

THE LYRIC *AENEID*:  
A FAT SACRIFICE TO A SLENDER MUSE

By

Laura E. Mawhinney

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2005

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank foremost the professors of my committee, Dr. Timothy Johnson, Dr. Gareth Schmeling, and Dr. Jennifer Rea, for guiding and advising me throughout my research and graduate studies. I am grateful to you Big Tim for suppressing your natural inclinations, and Dr. S. for not. Ms. Druscilla Gurahoo deserves my utmost gratitude, without whom I would have been lost (and quite hungry). I would like to thank my parents and my brothers and sisters whose support and encouragement kept me good these past years. Finally, to all my friends and fellow students who didn't.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 THE <i>POETOMACHIA</i> : HELLENISTIC POETRY AND THE CALLIMACHEAN AESTHETIC.....	4
3 <i>POETAE DOCTI</i> : THE CALLIMACHEAN AESTHETIC IN ROMAN LYRIC .....	20
4 THE “FAT LITTLE” VERGIL.....	38
5 THE “LITTLE FAT” VERGIL.....	48
6 CONCLUSION .....	64
WORKS CITED.....	66
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	72

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in  
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

THE LYRIC *AENEID*:  
A FAT SACRIFICE TO A SLENDER MUSE

By

Laura E. Mawhinney

May 2005

Chair: Dr. Timothy S. Johnson  
Major Department: Classics

Vergil's *Aeneid* is a lyrical epic. Aeneas' journey from Troy to Rome resounds with the epic tradition of heroes and wars, gods and men. Vergil creates his epic from deep within the context of the Homeric canon to validate and reinforce the historical and mythological ideals of his contemporary Romans. Vergil engages his contemporary audience with a communal and personal voice not heard in the Homeric epics: *canto*.

The following chapters will trace specific literary influences at work from Homer to Vergil which allowed Vergil's communal, lyrical voice to merge with his impersonal, epic voice. Like Vergil, the first chapter will start with Homer and will also introduce the emergence of the Callimachean aesthetic of "fatness" and "thinness." The second chapter will examine the reception and interpretation of Callimacheanism in Roman lyric. The remaining chapters first discuss Vergil's adaptation of the Homeric voice, and then explore how Vergil blends Hellenistic and Augustan poetic theory to let his own Muse soar.

CHAPTER 1  
INTRODUCTION

ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅτι πάχιστον  
θρέψαι, τῆ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην.<sup>1</sup>

“Singer, feed your sacrifice to be as fat as possible,  
But keep your Muse slender.”

Vergil never dies. His *Aeneid* invigorates the Latin epic genre and encourages Ovid, Statius, and Lucan after him to pick up the epic pen. Vergil becomes a guide through purgatory in Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, achieves an almost prophetic status in the middle ages, and even peeks into the recent film *Troy* in a somewhat comical Excalibur scene between Hector and Vergil’s hero Aeneas. In his own time, Vergil innovatively recasts the Homeric epics and canonizes the history and tradition of his own people.

Perellius Faustus would have us believe that Vergil plagiarizes Homer and steals his epics.<sup>2</sup> But imitation of past tradition, in fact, was essential to classical writers who used previous models to lay the foundation for and validate their own works.<sup>3</sup> Most ancient and modern writers and scholars are more receptive to Vergil’s imitation. Bowra, Clausen, and Pöschl,<sup>4</sup> for example, examine Vergil’s written adaptation of the oral tradition (*imitatio*) and consider Vergil’s literary transformation of Homer’s oral

---

<sup>1</sup> Call. *Aet.* 1.23-24 Pf.

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately Faustus’ catalogue of Vergilian “thefts,” *Furta*, do not survive; cf. Clausen (1966) 75.

<sup>3</sup> Williams (1968) 250; Clausen (1966) 75; cf. Conte (1986) and Williams (1983).

<sup>4</sup> Bowra (1966); Clausen (1966), Pöschl (1962) 1-32.

songs (*aemulatio*). Vergil re-imagines the Homeric heroes in his own Aeneas and creates a more personal hero than Odysseus and Achilles as Parry and Pöschl argue.<sup>5</sup>

Although scholars read Vergil's Aeneas as a more personal hero, very little is said about Vergil's own personalization of the epic voice. Heinze, Otis, and Segal give brief attention to moments when Vergil asserts his own voice behind the words and actions of his characters.<sup>6</sup> Yet the influence of these few has been hardly noticed, because the strong association between the epic genre and the absence of a personal voice, which Homer standardized in his impersonal invocations of the Muses and which Aristotle emphasized in his *Poetics*, seems to advise against searching Vergil's *Aeneid* too closely for the consciousness of the singer.

Shifts in community, philosophy, and literacy had made the imitation of Homer—and thus the epic genre—a rocky course, if not altogether unmanageable. Callimachus in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B. C. engaged in a polemic against epic which carried into Vergil's own time. The writers in Vergil's literary circle adhered to Callimachean aesthetics in their poetic theory and practice and composed in the “lesser” genres which encapsulated *brevitas*, the personal voice, and self-referentiality. In step with his contemporaries, Vergil announces his allegiance to the Callimachean aesthetic in the *recusatio* of *Eclogue* 6 (1-8). He will not write in the “greater” (Homeric) genre of kings and heroes and he instead turns to Hesiod, Nicander, and Theocritus for inspiration.<sup>7</sup> Vergil's poetic art in the “lesser” genres firmly establishes him as a leading voice of the Maecenas circle. Then after he has become a prominent writer in the “lesser” genres,

---

<sup>5</sup> Parry (1966); Pöschl (1962).

<sup>6</sup> Heinze (1993) 202, 207-208; Otis (1963) 51; Segal (1974) 37.

<sup>7</sup> Otis (1963) 63.

Vergil seemingly abandons his Callimachean *recusatio* against epic and turns to the “greater” epic genre in his *Aeneid*. Vergil’s journey from the “lesser” to “greater” genres not only seems to contradict the poetic ambitions of his younger poetic identity but the poetic theories of the other Augustan poets.

This rather typical reading of Vergil’s career is simply too “slender.” Horace surpasses his immediate lyric predecessors, the neoterics, and revives the personal poetry of the “lesser” genre, lyric, with its original communal power. Likewise Vergil emulates the founder of Greek literature, the epic Homer, and thus immortalizes himself within the epic canon. Indeed, Vergil conquers the vast gap between oral and literary epic and in the process makes his hero Aeneas relevant to his contemporary audience, and Vergil’s literary achievement certainly does not stop there. Vergil is not writing within an isolated competition between himself and Homer; the poetic rhetoric and dialogue of his contemporaries, most notably Horace, emphasize the communal nature of poetry, which is essential to both epic and lyric. In the *Aeneid*, Vergil adopts the same communal force as the lyric Horace. Vergil’s *Aeneid* is fully Callimachean: both fat and thin. In literary terms, the epic (fat) *Aeneid* is lyrical (thin).

CHAPTER 2  
THE *POETOMACHIA*:<sup>1</sup> HELLENISTIC POETRY AND THE CALLIMACHEAN  
AESTHETIC

Μουσέων δ' οὐ μάλα φιδὸς ἐγώ<sup>2</sup>

“I am not especially sparing of the Muses.”

During the Hellenistic Age, literature and philosophy fused as scholars became poets. Poets turned their critical, scholastic eye to the literary traditions first established by Homer and judged all successive poetry by that master's standards. Callimachus saturates his own texts with criticisms which detail his disparagement of Hellenistic poetry, and he forcefully denounces the path that poets had taken from Homer to their own times. Still, the exact targets of Callimachus' criticisms are hard to determine with any certainty. The problem becomes more difficult because the inadequate notations of scholiasts guide modern scholars.

Callimachus and his contemporaries lived in an atmosphere which encouraged the exploration of literary standards. Aristotle's Peripatetic school reached Alexandria through Demetrius of Phaleron, a student of Theophrastus, who may have been involved in the building of the *Museion* under Ptolemy Soter.<sup>3</sup> Zenodotus became the first librarian of the *Museion*, followed by Apollonius Rhodius and Eratosthenes.<sup>4</sup> Other

---

<sup>1</sup> I have borrowed this term from Vessey (1971) 4-5.

<sup>2</sup> Call. fr. 538b Pf.

<sup>3</sup> Brink (1946) 11 discusses how Callimachus and Aristotle share the same views in philosophy but as poets differ in opinions of literary theory.

<sup>4</sup> Bulloch (1985) 547-549.

scholar-poets such as Lycophron, Alexander Aetolus, and Callimachus were in charge of cataloguing the immense depository of texts at the Library.<sup>5</sup> Through their work, the Alexandrians were in constant dialogue with the writers of the past.

In forming impressions of past poets, Alexandrians were not working from a blank slate, especially in regard to Homer. Aristotle praises Homer in his *Poetics* as the source of literature from which writers of tragedy, comedy, and iambos draw their inspiration. Thus for the Alexandrians, Homer spoke with a pure voice from which all other voices flowed.<sup>6</sup> In discussing tragedy against the backdrop of epic, Aristotle distinguishes the narrative of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which encompasses multiple levels of action and character, from the narrative of tragedy which must be simplified.<sup>7</sup> Homer establishes a unity in his narrative through the action of the plot while interjecting his own voice as little as possible.<sup>8</sup> The poet sings in epic meter (dactylic hexameter), fills his song to epic length, and fattens the plot with episodic units.

The way in which Homer constructs his plot and works within the confines of epic meter and length becomes the canon by which Aristotle judges all other poetry. Homer wholly depends upon the oral tradition of the bards when composing his song.<sup>9</sup> This oral tradition discourages the poet from completely altering the outcome of known

---

<sup>5</sup> Bulloch (1985) 547.

<sup>6</sup> Newman (1986) 3.

<sup>7</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1459b: 20-30.

<sup>8</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1451a: 1-27; 1459a: 47-48.

<sup>9</sup> Lord (1960) 28: "What is of importance here is not the fact of exactness or lack of exactness, but the constant emphasis by the singer on his role in the tradition. It is not the creative role that we have stressed for the purpose of clarifying a misunderstanding about oral style, but the role of conservator of the tradition."

plots,<sup>10</sup> but Homer renews tradition by exploiting elements of character and recognition within the smaller episodic components.<sup>11</sup> When Homer transitions from one episode to the next, he charms the audience into a suspension of reality so that what might seem irrational or implausible to the plot overall escapes the notice of the audience.<sup>12</sup>

Therefore, episodes encapsulate surprise and creativity, but the audience remains focused on the general movement of the plot itself rather than the details of each episode.

Homer simplifies the plot enough that listeners can keep the beginning and the end—that is, the goal of the song—in their minds.<sup>13</sup>

Writers after Homer used his poems as exempla for their own epics by extracting the mythological elements and the historic, legendary scope of the material and projecting these onto contemporary events.<sup>14</sup> These Hellenistic writers, however, disassociated themselves from the legendary past and chose to write on events in their own time.<sup>15</sup> As a result, they struggled to appropriately blend the mythological, poetic style of Homer with contemporary history.<sup>16</sup> By Callimachus' time in the third century B. C., mythology and the world of the gods had lost their ability to contribute to the “high style” and *gravitas* of epic poetry within view of its contemporary setting. Audiences, for example, would no longer accept that soldiers in the Persian wars readily

---

<sup>10</sup> Aristotle (*Po.* 1453b: 31-32) provides, for example, the generic story of Orestes killing Clytemnestra.

<sup>11</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1453b: 35-6.

<sup>12</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1460a: 57-64.

<sup>13</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1459b: 15-16.

<sup>14</sup> Otis (1963) 6-11; Newman (1986) 17.

<sup>15</sup> For example, Rhianos wrote an epic on the Second Messenian War, among other epics on historical topics (*Achaika*, *Thessalika*, *Eliaka*). Other historical epicists include: Phaistos (*Lakedamonika*); Apollonius (*Ktisis Rhodon*, *Alexandrias*); Philo the Elder who wrote Jewish epics; cf. Otis (1963) 16-17.

<sup>16</sup> Otis (1963) 6-8; Newman (1986) 23-30.

and easily intermingled with the gods on the battlefield.<sup>17</sup> Consequently, epic poets wrote light poems which reduced the role of mythology or wrote historical epics that attempted to conform the Homeric canon to modern, historical events. Serious poetry that effectively incorporated both gods and men was left to the tragedians.<sup>18</sup>

Choerilus of Samos and Antimachus, two poets against whom Callimachus directs some of his most potent attacks, typify the trend of epic poets to divide the mythological and historical aspects of Homer into two separate threads. Choerilus imitated the historical aspects of the Homeric poems in his epic on Xerxes' invasion of Greece, written around 400 B. C.<sup>19</sup> Antimachus, writing in the fifth or fourth century B.C., avoided history and wrote a mythological epic, the *Thebais*.<sup>20</sup> These two epics are representative of the split in Hellenistic epic between "old" (Choerilian/historic) epic and "new" (Antimachean/mythological) epic, and reconciling these two aspects was a central struggle for Hellenistic authors.<sup>21</sup>

The mythological *Thebais* of Antimachus seems to have been received with more acclaim in the Hellenistic period than Choerilus' historical *Persika*, although little survives of the texts or their reception. Choerilus versified history and thus defied the Aristotelean and Callimachean doctrine that history and poetry represent two separate

---

<sup>17</sup> As in the epic about the Persian wars written by Choerilus of Samos (*Persika*); see Otis (1963) 9.

<sup>18</sup> Williams (1968) 33; Newman (1986) 26, 39.

<sup>19</sup> Otis (1963) 9-10; Hollis (2000) 13.

<sup>20</sup> Otis (1963) 10; Vessey (1971) 1.

<sup>21</sup> The terms "old" and "new" belong to Briggs. The distinction is that "old" refers to historical epicists such as Choerilus of Iasos, Choerilus of Samos, or Rhianos. In the "new" category belong the epics of Antimachus and Apollonius, who focus on the mythological aspects of Homer. In Apollonius in particular, Briggs describes the author's use of mythology, which no longer functions as the source of history for his Hellenistic audience. Briggs (1981) 950-953: "His attitude to myth allows its essential power and beauty to carry much of the weight, although one never imagines that Apollonius is describing 'real' or 'true' events."

facets of literature.<sup>22</sup> Whereas the art of poetry relies on a certain suspension of believability, historical narration describes actual events in singular moments of reality (sequential or not).<sup>23</sup> Another Choerilus, of Iasos, who wrote historical epic on the campaigns of Alexander, becomes a symbol of bad epic poetry for the Romans in the Augustan period and comes under attack by Horace.<sup>24</sup> Horace's criticisms are many and deprecatory, and concentrate on the fact that Choerilus wrote for profit (*Epist.* 2.1.230-44; *Ars* 357-60). Not only does a versified history not constitute poetry, but writing for profit can threaten the art out of the composition.<sup>25</sup>

Antimachus is one of the first to “rival Homer by outdoing Homer *at his own game*” and utilizes an obscure and archaic style that earned him the reputation of a *poeta doctus*.<sup>26</sup> Even Plato ordered that the text of the *Thebais* be preserved<sup>27</sup> and marked it for future generations. Nevertheless, by the time of the Alexandrians, Antimachus also comes under criticism so that later the Roman poets regard him as an example of the lengthy swollen poetry denounced by Callimachus. Catullus hopes that the small masterpieces of his friend Calvus will be close to his heart, but he leaves the people to enjoy Antimachus' swollen style (*parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta <sodalis>, | at populus*

---

<sup>22</sup> Newman (1986) 26.

<sup>23</sup> Newman (1986) 40. Aristotle (*Po.* 1459a: 14-17) draws a further distinction between the unity of the plot in history and poetry. As mentioned above, the beginning and end of a plot must be in the audience's mind as they learn the poet's treatment of tradition. In historical writing, there is not necessarily a distinct end nor does the narrative work towards this end.

<sup>24</sup> The writer who keeps making the same mistake and the cithara player who keeps messing up on the same note becomes another Choerilus to Horace (*Hor. Ars* 355-357).

<sup>25</sup> Johnson (2005) 23-24.

<sup>26</sup> Otis (1963) 10; Bulloch (1985) 546.

<sup>27</sup> Vessey (1971) 1-2. Cicero (*Brutus* 51) says that Plato was alone in his opinion: *Plato . . . mihi unus instar est centum milium.*

*tumido gaudeat Antimacho*; Cat. 95b).<sup>28</sup> Propertius further denounces Antimachus' epic for misappropriating his narrow elegiac voice for grave epic themes (*incipere iam angusto versus includere torno*, 2.3.43).<sup>29</sup>

The attitudes of the Roman poets also reflect Callimachus' criticism of Antimachus in his epigrams. Callimachus attacks the *Lyde* in his work against Praxiphanes (fr. 589 Pf.) where he criticizes Plato for holding the poem in such high regard.<sup>30</sup> Callimachus further disparages the *Lyde* for being fat and plain (**παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τωρόν**, Call. fr. 398 Pf.).<sup>31</sup> Although these criticisms specifically address Antimachus' elegiac work rather than his epic, they do address elements of style and typify the way in which Callimachus will defend his own poetry in the prologue of his *Aetia*.

Callimachus does not confine his criticism to Antimachus; he also takes aim at Apollonius and his *Argonautica*.<sup>32</sup> The *Suda* provides the primary evidence for Callimachus' attacks on Apollonius and his epic style, where an entry identifies Apollonius as the target of Callimachus' invective *Ibis*.<sup>33</sup> The notion of an actual argument between the two poets is not documented in any of their own texts, but is only

---

<sup>28</sup> Vessey (1971) 2-3.

<sup>29</sup> Propertius uses the term *angustus* to describe Callimachean poetry: *intonet angusto pectore Callimachus*, 2.1.40; *illa vel angusto mecum requiescere lecto*, 1.8b.34; *nos contra angusto versantes proelia lecto*, 2.1.45; See also Prop. 1.9.8-12. Vessey (1971) 9 argues that Propertius gives a lucid insight into the dispute by balancing the epic tradition (Homer and Antimachus) against the elegiac tradition (Callimachus and Philitas) and each poet's suitability to their genre. The rejection of Antimachus continues beyond the Classical period and the poet becomes characterized as verbose. Porphyrio writes: *ut viginti quattuor volumina impleverit, antequam septem duces usque ad Thebas perduceret* (ad Hor. *Ars* 146).

<sup>30</sup> Cameron (1995) 304.

<sup>31</sup> Lefkowitz (1980) 8.

<sup>32</sup> Lefkowitz (1980) 1-19; Bulloch (1985) 561.

<sup>33</sup> See Lefkowitz (1980) for the history of the ancient scholars' interactions with the texts.

evidenced in the scholiasts, and then noted by modern scholars.<sup>34</sup> According to the scholiasts, Callimachus and Apollonius traded insults. Callimachus attacked Apollonius' work, charging that a big book is a big evil (fr. 465 Pf.).<sup>35</sup> Apollonius answers back: "Callimachus—refuse, triviality, woodenhead! | The cause is Callimachus, who wrote the *Causes*" (Καλλίμαχος τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παίγνιον, ὁ ξύλινος νοῦς | αἴτιος ὁ γράψας Αἴτια Καλλίμαχος, *AP* 11.276).<sup>36</sup> The *vitae* and scholiast remarks can often prove anecdotal and exaggerated, but in this case they can be clarified through the poetry of these two poets and critics.

Although the texts of Apollonius and Callimachus do not substantiate in themselves the existence of a rivalry, they do reveal that the two writers interacted with each other's works. The ancient *vitae* state that Apollonius was a student of Callimachus. Although this student-teacher relationship may be another exaggeration of the *vitae*, the influence of the two poets on one another is clear.<sup>37</sup> Callimachus' influence on Apollonius' *Argonautica* has been shown to be pervasive.<sup>38</sup> Apollonius imitates Callimachus, for example, when Jason thrusts his hands in the air and promises sacrifice to the Pythian Apollo in return for a safe landing of the Argo (*Call. Aet.* fr. 1.18 Pf., A.R.

---

<sup>34</sup> Lefkowitz (1980) 4 writes, "the ultimate source of the biographers' information is poetry by and about Callimachus and Apollonius. Not directly, of course, but through that curious process of objectification that characterizes ancient scholarship, by which the humorous is taken seriously, and conventional metaphor is interpreted as literal fact."

<sup>35</sup> Atheneus provides the account: ὅτι Καλλίμαχος ὁ γραμματικὸς τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ (fr. 465 Pf.). For the most complete discussion of the relationship between Callimachus and Apollonius, see Lefkowitz (1980).

<sup>36</sup> The translation is Cameron's (1995) 227. Cameron (227-230) rejects the possibility that this epigram belongs to Apollonius Rhodius.

<sup>37</sup> Lefkowitz (1980) 12 cites these instances as "narrative metaphors for influence." *Vit.*<sup>A</sup>.8 calls Apollonius a μαθητῆς of Callimachus; cf. Lefkowitz (1980) 1.

<sup>38</sup> Könen (2001) 78 lists the allusions he sees to Callimachus in every book of the *Argonautica*. For common stylistic elements between Callimachus and Apollonius, see Briggs (1981) 950-953.

*Arg.* 1.367-425). Apollonius also describes specific aetiologies found in Callimachus, such as the origin of the Argo’s anchor (Call. *Aet.* fr. 108-9 Pf., A. R. *Arg.* 1.955). Apollonius, too, provided a source for Callimachus’ own works. Callimachus’ Athena addresses Chariclo with the same sense and diction (both use the rare word **παλινάγρετον**) that Phineus uses to address Jason in the *Argonautica* (Call. *Hymn* V: 103-4; A. R. *Arg.* 2.444-5).<sup>39</sup> The scholiasts, who give evidence for the quarrel, point out some of these similarities, but, as Lefkowitz writes, they “weren’t as sensitive about questions of *imitatio* as we have become, or they might have suggested that Callimachus collaborated with Apollonius.”<sup>40</sup>

Even given this high degree of interaction between Callimachus and the epicist Apollonius, it is only common sense that Callimachus’ criticisms take a wide look at multiple authors and genres. Callimachus’ disparaging remarks cannot be confined to a specific author or genre with unanimous certainty. Callimachus’ criticisms, such as **παχύ, μέγα, and οὐ τορόν**, consistently, however, emphasize style. The *Aetia* and *Hecale* provide the greatest source of information about Callimachus’ views on style. What can be learned from these texts, then, is not whom he is attacking, but rather what stylistic standards Callimachus is advocating via his criticism. The prologue to the *Aetia* (fr. 1.1-7; 17-24 Pf.) figures most prominently in discussions of the Callimachean aesthetic:

. . . . .]ι μοι Τελχίνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν αἰοιδῆ,  
 νήιδεῖς οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,  
 εἵνεκεν οὐχ ἔν αἴσιμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[η  
 . . . . .]. ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤγνυσα χιλιάσιν

<sup>39</sup> Kōnken (2001): 78; Cameron (1995) 247-262; Lefkowitz (1980) 15. Kōnken (2001) 79 disagrees with this hypothesis of mutual borrowing.

<sup>40</sup> Lefkowitz (1980) 15; Lefkowitz (17-18) sees even more correspondence when she examines the two poet’s influence on Vergil. She concludes, “I think that one can see that Vergil at least thought that Callimachus and Apollonius were fighting on the same side in the Battle of the Books.”

ἦ . . . . . ]ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[ίσσω  
παῖς ἄτε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἦ δεκάσις οὐκ ὀλίγη.  
*Act.1.1-7*

ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένοισι· αὐθι δὲ τέχνη  
κρίνετε, | μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τήμνι σοφίην·  
μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδίην  
τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός.  
καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πριώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα  
γούνασι, Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·  
“ . . . . . ] . . . ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον  
θρέψαι, τή]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·  
*Act.1.17-24*

(I know that) the Telchines mutter at my song, those foolish men who are not the friends of the Muse, because I did not sing of kings and heroes in one continuous song in countless verses, and I roll out the slender word like a child, though I am not few in the number of my years. | | Then judge my skill by its art, not by the Persian rope. Don't look for me to produce a great song sounding an empty noise. Thundering is not mine, but Zeus'. For when I first placed the tablet upon my knees, Lycian Apollo said to me: “Singer, feed your sacrifice to be as fat as possible, but keep a slender Muse.”

In Callimachus' vision of the Lycian Apollo, he defends his own poetry by criticizing elements of style most readily identified with the creator of Greek literature—the epic Homer. Callimachus accosts the Telchines<sup>41</sup> for insisting that he sing of kings and heroes in one continuous song (ἐν ἄεισμα διηνεκές).<sup>42</sup> Nor will he sing of these kings and heroes at length in a poem numbering thousands of lines (ἐν πολλαῖς. . . χιλιάσιν). “Thundering,” or writing a song loudly resounding such as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is for the

<sup>41</sup> Scholars do not agree on the identification of the Telchines. Scholars, ancient and modern, generally identify the Telchines as Callimachus' critics, see Bulloch (1985) 558; Briggs (1981) 951. Lefkowitz (1980) 11 believes the Telchines are anonymous critics and states: “the Telchines and his reply to them, like Apollo's speech, represent a fictitious situation.” Mythologically, the Telchines are a “fabled goblin-race of metal-workers, skilled in magic, who inhabited some of the Greek islands and whose most renowned characteristics were jealousy, maliciousness and possession of the Evil Eye;” Bulloch (1985) 558.

<sup>42</sup> Cameron (1992) 266-267 provides a history of the readings and conjectures of this line. We lack the (possible) adjectives which modify “kings and heroes,” and thus clear interpretation of Callimachus' meaning is impossible. Cameron further notes that Vergil translates this phrase with a different twist: *cum canerem reges et proelia* (*Ec.* 6.3). See Pagán (1991) for further textual emendations.

godlike Homer (the Zeus of the epic poets).<sup>43</sup> Like his predecessor Aristotle, Callimachus draws his poetic canon against a Homeric backdrop.

Callimachus defines his poetry as to content in the negative: not long, and not on the heroic world. These criteria certainly indicate that Callimachus refuses to write an epic.<sup>44</sup> Nevertheless, Callimachus envisions more than the negative, and encompasses more than the rejection of any specific genre. Through Apollo's instructions, while he rejects one single long narrative, he puts forward positively his own poetic program. Callimachus' vision concerns both voice and narrative, elements of structure and style.<sup>45</sup> He commands the Telchines not to look at what he would not write, but at the art of what he does write (τέχνη | κρίνετε). The Lycian Apollo commands Callimachus to feed his sacrifice to be as fat as possible (πάχιστον), but to keep the Muse slender (τὴν Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην). Here, Callimachus reinforces this point of the slender Muse further as he recalls the slender word of the previous lines (ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθόν).

Apollo's vision of Callimachean style presents a paradox when he recommends poetry that is at once slender (λεπταλέην, τυτθόν) and fat (πάχιστον). By these seemingly contrasting elements of style, Callimachus brings to the foreground the question of continuous narrative (ἐν ἄεισμα διηγεκές). Again, the audience is in the realm of epic, dwelling on aesthetics of length and heroes, and thus the Thunderer himself, Homer. Homer sings of heroes in thousands of lines, but his narrative is

---

<sup>43</sup> Bulloch (1985) 559.

<sup>44</sup> Aristotle (*Po.*1459b.4-5) cites length as one of the two (the other being meter) criteria which differentiate epic from tragedy.

<sup>45</sup> It is useful here to recall another epigram of Callimachus' which disparages the cyclic poets for dragging the reader this way and that: ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν οὐδέ κελεύθωι | χαίρω τις πολλοὺς ὦδε καὶ ὦδε φέρει (*Epigr.* 38.1-2 Pf.); see Bulloch (1985) 560.

discontinuous and episodic.<sup>46</sup> In fact, as outlined by Aristotle in the *Poetics*, Homer embraces both aspects of the fat and slender which Callimachus praises. Homer saturated his text with all the qualities that in later literature could only be unwoven by different threads of genres, such as tragedy, history, and mythological narrative. Homer keeps his Muse slender by weaving together a simple plot from the greater tradition of the Trojan wars.<sup>47</sup>

Callimachus therefore does not concentrate his criticism so much on length and subject matter as on voice and narrative. He will not write an epic of Homeric length in a non-Homeric voice. Callimachus' criticism in fact envalues Homeric expression, as is clear from his praise for Homer in the *Hymn to Apollo*. Callimachus writes that his own voice is superior to the other writers of the time because his is closer to the source—Homer.<sup>48</sup> Callimachus sings with the Homeric voice and embraces both the fat (a multiplex of tone and topics) and slender (the episodic). This is why Antimachus' epic can at once be fat (*παχύ*) but still miss its mark by not being slender. Choerilus of Iasos, too, writes many verses at great length, but lacks the brevity needed to keep Homer awake.<sup>49</sup> This paradox becomes the essence of Callimachus' criticisms, a critical element that the Romans adopt as *brevitas*.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Cameron (1992) 309 hits the nail on the head when he comments, “not all epics do consist of unbroken narrative—most conspicuously the two longest and most famous of all, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.”

<sup>47</sup> Arist.*Po.*1459a-1459b.

<sup>48</sup> Lefkowitz (1980) 5.

<sup>49</sup> Hor.*Ars* 359.

<sup>50</sup> See Horace, *Ars* 25: *brevis esse laboro*. Newman (1986) 22 comments that “in distinguishing between Homer and his imitators, Hellenistic critics, following Aristotle, had pronounced Homer to be superior precisely on the grounds of his brevity.”

The stylistic emphasis in Callimachus' poetic dictum was a primary concern for Propertius, who refers to the poet's statements of style in advising a fellow poet. In 2.34b, Propertius advises his friend Lynceus, who has fallen in love, on how to write poetry that uses language and style appropriate to its genre. He begins by listing models that would be useless for Lynceus to follow: the natural philosophy of Socrates and Aratus. Lynceus should rather imitate Philitas' elegies and the dreams of the "not-inflated" Callimachus (*tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan | et non inflati somnia Callimachi*; 31-32). But in his advice, Propertius does not recall Callimachus the elegist, he refers to Callimachus the author of aetiologies. Propertius' *somnia Callimachi* directly references Callimachus' vision of the Lycian Apollo in the *Aetia*.<sup>51</sup> The subject matter of the *Aetia* will not benefit the elegist, thus Propertius must be emphasizing the stylistic program set forth in Callimachus' prologue.

As Propertius draws his interpretation of Callimachus' vision, not only themes but style takes center stage. Lynceus should avoid the epic themes of the flooding Achelous and the wandering Maeander (*non rursus licet Aetoli referas Acheloi*, 33; *atque etiam ut Phrygio fallax Maeandria campo | errat et ipsa suas decipit unda vias*, 35-36),<sup>52</sup> and likewise he should avoid writing tragedies in the Aeschylean form (*desine et Aeschyleo componere verba coturno*, 41). Propertius then immediately returns to the *Aetia* and recalls Callimachus' use of **Διός** as symbolic of Homer: "You will not go more safely than Antimachus, nor will you go more safely than Homer, for the right girl despises the great gods" (*tu non*

---

<sup>51</sup> If Nairn's conjecture (*Aratei*) for (*Erecthei*) is correct, then as Camps (1966a) 224-5 notes, Propertius anticipates the Callimachean reference in the previous lines (*aut quid Aratei tibi prosunt carmina lecti*, 29).

<sup>52</sup> Propertius' description of the deceitful Maeander, which wanders through the camp and tricks its own courses, is reminiscent of Callimachus' disparagement of the cyclic poets who wander this way and that (See above). The Maeander is known for its winding course which inspired Daedalus' labyrinth (Camps 1966a) 227.

*Antimacho, non tutior ibis Homero: | despicit et magnos recta puella deos*, 45-46). Propertius is concerned that Lynceus' style, like these wandering and flooding rivers, is overblown and not in control, which will result in an unsafe journey for both author and audience.

In the *Hecale*, Callimachus shows his Telchines how an epic should be written and puts his criticisms to the test. Here, Callimachus describes the adventures of Theseus and the killing of the Marathon bull, and creates a name for his epic from the owner of a cottage in which the hero spends the night.<sup>53</sup> Callimachus draws heavily from conventional epic (Homeric) style by subordinating his own voice to the epic narrative, beginning *in medias res*, and infusing Homeric similes and borrowings into his heroic epic.<sup>54</sup> However, the narrative of his work, like Homer, is discontinuously episodic and does not encroach upon the poorly styled *ἐν ἄλεισμα διηγεῖς*.<sup>55</sup> Callimachus fattens his poetic sacrifice by exploiting obscure myth and rejuvenating traditional aspects of heroic and mythic elements. At the same time he extracts a voice from his archaic, traditional narrative that can speak with relevancy to his contemporary Alexandrians.<sup>56</sup> Bulloch writes, "Callimachus' studied insistence on examining with a shrewdly quizzical eye the very ordinary and practical aspects [of the poetic tradition] . . . was a highly individual choice and set poetry on a new direction which was to prove fruitful for centuries to come."<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Cameron (1992) 312.

<sup>54</sup> Cameron (1992) 312; Bulloch (1985) 563; Rengakos (2002) 143-145 finds many Homeric borrowings in the texts of Callimachus and Apollonius. Rengakos hypothesizes that these borrowings represent the actual manuscript tradition rather than conjectures and uses the two authors to reconstruct the Homeric texts. He writes (146) that the two poets "make up a remarkably rich collection of *memoria Homerica*."

<sup>55</sup> Brink (1946) 17.

<sup>56</sup> Bulloch (1985) 557, 564.

<sup>57</sup> Bulloch (1985) 557.

Just as Callimachus' criticisms on style color Propertius' advice to Lynceus, Callimachus' vision of Lycian Apollo guides Roman poets in their compositions. The Augustan poets most pointedly declare their allegiance to Callimachean standards of style and innovation through the *recusatio*. Poets such as Horace, Propertius, Vergil, and Ovid refuse to write poetry of a grand style and instead turn to genres which were in general considered light.<sup>58</sup> In these *recusationes*, the Augustans elevate the grand (epic) style of poetry to a plane above their own abilities so that they themselves appear incapable of or unsuitable for approaching it. The poets become apologetic that they cannot write poetry worthy of the epic meter and describe their own poetry in Callimachean language—*tenuis, deductus, parvus*. The Augustans invent within the Callimachean aesthetic the opportunity to praise their own work or addressee, even if with a little feigned modesty.<sup>59</sup>

Horace, for example, addresses his refusal to write epic poetry in terms of his own inability and lack of epic strength. Horace declares that he will not sing of the deeds of Caesar:

. . . nec sermones ego malle  
 repentis per humum quam res componere gestas  
 terrarumque situs et flumina dicere et arces  
 montibus impositas et barbara regna tuisque  
 auspiciis totum confecta duella per orbem,  
 claustraque custodem pacis cohibentia Ianum  
 et formidatam Parthis te principe Romam,

---

<sup>58</sup> Typical examples of the Augustan *recusatio* include Vergil (*Ec.* 6. 1-8), Horace (*Carm.* 1.6, 1.20, 2.12, 4.2), Propertius (2.1, 2.10, 2.15, 3.3), and Ovid (*Ars* 1.25-30). For the definitions of the *recusatio*, see Race (1978), Davis (1991), Lyne (1995), and Johnson (2005). Race (1978) 180-181 comments that the Hellenistic *recusatio* becomes stylized and sets the standards of *genus grande* and *genus tenue* for the Augustans. Race further discusses the conventional vocabulary of a *recusatio*. Race notes language of personal preference (*me iuvat, odi*), ability (*vires*), external compulsion (*nec patitur, vetuit*), and decorum (*pudor decet, convenit*).

<sup>59</sup> Johnson (2005) 48 emphasizes the importance of the opportunity for poetic self-definition in the *recusatio*.

si, quantum cuperem, possem quoque; sed neque parvum  
carmen maiestas recipit tua, nec meus audet  
rem temptare pudor, quam vires ferre recusent.

*Epist.*2.1.250-259

I would no more place composing my satires, which crawl upon the earth, above speaking of historical events, telling stories of places on the earth and rivers speaking of citadels placed on mountains, and foreign kingdoms, and wars completed throughout the world under your auspices, and Rome feared by the Parthians with you as leader, even if I were able, as much as I would want to sing these; but neither does your majesty allow my small lyric nor does my modesty dare to try this thing which my strength forbids me to undertake.

Horace refuses to write grand praise for Caesar and uses Callimachean language in his denial. Horace's small contribution in his lyric genre (*parvum* | *carmen*, 257-258) could not do justice to Augustus' majesty (*maiestas tua*, 258). But while Augustus' majesty is the very topic which Horace declares too lofty for his earthy poetry, Horace actually praises Augustus' deeds in this refusal to sing them (*res gestas*, 251): Augustus conquered foreign kingdoms (*barbara regna*, 254) and put an end to wars (*confecta duella*, 255). Horace has turned his refusal to write encomiastic poetry for Augustus into an opportunity to praise his deeds. While claiming the Callimachean aesthetic, Horace has incorporated praise for Augustus into his own chosen genre, lyric. So too will Propertius claim that his own slender style is not suitable for grand epic themes when he admonishes Maecenas for asking him to sail too vast a sea. Such grand sails are not fitting for his ship (*quid me scribendi tam vastum mittis in aequor? | non sunt apta meae grandia vela rati*, 3.9.3-4).<sup>60</sup> Propertius' disavowal, however, includes grand praise for Maecenas, Augustus' closest comrade (*Caesaris et famae uestigia iuncta tenebis: | Maecenatis erunt vera topaea fides*, 3.9.33-34).

---

<sup>60</sup> Race (1978) 190. See also Horace 4.15.3-4: *ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor | vela darem*. Rutherford (1989) 44 continues, "Epic, as often in *recusatio*, provides a foil against which the less ambitious but more creative or thoughtful work that the poet *does* offer can be seen to best advantage." See also Johnson (2005) 48.

The paradox within the Callimachean poetic vision warns us that when the Augustan poets contrast their own slender style against the grand style of epic poetry, we should not read them from too narrow a point of view. Despite claims of feebleness and lack of vigor, the Augustans continue on from the *recusatio* and soar in their own genre.<sup>61</sup> For the Augustans, the Callimachean aesthetic remains a paradox of “thinness” and “fatness.”

---

<sup>61</sup> Smith (1968) 57.

CHAPTER 3  
*POETAE DOCTI: THE CALLIMACHEAN AESTHETIC IN ROMAN LYRIC*

μή με τόν ἐν Δωδῶνι λέγοι μόνον οὐνεκα χαλκόν ἤγειρον<sup>1</sup>

“May he not say I only struck the bronze at Dodona.”

Callimachus’ standard of fat sacrifices and slender Muses acts as a lens through which the Roman poets in the first century B. C. look back to archaic Greek epic and lyric as sources of imitation. Catullus and the neoterics embrace and rival the literary standards of Callimachus and the Alexandrians through their poetry, and through the process become estranged from the original spirit of the archaic Greek poets. Horace, however, starts with the Greek lyricists themselves and infuses his poetry with Callimachean standards in order to both imitate and emulate the full potential of lyric poetry.

The archaic lyric poets played a key role for early Greek communities by performing hymns for festivals, drinking songs for *symposia*, and songs centered on the state and politics<sup>2</sup> to the tune of a lyre.<sup>3</sup> Homer and the epic poets had acted as historians for these communities and reinforced the common tradition for the myths and beliefs of the *polis*. The archaic lyric poets in turn depended on these shared myths and beliefs to create a universality in their hymns and songs that would be performed for

---

<sup>1</sup> Call. fr. 483 Pf. People who were garrulous were said to “strike the bronze at Dodona;” cf. Trypanis (1978) 252.

<sup>2</sup> Williams (1968) 32-33; Segal (1985) 165-166.

<sup>3</sup> Miller (1994) 12; Commager (1965) 83.

both public and private audiences.<sup>4</sup> But what differentiated epic and lyric song was the self-referentiality afforded to the lyric singer.

Archaic lyric poets gain this self-referentiality by appealing to the universality of the *polis* in terms of the individual. When Archilochus describes hiding his shield in the bushes, for example, we hear the thoughts and emotions from the perspective of the poet himself (5 W).<sup>5</sup> Archilochus then consoles himself: “why do I care about that shield?” I ask. I will get another one no worse” (τί μοι μέλει ἀσπίς ἐκείνη; | ἔρρέτω· ἐξᾠπτις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω). Whereas Homer might explicitly explain the sharp pain that comes over the hero at this loss or describe him as foolish (νήπιος) or cowardly (δειλός), Archilochus shows his emotions to his audience. Archilochus threw his shield away in order to save himself, although he hesitated to do so (οὐκ ἐθέλων). Likewise, Mimnermus’ discontent at the onset of old age (1 W), Alcaeus’ joy at Myrsilus’ death (332 L-P), and Sappho’s jealousy at a lover’s conversation (31 L-P) equally construct a *persona* of the poet that is foreign to Homeric epic. In these lyric scenes, the poets describe emotions in intimate personal terms (such as the subtle flame that runs through Sappho’s body or the swelling of her tongue) so that the audience can fill in any dramatic gaps with their own experiences and beliefs.<sup>6</sup> Tradition had defined the epic singer in his moment of performance, whereas in performance the Greek lyricist’s voice and *persona*

---

<sup>4</sup> Johnson (1982) 54. Johnson (1982) thoroughly examines the universal nature of lyric; see especially his discussions on Greek lyric (29-74).

<sup>5</sup> Barron and Easterling (1985) 119; Johnson (1982) 29-30; 72. Miller (1994) 12-19 does not actually consider Archilochus lyric because his voice is heavily influenced by Homer. Miller further denies that archaic Greek lyric poets sing in the “poetic *P*” because their voices are inextricable from the *polis*. Regardless of the level of “poetic *P*” in the archaic lyric poems, the point I am trying to emphasize is that the singers still create an un-Homeric *persona* in terms of the individual against the backdrop of the universal. See Johnson (1982) 82-86 and Harvey (2001) for a discussion on the history of the classification of the Greek lyric poets.

<sup>6</sup> Johnson (1982) 72-74.

emerge so that the audience, even at times beyond the poet's own era, may construct a picture or notion of the artist himself.<sup>7</sup>

As the *polis* moved from the sixth to fifth centuries, the context of universality changed when philosophers began to question the validity of the tradition set by Homer and the epic poets. During this time, Homer and his world began to drift into the distance and to be replaced by a more studied and systematic atmosphere that tested ideas outside of the world of the *polis*.<sup>8</sup> The emergence of writing further encouraged and provided the means for individuals to search for explanations outside of the traditional beliefs of the *polis*.<sup>9</sup> The new focus on the written word shifted the communal experience of public performance into a possibly more private experience within a text itself.<sup>10</sup> The community of the *polis* gradually shifted from one which shared a common tradition of myths to one in which individuals examined the nature of history and mythology with a rationalist view. Therefore, the universality of the *polis* moved out of a shared social and political context and into a philosophical, literary context more independent of the community.

This new literary universality did not necessarily change the communal nature of lyric poetry, but it did alter the way in which poets would develop their self-referentiality. Like Archilochus and Sappho, Hellenistic lyric poets created polymetric poems in terms

---

<sup>7</sup> Johnson (1982) 29-30; Commager (1965) 83. Lord (1960) 28 stresses "the constant emphasis by the singer on his role in the tradition. It is not the creative role that we have stressed for the purpose of clarifying a misunderstanding about oral style, but the role of conservator of the tradition."

<sup>8</sup> Johnson (1982) 55; Bing (1988) 12-13.

<sup>9</sup> Bing (1988) 12-17. Bing (27-40) describes the changing role of the Muses as the *polis* transitions from an oral to literary focus. Bing states, "books have become the vehicle, at least, of poetic inspiration, if not its equivalent."

<sup>10</sup> Miller (1994) 122-124; Bing (1988) 17, 37: "a person or place can exist wherever one finds a book."

of the individual. But because they could no longer appeal to a social or political commonality, they wrote in terms of the new literary universality. The lyric poet, therefore, became an individual in terms of the written word and operated within a literary self-referentiality. Whereas the oral poetry of the archaic Greek lyric poets by its nature did not allow for extensive self-referentiality from song to song, the new written word allowed poets to allude to the works of others and even to their own works.<sup>11</sup> Poets pushed self-referentiality further and began to reference themselves in terms of how they had already presented themselves. They wrote collections of poems in which the poetic *persona* reacts with different emotions in different episodes. Reading lyric, then, was no longer a process of transitioning from one episode to another in the way that one could read Homer. Readers had to look beyond the lyric poet's *persona* in one individual episode, and seek greater meaning by keeping in mind the poet's *persona* in the situation before, the present situation, and a possible future situation. The poet thus created a lyric consciousness which revealed a level of individuality and emotion beyond each lyric episode and which was enhanced with each reading of the text.<sup>12</sup>

As poets showed an increased interest in developing new expressions of self-referentiality within their own texts, they gradually abandoned the social and political potential of lyric. Poets instead became literary constructs and conscious of their own self-expression and artistry.<sup>13</sup> Lyricists took up positions as objective reviewers of their own work and thus in effect became literary critics. When Apollo comes to Callimachus,

---

<sup>11</sup> Miller (1994) 4-5.

<sup>12</sup> I am using Miller's terminology. Miller (1994) 1-2 defines lyric consciousness as a projection of a self-reflexive consciousness that shifts, changes, and adds meaning with multiple readings of a literary collection.

<sup>13</sup> Johnson (1982) 102.

for example, his instructions are not so much about the power of the Muse, but the vision reveals what qualities the poet prefers in his own art. The poet has become scholar. Rather than speaking to the community of the *polis*, poets wrote in a highly allusive and erudite style that could only be shared and enjoyed by a more select literary community.<sup>14</sup>

The garland of Meleager, Parthenius, and Philodemus, only three of what were no doubt numerous sources, introduced these Hellenistic standards of lyric poetry to the Roman poets, but with varied results and effects on individual arts.<sup>15</sup> Both Catullus and Horace, adopted the literary self-referentiality of Hellenistic lyric into their native Latin tongue. Catullus and the neoterics, however, pushed Hellenistic self-referentiality almost the point of an outright rejection of society.<sup>16</sup> When they did engage the social world, they spoke in a new neoteric language which emphasized their political withdrawal, using traditionally public values such as *foedus*, *fides*, and *amicitia* to express private and personal relationships.<sup>17</sup> Horace, on the other hand, utilized the written word and literary self-referentiality to revive the potential of the lyric poet's original social and political referentiality.

---

<sup>14</sup> Johnson (1982) 102 notes that with Callimachus and the new focus of literary referentiality, lyric becomes "oblique, learned, derivative." For further reference, see the comments of Bing (1988) 27 and Quinn (1969) 26.

<sup>15</sup> Ross (1969) 162. Philodemus was from the Macedonian colony of Gadara and was a student of Zeno; cf. Frank (1920b) 109. Philodemus brought aesthetics of Epicurean philosophy and poetic theory to the Roman poets of the first century B. C. including Vergil, Plotius Tucca, Lucius Varius Rufus, Quintilius Varus, Catullus, and possibly Horace; see Sider (1995) for Philodemus' direct influence on the Roman poets. Vergil may have composed a farewell *propemptikon* (*Cat.V*) in which he leaves rhetoric for poetry and presumably leaves Rome to study at Naples where Philodemus, along with Siro, was influential; on Vergil's early career cf. Frank (1920a; 1920b) and Rutherford (1989).

<sup>16</sup> Broege (1976) 171; Miller (1994) 135.

<sup>17</sup> Miller (1994) 135; Ross (1969) 80-95; Lyne (1980) 25-26. See also Lyne's introduction in which he discusses the institutions of love and marriage in Late Republican Rome.

Catullus and some of his fellow poets inherited the title of “neoteric” or *Poetae Novi* from Cicero,<sup>18</sup> and these *neoterói* possibly discussed and exchanged poetry between themselves as a type of literary circle.<sup>19</sup> As equestrians, the neoterics (possible members are Catullus, Valerius Cato, Calvus, Cinna, Furius Bibaculus, and Cornificius) were removed from the political obligations of the elite order and naturally became a circle apart from the noble class.<sup>20</sup> As they looked inward to themselves, these poets formed a closed literary circle in which poetry was not written for the *polis* at large but more for personal exchanges between themselves, the new literary elite.<sup>21</sup>

The very idea that Catullus and his contemporaries formed an isolated literary circle comes from Catullus’ poems themselves. Catullus’ numerous references to his fellow poets created an on-going literary dialogue within his collection which illuminated Catullus’ stylistic dictum. Catullus, for example, describes writing lyric with Calvus as they play with poetry in various meters (*Hesterno, Licini, die otiosi* | *multum lusimus in meis*

---

<sup>18</sup> *Att.* 7.2.1, τῶν νεωτέρων; *Orat.* 161, *poetae novi*; cf. Quinn (1969) 47; Lyne (1978) 167. See also *Tusc.* 3.45 in which Cicero calls the group *cantores Euphorionis*; Lyne (1978) 167. Cicero does not identify who might be included in his group of neoterics, nor is it clear if he is being critical of the poetic group. Laughton (1970) 3 concludes that Cicero’s remark in *Att.* 7.2.1 is a statement of his own poetic style rather than a criticism aimed at the *neoterói*. Lyne (1978) 168, Quinn (1969) 21, and Ferguson (1966) 871-872 argue that Cicero is deprecatory with these remarks, although Quinn and Lyne believe that Cicero is talking to a literary group that proceeds Catullus. According to Seneca, Cicero said that even if he could live his life again he still would not read the lyric poets (*Epist.* 49.5); cf. Johnson (1982) 76.

<sup>19</sup> Lyne (1978) 167 identifies the group as a literary circle. The evidence for this is controversial. I prefer Quinn (1969) 48-49 who identifies Catullus’ interaction with other poets (14, 22, 35, 36, 50, 65, 95, 116) as evidence that there was structured dialogue exchanged between the poets: “Catullus’ own poems make it clear that he was one of a group of poets who shared confidences, aspirations and ideas about poetry and literary criticism. It is also clear that these ideas had a permanent influence on Roman poetry.”

<sup>20</sup> Miller (1994) 132.

<sup>21</sup> Seneca the Elder commented that there were poets who imitated the esoteric language of neoterics in his age: they were mad on the dictionary (ἐπὶ τὸ λεξιχὸν μαίνονται, *Contr.* 9.26); cf. Wilkinson (1990) 428 n.82. Quinn (1969) 68 further notes that, “firstly, this is hard poetry—not for the general public, but for the lettered *élite* who have the culture needed to appreciate its subtleties and the enthusiasm for tracking them down. Secondly, it is the poetry of art for art’s sake, the poetry of the *littérature pure*: above all in its most serious productions at the highest level of intent but also in the *nugae*, the uselessness of which is deliberately emphasized.”

*tabellis | ut convenerat esse delicatos | scribens versiculos uterque nostrum | ludebat numero modo hoc modo illoc*, 50.1-5). The two poets compose little verses (*versiculos*, 4) at leisure (*otiosi*, 1). Catullus longs to see and to be with Calvus at once (*ut tecum loquerer simulque ut essem*, 13) so that they can again compose verses in this ideal poetic situation: light-hearted (*delicatos*, 3) and away from the crowd.

When Catullus addresses his fellow poets in other poems, he reveals the literary standards of this poetic circle, which look back to the highly allusive and erudite lyric of Callimachean and Hellenistic verse.<sup>22</sup> Like Callimachus, Catullus enumerates what is good about poetry in terms of what is bad. Catullus, for example, praises Cinna's *Zmyrna* in terms of invective against Volusius' *Annales*.<sup>23</sup> He envisions the doom of Volusius' collection at Padua (*Volusi Annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam*, 95.7) and muses over the nice wrapping paper they will provide for fish (*et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas*, 8). Similar to the poems which babbled on in thousands of lines in Callimachus' vision, Volusius's poems are tumid and not at all like the slender, polished monument of his friend Cinna (*parva mei mihi sunt cordi monumenta sodalis; | at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho*, 9-10). This is not the first time that Catullus disparaged Volusius' *Annales*, and the reader here is reminded of Volusius' *cacata charta* (36.1). Catullus thus creates a stylistic dialogue with his fellow-poets in terms of his literary criticism of others. Catullus' repeated interplay with his contemporaries throughout his collection<sup>24</sup> created a microcosm of literary criticism which was more distant from the political and social world in which he lived.

---

<sup>22</sup> See poems 65, 66, and 116 for Catullus' Callimachean style; cf. Lyne (1978) 183.

<sup>23</sup> Lyne (1978) 171: "the polemic not only confirms the cohesion of the three candidates for the neoteric school; it may be some guide to the nature of its programme."

<sup>24</sup> See also 14, 22, 35, 65, 116; cf. Lyne (1978) 167.

Catullus further constructs a personal microcosm through sophisticated self-referentiality in his Lesbia poems by re-visiting his character as a lover in various situations with his beloved. The reader encounters Catullus' infatuated *persona* as he struggles to define the number of kisses that would satisfy his mad love (5,7). Catullus exaggerates the hundreds and thousands of kisses that he might steal from his lover (*da mi basia mille, deinde centum . . .*, 5.6-9) and emphasizes the whimsical, blissful love that he and Lesbia share. The lovers are cut off from society as they reject the rumors of the more severe old men (*rumoresque senum severiorum | omnes unius aestimemus assis*, 1-2) and then deceive anyone who would be judgmental as to the extent of their love (*aut ne quis malus invidere possit | cum tantum sciat esse basiorum*, 11-12). Catullus again uses hyperbole to describe a satisfactory amount of kisses that would satiate him—only as many the are grains of Libyan sands in silphium-bearing Cyrene (*quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenae | lasarpiciferis iacet Cyrenis*, 7.2).<sup>25</sup> This time he is madly in love (*vesano Catullo*, 10) and emphasizes his insanity as he worries that curious minds might count the kisses and bewitch the lovers with evil curses (*quae nec pernumerare curiosi | possint nec mala fascinare lingua*, 11-12). The language of the two poems (*basia*, 5.7; *basiationes* 7.1; *mille . . .centum*, 5.7; *quot*, 7.1) and the hyperboles which Catullus uses to measure the kisses establish a literary link between the episodes. Catullus creates an implicit level of consciousness as the reader sees him on an emotional level in the two separate episodes. When taken in context of the previous poem (5), the reader now sees in poem 7 an almost paranoid pathos in Catullus' *persona*, which focuses on the seclusion and secrecy of the lovers. By considering the similarities in Catullus' emotions in the two episodes, the reader also

---

<sup>25</sup> I am progressing through Catullus' poems sequentially as we have them in modern collections. It is not clear whether Catullus arranged his poems as we have them today. For a detailed discussion of arrangement, see Wisemans' comments in *Catullan Questions* (1969).

realizes the extent of Catullus' infatuation with Lesbia. If either of Catullus' *basia* poems were considered in isolation, the reader might think that a momentary love enveloped the poet. Catullus, however, created an emotional continuity within the different contexts so that the reader sees his deep infatuation.

The depth of the poet's self-blinding love for Lesbia adds to the shock of the break-up. Catullus commands himself to stop being silly and to face the facts (*Miser Catulle, desinas ineptire | et quod vides perisse perditum ducas*, 8.1-2): his girlfriend does not want him anymore (*nunc iam illa non vult*, 9). Catullus' apostrophe both to himself (*desinas*, 1; *obstinata mente perfer*, *obdura*, 11; *obdura*, 18) and to his absent girlfriend (*scelestas, vae te, quae tibi manet vita? | quis nunc te adibit? cui videberis bella? . . .*, 15-18) demonstrate the emotional process that Catullus goes through in his attempts to deal with the break-up. The audience sees Catullus first dealing with the hurt and then turning to vindictiveness. After telling himself to "suck it up," Catullus becomes cruel toward his girlfriend and declares that he will no longer seek her company nor ask about her (*nec te requiret nec rogabit invitam*, 13). Soon in fact, no one at all will ask after her (*at tu dolebis cum rogaberis nulla*, 14). By the end of poem 8, Catullus has returned to the same, calm resignation with which he had begun (*at tu, Catulle, destinatus obdura*, 18). Catullus' intense focus on his own emotions in the episode (*miser*, 1; *impotens*, 9; *obstinata mente*, 11; *destinatus*, 18) and his descriptive language allow the audience insight into his *persona* so that the reader experiences Catullus' rejection with him.

Because Catullus empowers his poem with so much descriptive language, his audience can still experience and understand his emotional loss in an isolated reading of the poem. When the poem is read as part of the collection, however, the audience can

see Catullus' feelings on a dynamic plane of emotional ups and downs.<sup>26</sup> The "unwilling lover" is not an isolated moment but a part of Catullus' greater design and consciousness. Catullus constructs a literary reference to his former infatuated *persona* blissfully seeking endless kisses (*soles occidere et redire possunt*, 5.4; *fulsere quondam candidi tibi soles*, 8.3)<sup>27</sup> so that the reader, who has experienced the lovestruck Catullus demanding innumerable kisses, confronts Catullus' rejection poem with a deeper understanding and sympathy of the break-up. When Catullus later experiences another trying time in his relationship, he only needs to say that "I have and I love" (85) to bring the reader back to the dynamic of his love lost.<sup>28</sup> The reader re-visits the infatuated Catullus and the rejected Catullus, the kisses, the furtive lovers, and the break-up. This resultant backdrop of feeling against which we read the entire collection establishes Catullus' lyric consciousness and allows the poet to actually share his experiences with his audiences.

Horace considers the poet who knows only how to sing "Catullus" and "Calvus" a primate (*simius iste | nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum*, *S.1.10.18-19*). Catullus and the neoterics may have successfully brought Callimachean standards of innovation to their poetry, but Horace claims to be the first to return to the primary spirit of lyric song (*libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps, non aliena meo pressi pede*, *Epist.1.19.21-22*). Horace looks beyond his immediate Roman predecessors to the archaic Greek lyricists who drank a substance more potent than water (*nulla placere diu nec vivere carmina possunt | quae*

---

<sup>26</sup> Wiseman (1985) 137: "there are two stages to be borne in mind: that of the first-time reader of the collection, recognising the 'Lesbia' relationship as a major theme and having his insight into it progressively developed as he proceeds; and that of the returning reader, who knows what comes afterwards, and can use his knowledge to pick up cross-references in both directions. I think it is a fair assumption that Catullus hoped for readers who would not be satisfied with going through the collection only once."

<sup>27</sup> Catullus reinforces this literary allusion a few lines afterwards (*fulsere vere candidi tibi soles*, 8.8).

<sup>28</sup> Lyne (1980) 52 comments, "We share the experience with the poet and thereby come to an intuitive appreciation of often inexpressible things. And that is a richer adventure than being told the expressible."

*scribuntur aquae potoribus*, *Epist.*1.19.2-3) and performed songs that could affect and influence the *polis*. Horace, who is not satisfied with the personal context of Catullus' *nugae*, imbues his song with a communal self-consciousness which surfaces repeatedly throughout his lyric collection and which looks back to the original, political and social potency of archaic lyric poetry.

In Horace's first ode of his *tribiblos*, he introduces his poetic dictum: the viewpoint from which he wants the reader to approach his lyric. Horace constructs a Greek setting and through it claims and re-presents the social function of the lyric poet. He begins the song with a dedication to Maecenas:

Maecenas atavis edite regibus  
 o et praesidium et dulce decus meum:  
 sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum  
 collegisse iuvat metaque fervidis  
 evitata rotis palmaque nobilis  
 terrarum dominos evehit ad deos;  
 hunc, si mobilium turba Quiritium  
 certat tergemini tollere honoribus;  
 1.1.1-8

Maecenas, born from royal ancestors, O my guard and my sweet honor: there are those whom it pleases to have gathered Olympic dust on their chariot; and both the end-posts turned round with eager wheels and the noble palm carries them as masters of the earth to the gods. This one delights, if the crowd of noble Quirites struggles to raise him with triple honors.

The song quickly steps into the world of archaic Greek lyric and its meter.<sup>29</sup> The address may be to a noble Roman, but the cadence remains decidedly Greek, signified by the vocative ( $\bar{o}$ ) which like its Greek counterpart ( $\hat{\omega}$ ) remains unelided. Horace now borrows the construction of the priamel (*sunt quos*, 3) from the Greek lyricists when he lists the glories that occupy others and that are outside his own aspirations over the next

---

<sup>29</sup> The meter here is First Asclepiadean. The next eight odes, known as the Parade Odes, are each in a specific meter which establishes Horace's scope of borrowing and rivalry through the metrics. Lowrie (1995) argues that Horace extends this rivalry beyond the metrics of the Parade Odes through 1-18 by invoking individual lyricists themselves.

strophes.<sup>30</sup> Horace extends the Greek setting and metaphor as he describes those for whom it is pleasing to gather Olympic dust on their chariots (3-4) in a distinctly Pindaric style. Horace ends his priamel on an ostensibly Greek tone:

me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium  
 dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus  
 Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori  
 secernunt populo, si neque tibias  
 Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia  
 Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.  
 quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,  
 sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

1.1.29-36

The ivies, prizes of learned minds, mix me with the gods above; the chilly grove and the light choruses of Nymphs with Satyrs seclude me from the people, if neither Euterpe restrains her reed-pipes nor if Polyhymnia fails to tune the Lesbian lyre. But if you enroll me in the lyric canon, I will knock the top of the stars with my head.

Groves, their nymphs, the satyrs and their choruses, all joined by the Muses Euterpe and Polyhymnia create a literary celebration that is decidedly Greek. But throughout the party Horace shifts the focus to himself. The repetition of *me . . . me . . . me* (29-30; 35), the independence from the Roman crowd (*secernunt populo*, 32), and the final striking image of Horace's fame reaching the stars (*feriam*, 36) weave the poet into a Greek world. He becomes inseparable from the Greek images, literally sewing himself within the Greek lines.

In the center of his Greek priamel, Horace shifts the setting to Roman themes. Horace is just not looking back to Greek originals, but within this lyric context he will speak to his contemporary Romans in their own language. One man exalts in being raised into office by his fellow Quirites (7-8), another rejoices in tilling his father's land

---

<sup>30</sup> For the early Greek priamel, see Sappho 16 L-P; Pindar fr. 221 Schr.; Solon fr.1 D for the Greek priamel; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 232-233; N.-H. (1970) 2-4. For the form of priamel, see Race (1982).

(9-10). Horace continues through the occupations that give others joy—merchants, sailors, soldiers, and hunters. Horace has brought his poem out of the Greek literary context into a political context that speaks to the community of Romans. Horace is not merely concerned with a literary aspect of writing Greek verses; Quirinus himself thought he was insane if here merely wanted to re-write Greek poetry (*S.1.10.31-35*). The Roman community is central to Horace's ode and he avoids isolating his audience from his poetry by directly speaking to them. Horace is not just translating, but transforming lyric by making the *Latin* lyre assessable in a voice not spoken before (*hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus volgavi fidicen, Epist. 1.19.32-33*). Thus Horace does not strive to become a mere imitator of the Greek poets by translating verses; he will only be satisfied by becoming equal to the immortalized lyric canon.<sup>31</sup> At the same time that Horace emulates the sources of Greek lyric themselves, he adheres to the Callimachean standards of innovation. Horace imbues his texts with a self-referentiality that establishes his consciousness by speaking in a voice not heard before.

Horace's introductory poem (C.1) anticipates the situations and episodes of the rest of the collection so that Horace invites the reader to approach the artistic collection as interplay.<sup>32</sup> After addressing Maecenas, Horace returns to themes of patrons and politics in 1.2 and 1.3: the first to Augustus, the second to another member of the circle, Vergil. When Horace sings to Varro (1.6), the reader is again in the world of patronage

---

<sup>31</sup> The canon of nine lyric poets includes Alcman, Alcaeus, Anacreon, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Pindar, Sappho, Simonides, and Stesichorus (*Oxford Classical Dictionary*) 900.

<sup>32</sup> I agree with Fraenkel (1957) 26 who cautions the reader not to look beyond a single ode for meaning. What I am suggesting is that Horace, following the tradition of lyric, asks us to consider one situation at one time and then at another. When we consider this self-referentiality, we see a transformation of the poet. Consider, for example, the first and last odes of the collection, in which Horace first writes a somewhat modest (even if feigned) wish to be enrolled in the lyric canon (1.1.29-31) and then at last boldly declares that he has surpassed his models and created a more lasting monument (3.30).

and politics. The structure of the priamel foreshadows the Pindaric priamel in 1.7 and the Pindaric motto in 1.12. In addition, the metrical variations of the Parade Odes complement the meter of 1.1. Rather than offering *nugae* for his readers, Horace's introductory poem establishes his communal consciousness, that Horace's social contexts are never far from his own mind, nor will they be distant from the audience's mind as they move through the collection.

I have not overlooked Maecenas. Horace gives his patron the prime position in his lyric collection, and thereby highlights a more select audience—a private literary circle which influenced Horace's poetry. At the same time, *Maecenas*, the first word in the collection, indicates Horace's principal and foremost concern—to be communal. Horatian lyric has political connections. Maecenas and Augustus' poets formed a literary circle into which Horace was initiated in 38/37 B. C.<sup>33</sup> The Augustan poets, like the neoterics, adhered to Callimachean standards of literary innovation,<sup>34</sup> and exchanged poetry and creative philosophies between themselves. Unlike the politically withdrawn neoterics, however, Maecenas' circle maintained direct contact with Rome's political elite. Through their patron, the statesman Maecenas who held such close political ties to Augustus,<sup>35</sup> the poets had the opportunity to directly address matters of public policy. Just as the archaic Greek lyricists engaged and performed a social function for the *polis*, Horace relies on the political connections of his circle to engage a wider Roman audience. Thus he renews the spirit of the archaic Greek lyric poets, one which engages and performs a social function for the *polis*. The Greek meter, Pindaric style, and Greek

---

<sup>33</sup> Reckford (1959) 198.

<sup>34</sup> See my discussion of the Augustan *recusatio* in Chapter 1.

<sup>35</sup> For Maecenas' political career, see Reckford (1959) 195-197; Dalzell (1956) 151-152.

allusions throughout the ode emphasize that Horace looks beyond the neoterics who withdrew from politics to the Greek lyricists who performed an integral role for the *polis*.

Horace confirms the broad and more communal power of the poet with emphatic statements of his poetic program at the end of his second and third books. The lyric poet commands a prophetic and vatic function to such an extent that he defies the narrow strictures of the neoterics. In *C.2.20*, Horace transcends boundaries:

Non usitata nec tenui ferar  
pinna biformis per liquidum aethera  
vates neque in terris morabor  
longius invidiaque maior

urbis relinquam. non ego, pauperum  
sanguis parentum, non ego, quem vocas,  
dilecte Maecenas, obibo  
nec Stygia cohibebor unda.  
2.20.1-8

I will not fly on a common or slender wing, two-formed through the liquid air, a *vates*, nor will I be delayed on the lands too long, and I will triumph over the envy of the city. Not I, the son of poor parents, not I, whom you invite, beloved Maecenas, will die, and I will not inhabit the Stygian waves.

Horace will not be borne on a common or slender wing (*non usitata nec tenui . . . penna*, 2.20.1-2) through the liquid air. The *vates* (3) will never look upon the Stygian banks (7-8). Rather, he will glide far and wide as a bird (*canorus ales*, 15-16), visiting the shores of the groaning Bosphorus and the Hyperborean fields (14-16). Horace juxtaposes the broad range of his poetry to the common and slender wing of his opening line and uses Callimachean language (*non usitata nec tenui*) to define the stylistic qualities that will bring him immortality. Horace will be original and will reject the narrow project, and give the Callimachean aesthetic a new, communal focus.

Horace becomes both the *vates* and the *ales* in this poem, *biformis* (2). Part of him will die, but the other will reach far and wide and never meet the underworld's gloom.

Accordingly in the beginning of the song, the physical world takes center stage: air (2) and land (3), patrons (7) and cities (5). At this stage Horace's poetic *ego* dominates, appearing twice in the first stanza in line-final positions (*ferar* 1, *morabor* 3) and within each of the lines of the second stanza (*relinquam . . . ego*, 5; *ego*, 6; *obibo*, 7; *cohibebor*, 8). The anaphora *iam, iam* (9) emphasizes a shift into metaphor: Horace's metamorphosis into the swan. Horace, the person, is reduced to a single passive verb (*mutor*, 10). Horace as the *ales* moves into a more eternal and metaphorical state as new rough skin (*pelles*, 10) and light feathers spring throughout his fingers and toes (*leves. . . plumae*, 11-12). Horace the person now becomes entirely secondary to the imagery of far-off lands and peoples and the realm of the unreal. By the final two stanzas the poet is nearly absent as the poet and appears only as a single *me* in the fifth stanza. Still, Horace does not lose himself, but through his poetry he is transformed into a universal and eternal presence.

The final addressees of this poem are mourners in a communal moment. In this last stanza, Horace returns to the vatic power of the archaic lyric poet in terms of the social and political community. He instructs the crowd of mourners to stop their grief:

absint inane funere neniae  
 luctusque turpes et querimoniae;  
     conpesce clamorem ac sepulcri  
     mitte supervacuos honores.  
 2.20.21-24

Let your dirges be absent from this empty funeral, and your vile griefs and laments; hold your shouting in check and send away your empty honors from the tomb.

Horace quickly shifts from the far-off lands of the Hiber and Rhone to a private moment, and appeals to the crowd in terms of personal grief (*luctus, querimoniae*). Horace settles on this final impression of the poem and expresses his universal power as a *vates* in the context of community—the Roman people. Here he speaks more in the manner

of an archaic Greek poet as he appeals to a universal moment of his *polis*. By releasing the *polis* from their grief through his poetry, Horace has asserted the political and social potential of the lyric. Through this power to be influential in even the most personal moments, Horace writes with a timeless relevance that will carry his name and word beyond the Stygian shores.

At the end of his second book Horace emphasized the nations far and wide that would read his lyric, and now in the final moment of his first collection he emphasizes the immortality of his achievement:

Exegi monumentum aere perenius  
 regalique situ pyramidum altius,  
 quod non imber edax, non Aquilo inpotens  
 possit diruere aut innumerabilis  
 annorum series et fuga temporum.  
 Non omnis moriar multaue pars mei  
 vitabit Libitinam; usque ego postera  
 crescā laude recens, dum Capitolium  
 scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex.  
 Dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus  
 et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium  
 regnavit populorum, ex humili potens  
 princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos  
 deduxisse modos. Sume superbiam  
 quaesitam meritis et mihi Delphica  
 lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam.

I have built a monument more lasting than bronze and more lofty than the site of the regal pyramids, which neither the devouring storm nor the violent North Wind is able to demolish or the innumerable passings of the years, and the flights of times. I shall not wholly die, and a great part of me will avoid Libitina. Continuously onwards I will grow recent with praise, while the pontifex climbs the Capitoline with the silent virgin. I shall be spoken of, wherever the violent Aufidus roars and wherever Daunus, poor of water, has ruled over the rural peoples; I am rising from my humble start to become powerful, the first to have led Aeolian song to Italian meters. Receive the pride won by my service and willingly wreath my hair with the Delphic laurel, Melpomene.

Throughout the poem Horace highlights his role in the lyric tradition as the poet who has created a lasting achievement. Echoes of the bold statement of far-reaching influence

from 2.20 resound through 3.30. Again, Horace boldly declares his prominence in the emphatic first person (*exegi monumentum aere perennius*, 1). Horace remains the primary focus of the poem as he proclaims that he shall not wholly die, and a great part of him will avoid the shades of death (*non omnis moriar multaue pars mei | vitabit Libitinam*, 6-7). He himself will grow with praise (*ego postera | crescā laude*, 7-8) and he will be famed among people far and wide (*dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus*, 10). Now in this last poem of the collection, Horace defines his *monumentum* (*ex humili potens | princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos | deduxisse modos*, 12-14).

Horace frames his achievement on a communal moment as the Pontifex Maximus and Vestal march through the center of his poem. Because Horace has created referentiality in the personal and private moments of the community, as long as the *polis* stands, the community can reference and identify with his lyrics. Now as Horace reaches prominence in the lyric canon and crowns his head with victorious ivies, Horace's immortality is contingent on the community of the *polis*.

In Horace, lyric poetry has once again become inherently political. He writes according to the Callimachean standards of fat sacrifices and slender Muses, but avoids speaking to an isolated literary community by personalizing communal moments, and Horace himself has achieved eternal vatic status through these personal, communal moments.

CHAPTER 4  
THE “FAT LITTLE” VERGIL

ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἶδω<sup>1</sup>

“I sing nothing unattested.”

Horace would be named by peoples far and wide for ages to come because his poetry touched upon universal moments for the community. Yet even when read outside of the immediate political context, readers could experience Horace’s lyrics because they are grounded in the personal, human universality. Vergil too strives to achieve this poetic immortality but faces an opposite challenge: transforming epic, an inherently political genre, into a personal setting, which will give him relevance to an audience beyond his own age. Just as Horace bypassed his immediate predecessors in favor of archaic Greek models, Vergil seeks inspiration from the master—Homer. Vergil imitates Homeric language and style to fatten his poetic sacrifice and narrates in episodic elements which keep his Muse slender. Vergil further adopts the bard’s vatic role as he narrates the history of his Roman people against the backdrop of the Greek epic tradition.

Vergil explicitly states his allegiance to Homer in the proem to his epic. Scholarship has noted that Vergil’s proem follows the proemia of Homer’s epics in structure.<sup>2</sup> Closer analysis shows thematic parallels in the construction of the epic hero,

---

<sup>1</sup> Call. fr. 612 Pf.

<sup>2</sup> For the structure of the *Aeneid* and its relationship to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, see Heinze (1903); Williams (1968); Knauer (1964a), (1964b), (1990); Cairns (1989); Farrell (1991); Perkell (1999).

the journey, and the invocation to the Muse. Vergil's first words *arma uirumque* follow the theme-first convention used by Homer.<sup>3</sup> Vergil next references the poetic voice (*cano*) and then continues into a *narratio* concerning the deeds of the hero (2-4).<sup>4</sup> Homer identified Zeus and Apollo as adverse deities,<sup>5</sup> and Vergil now points to Juno (4) as the antagonistic goddess who drives his hero to suffer. This queen of the gods immediately returns into the narrative as the source of conflict for the hero (*dolens regina deum*, 9) and forces him to undergo endless labors (10-11).

Vergil alerts the audience to his imitation by citing precise titles: *arma* (*Iliad*) and *uirum* (*Odyssey*).<sup>6</sup> Vergil begins with the *Iliad*. Although the three heroes in the proemia each suffer at the hands of the gods, both Achilles and Aeneas face adversity as a direct result of the god—**ἐξ οὗ** (6) and *ob iram* (4). Furthermore, both the proemia of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* end with the renaming of the hero: **δῖος Ἄχιλλεύς** (7) and *insignem pietate* (10). However, the opening lines to the *Aeneid* parallel the proem to the *Odyssey* more closely than the proem to the *Iliad*. Vergil's *vir* mirrors Homer's **ἄνηρ**. In the *Iliad*, the wrath of the hero is the subject, but in both the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* the poet tells the story of the man himself. After the hero is introduced by a relative clause (**ὅς μάλα πολλὰ**, 1; *qui primus ab oris*, 1), Vergil's *vir* is thrown (*iactatus*, 3) just as Homer's hero is knocked about (**πλάγχθη**, 2). Both heroes suffer the forces of nature: the **ἄνηρ** suffers

<sup>3</sup> Perkell (1999) 29. In comparison, both the *Iliad* (**μήνιν**) and the *Odyssey* (**ἄνδρα**) begin with the subject of the epic.

<sup>4</sup> After the invocation in the *Iliad*, Homer sings the deeds of Achilles who brought innumerable sufferings upon the Achaeans (2), sent many stout-hearted souls to Hades (3-4), and left the bodies of heroes behind as loot for dogs and birds (4-5). See Weber (1987) 270 for further metrical allegiance to the *Iliad*. Similarly in the *Odyssey*, Homer describes the deeds of Odysseus in a *narratio* following the invocation: he destroyed the holy city of Troy (2); he saw and learned of many cities and the mindset of men (3).

<sup>5</sup> **Διός** (*Il*.1.5); **Ἀητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός** (1.9); **Ἵπερίονος Ἡελίοιο** (*Od*. 1.8).

<sup>6</sup> This analysis largely confirms Cairns (1989).

many toils on the sea (πολλὰ δ' ὁ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθειν, 4), while Vergil's *vir* is tossed about on land and on sea, and suffers also much in war (*multa quoque et bello passus*, 5). Furthermore, this ἄνηρ and *vir* suffer at the hands of deities, just as Zeus directed the course of the wrath in the *Iliad* (5). The ἄνηρ and *vir* struggle against this adverse god toward a final goal—one to secure his own safe return, the other to found a city. At the end of both proemia, the poets have introduced two men, both still unnamed, both the leaders of men, and both struggling to accomplish a mission.

Vergil extends his imitation beyond the proem and often quotes from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as he narrates his Roman epic. Aeneas' first speech, in fact, quotes Odysseus' speech when he laments his own fated wanderings. Such imitations launch a pattern of verbal reminiscences between the *Aeneid* and its Homeric predecessors. Both Aeneas and Odysseus cry out, “three and four times blessed are those who died at wide Troy” (τρὶς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις, οἱ τότε ὄλοντο | Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ, *Od.* 5.306-7; *o terque quaterque beati*, | *quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis* | *contigit oppetere!*, 1.94-96).<sup>7</sup> As leaders, Odysseus and Aeneas express comfort to their companions who suffer the wanderings with them in the same words: “O companions, we are not ignorant of hardships” (ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ πῶ τι κακῶν ἀδαήμενές εἰμεν, 12.208; *O socii (neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum)*, 1.198).<sup>8</sup> Vergil even leaves the reader at the end of his epic with a Homeric paraphrase as Turnus' life leaves its chilled limbs and slips into the shades below (ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων παταμένη Ἄιδόσδε βεβήκει | ὄν πότμον γόωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην, *Il.*16.656-7; *ast illi soluuntur frigore membra*

<sup>7</sup> Clausen (1966) 77-79; Pöschl (1962) 26.

<sup>8</sup> Pöschl (1962) 26.

|*uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras*, 12.951-2).<sup>9</sup> Through Vergil's imitation the Homeric models are never far from the audience's mind so that they read the *Aeneid* as an extension of the Homeric tradition.

Vergil's allegiance to Homer includes structure, which effects the basic plot-lines of his epic. Vergil condenses the events of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into his narrative.<sup>10</sup> Just as Circe and Calypso detained the Odyssean hero, for example, the African queen Dido delays Aeneas from reaching his homeland. Aeneas and the Trojans hold funeral games for Anchises in the same manner that the Greeks celebrate games for Patroclus (*Il.*23.226-897). Both the Odyssean hero and Vergilian hero visit the underworld and meet warriors and family members from their past (*A.*6, *Od.*11). Vergil's narration of battle scenes, enumerations of *aristeiai*, and descriptions of councils of gods enhance his imitation of Homeric plots and situate the trials of Aeneas deep within the Homeric tradition. Vergil thus reasserts his Homeric inspiration on multiple levels of narrative, from plot lines to the language itself.

Vergil's loaded introduction *arma uirumque* anticipates the Homeric structure of his narrative. Vergil conceives the first half of the *Aeneid* as the *Odyssey* and the second half as the *Iliad*.<sup>11</sup> The introductory *uirumque* and the *narratio* on the deeds of Aeneas reinforce the first half as Odyssean, while the second invocation at the beginning of

---

<sup>9</sup> Harrison (1971) 166.

<sup>10</sup> This argument is confirmed in Knauer who writes the definitive analysis of the similarities in Homeric and Vergilian plot lines in *die Aeneis und Homer* (1964a). See also his article "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer" (1990) and Heinze's work *Virgils epische Technik* (1903).

<sup>11</sup> Duckworth (1962) 11 extensively outlines the various structural patterns of the *Aeneid*. He notes the bipartite structure of the two halves and also examines a tri-partite division of the books, which is again reinforced by allusion in the opening scenes of the *Aeneid* (1.1-96). The mention of *Carthago* and the description of the old city (1.13-22) symbolizes the first third of the book (1-4: Aeneas at Carthage and Dido). Jupiter's prophecy (1.257-296) foreshadows the second third of the book (5-7: Latium, preparation for war, Rome's history and destiny). Finally, the *Furor impius* (1.294) anticipates the last third of the book, which concentrates on the wars and battles themselves.

*Aeneid* 7 (A.7.37-44) marks the halfway point and the transition to the *Iliad*.<sup>12</sup> Vergil does not adapt the whole of the *Odyssey*, but rather, as Knauer notes, extracts only the parts of Odysseus' *epitogoi* which are important to his own narrative.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, Vergil does not merely imitate the language or themes of Homer, he imitates the actual compositional methods of the epic bard. Just as Vergil borrowed select parts of the Homeric tradition, Homer borrowed select parts from the oral tradition.<sup>14</sup> Thus Vergil does not rewrite or reinvent Homer, but uses his epics as a spring-board for his own epic.

In his imitation Vergil alludes to parts of the Homeric texts and allows Homer and the tradition to speak. As Aeneas and his men wander closer to Italy, they skim by the mythical monsters Scylla and Charybdis (3.554-560). Because Vergil's audience of contemporary Romans would not readily believe that the historical Aeneas would encounter such fanciful creatures, Vergil only allows Aeneas to hear the monsters from afar (*audimus longe fractasque ad litora uoces*, 3.556).<sup>15</sup> Vergil's Aeneas grazes past the shores of the Cyclops and again only sees the mythical creatures from a distance (3.655-661). Vergil keeps Aeneas' struggles and narrative as the primary focus, and we see Homer's

---

<sup>12</sup> Duckworth (1962) 3-10. Anderson (1957) discusses Vergil's imitation of the *Iliad* in the second half of the book in depth. He argues that Vergil's Trojans evolve from a race of defeat and actually succeed the role of the Greeks as the victorious race. Anderson (27-30) further argues that Vergil works through the events of the last half of his epic so that Troy and the Trojans actually fall (*occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*, 12.828), which is necessary for Rome to rise again.

<sup>13</sup> Knauer (1990) 397-401.

<sup>14</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1456a.36-54; 1459a-1459b. Aristotle cautions poets to keep their plot lines manageable by selecting only certain aspects of the tradition. Aristotle observes that Homer himself selects only the important parts of the tradition and does not retell every aspect of the Trojan War, but sings only of the struggles of two heroes. Vergil constructs his poem to be read in the same way. See also the comments of Heinze (1903) 3-4, Otis (1963) 36, and Papanghelis (1999) 275-279.

<sup>15</sup> Papanghelis (1999) 277-290: "sailing too close to this particular Homeric coast is not an option for the Virgilian text: the *Aeneid* comes close enough to Odysseus' fantasy world to catch its echo—but it will not be drawn into it." Vergil treats Aeneas' encounter with the Sirens in a similar fashion.

world only from a distance. Vergil interweaves his own narrative with the scenes of the Homeric story and then allows his audience's familiarity with the tradition to fill in the gaps. The audience brings their own literary awareness and their experiences to the text, and thus they interact with Vergil's narrative, supplying their own knowledge when Vergil withholds his.

Vergil fattens his work with Homeric references but he keeps his Muse slender in the same manner as Homer by composing in episodes. The ancient *vitae* state that Vergil wrote the episodes of his narrative first without regard to chronology or development of the narrative.<sup>16</sup> Only then did he sew the episodes together into a united narrative.<sup>17</sup> Vergil therefore divides the whole of his narrative into episodic components such as Aeneas' arrival at Carthage, Dido's death, and Aeneas' descent to the underworld.<sup>18</sup> The episodes focus on a particular scene, narrative, or dramatic event of the epic which could be read separately from the main narrative.<sup>19</sup> The result of Vergil's episodic manner of composition is that the audience experiences the entire narrative as a series of brief events. Vergil thus achieves a *brevitas* which keeps his audience actively involved at each transition.

---

<sup>16</sup> Suet. *Vit.*94-96R; cf. Quinn (1968) 73.

<sup>17</sup> Duckworth (1962) 1; Quinn (1968) 72-73. Quinn breaks the *Aeneid* into 167 episodes of two types: one which expresses a "well developed coherent structure" that is essential to narrative; the other which is "less coherent" and provides "a link to the first type of Episode."

<sup>18</sup> Heinze (1903) 348.

<sup>19</sup> Heinze (1903) 210 argues that Vergil's epic was written to be sung, and thus the individual components of the narrative had to be short enough to be read at one sitting, but relevant enough to the main plot that the listeners could keep in mind that they were hearing only one part of the entire epic. Bowra (1966) 53-56 divides oral (which he terms authentic) and literary epic according to various criteria, including the use of episodes. In authentic epic, he observes, episodes are not as tightly woven and focus only on necessary elements. In literary epics such as the *Aeneid*, it is Vergil's prerogative to "pack each line with as much significance as possible, to make each word do its utmost work and to secure that careful attention which the reader, unlike the listener, can give."

Vergil can surprise the reader with each episodic turn, but he keeps the focus of each of his episodes solidly on the action and goal of the *Aeneid*. Aristotle praises episodes because they allow the audience to experience the action of the epic in terms of multiple tragic moments of role reversal, recognition, and suffering.<sup>20</sup> But Aristotle warns against writing an entirely episodic narrative in which each episode has no relevance to the poem as a whole.<sup>21</sup> Vergil carefully interweaves the drama and action of each episode into the action of the main narrative. When Aeneas first visits Carthage, for example, he marvels at the sight of the rising city (1.418-440). Aeneas sees the parts of the city which were once huts (*magalia*, 421) turn into structures of civilization: walls (423), a citadel (424), gates (427) and a theater decked with huge columns (427-428). Amid his wonder and amazement, Aeneas cries out, “O they are fortunate whose walls already rise!” (*O fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt*, 437). The lengthy descriptions of Carthage’s rising city and Aeneas’ words bring us back to the action of the very beginning of the epic (*atque altae moenia Romae*, 1.7). Aeneas focuses his attention on Carthage, but the struggle to found his city—the purpose of his quest—is the prominent theme of the episode.

Here in Carthage Aeneas first dared to hope for a better future for his men (*hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem | ausus*, 1.451-452) but his hope soon turns sour. As Vergil describes Dido’s consuming grief and pain, he does not allow the focus of the episode to become fixed too exclusively on Dido, but rather Vergil demonstrates his preoccupation with the events of the main narrative. After Mercury commands Aeneas to quit his delays and return to the fulfillment of his destiny (4.265-276), Vergil describes Dido’s

---

<sup>20</sup> Arist. *Po.*1459b.1-6; 1459a.7-17.

<sup>21</sup> Arist. *Po.*1451b.48-55.

distress in a frenzy of furor that overwhelms the narrative of Aeneas' visit to Carthage. Rumor brings the news of Aeneas' departure to the queen who rages through her city like a Bacchant (300-304). She has been utterly deserted and left with no remnant of Aeneas, not even a child that would console her in her distress (*si quis mihi paruulus aula | luderet Aeneas, qui te tamen ore referret, | non equidem omnino capta ac deserta uiderer*, 328-330). Vergil progressively directs the scene toward Aeneas who is preparing his fleet for departure. Aeneas, however, is enveloped in concerns for the grieving queen as he considers how he might console her (*At pius Aeneas, quamquam lenire dolentem | solando cupit et dictis auertere curas*, 393-394). As the Trojans burden their ships with supplies for their journey, Vergil interrupts and speaks directly to Dido who oversees the actions of the Trojans: "What feelings did you have Dido, as you look upon these things? What groans did you keep giving?" (*quis tibi tum, Dido, cernenti talia sensus, | quosve dabas gemitus*, 408-409). Dido and her grief pervades the sequence of events, but in her last outburst of emotion, the moment belongs to the Trojans. Dido's frenzy concludes in a curse against the Trojan race:

nullus amor populis nec foedera sunt.  
 exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor  
 qui face Dardanio ferroque sequere colonos,  
 nunc, olim, quocumque dabunt se tempore uires.  
 litora litoribus contraria, fluctibus undas  
 imprecor, arma armis: pugnent ipsique nepotesque.  
 4.624-629

May there be no love or treaties for your people. May there be an avenger to rise from our bones who will follow the Dardanian colonists with sword and firebrand, now, once and at whatever time strength will give itself. I beg for shores against shores, waves against waves, arms against arms. May they and their descendants fight.

In the end, Dido's rage has culminated in a curse that adds to the suffering and toil of the Trojans and their descendants, Vergil's Romans. Vergil takes us back to

Aeneas buffeted about on the sea by Juno's storms, to the battles already suffered at Troy, and looks ahead to the battles that await the Trojans in Italy and the Carthaginian wars. Dido in her maddened state will speak her last words in a resolute prayer to the shades of death (*dulces exuviae*, 651), and thus Vergil has hinged the episode's climax of emotion on the burden which he placed on Aeneas and his men at the beginning of his epic (*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*, 1.33).<sup>22</sup> Vergil has included within the main narrative of Aeneas' journey the collapse of another exile and her city. Within the episode, however, the audience never loses sight of the greater context of the narrative so that the individual episode—and others like it, such as those with Evander (8), Nisus (9), and Aeneas' shield (8)—maintains the brevity of the narrative and at the same time adds depth and meaning to the greater themes of the epic.

Vergil has thus not only imitated Homer, but he has become the Homeric bard. Vergil validates his epic as history by sewing his narrative deep within a Homeric context. Simultaneously he maintains credibility with his contemporary audience by selecting only relevant parts of the Homeric tradition and only alluding to less relevant mythologies so that the reader actively participates in the narrative and interprets what is left unsaid. Vergil achieves brevity through his shifting episodic narrative but fattens his Muse through the dramatic events of each episode. Even at the most basic level of these episodes, we see Vergil's greater design: to work through the toils and sufferings that were necessary to found the Roman race. Vergil hoists the history of his people on his

---

<sup>22</sup> We can see Vergil's focus on the goal of his narrative in comparison to the later novelist Petronius. As Schmeling (1991: 358-359; 358 n.22) notes, when Petronius alludes to the Dido and Aeneas episode in his *Satyricon*, he is able to surprise and redirect the actions of his characters and the plot itself. In Vergil's case, however, tradition and the inevitability of his ending dictate the course of the narrative. Schmeling continues, "the story of Dido and Aeneas moves inevitably from its beginning to its clearly predestined conclusion. . . .Virgil lives under the constant anxiety of the ending of Aeneas' story."

shoulders and carries epic out of the disparagement of Callimachus' criticisms to establish a completely revitalized tradition.

CHAPTER 5  
THE “LITTLE FAT” VERGIL

ἄκαπνα γὰρ αἰὲν ἀοιδοὶ θύομεν<sup>1</sup>

“For we singers always sacrifice unburned offerings (to the Muses).”

Propertius announces Vergil’s *Aeneid* as a grand birth: “Give way Roman and Greek authors, something greater than the *Iliad* is being born!” (*cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Graei!|nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, 2.34b.65-66). Vergil has accomplished more than fattening his text with a Homeric voice, he has made the epic voice his own.<sup>2</sup> As Vergil looks back to the original master, he does not forget the standards of innovation set by Callimachus nor does he ignore the literary programs of his immediate literary circle. Like Horace, the most notable lyricist of this circle, Vergil exploits the self-referentiality that a literary text allows and concentrates the greater focus of his narrative into recurring personal moments. On a literary level we read Vergil’s *Aeneid* within a Homeric context, but Vergil turns his narrative inward with a personal, lyrical focus so that we experience his poem on a universal, communal level.

Vergil’s opening themes of arms and men deeply embed the reader in a Homeric context. Structural and compositional elements throughout the *Aeneid* reinforce this Homeric imitation. But Vergil sings *cano*, an entirely un-Homeric disavowal of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Call.fr. 494 Pf.; cf. Trypanis (1975) 257.

<sup>2</sup> Clausen (1964a) 142: As Clausen notes, Vergil is “most himself, most Roman, when imitating Homer or some other Greek poet, as if he were then most conscious of his own individuality.”

Muses as inspiration.<sup>3</sup> Vergil projects a greater individualism in his voice than Homer who uses imperative invocations to his Muse to begin each of his epics (μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεὰ, *Il.*1.1; Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, *Od.*1.1). Homer immediately presents himself as the bard through which the Muses sing. Vergil’s Muse, however, must wait eight lines before Vergil will call upon her for inspiration (*Musa, mihi causas memora*, 8). *Musa* remains first in the line, but *mibi* directly follows and undercuts the power of the invoked Muse. Furthermore, Vergil does not ask his Muse to sing or speak through him; rather, he asks her only to remind him (*memora*, 8).<sup>4</sup> Vergil reinforces the poet’s control of the narrative in his invocation for the second half of the *Aeneid*. Vergil calls upon Erato to “come, give ear,” while he himself tells of the wars that have come upon Italian shores (*Nunc age*,<sup>5</sup> *qui reges, Erato, quae tempora . . . expediam, et primae revocabo exordia pugnae*, 7.37, 40). The Muse as inspiration is absent from this invocation as the reader first encounters the poet’s ego, *expediam* (40), which is reinforced by the elision (*expediam et*) that moves the line swiftly to *renocabo* (40). Vergil actually takes over for himself the role of memory which he had previously assigned to the Muse (*Musa, mihi causas memora*, 1.8), and with *renocabo*, Vergil does not relinquish control: “I will revive the memory of things.”<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Miller (1986) argues that the disavowal of the divine Muse is programmatic as seen through invocations by Propertius, Ovid, and Persius. Vergil is not the first to sing in the first person. Williams (1968) 36-37 lists instances of the first person invocation by Apollonius, Callimachus, and Theocritus. Kopff (1981) 927-944 argues that the invocation in the *Little Iliad* (cf. *Hor. Ars* 136-137) provided the model for Vergil’s epic and describes other parallels between the two epics. Vergil’s disavowal of a Homeric Muse is more than a claim to the first person but is a signifier of a consciousness that Vergil will develop throughout his epic.

<sup>4</sup> Clausen (1964a) argues that Vergil’s use of *memora* is a literary allusion. He explains that Vergil’s appeal to the Muse is not an appeal to the tradition but to the specific Homeric texts.

<sup>5</sup> This use of *age* gives a colloquial feel to the address, which differs from the formal structure of Homer’s invocations. Williams (1968) 738 cites other colloquial instances of *age*, such as Mercury’s speech to Aeneas (*heia age, rumpe moras*, 4.569) and Charon’s speech to Aeneas (*fare age, qui uenias, iam instinc*, 6.389).

<sup>6</sup> *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 13b: “to recall to mind;” “revive the memory of.”

Vergil's first words *arma uirumque cano* encapsulate his poetic program, which the bard then revives and enhances throughout his text.<sup>7</sup> His subject will be an *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but he himself will sing it. Vergil imbues his text with a Horatian referentiality and introduces the reader to a degree of self-referentiality not found in Homer, a type of lyric consciousness. Just as Horace introduced his poetic program for the *tribiblos* in his opening song, Vergil begins with a condensed program of how he will write his epic. He operates from this program throughout his narrative so that the reader perceives in each episode a poetic intent and consciousness that looks back to the poet's own plan, *cano*.

Vergil's opening lines anticipate the forthcoming action of the poem and establish a pattern of referentiality that the oral nature of the Homeric epics did not allow.<sup>8</sup> When Vergil describes Carthage, Jupiter's prophecy, and the *impius furor* that awaits Aeneas, he establishes a foundation for his epic that readers will work from and look back to as they progress through the epic. After the invocation, Vergil physically places Carthage opposite Italy (*Karthago, Italiam contra*, 1.13) and at length details the city and Juno's intense protection of its peoples (12-18). After Juno has scattered his fleet on the sea, Aeneas beaches his ships on the shores of this same Carthage (1.305). Vergil does not remind us of Juno's fierce protection of the city and her queen Dido, but we recall her devotion from the opening lines. Vergil again asks us to recall Juno's

---

<sup>7</sup> Vergil's declaration of a poetic program in the first lines of his poem is a weighty construction. Weber (1987) 262-267 notes the rare metrical pattern of the opening three words (trochee + amphibrach + iamb). Weber, citing Catullus 64 in which the poet uses a neoteric vocabulary to present his poetic genre, also notes the importance of the *incipit* to poets as an opportunity for poetic statement. The opening lines provide occasion for poets to state how they one day want to be quoted. We might consider Horace's use of his Greek models in the "*motto* construction," in which he begins with a quote from an earlier Greek lyric (e.g. *Carm.* 1.1.4, 1.12, 1.16, 1.18, and 1.37). Feeney (1993) 44 notes that this construction "is a mark of homage both to his poetic models and to the scholars who had catalogued them under the *incipit*, and it is a self-referential anticipation of how he himself will one day be cited." We might thus consider Vergil's *incipit* as *Iliad* (*arma*), *Odyssey* (*uirum*), me (*cano*).

<sup>8</sup> Both Pöschl (1962) 13-32 and Duckworth (1962) 1-11 note and expand upon this literary and symbolic referentiality in Vergil's opening lines.

motivations from the previous episodes when the goddess plans a marriage for Dido and Aeneas (4.92-104) and initiates the strife that will alienate Carthage from Italy. Carthage is now in reality against Italy, and when the Sibyl sings of horrible wars that await Aeneas and his men (6.86), Vergil brings us back to these opening lines. Simultaneously he casts our thoughts forward to the Italian wars which await us in his epic and the Carthaginian wars which await the actual Roman race.<sup>9</sup>

Vergil again references his own work when Jupiter prophesizes the ultimate outcome of Aeneas' journey. The prophesy naturally functions as a literary device to foreshadow forthcoming trials, but Vergil also achieves self-referentiality on a symbolic level. As Jupiter enumerates the prominent descendents of Aeneas such as Ascanius (1.267-271), Romulus (273-282), and Augustus (283-288), he symbolically reviews Roman history and its heroes from past to present (6.756-892). Jupiter tells his daughter Venus that Faith, Vesta, and Romulus and Remus will bring laws to Aeneas' race so that the twin gates of war will close (*cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus | iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis | claudentur Belli portae*, 1.292-294). Vergil directly references monuments which frame the Roman forum: the temple to *Fides* on the Capitoline, the temple to Vesta in the forum, and the gates of Janus.<sup>10</sup> The physical monuments symbolically anticipate Aeneas' arrival into Latium and his tour through Evander's city (4.8). Lastly, Jupiter prophesizes that an impious *furor* will rage inside these gates of Janus—the god's hands tied behind his back and his mouth bloodied (1.294-296). The

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Pöschl (1962) 15. Pöschl (13-24) examines multiple levels of symbolic unity within the first three hundred lines of the *Aeneid*, which encompass wars, politics, history, and mythology.

<sup>10</sup> For the location of the temples, see the entries in Steinby (1993), Richardson (1992), and the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. The location of the temple of Janus and the gate is dubious, but we know that the gate played a role in the triumphal route which took victorious Roman generals through the forum; see also R. D. Williams (1972) 182-183.

*furor* foreshadows more than the Italian wars themselves but the wrath and violent passion which drive the soldiers and heroes all the way through to the conclusion of Vergil's epic (*furiis accensus*, 12.946). Vergil symbolically anticipates the events of his narrative so that as an audience we no longer approach the episodes in a linear fashion, but rather we consider how episodic scenes work on a symbolic level towards the goal of the main narrative.

Within *arma uirumque cano*, Vergil creates a symbolic referentiality not found in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Thus the tradition, a specifically Homeric tradition, to which Vergil is inextricably and avowedly bound becomes a foundation into which Vergil inserts his lyric consciousness. The rich epic context of these Homeric scenes allows Vergil to write as a lyric poet, with referentiality, deictic emotions, and universal appeal in terms of the personal. The differences between the first speeches of Odysseus and Aeneas as stranded warriors on the open sea indicate how Vergil will give his episodes dramatic, emotional levels of feeling in terms of personal suffering. Vergil gives us glimpses of Aeneas reacting on an emotional level in different situations so that as we progress through the text we form an awareness of Aeneas' inner thoughts and emotions. We begin to see Aeneas in terms of a complex emotional context rather than an individual reacting to an isolated episode, which in turn allows us to reconsider Aeneas each time we encounter him in a new situation.

The contrasting motivations of Odysseus and Aeneas become apparent when Aeneas speaks his first words, which quote Odysseus' lament. Both heroes appeal to the gods and curse their fates, but Aeneas shows a deeper emotional concern for his people entirely absent from his counterpart Odysseus. The two cry out:

τῖς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις, οἳ τότε ὄλοντο  
Τροίη ἐν εὐρείῃ χάριν Ἀτρεΐδῃσι φέροντες.

ὡς δὴ ἐγὼ γ' ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν  
 ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλείστοι χαλκῆρεα δοῦρα  
 Τρῶες ἐπέριψαν περὶ Πηλεΐωνι θανόντι.  
 τῷ κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων, καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί·  
 νῦν δέ με λευγαλέω θανάτῳ εἴμαρτο ἀλῶναι.  
*Od.5.306-312*

Three and four times blessed are the Danaans who, giving help to the sons of Atreus, died there in wide Troy. Thus I wanted to die and to fall to my fate on that day when more Trojans who were gathered around the dying Achilles hurled their bronze-tipped spears at me. Then I would have obtained proper funeral rites and the Achaeans would bear my fame. But now it is fated that I wander until my mournful death.

terque quaterque beati,  
 quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis  
 contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis  
 Tydide! mene Iliacis occumbere campis  
 non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra,  
 saevus ubi Aeacidae telo iacet Hector, ubi ingens  
 Sarpedon, ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis  
 scuta uirum galeasque et fortia corpora uoluit!  
*1.94-101*

Three and four times blessed are those who chanced to fall before the faces of their fathers under the high walls of Troy! O Diomedes, most brave of the Greek race! O that I was not able to fall on the Ilian battlefields and pour forth this soul by your right hand, where fierce Hector lies killed by the spear of Achilles, where huge Sarpedon lies dead, where the Simois has rolled over so many shields and has seized under its waves the helmets and brave bodies of men!

Both heroes rather unheroically cry out in their frustration and wish that they would have escaped the present trial by dying at Troy. Odysseus wishes that he had been among those warriors fighting for Agamemnon and Menelaus, who fell on Troy's plain (306-7). He yearns to have died and met his lot (308) while the Trojans were attacking him (μοι, 309). Then the Achaeans would honor his fame (μευ κλέος, 311). But these things did not happen, and Odysseus fears he will suffer a miserable death at sea (312). His own lot, his own burial, and his own fame consume Odysseus' thoughts as he laments his fate.

As Aeneas cries out, he at first quotes Odysseus word for word: “three and four times blessed!” but by the end of his speech his worries move beyond his own fate to the fate of his Trojan comrades. Although Aeneas’ speech closely parallels that of Odysseus in structure (a relative clause and infinitive constructions), *Troiae*, emphatically placed at the center of its line is a heavy word for Aeneas who yearns to have died under the high walls of his homeland. Aeneas’ life takes on meaning because it is always in relationship to his community, Troy. Whereas Odysseus and his comrades fought for two foreign leaders, Aeneas and the Trojans battled for their homeland and lost. To have died at Troy would have been to die before the faces of parents (*ante ora patrum*, 95). Troy, mentioned by name now for the fifth time in the first one hundred lines, is the central locus of meaning for Aeneas and his men: Troy produced offspring that would overturn Carthage (*Troiano a sanguine duci*, 1.19), Juno had waged war for the Greeks against the Trojans (*ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis*, 1.24) and she had scattered them on the sea (*iactatos aequore toto | Troas*, 1.29-30). Most importantly, Aeneas suffers exile from this Troy: (*Troiae . . . fato profugus*, 1.1-2).<sup>11</sup> From this Troy Aeneas first took his father, son, and Penates, and at this very point the fates burdened him with the fate of his people.

In personal terms, Aeneas appeals to the universality of suffering. Aeneas only touches lightly upon his own near death at Troy by evoking Diomedes, the bravest of the race of Danaus who almost killed him (97).<sup>12</sup> The form of apostrophe brings the lament into a more universal context and differs from Odysseus’ wish to have died on the battlefield, a more individualistic focus which is emphasized with a first person verb

---

<sup>11</sup> *Troiae* in line 1 also holds central position. Both instances are in the third foot following a caesura.

<sup>12</sup> *Il.*5.297-313; R. D. Williams (1972) 168.

(ὄφελον, 308) and pronouns (ἐγώ, 308; μοι, 309). On the other hand, Vergil introduces us to Aeneas so that we experience the inner thoughts of the communal hero who bears the weight of the Trojan race (*genus unde Latinum | Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae*, 1.6-7). Aeneas' grief for Hector (99) and the men whom the Simois rolled under its waves (100-101) generalize his speech in terms of Trojan loss and suffering, rather than the personal loss of burial rites and κλέος which Odysseus laments. The reader pities the hero Aeneas who has suffered but in terms of what the Trojan race itself has lost.<sup>13</sup>

Instead of enumerating the ways he wishes to have died at Troy and the cost that it would have been to his own heroic status, Aeneas' personal grief and worry is shown through his pain and suffering for all the Trojans. Aeneas' personal voice appeals to the universal, a lyric moment embedded within an entirely epic, Homeric context. At the same time that Vergil repeatedly steers the reader in a Homeric context, he inserts his own poetic voice by asking the reader to reconsider the situation in a Roman context, presented and strengthened by the singer Vergil. Vergil, after delaying any action from the hero for ninety lines, points the reader back to the first reference to Aeneas. As we experience the Aeneas stranded on the sea, we recall the Aeneas of the proem who will suffer until he establishes his gods in his city (*dum conderet urbem | inferretque deos Latia*, 1.5-6). Aeneas here too differs from Odysseus who is driven by a personal motivation to return home (νόστον, 1.5; νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ, 1.9). Aeneas, on the other hand, suffers for his city (*urbem*, 1.5) and his race (*genus*, 6). The reader hears Aeneas' outcry within this context and gains an emotional perspective that enhances the depth of Aeneas' speech.

---

<sup>13</sup> Pöschl (1962) 53: "Homer's heroes suffer through 'love of self' in the high Aristotelian sense. And Vergil's other protagonists, Dido and Turnus, suffer in a similar way; but Aeneas suffers for the sake of others."

Writing emotive narrative alone does not set Vergil apart from Homer nor does it make him lyrical. It is the fact that he brings his audience back to these moments of personal grief again and again throughout the narrative so that the reader actually experiences Aeneas' emotions as Aeneas at one time laments his fate as a hero lost at sea, at another time mourns over those lost in the wars when he gazes upon the Daedalean doors (6.14-41), and at another time pities the death of his comrade's son (11.29-63). Through the course of the *Aeneid*, the reader considers Aeneas in terms of his emotional reactions as well as his actions themselves. These scenes cause the audience to revisit Aeneas in different contexts, and ultimately bring the reader back to the Aeneas of the poem who bears the fate of his race. It is this self-consciousness, a course directed by the will of the singer, that sets the *Aeneid* into a lyric mode.

Vergil colors his epic with these personal, more intimate moments so that readers develop a familiarity with Aeneas' character throughout his text. Vergil only needs to touch upon certain aspects of Aeneas' character to trigger the reader's own consciousness. Vergil does not always need to explicitly explain particular reasons behind Aeneas' actions because the reader brings this familiarity with Aeneas to each next situation and jointly experiences the trials of Aeneas. In two separate episodes of the *Aeneid*, Vergil uses the same words to describe Aeneas' reaction to fleeing shades, both which quote an Odyssean original. By comparing how Vergil imitates this passage on separate occasions, we can see how he will rely on the reader's consciousness to fill in any dramatic gaps:

τρίς μὲν ἐφωρμήθην, ἔλέειν τέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει,  
 τρίς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἵκελον ἦ καὶ ὄνειρῳ  
 ἔπτατ'. ἔμοι δ' ἄχος ὄξυ γένεσκετο κηρόθι μάλλον

*Od.*11.206-8

Three times I rushed forth, and my spirit compelled me to grab her. Three times her ghost flew from my hands like a shade or a dream. Then a more sharp pain came upon my heart.

ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;  
 ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago,  
 par leuibus uentis uolucrique simillima somno.  
 2.792-4; 6.700-702

There, three times I tried to put my arms around her neck; three times in vain her image, almost grasped, fled my hands, her image equal to the light winds and most similar to swift sleep.

The Vergilian lines are a near translation: both heroes try to grasp the fleeing shade, and the shades escape both their hands like a dream. The audience knows Odysseus' thoughts and feelings only through his actions and what he does. Odysseus rushes forth (ἐφορμήθην) because his spirit compels him (με θυμὸς ἀνώγει), and a harsh pain sets in upon his heart when he grasps at the empty shade (ἄχος ὄξυ γενέσκετο κηρόθι). The reader judges Aeneas' emotions through the words Aeneas speaks. Aeneas himself relates how Creusa has deserted him (*deseruit*, 791)<sup>14</sup> and Aeneas describes how he tried to grasp her shade (*conatus*). The reader discerns Aeneas' emotions through his narrative, first with the vain attempts by Aeneas to throw his arms around his mother (*frustra*), then when her shade is actually grasped (*comprensa*). Aeneas encapsulates the moment in

---

<sup>14</sup> Segal (1974) 34-36 argues that Vergil describes Aeneas' emotional *pathos* at two separate times in the text to imitate the repetitive nature of oral poetry; cf. Brown (1990) for further analysis of Vergil's sensitivity to the repetition of the Homeric songs. According to Segal, when Aeneas loses his wife, he is consumed by personal emotions but when he loses his father he becomes focused on his greater purpose. Heinze (1903) 224 too will argue that Aeneas as a character evolves through the text and reaches the ideal that Vergil envisions for him. I want to be clear in my argument that although Vergil constructs his narrative so that we weigh Aeneas' actions against his previous actions, this does not necessitate that Aeneas evolves to a certain ideal. In fact, as Otis (1976) 9 n.2 notes, Aeneas actually seems to 'relapse' in the sense of psychological development as we move through the text. I think that arguments of a development in Aeneas' character are based on too linear a reading of Vergil's text. Vergil's lyrical presentation of Aeneas' emotions in various episodes encourage us to evaluate Aeneas' actions not just in terms of his past actions, but in terms of his future actions. Because he writes in an episodic narrative, Vergil does not emphasize the actions of each episode in terms of the previous episode, but rather he concentrates the events on the fulfillment of the purpose of the main narrative. Thus, instead of assessing Aeneas' character based on a linear journey from Troy to Rome, we might rather consider Aeneas in the context of the purpose of the *Aeneid*.

images of futility—Aeneas’ arms reaching for Creusa’ neck, his empty grasps, the shade disappearing into the wind. Aeneas makes all other actions contingent on the primary reality, *effugit*, a dead-end verb that gives the action a sense of finality and completion.

Vergil describes the escaping ghost of Aeneas’ father Anchises with the same Odyssean quote (6.700-702). In both episodes, Vergil imitates the lines of Homer but re-casts them on an emotional level. The images of futility in the scene give us glimpses into Aeneas’ inner-thoughts and permits us to infer how these emotions relate to the main narrative when we bring our familiarity with Aeneas to the text. After the scenes of his wife and father fleeing his futile grasps, Aeneas turns his attention to the task at hand rather than lingering on the emotion of the moment (*sic demum socios consumpta nocte reuiso*, 2.795; *interea uidet Aeneas in ualle reducta | seclusum nemus*, 6.703-4). E. L. Harrison argues that Aeneas’ reaction does not entirely parallel Odysseus’ reaction in the same situation. He notes a “remarkable sterility about the aftermath, with Aeneas showing not the slightest reaction to this highly dramatic incident. . .”<sup>15</sup> This in fact is most Vergilian. Vergil leaves out the emotional aftermath of the scene because we know from earlier episodes that Aeneas carries a burden and purpose which is greater than Odysseus’ struggle to return home. At the end of the scene Vergil leaves us to interpolate Aeneas’ motives in terms of how we have already seen him: lamenting the fate of his comrades at sea, hoisting his father on his shoulders to save him from the burning city, abandoning a city and a queen where he first dared to hope for better times.

Now, when turning from the fleeing shade of his wife and father, Aeneas again moves onto greater themes. As Segal notes, Vergil does not linger on the emotion of the

---

<sup>15</sup> Harrison (1971) 167-168 stresses that Odysseus’ encounter with his mother and the moment of her elusive escape provide an introduction for a narrative on the nature of the soul and the reason why Odysseus can’t grasp his mother (*Od.11.215-224*), whereas Vergil’s quotation marks the end of a scene.

moment precisely because there are far greater things at hand—the safe escape of his comrades and the fate of his people.<sup>16</sup> The audience experiences Aeneas’ emotions through the narrative and must weigh Aeneas’ reaction against the other emotional settings in which Vergil has cast him. Here Vergil is the lyric poet, deictic rather than didactic,<sup>17</sup> showing Aeneas’ emotions rather than explicitly stating them at two separate moments of the narrative.<sup>18</sup>

Vergil’s Aeneas, even when losing his father for a second time (6.700-702), always keeps the burden of his race in mind throughout his actions. When Aeneas turns away from the ghost of his father, he turns away to fulfill his fate to re-establish the Trojans in a foreign land. In the sixth book of his epic, Vergil has the opportunity to blatantly glorify the race that Aeneas will found as he narrates Aeneas’ noble descendents. But Vergil sends his epic into a lyrical mode and universalizes the emotional loss that is inherent to the city’s establishment in an expressive, deictic moment. He does not tell us that Rome will be great, he shows us and leaves us to consider the suffering and grief in the context of our own personal reflection.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Segal (1974) 37-40 notes that Homer’s lengthened epic mode puts Odysseus’ grief within the ebb and flow of the narrative. The formulaic line κρυεροῖο τεταρπόμεσθα γόοιο (11.212) also gives a generic quality to Odysseus’ feelings. Segal continues, “the broader time-scale of the Homeric poem lets us see such moments as part of the continuities and expected, gradual rhythms of human existence. In the *Aeneid* such moments come as discrete, violent outbursts of emotion; and epic breadth gives way to something like lyrical intensity.”

<sup>17</sup> Deictic descriptions are a fundamental characteristic of lyric; cf. Johnson (1982) 74.

<sup>18</sup> Segal (1974) 51-52 defines Vergil’s purpose as highlighting the ambiguity and mystery of such moments. Vergil is “more self-consciously aware that the issues with which he deals do not admit of such definiteness or clarity [as they do in the *Iliad*]. The fact that tension, hesitation, and ambiguity exist may be more important for the understanding of the *Aeneid* than the mutually exclusive correctness of one or the other interpretations.” Segal picks up on what Otis (1963) terms Vergil’s subjective style. Segal and Harrison’s differing views of Vergil’s adaptation of the Homeric lines are what Otis (50-51) admits as a disadvantage of Vergil’s subjective style. Homer’s objective style gives us a clear interpretation of his characterizations.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Clausen (1964a, 1964b) and Parry (1966).

Vergil's description of Aeneas' descent to the underworld has Homeric precedent. From past episodes, we know that Odysseus and Aeneas bear different burdens and here again in the underworld Vergil contrasts Odysseus' own personal goals with the larger, national goals of his hero Aeneas. Odysseus recognizes his mother in the underworld (11.85) but will not talk to her until Teiresias assures him of a safe return home (89). Teiresias prophesizes that although Poseidon has great ambitions of keeping the hero from reaching his country, nevertheless Odysseus will reach Ithaca and restore order to his home (100-124). Teiresias assures Odysseus of his personal safety, and Odysseus now turns to his mother Anticlea. Odysseus' motives for speaking to his mother are again personal as he expresses his primary concerns: he asks how she herself came to the underworld (170-173), where his father and his son are (174), and whether his wife is protecting his home and possessions (175-179). Odysseus vainly tries to clasp his mother's ghost, as discussed above, and proceeds to meet the souls of women and heroes in the underworld.

Vergil's similar plot-lines and quotations of Odysseus' speeches demonstrates that we are deep within a Homeric context, but again Vergil manipulates the epic setting with a personal, lyric consciousness so that the audience experiences the ramifications of Aeneas' journey along with the hero. Aeneas learns of his destiny from the Sibyl in the upperworld (6.83-97) but longs to journey to the underworld to visit his father (108-123). He appeals to the Sibyl in terms of the *pietas* that he has shown by saving his father from the flames of burning Troy (110-111) and by enduring the perils of the sea with his ailing father (113). This *pietas* compels him to see his father once more (*ire ad conspectum cari genitoris et ora | contingat*, 108-109) and to undergo the toils of Avernus.<sup>20</sup> Vergil contrasts

---

<sup>20</sup> Heinze (1903) 351.

Odysseus' personal motivations against Aeneas' personal understanding of the universal concept of *pietas*. Aeneas' appeal to the Sibyl betrays his devotion to his father. Through his direct appeal we see Aeneas' devotion to his fatherland. Aeneas enters the underworld in an act of *pietas* and brings with him the burden his devotion has set upon him.

In the underworld, Anchises shows his son the glory that his devotion will bring to the Roman race. From Jupiter's prophesy in *Aeneid* 1 the reader already knows that glory awaits the Roman people. The Roman race has been given power without end (1.279) and will one day pacify the nations (1.283-296). Anchises identifies for his son the glorious Romans who will roam the earth: the lineage of the Roman kings (6.756-770), the birth of Romulus (6.777-780), and the rise of the Caesars and the golden age (6.789-797). When Anchises advises Aeneas, he addresses him as a Roman in terms which directly speak to his contemporary audience: "Be mindful to rule your people with power, Roman, (these will be your arts), and introduces the custom of peace on them, and spare the subjected and war against the proud to the end," (*tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento | (hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem, | parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*, 12.851-853).<sup>21</sup> The Roman Aeneas brings a custom of domination and of peace to his people and he immediately sees the elder Marcellus enjoying this glorified labor. This Carthaginian hero Marcellus<sup>22</sup> rejoices in his victorious moment with his fellow Romans (*magno turbante tumultu*, 857)<sup>23</sup> and dedicates the most cherished spoils (*spoliis*

---

<sup>21</sup> Augustus writes that he established a similar program in his own imperial government: *Bella terra et mari civilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum saepe gessi, victorque omnibus veniam petentibus civibus peperci. Externas gentes, quibus tuto ignosci potuit, conservare quam excidere malui* (R.G. 3).

<sup>22</sup> R.D. Williams (1972) 513.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Hor. *Carm.*1.1.7-8: *hunc, si mobilium turba Quiritium | certat tergemini tollere honoribus.*

*opimis*, 855) to father Quirinus (854-859). Vergil creates an optimistic picture of the extent and nature of Roman rule, which he reinforces in this hero celebrating the triumphal peace that Aeneas will bring to his race.

Surprisingly Vergil passes on the opportunity to sing any specifics about the golden age prophesized by Jupiter and Anchises. Instead he turns the celebratory image of Marcellus into a moment of lamentation and sorrow. Aeneas sees a soldier accompanying the triumphant elder Marcellus, but this young warrior bears an unhappy expression and a downcast face (*sed frons laeta parum et deiecto lumina vultu*, 6.862). Vergil describes both Aeneas and Anchises' emotion and anguish with the intimate tone of an apostrophe when they see this younger Marcellus, the nephew of the emperor Augustus. Aeneas cries out, "What a clamor of companions there is around him! What greatness there is in him!" (*qui strepitus circa comitum! quantum instar in ipso*, 865). Anchises explains the sad fates of Augustus' nephew Marcellus, a contemporary of Vergil's audience, with another exclamatory outcry: "Alas, what *pietas*, what faith of our forefathers and what a hand unconquerable in war! . . . Alas, pitiable boy, if in any way you might break your harsh fates, you will be Marcellus," (*heu pietas, heu prisca fides invictaque bello | dextera! . . . heu, miserande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas, | tu Marcellus eris*, 878-879; 882-883). The repetition of *heu . . . heu . . . heu* raises the drama of Anchises' speech and we actually hear the repeated anguish and groans of Anchises in the lines.

Anchises laments the young Marcellus' *pietas* and *fides*, moral characteristics which directly speak to Vergil's contemporary audience. Vergil is playing with the definition of his audience—is Anchises addressing Aeneas or is he reaching into the future to speak to Vergil's Romans? The form of the apostrophe further obscures the actual speaker of the lines. The apostrophe of Aeneas and Anchises objectifies their own voice so that the

lamentation comes from a deeper well of emotion, perhaps from Vergil himself. Vergil speaks from an entirely personal level of suffering that is not alien to Aeneas, his contemporary Romans, or we ourselves today. Thus Vergil creates a universal moment which any audience may share. At the end of Aeneas' *katabasis*, Vergil leaves us with the outbursts of emotion which allow us to understand the suffering of the moment, to revisit the trials of Aeneas and his own people, and to reflect upon our own experiences of suffering. In the end Vergil has not told us how to feel about the golden age which Jupiter and Anchises prophesized, but he has allowed us to experience it.

Vergil's *cano*, "I sing," through the more active inclusion of his audience within the composition of his narrative, has become *canemus*, "we sing." Given the communal nature of the *Aeneid*, the "fat" epic Vergil may be closer to the "thin" lyric Horace than ever imagined:

virtute functos more patrum duces  
 Lydis remixto carmine tibiis  
 Troiamque et Anchisen et almae  
 progeniem Veneris **canemus**.  
 C. 4.15.29-32

Let us sing of leaders who lived their lives virtuously according to the custom of our fathers in a song mixed with Lydian reed pipes, and let us sing of Troy and Anchises and the son of kind Venus.

CHAPTER 6  
CONCLUSION

οὐδὲ βοή κήρυκος ἔλινυσεν<sup>1</sup>

“And the cry of the herald did not rest.”

The “fatter,” older Vergil may not be that different from the younger Vergil. In the middle of his *Eclogues*, Vergil sings directly to his audience in the first person *canerem* (*Ec.*6.3-8):

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem  
vellit et admonuit: “pastorem, Tityre, pinguis  
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen.”  
Nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,  
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)  
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam.

While I was singing of kings and battles, Cynthian Apollo grabbed my ear and warned me: “It benefits the shepherd to pasture fat sheep, but to sing a slender song. Now I (for indeed there will be those who will want to sing your praises for you, Varus, and to fashion the sad wars) will reflect upon the rural Muse with a light reed.

Vergil’s Apollo admonishes him with the same advice Apollo gave to Callimachus: “poet, make your sacrifices fat, but keep your Muse slender.” Vergil operates within the Callimachean paradox of fatness (*pinguis*) and thinness (*deductum*) and Callimachus’ kings and heroes become Vergil’s kings and battles. But Vergil is actually interrupted. Callimachus had only started to place his writing tablet upon his knees, whereas Vergil claims to have already begun his composition: “while I was singing” (*canerem*). It should not be a surprise, then, that when the older Vergil again put a pen to epic, he returns to

---

<sup>1</sup> Call. fr. 526 Pf.

where Apollo interrupted him. Vergil was singing of kings and battles and now, in an ironic twist, he will sing of arms and a man.

How seriously, then, should we take Vergil's *recusatio*? Horace and Propertius later use Vergil's *recusatio* as a stylistic device to elevate the status of their own poetry. Vergil too pits his own bucolic poetry against the military emphasis of the epic kings and battles of his *recusatio* and specifically Varus' own military achievements.<sup>2</sup> But Propertius and Horace never actually attempted to unfurl their sails on the epic sea whereas Vergil gives us the impression that he had already tested or was anticipating testing the waters. With the *Aeneid* Vergil demonstrates that his slender Callimachean sails are entirely apt for the vast epic waters of Homer.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rutherford (1989) 44; cf. Elder (1961).

## WORKS CITED

### EDITIONS, DICTIONARIES, LEXICA

- Barber, E. A.. (1960) *Sexti Properti Carmina*. Oxford
- Glare, P. G. W. (1982) *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford
- Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. (1996) eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford
- Klingner, F. (1959) *Horatius: Opera*. Leipzig
- Muehll, von der, P. (1984) *Homeri Odyssea*. Stuttgart
- Murray, A. T. (1978) *Homer: The Iliad*. Cambridge, MA
- Mynors, R. A. B. (1969) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949) *Callimachus*. Oxford
- Richardson, L. (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore
- Trypanis, C. A. (1975) ed. *Callimachus: Fragments*. Cambridge, MA
- Williams, R. D. (1972) ed. *Virgil: Aeneid I-VI*. Bristol
- (1973) ed. *Virgil: Aeneid VII-XII*. Bristol

### OTHER WORKS

- Anderson, W. S. (1957) "Vergil's Second Iliad," *TAPA* 88: 17-30
- Barron, J. P. and Easterling, P. E. (1985) "Elegy and Iambus," in Easterling and Knox (1985), 117-164
- Bertman, S. (1976) ed. *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Amsterdam
- Bing, P. (1988) *The Well Read Muse*. Göttingen
- Bowra, C. M. (1966) "Some Characteristics of Literary Epic," in Commager (1966), 53-61

- Briggs, Jr., W. W. (1981) "Virgil and the Hellenistic Epic," *ANRW* 31.2: 948-984
- Brink, C. O. (1946) "Callimachus and Aristotle: An Inquiry into Callimachus' *ΠΡΟΣ ΠΡΑΞΙΦΑΝΗΝ*," *CQ* 40: 11-26
- Broege, V. (1976) "The Generation Gap in Catullus and the Lyric Poetry of Horace," in Bertman (1976), 171-204
- Brown (1990) "The Homeric Background to a Vergilian Repetition (Aeneid 1.744 = 3.516)," *AJP* 111: 182-186
- Bulloch, A. W. (1985) "Hellenistic Poetry," in Easterling and Knox (1985), 541-598
- Cairns, F. (1989) *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge
- Cameron, A. (1992) "Genre and Style in Callimachus," *TAPA* 122: 305-312
- (1995) *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton
- Camps, W. A. (1966a) *Propertius: Elegies: Book II*. Bristol
- (1966b) *Propertius: Elegies: Book III*. Bristol
- Clausen, W. (1964a) "An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*," *HSCP* 68: 139-147
- (1964b) "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5: 181-196
- (1966) "An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*," in Commager (1966), 75-88
- Commager, S. (1965) "Notes on Some Poems of Catullus," *HSCP* 70: 83-110
- (1966) ed. *Virgil: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ
- Conte, G. B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca
- Dalzell, A. (1956) "Maecenas and the Poets," *Phoenix* 10: 151-162
- Davis, G. (1991) *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horation Lyric Discourse*. Berkeley
- Duckworth, G. (1962) *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid*. Ann Arbor
- Easterling, P. E. and Knox, B. N. W. (1985) eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Cambridge
- Elder, J. P. (1961) "Non Iniussa Cano: Virgil's Sixth Eclogue," *HSCP* 65: 109-125

- Farrell, J. (1991) *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic*. New York
- Feeney, D. C. (1993) "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in Rudd (1993), 41-63
- Ferguson, J. (1966) "Catullus and Cicero," *Latomus* 25: 871-872
- Foley, J.M. (1986) *Oral Tradition in Literature*. Columbia, MO
- Fraenkel, E. (1957) *Horace*. Oxford
- Frank, T. (1920a) "Vergil's Apprenticeship. I," *CP* 15: 23-38
- (1920b) "Vergil's Apprenticeship. II," *CP* 15: 103-119
- Harrison, E. L. (1971) "The Subtlety of the Oral Poet," *Eranos* 69: 166-8
- (1976) "Structure and Meaning in Vergil's *Aeneid*," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 2: 101-112
- (1981) "The Structure of the *Aeneid*: Observations on the Links between the Books," *ANRW* 31.1: 359-393
- Harrison, S. J. (1990) ed. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford
- Harvey, A. E. (2001) "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry," in Nagy (2001a), 1-20
- Heinze, R. (1903) *Virgils epische Technik*. Bristol; trans. Harvey, H. et al. (1993) *Vergil's Epic Technique*
- Hollis, A.S. (2000) "The Reputation and Influence of Choerilus of Samos," *ZPE* 130: 13-15
- Johnson, T. (2005) *A Symposium of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV*. Madison
- Johnson, W. R. (1982) *The Idea of Lyric*. Berkeley
- Jones, C. P. (1968) "Parody in Catullus 44," *Hermes* 96: 379-383
- Kallendorf, C. (1993) ed. *Vergil*. New York
- Kazazis, J. N. and Rengakos, A. (1999) eds. *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart
- Knauer, G. N. (1964a) *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen
- (1964b) "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer," *GRBS* 5: 61-84
- (1990) "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer," in S. J. Harrison (1990), 390-412

- Köhnken, A. (2001) "Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius," in Papanghelis and Rengakos (2001), 193-216
- Kopff (1981) "Vergil and the Cyclic Epics," *ANRW* 31.2: 919-947
- Laughton, E. (1970) "Disertissime Romuli nepotum," *CP* 65: 1-7
- Lee, M. (1975) "Catullus in the Odes of Horace," *Ramus* 4: 33-48
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1980) "The Quarrel between Callimachos and Apollonius," *ZPE* 40: 1-20
- Lord, A. (1960) *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA
- Lowrie, M. (1995) "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace *C.* 1.12-18," *Phoenix* 49: 33-48
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1978) "The Neoteric Poets," *CQ* 28: 167-187
- (1980) *The Latin Love Poets*. Oxford
- (1995) *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven
- Matthews, V. J. (1979) "Antimachos in the *Aitia* Prologue," *Mnemosyne* 32: 128-137
- Miller, J. F. (1986) "Disclaiming Divine Inspiration: A Programmatic Pattern," *WS* 99: 151-164
- Miller, P. (1994) *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness*. London
- Montanari, F. (2002) ed., *Omero Tremila Anni Dopo*. Roma
- Nagy, G. (2001a) ed. *Greek Literature, vol. 3: Greek Literature in the Archaic Period*. New York
- (2001b) ed. *Greek Literature, vol. 7: Greek Literature in the Hellenistic Period*. New York
- Newman, J. K. (1986) *The Classical Epic Tradition*. Madison
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*. Oxford
- Obbink, D. (1995) ed. *Philodemus and Poetry*. Oxford
- Otis, B. (1963) *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford
- (1976) "Virgilian Narrative in the Light of its Precursors and Successors," *SPb* 73: 1-28

- Pagán, V., Könen, L., and Luppe, W. (1991) "Explanations of Callimachean 'Αίτια," *ZPE* 88: 157-164
- Papanghelis, T. (1999) "relegens erratorum litora: Virgil's reflexive 'Odyssey,'" in Kazazis and Rengakos (1999), 275-290
- Papanghelis, T. and Rengakos, A. (2001) eds. *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden
- Parry, A. (1966) "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*," in Commager (1966), 107-123
- Perkell, C. (1999) *Reading Vergil's Aeneid*. Norman, OK
- Pöschl, V. (1962) *The Art of the Aeneid*; trans. Gerda Seligson. Ann Arbor
- Quinn, K. (1968) *Virgil's Aeneid*. Ann Arbor
- (1969) *The Catullan Revolution*. Ann Arbor
- Race, W. H. (1978) "Odes 1.20: An Horation *Recusatio*," *CSCA* 11: 179-196
- (1982) "The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius," *Menemosyne Suppl.* 74
- Reckford, K. (1959) "Horace and Maecenas," *TAPA* 90: 195-208
- Rengakos, A. (2001) "Apollonius Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar," in Nagy (2001b), 241-264
- (2002) "The Hellenistic Poets as Homeric Critics," in Montanari (2002) 143-158
- Ross, D. O. (1969) *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge
- Rudd, N. (1993) ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration, Essays for the Bimillennium*. London
- Rutherford, R. B. (1989) "Virgil's Poetic Ambitions in 'Eclogue' 6," *GR* 36: 42-50
- Santirocco, M. (1980) "Horace's *Odes* and the Ancient Poetry Book," *Arethusa* 13: 43-58
- Schmeling, G. (1991) "The *Satyricon*: A Sense of an Ending," *RbM* 134: 352-377
- Segal, C. (1974) "Vanishing Shades: Virgil and Homeric Repetitions," *Eranos*, 72: 34-52
- (1985) "Archaic Choral Lyric," in Easterling and Knox (1985) 165-201
- Sider, D. (1995) "The Epicurean Philosopher as Hellenistic Poet," in Obbink (1995), 42-57
- Smith, P. L. (1968) "Poetic Tensions in the Horation *Recusatio*," *AJP* 89: 56-65

- Steinby, M. (1993) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. Roma
- Tatum, J. (1988) "Catullus' Criticism of Cicero," *TAPA* 118: 179-184
- Tracy, H. L. (1965) "The lyric poet's repertoire," *CJ* 61: 22-26
- Vessey, D.W. T. C. (1971) "The Reputation of Antimachus of Colophon," *Hermes* 99: 1-20
- Weber, C. (1987) "Metrical Imitatio in the Proem to the Aeneid," *HSCP* 91: 261-271
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1990) "The Language of Virgil and Horace," in S. J. Harrison (1990) 413-428
- Williams, G. (1968) *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford
- (1983) "Roman Poets as Literary Historians: Some Aspects of *imitatio*," *ICS* 8: 211-237
- Wiseman, T. P. (1969) *Catullan Questions*. Surrey
- (1985) *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Laura Mawhinney was born in Thornhill, Ontario, on September 24, 1980. She moved from Canada with her family in 1982 and attended school in Marietta, Georgia. In 1998 she moved to Manlius, New York, and graduated from Fayetteville-Manlius High School. She graduated from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in 2003 with a Bachelor of Arts in classics. She will receive a Master of Arts in classics from the University of Florida in 2005.