PAROLE RUBATE

RIVISTA INTERNAZIONALE
DI STUDI SULLA CITAZIONE

PURLOINED LETTERS

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF QUOTATION STUDIES

Rivista semestrale online / *Biannual online journal*

http://www.parolerubate.unipr.it

Fascicolo n. 6 / Issue no. 6

Dicembre 2012 / December 2012

INDEX / CONTENTS

MARIAPIA PIETROPAOLO

ECHOES OF HYLAS.
THE POETICS OF ALLUSION IN PROPERTIUS

In the wake of John Hollander's influential book on the phenomenon of echoes in post-Renaissance literature, classical scholars have identified echoes in and allusions to the subtexts and contexts of the elegiac genre, and continue to elucidate the theoretical stance that the elegists assumed with respect to both their contemporaries and the Greek and Roman literary traditions.[1] The acoustic phenomena implicit in the context of literary echoes were expressed in various myths, the oldest of which was the myth of Hylas, discussed by Hollander in the version told in the sixth *Bucolic* of

---

[1] See J. Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1981, *passim*; T. M. Greene, *The Light in Troy*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1982, pp.16-19. There has also been renewed interest in G. Pasquali, *Arte allusiva*, in Id., *Stravaganze quarte e supreme,* Venezia, Neri Pozza, 1951. See R. A. Smith, *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1997, pp. 8-10; R. Thomas, *Virgil's 'Georgics' and the Art of Reference,* in "Harvard Studies in Classical Philology," 90, 1986, p. 171; S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 20, p.102; L. Edmunds, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001, p. XII, p. 43.

Vergil.[2] Prior to Ovid's account of the myth of Echo and Narcissus in the *Metamorphoses*, the myth of Hylas is the earliest to foreground explicitly the idea of the repetition of voices, suggesting the possibility of using such resonance as an allegorical basis for a poetics of allusion.[3]

1. *The Hylan Paradigm*

The literary genealogy of the myth of Hylas up to and including the first book of Propertian *Elegies* conditions us to appreciate a poetic world constituted by the interplay of echoes and allusions. In this world the mythical past resonates in the present of the elegiac literary construct, in texts that consist largely of intertextual relations and intratextual repetition.[4] By the time Propertius wrote his *Elegies*, the myth of Hylas was a common motif in epic and other hexameter poetry. It appears in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* (1, 1172-1357),[5] Theocritus' *Idyll*, 13,

---

[2] See J. Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*, cit., p. 13.

[3] Although Hylas is mentioned in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* (3, 110), it should be noted that he is conspicuously absent from the *Metamorphoses*, where there is instead the story of Narcissus combined with that of the nymph Echo (*Metamorphoses*, 3, 339-510). Because of the parallels that can be drawn from the characterization of the boy protagonists, the nymphs, the pools, and the presence of echoes and Echo, we can consider Narcissus a type of Hylas.

[4] Intratextuality, as Alison Sharrock proposes, assumes that the meaning of a work of poetry emerges not only from a reading of the whole of its text and from the interpretation of its constituent parts, but also from the echoic relationships between parts, and between parts and whole. Such relationships are marked by authorial control and self-display, and, I would argue, ultimately reveal the poet's programmatic stance while actively involving his readers in the appreciation and admiration of the self-citational dynamics of his poetics. See A. Sharrock, *Intratextuality: Texts, Parts, and (W)holes in Theory*, in *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations,* Editors A. Sharrock – H. Morales, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 6.

[5] Varro Atacinus also produced an account of the Argonautic expedition, the *Argonautae*, of which only a few fragments survive. None of these fragments, however, mention Hylas. See A. S. Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 171-176.

Nicander's *Heteroeoumena* (*apud* Antoninus Liberalis *Metamorphoseon Synagoge*, 26) and Vergil's *Bucolic*, 6. There are also Hellenistic epigrams that feature a protagonist who resembles Hylas.[6] These elaborations of the Hylas myth all anticipate thematic features central to elegy and foreground the fundamental characteristic of literary echoes, which, as we shall see, is to confer on poetry a conspicuously self-referential quality. Not only do the narratives themselves echo each other, but they also frequently showcase the echoing mechanism at the core of allusive poetic practice, even as the echoing figure of Hylas moves out of Greek epic into Roman elegy. So common a topos of allusivity did the myth become that in *Georgics*, 3, 6 Vergil asks *cui non dictus Hylas puer?*[7]

In poem 1, 20 Propertius pays great attention to the myth, bringing it into the genre of elegy as an exemplum, both erotic and metapoetic, and offering evidence that his penchant for echoes and allusions is essentially the result of what we can call a Hylan poetics of elegy. Casting himself as the *praeceptor amoris* for Gallus, the Propertian poet-lover uses the story of Hylas as a vehicle for imparting instruction in love. The pivotal episode of the story occurs when Hylas, squire and lover of Hercules – here cast as an elegiac lover rather than an epic hero – is suddenly snatched by a nymph while drawing water from a spring and is dragged below, leaving Hercules to weep for his loss. Propertius calls attention to the elegiac aspects of the

---

[6] For other writers associated with Hylas' name, including Kinaithon, Hellanicus, Dionysius Periegetes, [Hyginus], and *P. Oxy* 3723 which also names Hylas, see R. Hunter, *Theocritus: A Selection,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 266-267; F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius the Augustan Elegist*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 239. In addition, despite the lack of direct evidence, "Parthenius' not very extensive fragments and testimonia contain two works in which the Hylas myth could appropriately have featured: he wrote a *Heracles* [...] and he also composed a *Metamorphoses*" (cf. F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius the Augustan Elegist*, cit., pp. 237-238).

[7] All citations of Vergil are from *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1969.

story through his emphasis on the beauty of Hylas, conventional of the elegiac beloved;[8] the solitude of the spring, a conventional setting of the elegiac love story;[9] and the pining of Hercules, conventional of the elegiac lover.[10] In a reprise of the myth of Narcissus in 1, 20, Propertius pairs Hylas with Gallus, the founder of the Roman elegiac tradition,[11] and uses both as devices for authorial self-reflection.

The popularity of the Hylas myth and the echoic relations that it foregrounds also make it very appealing on the intertextual plane, enabling the poet to link his poetry to a tradition by making it resonate within his work. The identification of intratextual and intertextual echoing reveals a form that is simultaneously fragmented and united, displaying both the origin of the constituent parts and the integrity of the new wholeness in which they are embedded. As the story of a boy who survives as multiple echoes of his name, the myth of Hylas exemplifies a poetics of selective appropriation in which inherited literary material is transformed into textual echoes and thematic allusions. The myth of Hylas is an appropriate one for this paradigmatic role on both the intratextual and intertextual levels. Hylas' absorption into the pool while lingering upon his own image, and his later existence as acoustic fragments of himself in multiple contexts, constitute an effective trope for the elegist's orientation of his gaze upon himself and for his practice of redeploying fragments of his poetry in other areas of the same work.

---

[8] Cf. e.g. Propertius, 1, 2; 1, 4; 1, 14; 2, 18b; 2, 22; Tibullus, 1, 1; 1, 5; Ovid, *Amores*, 1, 5; 1, 10; 1, 14; 2, 4; 2, 10; 3, 3.

[9] We can see this same setting especially in Propertius, 1, 18.

[10] Cf. e. g. Propertius, 1, 12; 2, 5; 2, 19; 2, 29; 3, 16; Tibullus, 1, 2; 1, 5; 1, 8; Ovid, *Amores*, 1, 2; 1, 4; 1, 6; 1, 9.

[11] See J. Booth – G. Lee, *Catullus to Ovid: Reading Latin Love Elegy*, Bristol, Bristol Classical Press, 1999, p. XXVII; O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975, *passim*.

The element of conscious self-display as an aspect of the poetics of allusion entered the discussion of Augustan literature with Gianpiero Rosati's 1983 analysis of the Ovidian myth of Narcissus and Echo.[12] The story of Hylas, which precedes the Ovidian account of Narcissus and may be interpreted as its archetype, especially in the elaborate elegiac version found in Propertius 1, 20, has yet to benefit from this discussion. Propertius retains the basic contours of the Hellenistic myth but uses them in a way that invites a metapoetic reading. The Argo reaches the Mysian cliffs (*Argo / […] Mysorum scopulis applicuisse ratem*) (1, 20, 17-20), where Hylas is sent off into the woods to fetch fresh water, *raram sepositi quaerere fontis aquam* (1, 20, 24), never to return.[13] This pentameter is a mannered line that illustrates a basic principle of Callimachean poetics: the echo of –*am* that links the first and last words (*raram* [...] *aquam*) of the line reflects the echoic mode of composition illustrated by the structure of the poem as a whole,[14] the last line of which ends with the word *amore,* echoing the final word of the first line, *amores.* Significantly, moreover, elegy 1, 20 starts with a reference to Gallus and ends with one to Hylas. Propertius both relates his Hylan poetics to the Gallan tradition and suggests that in elegy the Hylan mode is an echoic mode of composition. The conceptual equivalence of Hylas and echoic phenomena was already found in the

---

[12] See G. Rosati, *Narciso e Pigmalione*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1983, *passim.*

[13] Textual citations are from *Sexti Properti Elegiarum Libri IV*, Edidit P. Fedeli, Stuttgart, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1985.

[14] See Callimachus epigram 28, 5-6, where Callimachus manifests his interest in recherché echo as refined word play, the repetition of syllables and sounds in single syllables: Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλός καλός – ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν / τοῦτο σαφῶς, Ἠχώ φησί τις· 'ἄλλος ἔχει.' The repeated καλός καλός (already in itself an echo with prosodic variation) is echoed by the phrase 'ἄλλος ἔχει', which orally enacts the circulation of the beloved.

Hellenistic tradition, as exemplified by Nicander, whose Hylas was turned into an echo by the nymphs.[15]

On the intratextual plane, we can see Propertius consciously introducing the idea of an echo as a compositional device when he refers to the nymphs responsible for Hylas' abduction, calling them first *Adryasin* (1, 20, 12), then *Hamadryasin* (1, 20, 32) and, later still, *Dryades* (1, 20, 45). When they first appear in the text, the nymphs are inflamed by love. It is therefore appropriate that their name should be coupled with *amor* in the phrase *amor Adryasin* (*non minor Ausoniis est amor Adryasin*) (1, 20, 12), and that a later echo of their name should also include an echo of their love. The name *Hamadryasin* both subsumes and echoes *amor Adryasin*, while these two words retroactively acquire a layer of meaning when the sound of *amor* is partly heard in *Hamadryasin*. The self-citation suggests phonologically that the love that motivates the nymphs is the irradiating centre of the myth of Hylas. Since their names echo each other in the same poem, and, as we shall see, will all be echoed as *Hamadryadas* in the concluding poem of Book Two (2, 34, 76), Propertius uses the nymphs to allude to Hylas' transformation into an echo: they foreshadow it in this poem while echoing it from the preceding literary tradition.

Hylas' body yields easily to the nymphs, producing a slight sound: *prolapsum leviter facili traxere liquore: / tum sonitum rapto corpore fecit Hylas* (1, 20, 47-48). His disappearance is expressed in a pentameter that begins with a repeated *tum*-sound (*tum sonitum*) and that leads into the

---

[15] νύμφαι δὲ δείσασαι τὸν Ἡρακλέα, μὴ αὐτὸν εὕροι κρυπτόμενον παρ' αὐταῖς, μετέβαλον τὸν Ὕλαν καὶ ἐποίησαν ἠχὼ καὶ πρὸς τὴν βοὴν πολλάκις ἀντεφώνησεν Ἡρακλεῖ (Nicander, *Heteroeoumena*, *apud* Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoseon Synagoge,* 26, 4). Cf. M. Papathomopoulos, *Antoninus Liberalis: Les Métamorphoses*, Paris, Budé, 1968, p. 45. The metamorphosis thus serves to fix Hylas' name as the very figure of acoustic self-reflection. It may be Heracles who first calls out the name Hylas, but here, transformed into an echo, it is Hylas who gives back his own name.

description of what we could call a sonorous aftermath, in which Hercules is left to iterate his answers to Hylas' last sound, only to have the breezes echo back to him Hylas' name: *cui procul Alcides iterat responsa; sed illi / nomen ab extremis montibus aura refert* (1, 20, 49-50). The repetition of the syllable '*re*' in *responsa* and *refert* suggests the meaning conveyed by the prefix *re-* in compound words, where it generally signifies repetition and response.[16] Hylas both initiates the echoes and echoes them back. Also noteworthy is the fact that Hylas' name in the Greek accusative (*Hylan*, 1, 20, 52) closes the poem, subtly echoing the Greek and Vergilian Hylases who preceded, for in *Bucolic*, 6 Hylas also appears in the Greek accusative *Hylan* (6, 42).

David Petrain has convincingly argued that in 1, 20 Propertius engages in an etymological wordplay to establish an equivalence between Hylas and ὕλη / *silva*, understood not only as "wood", but also as poetic subject matter, "the unshaped source material that one fashions into a finished composition."[17] Petrain's reading suggests the interpretation of the Hylas myth as poetic material *par excellence* and invites a reading of poem 1, 20 as programmatic for Propertian elegy. The equivalence of ὕλη and *silva* with literary *materia* corresponds to Kristeva's identification of writing as a "lecture du corpus littéraire antérieur, le texte comme absorption de et réplique à un autre texte".[18] In this statement the ideas of absorption and reply refer to the work of echoes and allusion that inform the text, linking it to the canon and enabling it to respond to convention and

---

[16] See *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. *re-*.

[17] Cf. D. Petrain, *'Hylas' and 'Sylva': Etymological Wordplay in Propertius 1, 20*, in "Harvard Studies in Classical Philology," 100, 2000, p. 412.

[18] Cf. J. Kristeva, *Le mot, le dialogue et le roman,* in Id., *Σημειωτική: Recherches pour une sémanalyse,* Paris, Seuil, 1969, p.149. This statement represents Kristeva's concise formulation of Bakhtin's concept of dialogism in narrative discourse. The dialogical conception of narrative corresponds closely to the content and successive treatments of the Hylas story.

tradition. As Kristeva observes, the text becomes "un dialogue de plusieurs écritures".[19] Two fundamental implications here are, first, that the semantic principle that generates the alluding text is necessarily that of meaning-as-intention, and, second, that the aesthetic value of allusive poetry presupposes the text's ability to orient the consciousness of the reader towards other texts from within itself. At the same time, moreover, allusive poetry anchors the consciousness of the reader to the phenomenon of self-reference that is implicit in the idea of displayed authorial intention.

On numerous occasions Propertius engages in echoic wordplay that recovers the plurality of echoes and allusions in 1, 20 throughout Book Two. Significant instances of echoic composition are strategically located at the beginning and end of the book, as if to call attention to the citational and allusive dimensions of its internal structure. Propertius opens his second book with references to various poems in his first book, including poem 1, 20, and with echoes of and allusions to literary history. His allusions function primarily as an apparatus for his self-fashioning in relation to other poets and for his affirmation of the significance of his conception of poetry. The relevance of the myth of Hylas to Propertius' second book is chiefly of a perspectival and methodological nature. It offers us a paradigm for the aesthetic appreciation of figures of repetition and for the conception of intra- and intertextuality as deliberate echoic structures. It functions as a hermeneutical matrix through which the reader may discern the textual strategies Propertius employs to give his poetry a metapoetic dimension and to characterize his poetics in relation to the literary tradition. When he echoes the tradition, he does so only to show that he belongs to it as its latest and best representative. The myth of Hylas is itself present in Book Two only in dismembered linguistic forms. Hylas

---

[19] Cf. *ibidem*, cit., p.144.

is ὕλη, or raw (poetic) material subject to the poet's repeated transformations,[20] in which the original sources can be discerned, though the final product may have a deceptively different appearance. This is how in Book Two we can hear echoes of 1, 20 and of the Hylan tradition that informs it.

2. *Hylan Echoes*

A characteristic feature of Propertian elegy is that it manifests the poet's adherence to Callimachean principles. In the second half of 2, 1, various allusions to 1, 20 and to the earlier Hylas tradition confirm Propertius' program by displaying an intimate connection with the aesthetic precepts of Callimacheanism. For example, there is an allusion to the Argonautic context of the Hylas myth in the line in which Propertius narrates Medea's rejuvination of Aeson: *Colchis Iolciacis urat aëna focis* (2, 1, 54). Here Medea is identified not by her name, but by the toponym of Colchis, the place to which Hylas was sailing on the Argo. In 1, 20, Propertius hints at Colchis with *Phasidos* (1, 20, 18) in a display of Callimachean geographical *doctrina*, since Phasis was the river of Colchis. The words in the line that surround the heated cauldron resonate with a multiplicity of echoes: the last syllable of all three words has the same sound (*-is*) and, because of this, functions as a continuous internal rhyme. On the other hand, the first part of that syllable, the *c(h)i-* sound, is repeated twice in the same word *Iolciacis*. The sound *Colch-* of *Colchis* is

---

[20] See D. Petrain, *'Hylas' and 'Sylva': Etymological Wordplay in Propertius 1, 20*, cit., *passim.*

reduced to *-olc-* in *Iolciacis* and finally to *-oc-* in *focis,* illustrating the idea of the fading echo with which Hylas is associated (*Bucolic*, 6, 44).[21]

Some of the echoes of 1, 20 in 2, 1 occur in words that not only refer to the myth of Hylas but also combine it suggestively with other stories. For example, in line 64, Telephus, son of Hercules, is described as a *Mysus* [...] *iuvenis* (*Mysus et Haemonia iuvenis qua cuspide vulnus / senserat,* 2, 1, 64-65). The phrase may remind us of Hylas, who was captured by nymphs in Mysia (*Mysorum scopulis*) (1, 20, 20). The distorted conflation of Hylas with Telephus invites reflection on the Danaids as water nymphs a few lines later (*dolia virgineis idem ille repleverit urnis, / ne tenera assidua colla graventur aqua*) (2, 1, 67-68). Their *tenera* [...] *colla* (2, 1, 68) remind us of Hylas' *tenero* [...] *ungui* (*quae modo decerpens tenero pueriliter ungui* (1, 20, 39), while their association with water and wells echoes the nymphs who pull Hylas into the water. At the same time, the Danaids are like Hylas because they too are unable to fill their urns with water. In all the versions of the myth, Hylas is pulled in just as he reaches for the water, and so he never returns with water for the Argonauts.

Echoes of 1, 20 with an analogous melding of textual sources also occur, significantly, in the last poem of Book Two, in which Propertius uses a sophisticated echoic play to make explicit the link between the Callimachean basis of his poetics and the Hylas tradition. In the context of an encomium of Vergil, Propertius says *laudatur facilis inter Hamadryadas* (2, 34, 76). In this line we hear intertextual echoes of Vergil's *faciles*

---

[21] By condensing the whole of the narrative into two lines (*his adiungit Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum / clamassent, ut litus Hyla, Hyla, omne sonaret*) (6, 43-44), and making the repetition of Hylas' name their focus, Vergil turns Hylas' acoustic substance into a fading echo. Through Greek-style hiatus with correption, the second *Hyla* scans differently from the first, as a pyrrhic, producing an onomatopoeic effect. See R. Coleman, *Vergil: Eclogues,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977, p. 120; J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 53-55.

nymphae (*Bucolic*, 3, 9), a phrase recalled thematically by the fact that the Hamadryads are nymphs and acoustically by the recurrence of the adjective *facilis.* We can also hear an echo of *Bucolic*, 10, in which Vergil specifically mentions the Hamadryads: *iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis / ipsa placent* (*Bucolic*, 10, 62-63).[22] The allusion to *Bucolic*, 10, Vergil's emphatically Gallan *Bucolic*, suggests that Propertian elegy "rewrites pastoral"[23] just as Vergilian pastoral may have rewritten Gallan elegy. However, in the same line of 2, 34 we also hear intratextual echoes of 1, 20, in which Propertius explicitly mentions the Hamadryads three times, using three different versions of their name that echo each other: *Adryasin* (1, 20, 12), *Hamadryasin* (1, 20, 32), and *Dryades* (1, 20, 45).[24] Moreover, Propertius uses the adjective *facilis* to describe the water into which the nymphs pull Hylas (*facili* [...] *liquore*) (1, 20, 47), whereas in 2, 34 he melds the water and the Hamadryads into a single image: *laudatur facilis inter Hamadryadas* (2, 34, 76). Kennedy has argued that the Hamadryads may be regarded as Gallan muses, or muses of amatory elegy.[25] Propertius' blending of the two images confirms for his readers the Gallan nature of his Hylan poetics of elegy. That is to say, his poetry engages with the literary tradition by means of echoes and allusions from within the core of elegy.

---

[22] While we do not find *Hamadryadae* anywhere else in the *Bucolics*, we do find *Dryadasque puellas* (*Bucolic*, 5, 59), echoed in Propertius, 1, 20, 45: *Dryades* […] *puellae.*

[23] Cf. R. Thomas, *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1999, p. 266.

[24] In the Propertian corpus we find only a single occurrence of only one of these variations: *hoc et Hamadryadum spectavit turba sororum* (2, 32, 37).

[25] See D. Kennedy, *Gallus and the 'Culex,'* in "Classical Quarterly" 32, 1982, p. 378-380. With reference to *Bucolic*, 10 Kennedy argues that, since Gallus carves his *amores* on trees (10, 53-54), and since trees share the fate of the Hamadryads that inhabit them, the latter are indissolubly linked with his poems. See also O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome,* cit., p. 95; F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius the Augustan Elegist,* cit., p. 223.

Through the mediation of 1, 20 in 2, 34, 76 we can also hear an echo of the oak nymphs of Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*: ἦ ῥ' ἐτεὸν ἐγένοντο τότε δρύες ἡνίκα Νύμφαι; / 'Νύμφαι μέν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρύας ὄμβρος ἀέξει, / Νύμφαι δ' αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυσὶ μηκέτι φύλλα' (83-85).[26] Though Callimachus does not use the word Hamadryads, he does use the words δρύες […] Νύμφαι in a triple anaphora which Propertius echoes in the three times he names his nymphs.[27] The sequence δρύ- recurs in all three instances, suggesting a strong parallelism between Callimachus' poetic practice and his own.[28] The allusion to the *Hymn to Delos* is also significant because of the island's relationship to Apollo Cynthius, who is explicitly named in 2, 34, 80: *Cynthius impositis temperat articulis*. We can conclude, therefore, that Propertius presents the Hylan aspect of his poetry in Book Two as being not only of a Gallan but also of a Callimachean nature. The fact that the intertextual echoes of previous Hamadrayads are recalled intratextually through Propertius' own Hylas poem confirms that Propertius has given himself a conspicuous position in this literary tradition: his first book is already in the canon.

This final statement of loyalty to his Callimachean ideals places a seal of authentication on the dominant character of Propertius' poetry. His Hylan poetics of echo and allusion is entirely suitable to his project, since it allows Propertius to build into his verse references to various literary figures, both canonical and contemporary. The hermeneutical relationship

---

[26] Citations of Callimachus are from *Callimachus*, Edidit R. Pfeiffer, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 3 vols., 1949-1953.

[27] As the name of the oak trees, the word δρύς occurs also at Callimachus, *Epigram* 22, 3: οὐκέτι Δικταίῃσιν ὑπὸ δρυσίν.

[28] Propertius also makes explicit his connection with Callimachus and Callimachean poetics by naming Callimachus several times in his *Elegies*: 2, 1, 40; 2, 34, 32; 3, 1, 1; 3, 9, 43; 4, 1, 64. Of these citations of Callimachus' name, 3, 1, 1 is especially significant because it occurs in an emphatic and programmatic position – as the first word of a book – and because it is cast as an apostrophe to the shade of Callimachus, *Callimachi manes*.

that he creates between his work and the literary tradition serves to emphasize that, for a given theme, the texts from the past survive as fragmented echoes in Propertius' poetry in the present, which appropriates them. The incorporation of such echoes of texts into a new work represents a dialogue in which Propertius cites earlier poets in the attempt to define his poetics against theirs and to assert the value of his poetry. Propertius engages in dialogue with and about other authors, shows what he has in common with them and, at the same time, indicates what separates him from them. Throughout the process he affirms his unique contributions as a poet and the merits of his elegies, for which he claims a place of distinction in literary history.