In an amusing passage of his novel Königliche Hoheit (1909) Thomas Mann describes how Prince Klaus Heinrich nervously waits to bestow a literary prize on the poet Axel Martini, famous for his two volumes entitled Evoie! and Sacred Life. The poem which has won the prize is "an inspired hymn of praise to the joy of life, or rather a highly tempestuous outbreak of the joy of life itself, a ravishing hymn to the beauty and fearfulness of life...".

The interview however between Prince and poet, when it does eventually take place, is a series of anti-climaxes. The asthmatic Martini is in delicate health, a teetotaller who is normally in bed at ten every night. He explains that what distinguishes the artist is "hunger for the actual:"

"Enjoyment of life is forbidden to us, strictly forbidden, we have no illusions as to that—and by enjoyment of life I mean not only happiness, but also sorrow, passion, in short every serious tie with life. The representation of life claims all our forces, especially when those

---

1 An earlier treatment of the new fragment is to be found in my "De novo Galli fragmento in Nubia eruto," Latinitas XXVIII. 2 (1980), pp. 83-94. Now as then I should like to acknowledge my dependence on the editio princeps by R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons, R. G. M. Nisbet, "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrîm," Journal of Roman Studies 69 (1979), pp. 125-55, and especially of course here on the work of Professor Nisbet. I am grateful to Professor John Miller for reading and commenting on a first version of some of the points made now, and to members of the Liverpool Latin Seminar of April 29, 1983, for starting several stimulating trains of thought.

2 The English translation is adapted from that published by A. Cecil Curtis (London 1916), pp. 170 ff.
forces are not allotted to us in overabundant measure”—and Herr Martini coughed, his shoulders repeatedly shaking as he did so.

The prince is particularly surprised by Martini’s use of the first person in his work:

“But your poem,” said Klaus Heinrich, with some insistence. “Your prize poem to ‘The Joy of Life’, Herr Martini. . . . I’ve read it attentively. It deals on the one hand with misery and horrors, with the wickedness and cruelty of life . . . and on the other hand with the enjoyment of wine and fair women, does it not? . . .”

“And it’s all,” said Klaus Heinrich, “conceived in the form of ‘I’, in the first person, isn’t it? And yet it is not founded on personal knowledge? You have not really experienced any of it yourself?”

“Very little, Royal Highness. Only quite trifling suggestions of it. No, the fact is rather the other way round—that, if I were the man to experience all that, I should not only not write such poems, but should also feel entire contempt for my present existence. . . .”

“For hygiene is what I and such as I most need—it is our whole ethics. But nothing is more unhygienic than life. . . .”

Clearly Mann in this passage is having a great deal of fun at a certain level with naive notions that poet and poem must be one. Fun, yes, but there are also here in his portrait of Martini some features which will recur in deeply tragic colors in the picture of Adrian Leverkühn drawn by Doktor Faustus, and this suggests that he is concerned with a permanent aspect of his view of the artist at work. What Mann writes therefore becomes a useful corrective to the “autobiographical fallacy,” the belief that a poet using the pronoun ‘I’ is necessarily describing his direct personal experience. In fact, the ‘I’ in the context of a poem must always be as manipulable as the cut of a dress or the time of day. The point is made forcefully by the Formalist critic Boris Eichenbaum in his essay on “The Making of Gogol’s Overcoat”:

... pas une seule phrase de l’œuvre littéraire ne peut être en soi une “expression” directe des sentiment personnels de l’auteur, mais elle est toujours construction et jeu. . . .

And Yu. Tynianov remarks about the love poems of one of Pushkin’s contemporaries:

3 And it would be Proust who remarked in À la Recherche du Temps Perdu that at every moment we must choose between health and sanity on the one hand, and spiritual pleasures on the other.
The Formalists' argument should not be one which surprises students of Aristotle's Poetics, since in the last analysis it is simply another way of claiming that the poet is not a historian. Whatever the ostensible impulse in "real life" for his work, the poet, precisely because of his separating talent, immediately moves away from the personal to the universal. His genius explores levels of communication where experience inextricably blends with imagination (φαντασία), and on them he will impose a hygienic order which is ultimately foreign.

To understand this is to feel some impatience with the traditional problem of "the origins of Latin love elegy." The "objective" Greek, the "subjective" Roman—these are mechanical categorizations, which have rightly been handled with increasing scepticism in recent scholarship. The secret of the Augustan—and Roman—parade of the poetic ego is the national preoccupation with the present. What for the Greek vanished with the past, for the Roman is instantly recoverable, as myth is re-enacted in experience, and experience is reshaped by myth. So far from finding the missing link between Greek and Roman sensibility in some Roman poet who is half "objective" and half "subjective," we should expect all Roman poets, in so far as they are Roman, to behave alike. And the mystery of the origins of Latin love elegy is to be solved by looking in that most Roman of genres, satire, and especially in the work of Lucilius.

Axel Martini was probably far more like Propertius than Gallus, engineer, general, administrator and bon vivant. But since Gallus has so often been cast in the role of missing link, it is worthwhile to note that the new papyrus is particularly instructive in showing just how


8 M. Puelma, Lucilius und Kallimachos (Frankfurt 1949), pp. 266 ff. This explains the prosodic hiatus of Gallus' tûm erunt (v. 2), shared with Horace's Satires (nûm adest, II. 2. 28. A. Palmer ad loc. suggests that Horace is quoting Lucilius).
calculating a poetry is written by this so-called "subjective" elegist. Evidently, as the papyrus begins, the poet has been given a sad time by his mistress' wantonness. But his fata will be dulcia when Caesar fulfils some vast program of conquest, and returns to Rome to set his spoils in the temples of many gods. Fata dulcia is an astonishing paradox. Most of the time the Romans hardly thought so well of fate, and Virgil built the fourth book of the Aeneid on an opposition between these very concepts (culminating in dulces exuviae, dum fata deusque sinebat, 651).

Fata dulcia is therefore in Gallus a powerful oxymoron, which seems to be unique in Latin. Propertius knew the resonance of the noun. But not even he ventured such a combination. Such is the transforming power Gallus attributes to Caesar's coming pre-eminence.

None of the other elegists makes a statement remotely like this. Their poetic pose strikes a contrast between the joys of love and peace, and the harshness of war, with the palm always going to the former. No one of them suggests for a moment that the nequitä of his mistress can somehow be compensated for by the ostentation of public victory. But Gallus is excited by just such pomp. Caesar will be the maxima pars of Roman historia. Evidently, in taking over this Greek word from rhetorical theory (where it is so often featured, for example, in Cicero), Gallus invented a pentameter ending which was destined to faire fortune. Even Virgil's Aeneas claims only to have been pars magna of the battles at the fall of Troy. Gallus' Caesar, maxima pars, is greater than Aeneas: Auguste, Hectoreis cognite maior


10 The Theaurus Linguae Latinae lists no other instance.

11 See Nisbet's note. The ending does not occur in Tibullus, and Ovid's usages (Am. II. 4. 44; Tr. II. 416 and 444; Ibis 57 and 520) are not significant. By contrast, Propertius has four final pentameter examples of the Gallan type. Two of them are mentioned above, note 9. The others are II. 1. 16 and III. 20. 28. Of these, the first is evidently a challenge to the "official" Gallan sense: cf. causas (=Aetia), v. 12; Iliadas, v. 14. Propertius is listing different styles of poetry and explaining that, in his case, they are always inspired by love. The second uses historia in the sense of the French "une histoire," already familiar to Plautus. The "official" sense was still strongly enough felt however to be parodied by the author of Catalepton 11. 6 and to be exploited by Martial in his eulogy of Sallust (XIV. 191. 2).
avis, as Propertius will put it later (IV. 6. 38), in another typically Roman assertion of the superiority of the present to the past.

It is against this background of flattery that we must judge the extraordinary hexameter which follows: *postque tuum reditum multorurn

templa deorum . . . .* The late Mr. Geary of Corpus at Oxford used to illustrate how not to write Latin verses by citing from the prolific Anon. the half line *nox venit atroc nox.* Has Gallus been to school with that shy master?

No, because he is too calculating a poet. We are in a religious context, something which is never far from the Roman mind when flattery of the great is in the air. *Multorum templa deorum* sets the scene. But so does *reditus.* The "return" of a general or monarch was no ordinary event either in the hellenistic world or at Rome. In the hellenistic world, it may be associated with the whole concept of παροσονία.12 The visiting grandee heralded a fresh beginning for the people he so honored. New buildings greeted the arrival.13 In its religious aspect, this visit could mean an end to sorrow.14 Just so, Gallus expects richer temples and an end to his tristia, indeed their transformation into dulcia, with Caesar’s *reditus.*

The *Res Gestae* of Augustus confirm the religious nature of another *reditus:*

Aram Fortunae Reducis ante aedes Honoris et Virtutis ad portam Capenam pro *reditu* meo senatus consacravit, in qua pontifices et virgines Vestales anniversarium sacrificium facere iussit eo die quo in urbem ex Syria *redieram . . . .* (R.G. 11)

Similarly, “the most important iconographic evidence for Augustan

12 *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* begründet von Gerhard Kittel . . . herausgegeben von Gerhard Friedrich, vol. 5 (Stuttgart 1958), s.v. παροσονία (A. Oepke). It should be noted that this concept covers also that of “Second Coming.” M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* II (Munich 1961), pp. 391-92, notes the long history of these ideas. For example, the return of Vespasian to Rome as emperor was celebrated by Domitian on frieze B of the so-called “Chancery Reliefs” preserved in the Vatican. The winged Victory shown holding a crown of oak leaves over the emperor’s head picks up a theme which goes all the way back to the coins of Gelon and to Pindar’s religious eulogy of Hiero in the opening lines of *Pythian* 2. Cf. Colin M. Kraay and M. Hirmer, *Greek Coins* (New York 1966), plates 25, 26, 28. The motif is preserved on a brown sardonyx cameo of the fourth century after Christ: cf. “Triumphal Procession of a Christian Emperor,” reproduced as figure 7 in *History of the Byzantine State* by G. Ostrogorsky, Eng. tr. Joan Hussey (repr. Oxford 1980).

13 Oepke, p. 858, using examples drawn from Hadrian’s visit to Greece. These included a new temple of Athena.

ideals and propaganda,' according to P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore,\textsuperscript{15} is associated with another *reditus*:

\begin{quote}
Cum ex Hispania Galliaque . . . Romam *redi* . . . aram Pacis Augustae senatus pro *reditu* meo consacrandon censuit ad campum Martium . . . . (R.G. 12)
\end{quote}

It is to this last return that Horace refers in one of the most beautiful of his *Odes*, supplying us with evidence of the religious sentiment connected with such occasions from the very heart of political and poetic orthodoxy:

\begin{quote}
Divis ort\ae bonis, optime Romulae
Custos\textsuperscript{16} gentis, abes iam nimium diu.
Maturum *reditum* pollicitus patrum
Sancto concilio, *redi*. (IV. 5. 1-4)
\end{quote}

The final imperative here may be compared with the ἐρχον which comes at the end of the Book of Revelation (22:20) and therefore at the end of the New Testament. The "Messianic" language of *Eclogue* 4, the "kenotic" language of *Odes* I. 2,\textsuperscript{17} forms then part of an Augustan pattern.

What is fascinating about Horace's flatteries in *Odes* IV. 5 is that they show exactly the same sort of assonance as Gallus'. Yet we know that Horace is perfectly able to use the plural of *reditus* to avoid such a jingle when he wants: *et populum reditus morantem* (*Odes* III. 5. 52).

Horace's assonance occurs in a religious context. Kiessling—Heinze connect the ode with the well-known fragment of Ennius (110-14 V) in which Romulus' death is lamented: *o sanguen dis oriundum*. There is a propaganda intent in this echo, since Augustus had at one time entertained the idea of taking the name of Romulus, and Romulus was pointedly visible in an *exedra* of his Forum. Certainly *patrum / sancto concilio, redi* fits in with this religious solemnity. May we then not now hear in Gallus' assonance too, rather than the discord of an incompetent, the notes of a religious exaltation, given expression in the age-old device of rhyme? The twist given to *fixa*, the opulent sonority of the comparative *divitiora*, assume new significance. The organist, as we draw near to these temples, is pulling out all his stops.\textsuperscript{18}


\textsuperscript{17} Nisbet—Hubbard on v. 43.

\textsuperscript{18} Professor Nisbet already points out in his *editio princeps* (above, note 1), pp. 141-42, that the anaphora of second person pronouns and adjectives in vv. 2-5 of our fragment (*tu . . . tuum . . . tuiris*) is particularly suitable to a hymnic panegyric.
Templa . . . legam also speaks of serious themes. The organizers of a recent exhibition dedicated to the Image of Augustus at the British Museum point to the conscious propaganda which sought in the 30’s to recreate Octavian in the likeness of a hellenistic prince. A theme of this propaganda, still echoing in Horace, was the construction of temples. A gold coin which may belong to this period depicts on its obverse a bust of Diana, and on its reverse a tetrastyle temple whose pediment is adorned with a triskelion which associates it with the Sicilian victory over Sex. Pompeius in 36. Within the temple, a naval and military trophy is set on a prow. On its architrave is the inscription IMP. CAESAR. As early as 40, Octavian had begun to drop his praenomen Caius, and to assume in its place the honorific imperator which had been voted to Julius Caesar as a title which he might hand down to his heirs.

Another aureus, from the British Museum exhibition, dated about 36, shows a temple inscribed DIVO IUL. This temple was dedicated in 29 in the Forum. The aureus mentioned earlier may allude to the temple of the Palatine Apollo, dedicated the following year. It should be observed however that it is not a question of waiting for actual dedications, with appropriate inscriptions on their architraves, to take place. We are dealing with poetry, and flattery, and Gallus’ allusion to multorum templorum deorum fits perfectly with a propaganda campaign already being waged on Octavian’s coins. In the proem to the third Georgic, Gallus’ friend and admirer Virgil was shortly to fantasize just such another temple.

36 was in fact a key year in the unfolding of Octavian’s career.

21 These details are taken from Lily Ross Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor (Middletown, Conn. 1931), p. 132 with fig. 20.
When he returned to Rome to celebrate an ovatio after his great victories over Sex. Pompeius and Lepidus, he was met with a series of honorary decrees. Some he declined. Others, which he did accept, had already been given to Julius. Among them was the bestowal of the laurel crown. Meanwhile, under the able lieutenancy of Maecenas and Agrippa, a far-reaching program of rebuilding and reconstruction was put in hand. Virgil began to write the Georgics, which originally ended with the laudes Galli. Of course we do not know what Gallus himself was doing during this exciting time when Octavian was winning the hearts and minds of the Italian populace. We do know that he was an engineer (praefectus fabrum).

It is hard to believe that Octavian never talked intimately to his friends and associates before and during 36 about his plans for the future. These four lines of the papyrus may preserve the memory of just such stimulating conversation: the refurbishing of "many temples"; the dedication of spoils, whether these were literal trophies or simply manubiae, a word which will not scan in dactylic verse. Velleius at least hints that the spoils from Naulochus led on to the temple of the Palatine Apollo, so important for the Augustan vates.

Gallus foresees that he will "read" these temples. It is of course possible that he knew he would be away from Rome, and would have to content himself with written accounts. But when he was in Egypt he certainly knew the value of public inscriptions, and that from Philae is still preserved. May he not therefore be thinking of himself as "rubber-necking," just as Propertius later proposes to read the

34. The official line on Sex. Pompeius was that he was a renegade and pirate: cf. minatus urbi vincla, Horace, Epod. 9. 9: mare pacavi a praedonibus, Aug. R.G. 25 with Brutn and Moore's notes. Spolia then would have been quite properly taken from such a foe. But in fact Gallus' language is, I think, deliberately misleading: cf. below, note 25. Spolia are confounded with dona ex manubii. — Scholars now varyingly date the publication of the Eclogues to 37 (C. G. Hardie, The Georgics: A Transitional Poem [Albingdon 1971], p. 9) or even 35 (D. O. Ross, Jr., Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome [Cambridge 1975], p. 18, note 1, with reference to articles by G. W. Bowersock and W. V. Clausen). The argument for an earlier date because Maecenas is not mentioned deserves as much attention as most argumenta ex silentio. In any case the ancient concept of "publication" was much vaguer than ours (when was the Aeneid published?), and Gallus may easily have shared his poetry with his close friend Virgil before it went out to a wider circle. Cf. G. P. Goold, ICS VIII (1983), pp. 96-97 on publication dates in Ovid.

names of the cities Octavian has captured when they are displayed in his triumph? Could Gallus not "read temples" quite literally, just as we still read IMP. CAESAR and DIVO IUL. on the temples depicted on the aurei contemporary with Gallus?26

Gallus may read temples, but he has also written something, as with precise antithetical logic he now goes on to inform us (vv. 6-7). And no ordinary poems either. They have "at last," which is presumably some homage to the Alexandrian ponos-ideal, been made by the Muses, so that he can say they are worthy of his mistress. No small compliment to Lycoris, if she can command such talent! And no small compliment to the poet, if he is able to claim such inspiration!

But "made by the Muses" is a critical catchword, which vexes Horace when some fautor veterum applies it to archaic Latin monuments of letters. Elsewhere in the Epistles it springs to the lips of a Roman Callimachus. Varro had said something similar about Plautus, according to Quintilian.27 But, if Gallus employs a critical catchword of this kind, can we not say that he is the first index of his own verses? Historia already revealed the student of rhetoric.28

In this fragmentary final section we obviously enter into an area of great controversy. My article in Latinitas suggests that a sustained metaphor is drawn from the Roman courts. Dicere (v. 7) and iudice (v. 9) may be united in this way, and if we accept Professor Nisbet's testatur at 8 that verb would support this line of interpretation. Someone is being asked to come to "the same" (idem looks secure) verdict. I believe that this someone is Caesar.29 No one else is really

26 Cf. et titulis oppida capta legam, Prop. III. 4. 16. In describing the temple of Mars Ultor in the Fasti, Ovid writes: Spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum, / Et visum lecto Caesare maius opus (V. 567-68). Gallus will read a written text on either view, of course. It is simply a question of what is more consistent with the poetic and Roman imagination. The evidence of Propertius and Ovid in this regard is far more important than that of the author of Cons. ad Liviam 267.


28 And, though index may have Alexandrian antecedents (κρόω, Act.-pref. 18 dub.) its intrusion at this point into Gallus' elegy is extraordinary. This was obviously not the beginning of a book, where so many allusions to "judging," including Callimachus', seem to come, and apparently at some remove from the end. The use of ἐγκρίνων is no parallel at all, since it is clearly not a poet's word in Alexandria. One is reminded of Cicero on Calvus: nimium tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans, Brutas 82. 283.

29 And I would restore, not testatur, but another judicial verb, videatur, and before that SEI: CAESAR·.
good enough to fill the bill, and Caesar is certainly invoked as *iudex* of literature by both Horace and Ovid.\(^{30}\)

It is possible to conjecture therefore that in this extraordinary fragment Gallus was writing with more political inspiration than might appear. Octavian’s campaign against Sex. Pompeius was very far from successful in its early stages, and not wholly welcome anyway to Pompey’s old friends and supporters back in Rome. There was even a moment before the final victory, after the wreck off Scyllaeum, when Octavian was denied supplies by the Senate.\(^{31}\) Eventually private donors came to his aid. Gallus may have lent his pen to enhance his patron’s appeal to the wavering, just as later Augustan poets would.

The tantalizing Tyria could fit just such an interpretation. “Tyrian” purple may not have been known long at Rome when Gallus was writing. Pliny quotes Cornelius Nepos to the effect that P. Lentulus Spinther was the first to use *dibapha Tyria* for his *praetexta* in 63.\(^{32}\) The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* cites “Tyrius” in the meaning “purple” from Cicero’s *Pro Flacco* (59) and Catullus 61. 165 (before 54). Pliny notes that Romulus’ *trabea* was purple, and the *trabea* is important to Virgil.\(^{33}\) Gallus might have alluded to this, as part of an Octavian / Romulus equation, and this would explain why Horace associates a *reditus* with Romulus.\(^{34}\) Romulus was certainly connected with the Palatine, just like Octavian, who also began his building operations there.\(^{35}\)

There is also the question of Lykoris’ change of name. It is not methodologically sound to be always asking who “Cynthia” or “Delia” (or for that matter “Beatrix” or “Laura”) “really” were,\(^{36}\) but if it is right to identify Lykoris with Volumnia, how is it that Gallus has changed her professional name from the earlier “Cytheris” to “Lykoris,” from Aphrodite to Apollo? No doubt he may, as a poet, have had an interest in Apollo.\(^{37}\) But Octavian had an even bigger one! It is too convenient.

\(^{30}\) *Sat. II. 1.* 83-84: *sed bona [carmina] si quis / iudice condiderit laudatus Caesare:* *Fasti* I. 19-20: *pagina iudicium docti subitura movetur / principiis.*


\(^{32}\) *N.H.* IX. 39. 63.


\(^{34}\) Above, p. 24.

\(^{35}\) Velleius, above, note 23; Livy I. 7. 3, *Palatium primum... muniit* (Romulus).

\(^{36}\) D. O. Ross has said all that is necessary: *op. cit.* (above, note 24), p. 100, note 1.

Our fragment was evidently written by an ambitious soldier-politician, who would rise *ex infima fortuna* to be viceroy of Egypt, and who in real life would be very unlikely to burn his wings on Mark Antony’s old flame (*non fuit opprobrio celebrasse Lycorida Gallo*). Gallus was too much in love with himself to have much time for the love of a woman, and even perhaps eventually for the love of the Muse. In this sense, his subjectivity ultimately negated rather than defined his art. It was useful for him to be able to disarm criticism by casting himself in the comic role of the frustrated lover. But his mercurial temperament thrived on opposites. Lycoris was convenient foil. Against her *nequitia* (more of the *iudex* here!) could be set the glorious promise of the new regime, when *tristia* would become *fata dulcia*.

How dangerous therefore to present Gallus as some sort of bridge into a new “subjective” Roman style of elegy, especially if the unconscious analogy at work is some version of Shelley’s skylark, “That from heaven or near it / Pourest thy full heart / In profuse strains of unpremeditated art.” Even worse would be the uncritical assumption that poets are just “ordinary chaps” who happen to write verses. Fine art can only be the work of genius (Kant). Gallus certainly had genius. What he lacked was commitment.

Gallus was interested—too interested for Aristotle—in *historia*, in both judging and having the judgment of others on his verses. He lavished flattery on the man who could make his career. He trailed his poetic ego (*mihi . . . mea, v. 2; ego, v. 8*) across the stage of Augustan literary and political history, but not because he was fatally enamoured of Lycoris (as Virgil’s theatrical *indigno cum Gallus amore peribat* might lead the unwary to believe). That was what Mann calls “hygiene,” and what ancient literary theory calls *υπόκρισις* and *προσωποία*. Rather, he wanted to make an impression. He did, and when he fell from his giddy eminence, his self-dramatizing suicide was the crowning gesture of his histrionic and too vulnerable talent.

*University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign*

---

58 This need not mean “laughable,” of course. Servius says of *Aeneid* IV “paene comicus stilus est: nec mirum ubi de amore tractatur.” Perhaps Dido, with her intense capacity for identification with theatrical heroines, is Gallus’ greatest contribution to Augustan love-poetry.