight-book *Mathesis* appeared in or before A.D. 337; Manilius' five books were probably published sequentially (cf. 1.114–17), the first after A.D. 9, the fourth probably in the reign of Tiberius (cf. 4.763–6). Firmicus might seem more committed to his career as a writer than to the inculcation of his beliefs: so one could infer when the pagan *Mathesis*, written before Constantine's death in May

[8] O. Neugebauer and H.B. van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia, 1959).

[9] Kroll's punctuation is better than Pingree's: *ἤ … ἤ καί* shows that *τῆι τῶν λόγων συνθήκηι* goes with this clause.

[10] Intriguing for the different types of astrological writing is the elaborate prefatory letter in the horoscope P. Lond. 130.1–34 (first century A.D.; Neugebauer and van Hoesen no. 81), reminiscent of a literary preface. Further cf. A. Bouché-Leclerq, *L'Astrologie grecque* (repr. Brussels, 1993); W. Gundel and H.G. Gundel, *Astrologumena. Die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte* (Wiesbaden, 1966); T. Barton, *Ancient Astrology* (London, 1994), esp. 57–62; B. Bakhouche, *L'Astrologie à Rome* (Leuven, 2002). Aratus and his progeny: e.g. D.B. Gain, *The Aratus Ascribed to Germanicus Caesar: Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (London, 1976); G.O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988), 214–36; P. Bing, 'Aratus and his audiences', in Schiesaro, Mitsis, Clay (n. 2), 99–109; R.L. Hunter, 'Written in the stars: poetry and philosophy in the *Phainomena* of Aratus', *Arachnion* 1.2 (1995) (http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num2/hunter.html) ; D.A. Kidd, *Aratus,* Phaenomena*: Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1997); E. Gee, *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's* Fasti (Cambridge, 2000); C. Fakas, *Der hellenistische Hesiod. Arats* Phainomena *und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik*, Serta Graeca 11 (Wiesbaden, 2001); M. Fantuzzi and R.L. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2004), 224–45; W. Hübner, 'Die Rezeption der *Phainomena* Arats in der lateinischen Literatur', in Horster and Reitz (2005) (n. 1), 133–54; M. Semanoff, 'Undermining authority: pedagogy in Aratus' *Phaenomena*', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker (edd.), *Beyond the Canon*, Hellenistica Groningana 11 (Leuven, 2006), 303–17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

337, is followed in the 340s by the ferociously anti-pagan *De Errore Profanarum Religionum*, written under the more militantly Christian Constans and Constantius II. Firmicus well illustrates how didactic prose can use didactic poetry as a source. One of the texts he follows closely is Manilius' fifth book. That brilliant satirical parade is a neglected highlight of poetry in the early first century A.D.; we cannot know whether literary appeal helped to motivate Firmicus' selection.[11]

Firmicus' adaptations are usually shorter than the passages of Manilius on which they are based. But his writing has a more leisurely and expansive appearance than Manilius'. One brief example is provided by the indefatigable socialite in Manilius 5.64–6: *instar erit populi totaque habitabit in urbe, | limina peruolitans unumque per omnia uerbum | mane salutandi portans, communis amicus* ('he will equal a people, and will live in the whole city [by calling on everyone], speeding over thresholds, and bearing over them all a single word of morning greeting, a universal friend'). Here the paradoxes are tightly packed. Less so in Firmicus, who with some 'mistranslation' offers *uariabunt semper domicilia; domus sedesque mutabunt, | et per omnium limina | matutinis semper salutationibus | peruolabunt |* (8.6.2) ('they will always be changing their dwelling; they will alter house and abode, and always fly over the thresholds of all with morning greetings'). A point is made, and then elaborated with synonyms (*domus sedesque mutabunt*). *omn-* no longer relates in a tight unit to *unum*: it is reinforced by *semper*, which itself takes up the preceding *semper*. The verb, an independent rhythmical unit, forms a forceful climax, and surpasses the previous two verbs, strategically placed. The whole effect is less compact and more spacious. (The vertical lines mark rhythmic closes. The difference between prose and the fixed rhythm of poetry is less firm and more varied than might appear.)[12]

But we can see Firmicus' approach more fully by looking at one of his relatively extensive sections. In Manilius the Pleiades rising with the sixth degree of Taurus produce pleasure-going effeminates (cf. 4.518–22):

> … illis cura sui cultus frontisque decorae
> semper erit: tortos in fluctum ponere crines
> aut uinclis reuocare comas et uertice denso

[11] The most recent edition of Firmicus is P. Monat, *Firmicus Maternus.* Mathesis (3 vols., Paris, 1992–7) (footnotes will give editions and commentaries where works may be less familiar, or editions recent). See R. Turcan, *Firmicus Maternus.* L'Erreur des religions païennes. *Texte établi, traduit et commenté* (Paris, 1982), 7–18 for Firmicus' life, 15–19 for the paganism of the *Mathesis* (more – perhaps too – generous is M. Edwards, 'The beginnings of Christianization', in N. Lenski [ed.], *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine* [Cambridge, 2006], 137–58, at 141–2); contrast e.g. *Err.* 16.4 *amputanda sunt haec, | sacratissimi imperatores, | penitus, atque delenda, | et seuerissimis edictorum uestrorum legibus | corrigenda |*, 20.7 *profanarum rerum strage gaudentes | exultate fortius |*. Discussion of Firmicus' use of Manilius, and discussion of Manilius, esp. 5: e.g. W. Hübner, 'Manilius als Astrologe und Dichter', *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 126–320; F. Fontanella, 'A proposito di Manilio e Firmico', *Prometheus* 17 (1991), 75–92; D. Liuzzi (ed.), *Manilio fra poesia e scienza. Atti del convegno: Lecce, 14–16 maggio 1992* (Galatina, 1993); J.-H. Abry, 'Manilius et Julius Firmicus Maternus, deux astrologues sous l'Empire', in N. Blanc and A. Buisson (edd.), *Imago antiquitatis. Religions et iconographie du monde romain. Mélanges offerts à Robert Turcan* (Paris, 1999), 35–45; C. Salemme, *Introduzione agli* 'Astronomica' *di Manilio*[2] (Naples, 2000); A. Perutelli, 'Il disagio del poeta didascalico: sui proemi II e III di Manilio', *MD* 47 (2001), 67–84; Volk (n. 2), ch. 6. Less elaborate are the adaptations, say, of Oppian (whose *Halieutica* probably appeared A.D. 177–8) by Aelian (*c.* 170–235): cf. e.g. Ael. *NA* 1.32 with Opp. *Hal.* 2.253–320, Ael. *NA* 9.66 with Opp. *Hal.* 1.554–83.

[12] Cicero, admittedly making an argument, calls the poet *numeris astrictior paulo |* than the orator (*De Orat.* 1.70). On Latin prose rhythm, see e.g. G.O. Hutchinson, 'Rhythm, style, and meaning in Cicero's prose', *CQ* 45 (1995), 485–99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fingere et appositis caput emutare capillis
pumicibusque cauis horrentia membra polire 150
atque odisse uirum teretisque optare lacertos.
femineae uestes, nec in usum tegmina plantis
sed speciem, fictique placent ad mollia gressus …
semper amare parum est: cupient et amare uideri. 156 (5.146–53, 156)

They will always be concerned with their own appearance and the beauty of their brow: with arranging their hair so that it is twisted into a wave, or summoning back their locks with bands or shaping them in a thick mass, or altering their head by adding hair; with polishing their shaggy limbs using hollow pumice-stones, with hating their manhood, or wishing for smooth shoulders. Their clothes are women's; the covering of their feet is for show not use; they like a gait shaped for softness … It is not enough to be always in love; they will want to be seen in love.

In Firmicus:

… erunt semper nitidi, polita fronte et accuratis uestibus prompti, | quorum inflexi crines torquantur semper in bostrychos, | ut frequenter appositis alienis crinibus | fictam et compositam pulchritudinem | mentiantur, | totius corporis formam | uario pigmentorum genere mollientes. | hi demptis pilis corpus suum in feminei corporis | imaginem transferent, | quorum uestes et[13] ad muliebris cultus similitudinem | excolantur. | hi molliter ambulantes | uestigia sua cum delicata quadam moderatione suspendunt.[14] | … amabunt semper aut se amare simulabunt, | et paenitebit eos quod uiri nati sint. (*Math*. 8.7.2, 3)

They will always be gleaming, equipped with polished brow and meticulous attire. Their curled hair will always be twisted into curls, so that often by adding the hair of others they will lay false claim to a feigned and factitious beauty, softening the shape of their whole body with various types of ingredient. By removing their body-hair they will shift their bodies into the likeness of a woman's body; their clothes too will be adorned so as to be like a woman's get-up. Walking effeminately, they will take slow steps with a sort of mincing restraint. … They will always be in love or pretend to be so, and they will be sorry that they were born as men.

The closeness of Firmicus' adaptation is clear (contrast *Liber Hermetis* p. 53.8–10 Gundel);[15] but the stylistic differences are apparent, and might at first suggest generalizable differences between poetry and prose. The short parallel clauses of Manilius are turned into more elaborate periods. In Manilius the phrasing is pithy; individual words are charged with point and arrestingly combined. Firmicus typically expands, while building up a sustained rhetorical emphasis on falsehood which goes beyond Manilius: so for Man. 5.149 *caput emutare* he has, with a typical emphatic doublet, *ut … fictam et compositam pulchritudinem | mentiantur* |. Man. 5.147 *tortos in fluctum ponere crines* expands to *quorum inflexi crines torquantur semper in bostrychos* | (an unusual and satirical loan-word to close). Man. 5.151 *odisse uirum* becomes, again with stress on falsity, *corpus suum in feminei corporis | imaginem transferent* |; 152 *femineae uestes* becomes *quorum uestes et ad muliebris cultus similitudinem | excolantur* |. The dense *fictique placent ad mollia gressus* (153) becomes the vividly mocking *molliter ambulantes | uestigia sua cum delicata quadam moderatione suspendunt* |. The ablative adjective + noun is characteristic, the *quadam* Ciceronian;

[13] *et* is problematic; cf. Kroll, Skutsch, and Ziegler's apparatus. Possibly *uestes etiam*: *etiam* is very frequently postpositive in the work, cf. e.g. 1.9.2, 1.10.11; for its function cf. e.g. 1.7.16 *ista itaque confidentia mentis erectus | etiam corporis sui | curam tuitionemque suscepit* |.

[14] Perhaps *suspendent*?

[15] W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistos. Funde und Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der antiken Astronomie und Astrologie*, ABAW Phil.-hist. Abt. n.F. 12 (Munich, 1936).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the combination of *delicata* with the ostensibly laudatory *moderatione* swells out the Manilius with lively irony.[16]

Yet at the close of his description, Firmicus takes up Manilius' *odisse uirum* for an effectively curt reinforcement of his theme: the words *quod uiri nati sint* are short, the content is damning. Manilius himself closes with a neat *sententia*, where the first half elegantly prepares for the second. Such a *sententia* belongs to his period, in verse and prose alike.

And there lies the complication. Firmicus' style bases itself particularly on Cicero, as one might expect at this period. This is illustrated by the abundance of synonyms, and the reduction in epigrams. With the *cum delicata quadam moderatione* one may compare e.g. Cic. *Inv.* 2.164 *cum animi ampla quadam et splendida propositione* | or *Dom*. 115 *cum proiecta quadam et effrenata cupiditate* |; even the final phrase brings to mind *Cael*. 6 *id numquam tam acerbe feret M. Caelius* | *ut eum paeniteat non deformem esse natum* |. If we compared Manilius with prose writers from his own time or just after, the contrast between poetry and prose would be considerably lessened. One may instance, on related subjects, the concise, dense or epigrammatic phrases at Sen. Rh. *Con*. 1 *pr.*8 (e.g. *capillum frangere*), 2.1.6 (Arellius Fuscus; e.g. *conuulneratum libidinibus,* | *incedentem, ut feminis placeat,* | *femina mollius* |), 5.6 (e.g. *muliebrem uestem sumpsit*), Sen. *Ep.* 95.20–1 (e.g. *et oleo et mero uiros prouocant* |), 114.3–4 (e.g. *quam cupierit uideri* |). But the validity and effectiveness of Firmicus' transformation should be apparent.

It has been said above that Manilius' poetry is particularly ambitious; the range of astrological poetry should be briefly exemplified. Manilius' account of the tightrope-walker spectacularly defamiliarizes. The lines *et caeli meditatus iter uestigia perdet* | *paene sua et pendens populum suspendet ab ipso* (5.654–5) play on cosmic divisions and, through word-play, on the inversion of space (*pendens … suspendet*). The specifically poetic enjambement *perdet* | *paene* wittily focalizes the scene through the audience's terror. The fourth book of 'Manetho', probably a distinct poem, is not later than the third century A.D. (P. Oxy. 2546, P. Amsterdam inv. no. 56). It depicts the activity more straightforwardly: *ὑψόθεν εἰς γῆν* | *γειτονίηι θανάτοιο καταρριπτοῦντας ἑαυτούς,* | *ὧν ὁ πόρος μόρος ἐστίν, ἐπὴν εἰς σφάλματα νεύσηι* (287–9). The use of line-end and enjambement is still forceful (287), and the phrase *ὧν ὁ πόρος μόρος ἐστίν* is of Gorgianic flamboyance. In the preceding paragraph types of people are denoted with a huge string of adjectives, nouns and short nominal phrases. This is characteristic of the fourth book especially, and reminiscent of astrological prose treatises; it is quite unlike Manilius. But the words and phrases show an inventiveness unlike prose. So 281–2: *ὀθνιοτύμβους,* | *ὄρνεα γῆς, πόλιος πάσης ἀπόλιστα γένεθλα*; here *ὀθνιοτύμβους* 'with tombs in foreign lands' is a typical new compound, *ἀπόλιστα* a unique word, *ὄρνεα γῆς* a cosmic paradox. And even Manilius had a string of infinitive phrases: listing or accumulative structures, as we have mentioned, possess complex connotations.[17]

[16] Firmicus may presuppose the plain hairstyle for men in which his period was imitating Manilius': cf. A.T. Croom, *Roman Clothing and Fashion* (Stroud, 2000), 66.

[17] 'Manetho' 4.287–9 are cited by A.E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon liber quintus*[2] (Cambridge, 1937), 82. On the style of the fourth book, cf. C.A.M. Axtius and Fr. A. Rigler, *Μανέθωνος Ἀποτελεσματικῶν βιβλία ἕξ* (Cologne, 1832), xxiii. With *populum suspendet* cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.107 *populos suspendere*. Firmicus has an asyndetic tricolon in the passage parallel to Manilius' paragraph, 8.17.4, cf. the tetracolon at 8.15.2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Firmicus also adapts the poetry of Anubion, which has lately been resurrected on papyrus; this elegiac poem, probably in at least four books, was perhaps written in the first century A.D., and certainly by the second century. Subject headings in F 5 (horoscopes of types) and F 15 Obbink suggest in parts of the poem internal division at short intervals by readers or author; the asyndeton in F 2 and F 5 suggests internal division by the author: a less ambitious poem, then, than Manilius'. Anubion's elegiacs are simpler than Manilius' or even 'Manetho's' hexameters. Anubion's mention of the orator at F 5 b 9(–10?) Obbink μ]ῠ́θων τε ῥητῆρα ταχὺν πρη[| [γ]ε̣ννᾶῐο̣ν τρηχὺν δεινὸ̣ν α̣χ̣[(end of book) is greatly expanded by Firmicus, who eloquently depicts the orator's eloquent power: *talis erit orator* | *ut in modum fulminum* | *dictorum eius sententiae* | *proferantur,* | *ut pro arbitrio eius* | *multitudinis animi aut quiescentes excitentur* | *aut incensi facile mitigentur* | (6.30.22). He goes on, with anaphora, to the orator's impact on posterity, and to the verbal might of Demosthenes. The force of language is not only conveyed but exhibited: the reader is to admire not only Demosthenes but Firmicus. Even in this didactic 'genre', the prose – self-consciously rhetorical prose and not verse – conspicuously rises above its poetic source. We have seen, then, the stylistic range of astrological poetry and prose; the use that prose can make of poetry as well as poetry of prose; and the difficulties of generalizing about the relation between poetic and prose style, or of making the opposition between the two forms of didactic writing too rigidly hierarchical.[18]

II. HORSES

Another subject, horses, takes further the complicated relationship of poetry and prose; the treatment of animals brings in elaborate literary and intellectual issues. We will look at three Latin passages, after some points on the prose tradition which lies behind them. Didactic prose on horses begins with Simon in the fifth century. The first-person intellectualism of his very opening is highly characteristic of fifth-century prose: *Δοκεῖ μοι περὶ ἰδέας ἱππικῆς δεῖν πρῶτον, <εἴ τις> ἐπιθυμεῖ εἰδέναι καλῶς τοῦτο τὸ μάθημα, τὴν πατρίδα γιγνώσκειν* ... But when he tells us the *τεκμήριον* (5) of a good hoof, he says that the hollow hoof *κυμβαλίζει* ('sounds the cymbal') more. This use of language, though unpoetic, is no less vivid and imaginative than poetry. *solido grauiter sonat ungula cornu* is Virgil's version (*G.* 3.88); Xenophon, referring explicitly to Simon, reduces his linguistic boldness to *ὥσπερ γὰρ κύμβαλον ψοφεῖ πρὸς τὸ δάπεδον* (*Eq.* 1.3). Xenophon talks directly at the start of his treatise about its relation to Simon's: intertextuality is no less important in didactic prose than in poetry, even if differently expressed. Xenophon also introduces us immediately to epistemological questions and to the evidence of a horse's mind (*ψυχῆς*, 1.1); his treatise is not only practical but searchingly thoughtful. The division of mind and body stressed here will be important for the poetry and prose that follow.[19]

[18] F 5 b 10 sounds like an orator, cf. what precedes and the title; 8 might recommend *πρη[κτῆρά τε ἔργων*, considered by Obbink; *ταχύν* would then be the only basis for Firmicus' thunderbolt. For Anubion see D. Obbink, '4503–7. Anoubion, elegiacs', in N. Gonis (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 66 (London, 1999), 57–109; D. Obbink, *Anubio: carmen astrologicum elegiacum* (Munich and Leipzig, 2006). It is notable that while Firmicus, who came from Sicily, uses the Greek Anubion, his readers need an allusion to Philip's oratorical opponent to be spelled out (*Math.* 6.30.22 *ut manifestius explicemus,* | … *Demostheni* |).

[19] On philosophical issues involving animals in the ancient world see recently C. Osborne, *Dumb Beasts and Dead Philosophers: Humanity and the Humane in Ancient Philosophy and Literature* (Oxford, 2007). Text of Simon: e.g. K. Widdra, *Ξενοφῶντος περὶ ἱππικῆς* (Leipzig, 1964),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The sequence Varro, Virgil, Columella on the appearance of the good horse shows textual relationships clearly. It will be of special interest to see how the poet affects the subsequent prose-writer. Varro, whose work appeared from 37 B.C. on, begins his account of horses with his common metapoetic – or metaprosaic – appropriation of the subject matter, which Virgil will use extensively: *Lucienus, 'ego quoque adueniens aperiam carceres', inquit, 'et equos emittere incipiam'* (*RR* 2.7.1). Lucienus gives a long string of the physical features in the foal which suggest a good horse to come: *oculis nigris, naribus non angustis* (5), etc. There is no particular rhetorical force in the list. Lucienus comes a little later to indications of mind (not explicitly named): *equi boni futuri signa, si cum gregalibus in pabulo contendit, in currendo aliaue qua re, quo potior sit; si, cum flumen trauehundum est gregi, in primis progreditur ac non respectat alios* (6). The final phrase, with *alios* at the end, lightly suggests an admirable attitude.[20]

Virgil's account is affected by the sublime connotations of the horse in poetry; the *Aeneid* shows a clear perception of the prominence and magnificence of horses in the *Iliad*. Not that the aesthetic impact of the war-horse is a phenomenon confined to poetry: Xenophon explains how to make it μεγαλοπρεπῆ καὶ γοργὸν καὶ περίβλεπτον (*Eq*. 10.1–5). And while Virgil's didactic epic interacts here with narrative epic, he also relishes words that would not be expected in poetry: *spadices* (81, 'chestnut' horses) and *giluo* (82, 'dun'). Virgil's depiction interweaves features of the body with pieces of behaviour, and infuses physical description with mental and moral qualities; the poetic language realizes inexplicitly what is more explicit in Xenophon. So for Varro's *pectus latum et plenum* (5) Virgil has *luxuriatque toris animosum pectus* (*G.* 3.81). His version of the animal's behaviour is further made heroic, like a soldier's (or a poet's, cf. 3.6–12): *primus et ire uiam et fluuios temptare minacis | audet et ignoto sese committere ponti, | nec uanos horret strepitus* (77–9). He later extends this into a martial scene of known sublimity (so Aesch. *Theb*. 391–4 [simile for a hero]; cf. in prose Xen. *Eq. Mag*. 3.11–13): *tum, si qua sonum procul arma dedere, | stare loco nescit, micat auribus et tremit artus, | collectumque premens uoluit sub naribus ignem* (83–5). The young horse is already like a war-horse eager for the fray. Virgil ends the paragraph with mythical horses, some explicitly assigned to *Grai … poetae* (90); animal and human have hitherto been discreetly assimilated, but the metamorphosed Saturn (92–3) mixes animal and divine stridently. Employment of myth seems emphatically characteristic of poetry; but this distinction is weakened by Xen. *Cyn*. 1.1–17 (!) or Var. *RR* 2.5.5 (including Jupiter's metamorphosis into a bull).[21]

41–4. The text of the opening (if it is the opening) is uncertain (δεῖν πρῶτον εἰδ. L: ἐπιθυμεῖ πρῶτον εἰδ. C (the only MSS): πρῶτον <εἴ τις> ἐπιθυμεῖ Blass). A possible version is offered above; neither Widdra's nor G. Pierleoni's (G. Pierleoni, *Xenophontis opuscula* [Rome, 1933], 299) seems possible. On Simon and Xenophon: J. Althoff, 'Form und Funktion der beiden hippologischen Schriften Xenophons *Hipparchicus* und *De re equestri* (mit einem Blick auf Simon von Athen)', in Fögen (n. 2), 235–52; on horsemanship: J.K. Anderson, *Ancient Greek Horsemanship* (Berkeley, 1961).

[20] For the latest edition of Varro, with abundant notes, see J. Heurgon and C. Guiraud, *Varron,* Économie rurale. *Texte établi, traduit et commenté*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1978–97). For a substantial treatment of Varro's work, see Diederich (n. 4), 22–53, 172–209, 297–368, 410–19; cf. also J.E. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar: Studies in the First Book of Varro's* De Re Rustica (Copenhagen, 1968).

[21] On mythology in the *Georgics* see W. Frentz, *Mythologisches in Vergils Georgica*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 21 (Meisenheim am Glan, 1967); M. Gale, *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The* Georgics*, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition* (Cambridge, 2000), ch. 4. On the anthropomorphizing language used of animals in the *Georgics*, see M. Gale, 'Man and beast in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some of Columella's work was published before A.D. 65; his account of the horse essentially reworks Varro's. Xenophon's approach may well have affected him; the influence of Virgil's depiction is clear. So Columella's version of the desirable chest is *lato et musculorum toris | numeroso pectore |* (*RR* 6.29.2). He is more interested than Varro in mental qualities, and separates them explicitly from the body as Xenophon does (cf. 6.29.5, and, on other animals, 6.1.1, 2.2, 37.4). Unlike Varro, he starts with the mental, separating it overtly from the physical (*corporis uero forma*, 6.29.2).

cum uero natus est pullus, | confestim licet indolem aestimare; | si hilaris, si intrepidus, si neque conspectu nouae rei neque auditu | terretur, si ante gregem procurrit, si lasciuia et alacritate, | interdum et cursu certaminis[22] | aequalis exsuperat, si fossam sine cunctatione transilit, | pontem flumenque transcendit, | haec erunt honesti animi documenta. (6.29.1)

When the foal is born, one can swiftly judge its character. If it is cheerful, if it is fearless, if it is not alarmed by seeing or hearing something new, if it runs ahead of the herd, if it excels the other foals in playfulness and keenness, and in occasional running contests, if it leaps over ditches without hesitation and crosses bridges and rivers: these will be proofs of an admirable spirit.

The bridge and the noises come from Virgil; but more importantly the noble valour of the animal is now conveyed. The sequence of conditional clauses is not just a list but a rhetorical accumulation, which culminates in the moral main clause; this is apparent from the first three conditionals. The physical description follows Varro's string of ablatives, but near the end suddenly produces a climax which confers elevation on the horse and the account: *sitque sic uniuersum corpus conpositum ut sit grande, sublime, erectum* (6.29.3). The adjectives have a metaliterary resonance: the writing is conscious of its own ambition. Columella returns to the mental with *mores autem laudantur qui …* (6.29.4).[23]

In this case the poetic passage separates itself stylistically from the two prose passages; but the two prose passages differ from each other. The difference is caused by the impact of Latin poetry as well as of Greek prose. Poetry's range of language enables boundaries to be tacitly transgressed; but the later prose passage takes up the suggestions of the poetic language within a more directly philosophical framework.

III. DOGS (AND DOLPHINS)

Other creatures will bring us further into the division of human from animal, and into the wide aims and involved intertextuality of prose. An affective element was important in the passage of Columella; it actually forms part of Xenophon's rhetorical purpose in the *Cynegetica*. He wishes to inspire young men to hunting (1.18, 13.1–18). His description of dogs in action at 6.15–16 presents strings of adjectives and participial phrases: not an instructive list, but an atmospheric evocation of the

Lucretius and the *Georgics*', *CQ* 41 (1991), 414–26, esp. 417–18. In *G.* 3.81 more decadent senses of *luxuriat*, at least, may be pointedly cancelled out; in 84 cowardly connotations of *tremit* are forcefully excluded. *fremit* is a simpler verb in the simile at Ov. *Met*. 3.704. For Virgil's adaptation of Varro cf. E.W. Leach, '*Georgics* 2 and the poem', *Arethusa* 14 (1981), 35–48; R.F. Thomas, 'Prose into poetry: tradition and meaning in Vergil's *Georgics*', *HSCP* 91 (1987), 229–60.

[22] Perhaps read *cursus certamine*.

[23] Columella's emotive and extravagant account of mares' passion shortly before (6.27.3–7) is strongly affected by Virgil, of whom he says in quoting *neque enim poeta licentius dicit* (6.27.4). Contrast Var. *RR* 2.7.7–8 (though a drastic anecdote follows at 2.7.9). On Columella, see Diederich (n. 4), 53–68, 209–58, 368–95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dogs' enthusiasm and tumultuous activity. So: *ἐπειδὰν δὲ περὶ τὸν λαγῶ ὦσι, δῆλον ποίησουσι τῶι κυνηγέτηι σὺν ταῖς οὐραῖς τὰ σώματα ὅλα συνεπικραδαίνουσαι, πολεμικῶς ἐπιφερόμεναι, φιλονίκως παραθέουσαι, συντρέχουσαι φιλοπόνως, συνιστάμεναι, ταχὺ διιστάμεναι,*[24] *πάλιν ἐπιφερόμεναι …* (6.16, 'when they are near the hare, they will make this clear to the hunter, shaking their whole bodies along with their tails, charging against the hare in warlike fashion, racing alongside each other in competition, running together in toil, uniting, quickly parting, charging once more'). He repeatedly gives the words to be used by the hunter to dogs and others (6.17–20), not because the hunter needs a script but to capture and transmit the mood: *ἰὼ κύνες, ἰώ· καλῶς· σοφῶς γε, ὦ κύνες* (6.17). Such use of the language of everyday speech might seem available to prose only; but poetry too can imitate it from a distance (Eur. *Bacch*. 977 *ἴτε θοαὶ Λύσσας κύνες, ἴτ' εἰς ὄρος* – metaphorical). Interest in communication and feeling between man and animals will recur in writing on dogs.[25]

Xenophon's treatment of rearing and naming puppies (7.3–5) guides later treatments. Arrian was consul *c.* A.D. 130; his intertextuality with Xenophon in his own *Cynegetica* goes further than, and perhaps draws on, Xenophon's with Simon. Arrian on this subject (*Cyn*. 20.30.2–31.2) cites and quotes Xenophon explicitly; but he deliberately omits some of Xenophon's most striking phrases. So at Xen. *Cyn*. 7.3 puppies should be suckled by their own mothers, not other bitches: *τὸ … τῶν μητέρων καὶ τὸ γάλα ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ φίλαι αἱ περιβολαί* ('embraces'). The last emotive and anthropomorphizing phrase is omitted at Arr. *Cyn*. 30.2. Xenophon's list of suitable names is also omitted (Xen. 7.5, cf. Arr. 31.2); but here a more intimate intertextuality comes in.

Arrian so identified himself with the adored Xenophon that he adopted his name, and gave the last name in Xenophon's list to a beloved dog of his own (5.6). Stepping over boundaries of literature as the dog has stepped over boundaries of species, he climactically names and memorializes the dog along with himself and his work: *ὥστε οὐκ ἂν ὀκνῆσαί μοι δοκῶ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἀναγράψαι τῆς κυνός, ὡς καὶ ἐς ὕστερον < > ἀπολελείφθαι αὐτῆς, ὅτι ἦν ἄρα Ξενοφῶντι τῶι Ἀθηναίωι κύων, Ὁρμὴ ὄνομα, ὠκυτάτη τε καὶ σοφωτάτη καὶ †ἱερωτάτη* (5.6, 'Hence I mean not to hesitate in writing down the dog's very name, so that for the future too … has been left of her, that Xenophon the Athenian had a dog called Rush, most swift and wise and …').[26]

[24] I have changed the standard punctuation *συνιστάμεναι ταχύ, δι.* so as to give *ταχύ* more point and force.

[25] Xenophon's, and Arrian's, treatises are commented on by A.A. Phillips and M.M. Willcock, *Xenophon and Arrian:* On Hunting *(Κυνηγετικός)* (Warminster, 1999). On hunting see J.K. Anderson, *Hunting in the Ancient World* (Berkeley, 1985). The exact text at Xen. *Cyn*. 6.17 is uncertain; cf. also 6.19, 20, Arr. *Cyn*. 18.1. For excited exclamation which evokes hunting cf. Pl. *Rep.* 432D2–3.

[26] Some supplement is needed before *ἀπολελεῖφθαι*; e.g. *τόδε τὸ μνημεῖον* would lead better into *ὅτι* than Castiglioni's *μνήμην*. For the last word Hercher proposes the slightly weak *πραοτάτη*, taken from 5.2, Sykutris *πιστοτάτη*; Professor L. Battezzato attractively suggests *ἱλαρωτάτη* (cf. *hilaris* of animals?). P.A. Stadter, 'Xenophon in Arrian's *Cynegeticus*', *GRBS* 17 (1976), 157–67, at 163, n. 15 thinks that Horme was 'probably male'. See that article and id., *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill, 1980), ch. 4 for Arrian's treatise and its relation to Xenophon. For a relationship between authors approaching identity cf. Ennius' reincarnation as Homer (*Ann*. I.ii–x; testimonia O. Skutsch, *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* [Oxford, 1985], 150–3). On the names of dogs see E. Bäcker, *De canum nominibus Graecis* (Diss. Königsberg, 1884).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Horme is made to surpass her species particularly in her command of language: she has more sounds than any dog Arrian has seen, and communicates with her voice (5.5). He treats her reaction to mention of a whip as an understanding of the word, not just the speaker's tone (left out until the end). He gives a whole sequence of her actions here: the reader is to be amused by her vehemence and her quasi-human behaviour, but also impressed. … *πρόσεισιν τῶι ὀνομάσαντι, καὶ ὑποπτήξασα λιπαρεῖ, καὶ τὸ στόμα ἐφαρμόζει τῶι στόματι ὡς φιλοῦσα, καὶ ἐπιπηδήσασα ἐκκρέμαται τοῦ αὐχένος καὶ οὐ πρόσθεν ἀνίησιν πρὶν τῆς ἀπειλῆς ἀποπαῦσαι τὸν θυμούμενον* (5.5, 'she goes up to the man who has mentioned it, and crouches and begs him, and joins her mouth to his as if kissing, and jumps on him and hangs from his neck and does not let go until the angry man has desisted from his threat'). Epicureans might view human language as an extension of animal sounds (Lucr. 5.1056–90); but language is commonly seen as a human prerogative (Cic. *Inv.* 1.5, etc.). The whole passage is thoughtful as well as touching. Its intensely first-person quality distinguishes it from didactic poetry, and also from most didactic prose – but not from epigram (e.g. Mart. 1.109.6 *hanc* [a named dog] *tu si queritur loqui putabis*). Some types of poetry can encompass such lowly domestic affection and praise, not without an element of humour; but didactic prose can choose to follow them. In the content and the intertextuality of this passage, literariness, emotion and the author's private world are connected in self-consciously surprising ways.[27]

In poetry, we may briefly mention Grattius and [Oppian] on puppies; Grattius is a contemporary of Ovid, [Oppian's] four-book poem probably appeared in A.D. 212–17. Grattius begins from Xenophon's recommendation of simple food; he adds the unpoetic *maza* (308, 'barley-loaf'), and relishes the word. The theme of deleterious luxury enables him to rise into the human (*humanos non ēst magis altera sensus* sc. than luxury of taste, 310). He sweeps onward through geography, history and empire, addressing Cyrus, Greece and Serranus, and culminating in heaven (325). Such moralizing expansions are common say in Seneca's prose *Natural Questions* (e.g. 1.17.4–10: history of mirrors and decline). But Grattius' epic genre gives self-conscious point to the ascent, and to the tension between grandeur and relevance: *scilicet exiguis magna sub imagine rebus | prospicies* (326–7).[28]

[Oppian], though heeding Xenophon on short names (*Cyn.* 1.444–5), undoes him on feeding, and takes off into aspiring fantasy. While suckling from other dogs would indeed be bad, deer, gazelles, a tame lioness, or a she-wolf would be fine (availability is not discussed). The puppies would become strong and swift, *εἰδομένους αὐτῆισι γαλακτοφόροισι τιθήναις* (1.443). The humanizing *τιθήναις* heightens the cross-species play to close.

A passage not on dogs illustrates strong affectivity, with a rhetorical purpose; it illustrates too the interest of poetry as well as prose in the borders of human and animal. Oppian's five-book poem on how to fish (probably A.D. 177–8) is passionately

[27] On epigrams about dogs cf. M. Citroni, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber primus. Introduzione, testo, apparato critico e commento* (Florence, 1975), 331–4; G.O. Hutchinson, *Propertius:* Elegies *Book IV* (Cambridge, 2006), 112. For Lucr. 5.1056–90 see G. Campbell, *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution: A Commentary on* De Rerum Natura *Book Five, Lines 772–1104* (Oxford, 2003), 283–94.

[28] Commentaries on Grattius: P.J. Enk, *Gratti Cynegeticon quae supersunt. Cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico* (2 vols., Zutphen and London, 1918); R. Verdière, *Gratti Cynegeticon libri I quae supersunt* (2 vols., Wetteren, 1964); C. Formicola, *Il* Cynegeticon *di Grattio. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Bologna, 1988). For dogs in Grattius see J. Henderson, 'Going to the dogs/Grattius <&> the Augustan subject', *PCPS* 47 (2001), 1–22.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opposed to the fishing of dolphins, on the grounds of their mental equality with humans, and their friendship with humans on equal terms (*Hal*. 5.416–24). Not far from the close of his poem he depicts dolphin-fishers attacking a she-dolphin and her two young (5.519–88). The 'mother' (dolphin) is likened to a 'mother' (human) at the sack of a city (5.553–5): thus the animal sphere, in reversal of epic norms, is the target domain or tenor of the imagery, the human the source domain or vehicle. The likeness is focalized, as often in Oppian, through an ideal spectator: *φαίης κεν ὀδυρομένην ὁράασθαι | μητέρα* (5.553).[29]

The mother is given a speech, as she urges one of her children to flee. The device is used elsewhere by Oppian (as at 2.305–7); but it has special force when the attack is on mankind (*μέροπες γὰρ ἀνάρσιοι οὐκέθ' ἑταῖροι | ἡμῖν*, 5.560–1). That force subserves the persuasive ends of the author: the narrator's attack is now voiced by the character. The poem is exploiting direct speech with relation to humans and animals in an entirely different fashion from Xenophon's prose; one could not imagine such a device even in the *Georgics*. But its artifice is acknowledged at the end, with no loss of pathos: *τοῖα καὶ ἄφθογγός περ ὅμως τεκέεσσιν ἑοῖσι | μυθεῖται* (5.565–6). Poetry no less than prose is interested in divisions and difference; it can exploit the possibilities of its language to transgress supposed divisions, not merely in imaginative exploration, but with intellectual and argumentative point.

IV. MAKE-UP (AND THE GODS)

The questions we have been exploring could be extended into many other areas, and into other divisions of the world. It can only be mentioned briefly here that on the gods, say, prose and poetry show a kindred intellectual energy, kindred stylistic devices and implicit and explicit interaction. So on the causes of lightning, Lucretius and Cicero alike heap up mocking questions about Jupiter (e.g. Lucr. 6.404–5 *in mare qua porro mittit ratione? quid undas | arguit …?*, Cic. *Div*. 2.45 *quid enim proficit, cum in medium mare fulmen iecit?*; cf. Sen. *NQ* 2.42.1). The vigour of the Latin writers, prose and verse, may be set against the austere eloquence of Epicurus, at least in the condensed account of the *Letter to Pythocles* (104, *μόνον ὁ μῦθος ἀπέστω· ἀπέσται δέ, ἐάν τις καλῶς τοῖς φαινομέμοις ἀκολουθῶν περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν σημειῶται* ['makes deductions']). Although lightning is part of the epic conception of Jupiter, we do not here find Lucretius directly confronting narrative epic (contrast 1.68–9). His concern is rather with another kind of *carmina*, the books of the Etruscan experts (6.381–2). A plurality of divinities wielding thunder (6.387–98) suggests Etruscan belief, not the world of epic (cf. Plin. *HN* 2.138). It is Cicero who engages most explicitly with narrative epic: his own account (fr. 10 Courtney) of the portents before the Catilinarian conspiracy (*Div*. 1.17–22, 2.45). In a complex combination of generic, personal, political and philosophical elements, he stresses the self-contradiction (*urges me meis uersibus* |, 2.45; *contra facta tua et contra scripta*, 2.46), but he allows an

[29] For the simile cf. Hom. *Od*. 8.523–30, with I.J.F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey (Cambridge, 2001), 216–17; for the use of *μήτηρ* cf. *Il*. 17.3–4. [Oppian's] remarkable simile on the confused searching dog and the pregnant girl (*Cyn*. 1.494–505) may be contrasted with Valerius Flaccus' simile comparing Medea about to leave home with a rabid dog (7.121–6). The latest edition of Oppian: F. Fajen, *Oppianus: Halieutica. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung in deutscher Sprache, Ausführliche Kataloge der Meeresfauna* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1999); see also N. Hopkinson, *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology* (Cambridge, 1994), 185–97; F. Fajen, 'Oppianus Ciliciensis 1930–1999', *Lustrum* 41 (1999), 75–104; E. Rebuffat, *Ποιητὴς ἐπέων. Tecniche di composizione poetica negli Halieutika di Oppiano* (Florence, 2001).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

impression to linger: the signs of so great an event may in some sense have been true (2.46–8).[30]

In discussing the argument from design, the Stoic Manilius engages explicitly with Epicurus, but only through his language with Lucretius: *ut uoluit credi, qui primus moenia mundi | seminibus struxit minimis inque illa resoluit* (1.486–7). While Manilius here employs compact metaphors of building, Cicero's Stoic speaker had deployed an elaborate hypothetical simile on the order in a house or the like (*ut, si quis*, etc. *ND* 2.15) – an argumentative version of a poetic device. This is made to contrast with the drier abstraction of the Stoic Chrysippus' prose (2.16 = *SVF* III.1012). The treatment of the gods, then, would further display the importance, and the unpredictability, of the relation between poetry and prose, and the many factors which can be involved.[31]

But we may end by returning to the elemental form of the list, which well exhibits the scope and complication of stylistic relationships between didactic poetry and prose. Catalogues are an important form in narrative epic; lists bulk large in the least literary bureaucracy. The relatively unexalted subject of cosmetics illustrates how the opposition of poetry and prose is less straightforward than we might think. Medical recipes, under which ancient make-up falls, appear in simple form on papyrus: so Ψ 1180 (first–second century A.D.), fr. A, col. ii. 24–6, 32–4 *πρόσωπο̣ν[ν] εὔχρουν ποίησαι*[32] *ἀμύχ[δ]αλα | πικρὰ τρίψας μεθ' ὕδ̣ατος· καὶ κ[ατά]|χριε … κιρρά· δορυκνίου τοῦ φλοιοῦ τ̣ῆ̣ς ῥίζης, λιθαργ(ύρου), | χαλκάνθου, σχι(στῆς) ἀνὰ (δρ.) ιβ΄, ψιμιθίο(υ) (δρ.) λς΄, | μίλτου Μιναίας (δρ.) η΄, ὄξους τὸ ἱκανόν* ('Give your face a good complexion by crushing bitter almonds and mixing them with water; smear them on … Orange face-powder: bark of the root of convolvulus, litharge, helichrysum, schistus: 12 drachmas' weight of each; white lead: 36; Minaean red ochre: 8; vinegar: a sufficiency'). But verse is often used for medical recipes. Galen (second–third (?) century A.D.) commends Andromachus and Damocrates (both first century A.D.) for using verse: verse is easier to remember and harder to pervert, even if it made

[30] For the *De Divinatione* cf., as well as A.S. Pease, M. Tulli Ciceronis *De diuinatione* (2 vols., Urbana, 1920–3), D. Wardle, *Cicero on Divination:* De Divinatione*, Book 1, Translated with Introduction and Historical Commentary* (Oxford, 2006) (144–5, 160 on the discussion in Book 1). Cf. further M. Beard, 'Cicero and divination: the formation of a Latin discourse', *JRS* 76 (1986), 33–46. For Etruscans on gods and lightning, cf. S. Weinstock, 'Libri fulgurales', *PBSR* 19 (1951), 122–53, at 121–9; H.M. Hine, *An Edition with Commentary of Seneca,* Natural Questions*, Book Two* (New York, 1981), 389–90; J.-P. Jannot, *Devins, dieux et démons. Regards sur la religion de l'Étrurie antique* (Paris, 1998), 40–3. On Epicurus' Letter to Pythocles, see D. Sedley, *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* (Cambridge, 1998), 119–20.

[31] The argument in Cicero, based on Cleanthes (*SVF* I 528), is strictly meant to show how (true) ideas of the divine come to be formed in human minds; but in Balbus' speech it becomes an argument for the existence of gods (cf. *ND* 3.16–17, 25–8). On such arguments in the Stoics, see M. Dragona-Monachou, *The Stoic Arguments for the Existence and the Providence of the Gods* (Athens, 1976), esp. 88–91; K. Algra, 'Stoic theology', in B. Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (Cambridge, 2003), 153–78, at 156–65, esp. 161–2; J.C. Thom, *Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Tübingen, 2005), 70–1; D. Sedley, *Creationism and its Critics in Antiquity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2007), ch. 7, esp. 205–13. The comparison with a house comes already in Aristotle (fr. 12 Rose, Cic. *ND* 2.95); alternatives, and elaborate detail on the house, appear in Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* 3.98–9 (questionably seen since I. Bywater, 'Aristotle's dialogue "on Philosophy" ', *Journal of Philology* 7 [1877], 64–87, at 82–4, as based on Aristotle). For Lucretian language in the lines of Manilius cf. Lucr. 1.57, 59–60, 66–7, 73, 628, 2.708, 5.453–4.

[32] *ποιῆσαι· … ὕδ̣ατος καὶ* is given by I. Andorlini, 'Un ricettario da Tebtynis: parti inedite di PSI 1180', in I. Andorlini (ed.), *Testi medici su papiro. Atti del Seminario di studio (Firenze, 3–4 giugno 2002)* (Florence, 2004), 81–118; but the infinitive seems less plausible than the middle imperative suggested here, not least because of *καί*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Andromachus less clear than he could have been (*Antid.* 14.32, 44–5, 89 Kühn; Damocrates used iambics). This strikingly practical argument for verse is found already in the second century B.C. (probably) at Ps.-Scymnus 33–42: remembering unbound discourse (λελυμένην λέξιν, cf. *oratio soluta*) is like holding unbound logs. (The comic trimeter is favoured for clarity.) Medical recipes even have distinctive metrical tendencies: elegiacs are much favoured. Galen twice quotes entire the 174-line elegiac recipe-poem Γαλήνη of Andromachus, Nero's physician (*GDK* no. 62). Galen's *Theriaca* begins with a scene reminiscent of the introduction to Cicero's *Topica*: Galen has found his addressee reading Andromachus, whose work Galen admires. The pragmatics of prose and verse are not easily separated in this area.[33]

Ovid's poem on make-up derives from this poetic tradition, already seen in Eudemus' elegiacs (*SH* 412A, second–first century B.C.) as well as in Nicander's hexameters. Here is to be found the origin of his elegiac didactic; the metaphorically medical *Remedia Amoris* closes the series. Ovid's elaborate prologue approves make-up, but also limits its importance and value (43–50); the opening of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is not wholly dissimilar. For all the humour and the wider bearing of the work, he also takes on the tradition of presenting a list, numbers, and unusual words (unusual in poetry). Like Andromachus and others he relishes the idea of distant and diverse origins – an element important in the poetry and the ideology of luxury: so *hordea, quae Libyci ratibus misere coloni* (*Med.* 53), cf. Androm. *GDK* 62.146 νάρδου, Γαλάτης ἣν ἐκόμισσεν ἀνήρ; *Illyrica quae uenit iris humo* (*Med.* 74), cf. Nic. *Ther.* 607 ἶρίν θ', ἣν ἔθρεψε Δρίλων καὶ Νάρονος ὄχθαι. Nicander is here more precise and evocative, and proceeds to a myth full of irony: Cadmus and Harmonia's transformation into fierce snakes (608–9).[34]

[33] The reference to βασιλέων in Gal. *Ther.* 14.210 Kühn indicates the elder Andromachus, and presumably this work. On Galen's approach to Andromachus' poetry see P. Luccioni, 'Raisons de la prose et du mètre: Galien et la poésie didactique d'Andromachos l'Ancien', in N. Palmieri (ed.), *Rationnel et irrationnel dans la médecine ancienne et médiévale. Aspects historiques, scientifiques et culturels* (Saint-Étienne, 2003), 59–75; S. Vogt, '" … er schrieb in Versen, und er tat recht daran": Lehrdichtung im Urteil Galens', in Fögen (n. 2), 51–78. For lists in epic, cf. now S. Kyriakidis, *Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry: Lucretius – Virgil – Ovid* (Newcastle, 2007). Ψ 1180 is first fully published by Andorlini (n. 32); for the lines quoted see 94, 109–11. For medical recipes, etc. cf. L.C. Youtie, 'Three medical prescriptions for eye-salves: P. Mich. Inv. 482', in J. Bingen, G. Cambier, G. Nachtergael (edd.), *Le Monde grec. Pensée, littérature, histoire, documents. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), 555–63; H. Harrauer and P.J. Sijpesteijn, *Medizinische Rezepte und Verwandtes* (Vienna, 1981); M.H. Marganne, *Inventaire analytique des papyrus grecs de médecine* (Geneva, 1981); C. Schulze, *Die pharmazeutische Fachliteratur in der Antike. Eine Einführung*[2] (Göttingen, 2003). For Ps.-Scymnus see the recent editions of D. Marcotte, *Les Géographes grecs* i. *Introduction générale. Pseudo-Scymnos,* Circuit de la Terre (Paris, 2002), and M. Korenjak, *Die Welt-Rundreise eines anonymen griechischen Autors ('Pseudo-Skymnos')* (Hildesheim, 2003); on the prologue see R.L. Hunter, 'The prologue of the *Periodos to Nicomedes* ("Pseudo-Scymnus")', in Harder, Regtuit, Wakker (n. 10), 123–40. On elegiacs and medical recipes cf. M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 181.

[34] For the *Theriaca* see J.-M. Jacques, *Nicandre. Œuvres* ii. Les Thériaques. *Fragments iologiques antérieurs à Nicandre. Texte établi et traduit* (Paris, 2002). For the *Medicamina* see G. Rosati, *Ovidio,* I cosmetici delle donne (Venice, 1985), and V. Rimell, *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference and the Poetic Imagination* (Cambridge, 2006), ch. 2; for the designation see *Ars* 3.205–6, with R.K. Gibson, *Ovid:* Ars Amatoria *Book 3* (Cambridge, 2003), 179–80. The title of the *Ars Amatoria* points to a prose tradition: cf. Ath. 162 b on Sphodrias' (not Sphodrius') evidently racy Τέχνη ἐρωτική; N. Heinsius, *Commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia*, ed. J.F. Fischer (Leipzig, 1758), 259.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press

What distinguishes Ovid's presentation is the robust sense of action. So at *Med.* 57–62 the couplets end *lenta iube scabra frangat asella mola … contere in haec (solidi sexta fac assis eat) … protinus in cumeris omnia cerne cauis* ('bid the slow-moving she-donkey break them on the rough millstone … rub those into them (make a sixth part of a full pound go in) … straight away separate them all in hollow baskets'). Andromachus' poem has much more the character of an embellished series of nouns. This difference is a less extreme form of that between Manilius and 'Manetho'. The poetry in this area ranges widely. The Ovid should be seen, not as bizarrely tedious, but as a particularly animated version of a widely read type of poetry. This type bears an elaborate relation to prose, in form and purpose; Ovid's poem cannot plausibly be viewed as simple parody. Play on women, religion, genre is another matter; it flourishes in the *Medicamina*, but is typical of Ovid's work in other sorts of poem too.

This brief exploration may suggest the complexity of the relations between prose and poetry. Obviously, didactic prose and didactic poetry differ in expression and stylistic form: we have seen the exploitation of devices only possible in poetry or in prose. But we have also seen links and connections between stylistic forms in didactic prose and verse, and we have seen the enormous range within didactic prose and within didactic poetry. In the goals they pursue, and in what they offer to the reader, facile segregation is not possible. Neither type of work has a monopoly on affective or atmospheric writing, on argument or persuasive ends. Frequent in both are intellectual depth of content and a concern with divisions and their limits. Intertextuality is fundamental to both prose and verse, but it includes their interest in and impact on each other. We should not think of didactic prose as the banausic slave, offering lowly matter which the master can transform into art. It would be apter to think of a fascinated and flirtatious relationship between the two types of writing: even if one type notionally has a hierarchical superiority and the two are notionally contrasted, this does not prevent intricate interactions and many resemblances. Our approach to ancient didactic writing needs to be broadened, our understanding of the relation between prose and poetry deepened.

Exeter College, Oxford G.O. HUTCHINSON
gregory.hutchinson@exeter.ox.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809000159 Published online by Cambridge University Press