CALLIMACHUS BACK IN ROME

Richard F. Thomas

The study of Callimachean elements in Roman poetry has been a real growth industry in the recent years[1]. A number of general reasons, to some degree overlapping, may be seen as accounting for the increase: (1) first, and most obviously, there are the papyrological finds, particularly *POxy*. 2079 and the preface to the *Aetia*; although the preface was edited 65 years ago, its impact on Latin poetry is still being explored[2]; (2) the publication of Pfeiffer's edition in 1949 and 1953 meant that Callimachus was accessible as never before—and the most extensive and original work on Callimachus and Roman poetry is in fact contained in the notes of the first volume. Two other reasons have more to do with changes in the reading and criticism of Roman poetry: (3) in the past two decades Latin studies, albeit somewhat late, have begun to move away from the formalist, unitary preoccupations of New Criticism. The journals are no longer brimming with explications of the structure, imagery, sound-patterns, and affective metrical rhythms of individual poems

---

1 In his recent useful bibliography of Callimachus Luigi Lehnus (*Bibliografia Callimachea 1489-1988*, Genoa 1989, 358-87) lists, under the various sub-entries of the section "Fortuna a Roma" a total (E) of 511 entries, which I have broken down, by chronology somewhat arbitrarily, and by Roman poet: 62 were produced before 1900 (A), 37 between 1900 and the publication of the *Aetia* preface in 1927 (B), 112 between that date and Wimmel's monograph of 1960 (C)—though Pfeiffer's somewhat earlier editions constitute the more productive event—, and fully 300 between 1960 and 1988 (D). As of that date there were 50 entries on "Fortuna a Roma" in general, 29 on Ennius, 137 on Catullus (the winner), 45 on Virgil, 30 on Horace, 19 on Tibullus, 83 on Propertius, and 87 on Ovid, and 31 on the rest. I do not have the impression that the rate of production has decreased since 1988.

	pre-1900 (A)	1900-27 (B)	1927-60 (C)	1960-88 (D)	Total (E)
In general	1	5	11	33	**50**
Ennius:	0	3	7	19	**29**
Catullus:	22	2	45	68	**137**
Virgil:	2	2	7	34	**45**
Horace:	1	4	4	21	**30**
Tibullus:	3	1	3	12	**19**
Propertius:	14	3	8	58	**83**
Ovid:	15	13	22	37	**87**
Others:	4	4	5	18	**31**
OVERALL	**62**	**37**	**112**	**300**	**511**

The general bulk of *APh* in recent decades might suggest that this acceleration is not confined to studies of Roman Callimacheanism, and the increase might at first sight seem to have to do with general increases in the number of publications, but I do not think that can be the whole answer.

2 And Alan Cameron *may* make us rethink current orthodoxies in his forthcoming study of Callimachus.

of Catullus, Horace or Ovid[3]. And more complex, and particularly less self-contained, ways of reading now proliferate; specifically, (4) the phenomenon of intertextuality, of allusion and influence, has become of particular interest to Latinists since the work of Pasquali, and specifically for Callimachus since Clausen's *GRBS* article of 1964. Finally, (5) there has been an improvement in the reputation of much Hellenistic poetry, reflected not only in the edition of Pfeiffer, but also in the editions of other poets by Gow, Gow-Page, Vian, and Parsons and Lloyd-Jones, and those on individual poems of Callimachus, Theocritus and Apollonius. This improvement is also reflected in the current series of workshops. This appreciation has in turn to some extent removed the resistance to seeing such poetry as a fit model for the great poetry of Rome.

But have we overdone it? At times in discussions of Roman poetry the term 'Callimachean' seems to mean little more than 'clever', 'very Callimachean', little more than 'very clever', and in such cases it does not even seem to matter whether the 'cleverness' has any specific connection to Callimachus. Occasionally, moreover, we seem almost to be dealing with critical, rather than authorial, cleverness. This is particularly true with programmatic metaphor-hunting: sometimes spinning is just spinning, a big sea just a big sea, a little boat just a little boat. At the same time, in spite of Wendell Clausen's comments on the matter almost 30 years ago[4], the terms Hellenistic, Alexandrian and Callimachean tend still to be used interchangeably. If we mean some feature is Hellenistic, why do we keep calling it Callimachean? Are we unduly focussing on Callimachus at the expense of other Hellenistic poets? And are we doing so based on an accident of survival? And some critics of Roman poetry feel that even the emphasis on Hellenistic poetry is overdone. There is, in short, still a critical resistance to allowing such 'secondary' literature to be influential, particularly on Virgil. I myself was recently accused of "privileging the Hellenistic and neoteric over the Italian or Ennian tradition"[5]—though I don't think Ennius has much to do with Virgil's *Georgics*.

What of those Hellenistic authors, and proto-Hellenistic authors, who have not survived as extensively as Callimachus? Nita Krevans' paper draws attention to some of the ways Antimachus may have mattered within the Alexandrian milieu[6]. Does Propertius mention Philitas virtually as frequently as he mentions Callimachus chiefly, as Hutchinson claims[7], because both are exemplars for elegy? For instance, Prop. 1.2, with its metaphorical play on Coan silk and the like might suggest a greater programmatic importance. And I have recently suggested that Virgil's old man of Tarentum may likewise

3 It would be worthwhile to study some of the ways in which New Critical concerns forestalled some of the fruitful lines of enquiry in place in the first part of this century, in the works of Leo, Jacoby, Reitzenstein, F. Skutsch, *et al.*

4 W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry", *GRBS* 5, 1964, 181-96.

5 E. Fantham rev. in *CP* 86, 1991, 164.

6 Nita Krevans (this volume), *passim*.

7 G.O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford 1988, 280.

have an ancestor in the poetry of Philitas[8]. What about Eratosthenes, Euphorion and later Parthenius, all of whom are embedded in the Augustan poets. And what of Theocritus and Apollonius? Why, when Virgil can produce a book of poems generically and formally, and in many of its details, based closely on Theocritean pastoral—more so arguably than any Roman poem is based on a poem of Callimachus (the *Coma* is a special exception)—or when Apollonius' epic imposes its stamp so clearly on the *Aeneid* and was translated by a poet such as Varro of Atax, why, when all of this is so, do we never use the adjectives "Theocritean" or "Apollonian" in the same way that we use the word "Callimachean"—that is, as indicating a programmatic attitude, stylistic outlook, or general poetic and scholarly position? For that matter, what about archaic lyric? In D. Gerber's bibliography of Pindar, now somewhat old, there barely exists a "Fortuna a Roma", with the obvious exception of Horace, but it could be claimed that the self-consciousness, the metaphorical language and even the polemical and programmatic aspects of Greek lyric, deserve at least the same attention that has been accorded to Callimachus. Again, have we overdone it?

In spite of the foregoing, my cautious response to this question is a qualified 'no'; that Callimachus does in fact deserve, from a number of aspects, the prominent position accorded him by relatively recent criticism; and this paper will attempt to justify that response. Given the range and scope of the topic I will necessarily at times be rather superficial.

The clearest, most obvious, and most publicized, presence of Callimachus at Rome is in his capacity as a programmatic model, and this will remain so, whatever Alan Cameron's forthcoming book may or may not teach us about the realities of the *Aetia* preface. I will not go into much detail here since the matter is so well-covered, too well covered, some may think. It is really the chief, or sole, subject of Wimmel's 331 pages[9]. The Augustan poets in particular may be represented by the following highly selective group of *recusationes*, preceded by the Callimachean archetype:

"ἔλλετε Βαςκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος· αὖθι δὲ τέχνηι
  κρίνετε,] μὴ ςχοίνωι Περςίδι τὴν ςοφίην·
μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέουςαν ἀοιδὴν
  τίκτεςθαι· βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός."
καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιςτον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
  γούναςιν, Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος·
"...]... ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιςτον
  θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦςαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·
πρὸς δέ ςε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουςιν ἅμαξαι
  τὰ ςτείβειν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμὰ

8 R.F. Thomas, "The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg. Georg. 4, 116-48", *MD* 29, 1992, 35-70.

9 W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 16), Wiesbaden 1960.

δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις."
(Call. *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.17-28)

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
uellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen".
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:
non iniussa cano. (Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3-9)

nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec grauem
Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
nec saeuam Pelopis domum

conamur, tenues grandia, dum pudor
imbellisque lyrae Musa potens uetat
laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
culpa deterere ingeni. (Hor. *Odes* 1.6.5-12)

Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribantur amores,
unde meus ueniat mollis in ora liber.
non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo.
ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit. 4
quod mihi si tantum, Maecenas, fata dedissent, 17
ut possem heroas ducere in arma manus,
non ego Titanas canerem, non Ossan Olympo
impositam, ut caeli Pelion esset iter, 20
nec ueteres Thebas, nec Pergama nomen Homeri,
Xerxis et imperio bina coisse uada,
regnaue prima Remi aut animos Carthaginis altae,
Cimbrorumque minas et bene facta Mari:
bellaque resque tui memorarem Caesaris, et tu 25
Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores.
nam quotiens Mutinam aut ciuilia busta Philippos
aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae ... 28
sed neque Phlegraeos Iouis Enceladique tumultus 39
intonet angusto pectore Callimachus, 40

nec mea conueniunt duro praecordia uersu
Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos. (Prop. 2.1)

arma graui numero uiolentaque bella parabam
edere, materia conueniente modis.
par erat inferior uersus; risisse Cupido
dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem ... (Ov. *Am.* 1.1.1-4)

One could add several further passages, particularly from Propertius and Ovid, but these suffice as representative instances of the *recusatio* in its pure sense of the refusal to engage epic. Each resists a real or fictional impulse, internal, or externally imposed, to write some sort of epic or higher form of poetry. Callimachus is either mentioned, or translated, or at least visible in the adapting poet. Likewise when any of these poets *do* compose epic, they prominently refer to Callimachus and defend themselves through a modification of Callimachean aesthetics, even as they embrace the actual genre. This clearly applies for Ovid at the start of the *Metamorphoses*, a *carmen perpetuum* rendered tolerable by being *deductum*, and for Virgil at the opening of the second half where kings and battles are the theme, but in the context of an allusive reworking of a number of texts in the Callimachean manner. More on allusion later.

The question is what all of this means. If we go simply by these programmatic utterances, who is *not* Callimachean? And what does it precisely mean to produce a Callimachean *recusatio*, other than to point out what is already clear—that one is avoiding epic, or certain types of epic? In the absence of any other quality it becomes simply the 'right way' of beginning a poem, much like an invocation to the Muses, or a priamel. In fact the *recusatio* is structurally and rhetorically precisely a form of priamel: one or more options are rejected, as a precursor to the definition of the preferred option. David Ross has put the matter as follows: "Each generation of Latin poets, from Catullus and the neoterics on through Virgil and Gallus, through (the later) Virgil and Horace, through Ovid and on even through the Silver Poets until Statius, was to create a different image of Callimachus according to the needs of their own verse, an image which often had little resemblance to the original"[10]. Similarly Hutchinson: "The poets fit Callimachus into their own aesthetic language, and use that language to develop their own conception of their poetry, a conception far richer and far more insidious than Callimachus' own conception of his"[11]. If it is true that these poets' perceptions of their place in the tradition change from individual to individual, and from generation to generation, it is also true that allusion to, and

10 D. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry. Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge 1975, 142.
11 Hutchinson (n. 7), 283.

adaptation of, the Callimachean program really becomes a way of talking about one's own changing tradition, and one's own place in that changing tradition[12].

As a case in point we may look at that moment with which Wimmel ends his book, the moment at which Roman Callimacheanism in the view of some scholars, suffers the rejection that it normally imposes on others. That moment comes with the poetry of Persius.

Persius' prologue and his fifth satire, with their rejection of the *Somnium* tradition and their turning away from ornate language, mythological apparatus, and so forth, have been seen as "the most devastating rejection of Callimacheanism in the poetry of the Neronian age"[13]. These parts of Persius' satire chiefly mount an attack on contemporary poetry and morality, and in turn provide a defence of the low, plain words of satire against the excessively periphrastic, arid style of Silver Latin neo-Callimacheanism—such as we also see parodied in the *Apocolycontosis*. Here is Sullivan again on the prologue: "literary allusion (most notable to Horace); the avoidance of worn and commonplace language by deliberate archaisms, vulgarisms, or unexpected qualifiers (*iunctura*, as it were); the avoidance of hackneyed mythical themes and ornament except for satirical comment on them; and, last but not least, a highly inventive and individual style of imagery and metaphor, which is pointed up by his mockery of the traditional poetic devices" (p. 112).

But, in its general polemic as in its specific hostility toward current orthodoxies, I would say that such a program looks precisely like a work of Callimacheanism[14]. This also emerges from the details of his prologue:

nec fonte labra prolui caballino
nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnaso
memini, ut repente sic poeta prodirem.
* * * * *
quis expediuit psittaco suum 'chaere'
picamque docuit nostra uerba conari?
magister artis ingenique largitor 10
uenter, negatas artifex sequi uoces.
quod si dolosi spes refulserit nummi,
coruos poetas et poetridas picas
cantare credas Pegaseium nectar.

(Pers. *prol.* 1-3, 8-14)

12 From a-political point of view, the Callimachean model is also extremely convenient; any pressure to produce epic is countered by the fact that to do so would constitute a breach of poetic principles. The poets pose as types of conscientious objectors.
13 J.P. Sullivan, *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*, Ithaca/London 1985, 92.
14 See here the conclusions of Wimmel (n. 9), 309-19.

When Persius, having rejected Helicon and Pirene promotes as his *magister artis ingenique largitor* not a girlfriend, not Apollo, not Cupid, but the demands of his own *uenter* it seems to me he is simply appropriating the Callimachean metaphor to his own generic uses—the demands of the stomach are what drive the writer of satire. And if, *pace* Cameron, we still see the *Aetia* preface as at least in part directed against a turgid epic orthodoxy, we will easily find a parallel Neronian orthodoxy to motivate Persius' program. Persius claims *ingenium* but he also enlists the Callimachean ideal of *ars* (τέχνη), and that too is in keeping with the expectations of his genre—it has a social function and therefore needs the power of *ingenium*, as well as artistic perfection.

Persius' program viewed this way is no more anti-Callimachean than Propertius' parallel rejection and promotion at 2.1.3-4:

non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo,
ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.

Even closer to Persius, and perhaps even a model, is Ovid towards the beginning of the *Ars Amatoria*:

non ego, Phoebe, datas a te mihi mentiar artes, 25
nec nos aeriae uoce monemur auis,
nec mihi sunt uisae Clio Cliusque sorores
seruanti pecudes uallibus, Ascra, tuis;
usus opus mouet hoc: uati parete perito;
uera canam. coeptis, mater Amoris, ades. 30

(*Ars* 1.25-30)

Usus is what drives the didactic love-poet, as it had Virgil in the *Georgics*. The parallelism is clear: for Propertius, not Calliope and Apollo, but *puella*; for Ovid, not Apollo and the Hesiodic-Callimachean Muses, but *usus*; for Persius, not Parnassus and the Callimachean *Somnium*, but his *uenter*[15].

The situation in Persius is also very much like that at the beginning of *Georgics* 3, where I have argued that Virgil, as he looks towards the *Aeneid*—ostensibly non-Callimachean—and rejects the themes of Hellenistic and specifically Calllimachean poetry, gives as his reason the fact that those themes have become orthodoxies (*omnia iam uulgata*)—words which themselves translate the basis of Callimachus' rejection of the orthodoxy of his own literary milieu—cικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόcια. And the themes

15 A similar process of redefining the 'Callimachean' goes on in the fourth book of Propertius, particularly in 4.1 as the recusational tension is between the new (Callimachean) aetiological subject matter, which replaces the old (Callimachean) amatory themes—although the two will persist side by side, and often in alternation throughout the book; on this see H.E. Pillinger, "Some Callimachean Influences on Propertius, Book 4", *HSPh* 73, 1969, 171-99; cf. 172-4.

Virgil rejects are found in Callimachus[16]. The Roman *recusatio*, then, constitutes the use and adaptation of a metaphor in order to justify a wide variety, even a conflicting variety, of poetic enterprises; it justifies the preferred genre, regardless of the nature of that genre, and without the need for a link to Callimachean genre. If we are to identify the 'Callimachean' in Roman poetry, it seems to me that choice of form and of genre are therefore by definition dead issues—and as the fact of the *Aeneid* shows, that includes epic, which need no longer be unconscionable from a Callimachean viewpoint. We need to move away from programmatics to more fundamental, stylistic features, which will persist across genres and will still be present even where the new genre seems to depart from those tolerated or preferred by Callimachus.

The basic essence of the *recusatio* is its sustained polemical and self-conscious element, and this self-consciousness is a general poetic feature that ties Callimachus and a large number of Roman poets together.

Regardless of the genre, not just in the *Epigrams* and *Iambs* where we would expect it, but also in the *Hymns* and the *Aetia*, there is a much more pervasive self-conscious voice than we find in either Apollonius or Theocritus. Even a poem such as Theocritus 7 the bucolic masquerade has the effect of putting the Theocritean poetic voice at at least one remove from the immediacy that we regularly find in Callimachus. This is of course not novel with Callimachus (lyric and epinician abound in parallels), but the extent to which Callimachus sustains this presence, seems to me to separate him from his extant Hellenistic contemporaries. I think Callimachus appealed to the Roman poets for the same reason he appeals to many of us: as a scholar-poet, while producing his art, he talks about it, and talks about it in relation to its past tradition and contemporary context.

Roman poetry from its very beginnings shows its awareness of its place in its tradition; that is, it is metapoetical to a high degree. This is true not only in the obvious cases (Catullus and the Augustans), but already in archaic Latin—from Livius engaging the text of the *Odyssey*, to Ennius establishing his place in the Greco-Roman epic tradition (he interrupts his narrative to refer to Naevius, translating the Greek φιλόλογος with *dicti studiosus* which he applies to himself while writing annalistic epic—something utterly inconceivable in archaic Greek epic), to Plautus confronting and Romanizing Greek New Comedy. The prologues of Terence, the satires of Lucilius, and the *De poetis* of Volcacius Sedigitus, all of these evince a strong preoccupation with the metapoetical. Hutchinson, in his generally useful section on Hellenistic and Roman poetry claims (n. 7) that a strong Callimachean element resides in the Roman poet's preoccupation with talking about themselves. This is true particularly in their talking about themselves in relation to their tradition—that is, talking about each other.

16 See R.F. Thomas, "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices* and Roman Poetry", *CQ* 33, 1983, 92-101; *Virgil. Georgics 2*, Cambridge 1988, 36-47 *carptim*.

I would like briefly to enumerate, without any real detailed discussion, some of the areas which seem to me to show a debt more or less specifically to Callimachus[17]. I will then proceed with some more detailed discussion of a single aspect of the relationship between Callimachus and Virgil, on whom I will focus partly because of the greater resistance to seeing him as a Callimachean poet throughout his career. It will be assumed that almost *a fortiori* others, such as Propertius and Ovid, function in at least equally Callimachean ways; and there is now good work being done on quintessentially Callimachean works such as the *Fasti*. Hutchinson devoted to the *Aeneid* only one of his 76 pages (n. 7, 328-9) on Roman and Hellenistic poetry, on the following grounds: "The continuous endeavour for extremes of ὕψος, of intensity, elevation, sublimity, leaves little room (say) for play between levels of seriousness". It seems to me mistaken to categorize Virgil and the *Aeneid* simply as sublime, that is to assume that its content, tone, meaning and general essence are simply coterminous with its form, a presumption not peculiar to Hutchinson but implicit in Virgilian criticism from Heinze to Hardie. It partially explains why in the statistics with which I began Virgil loses so roundly to Catullus, Propertius and Ovid. We allow them to be playful, weird, bizarre, but Virgil is 'sublime'[18]. I think there may even have been a 'back-formation' from the *Aeneid* to the *Georgics* which has led to resistance by some to allowing Hellenistic and Callimachean poetry to be as formative of the *Georgics* as it seems to me to be. The result of this presumption, this generic fallacy, is a shutting off of the text, of its possibilities, and of its very richness and complexity[19].

Lapp in his study of tropes and figures in Callimachus[20] acknowledges that many of the features he treats are already in Homer, and the same goes for what follows. We are not dealing with exclusively Callimachean-Virgilian phenomena, but we are dealing with two poets who are demonstrably linked in other ways, and in what follows there is an assumption that Callimachus at least exerts some influence on Virgil. And this will be frequently confirmed in the actual details. Here then are some areas of contact:

Structure: the structural complexities of the *Aetia* are clear in spite of its fragmentary condition, and regardless of what we decide about the two editions[21]: patterns are formed by openings and closings, by the position of Berenice at the opening of 3 and close of 4, by the framing of 3 by two epinicians, and so on. I have argued that Virgil in the *Georgics*

17 Considerations of space force me to be selective and superficial here; nor have I been bibliographically complete in any way. A good start on this subject has been made by Nicholas Horsfall, *Virgilio: l' epopea in alambicco*, Naples 1991, *passim*.

18 Cf. the apologetic mode with which scholars approach the nymph/ship transformation in the *Aeneid*.

19 We might see a similar shutting off occurring in treatment of Callimachus' *Hymns*, in this case resulting not so much from notions of the sublime, but rather because of their ostensible performative nature. The work of Mary Depew (this volume, 57-77) is valuable as an antidote to such straightforward reading.

20 F. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis et Figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965, 13.

21 On the structure of the *Aetia*, see, most recently, Harder (this volume), 99-110.

to some extent imitated these structural patterns[22]. Likewise in the *Hymns*, there are large structural parallels, for instance in 5 and 6, as Hopkinson brings out. Structure is almost an obsession with Roman poetry, from patterns such as that of the parade odes of Horace, and his large architectural organizing of *Odes* 1-3, to the numerological and thematic patterns of the *Monobiblos* of Propertius, to Virgil's complex structures in all three poems. In Hellenistic poetry, structural attention seems, to the extent we can tell, to be a specifically Callimachean interest.

Chiasmus and visual patterns: these are really similar in effect to the preceding, The influence of technopaignia shows itself even in Virgil—if we believe he transmitted Aratus' acrostic. Aspects such as chiasmus are a clear part of the art of Callimachus and of Virgil, and at times there seem to be direct links between the two poets. Albert Henrichs referred to the visual effects of the description of Apollo's golden atributes at *Hymn* 2.32 and 34 and particularly 4.260-3, where four consecutive lines begin with forms of χρυc-; at 3.110-8 Artemis receives a similar description. Wendell Clausen (see n. 4) has noted the tricolon with forms of *aurum/aureus* that Virgil applies to Dido at *Aen.* 4.138-9, a pattern which mirrors stylistically the Callimachean instance, and is appropriate on the thematic level in describing Dido on the point of performing an action emblematic of Artemis (hunting).

We find a similar relationship in what follows:

[a]εἴκατι [b]δαῖτα πένοντο, [a]δυώδεκα δ' [b]οἶνον ἄφυccον· 69
καὶ γὰρ τᾶι [c]Δάματρι cυνωργίcθη [d]Διόνυcοc· 71
τόccα [d]Διώνυcον γὰρ ἅ καὶ [c]Δάματρα χαλέπει. 70
(Call. *h.* 6.69-71)

[a]rara sit an supra morem si [a]densa requires
([b]altera [c]frumentis quoniam fauet, [b]altera [d]Baccho
[a]densa magis [c]Cereri, [a]rarissima quaeque [d]Lyaeo) ... (Verg. *G.* 2.227-9)

[a]Liber et alma [a]Ceres, uestro si munere tellus
[b]Chaoniam pingui [c]glandem [d]mutauit [e]arista,
[c]poculaque inuentis [b]Acheloia [d]miscuit [e]uuis. (Verg. *G.* 1.7-9)

The structural and thematic parallels are clear. To focus on *G.* 1.7-9, the transition from nature to culture, represented by the exchange of water for wine and acorns for grain, is a central theme of the poem; hence the prominence and care of the lines. Close to the beginning of a passage which modifies the rustic prayer of Varro at the beginning of the

22 Thomas (n. 16, 1988), 7.

Res Rusticae, Virgil goes to some efforts to show that there will be other, less generically immediate, models which will inform the prayer—and the poem at large[23].

In any number of other *tropes and figures* we will find a Callimachean presence in Virgil, in *antonomasia* (or *periphrastic denomination*)[24]—of people, places and things[25]—*glossing*, the use of *figura etymologica*, of *neologisms*, of various types of *iteration*. Combinations of such features render a particularly Callimachean effect, for instance at *G.* 3.2 where the phrase *pastor ab Amphryso* combines antonomasia (*ab Amphryso* denotes Apollo's service for Admetus) and glossing (*pastor* = Νόμιοc); and it is to Call. *h.* 2.47-9 that Virgil's line refers. As S. Harrison has noted, there is still no comprehensive study of the style of Virgil[26]. Those studies that exist are now rather old, and any new work will take much greater account of Callimachus. Lapp's monograph on Callimachean tropes and figures provides a starting-point (see n. 20).

Embedded learning of all sorts shows a shared interest in scholarship; with Virgil such elements are perhaps less intrusive and more selective. The intention is often to give an impression rather than to be exhaustive—and also to sustain the impression of the 'sublime'—which will be destroyed by excessive and ostentatious learning. At the same time Virgil's use transforms the genre: where in Callimachus such elements may be simply coterminous with the genre (aretalogy in hymn; aetia in *Aetia*), Virgil embeds more. The *catalogue* is an instance of such embedding. Although Hesiodic and Homeric in origin, and therefore generically at home in epic, catalogues had become separable forms in the treatises of Alexandria, with their own antiquarian interest, separate from any poetic function. Virgil's catalogues, of nymphs (*G.* 4.334-47), of rivers (*G.* 4.363-73), of the cities of Sicily (*A.* 3.692-708); of Latin warriors (*A.* 7.647-817), of Etruscans (*Aen.* 10.166-212), all of these show a deht in spirit, and at times in detail, to the scholarly work of Callimachus. Likewise with *aetiology*, which for Virgil is 'textual' rather than 'real'[27]. Virgil also transforms Callimachean aetiology in other crucial ways: whereas for the Hellenistic poet the topics of the *Aetia* were of local interest, the treatments of Palinurus, and Caieta at each end of *Aeneid* 6, or that of Hercules and Cacus in book 8, become part of a national, Roman, or Italian, aetiology. A specific type of aetiology is *genealogy*, a subject which interested Callimachus (for instance in *Hymn* 2) and Virgil (particularly in the second half of the *Aeneid*)—though, of course, such an interest is not peculiar to them. Genealogy is frequently a part of foundation narrative (*ktisis*), a theme also common to the

23 For more detailed discussion of these passages, and of the textual problem in Callimachus, see R.F. Thomas, "What Virgil read at Callimachus, *Hymn* 6.69-71", *CJ* (forthcoming).
24 So I. de Jong, in an oral comment at the workshop.
25 For some instances, see "Virgil's 'White Bird' and the Alexandrian Reference", *CPh* 83, 1988, 214-7.
26 S. Harrison, *Vergil, Aeneid 10*, Oxford 1991, 285.
27 For the distinction, see Depew (this volume), 59.

two. And Mario Geymonat has now linked the account of the foundation of the Sicilian cities at *Aen.* 3.692-708 directly with Callimachus' parallel account at *Aetia* 2, fr. 43 Pf[28].

The *tone* of Callimachean, and Hellenistic narrative in general, is one of the features that distinguishes it from Homeric narrative. Among others, Hutchinson has noted the playfulness involved with the treatment of children and divinities[29]. In spite of its affinities with the sublime, Virgilian epic likewise admits a degree of domesticity, for instance in scenes involving Jupiter and Venus (*A.* 1.256 *oscula libauit natae*; 10.18 *o pater*). Generally Virgil allows a certain alternation between the high style and what Hutchinson, in characterizing Hellenistic tone, calls the 'weird'—for instance in the description of Ascanius/Cupid on Dido's knee, the treatment of Silvia's stag, or the account of the ship-nymphs.

Metapoetic play with time, directed particularly to contemporary political situations, is another shared feature. Callimachus, at *h.* 4.162ff., has Apollo refer, from the temporal perspective of his prenatal period, to the birth of Ptolemy Philadelphus at Cos; or at 4.171ff. to the Celtic invasion of Greece of 280/79. In these passages we have a model for *A.* 3.278ff., when Aeneas holds Trojan games and sets up an inscription at Actium, clear references through time to Augustus' institution of Actian games at Nicopolis and his restoration of the temple of Apollo at the site of his victory over Antony and Cleopatra. Virgil was to take this sort of metapoetics even further, ranging freely across all of Roman history through the devices of Anchises' prophecy and Aeneas' shield. This sort of play also owes something to the metamythic stance of epinician[30].

Intertextuality and *allusion* are clearly a vital part of Callimachean poetics, both of his own practice, and for instance as the basis for his admiration of others (so on Aratus, alluder to Hesiod, in *Ep.* 27). This is so pervasive as to need no account, but one aspect is worth pointing to—Callimachus frequent allusion across genre bounds. Depew (this volume, 000) talks about hybridization and shows that Callimachus frequently goes outside the genre at hand in his allusion. This is very important for Roman poetry, and for Virgil in particular. Such cross-generic allusion may have the effect of transforming genre. Hybridization is a natural consequence of being 'Callimachean' in the sense we defined earlier, that is in the sense of using the Callimachean *recusatio* and adhering to Callimachean stylistic features while writing in different genres, and following eclecticism in one's intertextuality. This cross-generic intertextuality in turn leads to generic complexity and renovation, and it is one of the reasons why it is hard to talk about genre and Latin poetry. Similarly the generic multiplicity of Callimachus' corpus, and his discussion of this

28 M. Geymonat, "Callimachus at the End of Aeneas' Narration", *HSPh* (forthcoming).
29 Hutchinson (n. 7), 326.
30 On this aspect of Callimachus' treatment of Cyrene, see Calame (this volume), 44-5.

feature in *Ia.* 13, is also inherited by the Roman poets, right from the beginning. This doubtless has something to do with a diminution of the performative and cultic aspects of literature—as it did for Callimachus—but here too some of the Roman poets may be consciously aligning themselves with Callimachus.

I would like to devote the rest of the paper to some aspects of Virgilian *ambiguity and ideology*, where I think we can see a connection to Callimachus, both in general attitude and outlook, and in detail.

Professor Haslam in his oral version drew attention to certain oddities and slippages in the first *Hymn* of Callimachus. Though addressed to Zeus, the thunderer, it is the shortest of the collection, it does not deal with exploits, it is apologetic about its failure to deliver. Nor can the brevity be simply explained on the basis of Callimachean poetics, or even on the grounds that Zeus' functions, *aretai* and iconography are paradoxically less diverse than many of his fellow Olympians. As Haslam noted, the apology "may fool Zeus, but it doesn't fool us, or shouldn't"[31]. This I think is a 'correct' reading of the subliminal level of this poem, a reading that competes with the simply encomiastic one—that is, an ambiguous reading. And it is this ambiguity that I want to consider. Do poets lie?

Callimachus sets himself against the Homeric (*Il.* 15.187ff.) and Pindaric (*O.* 7.54ff.) versions of Zeus' assumption of power in which lots were cast by Zeus and his brothers for the various realms. The Hellenistic poet, stating that only a fool would draw lots for Olympus and Hades, prefers the less rationalizing and less comfortable version in which Zeus wins rather by the deeds of his hands, by might and strength (ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν, | cή τε βίη τό τε κάρτος, 1.65-6). His reasons for this preference hold little water; as Haslam notes "what lottery ever had prizes of equal worth?" And Callimachus draws attention to the issue of truth and fiction with the words ψευδοίμην ἀίοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν (65). In the present context there is a clear irony to this statement in that the logic and truth of the very version to which it is appended may be called into question.

But I would like to look at the utterance of 1.65 in a larger context. McLennan points out that this line is somewhat at variance with the famous statement of scholarly principles enunciated in fr. 612 Pf. ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω ('I sing nothing without evidence')[32]. Whether or not Callimachus deals with truth in the first hymn, his statement is an admission that he is capable of doing otherwise; and to that extent he is of course operating in a good tradition, a tradition which looks to Homer, and particularly to Hesiod, and also to Solon:

31 Haslam (this volume), 116.
32 G.R. McLennan, *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus, Introduction and Commentary*, Roma 1977, 102. N. Hopkinson also points out ("Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*", *CQ* 34, 1984, 144) that in the light of *h.* 1.65, and given that we do not have a context for fr. 612Pf., we should not take the latter as having any universal application.

ἴσκε ψευδέα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα; (*Od.* 19.203)

"ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον
ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι." (Hes. *Th.* 26-8)

πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἀοιδοί (Solon fr. 29 West)

πρέσβυς ἐτητυμίηι μεμελημένος, ἔνθεν ὁ παιδὸς
μῦθος ἐς ἡμετέρην ἔδραμε Καλλιόπην. (*Aet.* 3, fr. 75.76-7Pf)

μῦθος οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων (Call. *h.* 5.56)

Like Odysseus and like the Hesiodic Muses, Callimachus would expect his fictions to escape notice. A. Harder notes Callimachus' play with truth in the *Aetia*, where the Muses are invoked in Books 1-2, other authorities in 3-4; in both cases there are indications of ironic attitudes as to the reliability of authority[33]. The Homeric narrator signposts Odysseus' plausible fictions, which are seen as such by the reader but not by Penelope. The Hesiodic-Callimachean tradition, which Virgil elsewhere embraces, warns that it is capable of such fictions, but produces them without immediate signposts.

Virgil shares in this attitude, which I believe, he develops from Callimachus. Early in *Georgics* 2, at the end of the invocation to Maecenas Virgil states: 45-46 *non hic te carmine ficto / atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo* ('not here shall I detain you with false song, and through obscurities and long exordia'). So Callimachus' '*When* I lie, may I be persuasive', and Virgil's 'I won't lie *here*', seem to me to occupy the same range. And just as, in Haslam's assessment, Callimachus may in fact be dealing in fiction, so, Virgil, precisely in this section of the *Georgics*, in the same breath in which he tells farmers to learn cultivation according to their particular *genus* (35 *proprios generatim discite cultus*) has given us a list of grafts which are in all but one case impossible—fictions with regard to *genus*[34]. No poet will say he is dealing in ambiguity and lies, but Callimachus and Virgil both state, in contexts of dubious veracity that they at least have the potential to do so. Such signposting alerts us to the actual ambiguities that lie in the vicinity.

Ambiguity and lies take on a special potency when they occur in the context of political or ideological situations. Quintilian, who continues the discussion of rhetorical ambiguity that begins in Aristotle and continues in Rome through the Auctor ad Herennium and Cicero, enumerates the conditions under which such ambiguity is permissible (*Inst.* 9.2.65ff.). These include cases where speaking openly is indecent, and when speaking

33 M.A. Harder, "Untrodden Paths: Where do they lead?", *HSPh* 93, 1990, 302-3.
34 See Thomas (n. 16, 1988), *ad loc.*

ambiguously gives greater elegance and novelty. But the first reason is of special interest: *si dicere palam parum tutum est* ('if there is danger in speaking openly').

Let us return to *Hymn* 1, which presupposes, in the view of many scholars, a contemporary political level behind the story of Zeus' forceful (non-lottery) elevation to the realm of heaven. The supposition is that the hymn refers either to the tripartite division of Alexander's kingdom, and to Ptolemy Soter's receiving of Egypt, or more likely to the seizure of power by Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285 joins father in power; 283-2 succeeds him)[35]. If so, then the oddities of the poem, the short shrift it accords Zeus, and the choice of the more violent tradition for his accession are all instances of a poet's need to speak less openly, one of the generative conditions, as Quintilian saw, of ambiguity[36].

Back to Virgil. In our commentaries Mynors and I both talk about the relationship of the *Georgics*' opening prayer to Hellenistic encomium, but neither of us links it specifically to Callimachus' *First Hymn*, as I now think we perhaps need to do. Virgil's situation is different, but emerges from that of Callimachus on the manner of Zeus' ascendancy, and is in a sense a rewriting of that situation: Octavian's future realm is debated by Virgil, and it is one in which he will make the choice, as the verb *uelis* at 1.26 makes clear—'whether you wish to have control of the earth, sea or sky'. Virgil, perhaps in the interests of his larger poetic purposes, has a four-part division rather than the three-part one of the tradition: Octavian will occupy the lands, the sea, the heavens or the underworld. Jupiter is completely absent from this prayer, both from the part addressed to Octavian, and from that which earlier addresses the 12 deities relevant to agriculture—this in spite of the fact that Varro's prayer, on which Virgil's was modelled, started with Jupiter. In a clear sense, then, Virgil has replaced Jupiter with Octavian, and in doing so has foregrounded the contemporary political level that existed only on an allusive level in Callimachus' first hymn. But in both poets we find Zeus/Jupiter associated with the poets' monarch or *princeps*.

Virgil has also, I think, adapted Callimachus' utterance about truth and ambiguity in poetry, not by reproducing, as he was to do later in *Georgics* 2, the actual statement, but by providing an actual instance of ambiguity. In Callimachus the statement that immediately generates the utterance about plausible lying has to do with the undesirability of being allotted Hades from *Hymn* 1: τίς δέ κ' ἐπ' Οὐλύμπωι τε καὶ Ἄϊδι κλῆρον ἐρύσσαι, | ὃς μάλα μὴ νενίηλος; (61-2) ('who but a fool would draw lots for Olympus and Hades?'). Virgil, in rejecting Hades as an option for Octavian, does so from two perspectives (36-7): *quidquid eris (nam te nec sperant Tartara regem, / nec tibi regnandi ueniat tam dira cupido)*. The traditional and primary reading has been 'whatever you become (neither does Tartarus expect you to be its king, nor would you conceive a desire for such a terrible realm)'—*dira* is thus a sort of transferred epithet, going with *cupido* but looking to the *locus* of the rule, Tartarus. But I have suggested another level of meaning

35 See J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, London 1985, 187 and n. 15, with citations.
36 See also Hutchinson (n. 7), 39 for parallel qualifications of the panegyric element in *h.* 4, although he plays them down more than one might.

can also exist, if we read *ueniat* as a jussive, rather than a potential subjunctive, and if we take *dira* simply with *cupido*—'and may you not conceive the terrible desire to be *rex*'[37]. Incidentally, some MSS read both *ne* (for *nec*) and *sperent* for *sperant* in the first line; it looks as if some ancient reader had the prohibition *ne sperent*, which would require taking the secondary level for which I am arguing as the primary one. If Virgil is on one level referring to Republican *regni cupiditas* (and Cicero has it in a letter to Brutus with reference to the motives of Octavian's adoptive father)[38], then I would suggest he is not far from the ambiguity and 'persuasive lying' that Callimachus claims for himself at the parallel moment in *Hymn* 1.

There are other instances of this sort of ambiguity towards Octavian in the *Georgics*, and possibly even in the *Aeneid*, but I would like to look to a larger Virgilian application of the Hesiodic-Callimachean principle that poets may lie and function ambiguously. Both have to do with a focalizing character voice, that of Aeneas himself. D.C. Feeney has claimed[39] that the hero "does not lie when he speaks". While this may be generally true, the two examples I will give suggest that he comes fairly close, certainly in one case and possibly in both. Again a reminder of Virgil's own potential for ambiguity and credible fiction, the lines from *Georgics* 2: *non hic te carmine ficto / atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo*—that is, at times he may choose to do so.

Feeney's study focusses on the response of Aeneas to Dido at 4.333-61, he shows its debt to oratorical usage, its public nature, and so on. This part of the paper is a valuable one, but here I want to look at only one of the details he brings up, Aeneas' use of the words *ne finge* at 338:

> neque ego hanc abscondere furto
> speraui (ne finge) fugam. (*A*. 4.337-8)

Feeney applies the words to Dido's claim that a marriage existed between the two; for Aeneas immediately continues:

> nec coniugis umquam
> praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera ueni. (*A*. 4.338-9)

37 The use of *nec*, where *neu* might be expected, seems to be a mannerism of Virgil's first two works; cf. *Ecl*. 8.88-9 *nec serae meminit decedere nocti, / talis amor teneat, nec sit mihi cura mederi*; 10.16-17 *nostri nec paenitet illas, / nec te paeniteat, diuine poeta*; *G*. 2.253 *a, nimium ne sit mihi fertilis illa, / nec se praeualidam primis ostendat aristis!* The closest parallel I can find in the *Aeneid* comes from a speech of Dido, which would support the thesis that the practice belongs to Virgil when he was '*audax iuuenta*': 4.618-20 *nec, cum se sub leges pacis iniquae / tradiderit, regno aut optata luce fruatur*. Cf. K.-S. II, 1, 194,5; 193,4 Anm. 2—though the treatment there is not entirely satisfactory.

38 Cic. *Ad Brut*. 24.3 *ista uero imbecillitas et desperatio ... Caesarem in cupiditatem regni impulit*.

39 D.C. Feeney, "The Taciturnity of Aeneas", *CQ* 33, 1983, 204-19; cf. 217.

The admonition *ne finge* may be a legitimate rebuke in the case of the marriage, on which Virgil is at best ambiguous, but what about it as a response to Dido's charge of concealment of the departure—her initial complaint against him:

> dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum
> posse nefas tacitusque mea decedere terra? (*A*. 4.305-6)

Are the words *ne finge* a legitimate response to her charge that he planned to conceal his escapes, for after all the parenthesis is embedded in Aeneas' response to that very charge, not to his claim that the marriage ceremony was not officially effected?

In short, I would suggest that Aeneas' *ne finge* is in fact a screen, for as regards the issue of a secretive departure the *ficta* belong not to Dido but to Aeneas. Austin claims "we must remember that [Aeneas] had hoped to find *mollissima fandi tempora;* he never meant to leave her, as she thinks he did, as some sneaking thief might go" (ad 337f.). This sort of spin control is fairly typical of the Augustan reading of the *Aeneid*, but it needs a little testing. We need to look at the twelve lines in which Aeneas, having been visited by Mercury ponders how to carry out the divine commands. Go he must, that is not at issue; what now matters is the manner of his going, over which he does have control, and his subsequent representation of that manner to Dido. Here are the lines, presented in the style of free indirect discourse[40]:

> heu quid agat? quo nunc reginam *ambire* furentem
> audeat adfatu? quae prima *exordia* sumat?
> atque animum nunc huc celerem nunc diuidit illuc
> in partisque rapit uarias perque omnia uersat. 285
> haec alternanti potior sententia uisa est:
> Mnesthea Sergestumque uocat fortemque Serestum,
> classem aptent taciti sociosque ad litora cogant,
> arma parent et quae rebus sit causa nouandis
> *dissimulent*; sese interea, quando optima Dido 290
> nesciat et tantos rumpi non speret amores,
> temptaturum aditus et quae mollissima fandi
> tempora, quis rebus dexter modus.
>
> (*A*. 4.283-94)

Three words immediately impress themselves: *ambire, exordia, dissimulent*, cognates in form or meaning of the members of the tricolon of *Georgics* 2: *ficta, ambages, exorsa*.

40 On this phenomenon, see A. Perutelli, "Registri narrativi e stile indiretto in Virgilio (a proposito di *Aen*. 4.279 sgg.)", *MD* 3, 1979, 69-82; also D. Fowler, "Deviant Focalization in Virgil's *Aeneid*", *PCPhS* n.s. 36, 1990, 42-63; cf. 59, n. 14.

What is happening here is a putting into action by a character, at the level of secondary focalization, of the Hesiodic-Callimachean-Virgilian potential for fiction on the part of the poet. I will not go into the critical struggles to remove deceptive force from the words *ambire* and *exordia*; they are just part of a larger pattern, to which I have already alluded. What, however, of Austin's claim that "we must remember that [Aeneas] had hoped to find *mollissima fandi tempora*; he never meant to leave her, as she thinks he did, as some sneaking thief might go". Aeneas first tells his lieutenants to *dissimulare* their preparations (the precise word Dido will use in her charge—*ne finge* forsooth!), then says that 'he himself in the meantime, since the good Dido is unaware and is not expecting that such a great love-affair will be broken off, will explore the right approach, and the moment for the smoothest speech, and the manner which will favor their interests'. The details of the causal *quando* clauses show that deceit and pretence are precisely what Aeneas intends.

A second instance comes in *Aeneid* 8, where Aeneas persuades Euander to join him in the struggle against Mezentius and the Latins (8.127-51). The argument is simple: Aeneas' Trojans and Euander's Arcadians are related through a common bond to Atlas, the former because Euander comes from Mercury, son of Maia, one of the Atlantides, the latter because Dardanus was born to Electra, likewise a daughter of Atlas. Having given this genealogy, Aeneas rests his case:

> his fretus non legatos neque prima per artem
> temptamenta tui pepigi; me, me ipse meumque
> obieci caput et supplex ad limina ueni. 145
> gens eadem, quae te, crudeli Daunia bello
> insequitur; nos si pellant nihil afore credunt
> quin omnem Hesperiam penitus sua sub iuga mittant,
> et mare quod supra teneant quodque adluit infra. (*A*. 8.143-9)

In these lines he claims not to be making 'crafty approaches' (*non ... per artem / temptamenta*) on Euander, but in the same breath presents himself virtually as a native of Italy in danger of suffering exile at the hands of the Latin aggressors. He had already used this tactic on Pallas at 8.117-8: "*Troiugenas ac tela uides inimica Latinis, / quos illi profugos egere superbo*". Any objective judgement of the reality of the situation, which sees the matter in these terms, must surely find that the reverse obtains: it is the Trojans who appear to be usurpers of Latin territory. These realities belie the claim of Aeneas that he is not acting with craft (*per artem*); that is precisely what he does here.

Along with this distortion there is an even more artful suppression of fact in the genealogy of itself. Someone is missing from it, a fairly important ancestor. Electra and Maia have more in common than their father; each conceived the son in question to Jupiter. Why does Aeneas suppress so famous an ancestor? The omission is particularly notable (and noticeable) in that the first line of the genealogy (8.134) refers to *Il*. 20.215 Δάρδανον αὖ πρῶτον τέκετο νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς ('first Zeus the cloud-gatherer begat

Dardanus')—hence Virgil's *ut Grai perhibent*? And the context of the Homeric line is a genealogical speech also by Aeneas, to Achilles. The reason for the omission has to do, I think, with the realities of the Italian-Trojan conflict in the second half of the *Aeneid*: this conflict is a reenactment of the supplanting of the Saturnian world by that of Jupiter, a supplanting which Aeneas does not wish to recall to Pallas or Euander as he presents himself as an oppressed exile from Latium—*non per artem* forsooth!

Incidentally, the misrepresentations of Aeneas may find their origin in the same Homeric speech dealt with above (*Il*. 20.200-58). After completing his genealogy and thereby establishing his qualifications as a fit opponent for Achilles, the Homeric Aeneas, in striking language, urges that they dispense with haranguing words, and words in general:

> cτρεπτὴ δὲ γλῶcc' ἐcτὶ βροτῶν, πολέεc δ' ἔνι μῦθοι
> παντοῖοι, ἐπέων δὲ πολὺc νομὸc ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα. (*Il*. 20.248-9)

They should not be like quarreling wives, who 'go out into the middle of the street and abuse each other with many words that are true, many that are not' (νεικεῦc' ἀλλήληιcι μέcην ἐc ἄγυιαν ἰοῦcαι | πόλλ' ἐτεά τε καὶ οὐκί). In other words, the Virgilian Aeneas, for strategic reasons, puts into action the linguistic slippages adverted to by his Homeric original, in a passage from which Virgil was in other ways clearly borrowing. The potential for Aeneas' deceptive behaviour is already there in the Homeric text, where we are expected to take ourselves for confirmation. But it is Callimachus, I suspect, who showed the way (as he did in many other ways), in theory and in practice, for the potent exploitation of the gap between truth and plausible fiction, who showed in short how to read, struggle with, and revitalize the tradition he was to share with the poets of Rome. Homer's Aeneas may be seen as already putting into action the Hesiodic-Callimachean program that poets claim for themselves. You *do* need your Homer to read the *Aeneid*, since Virgil constantly expects you to explore the original context, and to observe its new life in his own poem. But you also frequently need your Callimachus, who functions, as here, as a true ὑποφήτηc of the archetype, in short who shows how to read and how to write.

There are, then, many ways in which the *Aeneid* does belong to the sublime, but we might end by saying that poets like Virgil know how to be sublime, but also know how to say many Callimachean things which look like the sublime.

HELLENISTICA GRONINGANA

PROCEEDINGS OF THE

GRONINGEN WORKSHOPS ON HELLENISTIC POETRY

CALLIMACHUS

EDITORS

M. A. HARDER

R. F. REGTUIT

G. C. WAKKER

CALLIMACHUS

EDITED BY

M. A. HARDER

R. F. REGTUIT

G. C. WAKKER

Egbert Forsten Groningen 1993