

CALLIMACHUS AND THE MUSES:
SOME ASPECTS OF NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE IN *AETIA* 1-2 ⁽¹⁾

1. Callimachus is generally considered as a very sophisticated poet. An important aspect of his sophistication is the way in which he is playing with the style, conventions and vocabulary of the early Greek epic (2). The question I want to deal with here is whether the same can be said of his narrative technique in *Aetia* 1-2. I concentrate on the first two books of the *Aetia* because here the *aitia* are told in the frame-work of a dream which the narrator tells us he once had: he describes how, as a young man, he was carried away from Libya and brought to Mt. Helicon, where the Muses told him the *aitia*. In *Aetia* 3-4 there are no indications of such a framework: as far as we can see the *aitia* were simply juxtaposed there (3). The problems concerning the composition and narrative technique in *Aet.* 3-4 are therefore very different from those in *Aet.* 1-2.

Two questions must be asked: [1] do *Aet.* 1-2 contain elements of narrative technique which are clearly derived from the early Greek epic, and [2] if so, are these elements treated in an unepic way, i.e. did Callimachus create something new starting from the old material?

(1) This article is based on a paper given to staff and students of the Classical Institutes at Florence, London and Brussels (Free University); to the Hellenistenclub at Amsterdam and the Societas Philologica Graeca et Latina at Groningen. It has profited a great deal from the reactions of various members of the audiences, as well as from the lively discussions at the Hellenistenclub and the Societas. I must also thank S. R. Slings for writing me a letter with many useful suggestions. The research of which this article is the result was financed by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

(2) As is clear from various recent monographs (e.g. R. Schmitt, *Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos von Kyrene*, Wiesbaden 1970; H. Reinsch-Werner, *Callimachus Hesiodicus*, Berlin 1976) as well as from the recent commentaries on the *Hymns*.

(3) This is inferred from [1] the *diegeais* for *Aet.* 3 (fr. 67ff.)-4, which suggest no narrative framework; [2] the occasional transitions between the *aitia* (e.g. fr. 63.12-64.1, 66.9-67.1; cf. N. Krevans, *The poet as editor...*, Diss. Princeton 1984, 172f.); [3] the indication of a source in fr. 75.54ff., 92.2f. The fact that there are no traces of a dialogue with the Muses is of course no argument, as this may be due to accident, but it fits in with the idea that there was no such framework.

To find an answer to these questions I shall start from the dialogue with the Muses in relation to the invocations of the Muses in the early Greek epic. After this I shall investigate the narrative structure of *Aet.* 1-2 and some aspects of their contents, both again in comparison with the early Greek epic (Homer and Hesiod in particular).

2. The dialogue with the Muses

2.1 It is now beyond dispute that the narrative framework of *Aet.* 1-2 was the report of a dream in which 'young Callimachus' heard the *aitia* from the Muses on Mt. Helicon (4). Papyrus-finds have given a reasonably clear picture of the structure of this dialogue. The Florentine scholia, which are preserved for the first bit of *Aet.* 1 offer descriptions of the dialogue between 'Callimachus' and the Muses. So e.g. Sch. Flor. 22ff. ζητ[ε]ῖ δ(ιὰ) τίνα [αἰτίαν ἐν Πάρ]ωι χωρὶς αὐ[λοῦ κ(αὶ) στεφάνου ταῖς Χ[ά]ρισι θ[ύου]σι (5). Fragments of the text of the *Aetia* sometimes contain (part of) the transition between two *aitia*: e.g. fr. 7.19ff. κῶς δέ, θεαί, [...] μὲν ἄν[θρωπος] Ἀναφαῖος ἐπ' αἰσ[χροῖς] ἢ δ' ἐπὶ δ[υσφύμοις] Λίνδος ἄγει θυσίην, ἢ η...τηνε[... ..]τ[ὸν] Ἡρακλῆα σεβίζη; ἢεπικ[....]ως ἤρχετο Καλλιόπη· ἢ "Αἰγλήτην ἰ' Ἀνάκ[την] τε (6): one of the Muses finishes her story; 'Callimachus' asks a question; one of the Muses answers him and tells the next *aitia*. This straightforward scheme was varied in several ways (see 3.3).

2.2 When we are trying to establish the relationship between this dialogue of 'Callimachus' and the Muses and the early Greek epic we must first try to settle the question whether it can be a matter of direct influence. That is: [1] was Callimachus the first poet who choose this narrative form, and [2] did he derive it directly from the Greek epic? These questions cannot be answered with complete certainty, because it cannot be excluded that Callimachus had predecessors which have been lost. The only indication of dialogue-poetry which might be older than the *Aetia* is the *Silloi* of Timon of Phlius: the first book of this work consisted of a monologue by 'Timon', books 2-3 of a dialogue in which he asked his famous predecessor Xeno-

(4) Adesp. A.P. 7.42 ἃ μέγα Βαττιάδαο σοφοῦ περίπυστον ὄνειρα, ἢ ... μιν ἐκ Λιβύης ἀναείρας εἰς Ἑλικῶνα ἢ ἤγαγες ἐν μέσσαις Πιερίδεσσι φέρων· ἢ αἱ δέ οἱ εἰρομένῃ ἄμφ' ὠγυγίων ἡρώων ἢ Αἴτια καὶ μακάρων εἶρον ἀμειβόμεναι had long been our most important testimony for the dream (cf. A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*, Heidelberg 1965, 70ff.). It seemed to indicate that the whole of the *Aetia* was 'a dream', but papyrus-finds have since shown that this framework existed only in *Aet.* 1-2. See also n. 3.

(5) Cf. also Sch. Flor. 15ff., 38ff.

(6) Cf. also fr. 3.1, 43.56 and 84f.; *SH* 238.5ff.

phanes about other philosophers (cf. the description of Diogenes Laertius in *SH* 775). The chronological relation between the *Silloi* and the *Aetia*, however, is unknown as Timon was a contemporary of Callimachus (7).

However, as it is clear from research into Callimachus' style, vocabulary etc. that he was very familiar with the early Greek epic and was using it directly and frequently, with a great deal of subtle allusions, I shall assume that direct influence is also very likely in matters of narrative technique.

3. The dialogue with the Muses: structure

3.1 The question whether the dialogue with the Muses as a narrative framework contains epic elements should be answered in the affirmative. I think we may even claim that the whole idea of a dialogue with the Muses can be explained from the invocations of the Muses in the early epic. This can be illustrated with *Il.* 1.1ff.: Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος... ἥ ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε Ἄτρεϊδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. ἥ τίς τ' ἄρ' σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; ἥ Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός· ὁ γὰρ... It is quite conceivable that Callimachus read (or pretended to read!) the proem of the *Iliad* as a kind of dialogue between the Muse and somebody who asks her to tell about the wrath of Achilles and concludes his request with a concrete question about the cause of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles (8 "Which god made them start quarrelling?") (8). This question is then, as it were, answered by the Muse in 9: "The son of Leto and Zeus, for he...". This interpretation is not new: we find the idea of a question followed by an answer already in the scholia on this passage. Cf. Sch. b *Il.* 1.8-9 ἐπὶ τὸ διηγηματικὸν μετιῶν οὐχ ὑποβάλλει τὰς διηγήσεις αὐτομάτων, ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ τοῖς ἀκούουσι προσκορῆς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ διὰ πεύσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως τὴν πραγματείαν πεποιῆται, τὸν τῶν ἀκροατῶν νοῦν ἀναρτῶν καὶ ὑψῶν αὐτοὺς πρότερον τῇ πεύσει, εἴτα τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἐπάγων (9). Modern scholars have sometimes pointed to this idea too; e.g. Kambylis: "... so fühlt man sich versucht, darin eine Begegnung der Muse

(7) On Timon cf. e.g. A. A. Long, *Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonist and satirist*, "PCPS" 204, 1978, 68-91; Krevans (n. 3) 172f.; R. Pratesi, *Note ai Silli di Timone di Fliunte*, "Prometheus" 12, 1986, 39-56; 123-138.

(8) It has also been suggested that ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα in 6 is causal, instead of temporal; cf. Eust. 21.3. But I think we must take it as temporal, indicating the starting-point of the narrative (like ἀμύθεν in *Od.* 1.10).

(9) Similarly Sch. T *Il.* 14.509b ... τοῦτο γὰρ ἀποκρίνονται αἱ Μοῦσαι; Sch. A.R. 2.1090-94a τοῦτο ἐρώτησίς ἐστιν ὥς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ πρὸς τὰς Μοῦσας, τὸ δὲ υἱὸς Φρύξου ἀπόκρισις ὥς ἀπὸ τῶν Μουσῶν.

und des Dichters in dessen poetischen Phantasie zu erblicken" (10). We can look at *Od.* 1.1ff. in the same way: ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, ... ἡ τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν. ἢ "Ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ... etc. In the *Odyssey* we find this play with question and answer only in the prooem, but in the *Iliad* it occurs more often. We can detect various forms of this scheme: [1] an invocation of the Muses followed by an answer as in 11.218ff. "Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι, 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι, ἢ ὅς τις δὴ πρῶτος Ἀγαμέμνωνος ἀντίον ἦλθεν ἢ ἡ αὐτῶν Τρῶων ἢ ἐ κλειτῶν ἐπικούρων. ἢ Ἰφιδάμας Ἀντηνορίδης etc. (11); [2] a question in which the addressee is not mentioned explicitly, as in 5.703ff. "Ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξαν ἢ Ἐκτῶρ τε Πριάμοιο πάϊς καὶ χάλκεος Ἀρης; ἢ ἀντίθεον Τεύθραντ' etc. (12); [3] invocation of Patroclus, followed by an answer in 16.692ff. "Ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξας, ἢ Πατρόκλεις, ὅτε δὴ σε θεοὶ θάνατόνδε κάλεσσαν; ἢ Ἀδρηστον μὲν πρῶτα etc.; [4] an elaborate invocation of the Muses in 2.484ff. "Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι ἢ — ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαὶ ἐστε, πάρεστε τε, ἴστε τε πάντα, ἢ ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν — ἢ οἱ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοῖρανοι ἦσαν. ἢ πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω, ἢ οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν, ἢ φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη, ἢ εἰ μὴ 'Ολυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι, Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο ἢ θυγατέρες, μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον. ἢ ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆάς τε προπάσας. We see that here the invocation is followed by an explanation: the omniscience of the Muses is the reason for the request. Also, this is the only time when

(10) Kambylis (n. 4) 14. Cf. also O. Falter, *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern*, Diss. Würzburg 1934, 55ff., who said on the subject of the invocations of the Muses in Homer: "Dabei ist... immer zu beobachten, dass die nächsten Verse die Antwort auf die gestellten Frage bringen... Freilich bringt der Sänger selbst die Antwort, aber es klingt wie ein Echo der Musenworte selbst" (55) and saw the connection with Call. h. 4.79ff. and fr. 43.58: "In der Form [sc. of these passages from Callimachus] zeigt sich deutlich der Zusammenhang mit homerischem Gut" (56); and more recently Krevans (n. 3) 255: "The dialogue with the Muses is simply an extension of formulaic requests like that in *Iliad* 2.484-487"; U. Fleischer, *The Antinoopolis Papyri. Part 3...*, "Gnomon" 41, 1969, 640-646, esp. 644 (relating the dialogue in the *Aetia* to "die literarische Technik des Zwischenproömiums").

(11) Cf. also *Il.* 2.761ff., 14.508ff., 16.112ff.

(12) Cf. also 8.273f., 11.299ff. According to Sch. bT *Il.* 11.299f. and Eust. 845.26 the narrator is here addressing himself. It is more likely that the Muse, who is such a common addressee in this kind of questions, is implied here too. So also W. W. Minton, *Homer's invocations of the Muses: traditional patterns*, "TAPhA" 91, 1960, 292-309, esp. 304.

an invocation is *not* followed by an answer. The narrator announces in the first person singular (v. 493) that *he* is going to tell about the leaders and the ships. The reference to the omniscience of the Muses fits in with the fact that in the other invocations the questions are always of the type 'how/who first (and last) / best' and the answers are often a catalogue or — twice (13) — a cause. This kind of question seems to presuppose an authority with more than human knowledge, who knows all the facts and is able to give reliable information on matters as 'first' and 'best' (14).

Apart from Homer we find the invocation of the Muses also in e.g. Hes. *Th.* 1ff. This is a long hymn to the Muses in which the narrator, i.e. 'Hesiod', is telling how the Muses came to him on Mt. Helicon and made him a poet. The end of the hymn is as follows: ταῦτά μοι ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι || ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ εἶπαθ' ὅτι πρῶτον γένητ' αὐτῶν. || Ἦτοι μὲν πρότειστα Χάος γένητ' (114ff.). That is, 'Hesiod' is asking the Muses to tell him the *origins* of the earth and the gods. This question again is followed by an answer: the beginning of their story. So here too we seem to have a bit of dialogue, but with the narrator well in the picture and concluded by a question about origins, which is followed by a large quantity of factual information (15).

I shall not go into the problems of the background of these invocations of the Muses, because that is outside the scope of this article (16). What matters here is the following:

[1] the passages mentioned above give the impression of short bits of dialogue, which could easily inspire an imaginative poet like Callimachus to the idea of a long and consistent dialogue with the Muses;

[2] the information following the invocations does generally consist of origins / causes and/or a great deal of factual information (lists, numbers etc.): we can see the same in *Aet.* 1-2, where 'Callimachus' asks the Muses about facts and causes, but for poetical inspiration turns to the Charites (fr. 7.13f.) (17);

(13) I.e. 1.1ff., 16.112ff. "Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι, || ὅππως δὴ πρῶτον πῦρ ἔμπεσε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. || Ἐκτὼρ... etc.

(14) Cf. H. Maehler, *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* [Hypomnemata 3], Göttingen 1963, 17ff.

(15) Cf. G. Codrignani, *L' 'aetion' nella poesia greca prima di Callimaco*, "Convivium" 26, 1958, 527-545. Other invocations preceding a catalogue and followed by an 'answer' are Hes. *Th.* [965ff.] and [1021f.].

(16) For the most recent discussion of these problems and references to earlier treatments see I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and focalizers*, Amsterdam 1987, 45ff.

(17) This distinction between Muses and Charites has long been seen: the Charites are able to turn song into something beautiful and pleasing and their role has become particularly important in Pindar. Cf. e.g. Falter (n. 10) 26ff.; E. Schwarzenberg, *Die*

[3] once a question is addressed to a personage, i.e. Patroclus, on matters on which he may be considered to be particularly well informed (*Il.* 16.692ff. "Ενθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξας, ἢ Πατρόκλεις, ὅτε δὴ σε θεοὶ θάνατόνδε κάλεσσαν; ἢ Ἀδρηστον μὲν πρῶτα): in *Aet.* 1-2 we may also find a question directed to a mortal, i.e. a fellow-guest at a symposium. But this depends on the location of fr. inc. 178 (see 3.3) (18);

[4] once a question is not answered by the Muses, but the narrator himself is telling what he first asked them to tell him (*Il.* 2.484ff.): in *Aet.* 1-2 we also have instances of 'Callimachus' offering information himself (a.o. a catalogue of the foundations of Sicilian cities in fr. 43.18ff.; see 3.3);

[5] as early as Hes. *Th.* 1ff. the device of the invocation of the Muses was used in a subjective and programmatic passage: we shall see a similar thing in *Aet.* 1-2 (see 4.1-2).

3.2 The idea that Callimachus took a 'mimetic' view of the epic invocations of the Muses and took this as the basis for his narrative technique in *Aet.* 1-2 can be supported by two kinds of parallels. First of all we can detect a similar dramatization of the position of the narrator in some of Callimachus' other works, particularly in the so-called 'mimetic' hymns (*h.* 2, 5 and 6). These hymns are as it were short enactments of a ritual scene in which the narrator takes part (19). An explanation of this form may be that Callimachus is here dramatizing the position of the singer of a hymn, as in the *Aetia* he seems to have dramatized the position of the epic narrator. Secondly there is a great deal of play with the invocations of the Muses, in Callimachus as well as in other authors: we find this as early as Hipponax

Grazien, Bonn 1966, 44f.; R. Harriott, *Poetry and criticism before Plato*, London 1969, 125f.

(18) I am not quite sure though, as to Patroclus. There is a great deal of apostrophe of Patroclus in *Il.* 16, and this is generally considered to enhance the pathos of his death (cf. e.g. E. Block, *The narrator speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil*, "TAPhA" 112, 1982, 7-22, esp. 16f.). This may also explain our passage. Yet the scheme of question and answer is unmistakable (cf. also Minton [n. 12] 307 n. 23). It does not seem to be beyond Callimachus to transform this bit of dialogue between a narrator and his long dead epic hero into a homely dialogue with a fellow-guest at a symposium. On the other hand conversation at a symposium is common enough (see below), and there is no doubt that Callimachus could have got the idea for the conversation in fr. 178 also without *Il.* 16.692ff.

(19) Cf. on the 'mimetic' hymns e.g. N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge 1984, 11 n. 4 (lit.); A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus. The fifth hymn*, Cambridge 1985, 5ff. and 44f. Also *h.* 1.1f. can be said to contain "a slight hint of mimesis"; so N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus*, "CQ" 34, 1984, 139-148, esp. 139.

(20). It also occurs several times in Plato, particularly when the speaker wants to make it clear that what he is going to say demands a great deal of effort (21). The most elaborate treatment of the motif in Plato is found in *Resp.* 545c-547c (22). The subject of the discussion is how aristocracy developed into timarchy. The cause of this is said to be *stasis* among the ruling class, and Socrates asks the Muses about the *origins* of *stasis*: ἡ βούλει, ὥσπερ Ὀμηρος, εὐχόμεθα ταῖς Μούσαις εἰπεῖν ἡμῖν ὅπως δὴ πρῶτον στάσις ἔμπεσε, καὶ φῶμεν αὐτὰς τραγικῶς ὡς πρὸς παῖδας ἡμᾶς παιζούσας καὶ ἐρεσχηλούσας, ὡς δὴ σπουδῇ λεγούσας, ὑψηλολογουμένας λέγειν; There is an obvious reminiscence of *Il.* 16.112f. (one of the two 'aetiological' invocations in the *Iliad*) and a warning that what follows is going to contain an element of playfulness. In 546a1 Socrates 'quotes' the story of the Muses (ὦδὲ πῶς. χαλεπὸν μὲν...), which ends in 546e-547a with a reference to Hesiod's races of men (cf. *Op.* 109ff.) and another Homeric phrase (ταύτης τοι γενεῆς; cf. e.g. *Il.* 6.211). In 547a6-b1 we see that Glaucon took the story as the Muses' answer: Καὶ ὀρθῶς γ', ἔφη (sc. Glaucon), αὐτὰς ἀποκρίνεσθαι φήσομεν. Καὶ γάρ, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἀνάγκη Μούσας γε οὔσας. Τί οὖν, ἦ δ' ὅς, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγουσιν αἱ Μοῦσαι; Then Socrates goes on to tell Glaucon what else the Muses told him. So here we have an indisputable example of an author who looked at the epic invocations as a game of question and answer which could have an aetiological content.

Among Hellenistic poets we find a good example in Timon of Phlius *SH* 775 ἔσπετε νῦν μοι ὅσοι πολυπράγμονές ἐστε σοφισταί and 796 τίς γὰρ τοῦσδ' ὀλοῇ ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; || Ἥχοῦς σύνδρομος ὄχλος. ὁ γὰρ σιγῶσι χολωθεῖς || νοῦσον ἐπ' ἀνέρας ὥρσε λάλην, ὀλέκοντο δὲ πολλοί (cf. *Il.* 1.8-10!) (23).

(20) Hipponax fr. 128 West Μοῦσά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεα τὴν ποντοχάρυβδιν, || τὴν ἐν γαστρὶ μάχαιραν, ὃς ἐσθίει οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, || ἔννεφ', ὅπως ψηφίδι () κακὸν οἶτον ὀλεῖται || βουλῇ δημοσίῃ παρὰ θῖν' ἄλως ἀτρυγέτιο; cf. also e.g. Simon. fr. 17 West; Pind. *P.* 11.41f. Μοῖσα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μισθοῖο συνέθευ παρέχειν || φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα {χρῆ} ταρασσέμεν (an 'Abbruchsformel' in which the Muse is playfully reminded of her duties). For more examples see e.g. H. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* [Tüb. Beitr. 28], Stuttgart-Berlin 1937 [repr. Hildesheim 1967], 111ff.; R. Häussler, *Der Tod der Musen*, "A&A" 19, 1973, 117-145, esp. 122ff. (with references to further literature). On parody of Homer in general: R. Schröter, *Hor. Sat. 1.7 und die antike Eposparodie*, "Poetica" 1, 1967, 7-23; V. Buchheit, *Homerparodie und Literaturkritik in Horazens Satiren 1.7 und 1.9*, "Gymn." 75, 1968, 519-555.

(21) Cf. e.g. *Critias* 108e2-4; *Phdr.* 237a7; *Euthyd.* 275c-d.

(22) I am grateful to G. J. Boter and S. R. Slings for drawing my attention to this passage.

(23) Cf. also Posidippus *SH* 705.6f.; Choer. Sam. *SH* 316 (?); Matron *SH* 534.1f.,

In Callimachus we have two clear instances. The first is *h.* 3.183ff.: τίς δὲ νύ τοι νήσων, ποῖον δ' ὄρος εὖαδε πλείστον, ἢ τίς δὲ λιμὴν, ποίη δὲ πόλις; τίνα δ' ἔξοχα νυμφέων ἢ φίλαο καὶ ποίας ἡρωίδας ἔσχες ἐταίρας; ἢ εἰπέ, θεή, σὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐτέροισιν αἰίσω. ἢ νήσων μὲν Δολίχη, πολίων δέ τοι εὖαδε Πέργη. Here Artemis is asked a great deal of information about herself, but in 186f. the impression that she is answering the questions is carefully avoided: the narrator seems to act as the interpreter of the goddess' words and this reminds us again of *Il.* 2.484ff. (24). The second instance is *h.* 4.82ff. (the nymph Melia is shocked by the shaking of Mt. Helicon; then follows the question): ἐμαὶ θεαὶ εἶπατε Μοῦσαι, ἢ ῥ' ἐτεὸν ἐγένοντο τότε δρύες ἡνίκα Νύμφαι; ἢ "Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρύας ὄμβρος ἀέξει, ἢ Νύμφαι δ' αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυσὶ μηκέτι φύλλα". ἢ ταῖς μὲν ἔτ' Ἀπόλλων ὑποκόλπιος αἰνὰ χολώθη. The narrator is suddenly asking the Muses about the nymphs on Mt. Helicon and they seem to answer him in 84f., which are generally put between quotation-marks. Then with ταῖς μὲν the narrative returns to the places which aroused Apollo's anger because they refused to receive Leto. We get the impression of a small bit of dialogue interrupting the narrative (25).

3.3 If we may explain the dialogue with the Muses as a playful variation and elaboration of the invocations of the Muses in the epic, our next question must be *how* Callimachus elaborated this device. I shall first discuss the formal aspects. The occasional bits of 'dialogue' in the epic seem to be transformed into a consistent narrative structure in *Aet.* 1-2 (26). This

536.1. Without parody the motif is found in e.g. A.R. 2.851ff. (*aition*), 1090ff.; 3.1ff. (prooem); 4.1ff. (prooem), 552ff. (*aition* and 'dialogue'); Arat. *Ph.* 15ff. (invocation of the Muses followed by an 'answer' at the end of the prooem). On the passages in A.R. see H. Fraenkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*, Darmstadt 1968, 501f.; M. Campbell, *Studies in the third book of Apollonius' Rhodius' Argonautica*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1983, 1ff.

(24) The idea of the poet as the interpreter of the words of the gods is of course quite common; cf. e.g. Pind. *Pae.* 6.6; fr. 150; Pl. *Ion* 534e; Theocr. 22.115ff.; A.R. 4.1381f. For more examples and literature see Bornmann on *h.* 3.186.

(25) Less clear is *h.* 1.6ff.: (Zeus, they say you are born on Mt. Ida or in Arcadia) πότεροι, πάτερ, ἐνεύσαντο; ἢ "Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται". Assuming Pfeiffer's punctuation to be right: are we supposed to think that Zeus is shouting from heaven that the Cretans are always lying? Or is the narrator quoting a proverb? In fr. 86 Μοῦσαι μοι βασιληῖ[ἀεὶ]δεῖν we have the remains of what looks like an invocation of the Muses beginning *Aet.* 4 (cf. *Dieg.* II.10ff.). But its context is completely lost, so we do not know whether this invocation was purely conventional or containing an element of parody like the others. A similar difficulty affects the invocation in fr. 203.1. The epyllion *Hecale* on the other hand begins without an invocation of the Muses (fr. 230).

(26) That is, as far as our evidence goes it was consistent. Unexpected surprises

structure differs from its epic example in several respects. First of all we see that Callimachus transformed the 'mimetic' presentation of the epic 'dialogues' into a 'diegematic' presentation: he is *telling about* a dialogue he once had, not enacting it (27). Secondly, the framework is 'autobiographic': the narrator tells about a dream he had about himself as a young man. From the testimonia it is clear that the narrator has the same identity as Callimachus. This narrator is speaking in fr. 1 (the prologue), which contains a defence against negative criticism (on an earlier version of the *Aetia*?), presumably written by Callimachus in his old age and added to a second edition of the *Aetia* (28). Callimachus probably joined this prologue to the narrative of the dream in such a way that it became a more or less coherent unity (29), so that the same narrator must be speaking in fr. 2. The narrative scheme must have been more or less as follows: "I dreamt that I was carried off to Mt. Helicon, where I met the Muses and heard the *aitia* from them, when I was a young man. I asked them: 'What was the origin of a certain ritual?' and they answered me: 'It was as follows...', and I told them things too: 'I also have something to tell you...' ". This paraphrase shows that there was a great deal of embedded narrative within the framework of the dream. The primary narrator is telling about a dream in which his younger self played a part. This younger self and the Muses are acting as secondary narrators. Perhaps there is yet a further level of embedding. In fr. 43.12-17 somebody, presumably 'Callimachus', is telling about a symposium, from which the only thing which remained was the tales he heard there. In fr. inc. 178 somebody, again presumably 'Callimachus', meets a merchant at a symposium, who tells him about the cult of Peleus at Icus. These two passages have two things in common: [1] the symposium-setting and the preference for talk, [2] *perhaps* the subject-matter of the

through new papyrus-finds can of course not be excluded!

(27) The same distinction exists among the Platonic dialogues: some are 'mimetic', others 'diegematic'.

(28) I basically agree with the conclusions of P. J. Parsons, *Callimachus. Victoria Berenices*, "ZPE" 25, 1977, 1-50: early edition of *Aet.* 1-2; compilation of books 3-4, framed by two poems about Berenice in old age; all four books framed by prologue and epilogue.

(29) The presentation in Sch. Flor. presupposes this: prologue (fr. 1) and dream (fr. 2) are both treated under the same lemma (Sch. Flor. 1 = fr. 1.1). It has recently been suggested that the transition from prologue to dream was marked by an invocation of the Muses. Cf. A. Kerkhecker, *Ein Musenanruf am Anfang der Aitia des Kallimachos*, "ZPE" 71, 1988, 16-24, who infers from Sch. fr. 1a.24f. ὅπο]κρίσι[.]ς ἀποκρίσε[ι]ς ἢ ἀμν]ήσαιτε ἀναμνήσαιτέ μ[ε] that there was a request of the narrator, i.e. 'old Callimachus', to the Muses to remind him of 'the answers'. If this is right it would be a very subtle way of effecting the transition - just as one would expect!

aition: in fr. 43.1-11 we hear about a tomb (v. 4) and perhaps about Thetis (v. 6, but other divisions of the letters are possible), so that Peleus is a conceivable subject to be treated in these lines. If these two fragments must be connected and were part of the dialogue with the Muses (30) we would have yet a further level of embedding: "I dreamt that I told the Muses: 'I once was at a symposium, where I asked somebody: What is the origin of a certain ritual...? and my fellow-guest told me: It was as follows...'" (31). The fellow-guest would then be a tertiary narrator. But fr. 43.1-17 does not allow firm conclusions in this respect. The transition to the next question, which must have stood in 18ff., is almost completely lost. We know that this *aition* again was part of the dialogue with the Muses (cf. 56f.), but not its relation to the symposium-setting in 1-17. It may well be that this symposium was not at all embedded in the dialogue with the Muses, but was rather an interruption by the primary narrator reminiscing about another occasion at which he also once heard an *aition*. In spite of all these uncertainties it is at least clear from fr. 43.1-17 that an *aition* heard at a symposium was somehow inserted into the narrative framework of the dialogue with the Muses. That is, another way of embedding the tale of an *aition* was used beside or within the framework of the dialogue. Here too the example that springs to mind is Homer, who presents many stories within the framework of a symposium (e.g. the story of Odysseus' travels told at the meal with the Phaeacians) (32). But it is likely that the *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon played some part too (33). In any case, it is clear that the framework of the dialogue with the Muses was far from rigid: it was combined with or interrupted by a secondary framework, i.e. the

(30) This connection was recently defended by J. E. G. Zetzel, *On the opening of Callimachus Aetia II*, "ZPE" 42, 1981, 31-33; cf. also Krevans (n. 3) 245.

(31) This paraphrase sounds clumsy and not very elegant, but it should be borne in mind that the first level ("I dreamt that...") need not have been mentioned explicitly here. The first level of the narrative also tends to disappear quite often in e.g. Pl. *Symp.*, where the reader is reminded of it only at important points. Similarly in the famous and intricate passage Ov. *Met.* 5.250ff.: the primary narrator [1] tells that the Muse [2] tells Minerva that Calliope [3] told that Arethusa [4] told Ceres her story... At the beginning of the Ceres-story (5.337ff.) the levels 2 and 3 are mentioned explicitly, but not again at the beginning of Arethusa's story (5.577). After Arethusa's story we are led back step by step to the level of the primary narrator (5.642, 662; 6.1f.). Cf. on this passage e.g. G. Rosati, *Il racconto dentro il racconto...*, in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale "Letterature classiche e narratologia"*, Perugia 1981, 297-309.

(32) *Od.* 8.57ff. Cf. also *Od.* 3.103-328, 4.271-289. A.R. uses this narrative framework in 2.468-489. Cf. in general K. Giesecking, *Die Rahmenerzählung in Ovids Metamorphosen*, Diss. Tübingen 1964, 67ff.

(33) The insistence on the importance of talk over (food and) wine in fr. 43.12-17 and fr. 178 is reminiscent of Pl. *Symp.* 176b ff. and Xen. *Symp.* 2.24-27.

symposium-setting.

Another indication that the framework was sometimes interrupted may be found in some of the programmatic passages. Here too it is not always clear at which narrative level we are. In fr. 1 and - probably - fr. 2 the primary narrator is talking. The same could be said for the programmatic passages in *SH* 239 and 253, which perhaps stood at the end of *Aet.* 2 (34). But as these passages seem to be framing *Aet.* 1-2 they do not suggest an interruption of the dialogue with the Muses. More complicated however is fr. 7.13f., where the Charites are addressed and asked to favour the speaker's poetry: ἔλλατε νῦν, ἐλέγεγοισι ἰδ' ἐνιψήσασθαι λιπώσιας ἥ χειρῶς ἐμοῖς, ἵνα μοι πολὺ μένωσιν ἔτος. This passage concludes the *aition* about the cult of the Charites on Paros, which is the first *aition* of *Aet.* 1. Of course the choice of this *aition* as the first item of the first book must have been deliberate, dictated by the particular qualities of the Charites, who could give the work beauty and charm. But it is not quite clear how this apostrophe was inserted: either the secondary narrator could direct his request to the Charites within the framework of the dream or the primary narrator could interrupt the tale of the dream to address the Charites directly (35). A similar problem exists regarding fr. 26.5ff.: the text is too fragmentary to allow any conclusions, but 5 and 8 would fit a programmatic context.

Apart from these possible interruptions of the dialogue there are also certain changes of roles: the Muses are not the only ones to tell stories. A good example of this is fr. 43.23ff. Although much is still obscure it is clear that these lines must have contained a question by 'Callimachus': "Why are all founders of Sicilian cities called by their name when people sacrifice to them apart from the founders of Zankle?". This question was followed by a catalogue of Sicilian foundation legends (28ff.), in which 'Callimachus' as it were showed off his own erudition. Only in 56ff. Clio is allowed to answer the question. It is striking that 'Callimachus himself' is here offering a great deal of information and that it is a catalogue too: undoubtedly this is a subtle play with the conventions of the *Iliad*, where, as we have seen, the invocations (of the Muses) often precede catalogues and the impression is created that the catalogue is the answer to the question, the only exception being - no doubt significantly - the longest catalogue of them all, which is told by the narrator in the first person singular (*Il.* 2.484ff.). After the *aition*

(34) Cf. M. A. Harder, *Some thoughts about Callimachus SH 239 and 253*, "ZPE" 67, 1987, 21-30; Krevans (n. 3) 236f.

(35) Of course these technicalities did not affect the general effect of the scene, which showed the familiar sequence: "A tells B about a god; B subsequently addresses this god". Cf. e.g. Hes. *Op.* 1-10; Theoc. 15.100-149 (I owe this observation to S. R. Slings).

of Zankle a similar thing seems to happen in fr. 43.84ff.: 'Callimachus' asks the Muses why people in Haliartus are celebrating a feast from Crete and seems to go on talking himself (how long and about what is not quite clear due to the state of the papyrus). Sch. Flor. 32ff. show that in *Aet.* 1 too this change of roles could take place: 'Callimachus' is the one who first tells about the various traditions concerning the birth of the Charites (36).

If fr. 178 is from *Aet.* 2 we find here yet another change of roles: the merchant Theogenes is telling 'Callimachus' an *aition* concerning his country Icus.

4 The dialogue with the Muses: aspects of contents

4.1 From what has been said above I think it will be clear that Callimachus, starting from the simple scheme of the invocations of the Muses, created a completely new narrative structure for *Aet.* 1-2 (37). We must now look briefly at the contents of *Aet.* 1-2 in order to see how the new structure also implied a different kind of emphasis in the work's contents. When we compare the contents of *Aet.* 1-2 with the invocations in Homer we see that two important elements have been elaborated: [1] the *Aetia* show a fairly high degree of subjectivity, i.e. the narrator is clearly present and talking about himself; [2] the *Aetia* are an aetiological work. We saw that both elements are hinted at in the *Iliad*: the narrator speaks in the first person briefly in the invocations of the Muses and sometimes asks about origins. But they appeared to be much more prominent in Hes. *Th.* 1ff., a passage which has clearly influenced the *Aetia* a great deal (38).

4.2 The subjective element in *Aet.* 1-2 can be clearly seen in several instances, which I shall mention only briefly, as the subject has been treated more elaborately elsewhere (39):

[1] the 'autobiographic' framework: the dialogue with the Muses is

(36) A less certain case is Sch. Flor. 51ff., which has been interpreted as if 'Callimachus' added the story of Heracles and Thiodamas in order to supplement the *aitia* of the scurrilous rituals at Anaphe and Lindus told by the Muses: this story does not contain an *aition* and was not mentioned in the original question (cf. fr. 7.19ff.; Sch. Flor. 38ff.). So A. S. Hollis, *Teuthis and Callimachus Aetia Book I*, "CQ" 32, 1982, 117-120, esp. 118; Krevans (n. 3) 246f.

(37) Though, of course, the means he used to modify this scheme were not without precedent: embedding of stories in a narrative framework is as old as Homer; complicated forms of embedding at various levels are known from the dialogues of Plato.

(38) On Hesiod and Callimachus see in general Reinsch-Werner (n. 2); E. R. Schwinge, *Künstlichkeit von Kunst* [Zetemata 84], München 1986, 14 n. 36 (lit.).

(39) Cf. e.g. M. Puelma, *Die Aitien des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie*, "MH" 39, 1982, 221-246; 285-304; esp. 228ff.

presented as a dream by the primary narrator, perhaps interspersed with programmatic utterances and personal reminiscences. It is mostly only *through* this dream that we get glimpses of the real world in which these rituals and cities still exist and of the mythical world in which they originate;

[2] the programmatic passages: 'Callimachus' ' views and reflections about his poetry are mixed with the *aitia*;

[3] the motivations given for the questions: it is said several times that it was his curiosity which prompted 'young Callimachus' to a question (e.g. fr. 31b, 43.84f.); in fr. 43.12-17 the narrator's reaction to the symposium is of a very personal nature (40).

4.3 The connection of the invocation of the Muses with aetiological information was suggested by *Il.* 1.1ff. and 16.112ff. and elaborated in *Hes. Th.* 1ff. It recurs several times in later literature; e.g. *Pind. P.* 4.70f. *τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας, ἥ τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος δῆσεν ἄλλοις; θέσφατον ἦν Περίαν* etc.; *Bacch.* 15.47f. *Μοῦσα, τίς πρῶτος λόγων ἄρχεν δικαίων; ἥ Πλεισθενίδας* etc.; *Pl. Resp.* 545d and *Timon of Phlius SH* 796 (both quoted in 3.2) (41). This use of the motif shows that the association of an invocation of the Muses with a cause or origin was both old and familiar, a natural inference from its use in some of the epic passages, which Callimachus took a little further to create the framework for *Aet.* 1-2 (42).

5. Conclusion

The questions posed in 1 can both be answered in the affirmative. In the first place the framework of the dialogue with the Muses can be traced back to an epic element. As to the second question: the way in which Callimachus elaborated the motif of the invocations of the Muses does contain epic elements, but he stretched their narrative possibilities to a great extent so that form and contents of *Aet.* 1-2 eventually looked very different.

(40) This is even more so in fr. 178.1ff., where 'Callimachus' shares a couch with Theogenes and their common dislike of wine and preference for talk creates an opportunity to discuss the cult of Peleus at Icus.

(41) It is interesting to see how Milton too imitated the ancient invocations of the Muses when asking about the *cause* of the fall of man in the proem of his *Paradise Lost*: "Of man's first disobedience... ἥ sing, Heavenly Muse" and "Say first, what cause ἥ moved our Grand Parents... to fall off ἥ from their Creator... ἥ Who first seduced them to that foul revolt? Th' infernal Serpent..."

(42) Later we see Callimachean influence on this very point in Ovid's *Fasti*: the device of informative dialogue is used especially when *aitia* are concerned (cf. F. Bömer, *Die Fasten*, Heidelberg 1957-58, I.25ff. and 49; Puelma [n. 39] 230f. + n. 28). Cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 1.8ff.

As to Callimachus' play with the early Greek epic a statement made by Herter is often quoted: Callimachus' aim was, according to Herter, "in den Bahnen Homers so un-Homerisch zu sein wie möglich" (43). However, concerning his narrative technique in *Aet.* 1-2 this is not quite accurate enough. It is better to say that it was first of all Hesiod who gave an 'un-Homeric' twist to the epic element of the invocations of the Muses, and that Callimachus in his turn started from Hesiod's treatment of the motif, though without losing sight of the Homeric examples. The result was a subtle, playful and — as far as we can see — completely new narrative structure.

University of Groningen

ANNETTE HARDER

(43) H. Herter, *Kallimachos und Homer*, Bonn 1929, 50; quoted by e.g. Schmitt (n. 2) 53.