

# ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

TOME XLVIII

---

## CALLIMAQUE

SEPT EXPOSÉS SUIVIS DE DISCUSSIONS

PAR

LUIGI LEHNUS, ADRIAN S. HOLLIS, FRANCO MONTANARI,  
PETER J. PARSONS, RICHARD HUNTER &  
THERESE FUHRER, M. ANNETTE HARDER,  
SUSAN A. STEPHENS

Avec une contribution de Guido BASTIANINI

Introduzione de Franco MONTANARI

Conclusions de Luigi LEHNUS

Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari et Luigi Lehnus

Avec la participation de Claude Calame

Index rédigé par Lavinia Galli Milić

---

FONDATION HARDT  
POUR L'ÉTUDE DE L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE  
VANDOEUVRES – GENÈVE

2002

*Les premiers «Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique» ont eu lieu en 1952, du 8 au 13 septembre. Dans l'avant-propos du volume où ils sont consignés, le Baron Kurd von Hardt en donne la définition. La voici: «Chaque année, au siège de la Fondation à Vandœuvres, auront lieu des 'Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique', au cours desquels des spécialistes, représentant plusieurs pays, feront des exposés sur un domaine choisi et, au cours des discussions, procèderont à d'enrichissants échanges de vue.»*

*Conçue et mise au point par des savants tous aujourd'hui décédés – parmi eux Ludwig Curtius, Bruno Snell, Kurt von Fritz, Albin Lesky, Theodor Klauser, Olof Gigon –, l'institution s'est révélée viable. Quarante-huit fois, des savants de divers pays se sont réunis en été à Vandœuvres; les «Entretiens» ont été régulièrement publiés.*

P 23197/48



1901427173



FONDATION HARDT  
POUR L'ÉTUDE DE L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

*ENTRETIENS*  
*TOME XLVIII*

**CALLIMAQUE**



# **ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE**

TOME XLVIII

## **CALLIMAQUE**

SEPT EXPOSÉS SUIVIS DE DISCUSSIONS

PAR

LUIGI LEHNUS, ADRIAN S. HOLLIS, FRANCO MONTANARI,  
PETER J. PARSONS, RICHARD HUNTER &  
THERESE FUHRER, M. ANNETTE HARDER,  
SUSAN A. STEPHENS

Avec une contribution de Guido BASTIANINI

Introduzione de Franco MONTANARI

Conclusions de Luigi LEHNUS

Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari et Luigi Lehnus

Avec la participation de Claude Calame

Index rédigé par Lavinia Galli Milić

VANDOEUVRES – GENÈVE  
3-7 SEPTEMBRE 2001

MC 407

BREVETTES SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CIVIQUE

2002 XIX

## CATALOGUE

SUR EXPOSITIONS DE DOCUMENTATION

AN

LUDVÍK ADAM & HORN & SONIA ALEXANDRA  
LETTER & TAVRONA RICHARD HINTERBERGER  
TERESA HINTERBERGER MARGARET HINTERBERGER  
SUSAN A. STEPHENS

À tout ceux qui sont intéressés par l'art et l'archéologie

catalogue de vente à l'échelle internationale

catalogue de vente à l'échelle internationale

Émissions spéciales de brefs sur les expositions de fondation Hardt

avec la participation de l'École suisse d'art

ISSN 0071-0822

ISBN 2-600-00748-2

TOUS DROITS RÉSERVÉS

© 2002 by Fondation Hardt, Genève

1245165/11c

870/02, 2003

SCHWEIZERISCHE LANDES BIBLIOTHEK



BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE SUISSE

BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALE SVIZZERA

BIBLIOTECA NAZIONALA SVIZRA

## *PRÉFACE*

*Le sujet des Entretiens de 2001 a été proposé par le professeur Franco Montanari, qui a été chargé par le Comité scientifique de la Fondation Hardt de les préparer et de les diriger en collaboration avec le professeur Luigi Lehnus. Conformément à une pratique assez récemment introduite, mais qui est en passe de devenir traditionnelle, un texte introductif a été rédigé par le ou l'un des responsables des Entretiens, cette fois par Franco Montanari. Le lecteur y trouvera exposés les buts et les lignes directrices du Colloque.*

*La Commune de Vandœuvres, sur le territoire de laquelle se situent les bâtiments de la Chandoleine, soutient depuis plusieurs années son activité par un substantiel subside. Celui-ci, d'entente avec les donateurs, est utilisé pour financer la publication du volume annuel d'Entretiens. Dans le contexte actuel, ce montant couvre approximativement les deux tiers des frais d'impression. Les organes de la Fondation Hardt expriment à la Commune de Vandœuvres l'expression de leur profonde gratitude pour ce soutien, qui allège quelque peu le lourd fardeau financier qui menace de plus en plus le fonctionnement de notre institution.*

*La Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft alloue à la Fondation, chaque année, depuis très longtemps, un important subside, qui permet de couvrir pratiquement l'ensemble des dépenses de notre bibliothèque. Notre reconnaissance est acquise à cette institution, qui nous permet ainsi de maintenir à jour l'instrument de travail dont l'excellence attire nos hôtes à Vandœuvres.*

*Bernard Grange, année après année, prépare les communications et les discussions en vue de leur impression et assure la correction des épreuves. La réputation d'élégance et d'acribie de notre collection a été établie et se maintient grâce à lui. Comme l'an dernier, c'est Madame Lavinia Galli Milić, assistante à la Faculté des Lettres de*

*l'Université de Genève, qui a compilé les index. Les responsables de la Fondation et les futurs utilisateurs du présent volume leur disent un grand merci pour leur précieuse contribution.*

*François Paschoud  
Président du Conseil de Fondation*

## TABLE DES MATIÈRES

I.	Introduzione par Franco MONTANARI	IX
I. LUIGI LEHNUS		
<i>Callimaco prima e dopo Pfeiffer</i>		1
Discussion		30
II. ADRIAN S. HOLLIS		
<i>Callimachus: Light from Later Antiquity</i>		35
Discussion		55
III. FRANCO MONTANARI		
<i>Callimaco e la filologia</i>		59
Discussion		93
IV. PETER J. PARSONS		
<i>Callimachus and the Hellenistic Epigram</i>		99
Discussion		137
V. RICHARD HUNTER & THERESE FUHRER		
<i>Imaginary Gods?</i>		
<i>Poetic Theology in the Hymns of Callimachus</i>		143
Discussion		176
VI. M. ANNETTE HARDER		
<i>Intertextuality in Callimachus' Aetia</i>		189
Discussion		224

VII.	SUSAN A. STEPHENS	
	<i>Egyptian Callimachus</i>	235
	Discussion	263
	<i>Frammento inedito di glossario a un testo poetico ellenistico</i>	
	par Guido BASTIANINI	271
	Discussion	274
	Conclusions par Luigi LEHNUS	277
	INDICES	281

## INTRODUZIONE

Nella storia degli *Entretiens* della Fondation Hardt non solo finora non compariva un volume dedicato specificamente a Callimaco, ma neppure era mai stato trattato autonomamente uno dei grandi poeti greci dell'età ellenistica. Anzi, fra gli autori tramandati per lo più in frammenti, sembra di poter dire che Callimaco fosse uno dei maggiori poeti greci non ancora preso in considerazione in questa serie. Non è dunque un tema che abbia bisogno di giustificazioni. Negli ultimi decenni, il panorama degli studi sul mondo antico ha registrato una particolare fortuna dei poeti ellenistici e in generale delle ricerche sulla cultura di quel periodo, compresi gli aspetti che riguardano la filologia e l'erudizione, sia come ambito intellettuale autonomo e di primaria importanza, sia nei loro legami profondi e organici con la creazione poetica dotta. In tale quadro, Callimaco ha giocato un ruolo di primissimo piano per i nuovi ritrovamenti di testi e per i progressi nell'interpretazione puntuale e complessiva, nel lavoro editoriale e nell'inquadramento storico.

Da tempo è stata decisamente scartata, del tutto a ragione, la vecchia collocazione nella posizione di 'minore e alessandrino' (forse 'minore' in quanto 'alessandrino', in secondo piano nel confronto con l'eccellenza dei poeti arcaici e classici), almeno in parte dovuta alla svalutazione operata a suo tempo da C.G. Cobet. Tale prospettiva è completamente tramontata e Callimaco ha decisamente riacquistato una posizione di primo piano fra i maggiori poeti del mondo antico, suscitando negli ultimi decenni un interesse molto forte e sempre crescente. Si riconosce in lui l'erede più versatile e acuto della multiforme poesia greca precedente, il fondatore di quella ellenistica e il principale ispiratore della poesia dotta romana. Non si può trascurare il fatto che egli rappresenta uno snodo cruciale nella riflessione

antica sulla concezione della poesia e sul fare poesia. È in pieno corso un'approfondita riconsiderazione del suo ruolo e della sua posizione nel sistema letterario ellenistico. Inoltre, deve essere messo in luce il produttivo rapporto che l'attività artistico-intellettuale di Callimaco intrattiene con gli attori della storia del suo tempo: un'interazione complessa e mediata da sofisticati meccanismi letterari (confrontabile per certi aspetti con quella della lirica arcaica), che si realizza in modi ormai pienamente riconoscibili, preludendo a modalità romane. La complessità della sua figura si comprende meglio se, accanto agli aspetti poetici, si considera anche che egli è uno dei personaggi centrali nell'affermarsi della filologia e nella nascita della bibliografia.

Diversi fattori rendono dunque auspicabile un riesame complessivo del tema "Callimaco". L'eccezionalità dell'opera editoriale di R. Pfeiffer (1949-1953), accompagnata fra l'altro dalla riflessione nelle pagine della *History of Classical Scholarship* (1968), si trova confrontata con il recente fervore di studi, anche molto innovativi. Dopo l'importante libro di Alan Cameron (*Callimachus and His Critics*, 1995), molti problemi sono più che mai aperti: letterato da 'torre d'avorio' o poeta itinerante, relazioni con il contesto storico-politico, rivalutazione del rapporto con Omero, portata del conclamato 'esiodismo' callimacheo, esistenza o non esistenza di un'epica ellenistica, nuovo stile elegiaco, struttura variabile degli *Aitia*, il problema dei Telchini, composizione e esecuzione degli *Inni*, Callimaco autore di epigrammi (anche alla luce delle raccolte epigrammatiche ritrovate in frammenti papiracei, fra cui il recente Posidippo di Milano). La centralità intellettuale di Callimaco, le ragioni della sua particolare fortuna, il naufragio e il recupero della sua opera come moderno problema filologico-letterario identificano il cuore del dibattito in corso e ne riassumono le varie sfaccettature da approfondire analiticamente.

L'idea di questi *Entretiens* è nata ed è stata realizzata in comune fra il sottoscritto e Luigi Lehnus, al quale è toccato l'onere delle conclusioni nella seduta finale e in questo volume. La formula della Fondation Hardt costringe a numeri assai

limitati per quanto riguarda la scelta dei temi da trattare nel seminario tenuto nella villa di Vandœuvres. Dopo una relazione introduttiva, che inquadra le problematiche della nuova edizione dei frammenti in corso, gli interventi sono stati dedicati agli *Inni*, agli *Aitia*, alla posizione di Callimaco nel quadro dell'epigramma ellenistico, alla filologia callimachea, alla puntuale analisi di elementi della fortuna del poeta in autori della tarda antichità, agli aspetti suscettibili di una *interpretatio Aegyptiaca*. Come d'abitudine, le discussioni sono puntualmente registrate nel volume e costituiscono un complemento essenziale della trattazione. Inoltre, durante gli *Entretiens* il Prof. Guido Bastianini, Presidente dell'Istituto Papirologico "Vitelli" di Firenze, ha presentato alla discussione un frammento inedito contenente un glossario su un poeta ellenistico non identificato.

Mi prendo la libertà in questa introduzione (come ho fatto nell'introdurre gli *Entretiens*) di fare una piccola digressione di origine autobiografica. Poche settimane prima dell'appuntamento callimacheo, gli impegni nell'ambito della FIEC (Fédération Internationale des Associations des Études Classiques) hanno portato il sottoscritto (e anche il presidente della Fondation) in Brasile, dove si terrà il Congresso della FIEC del 2004. Il pensiero più o meno cosciente al vicino appuntamento su Callimaco mi dava evidentemente un occhio particolare, almeno in una occasione.

Il grandioso spettacolo naturale delle cascate del fiume Iguaçu, collocate in un punto di confine fra Brasile, Argentina e Paraguay, ha fatto nascere una famosa leggenda del Sud America, la storia di Naipi e Tarobà. Nella religione degli indios Caingangue, che popolavano le sponde dell'Iguaçu, il supremo essere del mondo era il dio-serpente M'boi, figlio di Tupâ. Il capo tribù Igobi aveva una figlia di nome Naipi, così bella che il fiume arrestava il suo corso quando la fanciulla si specchiava nelle sue acque. Per la sua bellezza, Naipi era votata al dio M'boi, perché vivesse solo per il suo culto: ma un giovane guerriero della tribù, chiamato Tarobà, si innamorò della fanciulla fin dalla prima volta che la vide. Nel giorno della consacrazione della ragazza, mentre tutta la tribù danzava nella festa ceremoniale,

Tarobà fuggì con Naipi su una canoa lungo la corrente del fiume. Quando venne a sapere della fuga di Naipi e Tarobà, il dio M'boi si infuriò moltissimo, penetrò sotto terra e, agitando il suo grande corpo di serpente, aprì una gigantesca spaccatura, che formò le enormi cascate. Trascinata dalle acque, la canoa dei giovani fuggiaschi precipitò nei gorghi e scomparve per sempre. La leggenda narra che Naipi fu trasformata in una roccia sotto le cascate e Tarobà fu trasformato in una palma che si piega verso il fiume: così gli amanti si contemplano in eterno, sotto gli occhi del dio.

Se volessimo immaginare questa bella leggenda narrata come un *action* in stile callimacheo, ne avremmo tutti gli elementi: e potremmo proseguire vedendola come storia metamorfica dentro il poema ovidiano. Ma è solo per divertimento e per condividere una curiosità che ho voluto fissare qui il ricordo di una delle tante favole eziologiche presenti nelle mitologie del mondo, che una sensibilità callimachea ci aiuta a capire ed apprezzare.

Franco MONTANARI

# I

LUIGI LEHNUS

## CALLIMACO PRIMA E DOPO PFEIFFER

“Studiorum Callimacheorum nihil nisi initia offero; ad ultiora per vestiganda eruditis magna patet area”. Con questa affermazione, la cui premessa il recensore E.A. Barber trovava “almost grotesquely over-modest”<sup>1</sup>, Rudolf Pfeiffer (1889-1979) si congedava, licenziando il 1° luglio 1951 il secondo volume della sua *editio maxima*<sup>2</sup>, da esattamente trent’anni di lavoro testuale su Callimaco. Il nostro compito oggi è quello di verificare la seconda parte dell’affermazione di Pfeiffer, tanto perfettamente credibile — e i progressi e i ritrovamenti di mezzo secolo si sono incaricati di confermarlo — quanto felicemente infondata. Callimaco è ciò che ci è stato dato da Pfeiffer (certo grazie anche al lavoro dei quattro secoli che l’hanno preceduto) e nel futuro prevedibile non ci sarà bisogno di un altro Pfeiffer. Eric Barber, e chi con lui, si rassicuri (“If these two volumes... are to be deemed only *initia*, Heaven help the rest of us!”). Callimaco dopo cinquant’anni resta *quasi* pronto. Quella che segue è una rassegna di cose da fare su binari ferreamente tracciati.

### A. *Callimaco prima di Pfeiffer*

Apparentemente il punto di partenza di chiunque a XX secolo avviato intendesse ripubblicare i frammenti di Callimaco era la

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E.A. BARBER, in *CR N.S.* 4 (1954), 227.

<sup>2</sup> *Callimachus*, ed. Rudolfus PFEIFFER, I-II (Oxonii 1949-53). Si noti che l’*editio maior*, denominata così da Pfeiffer stesso, è in realtà solo la seconda edizione (Bonae 1923) dei *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta* (*infra* n.26).

monumentale edizione curata da Otto Schneider (1815-1880), apparsa a Lipsia nel 1873<sup>3</sup>. Ma l'afflusso dei papiri, cominciato per Callimaco con la *Tabula Vindobonensis* (1893) e proseguito con le grandi acquisizioni dell'*Acontio e Cidippe* e dei *Giambi* nel 1910, nonché dei o del codice di Berlino (1912 e 1914, *Aitia e Carmi*)<sup>4</sup>, aveva rimescolato le carte. Alla fine della prima guerra mondiale, faticosamente ricomponendosi la *res publica litterarum*, la situazione era pronta perché eventuali nuovi *Callimachea* risultassero molto diversi dai precedenti, e se sul frontespizio del suo *Handexemplar* dell'edizione schneideriana Wilamowitz, sotto il titolo, callimacheamente annotava “ΜΕΓΑ ΚΑΚΟΝ”<sup>5</sup>, andare oltre non solo si poteva ma si doveva.

La storia è nota. Fino alla seconda metà del XVII secolo la raccolta dei frammenti di Callimaco si limitò a brevi farragini in appendice all'edizione degli *Inni* (ed eventualmente degli *Epi-grammi*); così è in Enrico Stefano (?1531-1598) e in Bonaventura Vulcanio (1538-1614), così sarà con Anna Fabri nonostante un certo incremento numerico. Estienne, che del resto annoverava tra i frammenti anche un epigramma, si limitò a espilare passi dagli scolî ad Apollonio Rodio, da Ateneo e da Clemente Alessandrino, senza curarsi di distinguere tra esametri e distici. De Smet raccolse in una rubrica a parte le citazioni callimachee dell'*Etymologicum Magnum*, e la sua silloge era ritenuta utile e riprodotta ancora da Ernesti quasi due secoli dopo<sup>6</sup>. Madame Dacier (1654-1720) ebbe a sua volta il merito di desumere una cinquantina di

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Callimachea*, ed. O. SCHNEIDER, vol. II: *Fragmenta a Bentleio collecta et explicata, ab aliis aucta* (Lipsiae 1873).

<sup>4</sup> Che *PBerol.* inv. 13417 e *PBerol.* inv. 11629 provengano dallo stesso papiro non è in realtà certo. Della *Cydippa* (come del *Prologo degli Aitia*, che apparirà nel 1927) esistenza e conformazione erano state variamente divinate nel corso dei secoli.

<sup>5</sup> Humboldt Universitätsbibliothek, Berlin, Wil 47-2. Ringrazio la direzione della Biblioteca per avermi consentito l'accesso al fondo Wilamowitz e i colleghi berlinesi Wolfgang Rösler e Thomas Poiss per avermene con la loro amichevole accoglienza facilitato la consultazione.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J.A. ERNESTI (ed.), *Callimachi hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta* I (Lugduni Batavorum 1761), 349-58. Le edizioni dello Stefano e del Vulcanio apparvero rispettivamente a Ginevra nel 1577 e ad Anversa-Leida nel 1584.

nuovi passi da compilazioni scolastiche (Pindaro, Sofocle, Aristofane, Teocrito), dallo Stobeo e da lessici varî. Ma confessava nella prefazione di non essersi sforzata più di tanto, anche perché “libri mei me in Urbem [a Parigi] haud comitati sunt”<sup>7</sup>.

La collezione con cui nel 1697 Ezechiel Spanheim, il cosmopolita diplomatico ginevrino (1629-1710), contribuì all'*editio variorum ultraiectina* di Theodor e J.G. Graevius ha diversi meriti, tra cui quello di aver alzato il numero dei frammenti a complessivamente più di cento, di aver riconosciuto l'importanza di Eustazio come fonte di *Callimachea*, e soprattutto di aver tentato una prima ricognizione di *Aitia* ed *Ecale*<sup>8</sup>. Ma ebbe, per così dire, il torto di apparire contemporaneamente (addirittura nello stesso volume) all'edizione di Richard Bentley (1662-1742), che coi suoi oltre quattrocento pezzi e con la genialità spesso palmare di molti suoi interventi<sup>9</sup> relegò di colpo al passato remoto tutti i tentativi precedenti<sup>10</sup>. E non è un caso che la numerazione di Bentley rimanesse pur con infiniti aggiustamenti la stessa fino all'edizione di Schneider.

Un singolare destino ha voluto che la più fulgida stagione della grecistica olandese desse alla raccolta dei frammenti di Callimaco un contributo non quale ci si sarebbe potuti aspettare. Beninteso, quel contributo fu grande in assoluto, grazie anche e soprattutto alla forza del preceppo hemsterhusiano di attingere ai grammatici editi e inediti e di pubblicare *etymologica* e lessici<sup>11</sup>. Ma la

<sup>7</sup> Cf. A. FABRI (ed.), *Callimachi Cyrenaei hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta* (Parisiis 1675), 161.

<sup>8</sup> In T. GRAEVIIUS (*ob.* 1692 [prefazione e cura di J.G. G.]), *Callimachi hymni, epigrammata, et fragmenta I* (Utrecht 1697), 273-302.

<sup>9</sup> L'eclatante restauro di fr.509 Pf., che ho da ultimo rivisitato in *Acme* 54 (2001), 283-84, è solo uno degli esempi possibili. I *Callimachi fragmenta a Richardo Bentleio collecta* si leggono alle pp. 303-429 e 434-38 del primo volume della *Graeviana* (vd. nota precedente).

<sup>10</sup> È peraltro notevole che alcuni dei frammenti individuati da Spanheim siano, più o meno casualmente, trascurati da Bentley; essi furono recensiti da Blomfield nell'edizione citata sotto alla n.16, pp.319-20.

<sup>11</sup> Valga in generale il rinvio a J.G. GERRETZEN, *Schola Hemsterhusiana. De herleving der Grieksche Studien aan de Nederlandsche universiteiten in de achttiende eeuw van Perizonius tot en met Valckenaer* (Nijmegen-Utrecht 1940).

vera portata della filologia formale detta anglo-olandese, applicata a Callimaco, si rivelerà solo al tramonto di quella scuola, quando nel 1842 (e il misocallimachismo di Cobet era già alle porte)<sup>12</sup> lo sfortunato Alphonsus Hecker (1820-1865) formulò a Groninga la regola che va sotto il suo nome, e che consente di recuperare meccanicamente da Suida un elevato numero di frammenti dell'*Ecale*<sup>13</sup>. Quand'anche nessuno possa sottovalutare il contributo dato all'edizione leidense di J.A. Ernesti (1707-1781)<sup>14</sup> da Hemsterhuis e da Ruhnkenius, resta il fatto che un infausto malinteso, destinato a protrarsi in annose polemiche, impedì un sereno scambio di idee tra l'arrogante Ernesti e l'uomo che più di ogni altro sarebbe stato in grado di fornire informazioni sulle fonti tardive dei frammenti di Callimaco, l'ipersensibile L.C. Valckenaer (1715-1785)<sup>15</sup>. L'edizione ernesiana è per i frammenti men che memorabile, e non molto più avanti si spingerà quella londinese di C.J. Blomfield, futuro vescovo di Chester (1786-1857), cui pure si deve la prima valorizzazione del materiale callimacheo contenuto negli scolî veneti all'*Iliade* (1815)<sup>16</sup>.

Premesso che dei *Giambi* prima dell'arrivo dei papiri si sapeva ben poco, e che prima di Hecker si possedeva poco e ancor meno si intendeva dell'*Ecale*, le principali ricerche e controversie

<sup>12</sup> Cf. C.G. COBET, in *Mnemosyne* 10 (1861), 389-437.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. A. HECKER, *Commentationum Callimachearum capita duo* (Groningae 1842), 79-152, e vd. G. BENEDETTO, in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT e G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1993), 1-15.

<sup>14</sup> *Supra* n.6 (di Ernesti si legga, in particolare, l'ultima pagina della prefazione).

<sup>15</sup> Vd. G. BENEDETTO, *Il sogno e l'invettiva. Momenti di storia dell'esegesi callimachea* (Firenze-Milano 1993), 94-173. L'incomprensione tra Ernesti e Valckenaer (su cui cf. di nuovo G. BENEDETTO, in *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammln*, ed. by G.W. MOST [Göttingen 1997], 95-110) risuona con marcati accenti campanilistici in J.A.H. TITTMANN (ed.), *David. Ruhnkenii. Lud. Casp. Valckenae-rii et aliorum ad Ioh. Aug. Ernesti epistolae* (Lipsiae 1812), XI-XVII e D. WYTTENBACH, "Defensio Batavorum contra Tittmannum", in *Miscellaneae doctrinae liber tertius* (Amstelodami 1817), 123-38.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. C.J. BLOMFIELD (ed.), *Callimachi quae supersunt* (Londini 1815), 314-19.

hanno di solito riguardato gli *Aitia*, il cui influsso sulla poesia romana, a cominciare dalla *Chioma*, era noto da sempre e impressionante. Di Valckenaer la raccolta delle reliquie euripidee resta una pietra miliare nella storia del recupero dei testi frammentari<sup>17</sup>, ma con Callimaco egli ebbe mano bensì felice in singoli interventi<sup>18</sup> ma sfortunata nelle questioni più generali. E che Valckenaer condividesse e addirittura radicalizzasse l'idea bentleiana che *Aitia* ed *Elegie* fossero due cose diverse è ragione non ultima per cui i suoi *Callimachi elegiarum fragmenta*, apparsi del resto postumi, fossero presto messi in disparte<sup>19</sup>.

L'edizione di Schneider è ricordata oggi più per l'inausta ripartizione degli *Aitia*, conforme Igino, in agoni, fondazioni, invenzioni e riti pubblici che non per la meritoria liquidazione della tesi di Bentley e di Valckenaer sulle *'Elegie'*. A sua volta la filologia monumentale dell'età di Böckh, K.O. Müller, Welcker e Otto Jahn ben poco si occupò di Callimaco; ma l'Ottocento pre-wilamowitziano vedeva all'opera sui poeti ellenistici la scuola di Hermann, capace di accoppiare perfetta conoscenza delle fonti erudite e nuova sensibilità ai valori metrici, linguistici e figurativi. A parte A. Meineke, che pubblicò da par suo *Inni ed epigrammi* (e il cui contributo a Callimaco mi è capitato di apprezzare altrove)<sup>20</sup>, due nomi entrambi legati a Bonn, dove ben presto approderà Wilamowitz, emergono dallo sfondo. A.F. Naeke (1788-1838) fu il primo a tentare una ricostruzione dell'*Ecale*, tuttora significativa per sparsi restauri testuali e per accorpamento di frammenti<sup>21</sup>; Karl Dilthey (1839-1907) legò il

<sup>17</sup> Cf. L.C. VALCKENAER, *Diatrībe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias* (Lugduni Batavorum 1767).

<sup>18</sup> Si consideri ad es. l'apparato di Pfeiffer a fr.7,12 (e l'approvazione di Valckenaer da parte di P. Maas, *infra* n.43) e a fr.43,13.

<sup>19</sup> Furono editi dal genero J. Luzac nel 1799. Cf. S.L. RADT, "Valckenaer 'en pantoufles' in einem rarissimum der Groninger Universitätsbibliothek", in *Bibliotheek, wetenschap en cultuur. Opstellen aangeboden aan mr. W.H.R. Koops bij zijn afscheid als bibliothecaris der Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen* (Groningen 1990), 321-32.

<sup>20</sup> Berolini 1861, cf. L. LEHNUS, in *Paideia* 45 (1990), 277-81.

<sup>21</sup> A.F. NAEKE (ed.), *Callimachi Hecale* (Bonnae 1845).

suo nome a un giovanile saggio di ricostruzione della *Cydippa* che, pur puntando decisamente troppo su Ovidio, sarebbe rimasto a suo modo epocale<sup>22</sup>.

Nell'era di Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848-1931) Callimaco doveva essere principalmente 'tedesco', ma così alla fine non fu. Il contributo personale di Wilamowitz, al di là della quadruplicie edizione di *Inni ed epigrammi* e a parte i due volumi di *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*<sup>23</sup>, che ebbero il difetto di venir prima della scoperta del *Prologo degli Aitia*, pare difficilmente quantificabile, sparso com'è tra miriadi di note miscellanee, interventi in libri diversi, edizioni di papiri<sup>24</sup>. Ma basti qui segnalare che Wilamowitz, gran sospitatore di edizioni di frammenti<sup>25</sup>, fu dopo O. Crusius, e con H. Diels, Ed. Schwartz e P. Maas, colui che di fatto commissionò a Pfeiffer l'edizione dei nuovi *Callimachea* post-schneideriani<sup>26</sup>. L'impresa, iniziata da Pfeiffer dopo il congedo dal servizio militare in seguito a grave ferita riportata a Verdun nel 1916<sup>27</sup>, fu apparentemente portata a termine in cinque anni (sette, se si considera l'*editio maior* del 1923). Essa però continuava ancora, con studi sul *Prologo*, sulla *Chioma* e sulle *Diegeseis*<sup>28</sup>, quando

<sup>22</sup> A K. DILTHEY, *De Callimachi Cydippa* (Lipsiae 1863) rinvia fin dal titolo (ma dopo la scoperta di *POxy.* 1011) G. PASQUALI, "Il nuovo frammento della Cidippe di Callimaco e la poesia ellenistica" (1911), ora in *Scritti filologici I* (Firenze 1986), 139-51. Risaliva a Dilthey il più consapevole tentativo di ricostruire il proemio degli *Aitia* sulla base dei poeti latini, cf. BENEDETTO, *Il sogno e l'invenzione*, 10ss.

<sup>23</sup> I-II (Berlin 1924). Cf. U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (ed.), *Callimachi hymni et epigrammata* (Berolini 1882; <sup>2</sup>1897; <sup>3</sup>1907; <sup>4</sup>1925).

<sup>24</sup> Il carteggio tra Wilamowitz e Hunt sul papiro 1011, diviso tra Gottinga e Oxford, è per giunta ancora inesplorato.

<sup>25</sup> Si pensi anche solo ai filosofi poeti di H. Diels e alla commedia dorica di G. Kaibel.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, ed. Rudolfus PFEIFFER (Bonnae 1921, 1923), 2.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. W. BÜHLER (1980), ora in *Philosophia Perennis. Colloquium zu Ehren von Rudolf Pfeiffer*, hrsg. von M. LAUSBERG (Augsburg 1996), 77.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. R. PFEIFFER (1928), ora in *Ausgewählte Schriften* (München 1960), 98-132; in *Philologus* N.F. 87 (1932), 179-228; e *Die neuen Διηγήσεις zu Kallimachosgedichten* (München 1934).

Pfeiffer all'inizio del 1938 fu costretto dal regime nazional-socialista ad esulare in Inghilterra<sup>29</sup>.

Per l'ultima fase della preistoria del Callimaco oxoniense ci si può affidare alle parole di K. von Fritz: "Den äußeren Lebensumständen nach war das Leben in Oxford für R. Pfeiffer wesentlich unbequemer als es in München gewesen war. Aber er brauchte keine Vorlesungen zu halten, und nach Oxford strömten in jenen Jahren unaufhörlich neue Papyrusfragmente von Gedichten, vor allem der Aitia des Kallimachos und diese wurden Pfeiffer von dem hervorragenden Papyrusexperten der Oxford University, E. Lobel, der auch bei der Entzifferung half, in der liberalsten Weise zur Verfügung gestellt. So hatte Pfeiffer eine Gelegenheit, seine Kenntnis des Werkes des Kallimachos zu vervollständigen, wie er sie nicht gehabt hätte, wenn er im Frieden in München geblieben wäre und auf die Veröffentlichung der Fragmente durch die Oxford University Kollegen warten und dann zur Nachprüfung nach England hätte gehen müssen"<sup>30</sup>. Kurt von Fritz, esule volontario, sapeva di che cosa parlava<sup>31</sup>. Con quel 'colpo di fortuna' dal prezzo personale altissimo — lo stesso che sarebbe stato pagato da un altro grande callimacheo, Paul Maas — il Callimaco tedesco si trapiantava in Gran Bretagna, e lì fruttificò.

### B. *Callimaco dopo Pfeiffer*

Malgrado ogni profferta di modestia Pfeiffer non poteva non considerare 'perfetta' la sua edizione del 1949, che sotto ogni

<sup>29</sup> Sulle circostanze della Amtsenthebung (25.6.1937) vd. E. MENSCHING, *Nugae zur Philologie-Geschichte II* (Berlin 1989), 93-98. Nel decennio trascorso tra l'arrivo a Oxford e la pubblicazione di *Callimachus I* Pfeiffer pubblicò "The Measurements of the Zeus at Olympia", sul VI giambico, in *JHS* 61 (1941), 1-5 (ora in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 72-79).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. K. VON FRITZ, in *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahrbuch 1979* (München 1979), 260.

<sup>31</sup> K. VON FRITZ, *The Reasons Which Led to my Emigration in 1936*, ed. W.M. CALDER III, in *ICS* 18 (1993), 374-78, è una lettura impressionante quanto istruttiva.

aspetto costituiva uno dei massimi sforzi mai prodotti dalla filologia nella sistemazione editoriale di un poeta disperso. C'è ragione di credere che a partire da quella data Pfeiffer cominciasse a staccarsi da Callimaco e a pensare a una nuova opera, quella *History of Classical Scholarship* il cui primo volume sarebbe uscito nel 1968 e il cui secondo fascicolo — da Petrarca a Mommsen — costituirà nel 1976 il suo ultimo lavoro<sup>32</sup>. Sembra che ad indurlo a pubblicare anche *Inni ed epigrammi* fossero più che altro le insistenze della Clarendon Press, e di Kenneth Sisam in particolare<sup>33</sup>.

Che nondimeno Pfeiffer abbia continuato anche dopo il 1950 a occuparsi di frammenti di Callimaco seppur con decrescente concentrazione era, oltre che prevedibile, noto. Basti ricordare le due serie di 'Addenda et corrigenda' apparse in calce al volume del 1953 con gli *Inni* e gli *Epigrammi*, il complesso saggio sull'aktion di Apollo Delio (fr. 114) pubblicato nel *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* del '52, due articoli dedicati all'*Ecale* e alla storia dell'esegesi della poesia ellenistica rispettivamente nella *Festschrift I. Kapp*<sup>34</sup> e in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1955, e soprattutto il capitolo su Callimaco filologo e grammatico nel primo volume della *History*<sup>35</sup>.

Se non così certo a priori, era intuibile che dovesse esistere anche materiale variamente inedito. Purtroppo non sono ancora riuscito a svolgere tutte le ricerche d'archivio che sarebbero necessarie e possibili per Pfeiffer; ma di cinque documenti, di diseguale importanza, sono in grado di dare notizia subito. Nel primo caso, in ordine cronologico, si tratta di una lettera di Pfeiffer a Franz Boll (1867-1924), datata 22 marzo 1922 e ora

<sup>32</sup> Oxford 1976 ("Von Petrarca bis Mommsen" recita il sottotitolo dell'edizione tedesca [München 1982]).

<sup>33</sup> Vol. II, p.v, cf. P. SUTCLIFFE, *The Oxford University Press. An informal history* (Oxford 1978), 258-61.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. R. PFEIFFER, in *Thesaurismata. Festschrift für Ida Kapp zum 70. Geburtstag* (München 1954), 95-104.

<sup>35</sup> R. PFEIFFER, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968). Gli articoli apparsi in *JWCI* e *JHS* sono ora in *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 55-71 e 148-58.

alla Biblioteca Universitaria di Heidelberg<sup>36</sup>. La lettera fa seguito al natalizio invio dei *Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta*, e accompagnava il dono delle *Kallimachosstudien* — la più problematica e meno felice tra le opere callimachee di Pfeiffer<sup>37</sup> — chiedendo a Boll in maniera evidentemente mirata<sup>38</sup> lumi su ἀστέρων a fr. 7,23 Pf.<sup>1</sup> (= 23,1 Pf.) e su un passo del *primo Giambos*, quello di Euforbo-Pitagora, che tra l'altro solo di recente sembra esser stato risolto<sup>39</sup>.

Il secondo inedito è costituito dalla corrispondenza inviata da Pfeiffer a Girolamo Vitelli (1849-1935). Si conserva alla Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze, ed è prevalentemente da riferire alle *Diegeseis*<sup>40</sup>.

Un terzo inedito è costituito di nuovo da una singola lettera, indirizzata a Edgar Lobel (1888-1982) e datata Natale 1941. Essa è dedicata in parte ad Alceo (fol. 1) e in parte a Callimaco *POxy.* 2170-2173 (fol. 2)<sup>41</sup>, e contiene osservazioni poi largamente confluite nell'edizione del 1949.

Un quarto documento concerne Paul Maas (1880-1964) e risulta dalla corrispondenza inviata da Maas a Pfeiffer, ora col Nachlass Pfeiffer alla Bayerische Staatsbibliothek di Monaco<sup>42</sup>. Si tratta di 24 cartoline postali più due lettere brevi, comprese tra il 28 settembre 1951 e il 30 settembre 1962; l'argomento è

<sup>36</sup> Cod.Heid. 384<sup>1</sup> = 22, IV. Sono grato alla direzione della Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg per avermi permesso la consultazione diretta di questo documento.

<sup>37</sup> *Kallimachosstudien. Untersuchungen zur Arsinoe und zu den Aitia des Kallimachos* (München 1922).

<sup>38</sup> Su Boll indagatore dell'astrologia e astronomia antiche vd. V. STEGEMANN, in F. BOLL, *Kleine Schriften zur Sternkunde des Altertums* (Leipzig 1950), XI-XXIV.

<sup>39</sup> Su fr.191,61 Pf. e dintorni cf. M. DI MARCO, in *RCCM* 40 (1998), 95-107.

<sup>40</sup> Carte Vitelli 5.988-1002. Su queste lettere, rilevanti come sono, mi riservo di intervenire per esteso in altra sede. Sono grato alla direzione della Biblioteca Laurenziana e al Prof. Rosario Pintaudi, Messina e Firenze, per avermene procurato copia.

<sup>41</sup> La lettera si conserva inclusa nella copia di *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XVIII appartenuta a Lobel e ora in possesso del Prof. G.O. Hutchinson, Exeter College, Oxford, che vivamente ringrazio per avermela mostrata.

<sup>42</sup> Ana 435 Paul Maas. Ringrazio la Dr. Sigrid von Moisy, München, per avermi cortesemente procurato una copia di questo testo nel dicembre 1994.

quasi sempre callimacheo (anche in vista delle bozze del secondo volume clarendoniano), i testi sono occasionalmente stenografati e risultano in genere spuntati e cursoriamente annotati da Pfeiffer. Parte del materiale (tra cui correzioni, integrazioni, emendazioni, aggiunte, espunzioni, brevi discussioni, comunicazioni di servizio con riferimento a Lobel o a Barber e Trypanis in campo inglese, a Treu e Buchwald, tra gli altri, in campo tedesco) si ritroverà anche in sedi a stampa, ma molto è nuovo e degno della massima attenzione.

Il quinto e di gran lunga il più importante tra gli ‘inediti’ pfeifferiani relativi a frammenti di Callimaco per il periodo successivo al luglio 1949<sup>43</sup> è e in certo senso non poteva che essere il volume primo dell’edizione oxoniense appartenuto a Pfeiffer stesso<sup>44</sup>. Gli appunti ivi annotati ci portano nel cuore di ciò che nella percezione di Pfeiffer restava da fare una volta compiuta, con sforzo trentennale, l’opera che soppiantava Schneider. Dal dottor Erwin Arnold mi giunge *per litteras* l’osservazione che Pfeiffer stesse accumulando col sistema delle postille marginali materiale in vista di una seconda edizione<sup>45</sup>, ed è questa una prassi ovvia e consolidata. Non una seconda edizione ma una ristampa ‘from corrected sheets of the first edition’ ebbe luogo nel 1965<sup>46</sup>, e molte delle correzioni di sviste e refusi annotate

<sup>43</sup> Pfeiffer I, annunciato per agosto 1949 in una brossura promozionale della Clarendon Press, era già nelle mani di Maas il 13 luglio di quell’anno. Lo si apprende dalla nota di possesso sul frontespizio della copia appartenuta a Maas stesso, ora di proprietà della biblioteca del Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Antichità dell’Università degli Studi di Milano, la cui direzione ringrazio per il cortese assenso alla consultazione e pubblicazione.

<sup>44</sup> Devo di aver potuto personalmente consultare questo eccezionale documento, trascrivendone tutto ciò che mi sembrasse opportuno, alla generosità e gentilezza del Dr. Erwin Arnold, suo attuale proprietario. Al dottor Arnold, ultimo allievo di R. Pfeiffer, andava già, com’è noto, la gratitudine degli studiosi di Callimaco e della storia degli studi classici per il sostegno da lui prestato al Maestro nel corso dell’allestimento dei due volumi della *History of Classical Scholarship*.

<sup>45</sup> Scusandosi per non aver segnalato tutti i refusi, Pfeiffer nella prefazione al volume II annota: “errores autem minores qui legentes non impediunt tolli poterunt, si unquam editio altera parabitur” (p.vi).

<sup>46</sup> È la stampa che tutti oggi consultiamo.

da Pfeiffer nel suo *Handexemplar* (anche se non tutte) si ritrovano lì. Per il resto le note si possono raggruppare grosso modo nelle seguenti categorie, tenendo presente che non tutte le proposte sono personali di Pfeiffer ma provengono talora da suoi corrispondenti<sup>47</sup>: (a) nuovi frammenti; (b) notizia di nuovi papiri o nuove fonti testuali ex auctoribus; (c) nuove lezioni, più o meno dubiosamente proposte, di papiri; (d) nuove lezioni di manoscritti medievali (per esempio del *Genuinum A*, grazie a O. Masson)<sup>48</sup>; (e) alterazioni testuali (per correzione, emendazione congetturale, rettifica ortografica, mutamento di punteggiatura); (f) spostamento ed eventuale accorpamento di frammenti; (g) integrazione di lacune; (h) alterazione o rimozione di segmenti di apparato o di commento, anche con l'aggiunta di nuovo materiale esegetico; (i) rinvii interni e ulteriori *loci similes*; (j) nuove interpretazioni (spesso formulate in chiave problematica); (k) segnalazione di fenomeni metrici, linguistici e stilistici (con eventuale ricaduta nel testo); (l) aggiornamento di citazioni; (m) supplementi bibliografici.

Va da sé che il lavoro testuale sui frammenti di Callimaco dopo Pfeiffer non può considerarsi limitato a ciò che Pfeiffer stesso e altri dotti a lui variamente collegati, o i loro allievi, hanno fatto o progettato di fare in questi decenni<sup>49</sup>. Il quadro

<sup>47</sup> I più frequenti sono, prevedibilmente, Lobel, Maas e Barber (oltre a M.T. Smiley).

<sup>48</sup> Ora in Pfeiffer II negli Addenda et corrigenda ad vol. I (pp.100-25).

<sup>49</sup> Mi astengo volutamente dal trattare degli *Inni* e degli *Epigrammi* sia per risparmiare spazio, sia perché altri relatori hanno in parte questo compito, sia soprattutto perché 'Pfeiffer' (come già 'Bentley') significa sul piano del metodo e del merito i frammenti più che ogni altra cosa in Callimaco. Del resto, la distanza che separa Pfeiffer dal Wilamowitz degli *Inni ed epigrammi* è infinitamente più breve di quella che macroscopicamente lo distingue dallo Schneider dei frammenti (oltre che, naturalmente, da quello degli *Inni*). E per giunta una valutazione dell'edizione pfeifferiana degli *Inni* e di ciò che resti ancora da fare non potrebbe prescindere dal carteggio Wilamowitz/Maas su questo argomento ([1924] di recente acquisito dall'Università degli Studi di Milano, biblioteca del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità), tuttora inedito, e dal contributo che Maas ("collega amicissimus de hac editione egregie meritus") manifestamente diede a Wilamowitz<sup>4</sup>. Sull'opera callimachea di Maas, edita e inedita, intendo tornare altrove.

generale è ancora quello che ebbi occasione di descrivere nella relazione “Verso una nuova edizione dei frammenti di Callimaco”, presentata nell’aprile 1997 al convegno sulla letteratura ellenistica di Roma ‘Tor Vergata’; e non è il caso di riproporlo ora in dettaglio<sup>50</sup>. Anche se alcuni richiami e aggiunte sono necessari.

Pubblicare frammenti equivale a fare un esercizio di realismo, in bilico tra l’attesa di edizioni migliori delle fonti e la necessità di non rinviare sine die il compimento dell’opera. Ma la raccolta dei frammenti di un autore come Callimaco (o come, poniamo, Euripide o Menandro), correntemente beneficato dai ritrovamenti papiracei, ha luogo in condizioni di particolare stress. ‘Centrare’ il momento in cui fermarsi equivale, se è consentita un’immagine enfatica, ad entrare nell’occhio di un uragano e lì sostare. È esattamente ciò che fece Pfeiffer scegliendo di non differire ulteriormente l’uscita di un volume che era in allestimento da oltre dieci anni e materialmente in stampa da almeno tre, allorché Lobel estrasse dal cilindro quello che per tutto il corso dell’opera è la ‘papyrus Oxyrhynchia inedita’ e che dal 1952 sarà il codice *POxy.* 2258; e ne derivò pur sempre una

<sup>50</sup> Rinvio a L. LEHNUS, in *La letteratura ellenistica. Problemi e prospettive di ricerca. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale, Università di Roma ‘Tor Vergata’, 29-30 aprile 1997*, a cura di R. PRETAGOSTINI (Roma 2000), 21-44. Lì, in particolare, è la presentazione dei testi latamente grammaticali che hanno ricevuto un’edizione autoritativa nel periodo intercorso tra Pfeiffer e noi — primi fra tutti Esichio  $\alpha\text{-}\omega$  (Latte), gli scoli VMK all’*Iliade* (Erbse), gli *Epimerismi omerici* (Dyck), Eustazio *ad Il.* (van der Valk, con l’indice di H.M. Keizer) e gli scoli all’*Ibis* di Ovidio (La Penna) — e di quelli che ancora ne attendono una in tutto o in parte. Va da sé che i problemi principali sono costituiti dall’*Etymologicum Genuinum*, dove pure importanti contributi per gli *Aitia* e per altri frammenti sono stati dati da G. Massimilla (apprendo dalla Dr. Amalia Kolonia, Milano e Atene, che un terzo volume dell’edizione [LASSERRE]-LIVADARAS sarebbe in corso di stampa), dagli scoli *ad Od.* e da Eustazio *ad Od.* Per gli scoli omerici D, di prevalente contenuto mitografico, osservo che una revisione complessiva dei casi in cui si viene lusingati da un  $\muένηται τῆς ιστορίας καὶ Καλλίμαχος$  non potrà a lungo essere rinviata. Utilmente ma senza particolari risultati per Callimaco è stato di recente esplorato, da N. PACE, in *Letteratura e riflessione sulla letteratura nella cultura classica*, a cura di G. ARRIGHETTI (& M. TULLI) (Pisa 2000), 309-25, il *Lexicon Ambrosianum*, annoverato da Ada ADLER tra le fonti di Suida e più volte segnalato da Pfeiffer come possibile veicolo di frammenti.

scomoda dispersione di materiale tra il volume del 1949 e le due serie di Addenda 1949 e 1953.

Oggi il flusso dei papiri per Callimaco sembra essersi arrestato. Dico sembra perché non più di qualche mese fa ho avuto notizia, grazie a dotti amici oxoniensi e italiani, di un frammento di lessico contenuto in un papiro fiorentino, con vario materiale callimacheo<sup>51</sup>; e un non meglio identificato papiro degli *Aitia*<sup>52</sup> è menzionato in un articolo di P. van Minnen<sup>53</sup> come proveniente da Karanis. A nostra volta il collega Claudio Gallazzi (Milano) ed io abbiamo pubblicato l'editio princeps di due frustoli derivanti dal rotolo milanese delle *Diegeseis*<sup>54</sup>, rimasti casualmente indietro allorché *PMil. Vogl.* 18 fu restituito all'Egitto, e solo di recente identificati da Gallazzi. Il primo dei due testi consente di riconoscere come appartenente al III libro degli *Aitia* la storia del tiranno Faleco e della statua di Artemide ambracia accompagnata dalla leonessa, già noto da uno scolio all'*Ibis* di Ovidio<sup>55</sup>. Il secondo, apparentemente meno significativo per scarsa leggibilità intrinseca, è in certo senso più interessante perché rimette in discussione la sequenza *Acontius et Cydippa* (frr. 67-75 Pf.) ed *Eleorum ritus nuptialis* (frr. 76-77a), elaborata a suo tempo da Pfeiffer con non lieve (quanto rara in lui) forzatura<sup>56</sup>. Dal nuovo papiro risulta che due diegesi oggi irriconoscibili intercorrevano tra *Acontius* e *Ritus*, e che perciò o

<sup>51</sup> PSI inv. CNR 80. Ringrazio per preziosi ragguagli il Dr. N. Gonis (Oxford) e il Dr. A. Kerkhecker (Oxford), nonché il Prof. Guido Bastianini, presidente dell'Istituto Papirologico Vitelli, Firenze. Su questo testo ci dirà di più il collega Bastianini.

<sup>52</sup> Anche questa segnalazione devo alla cortesia (e alla memoria) di Nick Gonis.

<sup>53</sup> P. VAN MINNEN, in *JJP* 28 (1998), 124 e n.67 ringrazia G. Schwendner, cui si deve l'identificazione del pezzo.

<sup>54</sup> *PMil. Vogl.* inv. 1006 e 28b, cf. C. GALLAZZI & L. LEHNUS, "Due nuovi frammenti delle Diegeseis", in *ZPE* 137 (2001), 7-18.

<sup>55</sup> Fr. inc. sed. 665 Pf. (gli scoli all'*Ibis* si rivelano di nuovo fonte problematica ma buona).

<sup>56</sup> Dell'incertissima sovrapposizione tra οὐγαρτασπολιωγοικήσσασασομαιηδη *POxy.* 1011 fol. I(→) 78 (legit Hunt) ed ειπαγεμοι ...[...] α[.....] [...] αιηγις *PMil. Vogl.* I 18 col. I 3, onde l'attuale CALL. fr.76,1, già Pfeiffer *ad loc.* riconosceva "valde dubitanter conieci".

la contiguità individuata da Pfeiffer non sussiste — e resta peraltro singolare che a fr. 76,2 comparisse Zeus Piseo — o nel codice 1011<sup>57</sup> mancavano dopo quella di *Acontio e Cidippe* — e la cosa sarebbe in sé allarmante — due elegie presenti invece all'estensore delle *Diegeseis*<sup>58</sup>.

Il problema che si pone ai callimachisti è in generale quello di armonizzare con l'edizione del 1949 le tre serie di Addenda et corrigenda pfeifferiani<sup>59</sup> e il materiale pubblicato (e talora, come nel caso della *Tabula Vindobonensis*, ripubblicato) da Lloyd-Jones e Parsons nel *Supplementum Hellenisticum*<sup>60</sup>. Pochissimo di successivo si aggiunge, e si tratta se mai di rendere compatibile con l'agglomerato Pfeiffer-SH l'apporto delle edizioni di G. Massimilla per *Aitia I-II* (e tra non molto, come si spera, per *Aitia III-IV*), di A. Kerkhecker per i *Giambi*, e di A.S. Hollis per l'*Ecale*<sup>61</sup>. Sono rimasti fermi i quattro *Carmi* frr. 226-229, già da Pfeiffer in qualche misura sottovalutati, se è vero come notava Barber nella sua citata recensione che per essi, e soprattutto per l'impressionante *Apoteosi di Arsinoe* (che tanto

<sup>57</sup> Bodl. inv. MS. Gr. class. c. 72 (olim d. 114), saec. IV ex.

<sup>58</sup> Sovviene che in *POxy.* 2258, contenente *Inni, Aitia, Ecale e Vittoria di Sosibio*, sembra mancare del tutto l'inno V. Di un nuovo papiro di Ossirinco con un passo dell'*Ecale* dà ora notizia Adrian Hollis (vd. *infra*, Discussion).

<sup>59</sup> Dove piccole discrasie, peraltro assai rare, erano inevitabili. Un esempio: ἦα fr.342 Schneider (da Eraclide Milesio, onde Eustazio ad *Od.* 14,212 [p.1759,27]) è stato riconosciuto in *Dieg.* col. VI 33 = fr.193,1 Pf. (Εἴρθο' ἦν, ἀλυξέ] ὥπολλον, ἤντικ' οὐκέ ἦα). Ma ora che gli Addenda II grazie all'*Etymologicum Genuinum A*, cui Pfeiffer in tempo di guerra non aveva potuto accedere, consentono di leggere il fr.507 φιλαδελφείων ἀτμενος ἦα δόμων (come già fu congetturato da Dilthey e da Diels in luogo del corrotto ἦ ἀδείμων del *Genuinum B*), nulla più garantisce che la testimonianza testuale di Eustazio sia da riferire al fr.193 anziché al fr.507. Cf. già WILAMOWITZ, *Hellenistische Dichtung*, I 193 n.1.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, edd. H. LLOYD-JONES & P. PARSONS (Berolini-Novi Eboraci 1983). Immagino che tra le scaturigini del SH figuri un seminario callimacheo tenuto a Oxford da H. (ora Sir Hugh) Lloyd-Jones intorno alla metà degli anni '60. Molti dei testimoni di quella non dimenticata stagione sono ormai senior scholars (qualcuno è già in pensione) e da alcuni di loro ho avuto modo di raccogliere testimonianze. Uno di loro è con noi oggi.

<sup>61</sup> Rispettivamente *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*. A cura di G. MASSIMILLA (Agnano Pisano-Pisa 1996); A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford 1999); *Callimachus. Hecale*. Ed. by A.S. HOLLIS (Oxford 1990).

piacque a Wilamowitz)<sup>62</sup>, il trattamento dell'*editio maxima* era sostanzialmente ancora lo stesso della *minor* e della *maior*, nonché delle *Kallimachosstudien*, del 1921-23. Non meno bisognosa di riconsiderazione, anche alla luce dei progressi fatti dall'egittologia lagidica nel frattempo, è la complessa *Vittoria di Sosibio*, forse l'ultimo poema callimacheo<sup>63</sup>. E qualcuno avrà mai il coraggio di riprendere in mano il problema *Ibis*?

Qualche rischio potrebbe venire al futuro editore dei frammenti di Callimaco da un eventuale indebolimento della legge di Hecker<sup>64</sup>, anche se Peter Parsons (il quale pure ci ha messo in guardia) osservava che “Callimachus may be allowed to use the same word twice”<sup>65</sup>. Per il resto solo minori incertezze gravano sull'eredità di Pfeiffer. Tra queste è il fatto, talora scomodo, che le testimonianze testuali sono dislocate all'interno del commento, e ciò può creare qualche confusione e può persino risultare nell'indebita cancellazione di frammenti. Un caso chiaro è quello di Ateneo 11,477c Καλλίμαχος... λέγων ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰκείου ξένου τοῦ παρὰ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ Πόλλιδι συνεστιασθέντος αὐτῷ, ridotto a semplice *testimonium* del fr. 178,8

ἢν δὲ γενέθλην  
Ἴκιος, ω̄ ξυνήν εἴχον ἐγώ κλισίην,

mentre il passo contiene, ed è il solo a farlo, l'ulteriore e indipendente informazione che ci consente di parlare di 'banchetto di Pollide'. Poco meno significativo è il caso dell'epigramma adespoto *Anthol.Pal.* 7,42, menzionato ma non stampato a test. 27 e poi relegato in una sorta di appendice al fr. 2 e al relativo scolio fiorentino (p.11), mentre è esso solo che ci dice che il sogno delle Muse trasse Callimaco all'Elicona *dalla Libia*. Curiosa è

<sup>62</sup> Fr.228; cf. WILAMOWITZ, *Hellenistische Dichtung*, I 193-96.

<sup>63</sup> Sarà da considerare in proposito la nuova documentazione implicitamente addotta dal Posidippo milanese nel settore degli *Ιππικά* (*PMil. Vogl.* 309 coll. XI 20-XIV 1).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. F. WILLIAMS, in *Eikasmos* 5 (1994), 209-12 (per fr.345 Pf. = Hec. fr.13 Hollis).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. P.J. PARSONS, in *ZPE* 25 (1977), 50.

anche la menzione di Strabone 17, 3, 21, p.837 su Callimaco discendente di Battō l'Ecista (test. 4). Pfeiffer rinvia l'espressa citazione del passo al fr. 716, dove però la frase πρόγονον δὲ τοῦτον [sc. Battum Cyrenarum conditorem] ἔκυτον φάσκει Καλλίμαχος è materialmente omessa. Si trattava di un autoschediasma derivato da 'Battiade', come il poeta chiamava i Cirenei e come definisce sé stesso nell'autoepitafio *Epigr.* 35,1 Wil. (onde il possibile carattere autoschediastico anche della notizia in Esichio Illustrio, test. 1 Pf., che vuole il poeta "figlio di Battō"), oppure da qualche parte, e avremmo allora un nuovo frammento, Callimaco parlava di sé come dell'autentico discendente di Battō Aristotele?

Una questione su cui riflettere, ma su cui non vorrei soffermarmi troppo dato il suo carattere eminentemente speculativo, riguarda la sequenza *attuale* dei poemi callimachei. Pfeiffer nella sua presentazione si ispirò alle *Diegeseis*, le quali cominciano, com'è noto, con gli *Aitia* (anzi col *Prologo degli Aitia* — nella loro versione fiorentina)<sup>66</sup> e proseguono coi *Giambi* (giuntura anche altrimenti verificata)<sup>67</sup> più i quattro *Carmi*, indi con l'*Ecale*. Una tale disposizione ha il pregio di far esordire Callimaco *elegiae princeps*<sup>68</sup> con la raccolta delle elegie e col relativo manifesto poetico. Ma, come è stato notato (ultimamente e con particolare vigore da Alan Cameron), l'ordine assiologico antico era da sempre un altro, e metteva l'epos, dunque *Inni* ed *Ecale*, al primo posto<sup>69</sup>. Quest'ordine sembra essere diventato canonico nelle 'edizioni' callimachee della tarda antichità; esso è ricostruibile nel codice 1011<sup>70</sup>, è indirettamente attestato dalla parafrasi giambica dei poemi di Callimaco allestita da Mariano di Eleuteropoli sotto l'impero di Anastasio<sup>71</sup>, si conferma nell'epigramma adespoto test. 23 Pf. (VI-XII sec.) che accompagnava l'archetipo Ψ (onde i

<sup>66</sup> PSI 1219 fr. 1,1-15.

<sup>67</sup> POxy. 1011 fol. II(↓); PMil. Vogl. 18 col. VI.

<sup>68</sup> QUINT. inst. 10,1,58. = test. 76 Pf.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 109-13.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. PFEIFFER, II, Praef. pp. XXII-XXIII e XXXVII-XXXVIII.

<sup>71</sup> Test. 24 Pf. Noto che l'ordine di Mariano (*Ecale*, *Inni*, *Aitia*) è lo stesso liberamente adottato da Nisetich nella sua recente traduzione di tutto Callimaco (cf. F. NISETICH, *The Poems of Callimachus* [Oxford 2001]).

subarchetipi  $\alpha$  e  $\gamma$ ) degli *Inni*, ed è incoraggiato dal codice ossi-rinchite 2258 (saec. VI-VII), nel cui spezzone A la sizigia *Inni-Ecale* difficilmente sarà stata posposta agli *Aitia*<sup>72</sup>. Ammetto peraltro che presentare i frammenti di Callimaco partendo da Ἀκταιή τις ἔναιεν (fr. 230 Pf.) anziché da Πολλάκι μοι Τελχῦνες (fr. 1,1) suonerebbe insolito se non forzato; e se ha per giunta ragione K. Gutzwiller nell'immaginare la coppia epitafio per Batto-auto-epitafio del Battiade (rispettivamente *Epigr.* 21 e 35 Wil.) come collocata originariamente a conclusione del Καλλίμαχος ὄλος<sup>73</sup>, allora, ed è sempre la Gutzwiller a proporlo, sussisterebbe un evidente rinvio circolare di *Epigr.* 21,4 δ 8 ἦεισεν χρέσσονα βασκανίης al v. 17 del *Prologo*: ἔλλετε βασκανίης ὄλοδν γένος.

Qualcosa va ancora detto a proposito dei papiri, per i quali peraltro il grosso del lavoro è stato fatto, e magistralmente, nel *Supplementum Hellenisticum* oltre che di recente da Massimilla (*Aitia I-II*) e Kerkhecker (*Giambi*)<sup>74</sup>. Di una revisione necessitano *POxy.* 1011 foll. I e II (↓) 81-90 (frr. 75-76 e 112 Pf.) nonché *PBerol.* inv. 13417 per i *Carmi*, frr. 227-228. Il futuro, cioè l'uso delle nuove metodiche di imaging, consentirà avanzamenti, come si spera, con l'evanido codice bodleiano<sup>75</sup>; nel frattempo piccoli ma concreti passi avanti si possono ancora fare con l'aiuto del passato, come tra poco vedremo. Un problema a parte, di natura squisitamente tecnica, è dato da *POxy.* 1793 coll. I-V (frr. 385-391) 'in Magam et Berenicens' e coll. VI-X (*Victoria Sosibii*, fr. 384), dove l'inchiostro scomparso ha talora aderito al retro di colonne successive e può forse essere recuperato. Frustoli inediti si trovano in *POxy.* 1362 (1), 2210 (3) e 2212 (5) nonché in *PSI* 1216 + *POxy.* 2171-2172 (1); parecchie altre reliquie,

<sup>72</sup> Cf. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn.* Ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 80-81 n.2.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. K.J. GUTZWILLER, *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1998), 211-13.

<sup>74</sup> Fondamentale è in quest'ultimo l'*excursus* sui papiri dei giambi V-VII (pp.116-22).

<sup>75</sup> La strumentazione digitale invita anche a riprendere in considerazione i frustoli minori di *POxy.* 2258, deliberatamente trascurati da E. LOBEL (*POxy.* XX [London 1952], 70).

pur edite, sono state volutamente omesse da Pfeiffer. In qualche caso (in Callimaco come altrove) i papiri pongono un problema quasi filosofico, cioè il conflitto tra una lezione consolidata e palmare e ciò che richiedono le tracce di scrittura rivisitate a distanza con mezzi più sofisticati. È il caso di  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{o}\nu$  in clausola a fr. 1,11 Pf., di recente eliminato da Bastianini<sup>76</sup> e tuttavia difficilmente sostituibile con qualcosa di altrettanto convincente; ed è il caso<sup>77</sup>, meno rilevante ma non meno reale, di Μεγακ[λ]ῆς ecista di Cartea in fr. 75,70, dove la terza lettera non è Γ (potrebbe essere M) e ciò che segue assomiglia vagamente a HPO (con forse un accento grave sopra O). In entrambe le circostanze si tratta di un regresso che solo l'ottimismo della ragione può far chiamare progresso.

Un'altra categoria di fonti testuali che l'eventuale revisione (uso questo termine con trepidazione) dello Pfeiffer dovrebbe considerare è notoriamente costituita dal riuso — dizione opportunamente generica — di Callimaco da parte di autori successivi, soprattutto greci d'età imperiale e bizantina ma anche latini. Qui molto si è fatto, e per quanto riguarda il callimachismo romano (penso al problema della *Dichterweihe*) forse anche troppo<sup>78</sup>. In campo greco all'attenzione degli interpreti sono da sempre, al di là com'è ovvio dei lessicografi e dei grammatici, gli epigrammisti, Babrio, gli Oppiani, Nonno e i nonniani<sup>79</sup>, gli epistolografi erotici e, tra i cristiani, Gregorio Nazianzeno<sup>80</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> G. BASTIANINI, in *'Οδοὶ διξήσιος: le vie della ricerca. Studi in onore di Francesco Adorno*, a cura di M.S. FUNGHI (Firenze 1996), 69-80.

<sup>77</sup> Come ho potuto accertare con l'aiuto del Dr. R.A. Coles (Oxford), che vivamente ringrazio.

<sup>78</sup> "It was not initiation by the Muses that caught his [di Callimaco] fancy, but *conversation with the Muses*", CAMERON, *Callimachus*, 368. In Italia, tra gli altri, A. La Penna ha messo in guardia contro l'eccessiva 'callimacheizzazione' della poesia latina.

<sup>79</sup> Cominciò nel 1589 F. Nansius con le sue note alla *Parafasi* nonniana (vd. anche i fogli 7-18 del ms. Leid. Vulc. 92 G II), mentre per l'escusione delle *Dionisiache* si è dovuto attendere soprattutto A.F. Naeke (1835).

<sup>80</sup> Per Gregorio come per Sinesio la prima vera esplorazione risale a Naeke; di Aristeneto ci si avvide già con Josias Mercier (1594) e poi ampiamente negli aurei *Verisimilia* di Joannes Pierson (Leiden 1752).

A proposito di Aristeneto, Annette Harder ha di recente mostrato come per la *Cydippa* (e verosimilmente per *Phrygius et Pieria*) si possa andare oltre il riserbo di Pfeiffer, anche se “Aristenetus’s diction, although containing certain poetic elements, is that of a late prose author and only very rarely allows conclusions about the actual text of Callimachus”<sup>81</sup>. A sua volta Adrian Hollis, oltre ad averci fatto intravvedere quanto ancora si possa estrarre da Esichio<sup>82</sup>, ha sicuramente qualcosa da dirci su Gregorio di Nazianzo prosatore nonché sul mai abbastanza frequentato Michele Coniate<sup>83</sup>. E la recente pubblicazione degli opuscoli di Eustazio da parte di Peter Wirth, sostituendosi all’incipiente e parziale edizione del Regel<sup>84</sup>, credo meriti assai più di un’occhiata preliminare<sup>85</sup>.

Avevo aperto questo capitolo (‘Callimaco dopo *Pfeiffer*’) col rinvio a qualcosa di nuovo proveniente da Pfeiffer stesso, ed è tempo di onorare la promessa riprendendo l’esame del suo *Handexemplar*. Osservo preliminarmente che, come sempre con questo tipo di materiale, ci addentriamo in un campo dove la prudenza è d’obbligo per quanto riguarda i reali intendimenti dell’autore (il quale del resto è il primo a largheggiare in punti interrogativi); e che quella che di seguito si offre è solo *una scelta* frutto di un primo esame, intesa a rendere omaggio all’estremo sforzo callimacheo di Rudolf Pfeiffer oltre che a fornire materia di studio ai dotti<sup>86</sup>. Faccio anche presente che sparsi nel volume

<sup>81</sup> Cf. A. HARDER, in *Polyphonia Byzantina. Studies in Honour of Willem J. Aerts*, ed. by H. HOKWERDA, E.R. SMITS & M.M. WOESTHUIS (Groningen 1993), 3-13.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. A.S. HOLLIS, in *ZPE* 117 (1997), 47-49 e 123 (1998), 61-72.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. già A.S. HOLLIS, in *ZPE* 130 (2000), 16. Per Gregorio (poeta) si veda anche F. TISSONI, in *Sileno* 23 (1997), 275-81, per Cristodoro ancora F. TISSONI, in *Acme* 53,1 (2000), 213-18.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. *Fontes rerum Byzantinarum*, ed. W. REGEL, I (Petropoli 1892).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. *Eustathii Thessalonicensis Opera minora, magnam partem inedita*, ed. P. WIRTH (Berolini-Novи Eboraci 2000).

<sup>86</sup> Le postille sono indifferentemente a matita (spesso mal leggibile perché a punta grossa) o in penna biro, blu o nera; esse risalgono per la maggior parte agli anni Cinquanta. Le ultime note sono, se non sbaglio, del 1976 (pp.57 e 321); la

sono alcuni fogli con annotazioni volanti, e che tra le pagine 254 e 255 si trova un piccolo dossier con ulteriori carte, corrispondenza con studiosi oxoniensi, fotografie e trascrizioni di papiri, e una copia dello specimen dell'edizione diffuso (all'inizio del 1949?) dalla Clarendon Press<sup>87</sup>.

(a) A parte i nuovi papiri, soprattutto dell'*Ecale*, dei quali è ripetuta e sporadica menzione specie nei fogli volanti, l'effettiva identificazione di nuovi frammenti è rara, e si riduce in sostanza all'attuale fr. 58 Massimilla<sup>88</sup>. Una nota a p.215 respinge senz'altro l'attribuzione a Callimaco del coliambo [Hippon.] fr. 216 Degani<sup>2</sup> ( $\varepsilon \nu \eta \nu \chi \circ \varsigma \; \dot{\omega} \nu \; \kappa \alpha \delta \nu \eta \nu \circ \; \dot{\chi} \rho \chi \nu \; \dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu \iota \alpha \varsigma$ ), tentativamente proposta da Gigon.

(c) CATEGORIA non ricchissima, dove oltre a Pfeiffer sono rappresentati Maas, Barber, Smiley. Qualche esempio:

– in *Dieg.* II 29 = fr. 90 (inizio dell'aition di Abdera) Pfeiffer ora legge  $\alpha$ [ e proporrebbe *dub.* (marg. inf.)

⊗ "Ενθ' Ἀβδηρο', οὐ νῦν ᾧ[νάπ]λέω, φαρμακὸν ἀγινεῖ

– fr. 384,15 χρυσὸν δν ἀνθρώποι[σ]ι καλὸν κακὸν ετρα [...] ....ξ: qui l'ulteriore collaborazione tra Lobel e Pfeiffer aveva portato a ετρα. [μ]ύ[ρμη]ξ<sup>89</sup>, su cui Maas e Trypanis si erano sbizzarriti, il primo integrando ἔτραφ[ε μ]ύ[ρμη]ξ nel rinvio al ferro κακὸν φυτόν di fr. 110,49, il secondo con ἔρρος[ε μ]ύ[ρμη]ξ e rinviano a Paolo Silenziario *Descr.S.Soph.* 768.<sup>90</sup> Ma Pfeiffer ha in serbo di meglio (marg. dextr.), e scrive:

grafia è progressivamente mal leggibile negli ultimi anni. Ciò che qui si presenta vale come proecdosi di quanto eventualmente figurerà in apparato all'edizione dei frammenti di Callimaco che sto preparando per la *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*.

<sup>87</sup> Per ragioni di spazio documenterò in questa sede solo alcune delle categorie di interventi elencate sopra (a, c-i).

<sup>88</sup> Identificato da L. LEHNUS, in *Paideia* 45 (1990), 281-86. Da appunti scarabocchiate su un foglio volante posto tra le pagine 58 e 59 Pfeiffer sembra supporre che si tratti del giudizio delle dee.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. *Addenda et corrigenda* II 121.

<sup>90</sup> Entrambe le proposte sono riportate in Maas, *Handexemplar*, oltre che presenti (la prima senz'altro nel testo) in C.A. TRY PANIS (ed.), *Callimachus* (Cambridge, Mass.-London 1958), 236.

έτραγε μύρμηξ “sc. ἐκ γῆς, βυσσόθεν sim. in pent.”<sup>91</sup> Il passo è risolto.

(d) Un solo esempio ma notevole: in fr. 360 (da Suida) οὗος ἔκεινος ᾧ εἰ περιδέξιος ἥρως (*Hec. fr. 147 H.*) Pfeiffer comunica di aver appreso da Maas che ᾧ è inserzione di Eustazio nel solo codice M<sup>92</sup> e che perciò occorre scrivere

οὗος ἔκεινος ⟨˘ - ⟩ περιδέξιος ἥρως

(oggi sappiamo che Maas stesso poi non escludeva <ἄει>)<sup>93</sup>.

- (e) Viene spontaneo correre ad alcuni luoghi conclamati:
- fr. 24,20-21 ἔκλυε ⟨-⟩ τῶν μηδὲν ἐμοὺς δι’ ὀδόντας ὀλίσθοι, / Πηλεύς: in margine alla proposta di Porson in app. τῶν ⟨οὐ⟩ μηδὲν ἐμοὺς δι’ ὀδόντας ὀλίσθη Pfeiffer annota con doppio punto interrogativo ⟨μὴ⟩ μηδὲν, presupponendo facile aplografia;
  - fr. 32 ταῦρον τέρουμην εἰς ἐνὸς ἀντερέτου<sup>†94</sup>: Pfeiffer annota su un foglio volante sia ἀντ’ ἀρότου (de aratore Lindio?) sia αὐτερέτου (“uno che rema lui stesso”, *cl. Adaeo Myt. Anthol. Pal.* 7,305,4), ripetuto con punto interrogativo in margine al testo;
  - fr. 110 = Catullus 66,77 *quicum ego dum virgo quondam fuit, omnibus expers / unguentis*: Pfeiffer ora obelizza *fuit omnibus* (in un passo la cui discussione ci porterebbe lontano);
  - ad fr. 192 *Dieg. VI* 22-23: τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις di Wesseling per τοῖς ἄλλοις in Porph. *Abst.* 3,16 = Pind. fr. 91 Maehler è esplicitamente (“non recte”) respinto;
  - fr. 326 αἴθ’ ὅφελες θανέειν τὴν πανύστατον ὁρχήσασθαι: per non arrendersi al bentleiano (*palmare?*) ἢ ὕστατον<sup>95</sup> Pfeiffer

<sup>91</sup> Maas *Handexemplar* propone βυσσόθεν μύρμηκες, anziché ἀμμόθεν, in fr. 202,59. Cf. A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford 1999), 238.

<sup>92</sup> Marc. 448, cf. P. MAAS (1935 e 1952), ora in *Kleine Schriften* (München 1973), 514-15 e 522 n. 9.

<sup>93</sup> Vedi la nota in *Handexemplar*.

<sup>94</sup> Apparato completo in L. LEHNUS, in *RFIC* 118 (1990), 29. *Etym. Gud.* codicis d'lectionem ἀστερέτου recepit Massimilla (fr.39).

<sup>95</sup> Qualche tenue resistenza ancora in HOLLIS, *Hecale*, 261-62, che pure opportunamente adduce ἢ ὕστερον\* HOM. *Il.* 1,27. Pfeiffer stesso sembra oscillare quando nel suo dogma “ἢ ὕστ-, i.e. syllaba longa post ἢ, ne in *Hecala* quidem admitti videtur” sottolinea (marg. inf.) “he in *Hecala* quidem” e contemporaneamente

torna a due riprese su una croce che doveva apparirgli, tutto sommato, risolvibile: in calce segnala μηδ' ὕστερον (con punto interrogativo), πάρος ὕστατον, ήδ' ὕστατον, νῦν δ' ὕστατον, νυ καὶ ὕστατον, mentre un'altra raffica di proposte, non più convinta, è annotata a parte su un foglio;

- fr. 510 η̄ δ' ὅτι τὰς δέ γένειος ἔχει λόγος: molto attraente η̄ δέ ἐτεῶς, preceduto da un possibile εἴπατε;
- fr. 567 ἡδομένη νεκάδεσσιν τέπισκυρῶντι πολέμουο: è accettato ἐπὶ σκύρῳ di Barber<sup>96</sup>;
- fr. 575 τοὶ δέ τις ἔξ ὀχεῆς ὄφις αἰόλος αὐχέν' τάναυχηντ: la corruttela si restringe a ΝΑΥΧΗΝ mentre l'editore sembra ora sicuro di αὐχένα;
- fr. 631 τὴσεν ἔκδοὺς σάμβαλον αὐλείου: Pfeiffer avvista η̄ς ἔνεκ<sup>97</sup>, dove il commentario *SH* 297,7-8 avrà, appunto, ] ἔνεκ' οὐδῷσι αὐ[—|—] σ[ά]μβαλον κα[;
- fr. 691 θήκατο τιμὴ εἰς τὰς αἷμα πιεῖν μύταλον: brillantemente risolto in θήκατο (-) μιάις αἷμα πιεῖν μύταλον<sup>98</sup> sulla base di Ael. *Nat.anim.* 11,8 (*cl.* 5,17) θύουσι (*sc.* Leucadii) βοῦν ταῖς μιάις, αἱ δὲ ἐμπλησθεῖσαι τοῦ αἵματος ἀφανίζονται;
- fr. inc. auct. 735 Μνημοσύνης ήδ' (?) ὥδε γόνου χαρίεντος ἐπισσα: *an* δέ η̄νωγε (marg. sin.)?

Altrove le proposte di Pfeiffer si limitano a rettifiche meramente scritturali, sempre significative. Qualche esempio:

- fr. 61 ⊗ Τὰς μὲν δέ Μνημάρχειος ἔφη ξένος, ὥδε συναινῶ<sup>99</sup> diventa συναινέω;
- fr. 75,57 Παρηγοσσοῦ: Pfeiffer osserva Παρηγοσόν in *Del.* 93;
- fr. 100,1? ⊗ Οὕπω Σκέλμιον ἔργον ἔύξοον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τεθμὸν / δηναιὸν γλυφάνων ἄξοος η̄σθα σανίς: Pfeiffer (fitte postille alle

rinvia con un tratto di matita a una serie di esempi omerici di ὕστατα\* davanti a clausola spondiaca.

<sup>96</sup> In *CR N.S.* 9 (1959), 101-2.

<sup>97</sup> Segue, con qualche dubbio, *(αἱ)δοῦς*.

<sup>98</sup> Forse con un punto interrogativo di troppo. Callimaco attinse alla stessa fonte locale usata per *Diana Leucadia* (fr. 31 b-e Pf.)?

<sup>99</sup> Maas *Handexemplar* è convincente nel ritenere questo frammento inizio di aition.

pp.104-105) è deciso a scrivere *σκέλμιον ἔργον*, cioè “opus Daedalicum”; ma sarà da ricordare che Lobel proponeva *Σκέλμιος*;

- fr. 113,3: possibile *ἄν*;
- fr. 115,5: *]τι παθών νο[*: fort. scrib. “*τι παθών ut 228,10*”;
- fr. 177,13: *ἐπεὶ μάλα [γ'] οὖ τι φέρο[ντες];* scrib. *οὕτι* (com'è ora in *SH* 259,13);
- fr. 177,29 *ἔγι*: Pfeiffer ricorda *ἔγι* come proposto da Maas<sup>100</sup> (così *SH* 259,29) rinviando però anche a fr. 1,21, nel cui commento sono menzionate le incertezze dei grammatici antichi in materia;
- fr. 177,35 (*SH* 259,35): possibile scrittura alternativa *ἐπείθ'* *ἄμα μίσγετο*;
- fr. 191,30 Kerkhecker è preceduto da Pfeiffer nel consenso all'interpunzione *φυσέων.* *[όκ]ως ... γυμνώση* di Diller;
- fr. 193,26 *]χαῖρ'* *ἔφησα .[.] . ιν . λῷ [σ]υναντήσας:* il rinvio di Sm(iley) a Babrio 75,11 δ' *ἰατρὸς αὐτῷ ‘χαῖρ’* *ἔφη συναντήσας* suggerisce a Pfeiffer la scrittura *ἔφη*;
- fr. 194,98-100

*οὐκ ᾖ τάλαιναι παυσόμεσθα, μὴ χαρταί γενώμεθ' ἐχθροῖς, μηδ' ἐροῦμεν ἀλλήλας ἀνολβ' ἀναιδέως, ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γ' .β..μ...;*

la sintassi del v.100 non persuadeva Maas, che inclina ad anticipare il punto interrogativo ad *ἄλλας*;:<sup>101</sup> ora Pfeiffer (preceduto da Gallavotti) lo anticipa senz'altro ad *ἀναιδέως*; per suggerimento di Sm(iley);

- fr. 203,38 *καὶ σὺ χωσε[*: marg. dextr. *χὼ σε[*;
- fr. 227,7 *παρλουσῶν* (sulla scorta di Ateneo 15,668c): *an παρλουσέων?* (cf. fr. 61);
- fr. 228,51 *ἢρά τι μοι Λιβύα κα[κοῦται];* scrib. *ἢ ῥά?*
- fr. 371 *Αἴθρην τὴν εὔτεκνον ἐπ' ἀγρομένης ὑδέοιμι:* scrib. *ἐύ-*?
- fr. 384,23-24

<sup>100</sup> Vd. ora *Handexemplar*.

<sup>101</sup> In PFEIFFER I 505.

ὅφρα κε Σωσίβιόν τις Ἀλεξάνδρου τε πύθηται  
γῆν ἐπὶ καὶ ναίων Κίνυφι διστεφέα

conserva l'eco di una piccola querelle. Al v.24 γῆν era correzione di Housman *ap.* Hunt in *POxy.* 1793, che ha THN — come THN sembra avesse, in base allo scolio, *POxy.* 2258. A sostegno e illustrazione della scelta housmanniana Pfeiffer adduce (marg. sin.) il corrompimento di γῆς in τῆς nella prima mano di *Etym. Gud.* d ad fr.514; ma in margine al relativo commento deve anche registrare il dissenso di E(duard) Fr(aenkel). Invero γῆν resta tanto paleograficamente facile quanto sintatticamente difficile (vedi Lobel *ad loc.*), e sappiamo che non piacque neppure a Maas. Ma mentre Fraenkel nella sua copia di Pfeiffer I (dunque non solo verbalmente) ricorreggeva γῆν in τὴν e in margine allo pfeifferiano “coniecturam γῆν recepi” annotava un severo “perperam”<sup>102</sup>, Maas più soavemente osserva: “τὴν ambo testes, recte”<sup>103</sup>;

- fr. inc. auct. 760 Τίρυνς οὐδέ τι τεῖχος ἐπήρκεσε: scrib. Τίρυνς· οὐδ’ ἔτι?

(f) Qui non c'era gran che di nuovo da attendersi, il giudizio dell'editore essendosi già consolidato in decenni di riflessione:

- fr. 97 (Mura pelasgiche) e fr. 771 κλεψύρων ὕδωρ: utile richiamo incrociato “de arce Athenaum”<sup>104</sup>;
- fr. 166,2 + fr. inc. auct. 742: nel palmare riconoscimento e restauro

].[  
ἀχρῆς δ' ἀνέπαλτο  
]τις ὅτι[  
]εὶ κοτ'

<sup>102</sup> Ringrazio la direzione della Ashmolean Museum Library (ora Sackler Library), Oxford, proprietaria del volume (segn. N.i.92<sup>cc</sup>), e il Prof. L. Edward Fraenkel (Bath), figlio dello studioso, per avermi formalmente accordato di pubblicare le note di Eduard Fraenkel.

<sup>103</sup> Maas (*Handexemplar*), con lo scolio, costruisce la frase con τὴν “ἀπὸ κοινοῦ”: “uno che abiti (la città) di Alessandro e la (città) sul Cinifi, cioè Cirene”.

<sup>104</sup> Pp.103 marg. dextr. e 481 marg. dextr.

i versi 3-4 sono exempli gratia, ma il v. 2 contiene un suggerimento prezioso che vorrei esplicitare a modo mio. “Pallidus, vel pallida (timore, dolore, frigore?), surrexit” interpreta Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, e adduceva l’esempio di Medea che in Apollonio 3,633 dal sogno παλλομένη (δ’) ἀνόρουσε φόβῳ. Un’altra candidata femminile potrebbe essere Alcmena<sup>105</sup>, ma poiché il fr. 166 viene da *POxy.* 2213, che nelle parti riconoscibili alberga elegie del III libro degli *Aitia*<sup>106</sup>, una diversa ipotesi si offre. Sospetto che si tratti qui di Diomede re dei Bistoni, che già in Pindaro fr. 169a,36 Maehler all’apprendere del notturno attacco di Eracle “balzò su” (a quanto pare) ποι]χιλφ[ν ε]χ λεχέφ[ν ἀπέ]διλ[ος, e che ora con l’aition dei Cabiri e con quello di Apollo Delio (nella verosimile sequenza riconosciuta da Borgonovo & Cappelletto e da G.B. D’Alessio) verrebbe a cadere come Fabula Thracia incerta (fr. 114,18-25 Pf. = 64,18-25 Massimilla) nella grande lacuna del III libro, dopo la *Vittoria di Berenice*<sup>107</sup>;

- fr. 168,6 e 8: rispettivamente ] ἀπηρν[ήσαντο (cl. *Cer.* 106)<sup>108</sup> e μ]εγάλ[;
- fr. 238d,2 + fr. 311: è notevole che Pfeiffer<sup>109</sup> e Hollis (*ad* fr. 23) arrivino indipendentemente alla stessa proposta

]μοι ἀήσυρον <-> γόνυ κάμψοι

- fr. inc. auct. 756 μύρσον ἐς ὠτώεντα παλαιφαμένης ἄγνοιο: ho l’impressione che Pfeiffer abbia ragione nell’intendere il passo “de cista a Cecropis filiabus aperta” (comm. *ad loc.*) e che Hollis *Hec.* fr. inc. 166 faccia bene a seguirlo. Che cosa intendesse esattamente Pfeiffer annotando in marg. sin. “[ταυφαμένο[ (fr.) 115,9” ignoriamo: ma l’intuizione era mirabilmente profetica

<sup>105</sup> Cf. PIND. *Nem.* 1,50 e *Pae.* 20,14-15, onde THEOC. 24,36.

<sup>106</sup> *Eleorum ritus nuptialis, Hospes Isindius, Phrygius et Pieria, Euthycles Locrus.*

<sup>107</sup> Cf. P. BORGONOVO-P. CAPPELLETTI, in *ZPE* 103 (1994), 13-17 e G.B. D’ALESSIO, in *ZPE* 106 (1995), 5-8. Vd. anche M.L. WEST *ad Hes. Op.* 345.

<sup>108</sup> Idem Maas nel suo *Handexemplar*.

<sup>109</sup> P.237 marg. dextr, p.282 marg. dextr.

visto che adesso sappiamo che i Cabiri dell'aition fr. 115 portavano con sé ἵερᾳ ... ἐν κίστει κεκαλυμμένᾳ<sup>110</sup>.

(g) Proposte variamente attraenti:

- fr. 1,37 ..... Μοῦσαι γγάρ ὅσους ἔδον ὅθματῃ παιδας: Pfeiffer riteneva “spatio longius et, ut nunc opinor, ab huius loci sensu alienum” οὐ νέμεσις: inizialmente supplito da Lobel; “οὐ κῆδος: (cf. χ 254)” (marg. sin.) esplicita ora “fort. ‘non debo lamentari?’” del commento;
- fr. 17,3: *an τείρεα δ'* ἐκρ[ύψαντο (*vel -πτοντο?*)
- frr. 24-25 *Schol. Flor.* 52: ἡνίκα ἀπαί[ρων (ἀπὸ) Αἰτωλίας etc. (Eracle si imbatté in Teodamante);
- fr. 23,15: *an θέντες]* ἀμίστυλλον ταῦρον ἐπ' ἴσχαδ[ίων (“ignis ficorum ope factus” marg. inf.)?
- fr. 59,23 = *SH* 265,23: ἔσχον ἀνα[κτορίην (marg. dextr.);
- fr. 123,2: *κρύφεν* [ (accento nel papiro) “impf. κρύφω (non κρυφέν neutr. partic. aor. pass.)”<sup>111</sup>;
- fr. 194,17 αῦτι[ς: in alternativa αὐτὶ[κ'] *vel* αὐτὶ[χ'];
- fr. 202,42 *κα[λ]λι[στ]*;
- fr. 202,49 δύ[δην *vel* δύ[δόν]<sup>112</sup>;
- fr. 383,9 (cf. *SH* 254,9): ἄσθματι χλι[αίνοντες sia Pfeiffer (marg. dextr.) sia Maas (*Handexemplar*);
- fr. 383,14 (= *SH* 254,14): Κολχίδες ἢ Νείλω [τῆσι παροικεστή (marg. dextr., *dub.*).

(h) Segnalo un supplemento di documentazione apparentemente inedito, fr. 200a,1-2

⊗ Τὰς Ἀφροδίτας — ἡ θεὸς γάρ οὐ μία —  
ἡ Καστνιῆτις τῷ φρονεῖν ὑπερφέρει  
πάσας

(vv. 2-3 ricostruiti da Meineke)<sup>113</sup>: D. H.<sup>114</sup> informava Pfeiffer *per litteras* (25.5.1956) di aver rinvenuto nel 1954 ad Aspendo un'iscrizione Διὶ καὶ Ἡραὶ | καὶ | Ἀφροδίταις | Καστνιῆτισιν.

<sup>110</sup> NIC.DAM. *FGrHist* 90 F 52, cf. G. MASSIMILLA, in *ZPE* 95 (1993), 33-44.

<sup>111</sup> Idem Maas nel suo *Handexemplar*.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. KERKHECKER, *Iambi*, 237 n.122.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. peraltro KERKHECKER, *Iambi*, 208-209.

<sup>114</sup> Daphne Hereward? Cf. L. ROBERT, *Hellenica XI-XII* (Paris 1960), 177.

- (i) Un richiamo palmare:  
 – fr. 2 *Schol. Flor.* 18 ἀ]ρτιγένειος ὄγ: cf. Peek *GVT* 971,1  
 ἀρτι γενειάζοντά με δ | βάσκανος ἥρπα[σε] δαίμων  
 (da Apamea di Bitinia, prob. I/II sec.).

C'è da chiedersi in conclusione come Callimaco potesse attrarre in maniera così esclusiva un filologo altrimenti onnivoro come Pfeiffer<sup>115</sup>. Al di là delle circostanze occasionali che non avranno mancato di incidere, e senza voler sopravvalutare un quesito in apparenza solo biografico, credo che la risposta vada cercata nell'anomalia fondamentale costituita da Callimaco. Come Menandro e come Ennio Callimaco rappresenta una disturbante lacuna nella trasmissione di autori che a giudicare dalla loro fortuna antica *si sarebbero dovuti* conservare. Bastava questo a spingere alla dedizione; e non è un caso che per la filologia enniana come per quella menandrea si debbano fare i nomi dei due autentici padri della 'frammentologia', Girolamo Colonna e Richard Bentley<sup>116</sup>, il secondo dei quali fu, come si è ricordato, ampiamente coinvolto con Callimaco.

Ma diversamente da Menandro e da Ennio Callimaco *si conservò*: possediamo gli *Inni*, e Michele Acominato leggeva ancora all'inizio del XIII secolo l'*Ecale* e forse gli *Aitia*<sup>117</sup>. Ciò acuisce il desiderio; tanto più che diversamente da quanto accade per i maggiori poeti alto-ellenistici<sup>118</sup> l'opera che sopravvive, gli *Inni* appunto, non è, al di là della rilevanza assoluta, la più importante. C'era a chi non piacquero, come Marziale o Severiano di Damasco<sup>119</sup>, ma gli *Aitia* furono il modello di un'intera stagione

<sup>115</sup> È noto il ruolo che la *History of Classical Scholarship* attribuisce alla poesia filologica callimachea come motore della nascita della filologia *tout court*.

<sup>116</sup> L'uno pubblicò *Ennii fragmenta* (Neapoli 1590), l'altro, sotto lo pseudonimo di Phileleutherus Lipsiensis, *Emendationes in Menandri et Philemonis reliquias* (Trajecti ad Rhenum 1710).

<sup>117</sup> Rinvio alla relazione di A.S. Hollis.

<sup>118</sup> Penso a Teocrito, Arato, Apollonio Rodio.

<sup>119</sup> Rispettivamente test. 25a e test. 85 Pf. È notevole che Severiano, che non poteva astenersi dallo sputare sui libri di Callimaco, avesse ricevuto una buona

della poesia greca<sup>120</sup> e del gusto letterario greco-romano. Che la loro mancanza si faccia sentire in modo acuto è normale — più che non la mancanza di opere pur grandi di autori dei quali conserviamo opere grandissime (vengono in mente gli scrittori di teatro) e dove la selezione naturale sembra aver agito in maniera più ragionevole.

Lavorare su Callimaco non poteva che catturare critici testuali poliedrici come Bentley, Pfeiffer, Maas. Quest'ultimo, come già sapevamo ma come ora definitivamente risulta da quanto dei suoi libri e delle sue carte si conserva, dedicò a Callimaco un'attenzione penetrante e instancabile<sup>121</sup>. A lui come al compagno d'esilio Rudolf Pfeiffer e come al comune maestro Wilamowitz<sup>122</sup> Callimaco offriva l'eredità della poesia arcaica e classica insieme alla nuova poesia ellenistica, la scienza dell'antichità germanica e la papirologia letteraria britannica<sup>123</sup>,

educazione poetica e soprattutto, al momento di scegliere il corso futuro della sua vita, *sognasse* di guidare (ἐλαύνειν) una montagna *come se si trattasse di un carro*. In proposito, vale la pena di leggere per intero il cap. 108 della *Φιλόσοφος ἴστορια* di Damascio (pp.258-63 ed. P. ATHANASSIADI [Athens 1999]). Sulla ‘guida del carro’ nella famiglia di Callimaco cf. L. LEHNUS, in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, a cura di G. CAMBIANO, L. CANFORA & D. LANZA, I 2 (Roma 1993), 76 n.8 e F. WILLIAMS, in *ZPE* 110 (1996), 40-42.

<sup>120</sup> Alan Cameron ha convincentemente confutato la teoria ziegleriana di un callimachismo ‘minoritario’ nel contesto della poesia ellenistica.

<sup>121</sup> Non sorprende troppo che anche nei margini del Kühner-Blass e del Kühner-Gerth Maas riportasse, dopo Omero, soprattutto Callimaco (devo al Sig. Franco Basso, Oxford, di avermi amichevolmente mostrato la copia appartenuta a Maas di queste due opere, ora in suo possesso). A p.80 di Kühner-Gerth I (marg. sin.), a proposito dello schema alcmanico, Maas suggerisce due possibili integrazioni al fr. 227,8 Pf.: ὅτι Κάστορ, [ἰππόται σοφοί,] καὶ σὺ Πωλύδ[ευκες oppure ὅτι Κάστορ, [ἴππων δμήτορες,] καὶ σὺ Πωλύδ[ευκες. Apparentemente preferibile, la seconda delle due ricorre anche nella copia personale maasiana di Pfeiffer I (p.218), dove pure è *dubitante* completato il supplemento di Wilamowitz (vd. Pf. app.) al verso successivo: καὶ τῶν ἀρ[ίκων ρύτορες] καὶ ξένων [[ἄρωγοι]] ὄδηγοι.

<sup>122</sup> Meno frequentemente ricordata, ma non trascurabile, è nei due la comune formazione monacense: con Karl Krumbacher Maas, con Otto Crusius Pfeiffer.

<sup>123</sup> Fa riflettere l'occasionale frase di Maas in una lettera ad Idris Bell del 24 luglio 1941: “Ich hatte in Deutschland, auch vor 1933, öfters die Empfindung, dass man meine Arbeiten nicht voll einschätzte. In England dagegen [...]” (Sir

l'umanesimo e la tecnica filologica. Callimaco significa tradizione diretta e indiretta, autori antichi (anche latini) e bizantini, papiri e grammatici, erudizione e storia degli studi. All'attrazione di una dieta così varia era e resterà difficile resistere.

H.I. Bell Papers, London BL Add. 59528 fol. 121). Sono grato alla direzione della British Library, Londra, per avermi permesso la consultazione di questo documento.

Th. Fuhrer: Do the two *diegeseis* in the Milan papyrus possibly suggest the hypothesis that there have been two different editions of books III and IV of the *Aetia*?

M.A. Harder: If the order of *aitia* in the *diegeseis* was different from that in *POxy.* 1011, should we begin to reckon with the possibility that the order of *aitia* in books III and IV was not quite fixed? Cf. the case of *Phrygius and Pieria*, which is found before *Euthycles Locrus* in *POxy.*, but lost (between *Hospes Isindius* and *Diana Lucina*) or omitted in the *diegeseis*; and fr. 114,18 (?), where the evidence of the two papyri suggests that the *Delian Apollo* was followed by different *aitia* in the two texts.

L. Lehnus: May I try to answer cumulatively? Conflict between *diegeseis* and papyri was so far confined to the *Aetia* epilogue, offered by *POxy.* 1011 but missing in the *diegeseis*, and to *Phrygius et Pieria*, either omitted by the diegetes or placed by him not immediately before *Euthycles* (where *POxy.* 2212 has it apparently) but before *Diana*. Both inconsistencies seemed to be curable; indeed, the *Phrygius et Pieria* diegesis was very probably to be found in what is now the central gap of column I, and the so-called epilogue might have been (felt as) one and the same with the conclusion of the *Coma*. But the case is worsening, and one cannot exclude that partially different collections of elegies were some time circulating for books III and IV. Apparently *POxy.* 1011 lacked two elegies between *Acontius* and *Eleorum ritus* — but what of *Pisaean Zeus* in fr. 76,2 Pf. if the first three verses of what for Pfeiffer was coincident with the Elean rite diegesis are now to be detached from it? I allow I am puzzled. Anyway, if such a conspicuous discrepancy is confirmed,

eventual conflict of papyri at fr. 114,18 will also have to be considered more seriously.

*P.J. Parsons:* How to indicate possible placings of *aitia*?

*L. Lehnus:* The way has already been paved by Pfeiffer. He helpfully introduced the general category of 'Fragmenta incerti libri Aetiorum', and he furtherly collected *incerta* from single books ('libri fortasse primi', etc.). I do not think we should depart from this method. Possibly we shall have to allot a clearly identified section of the apparatus to conjectural placings and connections.

*A.S. Hollis:* I wish merely to say how much I admire the meticulous care and fine discrimination with which you have prepared the ground for your future edition of Callimachus' fragments. We are learning this week that the supply of new papyri may not, after all, have come to an end. In addition to the piece which Professor Bastianini is going to show to us (I see from the hand-out that the poetic text is surely either by Callimachus or by a close imitator), I have been told that a further small fragment of the *Hecale* has recently been identified!

*L. Lehnus:* Thank you; and thanks for good news. New papyri may always surface, though I am not that optimistic. As for the *Aetia*, new evidence is badly needed for the second part of book I and above all for book II. Unmapped stretches abound. But I am also puzzled, inversely, by the apparent lack of space within the compass of four books, long as they may have been, for the huge amount of mythological material which seems to lie in wait from the *incertae sedis* and the *incerti auctoris*. Papyri have swallowed up fragments from the indirect tradition, but to my sentiment not so many as we should have expected.

*P.J. Parsons:* What about the universal validity of Hecker's law?

*L. Lehnus:* I think the *regula Heckeriana* still holds, and we can but make use of it until it is positively disproved. Even such a highly creative and original poet as Callimachus may be allowed to have repeated in an extreme minority of cases not only single words but also a whole phrase (I am thinking of *Hec.* fr. 134 Hollis). Hecker's law is one of the very few instances in the history of scholarship when a theory has been experimentally proved (I mean, by papyri).

*S. Stephens:* The production of a text of Callimachus, as all of you who have edited him know, can never be a completed task. As soon as you finish, another fragment will materialize to alter previous conclusions. In a Platonic sense it must always be  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ .

The question arises, therefore, about the possibility of using the web for a computer-generated text as a partial alleviation of the problem, as a complement to the printed text, naturally.

A web-based 'text' could allow considerable room for speculative re-orderings and restorations. Necessary testimonia could be hyperlinked and, in an ideal world, digital images of the papyri might themselves be made available.

*L. Lehnus:* I do share your forecast that a hypertext of Callimachus' fragments would prove of great help as a working tool. In variable-profile texts such as that, the editor's splendid isolation is bound to soften, and will become sooner or later unsustainable. Otherwise, that editorial results are doomed to remain  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  is a matter of textual philosophy. In principle it sounds true. But there always will be good and bad  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , and an edition is bound at every stage to try to side with the good ones. The moment comes when you have to make up your mind and definitively offer what you can.

*P.J. Parsons:* I wonder how to use unpublished marginalia of the dead.

*L. Lehnus:* Difficult question. Marginalia are no correspondence. In a sense they are even more private than letters, but they rarely entail private matters. I think a good idea is to publish only what is aimed at the critical edition (emendations, supplements) or the literal interpretation of texts, and to select what we would approve of, not what we should criticize and discard. That is sharing responsibility for publication. Time also matters. When does biography cease and history begin? If we discover marginalia by great scholars of, say, the XVI or XVII century we would hardly hesitate to publish them. Shall we consider Wilamowitz or Maas utterly different because they are more recent? Caution and respect are needed, as if we were communicating suggestions by dear friends and colleagues.

*F. Montanari:* Dunque, un'attenta revisione del papiro al fr. 75,70 Pf. esclude la lettura/integrazione Μεγάκ[λ]ῆς, finora largamente accettata, lasciando ὁ μὲν τείχισσε ... / Κάρθαιαν. Callimaco sta fornendo i nomi dei fondatori della tetrpoli di Ceo, e per gli altri tre cita esattamente il nome proprio. Malgrado questo, forse si può pensare che per il primo non ci fosse il nome ma qualcosa di sostitutivo, come un patronimico, oppure una parola estranea al nome, lasciando per l'ecista di Cartea solo un'allusione (certo difficile), con il solo ὁ μὲν τείχισσε ... / Κάρθαιαν. Al momento non trovo un nome proprio che si accordi con le tracce e la metrica. Ma tutte queste considerazioni non ci fanno fare nessun passo avanti.

*L. Lehnus:* Jacoby osservava che il nome Megacle rinvia ad Atene ed è adatto qui, anche se non altrimenti attestato. Occorrerà rileggere il papiro con le nuove metodiche; quanto si è visto finora ha il valore di un'indicazione diagnostica. Tuttavia un papiro può anche essere corrotto. Se posso dirlo, magari sotto-voce, io credo che al v. 11 del *Prologo degli Aitia* Callimaco non possa aver scritto altro che *αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν*, qualunque cosa abbia scritto a sua volta lo scoliaste londinese.



ADRIAN S. HOLLIS

CALLIMACHUS:  
LIGHT FROM LATER ANTIQUITY

My original title, "In Search of New Fragments", might have raised hopes of quotations attributed to Callimachus in neglected or unpublished works. I have none such to offer: the *Lexicon Ambrosianum* mentioned by Ada Adler in edition of the *Suda*<sup>1</sup> has, I gather, proved a disappointment. On the other hand there must be unrecognized snippets of Callimachus in scholia, lexicons, Etymologica, and embedded in the text of little-read authors. Thanks to F. Pontani<sup>2</sup> we can now fill that irritating gap, the first word of the *Aetia*, which is revealed as Πολλάκι<sup>3</sup> by a corrupt but unmistakable scholion on *Od.* 2.50. In my opinion it is worth contending for Callimachus as the possible author of fragments (even if no more than one or two words) in the *Suda* and Hesychius which have a Hellenistic air<sup>4</sup>. Among embedded fragments, E. Livrea<sup>5</sup> has given a Callimachean context (*Aetia*, Book III) to the metrical phrase νυκτελίοις ἴεροῖς

<sup>1</sup> *Suidae Lexicon*, Pars I (Leipzig 1928), pp.XVII-XVIII.

<sup>2</sup> *ZPE* 128 (1999), 57-59.

<sup>3</sup> This was already conjectured by Lobel and commended (or even printed as a supplement) by several scholars.

<sup>4</sup> Thus my edition of the *Hecale* (Oxford 1990), 358-361, Appendix V: "Ten Poetic Citations in Suidas"; "Three Possible Fragments of Callimachus' *Hecale* in Hesychius", in *ZPE* 117 (1997), 47-49; "Some Neglected Verse Citations in Hesychius", in *ZPE* 123 (1998), 61-71; "Darkness on the Mountains: A Fragment of Callimachus' *Hecale*? ", *ibid.*, 72 (from Hesychius).

<sup>5</sup> "P.Oxy. 2463: Lycophron and Callimachus", in *CQ N.S.* 39 (1989), 141-147 at p.147.

ἐπικείμενος in Plutarch, *Greek Questions* 37<sup>6</sup>, and Martin West (per litteras) draws my attention, suggesting Callimachus, to οἵς οὐ θέμις δύμα βάλησιν in Synesius<sup>7</sup>.

More specimens of this kind of material will be discussed later. But the main basis of this paper has been a study of three Greek authors, two of whom certainly knew the fragmentary poems of Callimachus, and the third seemed to offer considerable promise. I resolved to pay as much attention to their prose as to their verse, and hoped to find illuminating parallels with Callimachus. All three writers were Christian Bishops — two (Synesius of Cyrene and Gregory of Nazianzus) contemporaries at the end of the fourth century, while the third (Michael Choniates) lived eight hundred years later in the period when both Athens (Michael's see) and Constantinople fell to the Fourth Crusade. It is curious that none of the three actually names Callimachus<sup>8</sup>, who may have been sufficiently well-known in

<sup>6</sup> In fact A.D. NOCK, *ap.* W.R. HALLIDAY (Ed.), *The Greek Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford 1928), 160, had already suggested the *Aetia* of Callimachus. Accidental metrical phrases, sometimes even as long as a hexameter, regularly occur in prose authors (D.L. PAGE, *History and the Homeric Iliad* [Berkeley 1959], 211 n.73 has a nice collection, but one could not believe that any of them actually came from a poet). This example, however, seems convincing.

<sup>7</sup> *Provid. 2.5, Opuscula*, p.123 ed. N. TERZAGHI (Roma 1944), who signalled the quotation (but it does not appear in *Supplementum Hellenisticum*). The context is of religious mysteries; West suggests that it might alternatively refer to a woman's intimate parts, citing passages collected for the register of parallels to 17.10 in his Leipzig, 1993, edition of the *Anacreon tea*. If Synesius has preserved the original context, one might compare Paulus Silentarius, *S. Sophia* 757 δὲ μὴ θέμις δύμασι λεύσσειν (immediately following an echo of CALL. fr.75.4-5). The Thesmophoria Attica (fr.63 Pf.) would be one possible home for the fragment. Martin West also kindly passed to me εἰ δ' ἀδυτοῦ χάνοι περὶ πάντας δύλεθρος in *Schol. T ad Il. 23.79*, vol. V p.380 Erbse (there is no particular reason to think of Callimachus).

<sup>8</sup> The Greek poets most often named by my trio are Homer, Hesiod and Pindar; others much more rarely or not at all, even in cases where our authors make clear allusions or actual quotations (e.g. Synesius from Aratus, in *Opuscula* pp.123, 124, 180, 209, or Michael Choniates from Lycophron). MICH.CHON. confuses Δίηχι leaving the earth in Aratus, *Phaen.* 134-135 with Aidos and Nemesis in HES. *Op.* 197ff. at Vol. I pp.14 and 81 (with ἀνέπτατο from ἐπταθ'). ed. Lambros.

A.D. 400 but was surely confined to a very small circle in A.D. 1200. If an emendation by Alan Cameron (see below) is correct, Synesius alludes to Callimachus as a poet who was a fellow Cyrenean, and Gregory (*Or. 4, PG 35 col.640*) refers to him as “one of the specialist authors on sacrificial rites” (*τοῖς τῶν θυσιῶν τεχνολόγοις*) — at first sight an odd description, but covering a fair amount of the *Aetia*. One Callimachean theme which recurs in all three writers (particularly Gregory) is that of the Τελχῖνες, φθόνος and βάσκανία<sup>9</sup>. Presumably this comes from the *Aetia* prologue, but it is not usually coupled with close imitation of Callimachus’ actual words, and may have been absorbed into the general literary consciousness.

Synesius seemed a promising target for this investigation. Like Callimachus he was devoted to his homeland<sup>10</sup>; both refer to Cyrene as their ‘mother’<sup>11</sup>. Synesius’ hymns contain complicated metrics and exquisite vocabulary. But the fruits of reading him were meagre, with one exception. In his work *On Dreams*<sup>12</sup> he speaks of encounters with the gods, who may give advice and forewarning:

ώστε εἰ μέν τωι γέγονε Θησαυρὸς ὅπνου δῶρον, οὐκ ἐν θαυμαστοῖς ἄγω· οὐδὲ εἴ τις, καταδαρθών ἀμουσος, ἔπειτα ἐντυχὼν ὄναρ ταῖς Μούσαις καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰπών τὰ δὲ ἀκούσας, ποιητής ἐστι δεξιός, ὡσπερ δὲ καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνος ἤνεγκεν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο τῶν λίαν ἐστὶ παραδόξων.

Terzaghi (*ad loc.*) suggests that the reference of καταδαρθών — δεξιός is to Hesiod, thus making the mistake for which Fronto

<sup>9</sup> E.g. SYNES. *Dion 14, Opuscula* p.270 Terzaghi: Τελχίς καὶ βάσκανος ὁν; GREG.NAZ. *Or. 4, PG 35 col. 636* τίνες Τελχῖνες πονηροὶ καὶ βάσκανοι δαίμονες; MICH.CHON. I p.232 Τελχινῶδες καὶ φθόνοιν [v.l. φόνιον].

<sup>10</sup> *Ep. 131* (p.225 ed. A. Garzya) on a young man who showed himself φθόνου κρείττω (cf. CALL. *Epigr. 21.4 Pf.* κρέσσονα βασκανίης), conquering ὅπλοις μὲν τοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἐχθρούς, ἀρετῇ δὲ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ πονηρούς is distinctly reminiscent of Callimachus, *Epigr. 21 Pf.* = *Anthol.Pal. 7.525*.

<sup>11</sup> CALL. fr.602.3 (see Pfeiffer’s note); SYNES. *Ep. 5* (p.12 ed. Garzya).

<sup>12</sup> Περὶ ἐνυπνίων 4, *Opuscula* pp.150-151 Terzaghi. At first I thought that this passage had not been noticed before, but then realized that it was discussed by Alan CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 369-370.

(*Epist. ad M. Caesarem* 1.4.7) reproved his imperial pupil: *Hesiodum pastorem... dormientem poetam ait factum. at enim ego memini olim apud magistrum me legere* “ποιμένι μῆλα νέμοντι παρ’ ἔχνιον δέξος ἐπου / Ήσιόδωι Μουσέων ἐσμὸς δτ’ ἡντίασεν” [Call. fr.2.1-2 Pf.]. τὸ “δτ’ ἡντίασε” *vides quale sit, scilicet ambulantι obviam venisse Musas.* But these words of Synesius are a perfect fit<sup>13</sup> for Books I-II of the *Aetia*. τὰ μὲν εἰπὼν τὰ δὲ ἀκούσας make the point, which is perhaps becoming increasingly clear<sup>14</sup>, that Callimachus was not just a passive listener at his meeting with the Muses, but sometimes took the initiative, e.g. volunteering various opinions (ἀὐτὸς προειπών, *Schol. Flor.* vol.I p.13 line 32 Pf.) about the parentage of the Graces.

There is, however, an apparent objection to referring this passage to the *Aetia*: Synesius seems to have in mind a poet contemporary with himself (ώσπερ ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνος ἤνεγκεν), though it is hard to believe that a later poet would so exactly replicate the scheme of *Aetia* I-II. Alan Cameron<sup>15</sup> removes the difficulty by emending χρόνος to χῶρος, thus producing a recognizable allusion to the fellow Cyrenaean. Another possibility, which occurred to me, would be to delete the words ώσπερ — παραδόξων which were originally omitted by one manuscript<sup>16</sup>.

Although Synesius is quite prepared to allow that Callimachus met the Muses in a dream and awoke as an accomplished poet, this idea could easily be subjected to criticism and ridicule, particularly if it is stressed that the sleeper had no previous experience of the Muses (ἄμουσος) but then awakes instantaneously transformed without the need for study and hard work. The

<sup>13</sup> Ἐντυχόντων ὅντας ταῖς Μούσαις (Synesius) is close to the *Schol. Flor.* line 16 on CALL. fr.2 (vol.I p.11 Pf.) κατ’ ὅντα συμμειξας ταῖς Μούσαις.

<sup>14</sup> Particularly if fr.178 Pf. (the visitor from Icos) belongs to book 2 and preceded fr.43 (the Sicilian cities), as suggested by James ZETZEL (in *ZPE* 42 [1981], 31-33) and accepted by Cameron (p.133).

<sup>15</sup> P.370 n.35.

<sup>16</sup> “Ωσπερ — παραδόξων *om. o, add. o<sup>2</sup>* (Terzaghi). An interpolator might not have realized that οὐδ’ εἴ τις κτλ. could still depend on οὐκ ἐν θαυμαστοῖς ἄγω, and perhaps was led by the present tense of ἔστι to see here a reference to some contemporary poet.

satirist Persius, telling us how he became a poet<sup>17</sup>, makes fun of any such notion (*Prol.* 2-3):

*nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnaso  
memini ut repente sic poeta prodirem.*

The emphasis lies on *repente*<sup>18</sup>. Even more interesting is the case of Ennius, who in *Annals* I had a dream wherein he met the ghost of Homer. Whether he also met and conversed with the Muses remains a matter for controversy<sup>19</sup> but an epigram<sup>20</sup> in which Ennius is described as “pupil of the Muses”, *Ennius Musarum* [sc. *discipulus*] lends colour to the view that he did. Almost everyone would agree that Ennius, writing two generations after Callimachus, could not have opened his *Annales* with an initiatory dream without having in mind (and expecting his readers to remember) the beginning of Callimachus’ *Aetia*.

Ennius, it seems, returned to the subject of his Dream in *Annales* VII. That book contained a prologue<sup>21</sup>, in which the poet boasted that he was the first Latin poet to scale the mountain of the Muses and to be a φιλόλογος (*dicti studiosus*, 209) in the Greek style — all this to explain why he was not going to write of the First Carthaginian War, which had been covered by

<sup>17</sup> His driving force was hunger, *magister artis ingenique largitor / venter* (*Prol.* 10-11); cf. HOR. *Epist.* 2.2.51-52 *pauertas impulit audax / ut versus facerem*. One might be tempted to bring in Callimachus, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 239.9 ἦει]σεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος σιτύ[η “but the bread-bin sang a different tune” (to be discussed below), though the context is unclear.

<sup>18</sup> Compare a scholion cited by Walter KISSEL on Persius, *Prol.* 2-3 *qui* [sc. *Ennius*]... *fuit subito poeta iacens in Parnaso monte*. We shall find the same motif of instant creation of a skilled poet (though not involving a dream) in an iambic poem by Gregory of Nazianzus (below, p. 48).

<sup>19</sup> According to Otto SKUTSCH, *Studia Enniana* (London 1968), 128, there was “no initiation by the Muses” though in *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford 1985), 147, he is more cautious (“A brief meeting with the Muses... is not entirely ruled out”). For a detailed argument that Ennius did meet the Muses, see J.H. WASZINK, “The Proem of the *Annales* of Ennius”, in *Mnemosyne* S.IV 3 (1950), 215-240.

<sup>20</sup> By Pompilius, in E. COURTNEY (Ed.), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993), p.51. This epigram is not mentioned by O. Skutsch in either of his books.

<sup>21</sup> 206-210 Skutsch (not, unfortunately, a continuous quotation).

Naevius in his cruder Saturnian epic. The following two lines (211-212 Skutsch) also probably belong to the proem:

*nec quisquam sophiam, sapientia quae perhibetur,  
in somnis vidit prius quam sam discere coepit.*

Although no context is stated, it is hard to resist the impression that Ennius here is rebutting criticism (actual or potential) of his Dream in *Annales* I. The objection was what we later find in Persius ('repente... poeta'), and what might be deduced from Synesius (ἀμουσος . . . ποιητής ἐστι δεξιός). Ennius replies that he would never have dreamt his dream if he had not already started to study *sophia*<sup>22</sup>. A pattern is beginning to form, involving Latin as well as Greek writers. To these we can add a curious example in Michael Choniates, lamenting and extolling his teacher Eustathius of Thessalonica. Studying poetry with Eustathius was like being inspired by the Muses (ό παρὰ τῶν Μουσῶν ἐμπνευσθεὶς τὴν ποίησιν)<sup>23</sup>:

εἰ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀγροικίας βαθεῖ κάρωι καθεύδοι, ἀλλ' ἄμα μίκρ' ἄττα  
ἐψωμίζετο παρ' ἐκείνου καὶ παρὰ χρῆμα διυπνίζετο μουσικοῦ  
τινος κάτοχος ἀσθματος.

Here we have a young man with no obvious qualification for poetry (characterized by ἀγροικία, like the ἀμουσος in Synesius) who falls asleep through deep drowsiness but nonetheless absorbs titbits<sup>24</sup> from Eustathius during his sleep, and wakes up instantly possessed of some poetic inspiration. This is surely a humorous variation on the familiar pattern, with Eustathius standing in for the Muses. As in the other examples, stress is laid

<sup>22</sup> *Sophiam, sapientia quae perhibetur* most naturally suggests philosophy, and there was indeed a philosophical component (including Pythagorean metempsychosis) in the *Annales* I dream. But, in this context, it would be hard not to think of Callimachean *σοφίη* (ft. 1.18) as poetic craftsmanship. For Callimachus as *σοφός* in connexion with his dream, compare the anonymous epigram, *Anthol. Pal.* 7.42.1 ἢ μέγα Βαττιάδαο σοφοῦ περίπυστον ὅνειρο.

<sup>23</sup> MICH.CHON. I pp.286-287 ed. Lambros (Athens 1879).

<sup>24</sup> Could these small titbits reflect the μικῆ which Callimachus received from the Muses in his dream (*SH* 253.11)? But that is to anticipate the argument.

on the extraordinary change of state (from ἀγροικία to poetic inspiration) between the time when the pupil falls asleep and wakes up.

Skutsch debates<sup>25</sup> whether the criticism of Ennius' dream was actually made or merely anticipated: "That the *Annals* were edited in sections is probable enough, although it could be argued that the criticism against which Ennius seems to defend himself here [in Book VII] could be anticipated rather than experienced". A possibility worth considering, which would remove any unease about the timing is that Callimachus had already set a precedent for Ennius by returning in a later book to discuss his own Dream. That he mentioned the dream a second time in *Aetia* Book II is virtually certain<sup>26</sup>; what exactly he said about it unfortunately can not be determined owing to the damaged state of *Suppl. Hell.* 253:

## 253 (b)

1a [†τοιάδε θνητοῖσι κακὰ κακῶν †, ἀμφί τε κῆρες]  
 1 εἰλεῦνται· κατενεγή δ' εἰσδυστις οὐδ' ἀθέρι  
     [...]υκ[.]ο . [....]. ων επιχει[  
     [...].γ[.].ε[.]. αμμια[.  
     [...].η[.]. . . . . ? . . . . ρ[.  
 5      [...].γοδ[.]. ο[.]. . . . . υ[.  
     [...].υμε[.]. ου[.]. . . . . [  
     [...].ρουχεύ[.]. . . . . υ[.]. η[.  
     [...].γ[.]. σεδαησ[.]. . . . [  
     [...]. . . . . ἀνθρωποισε[.]. . . [  
 10 . . . . . εταις ἀγαπητὸν ἐνυπγ[.  
       αὶει, τοῖς μικκοῖς μικκὰ διδοῦσι θεοί  
     [...].εω τὸν ὄνειρον .[.]. ε[.]

<sup>25</sup> *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, 377.

<sup>26</sup> SH 253 comes from the same papyrus as SH 252 (Phalaris, including fr.46 Pf.), which is firmly attributed to *Aetia* II by the sources containing frs.45 and 47 Pf. Annette HARDER (*ZPE* 67 [1987], 21-30 at 30) suggests that SH 239+252+253 belong at the end of the book. Peter KNOX (his idea taken up by Alan CAMERON) believes that fr.112 Pf. was part of an Epilogue to Book II, later transferred to the end of Book IV, whether by the poet himself (*GRBS* 26 [1985], 59-65) or by a later editor (*ZPE* 96 [1993], 175-178).

. . . ]. μενος Μουσέων ει . [  
 . . .] αρ δππότ' ἔληξε θεῆς . [  
 15       . . .]. μ . . . . μα . . . . .

There are clear references to the Muses in line 13 and to the Dream in 10 ἀγαπητὸν<sup>27</sup> ἐνύπνιον and 12 τὸν ὄνειρον. Line 11<sup>28</sup> is quoted by Artemidorus to show that people's dreams are sent in accordance with their status — is Callimachus to some extent playing down the value of his own dream? In line 7 the traces allow οὐχ εὔδων ἀλλ᾽ ὑπ' ἀδη[<sup>29</sup>, “not when asleep but from...” Is the poet correcting some misapprehension about his dream?<sup>30</sup>

It was Callimachus himself who related and rebutted the criticism of the Telchines that he could not write a long poem (fr.1.1ff. Pf.), and, if there was controversy over his Dream, it seems likely that later generations knew of it from something which Callimachus said. In answer to any accusation that he had been an ἀμουσος instantly transformed into a poet, he could have replied (like Ennius) that the dream was not his first contact with the Muses. Had they not looked on him with favour as a child (fr.1.37-38 Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὅθματι παῖδας / μὴ λοξῶι)? Although Callimachus does not specify “at the moment of my birth” as Hesiod had done (*Theog.* 82 γεινόμενόν τ' ἐσίδωσι)<sup>31</sup>, I would take παῖδας to indicate a time before he had

<sup>27</sup> “Ἀγαπητόν: ‘gratum’ aut ‘quod satis facit, cum meliora non praebeantur?’” (SH p.100).

<sup>28</sup> Also quoted by Stobaeus under the heading of Poverty. One might have reservations about the latter, since sententious statements, once divorced from their context, can easily be misinterpreted.

<sup>29</sup> The SH editors suggest ἀδη[φαγίης or ἀδη[μοσύνης.

<sup>30</sup> Alan CAMERON (138) thinks that he is “waking up, now a poet” thus marking the end of his conversation with the Muses. I have not reproduced SH 239. There we seem to hear how poverty forced the speaker to abandon his previous maintenance of αἰδώς (cf. n.17 above?). CAMERON (137) thinks that there is too little preserved to be worth bothering about, but I have some sympathy with Annette HARDER's feeling (n.26 above) that the fragment has a programmatic air; in line 8 SH suggests e.g. οὐδὲ[άιδε]ιν ἐθέλεσκον & μὴ μάθον, which might refer to poetic craft and/or subject matter.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. HOR. *Carm.* 4.3.1-2 *Quem tu, Melpomene, semel / nascentem placido lumine videris.*

his dream as an ἀρτιγένειος (*Schol. Flor.* p.11.18 Pf.)<sup>32</sup>. And the advice given by Apollo ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα / γούνασιν (fr.1.21-22) is perhaps meant to predate the *Somnium*. So Callimachus might have argued that he had already thought about poetry before he dreamt his dream. It is worth noting that Wilamowitz wished to restore φῦλον ἀ[μουσον in fr.1.7, which would turn back against Callimachus' enemies any criticism that he himself had been ἀμουσος.

Passing now from Synesius to Gregory of Nazianzus, let us conduct a somewhat frivolous exercise by presenting the outlines of an *Aetia* prologue according to Gregory rather than Callimachus. Some of the imitations are clearly deliberate, others (where the context may be quite different) probably unconscious, indicating how deeply Callimachus had entered Gregory's mind<sup>33</sup>:

GREGORY	CALLIMACHUS
1277.72 πολλοὶ μὲν τρύζεσκον ἐμοῖς παθέεσσιν ἀπιστοὶ <sup>34</sup>	(fr.1.1)
1234.87 νήιδες οὐρανίων	(fr.1.2)
1519.184 διηνεκὲς . . . ἐν <sup>35</sup>	(fr.1.3)
471.14 πολλαῖς χιλιάσιν ἐπέων	(fr.1.4)
AP 8.125.1 ἐπὶ τυτθόν	(fr.1.5)
1474.324 πολλὰς . . . ἐτέων δεκάδας	(fr.1.6)
774.118 αὐτοφόνωι κακίῃ ἐνδοθι τηκομένους <sup>36</sup>	(fr.1.8)

<sup>32</sup> *Aliter* CAMERON, 130-131. SH 239.13 μ]ελαινομένη, “de barba (id est de acetate) loquentis?... sed alia multa possit” (edd.) might conceivably refer back to ἀρτιγένειος.

<sup>33</sup> Several of the parallels are absent from Pfeiffer, but nearly all are to be found in *Callimacho. Aitia, Libri Primo e Secondo*, a cura di G. MASSIMILLA (Pisa 1996). References to Gregory are by column and line or section (as marked in that column) of *Patrologia Graeca* vol.37; occasionally to Gregory's epigrams in *Anthol.Pal.* Book 8. I have admitted one or two pieces from Gregory's iambic poems, and even his prose.

<sup>34</sup> Or 1392.95 πολλοὶ δ' εὐσεβέεσσιν ἐπιθρώσκουσιν ἀκιδνοῖς, which preserves an ἐπι- compound of the same metrical shape as Call.'s ἐπιτρύζουσιν followed by a dative of the targed aimed at. We can now see that πολλοὶ (in both cases) is influenced by πολλάκι.

<sup>35</sup> 515.10 διηνεκὲς ἀείδουσι (a nice σπονδειάζων) may owe something to CALL. fr.26.8 ἡνεκὲς ἀείδω.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. 1409.8-9 φθόνωι . . . / τήκοντι τοὺς ἔχοντας; 582.50 φθόνος ὄμματα τήκοι.

1575.304	δὲ λιγόστιχον . . . μῦθον <sup>37</sup>	(fr.1.9)
1537.215	Βασκανίης	(fr.1.17)
105.18	ἡ τῇ Περσικῇ σχοίνῳ μετρεῖσθαι δεῖ τὴν σοφίαν	(fr.1.18)
1001.425	έοūς ἐπὶ γούνασι θεῖναι <sup>38</sup>	(fr.1.21-22)
1410.16	όδοις ἀτρίπτους	(fr.1.27-28)
1459.111	στεινὴν . . . ἀταρπόν	(fr.1.28)
1519.177	δγκηθμὸν ἀείδει	(fr.1.31)
591.167	οὐρανὸς εἶδαρ ἔδωκε <sup>39</sup>	(fr.1.34)
1386.13-14	γήραος . . . / ἄλγεα, καὶ σκοπέλων ἔχθεα Τρινακρίων	(fr.1.35-6)
AP 8.152.3	οὐ νέμεσις <sup>40</sup> . κείνοις γάρ ...	(fr.1.37)
1156.1806	λοξὸν βλέποντες . . . τοῖς ὅμμασι <sup>41</sup>	(fr.1.37-8)

Gregory's favourite episode from the *Aetia* was clearly the Lindian Sacrifice — perhaps in part because it stood early in the first book (frs. 22-23 Pf.), but most of all because of the peculiar nature of the cult. The worship of Heracles is accompanied by words of blasphemy, derived from the occasion when Heracles was cursed by the Lindian peasant whose ploughing ox the hero had slaughtered and devoured. This provided a fine opportunity for Gregory to stress the superiority of Christian worship while attacking the pagan emperor Julian: ποῦ δέ, ὥσπερ Λινδίοις, εὐσεβὲς τὸ καταρᾶσθαι τῶι Βουθοίναι<sup>42</sup>, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι

<sup>37</sup> Cf. 471.15-16 δὲ λιγόστιχα . . . / γράμματα, immediately after 471.14 (cited above as a parallel to CALL. fr.1.4).

<sup>38</sup> Perhaps rather glancing at CALL. fr.471 Μοῦσαῖ νιν ἔοūς ἐπὶ τυννὸν ἔθεντο / {γούνασι}.

<sup>39</sup> Of the manna which sustained the Israelites in the desert. Callimachus too prayed to eat food from heaven (fr.1.34 ἐκ δίης ἡέρος εἶδαρ ἔδων) — the dew which nurtured the cicada. The similarity of sound between ἔδων and ἔδωκε may point to a subconscious reminiscence.

<sup>40</sup> Despite the doubts of Pfeiffer and others, it seems to me highly probable / virtually certain that οὐ νέμεσις should stand in fr.1.37. The whole couplet has been interpolated in *Epigram 21* Pf. = *Anthol.Pal.* 7.525; if οὐ νέμεσις does not come from the *Aetia* prologue (like the rest of the couplet), who introduced the phrase into the Epigram and why?

<sup>41</sup> Perhaps owing more to CALL. *Hecale* fr. 72 H. = 374 Pf. 1-2 ὅμμασι λοξὸν ὑποδρᾶξ / ὁσσομένη.

<sup>42</sup> From this incident Heracles derived the epithet Βουθοίνας, 'ox-feaster'.

θεοῦ τιμήν, τὰς εἰς αὐτὸν λοιδορίας; (*PG* 35.640). Among the cults which must yield to Christ is Λίνδος<sup>43</sup> ἐφυβρίζουσ' ἵεροῖσι (37.1573.278). Echoes of Callimachus' words τέμνοντα σπορίμην αἴλακα γειομόρον (fr.22) are found in *PG* 37.1433.6 τέμνει γειομόρος<sup>44</sup>, while fr.23.6 οὐ μάλ' ἐλαφρός = *PG* 37.675.99<sup>45</sup>.

Immediately after the Lindian Sacrifice Callimachus placed the very similar<sup>46</sup> episode of Thiodamas the Dryopian (24-25 Pf. = 26-27 Massimilla). Vian<sup>47</sup> points out that Apollonius Rhodius seems to have borrowed some elements from Callimachus' Lindian Sacrifice for his own account of Thiodamas (1.1211-19). Perhaps we can add to these the phrase βοῦν ἀρότην (Apoll.Rh. 1.1217)<sup>48</sup>, in view of Greg.Naz. *PG* 35.661 δ Βουθοίνας. . . τὸν ἀρότην βοῦν λαφύξας. And I would not be surprised if Callimachus had used some part of the mainly poetical verb λαφύσσω. Sometimes Gregory's literary culture is mixed with his religious beliefs in a less polemical way. Thus the joys of Acontius wedding night (Call. fr.75.45 ἀντί κε<sup>49</sup>, τῇ μίτρῃ ηψαο παρθενίης) become a Christian marriage, τῷ μίτρῃ θεόθεν λύσαο παρθενικήν (*PG* 37.904.272) — but we remember that the marriage of Acontius and Cydippe was also divinely sponsored, by the goddess Diana. When celebrating the martyr's crown of St. Cyprian, Gregory allows himself to mention (35.1194) those "unhappy youths" (sc. Melicertes and Archemorus)

<sup>43</sup> The place-name rather than the inhabitant, as in CALL. fr.7.20 ἡ δὲ πόλις θυσφήμους Λίνδος ἔγει θυσίην, where the restoration of ἔπι perhaps gains a little support from Gregory's compound ἐφυβρίζουσ'.

<sup>44</sup> Metaphorically, of the path of life.

<sup>45</sup> Again, in a different sense.

<sup>46</sup> In *PG* 38.400 Gregory's commentator Cosmas confuses the two, attributing the cult-title Βουθοίνας, to the story of Thiodamas.

<sup>47</sup> In the Budé Apollonius, vol. I (Paris 1974), 47, comparing APOLL.RH. 1.1214-1215 γεωμόρου . . . / . . . γύας τέμνεσκεν with CALL. fr.22.

<sup>48</sup> Also in the anonymous *Anthol. Plan.* 101.3 of Thiodamas' ox, probably from APOLL.RH. Compare *PG* 36.617 (in a general description of Spring) γεωργὸς . . . ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἔγει βοῦν ἀρότην καὶ τέμνει γλυκεῖν [v.l. βαθεῖν] αἴλακα.

<sup>49</sup> Acontius would not have exchanged athletic prowess or wealth for his wedding night.

who were commemorated by wreaths at Nemea and the Isthmus — carefully specifying the original Isthmian pine-wreath (Call. fr.59.5ff.). To bring in briefly another Hellenistic poet, the much discussed and much imitated line about the ‘small plank’ which saves sailors from destruction (Aratus, *Phaen.* 299 ὅλιγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον Ἀϊδ’ ἐρύκει)<sup>50</sup> is transferred to Noah’s Ark: the survival of human and animal life rested ἐν μικρῷ ξύλῳ (PG 35.545, cf. 36.592).

From the *Hecale* Gregory makes, in quick succession, two verbatim quotations, appropriate to the Callimachean context of hospitable poverty<sup>51</sup>. I would also like to suggest that help with a badly damaged papyrus fragment of the *Hecale* might be offered by the following lines of Gregory (PG 37.907.309-10):

μὴ σύ γε, μὴ κείνησιν ὁμόπλοος, ὡς τέκος, εἴης,  
μὴ σύ γε συμφράδμων, μηδὲ συνωροφίη<sup>52</sup>.

The danger to oneself of being associated with some person who has incurred divine displeasure is (in various forms) a well-known *topos*<sup>53</sup>. But the idea of a woman consulting an adviser on some (commercial?) undertaking may surprise. Perhaps it is

<sup>50</sup> Like Synesius, Gregory never names Aratus, but knew him well (e.g. PG 37.616.485-486 ὡς τε Δίκη τοπάροιθε, βοὸς κταμένου ἀροτῆρος [cf. *Phaen.* 132] / δεῖδικα μὴ κοτέησι θεός). Some signs of Gregory’s familiarity with other Hellenistic poets: Choerilus of Samos, SH 317.1 ίδρις ἀοιδῆς, cf. PG 37.1494.198-199 ἀοιδῆς / ίδρις; APOLL.RH. 3.446 κῆρ ἄχει σμύχουσα, cf. 37.765.32 κῆρ ἄχει σμύχων; Euphorion fr.75 Powell χθιζόν μοι κνώσσοντι παρ’ Ἀργανθώνιον αἴπος, cf. 37.1369.229 καὶ ποτέ μοι κνώσσοντι παρίστατο τοῖος ὄνειρος; Nicander, *Ther.*265 δολιχῶν μηρύγματι γαστρός, cf. 37.576.715 δολιχῶν ὀφίων σκολιοῦς μηρύμασι γαστρός; Parthenius fr.9 Lightfoot ὅστις ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους ἔξυεν αἰγανέας, cf. 38.122.3 χρυσὸς ἔθηξε μάχαιραν ἐπ’ ἀνδράσι (cf. *Parthenius of Nicaea*. Ed. by J.L. LIGHTFOOT [Oxford 1999], 94 and on fr.28).

<sup>51</sup> Τέγος ἀκλήστον (37.602.302= fr.2.2 H.) and ἐλαχὺν δόμον (37.604.333 = fr.26 H.).

<sup>52</sup> Συνωροφίος seems to have eluded the standard lexicons (Stephanus, LSJ, Lampe, Sophocles). One would very much expect it to have only two terminations (like ὁμωρόφιος in GREG.NAZ. PG 38.88.2).

<sup>53</sup> See N. HOPKINSON on CALL. *Hymn.* 6.116-117 (Cambridge 1984) and my note on *Hecale* fr.47.10-11. The combination of ‘aboard the same ship’ (ὁμόπλοος) and ‘under the same roof’ (συνωροφίη) is paralleled in HOR. *Carm.*3.2.27-29 *sub isdem / sit trabibus fragilemque mecum / solvat phaselon.*

suggested by *Hecale* fr.47. There a woman, almost certainly Hecale herself, relates how another person (perhaps her husband) set sail amid unfavourable omens in order to bring back horses from Sparta. The voyage, it seems, ended in shipwreck and death; the speaker prays (10-11) that neither she herself (<μήτ' αὐτ[η] ἐγώ) nor any business associate of hers (<μέθοδτις ἄμμι βεβουλ[η], with ἐμ]πόριη possible in the next line) should set sail under the influence of that ill-omened bird. Hecale was originally quite prosperous (frs.41-42 H.), and might have contemplated commercial ventures.

Before leaving Gregory of Nazianzus I would like to mention some lines which have an unmistakably Callimachean air, without being closely related to any specific passage of Callimachus. For example, the following rejection of unsuitable poetic themes, which is perhaps even more reminiscent of a Roman Callimachean like Propertius. Gregory rejects not only mythological epic but also scientific didactic — to some Romans the highest ambition of all — and soft love poetry too, in favour of celebrating the Trinity and the hymns of angels which will produce a truer Harmony than that of the Platonic Spheres (*PG* 37.1312-1313.71-82):

μέλπω δ' ού Τροίην, ούκ εὕπλοον οἴα τις Ἀργώ,  
ούδε συδέ κεφαλήν, ού πολὺν Ἡρακλέα,  
ού γῆς εύρεα κύκλα ὅπως πελάγεσσιν ἀρηρεν  
ούκ αὔγας λιθάκων<sup>54</sup>, ού δρόμον ούρανίων.  
75 ούδε πόθιων μέλπω μανίην, καὶ κάλλος ἐφήβων  
οῖσι λύρη μαλακὸν κρούετ' ἀπὸ προτέρων.  
μέλπω δ' ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν μέγαν, ἥδε φαεινῆς  
εἰς ἐν ἀγειρομένης λάμψιν ἐμῆς Τριάδος,  
Ἀγγελικῶν τε χορῶν μεγάλους ἐριηχέας ὕμνους  
80 πλησίον ἔσταότων, ἐξ ὅπδες ἀντιθέτου  
κόσμου θ' ἀρμονίην καὶ κρείσσονα τῆς παρεούσης,  
ἥν δοκέω, πάντων εἰς ἐν ἐπειγομένων.

<sup>54</sup> Perhaps a reference to the lost *Λιθικά* attributed to Dionysius Periegetes (who may be recognized also in line 73).

Hitherto almost all of the allusions to Callimachus in Gregory have involved the *Aetia* and *Hecale*, but in a few poems the Saint seems to aim at the asperity of Callimachus' *Iambi*<sup>55</sup>. Once he opens a poem with an indignant question to an inferior rival who has dared to challenge him in verse (*PG* 37.1339.1-2):

τί ταῦτα· τολμᾶις καὶ σύ, Μάξιμε, γράφειν;  
γράφειν σὺ τολμᾶις; τῆς ἀναιδείας ὅση !

I am reminded of the contemptuous *καὶ σύ* with which Callimachus puts down an unworthy intruder in the *Fourth Iambus* (fr.194.1 Pf.):

Εἶς — οὐ γάρ; — ἡμέων, παῖ Χαριτάδεω, καὶ σύ

In a motif which we have encountered before<sup>56</sup>, Gregory ironically suggests that, without previous experience of poetry, Maximus has been inspired by the Muses (could Callimachus be one of *τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν τινες*)<sup>57</sup> and instantly made a skilled versifier (1340.15-19):

μὴ καὶ σὺ μουσόπνευστος ἡμῖν ἀθρόως,  
ώσπερ λέγονται τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν τινες;  
μὴ καὶ σὲ δάφνης ἐξέμηνέ τις κλάδος.  
ἢ μαντικῶν πέπωκας ὑδάτων ἄφνω,  
ἔπειτα μέτρων ἔβλυσας ἄμετρος ὥν;

Callimachus had been criticized because he attempted so many different poetic genres, but defended himself by citing the tragedian Ion (*Iambus* 13, fr.203 Pf.). Some felt that Gregory should not have written in verse at all; he pointed to the poetic books of the *Old Testament* (1335.82-3):

<sup>55</sup> Curiously, Gregory seems to have more technical problems with the iambic metre than with hexameters or elegiacs.

<sup>56</sup> See p. 39 above with reference to Synesius and Michael Choniates (and parallels from Persius and Ennius). Callimachus may have faced, and rebutted, similar criticisms of his Dream (fr.2 Pf.).

<sup>57</sup> Though Gregory mixes poetic with oracular inspiration.

πλὴν ἵσθι πολλὰ καὶ Γραφαῖς μετρούμενα,  
ώς οἱ σοφοὶ λέγουσιν Ἐβραίων γένους.

Finally, Callimachus' *Iambi* (above all, 2, fr.192) are full of parallels with the animal world, and the same is true of Gregory, e.g. 1343-1344.60-65, addressed to Maximus:

- ἴππον καλεῖς, βέλτιστε<sup>58</sup>, πρὸς λεῖον δρόμον·  
λέοντα νύσσεις ἀσθενεστάτη χερί . . .  
(65) τίς γὰρ κυνὶ πλέκοιτ' ἄν, εὖ φρονῶν, μάχην;

Michael Choniates in A.D. 1200 had a complete copy of the *Aetia* as well as the *Hecale*, and his knowledge of the *Hymns* is sufficiently established by vol. I, p.349.22-2 ώς λέαινα ἀρτιτόκος τὰς θηρευτικὰς κύνας βλοσυρώτερον ὑποβλέπεται, from *Hymn* 6.50-52 τὰν δ' ἄρ' ὑποβλέψας χαλεπώτερον ήὲ κυναγόν / ὥρεσιν ἐν Τμαρίοισιν<sup>59</sup> ὑποβλέπει ἄνδρα λέαινα / ὡμότοκος, τὰς φαντὶ πέλειν βλοσυρώτατον δῆμα. Michael's learned allusions and quotations are as likely to occur in his prose as his verse<sup>60</sup>, and may be introduced without warning, e.g. II, p.353.24 ἀποικίᾳ Σκυθική, ἢ τοῖς Ἀσιανοῖς “κακὴ παρενάσσατο γείτων” (= *Hecale* fr. 49.10 H. with change of gender). Like Gregory of Nazianzus,

<sup>58</sup> One is reminded of the ironical courtesy with which opponents are addressed in Callimachus' *Iambi* (e.g. fr.191.33 ἂ λῶιστε, fr.194.46 ἂ πάντα καλή).

<sup>59</sup> This quotation from Callimachus shares 'the Tmarian mountains' with *Aetia* ft.23.3-4 Pf., paraphrased inaccurately but unmistakably by MICH.CHON. II, p.350.12-13. In both cases Michael suppresses the mountains. λευκὸν . . . ἔαρ (I, p.210.24) might come from either the adjacent CALL. *Hymn.* 6.122 or Theocritus 18.27. Michael certainly knew the latter, as can be seen from I, p.206.10-11 τάχι ἀν καὶ ἀπὸ δρυμοῦ θῆρες ἔκεινον ἔκλαυσαν (from THEOCR. 1.72).

<sup>60</sup> Recently I suggested that he has preserved two very rare epithets from the *Hecale*, πέμπελος, 'very old', of the heroine (*ZPE* 115 [1997], 55-6), in a prose summary of the epyllion's main theme, and νήχουστος 'unheard' (perhaps Hecale's name would be 'not unheard', due to the honours which Theseus conferred on her, *ZPE* 130 [2000], 16), in a verse allusion to the *Hecale*'s ending. These epithets are shared with poets (respectively Lycophron and Aratus) who are linked to Callimachus. MICH.CHON. II, p.208.25-26 κανθήλιοι ἐννεάκυκλοι should, I feel, be emended to κ. ἐννεάκυκλοι, in view of CALL. fr.650 ἐννεάκυκλος ὅνος (the epithet is found elsewhere only in Hesychius).

Michael enjoyed mixing Christian sentiments with pagan learning; thus the *Hecale* is made to recommend charity to the poor (I, p. 113.11 τὴν αὐχμηρὰν λιπανέτω τοῦ πένητος τράπεζαν)<sup>61</sup> and the altar of Christ is compared<sup>62</sup> to the altar of Mercy, established uniquely by the Athenians, at the end of *Aetia* Book II (fr.51 Pf. οὗνεκεν οἰκτείρειν οἶδε μόνη πολιών)<sup>63</sup>. If the *Hecale* and *Aetia* were as rare texts as we think (or even unique) in A.D. 1200, did Michael expect his addressees to recognize such allusions, or was he playing a solipsistic game?<sup>64</sup>

A word or two more of the *Hecale* might be extracted from Michael's lines about the heroine in his poem *Theano*. I would not be surprised if Callimachus used the noun ἀμοιβή / ἀμοιβαῖ of the 'recompense' (a yearly banquet and eponymous deme) which Hecale received in return for her entertainment of Theseus. In the *Diegesis* (xi.3-4) of the epyllion we read εἰς ἀμοιβὴν τῆς ξενίας, in Plutarch, *Theseus* 14 ἔσχε τὰς εἰρημένας ἀμοιβὰς τῆς φιλοξενίας and in Mich.Chon., *Theano* 325-6 εὔρατ' ἀμοιβάς, perhaps verbatim (or ἀμοιβάς / εὔρατο) from Callimachus<sup>65</sup>. Michael's prose writings are an even more promising source of poetic allusions and quotations<sup>66</sup>. Very tentatively I suggest a possible home in the *Hecale* for an otherwise unknown three-word

<sup>61</sup> We do not know the exact wording of *Hecale* fr.83 H. (on frs.82 and 83 I list several passages of MICH.CHON., but not this one).

<sup>62</sup> MICH.CHON. II, p.281.1ff.

<sup>63</sup> The wording of Callimachus' line is clearly reflected in MICH.CHON. I, p.319.7-9 Ἀθῆναι, αἱ τοιοῦτον βωμὸν πρῶται καὶ μόναι τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων ἐνθυμῆσσαι καὶ ἰδρυσάμεναι. Michael makes several references to this altar.

<sup>64</sup> Similarly, did his correspondent in II, p.341.7 realize that he was being addressed in the words of Lycophron (ἢν δὲ μηχυνθῇ λόγος . . . σύγγνωθι, from *Alexandra* 2-3)?

<sup>65</sup> The somewhat controversial aorist form εὔρατο (see E. LIVREA on APOLL. RH. 4.746) is consistent with a learned Hellenistic poet. These words are not specifically applied to Hecale, but appear in a passage praising hospitality which throughout is full of Callimachus.

<sup>66</sup> A systematic investigation of these might prove fruitful in revealing a few otherwise unknown quotations (like the one given below) and giving us an idea of the range of classical authors available to Michael about A.D. 1200. Of course we could not take for granted that he had a complete text of every work from which he quotes; sometimes he may draw from an intermediate secondary source.

fragment κωφὰ ῥέουσαν / δάκρυα (Mich.Chon. I, p.346.14-15), from an account of Niobe turned to stone in which Adrasteia/Nemesis plays a leading part<sup>67</sup>. That goddess is mentioned in *Hecale* fr.116 H. Αἴσηπον ἔχεις, ἐλικώτατον ὕδωρ / Νηπείης ἡ τ' ἄργος, ἀοιδιμος Ἀδρήστεια, which looks like part of an invocation, listing centres of her cult, perhaps prompted by her importance at Rhamnus in north-eastern Attica, not far from Hecale's home. Be that as it may, the fate of Niobe could illustrate the goddess' power and the danger of offending her.

There are without doubt anonymous fragments of Callimachus (most of them no more than a single word) lying unrecognised in lexicons such as Hesychius, the *Suda*, and the *Etymologica*. If only we were able to identify them<sup>68</sup>. An ideal (though unlikely) vindication would be if the citation could be made to fit the traces of letters in a damaged papyrus. By great good fortune, that may be the case with Hesychius α 4132 Latte ἀμφὶ τεοῖο· περὶ σοῦ. Dr Dirk Obbink, after re-examining *POxy.* 2216, is prepared to sanction a reading of *Hecale* fr.17.1 H. as ].[έ]γισπε μὲν ἀμφὶ τε[οῖο]<sup>69</sup>. Even if that conjunction had not been possible, the controversial form τεοῖο = σοῦ found only in *Iliad* 8.37 = 8.468 ὁδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο, would have suggested a learned Hellenistic poet — and there is none other whom the grammarians and lexicographers cite anywhere near as often as they do Callimachus.

<sup>67</sup> *CQ N.S.* 47 (1997), 578-582. There may be reflections of the same original in MICH.CHON. I, p.283.3-4 and p.284.21-24; II, p.249.16 (note *ibid.* 10-11).

<sup>68</sup> In my edition of the *Hecale* (Oxford 1990), Appendix V discusses ten poetic citations from the *Suda* on which Hecale might have a claim. Similar entries in Hesychius are considered in *ZPE* 117 (1997), 47-49 and 123 (1998), 72.

<sup>69</sup> See *ZPE* 117 (1997), 47-48 for discussion of the text which emerges. For a comparable case in the *Aetia*, see Hugh LLOYD-JONES, in *ZPE* 26 (1977), 57-58. Faced by the "rare combination of letters εισδυστ, standing, it would appear, at the beginning of the second half of a pentameter", Sir Hugh was reminded of an anonymous elegiac couplet quoted by pseudo-Plutarch. Professor Parsons was able to examine *PSorbonne Inv.2248* in Paris, and to report that the quoted pentameter suited the traces well (now = *Suppl.Hell.* 253.1, cited on p. 41 above).

I would like to end by discussing a very few anonymous glosses in Hesychius which have the air of the Alexandrian Museum and something about them to suggest Callimachus<sup>70</sup>:

α 5073 ἀνηπελίη· ἀσθένεια. Based upon the Homeric *hapax legomenon* ὀλιγηπελίη (*Od.* 5.468). Callimachus has εὔηπελία (*Hymn* 6.135, see N. Hopkinson *ad loc.*)<sup>71</sup>, Nicander κακηπελίη (*Ther.* 319).

α 8709 ἀφνύει, ἀφνύνει: ὀλβίζει. Perhaps the alternative forms were variant readings in the same text<sup>72</sup>, as in Call. *Hecale* fr.48.3 we find variants ἀφνύονται and ἀφνύνονται. The active verb is not found elsewhere.

δ 2570 δυσηβόλον· δυσάντητον. In *Suppl. Hell.* 257.29 (*Victoria Berenices*) we find δυσηβόλιος, applied not (as one might expect in that poem) to the Nemean lion but to Molorcus' he-goat<sup>73</sup>. The *Victoria Berenices* has many things in common with the *Hecale*; perhaps it is worth suggesting that, in the latter, δυσηβόλον was applied to the Marathonian Bull. Callimachus is fond of words connected with ἀβολέω<sup>74</sup>. In Call. fr.767 *inc. auct.* we find an adjective, ἄβολον ἡμαρ (Hesychius η 19), of which one explanation is εὔκαιρον.

ε 5376 ἐπιφάτνιος· ὁ ἑωσφόρος ἀστήρ. In *Iliad* 11.62 οὐλιος ἀστήρ was (and is) generally read. But a variant αὖλιος, "the star which brings animals to their steadings", was taken up by both Callimachus (*SH* 259.5-6 = fr.177.5-6 Pf.) and Apoll.Rh. (4.1629-30). Ἐπιφάτνιος is clearly a variation of the variant — very much in the spirit of the Alexandrian Museum.

κ 2752 Κινύφιον· τὸν Ἀνταῖον, ἀπὸ Κινύφου τοῦ ποταμοῦ. This Libyan river, more often called Kīnuψ, is first used in poetry by

<sup>70</sup> From the list in *ZPE* 123 (1998), 61-71, "Some Neglected Verse Citations in Hesychius". It would surprise me if more of them were not by Callimachus.

<sup>71</sup> Also perhaps at fr.229.4 (Barber-Maas, see Pfeiffer, vol.II, Addenda, p.120).

<sup>72</sup> LSJ revised *Supplement* (1996), p.62, s.v. ἀφνύω seems to regard ἀφνύει as an explanation of ἀφνύει (which would not be very helpful) in this Hesychian gloss.

<sup>73</sup> A scholiast may have explained this epithet with reference to the goat's smell as well as its horns (*SH* 258.29).

<sup>74</sup> See my note on *Hecale* fr.159 *inc. sed.* = 619 Pf.

Callimachus (fr.384.24, from the *Victory of Sosibius*) who probably uses it there to indicate the western boundary of Ptolemaic power. Callimachus was much interested in the geography, myths, and antiquities of Libya, as of his native Cyrene<sup>75</sup>. If he called Antaeus 'Cinyphian', perhaps in the *Aetia*, that could have been the origin of this epithet in Latin poetry<sup>76</sup>.

π 158 παλαχῆθεν· ἐκ γενεᾶς, ἐκ παλαιοῦ. In π 157 Hesych. explains παλαχή with ἀρχή, ληξίς ('lot'), μοῖρα, γενεά. This connection with ἀρχή and γενεά may be that characteristics are assigned, as if by lot, from the moment of birth (ἐκ γενεᾶς)<sup>77</sup>. Nicander has ἐκ παλαχῆς (*Ther.* 449)<sup>78</sup>. The form παλαχῆθεν strongly suggests a learned Hellenistic poet.

π 1304 Πελεθρόνιος· ὁ Χείρων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελεθρονίου, ἐν ᾧ ἐτράφη. It seems that, in a lost piece of poetry, Cheiron had been so described (cf. n 2752 above). This epithet too was taken up by Latin poets (first in Virgil, *Georg.* 3.115).

I hope that the above investigation will be judged to have produced a few more words, phrases, and motifs which have a good chance of going back to Callimachus. My main objective has been to try to re-enter the mindset of later authors, in prose as well as verse, for whom Callimachus formed part of their (and their readers') education and mental furniture. Some of these would have known him so well that their echoes of him could often be unconscious<sup>79</sup>. The best example of such a writer is undoubtedly Gregory of Nazianzus<sup>80</sup>; there must be others

<sup>75</sup> See the material collected by Pfeiffer on his fr.602.

<sup>76</sup> First in Virgil, *Georg.* 3.312.

<sup>77</sup> M.L. West (*per litteras*).

<sup>78</sup> Explained ἐξ ἀρχῆς by his scholia and also by Hesychius ε 1579.

<sup>79</sup> E.g. some of the items in my frivolous attempt to construct an *Aetia* prologue according to Gregory of Nazianzus.

<sup>80</sup> Callimachean enthusiasts among Greek poets of the imperial age include Dionysius Periegetes and, above all, Nonnus of Panopolis. The latter has not appeared in this article because I have devoted quite a lot of attention to this aspect of him elsewhere (particularly in *CQ N.S.* 26 [1976], 142-150, in my Oxford, 1990 commentary on the *Hecale*, and in "Nonnus and Hellenistic Poetry", in *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, *PCPS Suppl.* 17 [1994], 43-62).

whom I have not yet read. Perhaps among the more erudite Greek fathers —<sup>81</sup> but the bulk of *Patrologia Graeca* is discouraging. What of Gregory's pagan contemporary Libanius?<sup>82</sup> In *Epist. 217.6* (vol.10, p.199 ed. Foerster) he gives the parents of the Graces as Dionysus and Coronis — a rare opinion but, according to the Muse<sup>83</sup>, correct.

When something new of Callimachus comes to light, it is always worth investigating whether Nonnus casts any light upon it.

<sup>81</sup> One or two further names have been suggested to me, and I have dipped into them, so far with little success.

<sup>82</sup> There are twelve volumes of Libanius in the edition by R. FOERSTER (1903-1927). Pfeiffer mentions him a few times in his *Index Rerum Notabilium*.

<sup>83</sup> CALL. *Aetia I, Schol. Flor. ad fr.6* (vol.I p.13 Pfeiffer).

## DISCUSSION

There was almost complete agreement that the passage of Synesius, *On Dreams* referred to Callimachus, *Aetia* (Harder thought it conceivable that a more recent poet had replicated the pattern of Call.'s *Somnium*), but general reluctance either to emend χρόνος to χῶρος or to delete ὥσπερ — παραδόξων. Lehnus (supported by Harder) suggested that χρόνος here might be used of a wider period, our time as opposed to other periods of the world's culture.

*R. Hunter:* How should we understand fr.1.21-2 ("When first I put the tablet upon my knees ...")? It has always seemed to me that there are three possibilities: (a) Call. is referring to the time when he first started to write poetry; (b) the reference is to his first lesson in writing; (c) those two incidents were simultaneous, i.e. at a very early age (cf. παῖς) Apollo commanded him to be a poet (by addressing him as ἀοιδέ) and a particular kind of poet.

*P.J. Parsons:* Is the παῖς stage the same as the ἀρτιγένειος stage?

*R. Hunter:* I have been assuming not, and we must take into account Alan Cameron's emphatically expressed view [*Callimachus and his Critics*, 131] that Callimachus does not *have* his dream when ἀρτιγένειος, but dreams that he *was* ἀρτιγένειος, thus being granted his wish of fr.1.33ff. for rejuvenation.

*P.J. Parsons:* The two stages well suit lines 37-38, as there would be a reference to statues of the Muses in the classroom (compare Herodas 3 and Call. *Epigr.* 48 Pf.).

*R. Hunter:* Do you think that ἄμουσος occurred in the *Somnium*? [That seems possible, no more, A.S. Hollis] Your paper made me wonder if there was a ‘Callimachean angle’ to the Cyclops-exchange (*Id.* 11) of Theocritus-Nicias-Callimachus on what makes a poet. Note that hunger is important in Call. *Epigr.* 46 (cf. Persius etc.).

*M.A. Harder:* Wilamowitz suggested ἄ[μουσον in fr.1.7, but the London *scholia* cast doubt on this supplement.

Lehnus felt that reconstructing the *Aetia*-prologue according to Gregory of Nazianzus was not such a frivolous exercise, since it shows that Gregory had learned the Prologue by heart, and enjoyed quoting and imitating it. “Surprisingly different is the case of the pagan Severianus of Damascus who simply hated Callimachus (*Test.85 Pf.*). Oddly enough he too had a dream, in which he was initiated into philosophy — and precisely the very poetic dream of driving a chariot (ὅχημα ἐλαύνειν).”

Führer wondered whether the prominence of the *Aetia* prologue in the Greek-speaking world of late antiquity may have been due to its importance to Roman poets; how great an impact did Roman poetry have on later Greek poetry? [On this question I have changed my opinions, particularly with regard to Nonnus, and in general now tend to ascribe similarities between Latin and later Greek poetry to common use of Hellenistic models. A.S. Hollis] Do you have definite criteria to distinguish between a citation, a fragment, and an allusion? [Sometimes indeed the distinction is not so clear; in my current work on Latin poetic fragments I simply have ‘items’ (as in *Supplementum Hellenisticum*).]

Many suggestions were made of later Greek authors who might be worth reading in the search for Callimachean elements. Susan Stephens mentioned Christian Iambography [I say a little about the iambic poems of Greg.Naz., A.S. Hollis], kindly sending me an unpublished paper by Gianfranco Agosti, “Late Antique Iambics and *iambikè idéa*”, Quintus of Smyrna and

Dioscuros of Aphroditos [both read, but I may have missed some things], and “writers like Cyril of Alexandria and Theodore of Mopsuestia”. Perhaps (Harder) Aristaenetus knew more of Callimachus than the two famous love-stories.

Finally, some individual observations: (a) Harder warns on ἀμφὶ τεῖοῦ that, although the overlap of book fragments is certainly important, when the book fragment is very small, the letters might also fit other words. [Agreed, and Dirk Obbink did have some doubts about the ε. I think that the phrase has a good chance of being correctly placed here, but perhaps it would be most scholarly merely to indicate the possibility in the apparatus criticus.] The subject of ἔνισπε would probably (Lehnus) be Aithra [Yes, or perhaps Pittheus]; (b) ‘Cinyphian’ Antaeus might (Lehnus) have appeared alongside Busiris in *Aetia* II. [They came from the same continent, and both were defeated by Heracles (after the end of the Busiris story Callimachus went straight on to Phalaris, frs.45-46 Pf. + SH 252). For Libyan references, perhaps in the *Aetia*, see Pfeiffer on fr.602. A.S. Hollis].



## III

FRANCO MONTANARI

## CALLIMACO E LA FILOLOGIA

Il titolo del mio intervento è consapevolmente ambiguo: *Callimaco e la filologia* può fare riferimento alla filologia *di* Callimaco e dunque alla molto indagata problematica del poeta erudito e filologo, oppure può fare riferimento alla filologia *su* Callimaco e dunque agli studi callimachei nel mondo antico.

Non c'è dubbio che le ricerche su Callimaco poeta-filologo siano assai più diffuse e differenziate rispetto a quelle su Callimaco oggetto di filologia, specie nei secoli stessi dell'età alexandrina, dunque per quanto riguarda i primordi e i primi passi della filologia callimachea. Qui parleremo di entrambi gli aspetti, la filologia *di* Callimaco<sup>1</sup> e la filologia antica *su* Callimaco: ma sarà la seconda ad avere lo spazio maggiore, riprendendo e proseguendo la discussione su una questione sollevata di recente, vale a dire l'epoca e le modalità di inizio nell'antichità del lavoro filologico sui poeti del primo ellenismo e in particolare su Callimaco.

*Callimaco filologo e l'ekdosis omerica di Zenodoto*

Pfeiffer pose con prudenza il problema della possibile conoscenza da parte di Callimaco del testo omerico di Zenodoto, sulla base di testimonianze costituite da alcuni casi in cui il testo

<sup>1</sup> Su questo aspetto resta fondamentale la sintesi di PFEIFFER, *Storia*, 207-231 (=123-140); cfr. BLUM, *Kallimachos*.

omerico presupposto dal poeta nella sua versificazione si accorda in modo particolare e univoco con quello scelto da Zenodoto<sup>2</sup>. Data anche la vicinanza cronologica (Zenodoto visse tra il 330 e il 260 circa), la questione è di assoluta rilevanza e si capisce bene la cautela mostrata da Pfeiffer. In seguito, tuttavia, credo che l'approfondita e documentata ricerca di A. Rengakos abbia raggiunto il risultato di provare (almeno con grande probabilità) che Callimaco e Apollonio Rodio abbiano effettivamente conosciuto il testo omerico di Zenodoto e lo abbiano talvolta anche presupposto e *utilizzato* nel loro fare poesia, riprendendolo allusivamente in alcuni luoghi<sup>3</sup>. È senz'altro un fatto importante, che indica come l'attività filologica di un grammatico<sup>4</sup> abbia in qualche modo influenzato la prassi poetica di due eminenti poeti-grammatici.

Il discorso coinvolge la tematica relativa alla forma in cui si presentavano le edizioni alessandrine, cioè che cosa era effettivamente l'*ekdosis zenodotea*, sia dal punto di vista materiale e librario, sia dal punto di vista dei contenuti filologici, implicando anche il problema del metodo e delle fonti delle lezioni di Zenodoto, basate o meno sull'utilizzazione e sulla collazione di diversi esemplari. Mi sono occupato di recente di tali questioni e, senza riprendere qui gli elementi e la bibliografia di un dibattito ultimamente piuttosto ricco, riassumo i risultati ai quali ritengo di essere pervenuto<sup>5</sup>.

Come procedeva e cosa faceva esattamente un grammatico alessandrino che voleva produrre una *ekdosis* di Omero? Una

<sup>2</sup> PFEIFFER, *Callim.*, ad fr.12,6 + *addenda* con i rimandi (cui aggiungi fr.633 e fr.497 + *addenda*); *Storia*, 229-230 (=139-140); cfr. ERBSE 1953.

<sup>3</sup> RENGAKOS 1993, 169: "Beide Dichter, *Kallimachos und Apollonios*, haben Zenodots Text nicht nur gekannt, sondern auch in ihren Dichtungen *benutzt*"; cfr. MONTANARI 1995, 53-54; RENGAKOS 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Un grammatico che, se davvero fu anche poeta, certamente non lo fu di grande rilievo: le sole indicazioni in questo senso vengono dall'articolo della *Suda* (Z 74: ἐποποιὸς καὶ γραμματικός) e dall'esistenza di tre epigrammi a lui attribuiti, ma di dubbia paternità (cfr. *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, ed. by A.S.F. GOW and D.L. PAGE [Cambridge 1965], II 557-559).

<sup>5</sup> MONTANARI 1998 e MONTANARI 2000 (con la bibliografia citata); cfr. anche JANKO 1998, NAGY 1998, MATTHAIOS 1999, NAGY 2000, NARDELLI 2001,

possibilità è che il risultato del suo lavoro fosse proprio una nuova copia continua recante il *suo* testo, l'intero testo riscritto come egli riteneva che fosse giusto e corretto: un'idea molto (troppo) vicina al concetto moderno di edizione. L'altra è che egli lavorasse su una copia già esistente, opportunamente scelta fra quelle a sua disposizione e tenuta come testo-base per fare i suoi interventi, dunque senza riscrivere un testo continuo e intero, ma scrivendo solo il necessario nelle parti disponibili, vale a dire margini, intercolumni e interlinei. In questo caso, si può immaginare facilmente che i segni critici venissero posti accanto ai versi in questa stessa copia: ma resta oggetto di dubbio definire se essa fosse corredata anche di annotazioni, in quale misura e con quali contenuti, insomma come e dove fossero scritte e conservate le vere e proprie lezioni volute dal filologo autore di una specifica *ekdosis*.

Questa seconda possibilità (cioè la copia annotata) sembra prevalere negli studi più recenti e anche a me pare la più verisimile. Zenodoto scelse una copia già esistente e la annotò via via con il procedere dei suoi studi e del suo lavoro di *diorthosis*. Su alcuni versi aveva dubbi di autenticità e accanto ad essi tracciò un *obelos*, il segno inventato per la proposta di atetesi. Più difficile è sempre stato capire come andavano le cose a proposito di quei versi che egli riteneva sicuramente spuri e dunque decisamente da eliminare dal testo: versi che comunque *dovevano essere presenti* nel suo testo-base. Mi pare che una buona indicazione su questo ci possa venire dal fatto che i papiri letterari ci testimoniano bene l'uso di diversi modi per cancellare qualcosa presente in un testo: sulle parole o le lettere da eliminare si poteva tirare un tratto orizzontale o obliquo, oppure esse potevano essere contrassegnate da punti o da linee al di sopra o al di sotto, oppure ancora essere racchiuse entro una sorta di parentesi tonde in coppia<sup>6</sup>. Le cancellazioni di solito erano operate,

FÜHRER-SCHMIDT 2001; solo dopo gli *Entretiens* ho potuto vedere WEST 2001. Mi propongo di tornare fra breve sull'argomento in altra sede.

<sup>6</sup> TURNER-PARSONS 16, con rinvio a esempi nelle tavole; cfr. TURNER, *GP*, 93 e Pl. VIII (= 113 e tav. VIII).

quando era il caso, dal διορθωτής, che nella bottega di produzione libraria aveva il compito di rileggere e correggere, spesso confrontando la copia con il modello (di fatto, un confronto di esemplari). La più nobile pratica scrittoria della produzione libraria indicava quindi a Zenodoto modi di procedere a ‘cancellazioni’, che egli poteva benissimo trasferire alla sua particolare διόρθωσις, la διόρθωσις del filologo invece che quella del correttore del lavoro di uno scriba<sup>7</sup>. Così la copia usata dal filologo come testo-base presentava, durante e dopo il suo lavoro, sia versi contrassegnati con *obelos* che versi decisamente ‘cancellati’ con qualcuno dei mezzi suddetti: accanto a questi ultimi, Zenodoto poteva benissimo annotare qualcosa come οὐ γράφειν o altro termine equipollente<sup>8</sup>; oppure affidarsi al solo segno di cancellazione senza annotazioni ‘verbali’, nel qual caso la terminologia per l’eliminazione di versi (οὐ γράφειν, οὐκ εἶναι, οὐ φέρεσθαι)<sup>9</sup> può essere stata riportata da chi seguì il suo insegnamento al Museo o anche essere stata creata dalla tradizione successiva per descrivere i suoi interventi.

A questa ricostruzione si possono fare alcune obiezioni. La prima è: cosa succedeva quando una proposta di atetesi o ancora di più una cancellazione comportavano di necessità cambiamenti nel testo restante perché esso fosse leggibile? Risposta: non vedo difficoltà a pensare che Zenodoto potesse scrivere il testo alternativo in margine, accanto al verso interessato, prima e/o dopo la parte atetizzata o cancellata<sup>10</sup>. Un’altra è: come mai nella tradizione scolastica per le eliminazioni di Zenodoto troviamo

<sup>7</sup> Cfr. LUDWICH, *AHT* II 134; NICKAU 1977, 10 sg.

<sup>8</sup> I verbi περιγράφω e διαγράφω sono termini tecnici per ‘cancellare’ con i mezzi materiali di cui sopra: cfr. TURNER-PARSONS 16; alcuni esempi sono rimasti negli scoli: per περιγράφω cfr. NICKAU 1977, 10-12 e 29.

<sup>9</sup> Cfr. NICKAU 1977, 1-30; NICKAU 1972, 29 sgg.

<sup>10</sup> Il caso dei vv. B 156-168 è emblematico: cfr. *schol. ad B* 156-169. Se la sua copia conteneva tutto questo passo e Zenodoto voleva eliminare i vv. 157-168, allora egli doveva per forza adottare per il v. 156 un testo diverso da quello che introduce 157 sgg.: accanto al v. 156 che trovava nella sua copia, cioè εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναῖν “Ἡρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν, poteva benissimo scrivere nel margine il testo da lui voluto per il v. 156 in seguito alla cancellazione di 157-168, cioè εἰ μὴ

anche l'uso di οὐκ εἴναι, se i versi eliminati c'erano nella sua copia, cioè erano visibilmente cancellati ma presenti? La spiegazione più semplice è che questa sia una maniera semplificata (e imprecisa) di descrivere l'intervento, probabilmente utilizzata ben più tardi e senza una precisa cognizione dei fatti: la terminologia fornita dagli scoli per gli interventi zenodotei pone problemi con qualsiasi ricostruzione, il che non può stupire troppo<sup>11</sup>. Una terza è: come può accadere che si trovino interventi testuali per versi eliminati e dunque cancellati? Risposta: e perché no? Caso mai, si deve pensare proprio al fatto che i versi eliminati erano nel testo-base e in qualche modo vi restavano anche se appunto 'cancellati': di conseguenza, potevano essere oggetto di attenzione o esserlo stati in un primo tempo (soprattutto pensando a un lavoro svolto su una copia pre-esistente, che recava i versi 'indesiderabili' per Zenodoto); potevano anche esserci ripensamenti, l'idea della eliminazione essere adottata in un secondo momento, dopo che si era pensato a un intervento esegetico su uno dei versi poi cancellati<sup>12</sup>. Bisogna pensare a un lavoro protrattosi nel tempo, la stessa copia utilizzata durante tutto il periodo di attività del filologo per i suoi studi omerici. Mi sembra, insomma, che questa idea spieghi in modo plausibile quello che sappiamo della filologia di Zenodoto, compreso il problema della differenza materiale 'libraria' fra i versi atetizzati (*obelos*) e i versi eliminati (οὐ γράφειν), senza comportare al momento obiezioni forti.

A proposito del metodo filologico degli alessandrini, in relazione al dibattuto problema se le loro lezioni fossero soltanto congetture basate su opinioni e gusti personali oppure avessero

Αθηναίη λαοσσός ξλθ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου. Cfr. LUDWICH, AHT II 134; NICKAU 1972, 30; NICKAU 1977, 6 sgg.

<sup>11</sup> Cfr. sopra e n.9; vd. anche MONTANARI 1988 (SGLG 7), partic. 83 sgg. e 95 sgg.

<sup>12</sup> Ancora il passo B 156-168 (v. n.10) ci offre un buon esempio: lo *sch.* B 161<sub>a</sub> ci informa di una variante zenodotea a B 161, anche se dallo *schol.* B 156-169 sappiamo che Zenodoto eliminava i vv.157-168: entrambi gli scoli risalgono a Aristonico, che evidentemente non si stupiva. Su questo problema cfr. NICKAU 1977, 6 sgg.

una fonte documentaria in esemplari omerici collazionati, ripeto qui brevemente che condivido del tutto l'idea che le due posizioni estreme (solo congetture autoschediastiche oppure solo fonti documentarie collazionate) siano entrambe da respingere, essendo ben più verisimile che ci fosse nel lavoro dei filologi alessandrini sia la critica congetturale che l'uso di materiale documentario proveniente dalla collazione di copie e dalla conseguente osservazione di varianti<sup>13</sup>. Naturalmente, con le testimonianze in nostro possesso sarà difficile distinguere di volta in volta se una lezione è congettura personale oppure ha una base documentaria, se non ricorrendo a ipotesi e deduzioni più o meno fondate e affidabili.

Questo modo di lavorare nel suo complesso (che non intende e non comporta una anacronistica assimilazione del grammatico antico al filologo moderno) fu applicato da Zenodoto e la sua *ekdosis* omerica ne fu il primo risultato sistematico, anche materialmente visibile e consultabile nell'ambiente dei dotti alessandrini. Una novità significativa e una acquisizione intellettuallamente e culturalmente importante: si può ben capire dunque che essa abbia influenzato poeti eruditi come Callimaco e Apollonio Rodio, che sicuramente ne furono a conoscenza. Pensando alle loro riflessioni di poeti-filologi, il fatto di avere a disposizione la copia omerica annotata da Zenodoto risulta un elemento per nulla secondario del quadro culturale e un supporto certamente utile.

#### *Gli inizi della filologia su Callimaco (e su altri poeti ellenistici)*

Qualche anno fa ho cercato di far emergere gli elementi per cui, a mio avviso, si può ritenere che l'attività filologica dei grammatici alessandrini sui maggiori poeti del primo periodo

<sup>13</sup> Sintesi recente in NARDELLI 2001, 51-70 e in FÜHRER-SCHMIDT 2001, 3-8; diversa la posizione di WEST 2001, 33-45, 54-56 (cfr. sopra n.5).

ellenistico non sia iniziata nel I sec. a.C. con Asclepiade di Mirlea<sup>14</sup> e Artemidoro (il padre di Teone), per realizzarsi soltanto con i commentari di Teone in età augustea, ma avesse mosso i primi passi qualche generazione prima e avesse conosciuto un considerevole sviluppo già ai tempi di Aristarco e dei suoi immediati discepoli. Sostenevo che, se in età augustea i poeti ellenistici erano evidentemente diventati un comune terreno di lavoro filologico, tuttavia la storia della loro esegezi doveva essere cominciata già da qualche tempo, ancora ben dentro l'età ellenistica. Non si dovette aspettare fino all'epoca di Teone perché l'esperienza sul passato, cioè sui prodotti della grande produzione letteraria prearistotelica, fosse trasferita pienamente anche sulla poesia del primo periodo alessandrino, iniziando il processo per cui i suoi autori sarebbero entrati nel novero dei *πραττόμενοι*, cioè 'trattati' dai grammatici<sup>15</sup>.

Una parte consistente di quel lavoro era dedicata ad analizzare alcune citazioni di Callimaco nella scoliografia omerica e il loro impiego come materiale di commento a Omero. Avanzavo l'ipotesi che l'uso abbondante di Callimaco nella filologia omerica (sia come testimonianza per la costituzione del testo, sia come parallelo e supporto per l'interpretazione), specialmente considerando le caratteristiche talvolta 'impegnative' per l'analisi del passo callimacheo chiamato in causa, costituisca un valido indizio di un lavoro su Callimaco stesso come autonomo oggetto di studio: che si tratti insomma di resti (per quanto ridotti) delle prime fasi della filologia callimachea (per limitata che fosse) e di un interesse attivo per la poesia ellenistica da parte dei grammatici alessandrini anteriori al I sec. a.C. (segnatamente Aristarco e il suo *entourage*). Grosso modo tra la fine del III e la prima metà del II sec. a.C. (cioè fra gli ultimi tempi di Aristofane di Bisanzio e il fiorire del lavoro di Aristarco) devono essersi via via affacciati l'idea e l'orientamento per cui ci si doveva occupare in qualche modo anche dei 'moderni', vale a dire delle più

<sup>14</sup> Cfr. *infra* e n.61.

<sup>15</sup> MONTANARI 1995.

significative figure di poeti del periodo ellenistico. Che le testimonianze dirette anteriori all'età augustea non siano abbondanti, non è davvero difficile da spiegare: in generale, i frammenti papiracei di *hypomnemata* o di altri prodotti eruditi databili all'età tolemaica sono complessivamente assai scarsi rispetto a quelli di età imperiale; e peraltro di per sé la produzione filologico-grammaticale sui poeti ellenistici non sarà certo diventata subito copiosa. Ma riflettendo bene, non è comunque più verisimile che l'abbondanza dei commentari a poeti ellenistici scritti da Teone in età augustea non sia un punto di partenza bensì, in un certo senso, un punto di arrivo? Punto di arrivo, naturalmente, di una prima fase della filologia sui poeti ellenistici, che ha portato da interventi critico-esegetici relativamente limitati e desultori fino a includere i 'moderni', come dicevamo sopra, nel quadro degli autori trattati dai grammatici. All'epoca di Teone, la filologia mostra di essersi ormai definitivamente impadronita del segmento di storia letteraria rappresentato dalla poesia dell'età ellenistica: mi sembra difficile pensare che questo fatto rappresenti una fase ancora relativamente iniziale<sup>16</sup>.

L'argomento porta inoltre ad aggiungere una considerazione sui progressi del lavoro filologico alessandrino sulle opere in prosa degli storici e degli oratori. Per Demostene, abbiamo una scoliografia povera di fronte alla testimonianza di un assai considerevole *hypomnema* di Didimo conservato su papiro e frammenti di altri *hypomnemata*. La consistenza della scoliografia questa volta ci trae in inganno, Demostene fu riccamente commentato almeno a partire dall'età augustea: sembra difficile che gli *hypomnemata* di Didimo sugli oratori<sup>17</sup> fossero senza precedenti e abbiano rappresentato la prima prova significativa della

<sup>16</sup> A. Harder mi ha ricordato le acute osservazioni di CAMERON 1995, 229-232, a proposito dell'esegesi callimachea; cfr. *infra*, nn. 44, 46 e 66. Per Apollonio Rodio cfr. *infra*.

<sup>17</sup> Oltre a Demostene, Eschine, Iperide, Iseo; forse anche Isocrate e Dinarco: cfr. *Didymi Chalcenteri Grammatici Alexandrini Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, coll. M. SCHMIDT (Lipsiae 1854). Per Demostene: M.J. LOSSAU, *Untersuchungen*

filologia sulla grande oratoria. Per quanto riguarda gli storici, ricordiamo che la scoliografia erodotea ci dice pochissimo e se non avessimo avuto il caso fortunato del piccolo frammento *PAmh. 12*, del III sec. d.C., con la sottoscrizione “hypomnema di Aristarco al libro I di Erodoto”,<sup>18</sup> non sapremmo che lo stesso Aristarco scrisse un commentario apposito sullo storico. Pfeiffer si esprime con cautela sul fatto che Aristarco abbia commentato anche Tucidide, ma è fiducioso sull'esistenza di studi tucididei prima di Didimo<sup>19</sup>. Considerando dunque da una parte i prosatori (storici e oratori) e dall'altra i poeti ellenistici, appare chiaro come nei tre secoli fra Zenodoto e l'età augustea (con personaggi come Didimo, Aristonico, Teone e altri) l'attività filologico-eseggetica sia arrivata a un raggio così vasto di interessi, da coprire praticamente tutti gli aspetti principali della letteratura greca arcaica, classica ed ellenistica. L'ampliamento dell'orizzonte fino a queste dimensioni deve essere maturato fra Aristofane di Bisanzio e Aristarco, per consolidarsi, nell'arco del II sec. a.C., con quest'ultimo e i suoi discepoli. L'idea di studiare i testi poetici del passato, di conservare e interpretare con sofisticati strumenti critici e intellettuali i monumenti di una *pαιδεία* venerata e codificata nella sua autorevolezza, era evidentemente diventata, nella consapevolezza dei suoi esponenti, un metodo abbastanza sicuro ed evoluto da essere applicabile e applicato a quanto era da considerarsi letteratura importante, arte della parola. Dalla novità dell'*ekdosis* di Zenodoto al maturo lavoro delle edizioni e degli scritti esegetici di Aristarco, dedicarsi

*zur antiken Demosthenesexegese* (Berlin-Zürich 1964); *Didymi in Demosthenem Commenta*, ediderunt L. PEARSON – S. STEPHENS (Stuttgart 1983).

<sup>18</sup> Cfr. A.H.R.E. PAAP, *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis* (Leiden 1948), 37-40; PFEIFFER, *Storia*, 348-350 (=224-225). Il testo del papiro è riprodotto in apparato nell'edizione teubneriana di H.B. ROSÉN, I 135-136.

<sup>19</sup> PFEIFFER, *Storia*, 348-350, 419-420 (= 224-225, 277-278); MONTANARI 1993, 247-249, 272; MAEHLER 1994, 121-124. La definizione di Dionisio Trace della *grammatikè* come *empeiria* delle opere di poeti e prosatori (*Techne* 1, definizione sicuramente autentica: cfr. da ultimo SCHENKEVELD 1994) significa che con la generazione immediatamente dopo Aristarco era normale parlare di lavoro filologico-grammaticale anche sulle opere in prosa.

alla filologia, all'interpretazione e allo studio erudito dei testi letterari era entrato nello spirito del tempo e nella formazione culturale degli intellettuali. Rovesciando il punto di vista, ci sarebbe forse da stupirsi che un filologo come Aristarco non provasse interesse e non si occupasse di poeti come Callimaco o Apollonio Rodio (anche indipendentemente dalle preferenze del suo gusto)<sup>20</sup>.

Alcuni indizi assai problematici vanno presi in considerazione ancora. Una notizia dell'*Etymologicum Genuinum* ci parla di un personaggio di nome “Edilo” che avrebbe scritto un’opera sugli *Epigrammi* di Callimaco: è una pura ipotesi che questo Edilo possa essere Edilo di Samo, poeta di epigrammi addirittura contemporaneo di Callimaco, e non un altrimenti ignoto grammatico di età posteriore, per cui possiamo solo sperare in nuovi dati che possano dirimere il dubbio<sup>21</sup>.

Una parte della voce riguardante la differenza di significato fra ὀλίγος e μικρός nei lessici sinonimici di Ammonio e di Erennio Filone<sup>22</sup> presenta un irrisolto problema di costituzione e comprensione del testo, che ci può riguardare<sup>23</sup>:

Amm. 352 Nickau: Ἀριστόνικος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τέκναλεσ' ἐπὶ στοιχείουτ 'ὀλίγην νησῖδα Καλυψοῦς' (Call. fr.470 b Pf.).

Herenn. Phil. 132 p.202 Palmieri: οὕτω Νικίας (loc. ign.) ἐν Υπομνήματι Ἐκάλης ἐπὶ στίχου — — — ὀλίγην τε παρέκ νησῖδα — — — (Call. fr.470 b Pf.).

In primo luogo, i due lessici si differenziano per il nome che introduce la citazione, Ἀριστόνικος oppure οὕτω Νικίας, mentre

<sup>20</sup> Richard Hunter ha sottolineato il problema posto dal passo di QUINT. 10, 1,54: cfr. la discussione.

<sup>21</sup> *Etym. Gen.* 551 = *Etym.M.* 960 (72,12 Gaisford) ἀλυτάρχης (vol. I 342-343 Lasserre-Livadaras) = CALL. T 45, ap. PFEIFFER, *Callim.*, II p.CII: Ἡδύλος δὲ εἰς τὰ Ἐπιγράμματα Καλλιμάχου; cfr. PARSONS 1977, *Callim.*, 5.

<sup>22</sup> *Ammonii qui dicitur liber de adfinium vocabulorum differentia*, ed. K. NICKAU (Lipsiae 1966); Herennius Philo. *De diversis verborum significationibus*, a cura di V. PALMIERI (Napoli 1988).

<sup>23</sup> Me lo ha ricordato Luigi Lehnus durante gli *Entretiens*.

concordano per ἐν ὑπομνήματι. Quanto segue, rimane piuttosto misterioso. In Ammonio, Nickau lascia fra *cruces* quello che danno (concordemente) i manoscritti prima del frustulo poetico. In Erennio Filone, Palmieri accetta una congettura di Valckenaer, che per primo attribuì il frammento a Callimaco e per di più introdusse la menzione dell'*Ecale* come opera da cui sarebbe tratta la citazione: la prima cosa è stata accettata dagli studiosi, la seconda invece respinta a favore di una possibile collocazione negli *Aitia*, e il testo accolto da Palmieri risulta piuttosto imprudente. Poiché la locuzione ἐν ὑπομνήματι è tramandata concordemente, non c'è motivo di dubitare che qui si parli di un commentario: ma rimane assolutamente in dubbio se esso fosse di Aristonico o di Nicia e se riguardasse Omero oppure Callimaco<sup>24</sup>. Un commentario callimacheo di Aristonico non è altrimenti attestato; Nicia dovrebbe essere il grammatico<sup>25</sup> citato più volte negli scoli omerici e vissuto probabilmente nel I sec. a.C.<sup>26</sup> Per entrambi, l'esegesi omerica sarebbe la cosa più ovvia, stando alla documentazione che abbiamo: certo un riferimento a Callimaco è possibile, in relazione all'uso di δλίγος nel senso di μικρός nel verso citato. Nel caso di Aristonico, avremmo un buon parallelo cronologico per il lavoro di Teone, che confermerebbe lo spazio già ben acquisito dalla filologia callimachea; nel caso di Nicia, potremmo forse collocarci un poco prima: ma anche la cronologia di questo grammatico è dubbia. Tutto è

<sup>24</sup> Cfr. PFEIFFER, *Callim.*, ad fr.470 (sulla scia di Schneider, ipotizza che il riferimento fosse al commentario omerico di Aristonico, in cui sarebbe stato citato il verso di Callimaco); esaustive informazioni in MASSIMILLA 1996, fr.120, p.160 e comm. a pp.451-452; BENEDETTO 1993, 72-76.

<sup>25</sup> Lehnus avanza la possibilità che si tratt di Nicia di Mileto, amico di Teocrito e poeta a sua volta (nr.24 in *RE* XVII 1 [1936], 335-336; nr.4 in *NP* 8 [2000], 914), il che ci porterebbe nettamente più indietro, alla stessa epoca di Edilo.

<sup>26</sup> Nr. 29 in *RE* XVII 1, 337; nr. 9 in *NP* 8, 915 sg., con bibliografia; cfr. MASSIMILLA 1996, 451. Temo che il Nicia citato in *schol. ad HOM. Od.* 23,218 non sia questo grammatico, anche perché sembra proprio che lo scolio recante la sottoscrizione ή ἴστορια παρὸν Νικίᾳ τῷ πρώτῳ non c'entri nulla con il problema dell'autenticità dei versi 218-224: su questo *NP* dipende direttamente da *RE*, che riprende un'attribuzione di J. TOLKIEHN; cfr. *FGrHist* 60.

estremamente incerto e anche questa notizia, allo stato attuale, mi sembra difficilmente utilizzabile.

Infine, negli scoli a Nicandro si trova citato alcune volte un grammatico di nome Demetrio Cloro, autore di un *hypomnema* nicandreo: l'opinione comune è che egli sia anteriore a Didimo di almeno una generazione, ma la datazione è ipotetica e quindi non possiamo fare molto conto neppure su questo<sup>27</sup>.

La mia proposta di retrodatazione degli inizi del lavoro erudito degli alessandrini sui grandi poeti del primo ellenismo è stata discussa in un articolo recente da A. Rengakos, con grande competenza e acribia, facendo un passo avanti nella discussione di questa tematica<sup>28</sup>. Mi pare che Rengakos condivida senz'altro (e anzi corrobori in modo importante, come vedremo subito) il risultato essenziale dell'indagine a proposito dell'interesse filologico alessandrino, in età aristarchea, per i poeti ellenistici, in primo luogo Callimaco. In conclusione tuttavia esprime un orientamento un pò diverso nella valutazione storico-culturale del fenomeno: e su questo mi pare utile tornare e riflettere ancora e aggiungere altre considerazioni, in un dibattito il cui progresso deve molto al suo intervento.

Al sondaggio da me fatto analizzando soltanto alcuni esempi callimachei significativi, Rengakos aggiunge una serie di altri casi in cui nella scoliografia omerica si trovano riferimenti di fonte aristarchea a Callimaco, Antimaco<sup>29</sup> e Euforione (i due poeti più citati dopo Callimaco, di gran lunga il più presente), distinguendo le occasioni in cui il passo di un poeta ellenistico è addotto in relazione alla costituzione del testo omerico, da quelle in cui esso è utilizzato nel contesto di una discussione sul significato di una espressione omerica<sup>30</sup>. Qualche caso interessante

<sup>27</sup> Cfr. SUSEMHL, II 20; W. KROLL, "Nikandros", nr.11, in *RE* XVII 1 (1936), 262; ID., "Demetrios", nr.100 a, in *RE Suppl.-Bd.* VII (1940), 124; F. MONTANARI, "Demetrios Chloros" [36], in *NP* 3 (1997), 439 (con bibliografia).

<sup>28</sup> RENGAKOS 2000.

<sup>29</sup> "For the purposes of this paper I will consider him a Hellenistic poet": RENGAKOS 2000, 326; SCHIRONI 1999.

<sup>30</sup> RENGAKOS 2000, 328, ricorda anche *Od.* 2,136-137, dove l'atetesi aristarchea del v.137 lascia nel v.136 una frase nominale per la quale viene citato il paral-

egli trova anche in Aristofane di Bisanzio e nell'aristarcheo Apollodoro.<sup>31</sup> Il risultato concreto è un incremento considerevole del gruzzolo evidenziato di osservazioni di filologi alessandrini sui poeti ellenistici. Ma cosa significa questo fenomeno?

Rengakos dichiara: "My main objective is to raise again the question whether Aristarchus did take an interest in the Hellenistic poets *per se* or whether he used their work merely as a tool in his interpretation of Homer" (p.326). E più avanti: "The fact that Aristarchus' criticism in the field of language but also of *Realien* adheres exclusively to Homer combined with his habit to regard Hellenistic poetry quasi as a part of the indirect Homeric tradition and use it for the constitution of the Homeric text shows that he did not grant the right to these poets 'to be as unhomeric as possible while being in Homer's tracks'<sup>32</sup>... this means that he had apparently no sense of the individuality of Hellenistic poetry" (p.331). Infine la conclusione: "Long before the heyday of Hellenistic studies in the 1st cent. B.C.... Hellenistic poets, from Lycophron, Callimachus and Apollonius to Euphorion and Nicander, were studied by professional Alexandrian scholars, esp. by Aristarchus, and used in their learned work on Homer. The Hellenistic *poetae docti* are regarded as a sub-group of the infamous *neoteroi*, who in the interpretation of Homer served only as means to distinguish what is Homeric from what is post-Homeric. The works of these poets were of particular value to the Alexandrian scholars who recognized the affinity of these works to the Homeric epics and thus used them as evidence for the constitution of the Homeric text. But this one-sided attitude of the Alexandrian scholars, as is apparent in particular from Aristarchus and Apollodorus, means that they did not appreciate the special character of the Hellenistic poets. This may also have been the reason why these poets were not

lelo di CALL. fr.637 (MONTANARI 1979 = 1995). Bisogna aggiungere il brillante risultato di PONTANI 1999, che nello *schol.* ad *Od.* 2,50 ha acutamente reperito il primo verso degli *Aitia* usato come parallelo stilistico-sintattico per Omero.

<sup>31</sup> RENGAKOS 2000, 333-334.

<sup>32</sup> Riprende qui una frase di H. Herter; cfr. sotto per Apollonio Rodio.

recognized in the 2nd cent. B.C. as an object of scholarship in their own right" (p.334).

Rengakos esprime con chiarezza e precisione la sua visione, che in sostanza è la seguente: i grammatici alessandrini, specialmente Aristarco, si interessarono effettivamente dei poeti ellenistici e li studiarono, ma soltanto in funzione strumentale per la filologia omerica e senza riconoscere loro un proprio autonomo valore come oggetto di studio eruditio. Questa idea non mi pare del tutto convincente e vedo alcune debolezze negli argomenti sui quali appoggia, che cercherò di mettere in luce.

Non c'è dubbio che il punto di partenza fosse normalmente Omero e che molta parte del lavoro filologico nascesse da oppure arrivasse a un problema di costituzione del testo o di interpretazione omerica: Omero era la base irrinunciabile dell'educazione e il banco di prova comune del lavoro dei grammatici. Ma ciò non significa certo che tutto si facesse in funzione soltanto di Omero e che ogni altro autore servisse e fosse oggetto di attenzione solo in quanto strumento e testimonianza per distinguere quanto è omerico da quanto è postomerico. Questa nozione storico-letteraria (riguardante lingua, stile, contenuti, *Realien*) era sicuramente l'obiettivo principale della *scholarship* e un cardine dei suoi ragionamenti, ma il suo risultato non doveva certo essere che solo τὸ Ὀμηρικόν fosse interessante come oggetto autonomo di studio e che tutto il resto avesse un valore puramente ancillare.

Certamente i *poetae docti* ellenistici erano considerati come un gruppo di *neoteroi*, ma sembra difficile sostenere che questo implicasse assolutamente che fossero indegni di interesse *per se stessi*. La qualifica di νεώτερος è utilizzata per gran parte dei (forse praticamente per tutti i) maggiori poeti posteriori a Omero, a cominciare da Esiodo, per proseguire con Archiloco, Pindaro, Sofocle e altri, fino agli ellenistici, tutti spesso utilizzati per confronto con passi omerici<sup>33</sup>. Dovremmo applicare lo

<sup>33</sup> Cfr. SEVERYNS, *Cycle*, 31-61. Per fare qualche esempio significativo: per Pindaro cfr. *POxy* 1086 ad *Il.* 2,783 (ERBSE, *Sch.*, I 168); per Sofocle *schol. A ad Il.* 23,679a (ERBSE, *Sch.*, V 471).

stesso ragionamento a tutti questi autori e vederli come oggetto di studio gregario, finalizzato solo a Omero? Mi pare invece che, se Omero doveva essere comunque il punto di partenza e/o di arrivo dell'argomentare filologico, non si possa affatto dedurne l'assenza di un interesse reale e autonomo anche per il poeta chiamato a confronto o utilizzato come parallelo, diverso e distinto in sequenza storica<sup>34</sup>. Molti studiosi arrivano a occuparsi di un autore essendo partiti da un altro (magari sempre dallo stesso), ma qui entriamo in distinzioni sottili, che riguardano i percorsi intellettuali della ricerca e la ricostruzione della vita scientifica di ognuno. È possibile, anzi probabile, che Aristarco sia arrivato a Callimaco solo secondariamente rispetto ai suoi studi su Omero: ma certo studiò anche Callimaco, e mi pare difficile dire se lo fece con maggiore o minore passione e convinzione rispetto a uno qualunque dei poeti postomerici e pre aristotelici, cui si dedicò con risultati ben noti.

L'altro aspetto da chiamare in causa è quello delle fonti delle nostre informazioni. Le fonti utilizzate sono sostanzialmente e con grande prevalenza gli scoli omerici, il che significa comunque una fonte orientata in partenza su Omero. Inoltre, l'epitomazione e selezione del materiale esegetico pervenuto attraverso la scoliografia deve avere accentuato questo aspetto, sopprimendo o riducendo di preferenza, nei commenti omerici, i materiali meno strettamente omerici, quali discussioni più o meno ampie e approfondite su passi paralleli presi da altri autori o *excursus* eruditi di vario contenuto<sup>35</sup>. Se altri *corpora* scolio-grafici non offrono attualmente materiale altrettanto interessante a proposito dell'uso dei poeti ellenistici da parte di Aristarco<sup>36</sup>, questo può indicare diverse cose: 1) l'esegesi omerica era effettivamente la più ricca nell'antichità ed è anche la più riccamente conservata, dunque è naturale che dia più materiali anche per

<sup>34</sup> Fatte salve naturalmente preferenze e predilezioni: fra i poeti ellenistici, l'apprezzamento per Callimaco si profila chiaramente.

<sup>35</sup> Cfr. sotto l'esempio dagli scoli ad Arato.

<sup>36</sup> RENGAKOS 2000, 326.

questo aspetto (come per molti altri); 2) gli altri poeti offrivano sicuramente meno occasioni di confronto e parallelo; 3) della filologia antica abbiamo perso moltissimo, per cui è molto facile che pochi indizi rivelino un fenomeno assai più cospicuo. Credo che valga la pena cercare altri dati e una piccola cosa faremo anche in questa occasione.

L'ultima considerazione riguarda la produzione di opere esegetiche specifiche sui poeti del primo ellenismo, che siano state sicuramente scritte prima della fine del II sec. a.C. Questa è già una limitazione molto forte, come già osservato sopra, perché sono veramente pochi i frammenti conservati di opere erudite su qualunque autore (incluso Omero) che siano anteriori a questa data. Tuttavia due esempi ci sono e mi pare giusto ribadire l'importanza di questi due reperti, la cui esistenza è un pilastro fondamentale per il ragionamento che stiamo facendo<sup>37</sup>. Ripeto qui solo le notizie essenziali.

Nel 1975 F. Lasserre pubblicò l'*editio princeps* del *PLouvre* inv. 7733 *verso*: due anni dopo il testo fu riconsiderato a fondo da P. Parsons e poi ripresentato nel *Suppl.Hell.*<sup>38</sup> Il frammento, datato al II sec. a.C., presenta sul *recto* un trattato di ottica<sup>39</sup> e sul *verso* un componimento di sei versi (un enigma, la cui risposta è: "un'ostrica"), seguito da un commento continuo di oltre cinquanta righe (forse più o meno completo). La poesia è

<sup>37</sup> Da questi prendevo le mosse in MONTANARI 1995, 49-52: mi pare che RENGAKOS 2000, 325, non dia loro il giusto rilievo: "Apart from some new papyrus finds documenting more or less learned commentaries on Hellenistic works which had appeared only a few decades ago we have no reports that the leading Alexandrian scholars worked on Hellenistic poetry": ma anche per Erodoto, ad esempio, non abbiamo nessuna informazione al di fuori del piccolo frustulo di papiro già ricordato (cfr. sopra e n.18).

<sup>38</sup> *Suppl.Hell.* 983-984, pp.497-500; F. LASSERRE, "L'élegie de l'huître (*PLouvre* inv. 7733 v° inéd.)", in *QUCC* 19 (1975), 145-176; M. MARCOVICH, "P.Louvre inv. 7733v", in *ZPE* 23 (1976), 219-220; PARSONS 1977, *Oyster*; DEL FABBRO, *Comm.*, 72-75; G.B. D'ALESSIO, "Aggiunte all' 'Ostrica'" (*Suppl.Hell.* 983, v.3)", in *ZPE* 81 (1990), 299-303; L. SBARDELLA (ed.), *Filita. Testimonianze e frammenti poetici*, SemRom., Quaderni 3 (Roma 2000), 179-184.

<sup>39</sup> Pack<sup>2</sup> 2579; il testo del *verso* era segnalato in Pack<sup>2</sup> 2911 come prosa non identificata.

senz'altro ellenistica, ma il nome dell'autore rimane ignoto<sup>40</sup>. Il commentatore cita il poeta Teodorida di Siracusa, attivo nella seconda metà del III sec. a.C., e il testo è stato copiato da una mano del II sec. a.C.: dunque l'autore deve aver scritto nel tardo III o comunque entro la metà del II sec. a.C.<sup>41</sup>, dunque entro la morte di Aristarco. Del componimento si ricostruiscono praticamente cinque versi su sei; del commento è probabile che non manchino molte righe: quelle conservate sono gravemente lacunose, ma quanto rimane è sufficiente per notare alcune caratteristiche. Data la brevità del componimento, è stato agevole per lo scriba riportare prima per intero l'opera commentata, con il suo titolo “*ὅστρειον*”, che viene ripetuto prima dell'inizio del commento. Benché il testo poetico sia comodamente a disposizione del lettore, il commento non rinuncia ad avere estesi lemmi (non si può dire con certezza se riportasse proprio tutto). Si affronta dapprima il problema dell'identificazione del luogo del sepolcro di Memnone e il discorso sembra essere: non Abido nella Tebaide egizia, dove non ci sono ostriche, bensì Abido nell'Ellesponto, che notoriamente ne produce. La seconda sezione (rr.25-29) spiega *ἀγροτέρη* come epiteto di Artemide e dunque qui equivalente a 'luna'; poi probabilmente collega a questo l'idea che le ostriche aumentino di dimensioni quando la luna cresce. Segue il commento al v.6, concentrato sul significato dell'aggettivo *ἀφέψαλος* sulla base di quello del suo componente *φέψαλος* (rr.30-39): qui si cita una commedia altrimenti ignota di Difilo, il *Παραλυόμενος*, di cui erano riportati probabilmente tre trimetri (fr.59, in *PCG V* 86), e un frammento di Sofocle (pure altrimenti ignoto, fr.966a Radt). L'ultima parte del commento (rr.41 sgg.) riguardava la frase finale del componimento, dalla dieresi bucolica del v.5 alla fine: il v.6 compare come lemma alla r.40. La prima questione era certamente il ricercato modo di indicare il coltello con cui si apre l'ostrica:

<sup>40</sup> Si è fatto il nome di Filita (cfr. bibliogr. alla n.38), ma senza un reale fondamento.

<sup>41</sup> PARSONS 1977, *Oyster*, 12.

l'amante di 'Doso', raro epiteto di Afrodite, è appunto Ares, cioè il ferro, cioè il coltello. Abbiamo qui la già ricordata citazione di Teodorida (fr.743 *Suppl.Hell.*), con ogni probabilità un parallelo per l'epiteto 'Doso'. Seguono parti troppo lacunose. Relativamente alle dimensioni del testo poetico, il commento appare di considerevole ampiezza: la varietà dei problemi e dei contenuti esegetici e l'utilizzazione di passi paralleli rivela un'opera di raggardevole erudizione, scritta su una poesia certamente di non molti decenni prima.

Nel 1977 C. Meillier diede l'*editio princeps* di alcuni frammenti papiracei conservati a Lille e contenenti versi della parte iniziale del III libro degli *Aitia* di Callimaco, inframmezzati da parti di commento: il testo fu studiato e riedito da P. Parsons e ripresentato infine nel *Suppl.Hell.*<sup>42</sup> La datazione del *P. Lille* ha oscillato fra la fine del III sec. a.C. e i primi decenni del II<sup>43</sup>. Il testo callimacheo è riportato per intero e ad intervalli irregolari si alterna con righe di commento rientrate di tre lettere. Nelle piccole e lacunose parti conservate, il commento per lo più consiste in glosse o parafrasi, ma non soltanto: occasionalmente esso offre anche qualche notizia di carattere storico oppure linguistico. A ragione A. Cameron ha osservato: "... the most significant feature of the Lille scholia is a detailed prosopographical note, an accurate explanation of the dynastic fiction whereby Berenice II, daughter of Magas and Apama, was officially styled the daughter of Philadelphus and Arsinoe"<sup>44</sup>: il riferimento

<sup>42</sup> C. MEILLIER, "Callimaque (P.L. 76 d, 78 a b c, 82, 84 et 111 c)", in *CRIPEL* 4 (1976), 261-286; PARSONS 1977, *Callim.*; *Suppl.Hell.* 254-265 (nuova edizione e ricostruzione, con altra bibliografia).

<sup>43</sup> Cfr. C. MEILLIER, *loc.cit.*; PARSONS 1977, *Callim.*, 4; G. CAVALLO, *Libri, scritture, scribi a Ercolano* (Napoli 1983), 53; TURNER-PARSONS, nr.74 e 75, pp.124-127.

<sup>44</sup> CAMERON 1995, 229 (cfr. nn.16, 46, 66), e prosegue: "An abbreviated version is to be found in the commentary to F 110.45 in the sixth- or seventh-century P. Oxy. 2258 (again in the hand of the text scribe). So this particular note in a late antique manuscript goes back 700 years to a text of the *Aetia* written barely a generation from Callimachus's death. For another prosopographical note, we have already considered the first-century London scholiast's identification of the 'tenth Muse' as Arsinoe (Ch. VI. 1), which, if correct, must also be early".

è alla nota che segue il v.2 del componimento (*Suppl. Hell.* 255) e può forse spingerci a vedere nei problemi prosopografici e dinastici dei regnanti un plausibile tema di interesse capace di stimolare l'esegesi callimachea più antica. Possiamo aggiungere che anche al v.9 l'estensione del commento sembra coprire diverse righe. Quanto rimane purtroppo non è molto e forse non fa molta impressione nello stato attuale: ma c'è da chiedersi che effetto facesse nella sua interezza e quanto contenesse degli *Aitia* una simile edizione. Dal poco superstite, non sembra un prodotto particolarmente erudito, piuttosto un lavoro volto ad aiutare la comprensione immediata, con notizie di base utilizzabili per così dire *inter legendum*, intercalate a un testo che si può leggere nella sua interezza. L'epoca è più o meno la stessa del commento all'*Ostrica*, ma qui abbiamo un testo esegetico — a quanto pare — con minori ambizioni: in questo caso, in compenso, è lecito dire con certezza che questa “edizione commentata”<sup>45</sup> di Callimaco fu ‘pubblicata’ in Egitto da un minimo di una a un massimo di due generazioni dopo la morte del poeta e ben prima della morte di Aristarco.

Possiamo permetterci di liquidare con sufficienza questi due testimoni sicuri di interpretazione specifica di poesia ellenistica per lo meno contemporanei di Aristarco, ritenendoli due casi sporadici e isolati, opere scarsamente significativi? Oppure dobbiamo pensare che la loro esistenza deve influenzare il modo con cui guardiamo gli indizi di lavoro sui poeti ellenistici già in età aristarchea?<sup>46</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Così la definivo in *Athenaeum* 54 (1976), 147; cfr. DEL FABBRO, *Comm.*, 70-71.

<sup>46</sup> CAMERON 1995, 229-230: “Even if there was no full-scale commentary before Theon, we now know that annotated texts existed from a very early date. The new Lille papyrus of *Aetia* III, written in the late third or early second century B.C., is already equipped with notes (interspersed among the lines of the text) in the hand of the text scribe. Most of them go no further than gloss and paraphrase, but that is immaterial. It is the existence rather than the nature of the commentary that matters. Many Byzantine scholia are no more substantial. We might in any case expect the notes on a contemporary text to be rather different from those on a classic”. Cameron ritiene che materiali degli *Scholia Florentina* risalgano a commenti più o meno contemporanei del poeta, che deve avere subito

### *Un'interpretazione aristarchea di Arato*

Arato rappresenta un caso relativamente particolare, perché le vicende della filologia sui *Fenomeni* dipendono in modo importante da problematiche di storia dell'astronomia, che possono avere percorsi anche distinti rispetto all'esegesi della poesia in senso stretto<sup>47</sup>. È caratteristico il fatto che il testo di Arato sia stato oggetto di cure esegetiche sia per gli aspetti propriamente scientifici che per quelli poetici e filologici: "The commentators on A(ratus) are of two kinds, grammarians and astronomers (μαθηματικοί), and sometimes both are involved in comment on the same topic, e.g. in sch. 23, were the former are dismissed as being ignorant of astronomy"<sup>48</sup>.

*Sch. ad Arat. Phaen. 23* (p.68,15-69,6 Martin) περὶ δ’οὐρανός *(αὐτὸν ἀγινεῖ)*<sup>49</sup>. πολλὴ καὶ διάφορος ἐνταῦθα ζήτησις περὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἐγένετο τοῖς μαθηματικοῖς καὶ γραμματικοῖς. οἱ μὲν γὰρ γραμματικοὶ ἀγνοήσαντες εἶπον· “περιάγει ὁ οὐρανὸς τὸν ἄξονα”. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο τῶν ἀτοπωτάτων. εἰ γὰρ ἀκίνητον αὐτὸν ἀπεδώκαμεν, [καὶ] αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀράτου ἀντικρυῖς εἰπόντος (21-22) “ἀλλὰ μάλ’ αὐτῶς / ἄξων αἰὲν ἀρηρεν”, πῶς αὐτὸν φασι περιάγεσθαι; ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν μαθηματικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸν δασύνουσιν, ἵν’ ἢ ἔαυτόν. ὁ δὲ λόγος· “περὶ δὲ τὸν ἄξονα ἄγει καὶ στρέφει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔαυτόν”. δύναται δὲ καὶ οὕτως ϕιλουμένου τοῦ αὐτόν, ἵν’ ἢ ὡς πρὸς τὰ προειρημένα· “περὶ δὲ τὸν ἄξονα αὐτὸν πάντα τὰ ἀστρα ό οὐρανὸς ἀγινεῖ (ὡς τὸ προειρημένον) καὶ περιφέρει”.

La discussione verte sul significato dell'emistichio περὶ δ’οὐρανός αὐτὸν ἀγινεῖ. Per i γραμματικοί la frase vorrebbe dire che il cielo porta in giro e fa muovere l'asse, quindi αὐτόν = l'asse.

stimolato il bisogno di spiegazioni per il suo carattere estremamente allusivo. Cfr. nn.16, 44, 46 e 66.

<sup>47</sup> Non ho nessuna competenza sull'astronomia antica; utilizzo: MARTIN, *Histoire*; MARTIN, Aratos; KIDD, Aratus.

<sup>48</sup> KIDD, Aratus, 44.

<sup>49</sup> Ho integrato il lemma.

Ma questo è impossibile, perché l'asse è immobile, come del resto ha detto Arato stesso pochi versi prima. I *μαθηματικοί* intendono allora *αὐτόν* aspirato col valore di *έαυτόν*, interpretando che il cielo muove se stesso (*έαυτόν*) = si muove e ruota intorno all'asse. Infine, viene aggiunta un'altra possibilità, di natura puramente esegetica: lasciando *αὐτόν* con lo spirito dolce e pensando a un oggetto sottinteso, il significato potrebbe essere che il cielo fa muovere, *scil.* tutte le stelle, intorno all'asse (*αὐτόν*), rispettando dunque la realtà astronomica e la coerenza interna del poeta. La prima interpretazione è attribuita ai *γραμματικοὶ ἀγνοήσαντες* e viene respinta dai *μαθηματικοί* sulla base sia evidentemente di una precisa nozione scientifica, sia di un confronto interno con Arato, che non può contraddirsi in pochi versi (un argomento di coerenza interna del poeta, che potrebbe andare benissimo anche per i *γραμματικοὶ*). Ad essa si contrappone non tanto un intervento testuale, quanto una lettura leggermente diversa (*αὐτόν* invece di *αὐτόν*) ma decisiva per il senso della frase: un ragionamento insomma di tipo esattamente 'grammaticale', che viene addotto dai *μαθηματικοί*. La terza possibilità è introdotta da *δύναται δὲ καὶ* e sembra una replica (senza indicazione di paternità neppure generica) all'intervento testuale dei *μαθηματικοί*, sostenendo che il significato da loro voluto è ottenibile anche soltanto su basi esclusivamente ermeneutiche, con una corretta interpretazione del passo. Per completare il quadro, aggiungiamo che esiste anche una lezione *οὐρανόν*, con la quale il soggetto sottinteso sarebbe l'asse: lezione che è presa in considerazione, parafrasata (*περιάγει, φησίν, ὁ ἄξων τὸν οὐρανὸν*) e criticata nell'altro scolio al verso<sup>50</sup>. Appare dunque una contrapposizione dichiarata fra *γραμματικοί* e *μαθηματικοί* per quanto riguarda la conoscenza dell'astronomia e il senso del passo di Arato, ma bisogna dire che sul piano del metodo non si vede una vera divergenza: si ricava piuttosto l'impressione che gli 'scienziati' applichino una filologia dotata di controllo serrato

<sup>50</sup> P.69,7-10 Martin, non riportato qui.

per i contenuti scientifici del testo, ma che non siano certo lontani da principi ermeneutici fondati sulla lingua, la grammatica, la correttezza delle lezioni testuali e la coerenza interna del poeta.

Il nucleo più antico del *corpus* degli scoli aratei pervenuti risale, a quanto pare, a un commentario di Teone, anche se, per vero dire, non sono fugati i dubbi che si tratti davvero del Teone di età augustea<sup>51</sup>. Molti elementi si aggiunsero a questi scoli nel corso della tradizione, ma cosa c'era stato prima di Teone, o comunque prima dell'età augustea? È imprudente fare riferimento a un'opera di Eratostene, o circolante sotto il suo nome anche se non sua: non ci sono indizi che egli abbia fatto un commentario, ma forse potrebbe avere scritto un trattato di astronomia poetico-letteraria per accompagnare e aiutare la lettura di Arato, con nozioni elementari di cosmografia e notizie sui miti relativi a trasformazioni in corpi celesti. Scrive D. Kidd: "By the second century BC the *Phaenomena* was already being read as if were an astronomical textbook, and the commentaries of Attalus and Hipparchus, especially the latter's, were written to explain and correct the poem from this point of view"<sup>52</sup>. Anche gli interessi di orientamento stoico sono ben documentati: alcune annotazioni aratee di Cratete di Mallo possono provenire dalle sue opere omeriche, mentre Zenodoto di Mallo<sup>53</sup> è possibile che abbia scritto un commentario su Arato e quello che sappiamo della sua opera fa pensare a contenuti filologici<sup>54</sup>; e poi Boeto di Sidone, che scrisse un commentario in almeno quattro libri<sup>55</sup>.

Negli scoli aratei il nome di Aristarco ricorre due volte e D. Kidd osserva che i suoi commenti furono probabilmente presi

<sup>51</sup> Cfr. MARTIN, *Histoire*; MARTIN, Aratos, pp.CXXVI-CXXX; KIDD, Aratus, 43-48; PFEIFFER, *Storia*, 203-204 n.90 (= 121 n.4); su questo problema di identificazione, cfr. da ultimo C. SCHIANO, "Teone e il Museo di Alessandria", in *QS* 55 (2002), 129-143, partic. 136-137.

<sup>52</sup> KIDD, Aratus, 45.

<sup>53</sup> Supposto allievo di Cratete, se lo era davvero.

<sup>54</sup> K. NICKAU, "Zenodotos" (4), in *RE X A* (1972), 45-47.

<sup>55</sup> KIDD, Aratus, 45-46.

dalle opere su Omero<sup>56</sup>. Questo può essere vero, ma i due casi sono abbastanza diversi fra loro da meritare una breve analisi e una riflessione.

Nello *schol.* ai vv.254-55 (p. 204,2-3 Martin), nel contesto di una discussione sul significato di ἐπιγουνίς del v.254, Aristarco è citato a proposito del significato del termine in Omero (τὸ ἄνω τοῦ γόνατος) e lo scolio adduce poi l'opinione del tutto differente di Cratete e quella del grammatico Chares. La parola ricorre in *Od.*17,225 e 18,74: in entrambi gli scoli omerici corrispondenti si trova un parallelo per il significato aristarcheo, anche se non ricorre il nome di Aristarco (*schol. ad* 17,225 τὸ ὑπεράνω τοῦ γόνατος; *schol. ad* 18,74 τὸν ἐπάνω τοῦ γόνατος τόπον), mentre non vi si trova alcun parallelo per l'interpretazione di Cratete. Assolutamente probabile dunque che la fonte dell'esegesi aristarchea presente in questo scolio ad Arato sia il commento omerico di Aristarco: e lo stesso può valere anche per il frammento di Cratete, di cui non è rimasta traccia negli scoli omerici, ma si ritrova adespoto in fonti lessicografiche<sup>57</sup>.

Nello *schol.* al v.28 invece è riportata una esegesi puntuale di Aristarco al verso di Arato, sulla quale vale la pena di soffermarsi. Dopo aver parlato dell'asse (cfr. sopra) e dei due poli, Arato comincia la descrizione delle costellazioni del nord con le due Orse o Carri, che ruotano intorno al polo nord (vv.26-44):

- 26 Δύω δέ μιν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσαι  
Ἄρκτοι ἀμα τροχόωσι· τὸ δὴ καλέονται Ἀμαξαι.  
28 αἱ δ' ἥτοι κεφαλὰς μὲν ἐπ' οἴξας αἰὲν ἔχουσιν  
ἀλλήλων.

*Schol. ad Arat. Phaen.*28 (p.78,9 Martin) αἱ δή τοι (*vel* δ' ἥτοι) κεφαλάς: ἐπὶ τὰς ἀλλήλων οἴξας τὰς κεφαλὰς ἔχουσι τετραμμένας, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτῶν, ὡς Ἀρίσταρχος ὁ γραμματικὸς φήθη, τὰς κεφαλὰς

<sup>56</sup> KIDD, Aratus, 45 (*Introd. VI b: Commentators*).

<sup>57</sup> Insieme alle altre, l'interpretazione di Cratete si ritrova, se pur anonima, in *Anecdota Graeca* e codd.mss.Bibl.Reg.Parisin. descr. L. BACHMANN (Leipzig 1818), I 228,35; *Etym.M.* 358,24 Gaisford; *Suda* ε 2269 (dove mancano anche i nomi di Aristarco e di Chares).

αὐτῶν πρὸς τὴν ἴδιαν ιἴξυν ἀποστρέφεσθαι, πάρα τὸ φαινόμενον. ὅρῶσι γὰρ εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλήλαις ἀνατετραμμέναι.

Secondo lo scolio, la frase *αἱ δὴ τοι κεφαλὰς μὲν ἐπ' ιἴξυας αἰὲν ἔχουσιν ἀλλήλων* significa che le due Orse hanno la testa rivolta l'una in direzione della groppa dell'altra, cioè la testa di ciascuna è allineata con il corpo dell'altra. Arato — prosegue lo scolio — non vuol dire che ciascuna Orsa guarda il proprio corpo, come credeva il grammatico Aristarco, secondo il quale le teste delle due Orse sarebbero rivolte ciascuna verso la propria groppa, il che è contrario a quanto si vede. Le Orse infatti, conclude lo scolio, guardano avanti (puntano sempre in direzioni opposte) e non sono rivolte all'indietro l'una verso l'altra<sup>58</sup>. A quanto pare, Aristarco viene rimproverato di avere trascurato il dato fenomenico osservabile, o comunque di averlo messo in secondo piano, rispetto a un'interpretazione filologica del testo che finisce con l'essere astratta e sbagliata: insomma, di essere stato solo un *γραμματικός* e non anche un *μαθηματικός*, secondo la stessa impostazione di ragionamento che abbiamo visto sopra.

Quale può essere la fonte di questa annotazione? Omero menziona soltanto l'Orsa maggiore, nominata nella descrizione dello scudo di Achille a *Il.* 18,487-489: tre versi che ricorrono uguali in *Od.* 5,273-275, quando Odisseo parte dall'isola di Calipso. Lo scolio di Aristonico a *Od.* 5,273 si limita a rimandare al passo dell'*Iliade*: *ὅτι καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι τὰ αὐτὰ περὶ τῆς Ἀρκτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων φησίν*. Purtroppo però negli *schol. ad Il.* 18,487-489 troviamo materiale vario, ma nessun resto di Aristonico. Al v.487abbiamo nel ms.A una nota di Erodiano a proposito dell'aspirazione di *ἄμαξα*, seguita da due *schol.* D: il primo parla dell'esistenza di due Orse, di cui la Minore non menzionata da Omero e scoperta da Talete; il secondo reca il breve racconto di una *ἱστορία* callimachea sul catasterismo della ninfa Callisto trasformata in Orsa Maggiore (fr.632 Pf.).

<sup>58</sup> MARTIN, Aratos, 159-160; KIDD, Aratus, 183.

A 18,488 i mss. bT offrono due *schol. ex.*, nel secondo dei quali (488 *b*, introdotto da ἄλλως) vengono citati tre passi di Arato, in un contesto in cui si parla dell'Orsa Minore, la Κυνόσουρα o Κυνοσουρίς.

*Schol. ad Il. 18,488 b (ex.):* ἄλλως· ή τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὁρίωνα δοκεύει ἄμα μὲν χαριέντως ὡς κυνηγόν, ἄμα δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν κίνησιν αὐτῷ ποιεῖται, ὡς πού φησιν ὁ Ἀρατος (*Phaen.* 226-7). “ὅς ῥά τε καὶ μήκιστα διωκόμενος περὶ κύκλων / οὐδὲν ἀφαυρότερον τροχάει Κυνοσουρίδος Ἀρκτου”. οὐκ ὀνομάζει δὲ τὴν ἄλλην, ἐπει τῶν ἔμφανεστέρων μέμνηται. τινὲς δέ τρασιν ἄκατι, ἵν’ ἥ “καὶ Κυνόσουρα”. αὕτη γάρ “μειοτέρη (...) πᾶσα περιστρέφεται στροφάλιγγι” (*Arat. Phaen.* 43). ἀλλὰ πρῶτα μὲν ἄμφω Ἀμαξαι ὀνομάζονται, ὡς καὶ Ἀρατος (*Phaen.* 27). “ἀτὰρ καλέονται Ἀμαξαι”. ἄλλως τε δὲ τὸ τέ νποτάσσει ὁ ποιητὴς τῷ ἀρθρῷ, οὐ σημαίνει κατί “ὅν τε καὶ ὑψόθ’ ἔόντα” (*P* 676), “ὅν τε κύν’ Ὁρίωνος” (*X* 29), “ἥ τε κατ’ αἰγίλιπος πέτρης” (*I* 15), “ἥ τ’ ἀνὰ νῶτα θέουσα” (*N* 547). οἱ δὲ τὸ “Ἀρκτον” (*Σ* 487) ἀντὶ πληθυντικοῦ, ὡς τὸ “θήγει δέ τε λευκὸν ὁδόντα” ([*Hsd.*] *scut.* 388).

La prima parte di questo scolio cita Arato 226-227, che ricorda il movimento della Κυνοσουρίς in rapporto con quello dell'Ariete, ma conclude che Omero di questa non parla, perché menziona solo gli astri più visibili (vedi sotto). La seconda parte (τινὲς δὲ...) fa riferimento a una possibile variante per il v.488, purtroppo corrotta, che vi introdurebbe un'allusione all'Orsa Minore, e viene citato Arato 43, vale a dire un verso della parte conclusiva della sezione sulle Orse (cfr. sopra), dove si dice che la Maggiore (Ἐλίκη) è più visibile e la Minore (Κυνόσουρα) si muove su un'orbita più piccola. Tuttavia questa possibilità per il testo omerico viene respinta, sia sottolineando che Arato può parlare in quel punto (vv.42-44) dell'Orsa Minore perché prima (vv.26 sgg.) aveva menzionato esplicitamente entrambe le Orse (e viene citato il v.27: vedi sopra), sia con una analisi dell'uso linguistico omerico. Infine (οἱ δὲ ...) è menzionata anche l'idea che a 18,487 Omero usi il singolare (Ἀρκτον)

per il plurale: una speculazione puramente esegetica per cercare di introdurre in Omero anche l'Orsa Minore<sup>59</sup>.

Attira la nostra attenzione la presenza di ben tre citazioni di Arato a fornire materiali di commento e di parallelo alla menzione omerica dell'Orsa Maggiore: due delle citazioni di Arato provengono proprio dalla sezione sulle Orse, vv.26-44, cui appartiene il verso per il quale è conservata la nota di Aristarco che abbiamo visto (cioè il v.28). L'insieme suggerisce senz'altro che ci fosse un commento cospicuo *ad Il.* 18,487-489, che probabilmente è confluito almeno in parte negli *schol. ex.* mentre non si è conservato nella tradizione di VMK. I versi omerici che parlano dell'Orsa Maggiore dovevano essere commentati con dovizia di materiali e di ragionamenti e con abbondanti richiami a quello che era il testo di riferimento per i problemi astronomici, appunto i *Fenomeni* di Arato. La conclusione che la nota di Aristarco ad Arato 28 provenesse anch'essa dal commento omerico risulta dunque plausibile e non possiamo certo considerarla, così isolata, una prova che egli abbia dedicato un qualche lavoro specifico (di qualunque genere) ai *Fenomeni*. Ma dobbiamo anche chiederci se questo conclude le nostre possibili riflessioni sugli interessi aristarchei per Arato.

Che Aristarco abbia scritto o no qualcosa proprio su Arato, la nota superstite al v.28 mostra che non fece unicamente un uso sussidiario e 'passivo' del suo poema, ma si impegnò anche (almeno talvolta) nell'esegesi puntuale di esso: cosa che peraltro poteva essere facilmente indotta o addirittura resa necessaria anche soltanto per utilizzare i *Fenomeni* come testo di riferimento o come parallelo. Mi pare lecito pensare che, se lo usò per commentare Omero, lo fece avendolo studiato in modo sufficiente per offrire contributi filologici di rilievo. Quanto lo fece, con quale dedizione e in quale sede (cioè in quale opera), è impossibile dirlo: la selezione dei materiali esegetici nella tradizione dei *corpora scoliografici* è stata troppo forte per consentirci

<sup>59</sup> Segue ancora nel ms. A lo *schol.* 488 c, uno *schol.* D che parla del movimento dell'Orsa Maggiore intorno al polo nord e del fatto che essa guarda in direzione di Orione.

considerazioni quantitative; il lavoro di Teone può aver costituito un filtro importante, riassumendo osservazioni precedenti e facendo perdere riferimenti esplicativi ai predecessori; e senz'altro molte cose si sono perse in seguito. Certo sarebbe ben strano se la puntuale esegeesi del v.28 fosse l'unico intervento filologico specifico sul testo di Arato prodotto da Aristarco e si fosse conservato così fortunatamente. Di fronte a un caso simile, la distinzione fra il contributo specificamente arateo e l'impiego ancillare nei confronti di Omero risulta forse, nella sostanza, troppo sottile o addirittura inutile. Aristarco 'doveva' utilizzare il moderno poeta astronomico per integrare e aggiornare quanto diceva il vecchio Omero a proposito di aspetti scientifici, sui quali le conoscenze avevano fatto innegabili progressi. Doveva dunque studiarlo bene e a fondo, come pure Callimaco, secondo il ragionamento già fatto sopra, e come Apollonio Rodio, di cui diremo fra poco: qualunque fosse l'impulso di partenza, l'interesse non poteva essere sporadico e passeggero; e senz'altro lo stimolo era facilmente suscettibile di sviluppi.

### *Un accenno su Apollonio Rodio*

Un breve cenno voglio dedicare anche ad Apollonio Rodio. Una prima considerazione riguarda il grammatico Chares, vissuto probabilmente fra III e II sec. a.C., del quale viene tramandato il titolo di uno scritto probabilmente sulle fonti del poema apolloniano<sup>60</sup>; e Asclepiade di Mirlea, a proposito del quale recentemente G.B. D'Alessio ha molto ben argomentato la possibilità che si sia occupato anche di Apollonio, il che rende quantitativamente più rilevante la sua attività sui poeti ellenistici<sup>61</sup>. Nel quadro rientra bene l'argomento che segue, a dare consistenza a una filologia apolloniana prima di Teone.

<sup>60</sup> Περὶ ἱστοριῶν τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου in *Schol. ad APOLL.RH.* 2,1052: cfr. D'ALESSIO 2000, 93-95.

<sup>61</sup> D'ALESSIO 2000, con le informazioni bibliografiche.

M. Fantuzzi ha recentemente pubblicato un'interessante analisi di un gruppo di scoli apolloniani, nei quali alcune scelte linguistiche del poeta sono criticate come "cattivo uso"<sup>62</sup>. Anche se non sempre esplicitato (almeno nella forma conservata), il termine di paragone "corretto" sembra essere (almeno nella maggioranza dei casi) il testo omerico approvato e accolto da Aristarco: in questi scoli non appare considerata la possibilità che gli usi di Apollonio siano innovazioni ricercate e apprezzabili rispetto alla vulgata omerica, ma solo quella che si tratti di scorrettezze e scelte sbagliate. D'altra parte, non accade per Apollonio quello che accade talvolta per Callimaco (e altri poeti ellenistici), cioè di essere spesso addotto negli scoli omerici come testimonianza per la costituzione del testo di Omero. Nel gruppo di scoli apolloniani selezionati da Fantuzzi si sottolinea piuttosto la differenza fra Apollonio e il testo omerico corretto, non per evidenziare un'apprezzabile modernità poetica del *νεώτερος*, bensì allo scopo di mostrare che egli pecca in termini di esegesi filologica e per questo compie scelte linguistiche non buone né apprezzabili. Una prospettiva evidentemente aristarchea, che per di più lascia intravvedere — anche se a livello di ipotesi e senza una esplicita menzione — l'idea che tali 'errori' di Apollonio possano essere condizionati da orientamenti 'zenodotei': dal momento che anche Apollonio (come Callimaco) a quanto pare conobbe e utilizzò il testo omerico di Zenodoto, il cerchio dell'argomentazione si chiude in modo plausibile<sup>63</sup>.

Abbiamo dunque una ventina di esempi di 'lettura' aristarchea del poema di Apollonio Rodio in termini di scarso apprezzamento: cosa ne dobbiamo pensare, nel quadro del tema che stiamo sviluppando? Dobbiamo pensare che Aristarco (o un suo allievo) abbia studiato Apollonio solo per estrarre un gruzzolo di casi da confrontare sfavorevolmente con Omero, cioè solo per togliersi il gusto di mostrare quanto il moderno sbagliasse

<sup>62</sup> FANTUZZI 2000; cfr. anche RENGAKOS 1994 e RENGAKOS 2001.

<sup>63</sup> Tanto più considerando che nella filologia alessandrina una sorta di "linea zenodotea" era rimasta viva fino all'epoca di Aristarco: cfr. MONTANARI 1988 (*SGLG* 7).

rispetto all'antico? Credo piuttosto che si tratti dei resti di uno studio della lingua e dello stile del poeta delle *Argonautiche*, rimasto nel *corpus* degli scoli apolloniani in seguito a processi selettivi svariati e pesanti. Pare certo che Aristarco amasse Callimaco più di Apollonio, ma difficilmente avrà mancato di riconoscere con interesse lo spessore di erudita filologia (specialmente omerica) che quest'ultimo aveva racchiuso in ogni verso del suo poema<sup>64</sup>: se gli interessava principalmente prendendo spunto da Omero, lo studiava in quanto Apollonio (e la linea di separazione rimane assai sottile), magari per mostrare che scelte errate di esegeti omerica portano a usi poetici non buoni. Se questi esempi di scelte censurate sono, almeno in parte, testimonianze di lezioni zenodotee, possono essere state evidenziate per questo, come accade per Callimaco, anch'egli qualche volta censurato per una scelta zenodotea<sup>65</sup>.

### *Conclusione*

Le conclusioni sono state anticipate e adesso devo soltanto riassumerle. L'attività filologica di Aristarco, ben impiantata su una tradizione già consolidata da Zenodoto ad Aristofane di Bisanzio, si concluse intorno alla metà del II sec. a.C. e fu seguita da quella rigogliosa dei suoi discepoli. Il panorama della cultura alessandrina aveva conosciuto una stagione straordinaria e aveva acquistato la sua ricchezza e la sua piena maturità. In tale contesto culturale, essere filologi non era un'eccezione: per gli ambienti intellettuali, leggere i testi poetici da eruditi e da grammatici, esprimere opinioni e dare contributi esegetici era nell'aria e nello spirito del tempo. Sembrerebbe dunque addirittura strano che non diventasse presto oggetto di queste cure e di questi atteggiamenti anche la grande poesia del primo ellenismo, dei poeti 'moderni'. Non mi sembra paradossale dire che quella

<sup>64</sup> Cfr. da ultimo RENGAKOS 2001.

<sup>65</sup> Cfr. per esempio *schol. ad Il.* 12,34 + *schol. ad APOLL.RH.* 1,1309; RENGAKOS 1993, 61-62, 82; RENGAKOS 1994, 61, 155; MONTANARI 1995, 57-58.

prassi poetica intrisa di erudizione invitava essa stessa alle cure filologiche, stimolava lo sforzo e il confronto intellettuale dell'esegesi, provocava il lettore colto all'analisi degli spessori abilmente dissimulati e delle ricercate preziosità<sup>66</sup>. Con interventi rilevanti a partire dall'età di Aristarco (quale che fosse la forma materiale in cui erano redatti), cominciò allora la storia della filologia sulla poesia ellenistica: Callimaco fu probabilmente l'autore più amato e per questo è, di quel gruppo di poeti, il più citato nella letteratura erudita antica. Grande poeta filologo, fu ben presto grande poeta oggetto di filologia.

## BIBLIOGRAFIA

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| APTHORP                  | M.J. APTHORP, <i>The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer</i> (Heidelberg 1980).  |
| BENEDETTO 1993           | G. BENEDETTO, <i>Il sogno e l'invenzione. Momenti di storia dell'esegesi callimachea</i> (Firenze 1993).  |
| BLUM, <i>Kallimachos</i> | R. BLUM, <i>Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen</i> , Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens, 18, 1-2 (Frankfurt/M. 1977) (trad. ingl.: <i>Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography</i> , transl. by H.H. Wellish, Univ. Wisconsin Press, Madison 1991). |
| CAMERON 1995             | A. CAMERON, <i>Callimachus and His Critics</i> (Princeton 1995).  |
| D'ALESSIO 2000           | G.B. D'ALESSIO, "Le Argonautiche di Cleone Curiense", in <i>La letteratura ellenistica. Problemi e prospettive di ricerca</i> , Atti Colloquio Intern., Univ. di Roma "Tor Vergata", 29-30 aprile 1997, a cura di R. PRETAGOSTINI, Quaderni dei seminari romani di cultura greca, 1 (Roma 2000), 91-112.  |

<sup>66</sup> Cfr. CAMERON 1995 (sopra, nn.16, 44 e 46), 230: "The moment the Aetia began to circulate outside Alexandria this need [di spiegazioni varie] will have become pressing. The work as a whole is highly allusive, and it is not hard to imagine very early copies being equipped with at least a skeleton of explanatory notes".

- DEL FABBRO, *Comm.* M. DEL FABBRO, "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea", in *StudPap* 18 (1979), 69-123.
- Entretiens Philologie *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 40. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco MONTANARI (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1994).
- ERBSE 1953 H. ERBSE, "Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios", in *Hermes* 81 (1953), 163-196.
- ERBSE 1959 H. ERBSE, "Über Aristarchs Iliasausgaben", in *Hermes* 87 (1959), 275-303.
- ERBSE, *Sch.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*, rec. H. ERBSE, voll. I-VII (Berlin-New York 1969-1988).
- FANTUZZI 2000 M. FANTUZZI, "An Aristarchean reading of Apollonius' *Argonautica*", in *SemRom* 3 (2000), 313-323.
- FÜHRER-SCHMIDT 2001 R. FÜHRER-M. SCHMIDT, "Homerus redivivus" (a proposito di: Homerus, *Ilias*, rec. M.L. West, vol. I, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1998), in *GGA* 253 (2001), 1-32.
- HASLAM 1997 M. HASLAM, "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text", in *A New Companion to Homer*, ed. by I. MORRIS and B. POWELL (Leiden-New York-Köln 1997), 55-100.
- JANKO 1998 R. JANKO, rev. of *A New Companion to Homer*, ed. by I. MORRIS and B. POWELL (Leiden 1997), in *BMCRev* 1998.05.20.
- KIDD, Aratus Aratus. *Phaenomena*. Ed. with Introd., Transl. and Comm. by D. KIDD (Cambridge 1997).
- LEHRS, *Arist.* K. LEHRS, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis* (Lipsiae 1882).
- LUDWICH, *AHT* A. LUDWICH, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos*, I-II (Leipzig 1884-85).
- LÜHRS 1992 D. LÜHRS, *Untersuchungen zu den Athetesen Aristarchs in der Ilias und zu ihrer Behandlung im Corpus der exegetischen Scholien*, Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 11 (Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1992).

- MAEHLER 1994 H. MAEHLER, "Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholiencorpora der Handschriften", in *Entretiens Philologie*, 95-127.
- MARTIN, Aratos Aratos. *Phénomènes*. Tomes I-II. Texte établi, trad. et comm. par J. MARTIN (Paris 1998).
- MARTIN, *Histoire* J. MARTIN, *Histoire du texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos* (Paris 1956).
- MASSIMILLA 1996 Callimaco. *Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di G. MASSIMILLA (Pisa 1996).
- MATTHAIOS 1999 S. MATTHAIOS, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Hypomnemata 126 (Göttingen 1999).
- MONTANARI 1979= F. MONTANARI, "Aristarco ad *Odissea* II 136-7. Appunti di filologia omerica antica", in *MD* 3 (1979), 157-170 = *Studi di filologia omerica antica*, II (Pisa 1995), 27-40.
- 1995
- MONTANARI 1988 F. MONTANARI (ed.), *I frammenti dei grammatici Agathokles, Hellanikos, Ptolemaios Epithetes*, Sammlung Griech. und Lateinischer Grammatiker, 7 (Berlin–New York 1988).
- (*SGLG* 7)
- MONTANARI 1993 F. MONTANARI, "L'erudizione, la filologia e la grammatica", in *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. I, t. II (Roma 1993), 235-281.
- MONTANARI 1994, V. Entretiens *Philologie*.
- Entretiens
- MONTANARI 1995 F. MONTANARI, "Filologi alessandrini e poeti alessandrini. La filologia sui 'contemporanei'", in *Aevum(ant)* 8 (1995), 47-63.
- MONTANARI 1998 F. MONTANARI, "Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer", in *Editing Texts – Texte Edieren*, ed. by G.W. MOST, Aporemata 2 (Göttingen 1998), 47-63.
- MONTANARI 2000 "Ripensamenti di Aristarco sul testo omerico e il problema della seconda ekdosis", in *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera* (Napoli 2000), 479-486.
- NAGY 1996 G. NAGY, *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge, Mass. 1996), ch. 5, 107-152.

- NAGY 1997 G. NAGY, "Homeric Scholia", in *A New Companion to Homer*, ed. by I. MORRIS and B. POWELL (Leiden 1997), 101-122.
- NAGY 1998 G. NAGY, "Aristarchean Questions", in *BMCRev* 1998.07.14.
- NAGY 1999 G. NAGY, "Les éditions alexandrines d'Homère au XVIII<sup>e</sup> et XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle", in *Homère en France après la Querelle (1715-1900)*, éd. par F. LÉTOUBLON et C. VOLPILHAC-AUGER (Paris 1999), 63-72.
- NAGY 2000 G. NAGY, rev. of *Homeri Ilias*, rec. M.L. WEST, vol. I (Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1998), in *BMCRev* 2000.09.12.
- NARDELLI 2001 J.-F. NARDELLI, "Éditer l'*Iliade*. I. La transmission et ses débats: perspectives critiques", in *Gaia* 5 (2001), 41-118.
- NICKAU 1972 K. NICKAU, "Zenodotos" (3), in *RE X A* (1972), 23-45.
- NICKAU 1977 K. NICKAU, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin-New York 1977).
- PARSONS 1977, *Callim.* P.J. PARSONS, "Callimachus: Victoria Berenices", in *ZPE* 25 (1977), 1-50.
- PARSONS 1977, *Oyster* P.J. PARSONS, "The Oyster", in *ZPE* 24 (1977), 1-12.
- PASQUALI, *Storia* G. PASQUALI, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Firenze 1952).
- PFEIFFER, *Callim.* C. PFEIFFER, *Callimachus*. Ed. R. PFEIFFER, voll. I-II (Oxford 1949-1953).
- PFEIFFER, *Storia* R. PFEIFFER, *Storia della filologia classica. Dalle origini alla fine dell'età ellenistica*, trad. it. Napoli 1973 (= Oxford 1968); München 1978.
- PONTANI 1999 F. PONTANI, "The First Word of Callimachus' Aitia", in *ZPE* 128 (1999), 57-59.
- RENGAKOS 1993 A. RENGAKOS, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*, Hermes Einzelschr. 64 (Stuttgart 1993).
- RENGAKOS 1994 A. RENGAKOS, *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung*, Zetemata 92 (München 1994).
- RENGAKOS 2000 A. RENGAKOS, "Aristarchus and the Hellenistic Poets", in *SemRom* 3 (2000), 325-335.

- RENGAKOS 2001 A. RENGAKOS, "Apollonios Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar", in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. by Th.D. PAPANGHELIS and A. RENGAKOS (Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001), 193-216.
- SCHENKEVELD 1994 D.M. SCHENKEVELD, "Scholarship and Grammar", in *Entretiens Philologie*, 263-301.
- SCHIRONI 1999 F. SCHIRONI, "Aristarco studioso di Antimaco", in *RFIC* 127 (1999), 282-290 (ma 2001).
- SCHMIDT 1997 M. SCHMIDT, "Variae lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?", in *ZPE* 115 (1997), 1-12.
- SEVERYNS, *Cycle* A. SEVERYNS, *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège-Paris 1928).
- SUSEMIHL F. SUSEMIHL, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I-II (Leipzig 1891-1892).
- THIEL 1992 H. VAN THIEL, "Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere", in *ZPE* 90 (1992), 1-32.
- THIEL 1997 H. VAN THIEL, "Der Homertext in Alexandria", in *ZPE* 115 (1997), 13-36.
- THIEL, *Ilias* Homeri *Ilias*. Recogn. H. VAN THIEL (Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1996).
- THIEL, *Odyss.* Homeri *Odyssea*. Recogn. H. VAN THIEL (Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1991).
- TURNER, *GP* E.G. TURNER, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction* (Oxford 1980) = trad. it., *Papiri greci*, a cura di M. MANFREDI (Roma 1984).
- TURNER-PARSONS E.G. TURNER, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd edition rev. and enlarged. Ed. by P.J. PARSONS, *BICS Suppl.* 46 (London 1987).
- VALK, *Researches* M. VAN DER VALK, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I-II (Leiden 1963-64).
- WEST, *Ilias* Homeri *Ilias*. Rec. M.L. WEST, I-II (Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1998-2000).
- WEST 2001 M.L. WEST, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (München-Leipzig 2001).

## DISCUSSION

*Th. Fuhrer:* Il me semble très intéressant de concevoir le texte des poèmes homériques, dès l'*ekdosis* de Zénodote, comme ‘copie de travail’: ayant cette forme de ‘brouillon élaboré’ (si vous me permettez d’utiliser cet *oxymoron*), il est aussi une documentation des apories de la philologie homérique. Si donc des poètes comme Callimaque et Apollonius utilisaient cette copie, cela explique peut-être pourquoi, dans leur poèmes, on trouve si nombreuses allusions et discussions au sujet du texte homérique: le texte était quelque chose de ‘flou’ pour eux. Puisque le texte des poèmes homériques était sujet de tant de discussions et débats philologiques, les commentaires sur ce texte ne peuvent forcément pas avoir eu le même caractère que les commentaires sur les textes des poètes contemporains ou peu antérieurs. Alors non seulement le commentaire sur Callimaque que nous a préservé le *papyrus de Lille*, mais aussi toute forme de travail d’un savant comme Aristarque sur le même poète devait être autre chose que le commentaire aristarchéen sur le texte d’Homère.

*F. Montanari:* Il caso di Omero è diverso da quello di tutti gli altri poeti, è un caso unico per il grande accumulo di erudizione che c’è stato nel corso del tempo, per la quantità d’interesse suscitato a vari livelli (da quello scolastico elementare fino a quello filosofico e teologico) e anche per le fluttuazioni testuali (qualunque sia l’interpretazione e la visione storica che se ne vuole dare, e anche il peso che si vuole attribuire al fenomeno: è un problema ancora molto dibattuto). È vero dunque che anche i prodotti eruditi relativi a Omero sono per certi aspetti differenti da tutti gli altri. Inoltre, ci si può facilmente immaginare che le annotazioni erudite su un testo ‘moderno’ fossero

diverse da quelle relative a un testo del periodo arcaico e classico.

*L. Lehnus:* Trovo molto suggestiva l'idea che Teone in età augustea non sia un punto di partenza bensì, in un certo senso, un punto di arrivo. In che misura l'esistenza precoce di commentari o comunque di interessi esegetici può aver influenzato la conservazione o la perdita di opere di poeti ellenistici? Per esempio: sarei indotto a credere che l'*Ibis* non sia stata commentata e quindi andò perduta (forse già in età ellenistica).

*F. Montanari:* Pensando a Teone come possibile punto di arrivo di una tradizione esegetica già formata, se pur solo da qualche generazione, devo naturalmente concepirlo anche come nuovo punto di partenza di una stagione nella quale i poeti ellenistici diventano più normalmente oggetto di cure esegetiche, fino a entrare a un certo punto, come dicevo sopra, nel novero dei *πραττόμενοι*, cioè i normalmente 'trattati' dai grammatici. Penso che l'attività esegetica possa aver avuto un ruolo nella conservazione e perdita di opere: eviterei di pensare a una relazione meccanica e necessaria, anche perché siamo costretti a ragionare *e silentio* (con la possibilità che un nuovo frammento di papiro ci smentisca): per esempio, a quanto pare gli *Aitia* furono presto oggetto di cure, ma non si conservarono.

*A.S. Hollis:* An example (perhaps not noticed before) of learned interpretation of Aratus, *Phaenomena*, reflected in Virgil, *Georgics*. In this case the issue is purely philological, no technicalities of astronomy are involved. In *Georg.* 1.387 *et studio incassum videas gestire lavandi*, why does Virgil write *incassum*, "in vain"? Perhaps he shows himself aware of an interpretation of αὕτως (*αὕτως*) in Aratus, *Phaen.* 945 γαστέρι τύπτουσαι αὕτως εἰλυμένον ὕδωρ. One possible meaning of αὕτως is "in vain" (LSJ I.2). Kidd, however, takes αὕτως (rough breathing, as in the manuscripts) with the words which follow, translating (p.143) "the water enclosed as it is" (see further his note on *Phaen.* 21).

Controversy may have extended to the breathing, since (according to LSJ) some grammarians distinguished between  $\alpha\beta\tauως$  (likewise) and  $\alpha\beta\tauως$  (in vain). Chronologically, it seems possible that Virgil read a commentary on Aratus by Theon, son of Artemidorus.

*F. Montanari:* Grazie, il caso è senz'altro interessante e l'idea mi sembra del tutto plausibile.

*R. Hunter:* How does the famous problem of Quintilian's report about Aristophanes Byz. and Aristarchus and poets of *suum tempus* relate to what you have been saying (*Inst. 10,1,54*: *Apollonius in ordinem a grammaticis datum non venit, quia Aristarchus atque Aristophanes neminem sui temporis in numerum redegerunt*)? Is it a question of 'genre', an idea that may have been associated only with 'older' poets, or of different levels of philological interest which can be discerned in the different types of material which survive?

*F. Montanari:* Credo che il passo di Quintiliano si riferisca alle famose (e anche abbastanza problematiche...) "liste canoniche", che effettivamente riguardavano i poeti 'antichi': mi pare del tutto naturale che, ai tempi di Aristofane e Aristarco, i canoni non comprendessero i poeti 'moderni', che ancora non erano normalmente e abbondantemente  $\pi\rho\alpha\tau\tau\theta\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\iota$ . A mio avviso, si deve pensare (come abbiamo già detto) che il lavoro filologico sui poeti alessandrini comportasse effettivamente nelle prime fasi materiali e modalità diverse rispetto a quello sugli autori da Omero a Aristofane, dunque anche un livello diverso di interessi filologici (si veda per esempio quanto detto nel testo a proposito delle spiegazioni di carattere prosopografico). Comunque, Quintiliano offre una testimonianza da tenere presente nella valutazione del problema e dei suoi connotati storici.

*P.J. Parsons:* Why do we have no reference to commentaries on Alexandrian poets, e.g. by Aristarchus?

*F. Montanari:* Colgo l'occasione per precisare che non voglio sostenere per forza che ci fossero veri e propri *hypomnemata* sui poeti ellenistici già ai tempi di Aristarco: questo è possibile, ma è difficile dire se e quanto fossero estesi ed impegnativi; gli unici esempi su cui possiamo ragionare sono i due frammenti papiroacei di cui abbiamo parlato. Credo fermamente che esistessero già interessi filologico-esegetici diretti e specifici sui 'moderni', ma non voglio impegnarmi molto nel supporre quale forma potessero avere (brevi trattazioni tematiche? annotazioni marginali?). Non possiamo considerare troppo significativo il fatto che non abbiamo testimonianze e riferimenti specifici, considerando la scarsezza del materiale pervenuto: ricordiamoci (cfr. nel testo, n.18) che nessuna testimonianza ci parla di commenti a Erodoto, ma *PAmh.*12 ci ha restituito la prova che Aristarco aveva scritto un vero e proprio *hypomnema* su questo autore.

*R. Hunter:* Can we be sure that Aristarchus actually 'discussed' (somewhere) the meaning of Aratus, *Phaen.* 28-29? Is it possible that he just quoted and/or paraphrased the verses without any sign that the meaning was problematic? Aratus was the acknowledged text on the stars and (if my memory is correct) Hipparchus sees problems not with the interpretation of Aratus' text but with his facts.

*F. Montanari:* Non posso certo negare che il mio discorso si basi su indizi e non si può certo avere una certezza assoluta; d'altra parte, credo di averlo presentato con le dovute cautele. Tuttavia, mi pare che il riferimento agli interventi di γραμματικοί e μαθηματικοί vada tenuto presente come testimonianza di discussioni su problemi sia filologici che scientifici. Dovunque fosse trattato il caso che abbiamo visto, si tratta comunque di un contributo esegetico specificamente arateo: l'interesse proprio per Arato mi sembra innegabile, qualunque fosse stato il punto di partenza o il primo impulso.

*P.J. Parsons:* Are these two papyri (*Oyster* and *PLille*) special cases? 1) *Oyster:* a riddle, therefore needs explanation. Riddles

(here in epigram-form) are sympotic material and their explanation could be part of the learned symposium? 2) *PLille*: was it designed as patriotic reading for schools (cfr. epigrams on Ptolemaic achievements in the school texts *PDidot* and *PGuéraud-Jouguet*)? Was it just this poem, not the whole of book III (not probable)? Its explanatory material is basically elementary (and glosses become less frequent as the text progresses?): should we distinguish between schoolmasters' *explication de texte* and the serious work of philologists like Aristarchus?

F. Montanari: Certo, è sempre possibile che la casualità dei ritrovamenti papiracei ci faccia lo scherzo di proporci 'casi speciali': almeno altrettanto possibile è che ci offra esempi limitati di qualcosa che esisteva con maggiore abbondanza. Il fatto è che questi testimoni esistono e che la loro esistenza appare consonante con alcuni indizi che ho cercato di far emergere (cfr. anche Cameron, *supra* nn.16, 44, 46 e 66). D'altra parte, non è certo mia intenzione sostenere che nel II sec. a.C. ci fosse una produzione esegetica sui poeti ellenistici abbondante quanto quella sui poeti arcaici e classici e con le stesse caratteristiche. Certamente c'è differenza fra la *explication de texte* in forma parafastica per uso esclusivamente scolastico e il lavoro filologico-esegetico di più alto livello: tuttavia non credo giusto tracciare una linea di separazione totale e addirittura di contrapposizione, la parafasi del testo è uno strumento utilizzato anche dal filologo più agguerrito. Inoltre, in *PLille* non ci sono soltanto glosse e parafasi, pur nel poco che si è conservato del commento. E' importante sottolineare, come ho detto nel testo, che una nota 'lunga' tratta di problemi prosopografici dei Tolomei.



PETER J. PARSONS

## CALLIMACHUS AND THE HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM

This paper sets out to discuss Callimachus' epigrams in context, principally their epigraphic and papyrological context<sup>1</sup>. Since the Entretiens Hardt last considered the epigram, in 1967, we have acquired further evidence for the composition and circulation of epigrams in the hellenistic age: above all, in the Milan and Vienna papyri which (it will be argued) represent poles in the epigrammatic production of the third century BC and so illustrate the choices that Callimachus may have had to make. This material has two special advantages. The epigrams transmitted in the *Palatine Anthology* represent a compilation of selections: the papyri take us back to a world before selection, demonstrating how reduced and one-sided that selection was to be. Much of this book concerns itself with the siting of Callimachus' work *vis-à-vis* past poetry and contemporary poets: the epigram is unusual in that we know more about its present, and — through an epigraphic tradition covering more than three centuries — much more about its past, than for other poetic genres.

### I. *Epigrams and audiences*

Among the ruins of Callimachus' œuvre, we have only one complete collection of complete poems, the *Hymns*. The *Epigrams*

<sup>1</sup> The epigrams are cited by Pfeiffer's numeration. For bibliography see LEHNUS 2000. For recent commentary see COCO 1988; GOW in *HE* (1965); various annotations in D'ALESSIO 1996; HOPKINSON 1988; FRASER 1972. 'Mil.' refers to the new Milan papyrus with epigrams of Posidippus (and others?), see n.86.

occupy second place, as an incomplete collection of complete poems, which we owe to the vagaries of chance and choice. Meleager chose fifty five for his *Garland*<sup>2</sup>, the *Anthologia Palatina* has added two more via Diogenes Laertius (1-2), and four more from a collection of poems in odd metres (37-40)<sup>3</sup>; Athenaeus and Strabo contribute one each (5-6). Ten further fragments (frr.393-402) quote or refer to Callimachus ἐν ἐπιγράμμασιν or the like<sup>4</sup>. Scholars have added other fragments with more or less likelihood (479, 516, 554, 621, 635, 715; inc.auct. 761, 782). A few other poems in *AP* are assigned by their sources alternatively to Callimachus and to another author: none (except possibly *AP* 7.170) likely to be his<sup>5</sup>. A selection, that is; how small a selection we do not know, although the Milan and Vienna papyri have hinted how ruthlessly Meleager (or his sources) culled the swarming tribe. The original bulk we can only guess; but the calculation experimentally proposed by Professor Lehnus<sup>6</sup> would suggest a primary collection of some

<sup>2</sup> Modern scholars have doubted the authenticity of 3, 36 and 63.

<sup>3</sup> On *AP* 13 see PALUMBO 1984; MORELLI 1985; CAMERON 1993, 137-45; ROSSI 2001, 77-9.

<sup>4</sup> Gow in *HE* II 153 doubts whether frr.399-401 really derive from epigrams. But see below n.112.

<sup>5</sup> *AP* 9.391 = Diotimus 8 *HE*, attributed to C. by the Bernese *scholia* on Plan.; *AP* 7.320 = Hegesippus 8 *HE*, attributed to C. by Plutarch *Ant.* 70; *AP* 7.170 = Posidippus 21 *HE*, repeated in Pal., the second time with ascription to C.; *AP* 7.344b, ascribed to C. in Pal. and to Simonides (like 344 on the same subject) in Plan.; *AP* 9.67, ἀδεσπότον Pal., Καλλιμάχου Plan. See *HE* II 154.

<sup>6</sup> See below p. 137. The calculation rests on the *Suda*'s notice of the consular and patrician Marianos (M 194 Adler; CALL. T24 Pf), whom it dates to the reign of Anastasios (AD 491-518); see *PLRE* II p.722, Marianus (3). (This Marianos has sometimes been identified with Marianos Scholastikos, an epigrammatist included in the *Cycle* of Agathias. Their identity becomes much less likely if CAMERON 1993, 70-2 is right to date one of Marianos' epigrams under Justin II.) The *Suda* records a series of iambic metaphrases: (i) Theocritus in 3150 lines; (ii) Apollonius *Argonautika* in 5608 lines (so cod. A: 5620 GVM); (iii) Aratus in 1140 lines; (iv) Nicander *Theriaka* in 1370 lines. Two of these come close to the length of the original poem: (ii) 5835 hexameters; (iii) 1154 hexameters. Two diverge more substantially: (i) the genuine Theocritus comes to 2350 hexameters, the extant corpus to 2865, but in any case "it is impossible to guess what spurious works M. in the fifth century may have found in his 'Theocritus'" (Theocritus.

800 lines, perhaps 150-200 poems at standard lengths, enough for a slim volume<sup>7</sup>.

Some ingenuity has gone into reconstructing a Callimachean epigram-book and its place in a complete Callimachus<sup>8</sup>. Ideally we would like to know whether Callimachus collected his own epigrams into a book or books (as perhaps the *Aetia*), a *libellus*, in Argentieri's terminology. How would such a book have been arranged (alphabetically, like Meleager? by subject-groups, like the Milan papyrus? in metrical groups, compare the corpus of Theocritus' epigrams, and the book of Catullus? or, like the *Aetia*, on a pattern of similarities and contrasts?). No one has identified a proem; some have seen *Epigr.* 35 as the sphragis (so that Callimachus' σῆμα represents his monument in two senses). Was the book then integrated into the presumed 'Collected Works'? Should we visualise a corpus beginning with *Aetia* I and ending with *Epigr.* 21, whose last line (assuming the third couplet to be interpolated) echoes the first line of the *Aetia*?<sup>9</sup> An elegant structure; but of course there are arguments against the

Ed. by A.S.F. Gow, Vol. I [Cambridge 1950], p.xxv n.1); (iv) *Theriaka* comprises 958 hexameters (or, if mention of *Alexipharmaka* has fallen out, as BIRT suggested, the two poems together 1588) — here it might be guessed that the technical obscurities of Nicander required expansion. Thus we may, but need not, believe that Marianos' metaphor of Callimachus *Hekale*, *Hymns*, *Aitia* and *Epigrams* in 6810 iambic lines represents the approximate line-count of the original: allowing 1000 for *Hekale*, 1000 for *Hymns* and 4000 for *Aitia*, we come to c. 800 for the *Epigrams*. See further BIRT 1882, 291, 400.

<sup>7</sup> Scholars sometimes speak of a "standard roll", which would contain a full book of (say) Apollonius Rhodius, and assume that shorter texts would be combined with other matter to use up the available space. I doubt whether this is safe. A roll is as long as you make it. (See n.87.) In any case, how much can be contained depends on the height of the roll as well as on the length. *POxy* IV 662 (1 BC) contains epigrams in columns of c. 20 lines; *BKT* V 1 p.75 (1 AD) contains erotic epigrams in a roll only 4-5 cm high (the editors comment "Wir lernen ein Format kennen, geeignet für ein Poesiebuch, das eine elegante Dame rasch in dem Busen verbergen konnte"). We could intuit the charm of a small format for these small poems; and it may be that Martial's emphasis on his "small book" (1.3.2) looks to this as well as to portability (1.2.1; 6.60.2).

<sup>8</sup> See most recently GUTZWILLER 1998, 188ff.

<sup>9</sup> GUTZWILLER 1998, 211-3.

basic idea that *Aetia* occupied first place<sup>10</sup>. In all this, we have little to go on except the guess that, when epigrams of Callimachus appear together in *AP*, they appear in the original sequence. The only contribution of the new material here is to expand our view of what sorts of arrangement were possible.

'Επιγράμματα does not appear in the *Suda*'s list of works, unless concealed under a different title<sup>11</sup>; but then most of the major poems lurk under the catch-all ποιήματα εἰς πᾶν μέτρον<sup>12</sup>. But we can follow the title through the commentaries of Hedylos<sup>13</sup> and Archibios<sup>14</sup>, and the paraphrase of Marianos c. 500 AD<sup>15</sup>; now that we have, already in the second century BC, a paraphrase of *Victoria Berenices*<sup>16</sup> and an exegesis of the anonymous *Oyster* (*SH* 983), we may be more inclined to identify Hedylos as the contemporary poet<sup>17</sup>. We are then free to believe that Callimachus survived substantively, as well as in anthologies, into the Roman period, to be read in schools<sup>18</sup> and held up as a master by Martial<sup>19</sup> and an exemplar by Pliny<sup>20</sup>. It is of course clear that individual poems were read and imitated, though from what form of text we do not know. Within a generation, *Epigr.* 19 inspired an inflated imitation at Kios on the Propontis<sup>21</sup>. Agatharchides (if it is he) seems to quote a phrase from *Epigr.* 16.<sup>22</sup> *Epigr.* 41 had reached Rome in time for Catulus to

<sup>10</sup> CAMERON 1995, 109-13; LEHNUS [this volume p. 16].

<sup>11</sup> Schneider conjectured that the Γραφεῖον (fr.380) contained epigrammatic verdicts on past poets. Nothing has accrued to confirm or refute this, or to show whether the title means 'stylus' or (as in the contemporary administrative language) 'record office' (see WOLFF 1978, 21-3).

<sup>12</sup> *Suda* K 227 (T1 Pf.).

<sup>13</sup> *Etym. Gen.* s.v. δίλυτάρχης, I p.342 Lasserre-Livadaras (οὕτως Μεθόδιος A) (T45).

<sup>14</sup> *Suda* A 4105 (T44).

<sup>15</sup> *Suda* M 194 (T24), see n.6.

<sup>16</sup> *SH* 254-261.

<sup>17</sup> See MONTANARI [this volume].

<sup>18</sup> ATHEN. 15.669b (T41).

<sup>19</sup> 4.23 (T75).

<sup>20</sup> *Epist.* 4.3.3-4 (T77).

<sup>21</sup> GVI 661; VÉRILHAC 1978-82, I no.164; *SGO* II p.136.

<sup>22</sup> Anon., in *PHOT. Bibl.* cod.250, §63, doubtfully attributed to Agatharchides. See FRASER 1972, II 782 n.199.

rework it<sup>23</sup>. *Epigr.* 23 was cited by Cicero<sup>24</sup>, *Epigr.* 27 drawn on by Cinna the poet<sup>25</sup>. *Epigr.* 42 was inscribed, as a graffito, on the outer wall of a grand dining room in the Gardens of Mae- cenas<sup>26</sup>. Virgil had read *Epigr.* 2, before writing *Ecl.* 9.51f; so had the author who, a century later, wrote the epitaph of the boy-poet Q. Sulpicius Maximus<sup>27</sup>. One thing is odd. Stone epi- grams of the imperial period look to Callimachus<sup>28</sup>; papyri of epigrammatists or of anthologies are not uncommon. Yet Callimachus' epigrams have not turned up on papyrus, not even at literary Oxyrhynchus in its heyday. Were they banished to anthologies? Were they too difficult? (Hence the commentaries.) Or did epigrams become unfashionable in Egypt? At Oxyrhyn- chus, at least, people seem to read epigrams in the first century AD, but not much in the second and third centuries from which most of our literary papyri date.

In the hellenistic age the epigram enjoyed wide popularity. Only one poet that we know of, Posidippus, specialised enough to acquire the public title of ἐπιγραμματοποιός<sup>29</sup>, although for him (as for Asclepiades but not for Dioscorides) longer works are known<sup>30</sup>. But most of the great names of the third century had epigrams, indeed collections of epigrams, attributed to them<sup>31</sup>. Questions arise about the composition and circulation of these works, which new finds clarify only in detail.

We can imagine some practical occasions. There may be commissions, for poems to be inscribed, notably epitaphs and

<sup>23</sup> P.43 Morel; fr.1 Courtney. See in general WIMMEL 1960.

<sup>24</sup> *Tusc.* 1.84.

<sup>25</sup> Fr.11 Morel, Courtney.

<sup>26</sup> MURRAY 1985, 43; STEINBY III (1996) 74-5 (the stages of construction and decoration are assigned to the late Republican/early Imperial period).

<sup>27</sup> GVI 1924.52-3 (*IG XIV* 2012); VÉRILHAC 1978-82, I no.78; *IGUR* III (1979) p.189.

<sup>28</sup> Thus GVI 2036.11-12 models itself on *Epigr.* 21.1-2 (FRASER 1972, II 821 n.185).

<sup>29</sup> *IG IX<sup>2</sup>* 1.17.24, 264/3 BC.

<sup>30</sup> FRASER 1972, I 575-6.

<sup>31</sup> ARGENTIERI 1998, 5-7.

dedications. The epitaphs on Zeno's hunting dog Tauron show the process carried on by post: the poems (a pair, one in elegiacs, one in iambics) were copied fair on a piece of papyrus, which was then rolled up and addressed as a letter<sup>32</sup>. Other poems might serve practical purposes in less monumental form: shop-signs, like Theocr. *Ep.* 14 (for a bank) or Mil. vi 1-4 (for a soothsayer)<sup>33</sup>; verses to accompany presents (a less commercial ancestor of Martial's *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*), like Mil. I 20-23 for an engraved gem given to Nicaea "in return for a kiss"; verses to preface books old or new, as may be suspected for Call. *Epigr.* 6 (on the *Capture of Oechalia*) and 27 (on Aratus' *Phaenomena*)<sup>34</sup>. Others again belong in the sympotic sphere<sup>35</sup>, like the elegiac admonition to συμπόται ἀνδρες found at Elephantine, rolled up with a collection of drinking songs<sup>36</sup>. Callimachus himself represents half his life as οἶνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι (*Epigr.* 35.2). Here, but not only here, poems may be improvised, as hellenistic scholars visualised Simonides improvising at the feast<sup>37</sup>. Improvised or not, the sympotic epigram may extend into the space traditionally occupied by drinking songs and dramatic monologues; in the Roman period, at least, it extends

<sup>32</sup> *PCairoZen.* IV 59.532, one of the few literary items in an extensive archive (PESTMAN 1981, I 189); texts and commentary in SH 977.

<sup>33</sup> See ROSSI 2001, 251ff. The Milan poem, ostensibly sited on the hill-top from which Damon observes the birds, might be thought of as a parody; Damon's 'shop' has something in common with Tiresias' (EUR. *Ba*.347). But the editors cite BERNARD 1969, no.112 (3rd cent. BC), a stone carved as a portico and inscribed in ink with an image of the Apis and an iambic couplet which advertises a Cretan interpreter of dreams: two holes towards the top suggest that it was once hung on a wall.

<sup>34</sup> For other examples see FGE pp.336-337; ROSSI 2001, 85-86, 343-347. So far as I know no such 'label' epigram has been found in situ (*POxy* 3726 transmits 'Theoc.' *AP* 9.434, but not apparently as preface to a text of Theocritus).

<sup>35</sup> GENTILI 1968; CAMERON 1995, 71-6.

<sup>36</sup> BKTV (ii) p.62: *IEG* Adesp.Eleg.27, II p.12; *PMG* 917. Texts republished with commentary by FERRARI 1989; further notes in FABIAN 1991.

<sup>37</sup> Chamaeleon, Περὶ Σιμωνίδου, fr.33 Wehrli, *ap.* ATHEN. 14.656c (a single hexameter, adapting *Il*.14.33). Callistratus, Σύμμικτα, *FGrHist* 348 F 3, *ap.* ATHEN. 3.125c (a complete epigram). GUTZWILLER 1998, 231-2. Improvisation continues to be admired in an increasingly literate culture, see HARDIE 1983, 76-85: so Cicero on Archias and Antipater of Sidon (*Arch.* 8; *de orat.* 3.194).

again by versifying the jokes about personal appearance which earlier circulate in prose<sup>38</sup>.

We can imagine some processes of composition. Individual items might be written or improvised. Paired epigrams may have a vogue<sup>39</sup>, like Zeno's epitaphs. At the symposium, or through a virtual symposium, poets may vary a theme or cap previous offerings: so the mock epitaph for the grouch, Timon — to the eight examples transmitted in *AP* (two by Callimachus), we can now add another from the Vienna Papyrus and a variant (Menoitios the laconic Cretan) from the Milan Papyrus<sup>40</sup>. They may compete round a special occasion, like the dedication of the temple at Zephyrium<sup>41</sup>. We could reckon also with epigram-series by a single author. Such is the group of quatrains on tragedies, *SH* 985<sup>42</sup>. Such perhaps was the bizarre sequence on prophetic birds in Mil. IV 8ff, now jumbled and interspersed with other ominous occurrences<sup>43</sup>.

We can imagine some channels of circulation. Individual poems might circulate by word of mouth, or in copies among the poet's private friends. The author might collect his epigrams

<sup>38</sup> *P. Heid.* I 190 (later 3rd cent. BC): ten one-line insults to a red-faced man, ten to a bald man etc, on the level of "That's not a face you have, it's a baby's bottom" (75; for the text see BAIN 1978). KASSEL 1956 identifies the form of joke (*εἰκόνες*) and notes how, for example, Gelasimus in Plautus consults his books for a supply of winning wit (*Stich.* 454-5). The Petrie scolion (n.99) mentions someone bald: is that a personal reference, or an evocation of Silenus?

<sup>39</sup> R. KIRSTEIN, "Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram", to be published in the proceedings of the Fifth Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry.

<sup>40</sup> See below p.125. Menoitios, Mil. xv 24-27, closely related to CALL. *Epigr.* 3, but even more closely to *Epigr.* 11 (it has indeed been suspected that Callimachus' close-mouthed Cretan sets out to trump Posidippus' by being yet more brief about brevity).

<sup>41</sup> BASTIANINI and GALLAZZI 2001, 155.

<sup>42</sup> New edition: MALTOMINI 2001.

<sup>43</sup> They exemplify the knowledge of Damon, whose hill-top is advertised at the end (vi 1), and in that sense they (or at least those which contain a personal example of the principle stated) have similarities with the *ιαματικόν*. But I wonder whether they derive from a systematic (alphabetic?) handbook. (Cf. CALL. fr.428.) The sequence would be ἀετός, αἴθυια, βουκαῖος, ἐρωδίος, ἵρηξ, κορυδοί, φήνη (v 20, IV 20, IV 14, IV 36, IV 8, V 12, IV 40); the poems have 6, 4, 6, 4, 6 and 6 lines respectively — but perhaps that is mere coincidence.

finally or (like Martial) periodically, to produce a *libellus*; an editor might make a collection of or selection from an individual author, to produce a *sylloge*. That there are epigram-books of mixed authorship is shown by SH 961 (Posidippus and others), perhaps not an all-purpose collection but a wedding-garland for Arsinoe; Reitzenstein imagined his Soros as a similar collection of poems by Asclepiades, Posidippus and Hedylus, in which no poem was attributed to its author<sup>44</sup>. Beyond that there are anthologies of various intent and structure. One general question concerns revision. In a few cases (none in Callimachus) we find variant versions of the same poem<sup>45</sup>. Of special interest

<sup>44</sup> For the theory and its flaws, see CAMERON 1993, 369–76. The fundamental point is the *systematic* variation of attributed authorship. In individual cases it would not be surprising if anthologists included epigrams which, like limericks, were catchy enough to circulate by word of mouth, and so liable to be attributed to more than one best-selling name.

<sup>45</sup> See HECKER 1843, I 220ff. I am grateful to Lorenzo Argentieri for the reference and for discussion. The examples are: (i) Dioscorides *AP* 5.53 and 5.193 (3 and 4 *HE*) are effectively the same poem, with variations of phrasing and word-order; but in one the femme fatale is Aristonoe, in the other Kleo. (ii) Posidippus (or Plato or Crates) *AP* 9.359, on the poet's love for Heliodora, recurs as Meleager *AP* 5.215; that is repeated after 12.19 (*P<sup>b</sup> Μελεατοῦ, Pl A Ποσειδίππου*), with a substantial variant in line 5 and a change of name to the masculine Helidoros. (iii) Strato *AP* 11.21, Agathon in the nominative, reappears as *AP* 12.242, Alkimos in the vocative. (iv) Antipater Thess. *AP* 9.149, 150 might be authorial versions of the same poem, but see *GP* II 72f for the complications. (v) *AP* 6.266, ascribed to Hegesippus, has turned up in *PKöln* 204, which has the general heading *Μνασάλκου*, with the name Nikaret- in place of Damaretos. The text of the papyrus is fragmentary, and various explanations have been canvassed (CAMERON 1993, 3f). (vi) Nikarchos *AP* 11.328 has turned up in *POxy* 4502, perhaps with a different sentence-structure in 9–10, certainly with Didymarchos in place of Kleoboulos. (vii) Martial shows similar variations of name, e.g. 1.10.1 Gemellus/Venustus, see *POxy* *ibid.* p.53. In all this, the majority replaces one name by another of identical scansion; only in (i) and (iii) does the change affect the metre; only in (iii) the syntax. How do we assess this phenomenon? Alan Cameron suggests that poets might appropriate epigrams of their predecessors with a simple change of wording or nomenclature (CAMERON 1993, 381ff). But if so, we might expect more variants to be ascribed to the adaptor, not to the original poet; and in any case this cannot be the case with Martial. Of other explanations, that of scribal carelessness will not wash for (i) and (iii). That leaves us, supposing that all the examples have the same cause, to wonder about authorial adaptation or oral corruption.

is a tradition, in examples dating from Asclepiades to Martial, of replacing a proper name with another of the same metrical value. Various explanations have been canvassed: one proposes that the author adapted his poem to new topicality between one circulation and another — or from a topical name to a speaking name for the general reader's convenience.

The narrower audience will comprise friends, clients and patrons (overlapping circles); patrons might be active, offering support and commissions, or passive, those whose favour the poet solicits with unsolicited verses. Callimachus' epigrams, typically, are not helpful as regards times, places and persons. *Epigr.* 45 uses Macedonian months; *Epigr.* 10 refers (probably) to an Alexandrian tribe. The expedition against the Hesperitai, *Epigr.* 37, cannot be dated<sup>46</sup>. A few notables can be identified with reasonable probability: the poet and diplomat Heraclitus (2)<sup>47</sup>, the Coan doctor Philip (46)<sup>48</sup>, the philosopher Timarchos (10). Various epigrams give the ethnic of their subject: outside Egypt (Alexandria 10?, Naucratis 39), Ainos (61), Akanthos (which?) (9), Amphipolis (24), Crete (11, 22, 34, 37, 62), Cyrene (13, 20), Cyzicus (12), Elis (60), Methymna (15), Naxos (18), Rhodes (49), Samos (16), Smyrna (5), Thessaly (30). It would be an easy guess that Callimachus maintained Cyrenean connections, whether at home or through an émigré circle in Alexandria<sup>49</sup>. Most of the subjects come or could come from the (expanding and contracting) Ptolemaic empire or its fringes, but of course not necessarily direct — it is a time when immigrants to Egypt maintain their original ethnics. Very few of them come from the Greek heartland. Prosopography may add more ethnic information, as the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* expands: what we have confirms that the name Arimmas (13) appears only in the Cyrenaica, Agoranax (49) overwhelmingly

<sup>46</sup> FRASER 1972, II 826 n.221.

<sup>47</sup> SWINNEN 1970; BARBANTANI 2001, 32-3.

<sup>48</sup> FRASER 1972, I 369-70.

<sup>49</sup> MEILLIER 115-128 seeks to expand the circle.

on Rhodes. More important, it may help to decide whether particular names could belong to real people, or whether they should be taken as speaking names. Erasixenos, the great party-giver of *Epigr.* [36], bears a suitable name which is so far not attested in ordinary use. On the other hand, it turns out that Acheloos (29) can indeed be a personal name; however comic they sound, Aischra (50) is occasionally attested, Mikkos (48, 50; cf. Mil. XIV 28?) quite widely. Akeson (54) sits well in a healing inscription; but again the name is well-attested for Cyrenaica and on Rhodes. Speaking names may in any case exist in the real world: Kallistion, 'Little Beauty', nicknamed 'Sow' (Machon 433), who may be the same as Kallistion nicknamed 'The poor man's Helen' (Athen. 13.585b), may also feature in, or inspire, Posidippus (8 *HE*), whose Kallistion never turned away a lover, Hedylus (3 *HE*), whose Kallistion drank 18 pints of neat liquor, and the Vienna papyrus (114), where Kallistion and vomit cohabit. But this does not sound like the Kallistion of Callimachus *Epigr.* 55, who dedicates a fine lamp for her child Apellis.

Among all these names, those of the all-highest rarely figure. *Epigr.* 5 records a dedication to Aphrodite-Arsinoe in the much-lauded temple at Zephyrium, the dedicatrix Selenaie comes from Smyrna, the dedicated shell from Ioulis on Ceos, a Ptolemaic possession which has special connections with Arsinoe<sup>50</sup>. An elaborately subtle tribute. But it was the omnipresent Posidippus who celebrated the dedication of Callicrates' temple (Mil. VI 30; Posidipp. 12 and 13 *HE*), as well as other dedications to Arsinoe, and whose epigrams on Ptolemaic achievements were still remembered by a cack-handed Macedonian porridge-seller at Memphis two generations later<sup>51</sup>. Posidippus (assuming that the Milan poems are his, and that the editors rightly identify epinician poems for Berenice I and for Berenice II) must have been a close contemporary of Callimachus; he may have been

<sup>50</sup> ROBERT 1960, 153-5; BAGNALL 1976, 142-3; BARBANTANI 2001, 53.

<sup>51</sup> See n.61.

a competitor in this market (later identified as one of the Telchines<sup>52</sup>, but we should not put too much trust in that). The argument from silence is dangerous. It may be that Callimachus chose to celebrate Berenice II, at least, in longer and more elaborate elegies<sup>53</sup>; it may be that he too wrote epigrams, which have not survived because Meleager ignored them just as he did those of Posidippus<sup>54</sup>. However that may be, we have no way of telling from such ‘court poetry’ what sort of position either poet occupied in regard to the court: salaried dependent, or an independent with privileged entrée?<sup>55</sup>

The audience was not limited to the literary salons of the capital. Zeno, who commissioned two epitaphs on a hunting dog, may have imported the poems, but they remained among his papers at Philadelphia<sup>56</sup>. The Riddle of the Oyster (*SH* 983) is said to have been found at Memphis. Four notable collections come to us from mummy cartonnage found in the *chora*: the Vienna papyrus kept company with documents from the Arsinoite nome<sup>57</sup>, the Milan papyrus was accompanied by documents from the Heracleopolite and the Arsinoite<sup>58</sup>; *SH* 961 and 985 derive from cartonnage excavated in the same area (Gurob). Bastianini and Gallazzi repeat the warning that the provenance of the cartonnage (demonstrated by its find-place or by its documentary content) does not prove the provenance of its literary content; they cite the famous example of the cartonnage recovered at Abusir el-Melek but constructed of documents from Alexandria<sup>59</sup>. The caution is wise, but it is only a caution. The added premise, that bibliographically elaborate literary texts must come from Alexandria, is not proven and in

<sup>52</sup> *Schol. Flor.* 5 on *Aet.* fr.1.

<sup>53</sup> Below p.130.

<sup>54</sup> Below p.124.

<sup>55</sup> WEBER 1993, 8ff. On the concept see KERKHECKER 1997.

<sup>56</sup> See n.32.

<sup>57</sup> *CPR* XVIII p.1. See p.119.

<sup>58</sup> BASTIANINI and GALLAZZI 2001, 3-5. See p.116.

<sup>59</sup> Published in *BGU* IV.

my view begs the question; and even if it is true, that does not prove that these texts arrived only as scrap. The fact that there are four instances undermines scepticism. Some epigrams will have had a social use: so with the poem which a soldier took, along with some drinking songs, as far as Elephantine<sup>60</sup>. Others, of a patriotic kind, had their place in the school: note the Didot papyrus (written in the Memphite Serapeum) and the Guéraud Jouguet schoolbook (reported to come from the Fayum)<sup>61</sup>.

## II. *A historical context: the inscribed epigram*

This volume says much about Callimachus' relation to the literary tradition. The epigrams present a special case. The inscribed epigram attests a continuous history over four centuries; and that history overlaps the tradition of the book-epigram, since it seems clear that at some stage (but perhaps not until the third century, in parallel with the larger collection and coordination of the Greek poetic inheritance) some stone-epigrams were collected in book form. The exact channels of transmission are not traceable. If we ask about the sources of the presumed *Sylloge Simonidea*, we could think of oral transmission; of piecemeal quotation in earlier authors, as with the epitaph of Megistias<sup>62</sup>; or of systematic activity by hellenistic (or earlier)

<sup>60</sup> See n.36.

<sup>61</sup> Posidippus 11 and 12 *HE* (on the Pharos and on the temple of Arsinoe Aphrodite at Zephyrium); Anonymus, *SH* 978-9 (on a fountain with a statue of Arsinoe; on Ptolemy IV's temple of Homer). The literary extracts in the Didot papyrus were copied by the teenager Apollonius and his older brother Ptolemy. It was Ptolemy who supplied the epigrams; but it seems likely that he retained them from his schooling, indeed he may have written them from memory like the 'Euripidean' speech which precedes them, see THOMPSON 1987, 112-3. See in general J. WISSMANN, "Hellenistic Epigrams as School-Texts in Classical Antiquity", to be published in the Proceedings of the Fifth Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry.

<sup>62</sup> HDT. 7.228.3.

epigraphers<sup>63</sup>, who will have assigned anonymous inscriptional poems to what they thought appropriate golden names from the past. In this way epigram joins the emergent canon; this 'Simonides' may be present to Callimachus' mind as he organised Simonides' epinicians, and could extend classical prestige to the genre<sup>64</sup>. At the same time, new patrons could, through the old form, share the glamour of old patrons. Thus the Milan epigram for an Olympic victory of Berenice (I) deliberately alludes to the dedication of the Spartan princess Cynisca: new inscription (or pseudo-inscription) looks back a century to historical inscription, the new Macedonian Queen of Egypt acquires the prestige of the blue-blooded princess of Sparta<sup>65</sup>.

There is a temptation to make a simple division between stone-epigrams and book-epigrams, the former old, functional and anonymous, the latter new, ornamental and authored, and to link this with a chronological scheme, under which the epigram expands from stone to book only in the hellenistic age and in so doing moves to new functions or non-functions, either by the expansion of epigraphic genres (thus from real epitaphs to fictional or parodic epitaphs) or by the creation of new types (thus, erotic/sympotic epigrams which have no inscriptional use). But of course things are not so simple<sup>66</sup>. (i) Stone-epigrams were already entering book-transmission, as with 'Simonides' or (for example) the Athenian herm of the early fifth century whose inscription (*CEG I* 313) reached the Anthology (*AP* 6.138) under the name of Anacreon. (ii) Already in the fourth century we find inscribed epitaphs which are in fact fictional. Epitaphs

<sup>63</sup> ROSSI 2001, 98-9.

<sup>64</sup> CALL. fr.441. On the *Sylloge Simonidea*, *FGE* pp.119-23; ERBSE 1998. No specimen of such a collection has yet appeared among the papyri; the Σιμωνίδειων ὑπ(όμνημα) of *POxy* 2433 most likely expounded Simonides' dicta, see PFEIFFER 1968, 222 n.6.

<sup>65</sup> Berenice, Mil. XIII 31-4; Cynisca, *CEG II* 820 (and *AP* 13.16). Of course, the poet might have taken his knowledge of Cynisca from Xenophon (*Ages.* 9.6). But both ladies dedicate quadrigas; and Cynisca's epigram circulated beyond the stone, since it made its way into *AP* 13.

<sup>66</sup> See most recently ROSSI 2001, 3-13.

for mythical figures and on dead poets are already exemplified, on bronze or stone, in *CEG* II 656 (Sicyon, the grave of Iphi-noe buried by Melampous!), 674 (Paros, the grave of Archilochus)<sup>67</sup>. (iii) Anonymity was first breached, so far as our evidence goes, by Ion of Samos, who claimed authorship (by way of a sphragis, not by simple signature) of verses added to the Spartan dedication at Delphi for the victory of Aigospotamoi (*CEG* II 819) — added probably in the later fourth century, another example of the post-historical epigram. Signatures begin later: so with Philostratos' dedication on Delos (late II BC), which carries verses signed by Antipater of Sidon and Antisthenes of Paphos<sup>68</sup>. (iv) The distinction between functional and amusement epigrams did not hold in the inheritance either. Callistratus quoted a sympotic improvisation of Simonides, Chamaeleon cited two hexameter riddles of Simonides as 'epigrams'<sup>69</sup>. Polemo of Ilium, although he earned the sobriquet στηλοκόπας, recorded in his 'Epigrams city by city' an epitaph on the boozy Arcadian (more conventional than *Epigr.* [36]) and a couplet on the drunkenness of the Eleans, neither likely to have stood on stone<sup>70</sup>. Even sympotic epigrams have a function, as party pieces; and the wide circulation of epigrams in the third century may relate to social performance as well as to private reading. Some items may survive in oral tradition; presumably we cannot rule out the possibility of private collections or systematic joke-books even before the third century<sup>71</sup>.

Even in individual poems, the distinction between a 'literary' and a 'real' epigram may be hard to draw. Callimachus' *Epigr.* 54,

<sup>67</sup> It would not be surprising if mock-epitaphs have an early history in the sympotic tradition, but in the nature of things we have no way of proving it. See e.g. *FGE* p.252 on Timocreon.

<sup>68</sup> *Inscr Délos* 2549 (Antipater Sid. 42 *HE*). Antipater's piece did not make its way into Meleager's Garland — because never circulated in book-form? or because judged too run-of-the-mill?

<sup>69</sup> ATHEN. 3.125c = CALLISTR., *FGrHist* 348 F 3; ATHEN. 10.456c = CHAMAEI. fr.34 Wehrli.

<sup>70</sup> ATHEN. 10.436d, 442e = frr.79-80 Preller.

<sup>71</sup> For the Elephantine material see n.36; for joke-books, n.38.

where the *pinax* witnesses that Akeson has paid his vow to Asklepios, looks very like the epigram of Kleo which anchors the first of the Epidaurus healing inscriptions<sup>72</sup>. It has been argued that Akeson is a speaking name, the poem therefore a simulation. The fact that Akeson exists as a real name elsewhere<sup>73</sup> is not necessarily decisive; a speaking name may be invented, but it may also be a real name which is made to speak by its context. Among the *Iamatika* of the Milan papyrus, Antichares on his two sticks has a direct parallel at Epidaurus<sup>74</sup>. Even the extraordinary skeletal bronze dedicated by Medeios, who came from far-away Olynthos to cure the bite of the Libyan asp, corresponds to a real type<sup>75</sup>. But what of the deaf Cretan, whom Asklepios cured so thoroughly that he could "hear through a brick wall"?<sup>76</sup> Real inscription, imitation inscription, or parody? In many ways, such questions may be trivial. But they affect also a basic question of interpretation. An epigram placed in a particular temple, or below a particular statue, may not need to specify details which the stone-reader sees for himself; a verse-epitaph may deliberately exclude basic information about the dead, because that is supplied by an accompanying prose inscription (the point is made explicit in *CEG* II 532). It has been argued, for example, that Callimachus' two self-epitaphs (21, 35) must have stood together in a book-text, so that one explained the other. How do we know that one of them (35?) was not designed for inscription, with a prose heading and perhaps a monument which did explain? We assume that such incomplete texts, like allusive personal squibs, would not be published, unless rewritten to be self-explanatory. Did ancient authors think the same?

There is another aspect of the epigraphic tradition. The hellenistic epigrammatist will be surrounded by inscribed verses in

<sup>72</sup> *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1 121.2 A 7ff (HERZOG 1931, p.8).

<sup>73</sup> Above p.108.

<sup>74</sup> Mil. XIV 38-XV 2; *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1 123.123ff.

<sup>75</sup> Mil. XIV 30-37. Compare the 'emaciated youth' found at Soissons, pictured e.g. in KOZLOFF, MITTEN and FABING 1988, 151. I owe the parallel to Professor R.R.R. Smith.

<sup>76</sup> Mil. XV 11-14.

traditional uses — epitaphs, dedications, and perhaps others less obvious or on material less durable (on shop-signs see above p.104)<sup>77</sup>. These represent an accumulated inheritance of motifs and diction, a kind of epigrammatic koine<sup>78</sup>. The day-to-day demand for epitaphs and dedications continued; I assume that all over the Greek world educated amateurs or moonlighting schoolmasters could construct occasional pieces to a very respectable standard; Zeno's composer<sup>79</sup> may be one of these. At the same time, more ambitious poets have something which they could spin, avoid or parody. The conventional epitaph asked the passer-by to stop and read; so the joke epitaphs of Timon and Menoitios reverse the convention — the dead grouch resents being disturbed<sup>80</sup>. More subtle effects can be obtained by modifying conventional language. Thus in Callimachus' epitaph for Nikoteles (*Epigr.* 19)<sup>81</sup>. The distich limits itself largely to the basic information: age, patronymic, 'here' (in his unnamed city), name occupy the four corners of the couplet. Within these limits, the emotional comment: *παῦδα πατήρ*, the order of nature reversed; *τὴν πολλὴν ἐλπίδα*, the future destroyed. The death of the *παιᾶς ἀωρος* has a long tradition, the examples collected by Véritilhac; and it is in *ἐλπίδα* that Véritilhac sees the originality of this poem. Simplicity makes it, as one can see from the floundering imitation set up, a generation or two later, at Kios on the Propontis<sup>82</sup>. The cement is the verb, *ἀπέθηκε*. That emphasises the pathos, says Wilamowitz: "Vorbei, vorbei". True; and it works in part by contrast with tradition. In the stone epitaphs

<sup>77</sup> On the reactions of the passing reader: P. BING, "Pleasure in reading? Inscribed Epigram and its Readers in Antiquity", to be published in the proceedings of the Fifth Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry.

<sup>78</sup> For the moment I assume that this is a panhellenic koine. But it may well be that further study would show local sub-traditions.

<sup>79</sup> See p.104.

<sup>80</sup> Above p.105. ROSSI 2001, 10-11.

<sup>81</sup> See on this WILAMOWITZ 1924, II 119; VÉRILHAC 1978-82, II 121-2. DECREUS 1986 and REDONDO 1987/8 discuss the affective alliteration.

<sup>82</sup> GVI 661 (VÉRILHAC no.164; now SGO II 09.01.03), dated with the usual doubts iii/ii BC. Noetus commemorates his son Asclepiodotos, *τὴν πᾶσαν εἰς γῆν ἐλπίδων κρύψας χαράν*.

of the fourth century, collected in *CEG* II, the grammatical subject is normally the dead, or the tomb that contains him; when the subject is a survivor, the object is normally the tomb or its equivalent (*μνῆμα*, *μνημεῖον*, *σῆμα*, *εἰκών*); only very rarely is a survivor said to bury the dead (533, 548, 648). In the second case, the verb is variously *τεῦξε*, (*ἐπ*)*έστησε*, *ἔθηκε*, *ἀνέθηκε*<sup>83</sup>, and more often *ἐπέθηκε*. The first pattern continues in a contemporary distich inscribed at Alexandria<sup>84</sup>. Callimachus chooses the third structure (whose possibilities are illustrated by *GVI* 286-301), and combines it with a different compound of *τίθημι*. *Κατέθηκε* had a history (*CEG* I 66) and a long future (*GVI* 314 etc.), and an obvious meaning. For *ἀπέθηκε* I have not found a parallel earlier; when it reappears five centuries later, in stone epitaphs from Termessos (*GVI* 1751 = *TAM* III 689) and Rome (*GVI* 298), it looks like an imitation of Callimachus. It is best illustrated from a contemporary document. In *PTebt* III 703.158 the dioiketes of Egypt instructs subordinate officials what to do with oil-making machinery not currently in use: it is to kept under seal *ἐν ταῖς ἀποθήκαις*. Just so Callimachus' own Hecale set aside her precious olives to be preserved: this time the middle, *ἀπεθήκατο* (fr.36 Hollis), for this time what is 'set aside' can be brought back into the living world.

### III. A contemporary context: the epigram on papyrus

The chance finds of papyri from the third and second centuries illustrate the wide circulation of epigram-books, the profuse production of epigrams, and the small proportion of them which was transmitted in Meleager's *Garland*. For the present purpose I concentrate on two major finds which illustrate what an epigram book could look like in the late third century BC<sup>85</sup>.

<sup>83</sup> See FRASER 1972, II 823 n.195.

<sup>84</sup> *GVI* 112 = BERNARD 1969, no.92 = VÉRILHAC no.6.

<sup>85</sup> For surveys of the papyrological material, see CAMERON 1993, 1-18; ARGENTIERI 1998; GUTZWILLER 1998, 20-36.

(i) The Milan Papyrus (*PMil. Vogl.* VIII 309).<sup>86</sup>

*Content.* c. 110 elegiac epigrams (in all c. 600 lines).

*Preservation.* What we have seems to be the beginning of the roll; the end is lost. There is no way of telling how much has gone. The preserved portion covers 1.5 m. of papyrus; some rolls of this period can be calculated (when they contain known texts) at 4 to 9 m. and more<sup>87</sup>.

*Provenance.* The roll was reconstructed from cartonnage. The cartonnage is of unknown provenance, but it contains also five documents (*PMil. Vogl.* [IX] 320-4), one from the Arsinoite nome and four from the Heracleopolite.

*Date.* (a) The accompanying documents carry dates which range from 188/7 to 178/7 BC. (b) The literary script would be consistent with a date in the later third century.

*Format.* The epigrams are set out consecutively and divided only by paragraphoi.

*Production.* The epigrams are written on the recto; the verso has been used to carry four columns of a mythographic work. The original scribe corrected some of his own errors; according to the editors, two other hands intervened later — one only in cols IV-V (they think him a proof-reader), one only in col. XI (an attentive reader?).

*Stichometry.* Col. I has a line-total written at the foot. Otherwise the line-count is done section by section: lines marked off in tens by dots in the left-hand margin, the total for the section noted to the left of the last line.

*Annotation.* Eight epigrams have τοῦ written to the left of their first or second line. The editors suggested understanding this as τοῦ(τοῦ).

*Organisation.* The poems come in sections, each with a section-heading. Ten sections survive in part: λιθι]κά, οἰωνοσκοπικά, ἀναθεματικά, [ ] (epitaphs), ἀνδριαγτῷποικά, ἵππικά, ναυαγικά, ἱαματικά, τρόποι, [ ].

<sup>86</sup> G. BASTIANINI and C. GALLAZZI, *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi* (Milano 2001). Some addenda and corrigenda: AUSTIN 2001.

<sup>87</sup> BLANCHARD, in MANIACI 1993, 37-9.

*Title.* The first column begins with a heading, but this the editors reconstruct as the expected section-heading. They report that the beginning of the roll has been repaired, so that any original initial title (written to the left or on the back of the roll) will have been removed. Any final title is lost with the roll-end.

*Authorship.* One epigram is transmitted in *AP*, another by Tzetzes, under the name of Posidippus. The editors infer that all these poems belong to him. They discuss whether this collections represents his complete works (but we know from *AP* epigrams of Posidippus which do not appear in the relevant sections of the papyrus); or his complete work of certain years (but the epigrams, as interpreted here, range in date from c. 284 to c. 247 BC); or a selection made by the poet or by an editor. Perhaps. The concrete arguments against are not decisive. It could be said that the accumulation of poems on limited topics (gems, royal victories) is beyond a single author<sup>88</sup>: but not beyond a serial epigrammatist such as Posidippus? It could be said that the epigrams vary greatly in quality<sup>89</sup>: but most poets will have their ups and downs. Yet the argument in favour rests on an assumption, that, if the epigrams belonged to different authors, the scribe would have attached a name to each. It is true that the Soros conjured up by Reitzenstein (in which poems by Asclepiades, Posidippus and Hedylus were mingled without attribution) remains an ingenious spectre<sup>90</sup>: *SH* 961, with the title σύμμεικτα ἐπιγράμματα and the name of Posidippus so placed as to suggest that other names followed, proves only the existence of mixed collections, not the absence of attributions within them. But it may be worth asking who was interested in authorship. Authors, of course, may wish to maintain their authorial claims (Ion of Chios, and then Posidippus himself, took

<sup>88</sup> So PUELMA 1997, 196 n.28.

<sup>89</sup> H. LLOYD-JONES (review forthcoming in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*).

<sup>90</sup> See H. LLOYD-JONES, *ibid.* for the suggestion that the Milan Papyrus actually contains the Soros.

the most effective step of naming themselves in their poem)<sup>91</sup>; those who commission poems may want to assert their own prestige by asserting a famous author (as the Delian dedication of Philostratos is actually attributed on the stone to Antipater of Sidon<sup>92</sup>). But how clear is it that readers cared? and, if not, compilers may have been equally careless. Some readers did care: when Ptolemy, around 161 BC, wrote out two epigrams on royal achievements, he duly headed them with the name of Posidippus<sup>93</sup>. But that reflects school, and patriotism. On the other hand, the sympotic elegy (or is it an epigram?) of the Elephantine papyrus is as anonymous as the scolia that go with it<sup>94</sup>. Perhaps a reciter for party-goers had different proprieties.

*Metre.* All the poems are in elegiacs.

*Lengths.* 0 epigrams of 2 lines, 58 of 4 lines, 39 of 6, 11 of 8; only 1 of 10 lines, and 3 of 14 (two of them among the ἵππικά).

*Function.* On the face of it, a full text for reading, perhaps produced by a professional scribe (note the corrections by other hands). That leaves two oddities. One is the stichometry, not for a unified book but section by section. The other is the question of τοῦ(το): if the note is correctly expanded, and picks out certain poems as 'this one', what purpose does the selection serve? To be recited at the next party? To be recopied for a smaller selection?

(ii) The Vienna Papyrus (*P.Vindob G 40611*)<sup>95</sup>.

*Content.* c. 240 epigram-incipits, each followed by a note of the total number of lines in the original poem.

*Preservation.* The beginning of the roll survives, with its head-title. Length at present 70 cm. The last of the seven columns on

<sup>91</sup> CEG II 819.13; SH 705.5.

<sup>92</sup> *Inscr. Délos* 2549 = Antipater Sid. 42 HE.

<sup>93</sup> POSIDIPP. 11-12 HE. See n.61.

<sup>94</sup> See n.36.

<sup>95</sup> Preliminary account in HARRAUER 1981. Details of documents from the same cartonnage: *CPR XVIII* p.1. B. Kramer and P. Parsons are preparing a full publication.

the recto ends short, which implies an end; yet the text on the verso suggests that the roll continued.

*Provenance.* The roll was reconstructed from cartonnage. The cartonnage is of unknown provenance, but it contains also documents from the Themistes and Polemo divisions of the Arsinoite nome, some published (*P.RainerCent.* 47-9, *CPR XVIII*), some not.

*Date.* (a) The documents *P.RainerCent.* 47 and 49 carry the dates 213 and 212 BC; the register *CPR XVIII* dates from a 'year 16', probably 231 rather than 206. (b) The literary script would be consistent with a date in the later third century or the earlier second.

*Format.* The incipits are set out consecutively and divided only by paragraphoi.

*Script.* A rapid half-cursive, which (like the nature of the text) suggests a private document.

*Production.* The epigrams continue from the recto to the verso.

*Stichometry.* At the foot of each of the first four columns, a total of the lines in the poems listed. At the foot of col. IV, a total of the epigrams (83) and of the lines (more than 300) under Book I. The other columns (V-VII) on the recto have no such totals; at least one occurs on the verso (213).

*Annotation.* At least 17 incipits have εὐ written to their left, without any mark of abbreviation. It might be taken as εῦ; but given the use of ἐπιζητούμενα in the heading, εὔρον or εὔρημένον seems more appealing.

*Organisation.* The incipits are apparently drawn from a larger work in at least four books. Apart from the initial title (below), we have ἐν τῇ β̄ βύβλῳ (92) and ἐν τῇ δ̄ βύβλῳ (173). No section headings; and in fact, the arrangement, so far as can be judged from first lines, mingled different types — thus the first column offers a white headband, charming Parthenios, Saktas the herald, Timon's old woman, Delos, love, and Laios, i.e. elements of the erotic, the satyric and perhaps the dedicatory. There is no clear sign that the original books differed by content.

*Title.* The first column begins with the heading  $\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\pi\iota\zeta\eta\tau\omega\mu$   $\nu\epsilon\nu\alpha\ \tau\omega\ \epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\rho\mu\mu\alpha\tau\omega\ \dot{\nu}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\iota\ \bar{\alpha}\ \beta\bar{u}\beta\lambda\omega\iota$ .

*Authorship.* One incipit (1 14) recurs in Asclepiades *AP* 12.46, and provisionally (note Harrauer's reservations, and Cameron 1993, 381-2) we can assign this line to him (the line-total also suits). Since there are no author names, it would be possible to infer that all the poems are by Asclepiades. But this argument, uncertain for the Milan Papyrus, would be still more uncertain here, where there is no substantive text but only a concatenation of incipits.

*Metre.* Not all the incipits would scan as hexameters.

*Lengths.* Where the figure is legible: 13 epigrams of 2 lines, 106 of 4, 20 of 6, 9 of 8, 1 of 10, 2 of 12; also 2 of 20, 1 of 21 (not elegiacs!), 1 of 40<sup>96</sup>.

*Function.* This is not a reading text, but a list. The heading shows that the list represents a selection from a longer work in at least four books. Most likely, it seems to me, it is a list of desiderata which were to be copied from the longer work, each item specified by its first words and (for greater security in an undivided text) its number of lines<sup>97</sup>.

(iii) Other papyri illustrate other possibilities<sup>98</sup>:

*PPetrie F134* (earlier III BC?)<sup>99</sup>, a three-line poem (or excerpt), apparently in hendecasyllables, mentioning a bald man and "wine, love and the lyre"; then  $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , as often in collections of epigrams, to introduce the next poem, though the rest of the papyrus is blank.

*SH 961* (mid III BC?), with the back-title  $\sigma\mu\mu\epsilon\iota\kappa\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\rho\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ , then, on another line and indented,  $\Pi\sigma\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\pi\tau\omega\mu$ . Lasserre read other names after this; I couldn't see them, but the placing of the first name does seem to suggest that others

<sup>96</sup> HARRAUER 1981, 51 mentions a further poem of 52 lines, but the reading of the figure is doubtful.

<sup>97</sup> Contra CAMERON 1993, 10.

<sup>98</sup> See n.85.

<sup>99</sup> Published in WOUTERS 1977.

originally stood there, i.e. this was not 'Mixed Epigrams of Posidippus' but 'Mixed Epigrams by Posidippus and...'.<sup>100</sup>

*SH* 985 (datable to the later third century BC), epigrams on tragedies<sup>100</sup>, each tragedy and its author (but not the author of the epigram) identified in a heading. This looks like a thematic set by a single poet. Some scholars have seen them as destined to be prefixed individually to the play-text concerned. Gabathuler 1937, 50 sensibly observed, that such epigrams should begin with an element of the type 'This is the work of...', as e.g. in *Asclep.* *AP* 7.11 (on Erinna's *Distaff*); thus *Call. Epigr.* 6, in which the *Oechalia* speaks (but not in *Epigr.* 27 on Aratus). In the papyrus, not enough survives of the line-beginnings to see whether this element is present. Aristarchus (12), Astydamas (16), but then Pratinas (21, as re-read by Maltomini), i.e. hardly an alphabetic sequence of playwrights.

*PKöln* V 204 (II BC) has the heading Μνασάλκου, then six epigrams, two known from *AP* (which assigns one to Mnasalkes and one to Hegesippus). No individual headings; if there were dividing paragraphoi, they are lost with the left-hand margin.

*POxy* XLVII 3324 (I BC/I AD), four known epigrams by Meleager (all amatory), one unknown. No general or individual headings; left-hand margin lost.

*POxy* IV 662 = *PLitLond* 62 (I BC/I AD), epigrams grouped thematically, each with author heading.

*POxy* LIV 3724 (later I AD), c. 175 incipits in rapid cursive, another private document, most likely a list of epigrams for an anthology (with check-marks against some items). No subject headings, no author names; content, where deducible, mainly sympotic/erotic. 30 reappear in *AP*, of which 2 ascribed to Asclepiades and 27 to Philodemus. There are arguments for attributing more to Philodemus, or even all<sup>101</sup>.

*POxy* LIV 3725, LXVI 4501-2 (later I AD?), amateur copies, perhaps from the same manuscript or at least the same hand,

<sup>100</sup> See the valuable reedition in MALTOMINI 2001.

<sup>101</sup> See CAMERON 1993, 380-1; SIDER 1997, 203-25; PUGLIA 2000.

epigrams of which three reappear in *AP* with an ascription to Nicarchus (II) and the rest could be attributed to him. Subject headings (not consistently); no author headings.

#### IV. *Schools of epigram?*

Direct comparison between the Milan and Vienna papyri is bound to be partial, and not just because the full publication of the Vienna incipits is yet to come. M looks like a normal book, despite its oddities; V looks like working papers, on the lines of *POxy* 3724. M breaks off; we cannot tell how much is missing, but certainly there is room for as many epigrams again, in other categories. V may be complete; but the reconstruction of a poem from its incipit, even when fully legible, leaves much room for uncertainty. M may transmit poems by a single author, though the proof is from the negative. V looks more like an anthology, though that too cannot be proved.

Even so, some points of interest emerge from these texts individually or in contrast. We can look at them in terms of organisation, subject-matter, poem length and range of metres.

**Organisation.** M, whether it is the work of a single author or an anthology of several, organises itself by subject-types of an idiosyncratic kind. V depends on a work in four or more books; but to judge from what can be seen, these books were not arranged by metre, or alphabetically, or indeed by subject.

**Subjects.** In M as it stands, most of the epigrams belong to traditional epigraphic types or at least relate closely to objects; in V it seems that typically sympotic themes are mixed with the rest. But of course it is possible that M too included sympotic material, in the part of the roll now lost.

M's subject-headings are more specific than the very general divisions familiar from *AP* and first attested for Agathias' *Cycle*: thus *epitumbia* are subdivided under at least three categories

([ ], *nauagika, tropoi*). The division shows up the less obvious possibilities of the genre — less obvious to us, perhaps, because Meleager suppressed them.

Thus of 15 epigrams on engraved gems (Mil. I 1 – III 7), only one (II 39) survived elsewhere, and that in Tzetzes for its herpetological interest. We have a parallel in Asclepiades' lines on Cleopatra's ring (*AP* 9.752)<sup>102</sup>, the only such piece to be included in the *Garland*<sup>103</sup>. Most of the Milan poems include a deictic pronoun, as if the epigram were attached to the gem as an inscription to a statue; that suggests that they were not simply mini-ekphrasis of mini-artworks (the context in *AP*), nor simply tributes to the grandees who owned the treasures, although some of the gems have an antiquarian glamour (engraved with a Persian king, I 14, I 36; even the Ring of Polycrates, II 3!<sup>104</sup>) suitable to the very rich, but labels or notes to accompany presents. We would guess this to be a flourishing type. But Meleager included only the one; Callimachus, as we have him, shows no example.

The *Oionoskopika* (Mil. IV 8 – VI 8) include a series of ominous birds, ominous human encounters (IV 30, V 6) and accidents (V 26), a sweating statue (V 16) and a fatal dream (V 32); at the end an advertisement for Damon the diviner and an epitaph for Strymon the soothsayer set up in thanks by Alexander (VI 1, VI 5). Some at least, which validate general predictions with a real case (even that of the Argeads and Alexander, V 20), may have functioned like *Iamatika* in confirming the credentials of the art or indeed of Damon in particular. No parallel in Callimachus; nor I think in the *Garland*, though they may be presupposed in later epigrams which satirise the omen (*AP* 11.186) or the mantic profession.

*Anathematika* (VI 10 – VII 8) comprise only six poems, and the four which can be understood are all dedications to Arsinoe

<sup>102</sup> See GUTZWILLER 1995.

<sup>103</sup> The other items collected (*AP* 9.746–54) are all later.

<sup>104</sup> The Empress Livia dedicated a Ring of Polycrates in the Temple of Concord, PLIN. *Nat.* 37.4. Was it another fake? or did it reach her through the Ptolemaic royal treasure?

(II): a royal selection. There must have been a lot of these; the Didot papyrus preserves another by Posidippus (12 HE), Athenaeus collects one each by Posidippus (13 HE), Callimachus (*Epigr.* 5) and Hedylus (4 HE) — none of these in the *Garland*.

*Andriantopoika* (x 8 – xi 19). *AP* collects descriptions of statues, and of these some go back to the *Garland* (of course the boundary between *ekphrasis* and dedication may be blurred). Callimachus' surviving epigrams include no such *ekphraseis*: because he chose to develop statues at greater length, in the *Aetia* and most spectacularly in the statistical anti-*ekphrasis* of *Iambus* 6?

*Hippika* (Mil. xi 21 – XIV 1). Eighteen dedications for victories in the horse- and chariot-races at the Olympian, Pythian and Nemean Games. Five refer apparently to Berenice II, two more to Berenice (I) (xii 20 – XIII 14; XIII 31 – XIV 1). These link to a long epigraphic tradition<sup>105</sup>, indeed, one alludes directly to the preserved inscription of another royal victor (above p.111). Callimachus would have had opportunities here, but his surviving epigrams celebrate other sorts of victory — in a cock-fight (56), in the theatre (8, 49). Was it too obvious? did he choose grander forms for royal patrons? (Below p.130.) But again there is the possibility that the *Garland* was not receptive to such topical items. It seems to have included *AP* 6.135, ascribed to Anacreon; and 9.588, ascribed to Alcaeus (of Messene) and attested also in *PTebt* I 3. The others, all ascribed to Simonides except for the anonymous 13.16, appear only in Book 13 and *App. Plan*. The same question might be asked about royal poems in general. Callimachus wrote an epigram for a statue of Berenice (which?) (51; cf. Asclepiades, *AP* 16.68), which found a home in the *Garland*; but the poems he and others centred on the temple of Aphrodite-Arsinoe were not taken up. Were Ptolemaic monarchs too remote from Gadara and the first century?

<sup>105</sup> Examples collected in EBERT 1972.

*Iamatika* (Mil. XIV 29 – XV 22). These too continue a vigorous epigraphic tradition<sup>106</sup>. Callimachus *Epigr.* 54 is one of the few surviving in *AP*.

*Tropoi* (Mil. XV 24 – XVI 17), eight poems of which only two survive substantially, both eccentric epitaphs: Menoitos the Cretan asks the passers-by why they bother him by asking his name and country; Soses of Cos reproaches the passer-by for not asking these questions. The former recalls the same joke in Callimachus *Epigr.* 3 (if it is his), and the similar Cretan in Callimachus *Epigr.* 11, both from *AP*.

Cameron notes that *skoptica*, *protreptica* and straightforward *sympotika* were not to Meleager's taste<sup>107</sup>. The Milan categories say something about other less popular types, and leave us to ask whether it was Callimachus or his anthologist who neglected these possibilities.

**Length.** The epigrams of the Milan Collection average six lines each; the longest run to 14 lines, of which one appropriately describes a giant boulder (III 28), two are dedications for royalty (XI 33, XII 20). Of the legible incipits of the Vienna Collection, 60% are of quatrains; but one at least — a description of a dinner, apparently<sup>108</sup> — ran to 20 lines; another to 21 and the next to 40. We could imagine, clearly, that the first poem of a book might be longer (such perhaps is the Arsinoe-poem which begins *SH* 961), and the last also (such would be Posidippus *SH* 705, if this was indeed the seal-poem of an epigram-collection). But the 40-liner is apparently the penultimate, not the last, poem of its column and perhaps of the whole list. This question, of course, has a wider bearing, to which I return below: how clearly was 'epigram' distinguished from 'elegy', and how far did any such distinction affect the Latin heirs of hellenistic poetry?

**Metres.** The Milan Collection offers only elegiac epigrams, and in that it agrees with the epigrams of Posidippus known

<sup>106</sup> Examples conveniently collected in HERZOG 1931; GIRONE 1998.

<sup>107</sup> CAMERON 1993, 12–15, 26.

<sup>108</sup> Something on the lines of Asclepiades *AP* 5.181?

from other sources, and by and large with the epigraphic tradition. The Vienna Collection, by contrast, has a good sprinkling of other metres: the best preserved column (and of course there is no guarantee that this is typical) 7 non-hexameter incipits out of 24. Callimachus' epigrams, as we have them, include three dedications in other metres: 37, iambic dimeters catalectic;<sup>109</sup> 38, the same alternating with a Phalaean; 39, pairs of the same alternating with an Archilochean; plus 40, an epitaph, Archilochean followed by Phalaean. The first three are transmitted in *AP* 13, the book of odd metres; Cameron has suggested that all four came to Cephalas from a polymetric book compiled not long after its latest poet, Philip<sup>110</sup>.

Cameron notes that, with the exception of Philip, these polymetric poems are by, or ascribed to, poets of the 5th to 3rd centuries and no later. Inscribed epigrams of the 5th and 4th centuries use no metrical units but hexameters, pentameters and iambic trimeters; epigrams in the literary tradition which diverge from this norm, and yet carry an attribution to the classical period, will be later fictions. For the third century poets certainly do borrow cola or structures from the lyric and epic past. The new epic structures have a clearer link to their archaic exemplars. The new use of lyric cola, stichically or not, looks more striking, and this is reflected in the designations Phalaean, Archebulean and the like; to recreate poems from lyric metres, and ascribe them to the original lyricists, are part of the same virtuoso exercise<sup>111</sup>. It may be significant that, when we turn to the quoted fragments of Callimachus' epigrams, we find more eccentric lengths: fr. 395 Phalaean again, fr. 399 a trochaic pentameter catalectic (ungainly enough to recall Philicus), fr. 400 Greater Asclepiad, fr. 401 stichic Pherecrateans (with a strong smell of Catullus), fr. 402 ithyphallics<sup>112</sup>. Of

<sup>109</sup> Cf. *SH* 12; 711.

<sup>110</sup> CAMERON 1993, 137ff.

<sup>111</sup> See most recently ROSSI 2001, 75-80.

<sup>112</sup> GOW in *HE* II 153 doubt whether frs. 399-401 come from epigrams at all. *AP* 13 describes fr. 399 and then fr. 400 as *ἐπιγραμματά*; I don't think that guesses

course these fragments survive precisely because of their metrical interest. But it shows that there were such things to find. It also invites the question, whether Meleager tended to neglect such poems (856 poems, of which only 25 not in elegiacs, a proportion of 3%). Thus with Asclepiades: the naming of the Asclepiad implies that he used it commonly; but there is no trace in the surviving epigrams (and indeed no adventure at all, except for the iambic-epodic *AP* 13.23 preserved for that reason). Thus with Phalaecus: two elegiac epigrams in the *Garland*, two eccentricities (including one in his named metre) in book 13. It could of course be argued that all eccentricities would have been picked up by the ancestor of *AP* 13. But that collection, it seems, took only one example of each metre or combination of metres, so that it says nothing about statistical incidence.

This raises the quantitative question: were the eccentricities originally more numerous than the *Garland* suggests, and in whom (note the unpurged corpus of Theocritus' epigrams)? Further, a question of how lyric metres in particular affected the epigram tradition. Much later, Diogenes Laertius would distinguish epigrams and lyrics, although they coexisted ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἐπιγραμμάτων ἡ Παχυμέτρῳ (1.39)... ἐνθα καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν τελευτησάντων ἐλλογίμων διείλεγμαι παντὶ μέτρῳ καὶ ῥυθμῷ, ἐπιγράμμασι καὶ μέλεσιν... (1.63)<sup>113</sup>. How far did Diogenes model his book on hellenistic collections? Is the distinction functional or merely metrical? It has been argued that the 'short lyrics' of Catullus draw themes from Greek epigram, whereas his Latin 'epigrams' do not. The answer may be that his elegiac epigrams relate closely to the hairy local tradition<sup>114</sup> still visible in the epigrams of Cornelius Gallus; whereas the 'short lyrics' look directly to similar pieces transmitted within the Greek epigram tradition. Here we have not only the Phalaean poems in *AP*,

about the content weigh enough to overturn this. Fr.401 is quoted simply as ποιημάτιον, but Caesius Bassus attests at least the same metre in *epigrammatibus*.

<sup>113</sup> See on this work MEJER 1978, 46-50.

<sup>114</sup> See in general MORELLI 2000.

but chance survivors on papyrus, the Petrie scolion<sup>115</sup>, and on stone, the dedication of Dionysodorus<sup>116</sup>. The chances increase that Callimachus' *παιᾶς κατάκλειστος* (fr. 401, stichic Pherecrateans) stands among Catullus' models.

Scholars who try to distinguish an Ionian from a Peloponnesian 'school' of epigrammatists rely chiefly on their subject matter, erotic/sympotic versus rustic/bucolic; the distinction seems increasingly untenable<sup>117</sup>. I am tempted to construct a simpler picture, based on formal factors: a more conservative tendency, short epigrams in elegiacs only, represented by the Milan Papyrus and so perhaps by Posidippus, and a more adventurous tendency, some longer poems, some rarer metres, represented by the Vienna Papyrus. Between these poles, we can place Callimachus's epigrams (and by inference his original collection) on the adventurous side. This might be a matter of generation; but since the evidence now makes Posidippus and Callimachus contemporaries, it will be a matter of taste. The conservative side came closer to continuing the epigraphic conventions; and contemporary epigraphic poems, not surprisingly, adhere with very few exceptions to the conservative wing. An epitaph on Ithaca (*GVT* 102) has Archilocheans alternating with pentameters; less surprising the Phalaean dedication from Pergamum, as carefully contrived in style and metre as suits a grandee dedicating a work of art to a king<sup>118</sup>.

## V. Epigrams and elegies

Jacoby argued that the Roman love-elegy did not imitate a hellenistic love-elegy, it amplified the hellenistic love-epigram<sup>119</sup>.

<sup>115</sup> See n.99.

<sup>116</sup> See n.118.

<sup>117</sup> Most recently, ROSSI 2001, 47.

<sup>118</sup> Now *SEG* 39.1334. PARSONS 1992, 15; LEHNUS 1996; ROSSI 2001, 79-80.

<sup>119</sup> JACOBY 1905. No certain example of a hellenistic love-elegy has accrued since. The curious elegy *POxy* 3723 has been argued to be a Roman imitation of a hellenistic text, or indeed a hellenistic text itself (that would be excluded, if we

That assumes that epigram and elegy occupied separate worlds (and book-rolls). Were there ambiguities? It is not clear at what point the two terms were distinguished enough to mark, as they do for us, a clear generic boundary<sup>120</sup>. In any case, the sympotic user of the *Theognidea* will have found longer and shorter elegiac passages juxtaposed for the same function. Length is an objective criterion; but it may be that matter and immediate literary context were more important.

That emerges when we look at Callimachus' epigrams in relation to his other works as they have been gradually reconstructed. Recent finds may suggest that, in the third century, the skies rained epigrams like tadpoles — a genre produced, it seems, in bulk, and read more widely than the larger achievements of contemporary poetry (the business of counting papyri is notoriously unreliable; but, with that reservation, epigram rivals New Comedy in its circulation). *Epigr.* 35 ostensibly opens a divide between ἀοιδή and the opportunist wit of the symposium (classifiable presumably as πατέγνια). But in fact there are clear interactions in Callimachus between the epigram tradition and his other poetry, especially the *Aetia*.

Thus *Epigr.* 1 is an αἶνος in sixteen lines, which Diogenes Laertius certainly found among the epigrams; its interest in the origins of a proverbial phrase might have qualified it for the *Aetia*, its personal (hostile?) application for the *Lambi*. Contrast the *Sepulchrum Simonidis* (fr. 64), which stands securely in the *Aetia*: this is an elaborate re-working of the funerary tradition, in which the dead epigrammatist speaks his own epitaph at more than traditional length and in more than traditional detail<sup>121</sup>.

Similarly with other types. The dialogue with the god-dedicatee (*Epigr.* 34) expands in the *Aetia* to a full-scale conversation

accept the enticing suggestion of John REA, *POxy* LXIII pp.2-3, that the poem refers to the death of Antinous); HOSE 1994 argues the contrary case that it represents a Greek imitation of the Latin elegy.

<sup>120</sup> See PUELMA 1997.

<sup>121</sup> Professor G.O. Hutchinson observes that, although the dead man speaks, the poem avoids indicating that it is inscribed.

(fr. 114, on the image of Apollo on Delos). The dedication of a lock of hair, a familiar epigrammatic theme, rises to new heights (like the lock itself) in the *Coma Berenices*. The Milan Papyrus shows how widespread were dedications by victors, including royal victors; it is a dedication by royalty, and a dedication to royalty, that are elaborated at the unusual length of 14 lines. Callimachus takes the historical victor Euthymus, whose original epigram could be seen at Olympia (*CEG* I 399), and celebrates his legend in elegy (*Aetia* frr. 98-99). For the new Nemean victory of Berenice II, probably one of those celebrated by 'Posidippus' (Mil. XII 34-9?), he went further. Pindar's victors could commission both an epigrammatic dedication and an epinician ode: so the Cretan long-runner Ergoteles (*CEG* I 393; *Ol.* 12). The *Victoria Berenices* combines the two<sup>122</sup>, in a poem which represents both an elegiac mutation of the epinician and a grandiose expansion of the epigram, with a glance perhaps at the victory-elegy with which the New Simonides has just acquainted us<sup>123</sup>.

<sup>122</sup> See FUHRER 1992, 1993.

<sup>123</sup> On hellenistic developments see BARBANTANI 2001. On Latin poets' play with epigram and elegy, G.O. HUTCHINSON, "The New Posidippus and Latin Poetry", in *ZPE* 138 (2002), 1-10.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Publications of papyri are referred to be the standard abbreviations listed in J.F. OATES et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, 5th edition, BASP Supplement 9 (2001).

- CEG P.A. HANSEN (Ed.), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, I-II (Berlin & New York 1983-1989).
- FGE D.L. PAGE (Ed.), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981).
- GP A.S.F. GOW and D.L. PAGE (Eds.), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*, I-II (Cambridge 1968).
- GVI W. PEEK (Hrsg.), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. Bd. I: *Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin 1955).
- HE A.S.F. GOW and D.L. PAGE (Eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, I-II (Cambridge 1965).
- IGUR L. MORETTI (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, I- (Roma 1968- ).
- SGO R. MERKELBACH and J. STAUBER (Hrsgg.), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, I (Stuttgart 1998); II (München-Leipzig 2001).
- SH H. LLOYD-JONES and P. PARSONS (Edd.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin & New York 1983).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ARGENTIERI 1998 L. ARGENTIERI, "Epigrama e libro", in *ZPE* 121 (1998), 1-20.
- AUSTIN 2001 C. AUSTIN, "Paralipomena Posidippaea", in *ZPE* 136 (2001), 22.
- BAGNALL 1976 R.S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976).
- BAIN 1978 D. BAIN, "Another occurrence of φίκις?", in *ZPE* 30 (1978), 36.
- BARBANTANI 1993 S. BARBANTANI, "I poeti lirici del canone alessandrino nell' epigrammatistica", in *Aevum Antiquum* 6 (1993), 5-97.
- BARBANTANI 2000 S. BARBANTANI, "Epinici distici di età ellenistica", in *Studium atque Urbanitas. Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris*, ed. M. CAPASSO and S. PERNIGOTTI, *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 9 (Lecce 2000).
- BARBANTANI 2001 S. BARBANTANI, Φάτις νικήφορος (Milano 2001).
- BASTIANINI and GALLAZZI 2001 G. BASTIANINI and C. GALLAZZI (edd.), *Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi* (Milano 2001).
- BERNAND 1969 E. BERNAND, *Inscriptions métriques de l' Égypte gréco-romaine* (Paris 1969).
- BIRT 1882 Th. BIRT, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Litteratur* (Berlin 1882).
- CAMERON 1993 A. CAMERON, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993).
- CAMERON 1995 A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995).
- COCO 1988 L. COCO (ed.), *Callimaco. Epigrammi* (Manduria-Bari-Roma 1988).
- D'ALESSIO 1996 G.B. D'ALESSIO (ed.), *Callimaco. I: Inni Epigrammi Ecale* (Milano 1996).
- DECREUS 1986 F. DECREUS, "Le poème 85 de Catulle et les épigrammes 28, 35 et 19 (Pf.) de Callimaque", in

- EBERT 1972 *Hommages à Jozef Veremans*, éd. par F. DECREUS & C. DEROUX (Bruxelles 1986), 48-56.
- ECKER 1990 J. EBERT, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gym-nischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin 1972).
- ERBSE 1998 U. ECKER, *Grabmal und Epigramm. Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* (Stuttgart 1990).
- FABIAN 1991 H. ERBSE, "Zu den Epigrammen des Simonides", in *RhM* 141 (1998), 213-30.
- FERRARI 1989 Oἰνηρὸς τεύχη. *Studi triestini di poesia conviviale*, a cura di Kl. FABIAN et alii (Alessandria 1991).
- FRASER 1972 F. FERRARI, "P.Berol. inv. 13270: I canti di Ele-fantina", in *SCO* 38 (1988), 181-227.
- FUHRER 1992 P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I-III (Oxford 1972).
- FUHRER 1992 Th. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel 1992).
- FUHRER 1993 Th. FUHRER, "Callimachus' Epinician Poems", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1993), 79-97.
- GABATHULER 1937 M. GABATHULER, *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*, Diss. Basel (Leipzig 1937).
- GENTILI 1968 B. GENTILI, "Epigamma ed elegia", in *L'Épigramme grecque*, Entretiens Hardt 14 (Vandœuvres-Genève 1968), 39-81.
- GIRONE 1998 M. GIRONE (ed.), *'Ιάματα. Guarigioni miracolose di Asclepio in testi epigrafici* (Bari 1998).
- GUTZWILLER 1995 K.J. GUTZWILLER, "Cleopatra's Ring", in *GRBS* 36 (1995), 383-98.
- GUTZWILLER 1998 K.J. GUTZWILLER, *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epi-grams in Context* (Berkeley 1998).
- HARDIE 1983 A. HARDIE, *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, Patrons, and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Liver-pool 1983).
- HARRAUER 1981 H. HARRAUER, "Epigrammincipit auf einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr., P.Vindob. G 40611. Ein Vorbericht", in *Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Papyrology* (Chico 1981), 49-53.

- HECKER 1852 A. HECKER, *Commentationis criticae de Anthologia Graeca pars prior* (Lugduni Batavorum 1852).
- HERZOG 1931 R. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion* (Leipzig 1931).
- HOPKINSON 1988 N. HOPKINSON (Ed.), *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge 1988).
- HOSE 1994 M. HOSE, "Die römische Liebeselodie und die griechische Literatur", in *Philologus* 138 (1994), 67-82.
- JACOBY 1905 F. JACOBY, "Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie", in *RhM* 60 (1905), 48-67 = *Kleine philologische Schriften* (Berlin 1961), II 73-89.
- KASSEL 1956 R. KASSEL, "Reste eines hellenistischen Spassmacherbuches auf einem Heidelberger Papyrus?", in *RhM* 99 (1956), 242-5 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin-New York 1991), 418-21.
- KERKHECKER 1997 A. KERKHECKER, "Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ. Dichter und Dichtung am Ptolemäerhof", in *A&A* 43 (1997), 124-44.
- KOZLOFF et al. 1988 A.P. KOZLOFF, D.G. MITTEN, S. FABING, *The Gods delight. The human figure in classical bronze* (Cleveland, Ohio c.1988).
- LEHNUS 1996 L. LEHNUS, "On the metrical inscription found at Pergamum (SEG 39.1334)", in *CQ* 46 (1996), 295-7.
- LEHNUS 2000 L. LEHNUS, *Nuova bibliografia callimachea* (Alessandria 2000).
- MALTOMINI 2001 F. MALTOMINI, "Nove epigrammi ellenistici riveduti (PPetrie II 49b)", in *ZPE* 134 (2001), 55-66.
- MANIACI 1993 *Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques*, a cura di M. MANIACI & P.F. MUNAFÒ, I, Studi e Testi 357 (Città del Vaticano 1993).
- MEILLIER C. MEILLIER, *Callimaque et son temps* (Lille n.d.).
- MEJER 1978 J. MEJER, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, Hermes Einzelschriften 40 (Wiesbaden 1978).
- MORELLI 2000 A.M. MORELLI, *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo* (Cassino 2000).

- MORELLI 1985 G. MORELLI, "Origini e formazione del XIII libro dell'Antologia Palatina", in *RFIC* 113 (1985), 257-96.
- MURRAY 1985 O. MURRAY, "Symposium and Genre in the poetry of Horace", in *JRS* 75 (1985), 39-50.
- PALUMBO 1984 B.M. PALUMBO STRACCA, "Le note metriche di A.P. XIII e la genesi del libro", in *BollClass* 5 (1984), 61-85.
- PARSONS 1992 P. PARSONS, "Poesia ellenistica: testi e contesti", in *Aevum Antiquum* 5 (1992), 9-19.
- PESTMAN 1981 P.W. PESTMAN (Ed.), *A Guide to the Zenon Archive (PL.Bat. 21)* (Leiden 1981).
- PFEIFFER 1968 R. PFEIFFER, *History of Classical Scholarship*, I (Oxford 1968).
- PUELMA 1997 M. PUELMA, "Epigramma: osservazioni sulla storia di un termine greco-latino", in *Maia* 49 (1997), 189-213.
- PUGLIA 2000 E. PUGLIA, "Considerazioni bibliologiche e testuali sulla raccolta di epigrammi di POxy 3724", in *Studium atque Urbanitas. Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris*, a cura di M. CAPASSO & S. PERNIGOTTI, *Papyrologica Lepensia* 9 (Lecce 2000), 359-380.
- REDONDO 1987/8 J. REDONDO, "Calímaco A.P. VII 453 y 523", in *Habis* 18/19 (1987/8), 87-91.
- RIEDWEG 1994 C. RIEDWEG, "Reflexe hellenistischer Dichtungstheorie im griechischen Epigramm", in *ICS* 19 (1994), 123-150.
- ROBERT 1960 L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* 11-12 (Paris 1960).
- ROSSI 1999 L. ROSSI, "Lamentazioni su pietra e letteratura 'trenodica': motivi topici dei canti funerari", in *ZPE* 126 (1999), 29-42.
- ROSSI 2001 L. ROSSI (Ed.), *The Epigrams ascribed to Theocritus* (Leuven 2001).
- SIDER 1997 D. SIDER (Ed.), *The Epigrams of Philodemus. Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (New York & Oxford 1997).
- STEINBY E.M. STEINBY (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, I-V (Roma 1993-1999).

- SWINNEN 1970 W. SWINNEN, "Herakleitos of Halikarnassos, an Alexandrian Poet and Diplomat?", in *AncSoc* 1 (1970), 39-52.
- THOMPSON 1987 D. THOMPSON, "Ptolemaios and the 'Lighthouse': Greek Culture in the Memphite Serapeum", in *PCPhS* 33 (1987), 105-21.
- VÉRILHAC 1978-82 A.-M. VÉRILHAC, Παῖδες ἀνδρῶν. *Poésie funéraire* (Athènes 1978-1982).
- WEBER 1993 G. WEBER, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart 1993).
- WILAMOWITZ 1924 U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, I-II (Berlin 1924).
- WIMMEL 1960 W. WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960).
- WOLFF 1978 H.J. WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Aegyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaeer und des Prinzipats*, II, HAW 10, 5, 2 (München 1978).
- WOUTERS 1977 A. WOUTERS, "Two Unedited Literary Petrie Papyri", in *AncSoc* 8 (1977), 209-15.

## DISCUSSION

*L. Lehnus:* You say that one should perhaps distinguish two schools of Greek epigram in the third century, one conservative (short elegiac epigrams only), perhaps represented by Posidippus, one more adventurous (some longer poems, some rarer metres) to which perhaps Callimachus' original collection belonged. By this I do not think you are prepared simply to revive Reitzenstein's ancient distinction between 'Peloponnesian' and 'Ionian' schools of epigram. Couldn't we imagine that 'conservative' were those epigrammatists who had smaller (or less continuous) access to the Alexandrian Museum, and 'more adventurous' those who enjoyed a deeper and more professional truck with its treasures? We find Posidippus wandering through continental Greece, while Callimachus seems to have hated navigation...

May I also ask you your opinion about Marianos of Eleutheropolis' iambic metaphrasis (test. 24 Pf.) of Callimachus' epigrams? I simply do not understand what it might have meant. — Let us for a moment imagine that numbers matter in this kind of thing. Marianos paraphrased *Hecale* and *Hymns* and *Aitia* (say, as a very long shot, 6000 verses) and *Epigrams* in 6810 iambs. Callimachus' 63 or so preserved epigrams account for 297 lines. One could fancy that ca. 800 lines would equal ca. 170 epigrams. Given that all that precedes is mere speculation, if not a joke, 170 is a rather reasonable number, isn't it?

*P.J. Parsons:* No, indeed, I didn't have Reitzenstein's distinction in mind, only a much vaguer and more empirical pair of poles or rather tendencies, corresponding perhaps to the tralatitianian distinction between 'Callimachean' poets and 'traditional' poets (though no doubt we would all treat that distinction too

with scepticism). The tendencies might be a matter, as you say, of learned ambience; though they might perhaps also correspond to professional and economic circumstances — how far, say, Posidippus relied more than Callimachus on small commissions from conservative patrons for functional epigrams of traditional type. The Pergamum dedication [above n.118] may illustrate the contrary case: its unusual metre and convoluted syntax suit the sophisticated taste of a grandee who dedicates an art-work to a monarch.

I had failed to take Marianos seriously, but of course you are absolutely right: most of his paraphrases [above n.6] show approximately the same line-total as the original paraphrased, so that may be true for Callimachus too. Certainly c. 800 lines would make a plausible book-roll (the Milan papyrus has c. 600, but the end of the roll is lost). If the calculation is right, the survival rate of Callimachus' epigrams, at nearly 40%, or just over 30% if one counts only the *Anthology*, is remarkably high — a tribute to his standing?

*Th. Fuhrer:* The Hellenistic Age was obviously a time when poetry books were put together just to put the collected material together (esp. lyric poetry): but there were collections of other poets' pieces, put together by scholars or scholar-poets. Surely, we do have the collection of the *Aetia*, the *Iambi*, and perhaps of the *Hymns*, but since we are on no certain ground with the epigrams, we might allow the assumption that, in the 3rd century, the obligation to compose poetry books was not yet as strong as in the 1st century BC.

I'm a bit hesitant to call a poem like the *Victoria Berenices* an extended (or expanded?) epigram since it contains a — probably — large part of mythical narrative. I'd rather say that it contains elements of victory epigrams in its first part, i.e. it uses the genre of the epigram in the genre of the epicinian which is, though, written in the form of the former (the epigram). One could say the same thing of the *Sosibiou Nike* although it doesn't contain a myth.

*P.J. Parsons:* Yes, I agree that we should be careful about assuming that all poets put all their own works together in books, by way of giving them equal status with the 'collected works' of classical poets which were then being concocted. Most of us, I suppose, would agree that fr. 112.9 represents an authorial link between (collected) *Aetia* and (collected) *Iambi*. No such link exists to prove that Callimachus left a collection of epigrams as part of his collected works.

Yes, I agree that it is a very partial truth to see *Victoria Berenices* as a hypertrophied epigram. It would be better, perhaps, to see it as amalgamating the two forms of celebration, the epinician and the epigram, available to victors like Ergoteles in the age of Pindar. Of these the epigram continued to flourish in the fourth century, as the epinician (at least in the present state of our knowledge) died out. The Milan papyrus shows the epigram still popular in the third century, even for royal victors; in another sense, the *Victoria Berenices* is a mutated epinician which trumps any epigram for the same occasion (Mil. XII 34-39?).

*M.A. Harder:* There will be an article by Robert Kirstein on pairs of epigrams in the Proceedings of the Groningen workshop on epigram.

There are quite a number of epigrammatic *aitia* in *Aetia* 3-4: apart from your original examples, to which the *Coma* must be added, consider possibly fr. 97, which may be compared with epigrams on destroyed monuments and cities.

*P.J. Parsons:* Thank you for expanding the range of connections! These no doubt provide the precedents for various expansions and insertions of epigram-material in the Roman elegists [now discussed, in the light of the Milan papyrus, by Professor G.O. Hutchinson, in *ZPE* 138 (2002), 9].

*R. Hunter:* I wonder (entirely idly) whether *kuklikon poiema* would not be a good description of the banal kind of epigram that 'does the rounds' at a symposium.

*P.J. Parsons:* In itself, why not? Contemporary Homeric scholarship recognised not only *οἱ κυκλικοί* (which is normally invoked to explain the phrase in *Epigr.* 28) but ἡ κυκλική, ‘the text in common circulation’; and a sympotic context would mediate the sudden emergence of ‘handsome Lysanias’ later in the poem. But in a flat-footed moment I’d be inclined to put weight on the second line, where it’s so tempting to relate the ‘path which carries many people’ to the ‘carriage road’ of fr. 1, and so to Homer (*Pind. Pae.* 7b.11) and other earlier epic.

*S. Stephens:* From what you have given us we have a much clearer sense of what early/near contemporary collections of epigrams would have looked like. A much more complicated question (as you say) is how this translates from the formal to the interpretative level. Can we discern what is typical or untypical in these collections? How does Callimachus’ collection compare? Does contemporary practice allow any inferences about authorial intent, in the broad sense of what is or is not a ‘collection’ as opposed to a random set of ‘collected’ texts. Can arguments be made about positionality in these early collections? To what extent do you think Callimachus’ experiments with the narrative potential of epigram collections influenced the *Aetia*?

Although we usually discuss Callimachus’ Greek sources or antecedents in terms of poetry, there can be no doubt that he would also have had a rich tradition of prose writers at his disposal. Local historians of various regions, like Xenomedes, whom he mentions as a source for the story of Acontius and Cydippe (fr. 75.54 Pf.), might well have been the source for some regional inscriptions and/or occasional descriptions of local monuments and dedications.

*P.J. Parsons:* Authorial intent is notoriously slippery; and particularly when our only guide to the ordering of Callimachus’ epigrams in an original (authorial? editorial?) collection is the assumption that fragments of an ordered corpus survive intact in the *Anthology* — an assumption about which I myself feel

sceptical. The Milan papyrus shows a formal system of ordering in subject-sections, e.g. *On statues*. In one way that illustrates what the *Aetia* does not do, since there the various poems on statues are not put all together; on the other hand, the Milan papyrus contains other epigrams centred on statues which come under other headings. Within the subject-sections, more subtle orderings can be detected (as the editors show, pp.25-26), and those might provide a better model for the thematic pairings still visible here and there in the *Aetia* (e.g. the Anaphean and Lindian rites, fr. 7.19-23; the two statues of Hera on Samos, frs. 100-101).

As to prose authors, you must certainly be right. Callimachus makes a point of mentioning Xenomedes (because Xenomedes was a particularly choice find?). But it is just chance that we know from scholia that he drew on Agias and Dercylus for at least three episodes of the *Aetia* (and for the *Baths of Pallas*?). Such local historians may well have quoted local inscriptions; Herodotus had set the precedent, though in a larger context.



known enough and that of Callimachus' own poems and his  
doles of Simonides' songs which were doubtless admirably  
suited to such off-beat and rhythmic choral pieces as the  
ancient cultic ones did not. V

RICHARD HUNTER & THERESE FUHRER

## IMAGINARY GODS?

### POETIC THEOLOGY IN THE HYMNS OF CALLIMACHUS

#### 1. Introduction

The Alexandrian poets' familiarity with popular cult hymns and the great hymns of the choral and lyric traditions, as well as the so-called *Homeric Hymns*, is obvious from the surviving texts. What ideas they had, however, about what constituted the form and nature of 'a hymn', as indeed of poetic genres in general, remains in need of further research and, perhaps, new information. We have traces of scholarly attempts to classify the lyric poems, among which there were several types of 'hymns' in a broad sense (paeans, dithyrambs, 'hymns' in the narrow sense, etc.)<sup>1</sup> and, in addition, we have Hellenistic poems which correspond in form and content to whatever we may call 'a hymn' in a general sense. As for Callimachus, his obvious close familiarity with the work of Simonides, Pindar<sup>2</sup>, and Bacchylides may

<sup>1</sup> On the Alexandrian classification of poetry cf. A.E. HARVEY, "The classification of Greek lyric poetry", in *CQ* 5 (1955), 157-75; L. KÄPPEL, *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung* (Berlin 1992); I. RUTHERFORD, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford 2001), 152-8; cf. also M. DEPEW, "Enacted and represented dedications: genre and Greek hymn", in *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, ed. by M. DEPEW and D. OBBINK (Cambridge, Mass./London 2000), 59-79; C. CALAME, "La poésie lyrique grecque, un genre inexistant?", in *Littérature* 111 (1998), 87-110, esp. 103.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. esp. T. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel 1992).

safely be assumed to have extended to their lyric hymns (paeans, dithyrambs, etc.) which were also the subject of intensive scholarly activity in the Alexandrian Library. The *Homeric Hymns* have, on the other hand, left very little trace in the papyrus record and do not seem to have been the subject of serious Alexandrian exegesis<sup>3</sup>; this apparent neglect, however, contrasts strikingly with their obvious importance as model texts for the Alexandrian poets (Callimachus and Theocritus) and for, at least, Ovid after them<sup>4</sup>.

What features of the *Homeric Hymns* were particularly attractive for third-century élite poets is a question which is asked too rarely. Why did Callimachus pay such attention to these poems? Any answer to this question must, of course, remain speculative, but in this paper we wish to approach the subject from a number of angles in the hope, at least, of establishing some important parameters within which the matter may be considered. It is worth saying at once that one possible answer which we will not consider may lie in the opportunities for poetic performance afforded by the Ptolemaic court<sup>5</sup>; it may be that hymnic writing was positively encouraged, in part for the encomiastic opportunities it offered (cf. Section 5 below). Our concern, however, will be with the inner dynamics of the hymnic form, not with its social setting, and four broad concerns will structure the argument:

1) Hymnic form allowed poets to display their knowledge of cults and rites from all over the Greek world, both in

<sup>3</sup> That they were not completely neglected is suggested by two places where *h.Ap.* seems to have affected the Homeric text, cf. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, ed. by S. WEST (Köln/Opladen 1967), 32-5.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, ed. by N. RICHARDSON (Oxford 1974), 67ff; S. HINDS, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge 1987); R. HUNTER, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge 1996), Chapter 2; A. BARCHIESI, "Venus' masterplot. Ovid and the Homeric Hymns", in *Ovidian Transformations*, ed. by Ph. HARDIE, A. BARCHIESI, S. HINDS (Cambridge 1999), 112-26.

<sup>5</sup> On this topic cf. G. WEBER, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft. Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* (Stuttgart 1993).

'mimetic' form and through the use of elements of more traditional hymnic encomia (divine epithets, aetiology etc.). The gradual freeing of the hymnic form from necessary ties to a particular cultic locale allowed poets to include cultic material from the widest possible area: hymns, in other words, become panhellenic.

2) Hymnic *narrative* becomes correspondingly free, and poets are no longer tied to particular narratives for particular settings. Hymns can now accommodate both the arcane and the alarming, and the criticism of myth now also plays a much greater rôle.

3) Hymnic form allows poets to lay bare and experiment with the technique and rhetoric of encomium, for it is 'praise' towards which every element of the poems is directed. In particular, poets broke down the boundaries of 'mortal' and 'divine' praise, thus re-drawing the very categories of existence.

4) We will make use — as a heuristic device — of the possibility that Callimachus put his *Hymns* together in a poetry-book, thereby creating a dynamic system, a 'language' if you like, in which each poem and each divinity may be read in relation to all others; the resulting set of overlapping relations in a divine hierarchy turns this poetry-book into a kind of *Theogony*. This assumption of a poetry-book is, of course, a large one, but one whose suggestiveness, to which we hope that the present essay contributes, seems to us to justify it<sup>6</sup>. Even if we stop short of the assumption that the six extant poems which we call 'hymns' are intended to be read as a unity, it is still legitimate, and now common practice in literary scholarship, to see them as a (loose) system with inherent cross-references to each other.

<sup>6</sup> For some bibliography cf. A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of Lambi* (Oxford 1999), 277, adding M.W. HASLAM, "Callimachus' *Hymns*", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1993), 111-25 and V. KNIGHT, "Landscape and the gods in Callimachus' *Hymns*", in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 7 (1993), 201-11.

## 2. *The cultic imagination*

The 'rhapsodic' *Homeric Hymns* were probably performed in very similar circumstances to that of the epic recitations which they often preceded — competitions at festivals, aristocratic symposia and so on. It is standard scholarly practice to distinguish these hexameter poems from 'cult hymns', usually choral and lyric, the performance of which formed an important part of the religious celebration itself; whereas the hexameter 'hymns' concentrate upon praise of the god and an account of his or her place in the divine scheme, and there is merely an understated (or even just implied) request for the god to favour the poet in return for his song, 'cult hymns' have at their centre a request to a god for specific or general favour<sup>7</sup>. Such favour may extend to the very appearance or epiphany of the god; the 'cleric' hymn, literary versions of which are most familiar from the poetry of Sappho, will assume a special importance for Callimachus, as two of his hymns (*Apollo* and *Athena*) recreate the experience of (waiting for) epiphany, and there are reasons for thinking that the phenomena of epiphany did indeed assume new importance within Hellenistic religious experience. Nevertheless, the distinction, at least in form, between rhapsodic and cultic hymns can be seen breaking down well before the Hellenistic period, and from the fourth century onwards survive a number of hexameter 'hymns' which clearly occupied a genuine place in cultic performance. Callimachus' hymnal experiments with a semi-dramatic, mimetic mode are in part a reflection of (and upon) this gradual fusion of originally separate forms.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. A. MILLER, *From Delos to Delphi. A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Leiden 1986), 1-5; W.D. FURLEY, "Praise and Persuasion in Greek Hymns", in *JHS* 115 (1995), 29-46. A useful introduction is J.M. BREMER, "Greek Hymns", in *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, ed. by H.S. VERSNEL (Leiden 1981), 193-215. There is also much relevant material in *AION* 13 (1991) which is devoted to *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico*.

In this changed situation of the gradual divorce of the cultic referents and aetiology of literary hymns from the actual cultic experience of the audience<sup>8</sup>, the most important experience of the audience to which the poet appeals is that of prior texts, though we must acknowledge that the power of these poems cannot be explained solely in these terms. Much in the *Hymns* of Callimachus also appeals to a cultic *imagination*, which may of course be grounded in a shared experience of literary representations and local chronicles. Nevertheless, the so-called 'mimetic' *Hymns to Apollo, Athena* and *Demeter* are merely the limit case of a constant appeal to active engagement with what is being described<sup>9</sup>. Such mimeticism greatly elaborates the important rôle of deixis and of (self-) reference to the festival and its choruses in early hymns by actually scripting a context for performance, whereas such a context needed no such script when the poem was indeed part of a real performance<sup>10</sup>. Discussion of Callimachus' *Hymns* has too often been bedevilled by the (normally silent) running together of two questions which should, at least in the first instance, be kept separate: "What kind of audience reception do these poems construct?", and "How were these poems first presented and subsequently received?"<sup>11</sup> An understandable fascination with the second 'historical' question may obscure the merits of asking the first. A similar dichotomy operates with the world of cult which these poems call into being. Of primary importance is not how widely

<sup>8</sup> This has been the subject of a series of papers by Mary DEPEW, cf. "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' *Hymns*", in *Callimachus* (n.6 above), 57-77; "Delian Hymns and Callimachean Allusion", in *HSCP* 98 (1998), 155-82; "Enacted and represented dedications" (n.1 above); cf. also W.D. FURLEY, "Apollo humbled: Phoenix' Koronisma in its Hellenistic literary setting", in *MD* 33 (1994), 9-31, esp. 25-30; RUTHERFORD (n.1 above), 128-30 with the cautionary remarks 177-8.

<sup>9</sup> 'Mimetic' is in fact a rather unhelpful term (cf. M.A. HARDER, "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus", in *CQ* 42 [1992], 384-94), but it would be foolish to imagine that we can now get away from it.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. DEPEW, "Dedications" (n.1 above).

<sup>11</sup> A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 64 does seem to acknowledge the separateness of some version of these questions.

familiar and practised such a cult as the Delian tree-biting (*b.* 4.316-24) 'really' was;<sup>12</sup> as it happens, the antiquarian tendencies (and a developing tourist trade?) of the third century may in fact have increased the actual practice of rites believed to be ancient. Rather, what matters is that the poems construct an audience interested in rites practised by others, often very remote 'others', to a far greater degree than the lyric hymns and the major *Homeric Hymns*<sup>13</sup>; rites, real or imaginary, now exist in a decontextualised space from which they can at any time be drawn into poetic description. From a theological point of view, then, a god may be the sum of the rites practised, stories told, and epithets ascribed to him or her; the *Hymn to Artemis* is a very good example of this<sup>14</sup>. Such a text offers itself as, to some extent, a historical record, a poetic version of a 'On the cults of Artemis'; its very form has been affected by contemporary readerly and scholarly practices. Though the hexameter *Homeric Hymns* are themselves more 'all-inclusive', less narrowly bound in their concerns to a specific performance context than are lyric cult hymns, these tendencies inherent in the form are taken to new levels and in new directions in the third century.

In the *Hymns to Athena* and *Demeter* Callimachus abandoned the traditional Ionic language of the hexameter hymn in favour of a Doricising *Kunstsprache*, itself heavily indebted to the language of epic. This choice has been plausibly traced to a creative imitation of the public choral poetry of the archaic *polis*, in

<sup>12</sup> W.H. MINEUR (*Callimachus. Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary* [Leiden 1984], on v.317) asserts that the aorists of the description show that there is no certainty that the rite was still in existence; he is right to call attention to this, but these tenses may fall into the very broad category of 'the gnomic' (Kühner-Gerth II 158-61).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. DEPEW, "Delian hymns" (n.8 above), 180.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. below pp.161-4, and G. VESTRHEIM, "Meaning and Structure in Callimachus' Hymns to Artemis and Delos", in *SO* 75 (2000), 62-79. The *Hymn to Artemis*, whose structure and pattern has always been found so confusing, is the one example among the *Hymns* of a lengthy account of a major Olympian in the traditional mode of the *Homeric Hymns*; as such it has a particular importance which has not always been recognised.

which Doric was the predominant dialectal colouring<sup>15</sup>; it must also be relevant that the *Hymn to Athena* is set in Doric Argos (and is perhaps indebted to Argive sources)<sup>16</sup>, and the *Hymn to Demeter* would, at least, not be out of place in Callimachus' home city of Cyrene<sup>17</sup>. The imaginative reconstruction of the choric mode in these hymns extends also to form; a central narrative is framed by dramatic indications of a cult celebration currently taking place (*Demeter*) or just about to begin (*Athena*), whereas in the *Hymn to Apollo*, which advertises its debt to the Ionic tradition, the opening mimetic indications do not recur at the end<sup>18</sup>. 'Choral' poetry composed to be read and recited thus sought a partial analogy to the performative element inherent in the archaic texts<sup>19</sup>. As for the elegiac metre of the *Hymn to Athena*, this may not have had the central importance for ancient readers which it has assumed for some modern scholars, whose aesthetic sense is often shaped by the programmatic importance which the Roman elegists gave to the difference between hexameters and elegiacs. Callimachus may have been gesturing towards a real or believed tradition of Argive elegy<sup>20</sup>,

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. FANTUZZI, "Preistoria di un genere letterario: a proposito degli *Inni V e VI* di Callimaco", in *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di B. Gentili* (Roma 1993), 927-46.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*, ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 16-17 on the possible use of the *Argolika* of Agias and Derkylos.

<sup>17</sup> That the *Hymn to Demeter* has a Cyrenean setting has often been argued, as Demeter had important cult sites there (cf., e.g., A. LARONDE, *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique* [Paris 1987], 363-5; L. BACCHIELLI, "I 'luoghi' della celebrazione politica e religiosa a Cirene nella poesia di Pindaro e Callimaco", in *Cirene. Storia, Mito, Letteratura* [Urbino 1990], 5-33), and is not improbable, but N. HOPKINSON (Ed.), *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge 1984), 38 is correct that there is not "a scrap of real evidence". The festival is of a kind familiar throughout the Greek world; for the cult of Demeter in Alexandria and Egypt cf. D.J. THOMPSON, "Demeter in Graeco-Roman Egypt", in *Egyptian Religion. The Last Thousand Years*, ed. by W. CLARYSSE, A. SCHOORS, H. WILLEMS (Leuven 1998), 699-707. To what extent the dialect of *Hymns 5 and 6* is distinctively Cyrenean (Ruijgh's thesis) is disputed.

<sup>18</sup> Note however v.97: ἵη ἵη πατῆσον ἀκούομεν.

<sup>19</sup> See the bibliography cited in n.7 above.

<sup>20</sup> For the evidence cf. BULLOCH (n.16 above), 36-8. For an argument that, in one section of the poem at least (the lament of Chariclo), traditional associations

but the two metres had traditionally shared much common subject-matter, and elegiac hymnal poetry is found elsewhere in both literary (e.g. Simonides' *Hymn to Achilles* in his Plataea elegy, fr.eleg.22 West) and non-literary (the *Second* and *Fourth Isis Hymns* of Isidorus)<sup>21</sup> contexts.

A closely related appeal to cultic imagination is found in the *Hymn to Apollo*. Important to the design of this poem are not only cult hymns to Apollo (esp. paeans, as the frequent ιη̄ ιη̄-cries suggest) but also the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, a poem upon which Callimachus was also to draw extensively in the *Hymn to Artemis* and the *Hymn to Delos*, which re-tells the same birth myth as the 'Homeric' poem. It may indeed be that the absence of any explicit treatment of the birth myth in the *Hymn to Apollo* is in part to be connected with the existence of the *Hymn to Delos*; although the opening of the *Hymn to Apollo* does gesture towards the analogy between epiphany and birth (or perhaps rather suggests birth as the originary epiphany) — the natal palm-tree (v.4), the swan (v.5, cf. h. 4.249-55), the opening of doors attended by song — and although the birth of the god recurs in the Pythian aetiology at the end of the poem (v.104), the hymn's comparative silence about the divine birth may otherwise surprise. If, however, we are to think of the hymns as in some sense a group to be read both separately and together, the surprise will be less.

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is unlike the other poems in its collection in at least two important respects. First, it seems to combine two, presumably originally distinct, hymns, one a 'Delian' hymn (vv.1-181) and the other a 'Pythian' composition which tells of the foundation of the most important centre of Apolline cult, Delphi. Secondly, the closing verses of the Delian section both describe explicitly a festival on Delos such

between elegiac metre and lament for the dead resonate strongly cf. R. HUNTER, "Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus, *Hymn to Athena*", in *MD* 29 (1992), 9-34, esp.18-22.

<sup>21</sup> E. BERNARD, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine* (Paris 1969), 633-6. These are, of course, of a much later date, but may well point to a persistent tradition.

as that at which the poem itself might well have been performed, and are also the only passage in the *Homeric Hymns* in which the poet makes extended reference to himself (*Hom.h.Ap.* 165-77):

165

ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἵλήκοι μὲν Ἀπόλλων Ἀρτέμιδι ξύν,  
χαῖρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε  
μνήσασθ', διπότε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων  
ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ζεῦνος ταλαπείριος ἐλθών·  
ῶ κοῦραι, τίς δ' ὑμμιν ἀνὴρ ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν  
ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα;  
ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθ' ἀμφ' ἡμέων·  
τυφλὸς ἀνήρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίψ ἐνι παιπαλοέσση,  
τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαῖ.  
ἥμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον **κλέος** οἴσομεν ὅσσον ἐπ' αἶν  
ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·  
οἱ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ πείσονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐτήτυμόν ἐστιν.  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οὐ λήξω ἔκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα

170

175

At the conclusion of his *Hymn to Apollo*, Callimachus imitates the archaic hymnal poet ('Homer') by making a claim for the artistic superiority of his — the poet's — own verse and puts this in the mouth of the very god of poetry himself (Call. *h.* 2.105-13)<sup>22</sup>:

105

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὐατα λάθιοις εἶπεν·  
‘οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει·’  
τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὕδε τ' ἔειπεν·  
‘Ασσυρίου ποταμοῦ μέγας ὁρός, ἀλλὰ τὰ **πολλά**  
λύματα γῆς καὶ **πολλά** ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.  
Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,  
ἀλλ' ἡτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράντος ἀνέρπει  
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἀκρον ἄκτον·’  
χαῖρε, ἄναξ· ὃ δὲ Μῶμος, ἵν' ὁ Φθόνος, ἐνθα νέοιτο.

110

It is Apollo, rather than the poet himself, who thus proclaims that Callimachus' "songs are supreme for ever more" (*Hom.h.Ap.* 173) and who places Callimachus in a structural parallel with the poet of the *Homeric Hymn*, thus authorising the claim of the

<sup>22</sup> The Callimachean passage is, in one sense, isolated from the rest of the poem (cf., e.g., HASLAM [n.6 above], 117), but the importance of the model in the *Homeric Hymn* is regularly overlooked.

poet to artistic superiority and subsequent *kleos*. Whatever the verses mean in detail<sup>23</sup> — and one of the few things which ought to be undisputed is that Apollo here speaks, appropriately enough, in the riddling language of oracles — it is clear that they privilege quality of verse over quantity. The familiar etymological play between πολύς and Ἀπόλλων (cf. vv.34-5, 69-70 etc.) is here given a new direction with the suggestion that the god's name signifies ἀ-πολύς, i.e. 'not a lot' (cf. vv.108-9)<sup>24</sup>. The point is made sharper if we compare the archaic hymn in which the poet promises never to cease from hymning the god (vv.177-8); Callimachus' Apollo has other ideas about how he would like to be celebrated. Moreover, in the *Homeric Hymn* the usual promise "to remember the god (and another song)" has already been converted into a request to the Delian choir to remember the poet (vv.166-7); god and poet are thus far more closely bound together in this archaic hymn than is usually explicit in the hymnic mode. Callimachus takes this one stage further by virtually equating the epiphany of the god with the performance of his poem, and by making the god the spokesman for the poet's own aesthetic principles.

The description of the Delian festival may have influenced Callimachus' hymn in another way also. Instead of inscribing such a description in his hymn, Callimachus makes his poem dramatic by inscribing it within a festival in the god's honour, imagined as taking place during the performance of the hymn and thus making it a representation of a cult hymn. Moreover, Apollo is precisely the god of singing and dance, and the performance of the Delian choir in the *Homeric Hymn* to this god re-enacts on earth the Olympian music which Apollo leads

<sup>23</sup> The bibliography is now very large, but may conveniently be followed through M. ASPER, Onomata allotria. *Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Stuttgart 1997), 109-25 and D.A. TRAILL, "Callimachus' Singing Sea (*Hymn* 2.106)", in *CPh* 93 (1998), 215-22.

<sup>24</sup> Note too how Apollo's words (vv.108-10) pick up the play between πολύς and πᾶς of vv.9 and 69-70. The paradox is sharpened by a suggested association between Φθόνος and φθονέω / (ἀ)φθονία.

(vv.131, 182-206). The suggestion in this hymn that the performance of 'the blind poet' himself is a mortal reflection of the divine *aoidos* Apollo is picked up in two ways by Callimachus.

First, Callimachus' Apollo is indeed the divine model of the poet, just as the Zeus of the *First Hymn* is the divine model for the king, and his hymn in the god's honour not merely effects the epiphany of the god, but in its power to put an end to the extreme of grief presents itself as a perfect model of poetry (20-24)<sup>25</sup>:

οὐδὲ Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα κινύρεται αἰλινα μήτηρ, 20  
όππόθ' ἵη παιῆνον ἵη παιῆνον ἀκούσῃ.  
καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυσθεῖς ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,  
ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,  
μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς δίζυρόν τι χανούσῃ.

The *Hymn to Apollo* thus forms a close counterpoint to the *Hymn to Zeus* in its debt to Hesiod's *Theogony* (94-103):

ἐκ γάρ τοι Μουσέων καὶ ἔκηρβουλου Ἀπόλλωνος  
ἀνδρες ἀοιδοὶ ἔασιν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κιθαρισταί, 95  
ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες· ὁ δ' ὅλβιος, ὅντινα Μοῦσαι  
φίλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδῆ.  
εἰ γάρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων νεοκηδέει θυμῷ  
ἄζηται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος, αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς  
Μουσάων θεράπων κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων  
ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεοὺς οἱ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν,  
αἴψ' δ' γε δυσφροσύνεων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων  
μέμνηται· ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.

Whereas in the *Hymn to Zeus* it is v.96 which is quoted (ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες κτλ.), in the *Hymn to Apollo* it is the immediately following Hesiodic theme of the power of poetry, which comes from Apollo and the Muses, to postpone grief which is important. Moreover, in both poems the evocation of Hesiod leads to the assimilation of the poet's king to (respectively) Zeus (*h.* 1.85-90) and Apollo (*h.* 2.26-7)<sup>26</sup>.

Secondly, whereas the *Homeric Hymn* describes both the Olympian model and the earthly reflection, the Callimachean

<sup>25</sup> On these verses cf. below pp.162-3.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. further below pp.167-9.

chorus tells of the 'mythical' model for their present performances, namely the dances of the Dorians and the Libyan women which brought pleasure to Apollo (vv.85-96)<sup>27</sup>. The emphasis on performative re-enactment of an event in the immemorial past is typical of the Hellenistic historical sense; the closing sections of the *Hymns to Artemis* and *Delos* offer a number of parallel examples.

The exciting, but potentially frightening, experience of the god's nearness and his power to cleanse men of disease (vv.45-6), of threatening monsters (vv.100-4), and of the impure poison of envy and bad poetry (vv.105-12), is a form of 'possession', such as that felt by the Pythia at Delphi, and that possession should not be disassociated from the 'mimetic' form which the poem dramatises. The opening seismic movements which mark the nearness of the god (vv.1-5)<sup>28</sup>, indicated for us by an unidentified voice which speaks with pious authority<sup>29</sup>, are a dramatic version of the 'natural' phenomena which standardly attend divine epiphany<sup>30</sup>, and are thus seen to be particularly 'Apolline'. The fact that *Hymns* 5 and 6 also employ 'mimetic' frameworks should not obscure the meaning of such *mimesis* in *Hymn* 2. The presence and power of Apollo inevitably evokes immediate

<sup>27</sup> Cf. C. CALAME, "Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*", in *Callimachus* (n.6 above), 37-55, esp.46.

<sup>28</sup> It is tempting to see here some echo of the 'trembling' with which the other gods greet the epiphany of Apollo on Olympus in the *Homeric Hymn* (v.2 τρομέουσιν). For the subsequent history of this motif in Roman poetry cf. A. BARCHIESI, "Immovable Delos: *Aeneid* 3.73-98 and the Hymns of Callimachus", in *CQ* 44 (1994), 438-43.

<sup>29</sup> S. KOSTER, "Kallimachos als Apollonpriester", in *Tessera. Sechs Beiträge zur Poesie und poetischen Theorie der Antike* (Erlangen 1983), 9-21, argues that the speaker is a "priest of Apollo" and the addressee (cf. v.4) a young man being introduced into the cultic mysteries of the god. The difficulty with this reading is that the label 'priest' is misleading, even allowing for the validity of the category; this is merely one of the relationships between speaker and god which the poem evokes.

<sup>30</sup> Particularly relevant, of course, is APOLL.RH. 2.679-80 (the epiphany of Apollo at Thynias), "the whole island shook beneath his feet"; for other links between that scene and CALL. b. 2, cf. R. HUNTER, "Apollo and the Argonauts: two notes on Ap.Rhod. 2, 669-719", in *MH* 43 (1986), 50-60, esp.57-60.

praise; this is the lesson of the aetiology of the ritual cry in vv.97-104. As this hymn is itself a manifestation of the god, it demands our active response of praise; it cannot simply be received as a narrative. The reception of the poem is itself the presence ( $\tauὸς ἐπιδημεῖν$ ) of the god. We *must* respond. This Callimachus has ensured by the 'mimetic' mode in which he has constructed his poem; *our* response is choreographed by the response of the choir.

The centre of the poem is formed from a series of verse-paragaphs marked out by the god's name (vv. 32, 42, 47, 55, 65) which celebrate the powers and spheres of the god. Pride of place is assigned to Apollo's traditional rôle in the founding of cities, an activity which, at least in cultural memory, standardly began with an oracular response of the god<sup>31</sup>. The longest section of the poem (vv.65-96) tells of the founding of Cyrene, Callimachus' home city, and the celebrations of the god there under the specifically Dorian epithet, Καρψεῖος<sup>32</sup>. That the poet's city is a central site of Apolline cult is a manifest sign of the god's favour towards the poet and the special authority with which he speaks; this divine approval, and specifically approval for the extraordinary narrative construction of the Cyrenean foundation story, is then most clearly confirmed in the Apolline epilogue<sup>33</sup>. Beyond this, however, it has also often been argued that we are to understand that the poem is in fact set at a celebration of the Cyrenean Karneia; such a view fits the evocation of the model for Karneian choral performance at vv.85-96 (cf. above), but it may be more accurate to imagine a fluid 'ritual context' which can at one moment be the Cyrenean Karneia and at the next a celebration in Delphi, for vv.97-104 (the Pythian

<sup>31</sup> For an 'Egyptian reading' of this section cf. D.L. SELDEN, "Alibis", in *ClAnt* 17 (1998), 392-404.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. R. NICOLAI, "La fondazione di Cirene e i Karneia cirenaici nell'Inno ad Apollo di Callimaco", in *MD* 28 (1992), 153-73. These myths have also been much discussed by Claude Calame; his publications are conveniently listed in the article cited in n.27 above. For the Karneia cf. W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985), 234-6.

<sup>33</sup> We hope to discuss this matter elsewhere.

aetiology of the ἵη ἵη παιῶν cry) provide a further ‘mythical model’ for the celebration being enacted through the poem.

Nevertheless, the central section of the poem owes a very clear debt to Pindar’s *Fifth Pythian*<sup>34</sup>, an epinician (celebrating the same chariot victory as *Pythian 4*) for Arcesilas IV of Cyrene, which, at the very least, gives a particular prominence to the cult of Karneian Apollo at Cyrene, if indeed its setting is not the Karneia itself (71-81):

ἐνασσεν ἀλκάεντας Ἡρακλέος  
ἐκγόνους Αἰγαμιοῦ τε. τὸ δ' ἐμὸν γαρύει  
ἀπὸ Σπάρτας ἐπήρατον κλέος,  
ὅθεν γεγενναμένοι  
ἴκοντο Θήρανδε φῶτες Αἰγεῖδαι, 75  
ἐμοὶ πατέρες, οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, ἀλλὰ Μοῖρά τις ἄγεν.  
πολύθυτον ἔρανον  
ἔνθεν ἀναδεξάμενοι,  
Ἄπολλον, τεᾶ,  
Καρνήι', ἐν δαιτὶ σεβίζομεν 80  
Κυράνας ἀγακτιμέναν πόλιν.

It is thus not improbable that it was precisely the ambiguous identity of the singers of *Pythian 5*, a matter discussed in antiquity as well as (endlessly) by modern scholars<sup>35</sup>, from which Callimachus developed the apparently shifting location of the “speaking voice” in his *Hymn to Apollo*. As so often, he goes one step beyond his models. His reworking highlights by exaggeration the problems that arise when a performative text, such as *Pythian 5*, is read away from performance; it is the read and written text that offers the limit case of the text as script. Be that as it may, the reworking of *Pythian 5* (cf. esp. vv.71-72 of Callimachus’ hymn) confirms the *Hymn to Apollo* as an offering to

<sup>34</sup> Cf., e.g., M.T. SMILEY, “Callimachus’ debt to Pindar and others”, in *Hermathena* 18 (1919), 46-72; M.R. LEFKOWITZ, “Pindar’s *Pythian V*”, in *Entretiens Hardt* 31 (1985), 33-63, esp. 44-9; E. KRUMMEN, *Pyrros Hymnon* (Berlin/New York 1990), 95-151; FUHRER (n.2 above), 40-2; W. KOFLER, “Kallimachos’ Wahlverwandtschaften”, in *Philologus* 140 (1996), 230-47.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. KRUMMEN (n.34), 138-9; KOFLER (n.34).

Callimachus' "king" (v.27), although it would be rash to infer from this alone that that king must therefore, like Arcesilas, be 'king of Cyrene'<sup>36</sup>. The Callimachean scholiast — on what authority we do not know — identified Callimachus' "king" as Euergetes, and it is at least worthy of remark that Euergetes' marriage to the Cyrenean princess Berenice, celebrated by Callimachus in the *Coma Berenices*<sup>37</sup>, would make an appropriate (though, of course, by no means necessary) context for the prominence of Cyrenean traditions in the hymn<sup>38</sup>. Callimachus' poem thus not only effects the epiphany of the god, but demonstrates, rather than merely describes, his power.

Finally, the relatively greater prominence of ritual in Hellenistic hymnic poetry (cf. Theocritus 26), the fact that, as Albert Henrichs has often observed, myth is increasingly presented as explanatory of ritual (i.e. aetiological), may also be seen, in part, as a related instance of the appeal to the cultic imagination. It is again important to remember that such poems are modern 'versions' of choral hymns, as well as of the hexameter *Homeric Hymns*. When reading becomes a, if not the, standard mode of reception, poets must accommodate a potentially very wide plurality of sites of reception. There is no longer a performative context which allows 'the unspoken' to be understood by a collective audience. Ritual is thus inscribed within the text.

### 3. 'How shall I hymn you?'

In the *Hymns to Athena* and *Demeter*, the relation between the choice of narrative and the cultic frame is self-consciously problematised in ways which it is hard to imagine in 'real' choral poetry:

<sup>36</sup> That the king is indeed Magas of Cyrene has often been suggested, cf. most recently CAMERON (n.11 above), 408-9. The position of a Ptolemy as Horus/Apollo is perhaps more relevant than Cameron seems to allow.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. above p.155.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *Callimachus*, ed. R. PFEIFFER, II (Oxford 1953), pp.XXXVIII-XXXIX.

5.55-6

πότνι' Ἀθαναία, σὺ μὲν ἔξειθι· μέσφα δ' ἐγώ τι  
ταῖσδ' ἐρέω· μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων.

6.17-23

μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες & δάκρυον ἄγαγε Δηοῖ·  
κάλλιον, ὃς πολίεσσιν ἔαδότα τέθυμα δῶκε·  
κάλλιον, ὃς καλάμαν τε καὶ ἵερά δράγματα πράτα  
ἀσταχύων ἀπέκοψε καὶ ἐν βόας ἡκε πατῆσαι, 20  
δύνικα Τριπτόλεμος ἀγαθὸν ἐδιδάσκετο τέχναν·  
κάλλιον, ὃς (ἴνα καὶ τις ὑπερβασίας ἀλέγηται)  
π ιδέσθαι

It would be difficult indeed to find an archaic parallel for the insouciant *τι* of 5.55. Nevertheless, the starting-point for Callimachus' technique may well be reflection upon the actual practice of archaic and classical lyric; modern scholars were certainly not the first to ask "Why is this story told here?"<sup>39</sup> We may perhaps think of this problematising of the central narrative as a version of the traditional hymnic question "How shall I hymn you?" Implicit in that traditional *topos* was the question of the poet's freedom to choose (*Hom.h.Ap.* 19-27):

**Πῶς τάρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὔμνονον ἔοντα;**

πάντη γάρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομὸς βεβλήσται φόδης,  
ἡμὲν ἀν' ἥπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἥδ' ἀνὰ νήσους.  
πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαὶ τοι ἄδον καὶ πρώσονες ἄκροι  
ὑψηλῶν ὅρέων ποταμοί θ' ἄλλα δὲ προρέοντες,  
ἄκταὶ τ' εἰς ἄλλα κεκλιμέναι λιμένες τε θαλάσσης.  
ἢ ὡς σε πρῶτον Λητὸν τέκε χάρμα βροτοῖσι, 25  
κλινθεῖσα πρὸς Κύνθου ὄρος κραναῇ ἐνὶ νήσῳ  
Δήλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ;

In the archaic poem the hymnic rhetoric functions like a priamel to throw the poet's choice into relief<sup>40</sup>, but that 'choice' seems itself to have been contextually (pre-)determined (cf.169-76). It is this inherited hymnic rhetoric which Callimachus lays bare.

<sup>39</sup> Good general remarks on hymnic myth in W.D. FURLEY, "Praise and persuasion in Greek hymns" (n.7 above), 43.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. W.H. RACE, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden 1982), 47-53; DEPEW (n.8 above), 61-62.

The two Callimachean narratives are, however, also importantly different. In the *Hymn to Demeter* an obviously relevant<sup>41</sup>, if very untraditional, tale is told by the fasting women during their procession, which was the normal place for such hymnic myth. Whereas the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* records and celebrates the establishment of Demeter's cult and tells a tale of separation and famine followed by re-integration, blessedness and plenty, Callimachus' hymn confirms the continuing power of the goddess of the crops through an apotropaic tale of plenty wasted by folly and leading to ultimate separation and misery. Erysichthon's punishment is to break those distinctions in social behaviour, established by Demeter the θεσμοφόρος (v.18), which separate us from the animals. In the *Hymn to Athena*, however, the story of Teiresias is apparently told to fill in the time before the procession begins. If μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἔτέρων (56) is not merely an 'Alexandrian footnote' acknowledging the use of sources, but also a cautionary apology to the goddess for any offence the story might cause<sup>42</sup>, there is here a further self-conscious invitation to the reader to reflect on why the tale has been chosen, for potential offence is the very last thing that a hymn ought to offer<sup>43</sup>. Be that as it may, the crucial point is that, whereas for the archaic performer a Delian context demanded a Delian narrative, the Argive context of the *Hymn to Athena* no longer 'requires' an Argive narrative: the poet claims to be really 'free', to have that power of choice to which the archaic hymnist could only pay lip-service.

The story of Teiresias, who while hunting on Mt Helicon in Boeotia inadvertently saw Athena and his mother Chariclo

<sup>41</sup> The meaning of the Erysichthon story within a hymn to Demeter is discussed in HUNTER, "Writing the god" (n.20 above), 30-33.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. T.C.W. STINTON, "Si credere dignum est": some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others", in *PCPS N.S.22* (1976), 60-89, p.66 (= *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* [Oxford 1990], 243). The relevant parallels are collected in BULLOCH's note and D. KIDD on Aratus, *Phaen.* 637.

<sup>43</sup> On this passage cf. T. FUHRER, "A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus", in *AJP* 109 (1988), 53-68, esp. 66f.

bathing in the stream Hippocrene and was punished with immediate loss of sight, has of course many links to the Argive festival which Callimachus conjures up, in which a statue of the goddess received a ritual bath<sup>44</sup>. Pherecydes seems to have been the main source for this rare story of Teiresias, and there is no good reason to think that it was connected with the Argive Palladion before Callimachus brilliantly juxtaposed two different 'baths of Pallas', thus making the Teiresias story a quasi-aetiological warning to Argive men not to catch sight of Athena. What is clear is that such a myth about 'looking' is peculiarly appropriate to a *written* text of this mimetic, quasi-performative nature<sup>45</sup>. First, the poem evokes the similarity and difference between the mental images excited by literary *enargeia* and the experience of 'epiphany': is there a difference between our 'seeing' Teiresias seeing Athena and epiphanic experience? Secondly, we will never in fact 'see' the goddess, not only because 'we' are men, but also because the poem ends as she appears (or does she?), and because the acknowledged divorce of the written recreation from any 'real' occasion emphasises the artificiality of the *mimesis*. Moreover, in exploiting the traditional slippage between an image and what that image 'represents' — i.e. the whole problem of how to represent the divine — Callimachus raises the question of whether, in seeing an image or statue, we are 'seeing' the god as Teiresias saw her<sup>46</sup>.

The 'oddness' of this usurpation by Athena of an 'Artemis' rôle further illustrates (and celebrates) the real freedom which poets now enjoyed. The inherited pantheon was a dynamic system of overlapping relations, narratives, and spheres of influence. By exploiting the new possibilities offered by the use of written records, what we might in fact call 'the pursuit of oddness', and by a highly allusive textual practice, Callimachus' interlocking

<sup>44</sup> Cf. HUNTER, "Writing the god" (n.20 above).

<sup>45</sup> 'Looking' and 'seeing' are, of course, also very important in the *Hymn to Apollo*, another epiphanic text.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. N. LORAX, *Les expériences de Tirésias* (Paris 1989), 253-71 (= *The Experiences of Tiresias* [Princeton 1995], 211-26).

*Hymns* exaggerated these tendencies to make the system more, rather than less, dynamic, and in so doing to foreground the controlling power of the poet.

#### 4. *Intruding upon Apollo*

Like the *Hymn to Zeus*, the *Hymn to Artemis* begins with the god's name, but whereas Zeus imposes himself as the only possible subject for song<sup>47</sup>, in the *Hymn to Artemis* a novel variation of the common hymnic *topos* of 'forgetting'<sup>48</sup> may suggest that praise of the goddess has been deferred, if not indeed, actually overlooked (*b.* 3.1-2):

Ἄρτεμιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι)  
ὑμνέομεν

Who might have forgotten Artemis? Two related answers suggest themselves. The first is the (hexameter) hymnic tradition as a whole: there are two fairly perfunctory *Homeric Hymns to Artemis* (9, 27), and the goddess makes only a few brief appearances as an adjunct to her brother in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. More pointedly, however, there is the case of Callimachus himself. In the corpus of his *Hymns* as we have it, the *Hymn to Artemis* is surrounded by two contrasting rewritings of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and, more specifically, the goddess appears only once in the immediately preceding *Hymn to Apollo*: at vv.60-3 her endless labour supplies the raw material from which her brother weaves the wondrous altar of goats' horns. To

<sup>47</sup> Cf. below p.171.

<sup>48</sup> Cf., e.g., *Hom.b.Dion.* 19. In view of this *topos* at the opening of Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis* it may be important that the motif occurs in the opening verse of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν most naturally means 'it is no light thing...' (i.e. it has dire consequences) not 'it is not easy...' (as P. BING and V. UHRMEISTER, "The Unity of Callimachus' Hymn to Artemis", in *JHS* 114 [1994], 19-34, p.27). The consequences of annoying Artemis are uncomfortably familiar from well-known stories, and a closing catalogue of those whom she has punished (vv.260-67) secures a ring around the poem.

add insult to injury, her birthplace, according to the *Homeric Hymn*, was 'Ortygia' which in Callimachus had become the site of Apollo's marvel (*h.* 2.59). Artemis gets her own back, however: in Callimachus' hymn to her, Apollo appears in the servile rôle of unloading the dead animals from her chariot as she returns to Olympus, in a scene which 'steals' Apollo's arrival on Olympus from the *Homeric Hymn* in his honour (Call. *h.* 3.140-69 ~ *Hom.h.Ap.* 1-13). Thus Callimachus has broken the *Homeric Hymn* into its constituent parts of 'Apollo', 'Artemis' and 'Delos', and ensured divine favour by a strategy of ever-increasing length; if Apollo approves of short poems, then he will (of course) not be able to complain since his is the shortest of the poems<sup>49</sup>.

The opening of Callimachus' poem, therefore, appears to use the fact of a 'poetry-book' to set up a dialogue between poems and between gods. The shrine of Artemis at Ephesus "would easily surpass Pytho" (v.250), a jibe whose full force derives from being read against the praise of *h.* 2.34-5:

χρύσεα καὶ τὰ πέδιλα· πολύχρυσος γάρ Άπόλλων  
καὶ πουλυκτέανος· Πυθῶνί κε τεκμήραιο.

So too, the opening of the *Hymn to Artemis* (οὐ γάρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι) invites us to look back to the last poem, the *Hymn to Apollo*, and to read it again for signs of forgetting. Once we have done this, such signs are not difficult to find. Consider, for example, the case of Niobe, cited as one of the victims of Apollo who nevertheless falls under the spell of poetry in his honour (*h.* 2.22-7):

καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἀλγεα πέτρος,  
ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερός λίθος ἐστήρικται,  
μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικός διζυρόν τι χανούσης.  
ἴη ἡ φθέγγεσθε· κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν.

25

<sup>49</sup> Delos' poem, on the other hand, is the longest of all, and this may be seen as a recompense for the fact that she has never before had a 'hymn'; if, moreover, she feels that she has had to wait too long, then it is the poet's *thumos*, not the poet himself, who is to blame (*h.* 4.1). For this ironic strategy cf. CALL. fr.75.5. There are excellent remarks on the *Hymn to Artemis* in HASLAM (n.6 above), 117.

ὅς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο·  
ὅστις ἐμῷ βασιλῆι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο.

The model here is Achilles' famous account to Priam (in *Iliad* 24.602-17) of Niobe, also used as an *exemplum* of behaviour which might be thought paradoxical, in which Artemis kills Niobe's six daughters and Apollo her six sons. In Homer there is an even distribution of killing between the sibling gods; in Callimachus there is no word of Artemis. We could read her into the plural μακάρεσσιν of v.25, but — particularly when we read back from the *Hymn to Artemis* — the chiastic game of the following verses (26f.) even squeezes her out of that by bringing the poet's king into the equation<sup>50</sup>. The best that the poet can do is to allow her to turn his words of praise against her brother (*h.* 3.6-9):

'δός μοι παρθενίην αἰώνιον, ἄππα, φυλάσσειν,  
καὶ πολυωνυμίην, ἵνα μή μοι Φοῖβος ἔριζῃ,  
δός δ' ιοὺς καὶ τόξα—έα πάτερ, οὐ σε φαρέτρην  
οὐδ' αἴτεω μέγα τόξον.'

The inversion of *h.* 2, and the childish desire for supremacy over her brother in a poem (the 'Artemis') at whose heart will indeed lie *eris* with 'Phoebus', makes plain the textual game upon which this encomium is based. The infant god's request for πολυωνυμίη is perhaps not just a request for 'many names', as her brother has, but also for 'the name of πολύς', a standard etymology for Apollo's name, of which Callimachus has made much in the preceding poem (cf. *h.* 2.34-5, 69-70). By the middle of the poem, the poet will have granted her even this (137-9):

εἴην δ' αὐτός, ἄνασσα, μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδή·  
τῇ ἔνι μὲν Λητοῦς γάμος ἔσσεται, ἐν δὲ σὺ πολλή,  
ἐν δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλων, ἐν δ' οὐ σε πάντες ἀεθλοι...

<sup>50</sup> There is much characteristic verbal smartness in these verses: πέτρος is a surprise for πατήρ, as a counterpoint to the pathetic μήτηρ at the end of v.20. Ἀναβάλλεται has a musical sense which is momentarily evoked by the parallel κινύρεται (a related 'pun' at fr.75.43); just as v.21 foreshadows the etymology of the ritual cry from παῖ, παῖ, so v.25 suggests the etymology from ἴημι, given the fate of Niobe's children. On this passage cf. also SELDEN (n.31 above), 378; RUTHERFORD (n.1 above), 122.

The prominence of ‘sibling rivalry’ as a motif and narrative impulse in the *Hymn to Artemis* is in fact too obvious to require lengthy discussion; in the *Homeric Hymns* in her honour, Artemis’ identity was already crucially dependent upon that of her brother, and Callimachus explores the potential tensions within such familial structures. If, however, he rewards the sister with her own hymn, he restores the balance in the *Hymn to Delos* from which she is all but entirely absent.

Artemis makes in fact at most two appearances in the *Hymn to Delos*: the slavish<sup>51</sup> Iris is compared to one of her hunting dogs (v.228–9), a comparison which casts at best an ambiguous light on the goddess, and the final verse may refer to her by circumlocution, ‘the girl whom Leto bore’, though both text and interpretation are disputed. Artemis’ painless gestation and birth (*h.* 3.24–5) is thus written against Leto’s sufferings with the foetal Apollo in the following poem. The relative age of Apollo and Artemis is indeed a very grey area in the tradition. That they are twins is an idea “surprisingly rare outside Pindar”<sup>52</sup>, and nothing in Callimachus’ *Hymns* suggests such a notion; though Delian cults of Artemis are amply attested<sup>53</sup>, it is Apollo alone with whom the island is intimately associated. The place of Artemis’ birth remains as mysterious as the ‘Ortygia’ of the archaic *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (v.16).

##### 5. ‘From Zeus are kings’

Throughout the first four hymns<sup>54</sup>, we are engaged in a constant struggle to control a shifting set of ways of talking about

<sup>51</sup> She is in fact a ‘comic’ *serva currens*, cf. HUNTER, *Theocritus* (n.4 above), 96; for the ‘breathlessness’ motif cf. SOPH. *Ant.* 224; AR. *Au.* 1122; R. HUNTER, *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome* (Cambridge 1985), 165. On this scene cf. also DEPEW, “Delian Hymns” (n.8 above), 171.

<sup>52</sup> I. RUTHERFORD, “Pindar on the Birth of Apollo”, in *CQ* 38 (1988), 65–75, p.72.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Ph. BRUNEAU, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris 1970), 171–206.

<sup>54</sup> It is worth pondering how the *Hymns to Athena* and *Demeter* are different from the rest in many more ways than just dialect.

the nature of power — similes, analogues, suggestive juxtapositions<sup>55</sup>. In any state with strongly centralised power, be it Alexandria or even Cyrene, writing of this kind is ‘political’, because of the distribution of power within society. The divinity or quasi-divinity of the ruler, even before the formal institution of ruler cult, can change the contours of the pantheon by offering a point of reference (the ruler) through which new overlapping spheres within the ‘generic system’ are created; here too it is reasonable to think that poets often ran ahead of more broadly disseminated representations. Moreover, the first two hymns in the collection, *Zeus* and *Apollo*, establish fairly explicit links between human and divine power; thereafter, the reader is always held by the possibility of a thoroughgoing ‘system’ running through the corpus, particularly as both Olympian and Ptolemaic structures are based on family relationships. Thus, for example, it is tantalising that a poem about Artemis is surrounded by two poems in honour of her brother Apollo, one of which at least makes quite explicit the similarities between Apollo and Philadelphus<sup>56</sup>. The hymns must be contextualised within the social structures which produced them, and it is here that Callimachus’ Alexandrian context becomes determinative upon interpretation.

Hymnal writing and performance flourished at all levels of Hellenistic society, as papyri and inscriptions amply attest, and the range of beings who were the object of hymnic praise was also greatly increased. The political upheavals of the later fourth century had placed the safety of cities (and later empires) in the hands of powerful military dynasts, and we find many of these celebrated in similar terms and similar poetic modes to those in

<sup>55</sup> DEPEW, “Delian Hymns” (n.8 above), 175 n.51 makes the nice suggestion that “Iris’ sycophantic address to Hera (*b.* 4.216-39) provide[s] a negative exemplar of more overt praise”.

<sup>56</sup> P. BING, *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen 1988), 126 n.57 suggested, on the basis of certain shared motifs between *b.* 3 and *b.* 4, that they were “originally companion pieces, the one perhaps written for Arsinoe, the other for Philadelphus”.

which the Olympian ‘saviours’ or ‘protectors’ of cities had earlier been, and continued to be, glorified<sup>57</sup>.

The distinction between men and gods, rather than some unchanging value associated with the language in which they were each described, was the crucial issue. Traditional Greek culture had always been uneasy with men whose good fortune seemed to threaten the privileges of the divine, and Pindar (like Homer before him) is constantly at pains to warn of the dangers and the unbridgeable divide which separates the two; in the third century and after, some men did in fact cross over, but only in very particular circumstances and often only after death. The old pattern persisted with remarkable tenacity: the apparently drily scholastic division in late antique rhetoric between ‘hymns’ to gods and ‘encomia’ to men is a manifestation of that persistence. Nevertheless, poems such as Theocritus 17 (*Encomium to Ptolemy Philadelphus*) and Callimachus’ *Hymns to Zeus* and *Apollo*, like the epinician tradition before them, creatively explore the boundaries between ‘analogy’ and ‘identification’ in ways which must have reflected the fluid search for new modes of praise in a changed situation<sup>58</sup>. One modern difficulty in understanding this poetry arises from the assumption that there must be a simple and consistent analogy between two classes of being who are described or praised in similar language; rather, we must consider the occasion-specific rhetoric of Greek praise and always be prepared to ask after the *function* of praise, rather than after some (probably illusory) ‘essential meaning’ for the terms in which the praise is couched. Praise exists to offer thanks for benefactions received and/or to create the circumstances for benefactions in the future; the

<sup>57</sup> For a helpful discussion and list of references to such compositions cf. CAMERON (n.11 above), 291–5; KERKHECKER (n.6 above), 289 draws attention to Callimachus’ generic sensitivity in avoiding ‘hymns’ directly addressed to mortal kings.

<sup>58</sup> This will be discussed in greater detail in R. HUNTER, *Theocritus. The Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley, forthcoming).

pragmatics of hymnal discourse may thus be a more useful subject than its 'religion'.

A feature of the *Homeric Hymns* which assumes great importance within the changed conditions of poetic composition which prevailed in the Hellenistic period is that these poems have at their heart the link between the past and the present. The hymns tell of the birth of gods or the establishment of their powers or of incidents in the heroic past which exemplify that power. Like mythological narrative in general, the hymns look to the past for the validation of the present order, particularly where they touch upon the position of kings and patrons, for here, more than anywhere else, an authorising tradition is of the greatest significance. Hymns thus take their place within the array of techniques by which Hellenistic poets both sought continuity with the past and also advertised their disjunction from it<sup>59</sup>.

There is no major *Homeric Hymn to Zeus*<sup>60</sup>, but the opening of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* evokes a setting where the celebration of Zeus was a familiar act: the third introductory libation before the start of the symposium proper was to Zeus Soter (Athenaeus 15.692f-693c), and the singing of paeans was a regular part of the symposium<sup>61</sup>. In the absence of a formal model in the *Homeric Hymns*, Callimachus' narrative of the birth and power of Zeus is, as has long been recognised, in part a re-writing of sections of Hesiod's *Theogony*<sup>62</sup>; in describing the creation, coming to power and *timai* of Zeus, the *Theogony* is, in any case, importantly like a hymn. If the central concern of the

<sup>59</sup> Cf. BING (n.56 above), *passim*.

<sup>60</sup> *Hymn 23* is a four-verse proem to Zeus.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. RUTHERFORD, *Paeans* (n.1 above), 50-2; thus, for example, Ariphron's paean to Hygieia (*PMG* 813) is most naturally associated with the standard sympotic toasts in honour of that goddess (HUNTER on Eubulus fr.94.2 [= *PCG* 93.3]). Relevant also are the hymnal themes of some of the Attic skolia, cf. *PMG* 884, 885, 886, and cf. also the self-referential opening of one of Alcman's paeans (*PMG* 98).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. especially H. REINSCH-WERNER, *Callimachus Hesiodicus* (Berlin 1976), 24-73; W. MEINCKE, *Untersuchungen zu den enkomastiischen Gedichten Theokrits* (Diss. Kiel 1966), 165-82.

major *Homeric Hymns* is the placing of their respective gods within the overall Olympian scheme, what Jenny Clay has termed “the politics of Olympus”, then the absence of a hymn to Zeus, the god who is responsible for that scheme, is unsurprising; a ‘theogony’ which tells of the creation of the whole scheme *must*, on the other hand, inevitably be in some sense a ‘hymn to Zeus’. Moreover, Hesiod’s poem explicitly foregrounds the relationships between Zeus and powerful men on earth, the aristocrats whom Hesiod calls *basileis*, and between the *basileis* and poets (*Theog.* 80-103). Both of these relationships are of crucial importance to Callimachus writing in the world of the Alexandrian court, under the patronage of a new kind of *basileus* whose ‘assimilation’ to Zeus seems to have been a commonplace of contemporary Greek poetry (*Theocritus* 17 etc.)<sup>63</sup>. The analogy between the master of Olympus and the great king on earth became a commonplace of Hellenistic kingship theory, by no means restricted to the ambit of the Ptolemaic court, and is indeed foreshadowed in the *Iliad* in the similarity (and tragic dissimilarity) of Zeus and Agamemnon. A poem such as Pindar’s *First Pythian* which establishes a close analogy between Zeus’ harmonious control of the cosmos, based upon the crushing of his enemies, and Hieron’s harmonious guidance of his people shows how powerful, and how traditional, such ideas were. In his *Hymn to Zeus* Callimachus cites this passage of Hesiod — ἐν δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες — to position himself within a traditional negotiation between poetic encomium and kingly

<sup>63</sup> We hope that uncertainty as to the date of the hymn and the identity of “our ruler” (v.86) does not rob these general considerations of all their force. We ourselves would identify the ruler as Philadelphus (cf. J.J. CLAUSS, “Lies and allusions: the addressee and date of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*”, in *ClAnt* 5 [1986], 155-70; CAMERON [n.11 above], 10), but other proposals are current (Magas: C. MEILLIER, *Callimaque et son temps* [Lille 1979], 61-78; Soter: J. CARRIÈRE, “Philadelphe ou Sôter? À propos d’un hymne de Callimaque”, in *Studii Clasice* 11 [1969], 85-93). For a reading of the *Hymn to Zeus* in the light of Egyptian as well as Greek ideas cf. S. STEPHENS, “Callimachus at court”, in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1998), 167-85.

power, while celebrating what was (in some ways) a radically new kind of power.

One crucial difference, however, between Callimachus and Hesiod is that, in the *Theogony*, the good king on earth follows (or imitates) the immortal pattern of Zeus, at least in the functions of *diakrinein*, “of physical and intellectual distribution”, and imposing dispute settlement. In Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus*, however, Zeus and the good king are, at least potentially, fused together: we are *almost* dealing with one paradigm, rather than two related figures. Both the political and religious reality of the Ptolemy-Pharaoh, the first of whom was called, like Zeus, Soter, and the evolution of Greek poetic encomium contribute to this change. Such a fusion, however, foregrounds questions of ‘control’: *When* is Ptolemy ‘like’ Zeus? Always, or only at certain moments and in certain circumstances? *How* and *when* is Arsinoe ‘like’ Helen (*Theocr. 15.110*)?<sup>64</sup> As Egyptian monarchs, the Ptolemies were both in some sense divine, but were also mortals under the special protection of the gods; this doubleness can be amply illustrated from the iconography of the early reigns<sup>65</sup>. A sense of overlapping, of shared but not identical characteristics, and of present copies of timeless models is thus built into the very nature of kingship. It is perhaps no accident that the allusive practice of Alexandrian poetry shows similar features: can a reader’s receptiveness to explicit allusion be controlled in such a way as to block off (as far as possible) unhelpful associations and echoes; is one of the criteria of ‘rightness’ in reading knowing how far to read ‘intertextually’ and when to stop?<sup>66</sup>

The *Hymn to Zeus* begins on a note of certainty (1-3):

Ζηνὸς ἔσι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῆσιν ἀείδειν  
λώιον ἢ θεὸν αὐτόν, ἀεὶ μέγαν, αἰὲν ἄνακτα,  
Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, δικασπόλον Ούρανίδησι;

<sup>64</sup> Cf. HUNTER, *Theocritus* (n.4 above), 165-6 on the “process of selective memory” which the use of such mythological figures imposes and which poets dramatise and ironise.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. SELDEN (n.31 above), 350-1, 386 (with bibliography).

<sup>66</sup> Some of the issues are set out with great clarity in S. HINDS, *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge 1998), esp. Chapter 2.

Zeus' name stands, as is only proper, at the head of the hymn, and perhaps of the collection of hymns. Within this certainty, however, unsettling doubts lurk, and not merely about the meaning of the riddling third verse<sup>67</sup>. At first we assume that the opening words mean "What other than Zeus would it be better to sing at libations?", and it is only when we reach ἦ θεὸν αὐτόν in v.2 that we realise that the opening Ζηνός actually belongs with σπονδῆσιν, "at libations to Zeus"<sup>68</sup>. Although we have 'mis-construed' the syntax of the opening verse, we have in fact correctly appreciated the meaning: Zeus is the only possibility, regardless of grammatical construction. Zeus, whose precocious power (v.57) is shared only with "our king" (vv.87-8) and overturns all our accepted notions of progression and generational succession (vv.58-9), is the only certainty amidst the treacherous shoals of competing 'mythologies' (vv.4-9), Cretan paradoxes (v.8) and the untruths of poets (vv.60-5). That the opening verses themselves appear to be written 'in competition' with a famous Pindaric opening is itself a manifestation of the shifting layers of tradition<sup>69</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> On Πηλαγύνων (*Etym. Gen.*: Πηλο-MSS) cf. PFEIFFER II 41. The traditional interpretation, current already in antiquity (cf. *Scholia ad loc.*; NONN. *Dion.* 18.266, and perhaps HOR. *carm.* 3.1.6-7 *Iovis | clari Giganteo triumpho*, in a very Callimachean context [S.J. HEYWORTH, "Some allusions to Callimachus in Latin poetry", in *MD* 33 [1994], 51-79, pp. 54-6]), of the first half is "router of the Mud-born, i.e. the Giants (the γηγενεῖς, "born from earth") and/or the Titans"; if this were correct, we would have a brief allusion to the establishment of Zeus' rule, and this interpretation would seem to find support in *Theogony* 820, "when Zeus had driven (ἐξέλασε) the Titans from heaven...". Adolf KÖHNKEN, "Πηλογύνων ἐλατήρ. Kallimachos, Zeushymnos v.3", in *Hermes* 112 (1984), 438-45, however, has argued that the 'Mud-born' are mortals, traditionally fashioned by Prometheus from mud; ἐλατήρ will, therefore, mean "gatherer, controller", as of flocks of sheep, and this would be a Callimachean way of re-writing the Homeric ποιμὴν λαῶν, "shepherd of the people". Not only would this interpretation offer the witty equation of human beings to sheep, but it would also play off the origins of men ('mud') against the origins of the gods ('sons of Ouranos').

<sup>68</sup> The syntactic ambiguity is noted already by the scholiast.

<sup>69</sup> The brilliant insubstantiality of the poetic voice in the *Hymn to Zeus* has often been discussed, and we shall say little about it here; among recent accounts cf. N. HOPKINSON, "Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*", in *CQ* 34 (1984), 139-48; S. GOLDHILL, "Framing and Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry", in *PCPS*

The verbal style of Callimachus' opening is close to the opening of a Pindaric prosodion (fr. 89a Sn.-M., presumably to Artemis):

Τί κάλλιον ἀρχομένοισ(ιν?) ἢ καταπαυομένοισιν  
 ἢ βαθύζωνόν τε Λατώ  
 καὶ θοὸν ἵππων ἐλάτειραν ἀεῖσαι;

Nevertheless it seems very likely that we are primarily to think of Pindar's own *Hymn to Zeus*<sup>70</sup> which began with a priamel listing of possible Theban themes for song (fr. 29 Sn.-M.):

Ισμηὸν ἢ χρυσαλάκατον Μελίαν  
 ἢ Κάδμον ἢ Σπαρτῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἀνδρῶν  
 ἢ τὰν κυανάμπυκα Θήβαν  
 ἢ τὸ πάντοιλμον σθένος Ἡρακλέος  
 ἢ τὰν Διωνύσου πολυγαθέα τιμὰν  
 ἢ γάμον λευκωλένου Ἀρμονίας  
 ὑμνήσομεν;

5

Against Pindar's embarrassment of choice is set by Callimachus a confidence that there is only one possible subject for song. Pindar's hymn appears to have made extensive use of Hesiod's *Theogony*, especially if Bruno Snell was correct in arguing that Pindar depicted Apollo and the Muses performing at the wedding of Kadmos and Harmonia "ein grosses mythisches Gedicht... das vom Werden der Götter und Menschen erzählte"<sup>71</sup>. In reading the *Theogony* as a 'Hymn to Zeus' Callimachus is also interpreting Pindar. As Callimachus here appropriates Pindar and is

212 (1986), 25-52; K. LÜDDECKE, "Contextualizing the voice in Callimachus' 'Hymn to Zeus'", in *MD* 41 (1998), 9-33.

<sup>70</sup> This poem seems to have stood first in Aristophanes of Byzantium's seventeen-book edition of Pindar (cf. PFEIFFER [1968], 183-4), but we cannot necessarily extrapolate back from this to the scholarship of a previous generation; there must, however, be a strong suspicion that Callimachus' contemporaries also knew it in a very prominent position. For Horace's use of Greek poems which were significantly placed in their respective books cf. A. BARCHIESI, "Rituals in ink: Horace on the Greek lyric tradition", in DEPEW-OBINK, *Matrices* (above n.1), 167-82, esp. 171-3.

<sup>71</sup> *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Göttingen 1975), 82-94. With fr.30 M. cf. HES. *Theog.* 901-6, which Pindar appears partially to 'correct'.

soon to incorporate Homer, whose account of Achilles' killing of Lykaon is re-written in Rhea's creation of rivers to wash the new-born infant<sup>72</sup>, so Zeus surpasses all other gods; the eternal constancy of Zeus' power (v.2) is set off against the agonistic struggles of poets and the myriad voices of the poetic tradition.

Another one of those voices also demands special attention. As has long been recognised, vv.5-6 which oppose the Cretan and Arcadian birth legends of Zeus seem to rework parallel verses from the fragmentary *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (1-7):

οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνω σ', οἱ δ' Ἰκάρω ἡγεμοέσση  
φάσ', οἱ δ' ἐν Νάξῳ, δῖον γένος εἰραφιῶτα,  
οἱ δέ σ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ βαθυδινήντι  
κυσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνω,  
ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβησιν ἀναξ σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι  
ψευδόμενοι· σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε  
πολλὸν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων κρύπτων λευκώλενον "Ηρην.

Whereas the archaic poet himself declares the variant traditions of Dionysus' birth to be 'lies' and imposes the 'true' account, in the case of Zeus Callimachus leaves the choice up to Dionysus' father himself<sup>73</sup>. Despite the loss of so much hymnic poetry, the relationship between the two passages seems reasonably clear<sup>74</sup>. There may in fact have been a formal reason for Callimachus' choice of model. Although the quoted verses survive only in the indirect tradition, the close of what is pretty certainly the same poem introduces the text of the hymns in the damaged

<sup>72</sup> Cf., e.g., A. GRIFFITHS, in *JHS* 101 (1981), 160. J.K. NEWMAN, "Pindar and Callimachus", in *Illinois Classical Studies* 10 (1985), 169-89, pp.184-5 makes the interesting suggestion that the stress on the sudden appearance of water carries particular resonance as the Ptolemies, the heirs of the Pharaohs, were lords of the Nile; the reign of Zeus/Ptolemy thus ensures abundant fertility for thirsty Egypt. Cf. further STEPHENS (n.63 above).

<sup>73</sup> Is πάτερ in v.7 a hint at the model text being used?

<sup>74</sup> The *Hymn to Dionysus* also shares with the story of Zeus' birth the motifs of hiding the baby from the wrath of another god (in Dionysus' case, Hera) and birth on a thickly wooded mountain (cf. CALL. *b.* 1.11, perhaps a rewriting of the description of Nysa in vv.8-9 of the archaic hymn). On this *Homeric Hymn* see now M.L. WEST, "The fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus", in *ZPE* 134 (2001), 1-11.

Mosquensis manuscript of the early fifteenth century. This manuscript, which by common consent is the best witness to the text of the hymns<sup>75</sup>, also preserves uniquely the *Hymn to Demeter* which follows the Dionysus-fragment; all other manuscripts begin with the *Hymn to Apollo* (*Hymn 3* in T.W. Allen's standard Oxford edition). It is not possible to tell from the manuscript how much of the *Hymn to Dionysus* is lost nor whether this was the first hymn in that text, though this seems indeed very likely. As the order of the preserved hymns is standard in the vast majority of witnesses<sup>76</sup>, there is a presumption that this order goes back to the collection of *Homeric Hymns* which was at some date incorporated into a larger collection of hymnic and Homeric material. If so, we must at least reckon with the possibility that the *Hymn to Dionysus* was the first poem in a collection of *Homeric Hymns* known to Callimachus. In the opening verses of his opening hymn, therefore, Callimachus may have alluded to the 'opening' poems of the two major hymnic collections of the past, the 'Homeric' and the Pindaric. In doing so, Callimachus not merely places himself within a tradition, but calls attention to the written form of collected 'poetry-books' which offered new possibilities for beginnings and ends.

The ludic wit with which Callimachus juxtaposes "the eternal Zeus" with the story of his birth in all its physical detail is of a piece with the games which he plays with notions of truth-telling and the 'Hesiodic' claim of poetry to be able to convey both truth and falsehood (*Theog.* 22-28)<sup>77</sup>; the poet's demand for "plausible fiction" (v.65) is not merely a way to dismiss the Homeric account of the division of the universe among the three sons of Kronos in favour of the Hesiodic version<sup>78</sup>, but it

<sup>75</sup> The most accessible account is the Introduction to the edition of T.W. ALLEN - W.R. HALLIDAY - E.E. SIKES (Oxford 2<sup>nd</sup> 1936).

<sup>76</sup> A small sub-group (HJK) have the order 8-18, then 3.1-186.

<sup>77</sup> Particularly valuable is A. BARCHIESI, *Il Poeta e il Principe. Ovidio e il discorso augusto* (Bari 1994), 169-75.

<sup>78</sup> *Iliad* 15.187-93. Appeals to τὸ εἰκός and τὸ πιθανόν are very common in the Homeric *scholia*, and we should catch here the tones of the scholar, as well as the calculating peasant. There was a rich tradition of allegorising this Iliadic

also of course undermines any temptation we might have to ‘believe’ his own narrative of Zeus’ birth. The physical vividness of this narrative is not merely a technique for disorienting the reader, let alone a tool of ‘realism’, but is rather one of the ways in which it is made clear that what is at issue is not literal ‘belief’ in the story. The strategy of the poem is to divorce the power and nature of Zeus from the ‘mythology’ of Zeus, so that the former does not depend upon the latter. The learned poet can have lots of fun with the absurdities of traditional stories and the inconsistent tales of poets, and yet still expound the realities of power.

There is, moreover, a broader context of ‘religious’ ideas into which Callimachus’ poem and its tradition fits<sup>79</sup>. Greek poetic reflection upon the nature of Zeus, and hence upon the nature of power, tended to stress not the god’s (perhaps original) rôle as the elemental sky-god, but rather the universality and uncertainty of supreme power. When Callimachus excuses himself at the end of the hymn (92-3),

δῶτορ ἀπημονίης. τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδου;  
οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' ἀείσει;

this is not to be dismissed as merely a “bold-faced inversion of one of the most conventional motifs of praise-poems”<sup>80</sup> or as a ‘scholarly’ allusion to the absence of a major ‘Homeric Hymn

passage, and it is not impossible that Callimachus alludes to an actual scholarly argument; cf. Ps.-Heraclitus, *Probl.* 41.5 where the division is described as ἀνώμαλος. Moreover, in the *Iliad* ‘Hades’ is the name of one of the brothers, not a term for the Underworld, and ‘Olympos’ remains common to all three (15.191-3); Callimachus is, therefore, demonstrating how scholars “play fast and loose” with the text in their interpretative arguments.

<sup>79</sup> S. PIETSCH, *Die Argonautika des Apollonios von Rhodos* (Stuttgart 1999), 181-92 is a serious attempt to pay attention to the background of theological ideas in the *Hymn to Zeus*, as well as to the poem’s obvious humour, though our analysis would be very different.

<sup>80</sup> HASLAM (n.6 above), 116, cf. also VESTRHEIM (n.14 above), 63-4. More promising, though equally limiting, is NEWMAN (n.72 above), 185, “evidently [Zeus’ deeds] have been sufficiently replaced by what we have heard of the deeds of Ptolemy”.

to Zeus', though it is, of course, both of those things; there is no point seeking to celebrate or catalogue 'the deeds of Zeus', to write, if you like, a *Hymn to Zeus* on the lines of Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*, because to do so is to misrepresent the nature of Zeus, and it is that nature which is the object of hymnic form. To an important extent, Zeus is 'process', to be perceived only as the pattern of events which have already unfolded, what Aeschylus calls 'Zeus' valid law', πάθει μάθος, "learning through experience". Everything which happens is 'Zeus'.<sup>81</sup> This is, however, not a matter of 'what Callimachus believed' (which we shall never know) or 'the religion of Callimachus', but rather of the literary and cultural tradition in which his poem fits. So much about the style of his poetry seems revolutionary, that the traditional matrix of ideas into which it fits is often forgotten.

<sup>81</sup> Some key texts: AESCHYL. *Ag.* 160-83; SOPH. *Trach.* 1278; EUR. *Tr.* 884-8; CLEANTH. *Hymn to Zeus*; ARAT. *Phaen.* 4.

## DISCUSSION

*M.A. Harder:* You use as a working hypothesis the idea that the *Hymns* form a deliberately organised ‘poetry book’, but I wonder whether you would be prepared to go further than this: just how strong is the evidence for such an arrangement?

*R. Hunter:* It must be freely admitted that the strongest evidence is precisely the interpretative advances which the hypothesis allows, and ‘evidence’ of this kind is, of course, never going to be conclusive or convince everyone. I should also add that we should perhaps not put too much stress on the (physical) idea of a poetry *book*. Poems may ‘use’ other poems in a variety of ways, even when they do not (originally) travel together; thus, for example, Theocritus’ *Sixth Idyll* can be seen to ‘use’ the *Eleventh Idyll*, regardless of how we imagine the first transmission. Perhaps we should be thinking of a stage preliminary to, but foreshadowing some of the effects of, the later ‘poetry book’. If so — but I would not wish to push the analogy too far — we may compare some of the other ways in which the Latin poets sharpened the focus of and made more explicit features merely adumbrated in Hellenistic poetry.

*Th. Fuhrer:* Rather than going further, I would like to be even more sceptical and say that we should always take into consideration that the six Callimachean poems which we call ‘hymns’ might always have circulated separately. But even then we may say that these six poems or even only a part of this corpus (e.g. 2 to 4 or 2, 5 and 6 or 1 and 4 etc.) contain features or material pointing towards a common system of signs (e.g.: the Hellenic pantheon, mimesis of performance, the Ptolemaic kings etc.) that may be read as cross-references. In this sense most of our observations on the extant corpus can be maintained, even

if the possibility that Callimachus composed a poetry book of hymns be denied.

*S. Stephens:* Alexandrian scholars were collecting individual works of previous writers like Pindar and gathering them together; they were *de facto* creating poetry books. The narrative potential for this new form may perhaps be thought of as no more than an extension of the narrative freedom you have already attributed to the choice of the hymn form.

*R. Hunter:* This is indeed a very important consideration and, as you are aware, very interesting work has been done on how the shape and order of the Alexandrian arrangement of archaic and classical poets has influenced subsequent 'poetry books', particularly at Rome. We expressed ourselves cautiously about the positioning of the Pindaric *Hymn to Zeus* — the question of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* remains even more speculative — because of the inevitable problems of chronology when attempting to relate Alexandrian scholarship to Alexandrian poetry. The basic point, however, remains fundamental.

*Th. Fuhrer:* The *narrative* potential of entire corpora of poems or even of less clearly defined groups of poems is in fact something that deserves further discussion: to what extent do the single poems refer to each other and thereby, taken together, form a 'narrative'?

*A.S. Hollis:* It is worth noting too that, to judge from the methods of citing from the *Hymns* in late antiquity, there does seem to have been a sense that these formed a 'collection'; a rough count from Pfeiffer reveals 10 examples of citations from 'the *Hymns of Callimachus*' and 8 from 'Callimachus in the *Hymn to X*', a method which perhaps facilitated the finding of a reference. This does not, of course, prove anything for the intentions of Callimachus himself.

*L. Lehnus:* Perhaps I may also add that it is at least tantalising that, as far as our evidence allows us to judge, the *Hymns* could have been composed in the order in which they have been transmitted, and this would certainly suit your hypothesis of an organic collection.

May I raise two other matters which are relevant to the question of the *Hymns* as a meaningful collection? First, I wonder how highly Callimachus rated the importance of these poems within his oeuvre as a whole; were they a kind of *parergon* to the main poetic business? Secondly, I wave the possibility that the *Hymn to Athena* is elegiac because Callimachus originally conceived it as part of the *Aitia*; I note his use of the *Argolika* of Agias and Derkylos at least thrice in the great elegiac collection and the fact that the *Hymn to Athena* is apparently lacking in *POxy.* 2258A.

*R. Hunter:* On the first point, we cannot of course say how Callimachus regarded the different areas of his own work. At most, we can look to the reception of his work and note that, although he is – particularly, though not exclusively, for the Romans – the poet of the *Aitia* and the *Hecale*, the *Hymns* (and I am not just thinking of the end of the *Hymn to Apollo*) are echoed (*inter alios*) by Horace, Virgil, Propertius and, of course, Ovid; no sign there that they were regarded as of little importance.

As to the second point you make, that is a very interesting suggestion, but I would add three notes of caution. First, the Doric dialect of the poem certainly does not suggest the *Aitia*, whereas of course we have another hymn in precisely this linguistic form. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the fate of Teiresias suggests, though the poet does not make this explicit, why men should not see Athena naked or, more specifically, why Argive men should not look upon the statue of Athena while it is being bathed. As such, the story differs from the *aitia* in the *Aitia* both in not being explicitly aetiological of the cult at issue and in not being specifically tied to the area of the cult; indeed, Callimachus parades the fact that this is a Boeotian story told at an Argive cult. Viewed from this perspective, the structure

of cult and aetiological tale seems closer to the concerns of the *Hymns* ('How shall I hymn you?') than to the (apparently regular) pattern of the *Aitia*. We must, of course, always make allowance for the gaps in our knowledge of the *Aitia*, but the humour of that poem at the expense of aetiological structures seems to me to be rather different.

Finally, we cannot ignore the juxtaposition, whether it is to be traced to Callimachus or an 'editor', of the narratives of Teiresias and Erysichthon, two young men whose punishment also brings suffering to their mothers, but whose 'errors' seem morally worlds apart; this is a further demonstration of the power of the hymnist to shape his material (and our response to it), though it does, of course, 'prove' nothing about the original circumstances of composition. If the 'moral' of both stories — divine power — is the same, our response to them is quite different; everything lies, after all, in the telling, and Teiresias could so easily have been made a voyeuristic Actaion and Erysichthon a naïve woodcutter. Not dissimilar, perhaps, is the effect of the paired stories, quite different in tone and direction, in Theocritus' *Hymn to the Dioscuri* (*Idyll 22*): Polydeuces overcomes a rude bully, thus making the world a safer place, whereas Kastor appears to exercise a more random and purposeless violence against a polite young hero.

*M.A. Harder:* For juxtaposed stories which are very similar but also importantly different we may also think of the stories of Heracles and the Lindian peasant and Heracles and Theiodamas in *Aitia 1*.

*R. Hunter:* That is a very nice example. Thank you.

*S. Stephens:* Antecedents for Callimachus' hymns should not be restricted to Homeric and Pindaric collections that were known to him. Whether or not it has left a textual residue, there would still have been contemporary public performance of hymns for ritual occasions. Also, there are the near contemporary

examples of the hymnic form now detached from cult and, as in Aristotle's *Hymn to Arete* or Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, already at a relatively high degree of abstraction. Another tradition that I think has been neglected is that of *Orphic Hymns*. Nor should we forget the admittedly late, but suggestive, *Hymns* of Isidorus, written to Isis, in hexameters and elegiacs and dated to the end of the first century BC. These display language in part derived from Homer and Hesiod. All these suggest that the hymnic form was quite fluid by the early Hellenistic period both for subject matter and style. (The *Hymn to Artemis* has something in common with Isis aretalogies, for example, with its many lists.) In this context writing Hymns need not be construed as antiquarian or a response to an obscure inheritance of the literary tradition, but an attempt to position appropriate divinities of the panhellenic pantheon in new contexts. Nor should one assume that novel elements that first appear in Callimachus are necessarily his invention.

*R. Hunter:* I entirely agree that the situation is complex, and there is much that we should know which we cannot; we by no means wished to limit Callimachus' 'models' to the Homeric and Pindaric collections. The Isidorus *Hymns* to which we drew specific attention are very suggestive.

*Th. Fuhrer:* I would like to confirm your statement that the hymnic form was something rather fluid from the perspective of poets like Callimachus and Theocritus. We even cannot be sure whether Callimachus would have called these six poems 'hymns' (the *Hymn to Apollo* might well be called a paean).

*P.J. Parsons:* Does the dissociation of myths from their original context and the 'cultic imagination' of which you speak correspond to the dissociation of (immigrant) Alexandrians from their native cities and a related willingness to accept an 'olde worlde' view of old Greece?

*R. Hunter:* There must indeed be something in this: Pollis is one kind of 'implied reader' for the *Aitia*, as Theogenes is another. I am, nevertheless, cautious (as I imagine Professor Parsons is) about grand theories of deracination and alienation, as they have been applied to Alexandrian Greeks of the early Ptolemaic period.

*P.J. Parsons:* As you mention 'implied readers', may I ask whether the meaning of the text is so transparent that it is really possible to treat the two questions about performance and audience which you raise as entirely separate: in other words, can we really use only 'the text' without certain assumptions about the knowledge and imagination of any contemporary audience, which must to some extent be a 'historical' question?

*R. Hunter:* I entirely accept the thrust of this question: for both writer and critic, all notions of 'implied audience' must to some extent be constructed on the basis of 'historical' experience and (in the case of the critic) judgement.

*Th. Fuhrer:* But of course there is a crucial difference between what critical theory calls the implied and the historic reader or audience: the implied audience is entirely inherent in the texts themselves.

*M.A. Harder:* For the so-called 'mimetic' hymns, we must also remember that the presence of *both* an audience within the poem *and* an 'implied audience' makes the situation particularly complex.

*P.J. Parsons:* On the division between man and god, the now long-established heroisation of the dead (e.g. Brasidas) and the tradition of paeans for the living (Lysander, Demetrius Poliorcetes etc.) is obviously of great importance. May I, however, ask whether it was your intention to suggest that we are to sense the sister-wife Arsinoe behind Artemis' access to the seat of power in Callimachus' *Hymn*?

*R. Hunter*: Yes. It seems to me very hard to see how one can avoid this sense in a world in which the 'real' rulers are brother and sister. Callimachus' divine sister has access to the ultimate source of power (Zeus), and can act as his agent in dealings with ordinary mortals; it would not have been difficult to think of parallel structures here on earth.

I should note that Michael Erler ("Das Recht ( $\Delta$ IKH) als Segensbringerin für die Polis. Die Wandlung eines Motivs von Hesiod zu Kallimachos", in *SIFC* 80 [1987], 22-36) has suggested that, in the account of the goddess' punishment of the unjust and her corresponding blessings upon those whom she favours (*b.* 3.121-37) which is very obviously a rewriting of the description of the just and unjust cities in the *Works and Days* (225-47), the Callimachean Artemis is shaped in such a way as to appear "eine Art Vorbild und einen Spiegel für die Monarchin Ägyptens" (35): on her depends the fruitfulness of the land and the peace and prosperity of the people. The change from communal responsibility for prosperity, through the practice of justice, in Hesiod to a dependence upon the care and bounty of the ruler is, in Erler's reading, a measure of the ideological shift which the appropriation of certain Egyptian ideas of kingship had wrought. The idea is an attractive one, particularly if the hymn can be associated with Arsinoe, whose associations with Isis-Demeter, the bringer of fertility and agricultural prosperity, are well known, and in *Idyll* 17 Theocritus clearly depicts the Egypt of Arsinoe's brother-husband Philadelphus as the Hesiodic 'Just City' on a grand scale. Two cautionary footnotes to this important reading are, however, necessary.

First, it is true that, unlike Hesiod, Callimachus does not make explicit how men earn the god's favour, but it is in fact no large interpretative leap to understand from vv.122-3 that Artemis favours 'the just', and if it is correct to associate the damaging διχοστασίη of v.133 with the ἔργα διχοστασίης which are ended by Solon's Εὐνομίη (fr. 4.37), in a passage which itself rewrites the two cities of the *Works and Days*, it will be even clearer how one comes to enjoy Artemis' favour. It may be, moreover, that Callimachus wishes to create an association

between his Artemis and the Hesiodic Dike, another *parthenos* who sits with her father Zeus and tells him of the outrages of unjust men. Secondly, there is, unfortunately, very little evidence for Artemis' importance or association with Arsinoe at Alexandria, where the bliss of mutual marital affection was given a far higher status than Artemis' stern chastity. For some ambiguous evidence for the association of Arsinoe with Artemis on Delos cf. A. Plassart, *Les sanctuaires et les cultes du Mont Cynthe* (Paris 1928), 227-8. The earlier re-naming or re-foundation of Ephesus as 'Arsinoe' by Lysimachus (Strabo 14.1.21) perhaps made Arsinoe somewhat reluctant to stress her links with Artemis, once she was safely married to Ptolemy II. I must also stress that the date of the *Hymn to Artemis* is quite uncertain; C. Meillier, *Callimaque et son temps* (Lille 1979), 107-14 argues forcefully, but inconclusively, for a Cyrenean origin for the poem.

*P.J. Parsons:* Is there then no *Hymn to Aphrodite* (cf. *Collectanea Alexandrina* p.82) and no *Hymn to Sarapis* because these would be too obvious exploitations of the royal house and its ideology?

*R. Hunter:* That is an attractive inference, though of course the 'historical' explanation for the lack of such poems might be entirely different. As for a 'Hymn to Sarapis', I believe that our stress on the importance of Greek (literary) heritage in the writing of Callimachus' *Hymns* can help to explain why a 'Hymn to Sarapis' would have been an entirely different exercise than the six *Hymns* which we possess.

*S. Stephens:* I would say that the hymns are constructed to position familiar Greek gods in such a way that they may be seen to correspond to or share elements in common with the principal deities of pharaonic state cult. Hence Zeus, Apollo, and Delos all correspond to Horus in some measure and the three hymns to the goddesses, all of whom are *megalai theai*, can be understood as avatars of Isis. Moreover, the cults and myths

that are included for each deity are selected not so much for occasion but for viability of their myths in this new milieu. Hence, for Apollo we get Delos, Cyrene, and Delphi as the three cult sites most of interest for or relevant to the Ptolemies. This also, I think, accounts for the absence of a Sarapis hymn. Sarapis represents an attempt at syncretism that does not depend on panhellenic divinities — its direction is from solely Egyptian (Osiris, Apis) to a hybrid specifically reconstructed for Greek consumption. Callimachus approaches the problem from the opposite direction to move from panhellenic Greek to an intermediate position of Greek plus recognizable Egyptian elements. Herodotus, Hecataeus of Abdera, and Dionysius Scytobrachion all behave similarly in that they associate Egyptian divinities — Isis, Osiris, Horus — with the Olympic pantheon.

*P.J. Parsons:* One final point. Your view of the *Hymn to Zeus* is suggestive also for Cleanthes' *Hymn*: another revolutionary re-definition of the elemental god who defies ordinary hymnic technique.

*R. Hunter:* That is very interesting, and one could add in the stoicising hymn which opens Aratus' *Phainomena* as a further way of 'dealing with' the intractable Zeus.

*Cl. Calame:* La double intervention que l'on vient d'entendre le montre encore une fois clairement: pour une investigation sur la poétique alexandrine, aucun corpus transmis sous une même dénomination générique ne permet de mieux poser la question des genres et de leurs règles à la fois langagières et situationnelles que les *Hymnes* de Callimaque. Pour ne reprendre que l'exemple des deux poèmes commentés en parallèle (l'*Hymne au bain de Pallas* et l'*Hymne à Déméter*), l'aspect narratif qui rapproche ces deux compositions évoque à l'évidence le corpus des *Hymnes homériques*, et en particulier les quatre (ou cinq) poèmes qui, ouvrant pour nous cette collection, se distinguent par leur longueur en raison même du développement qu'y

connaît le récit. Dans cette mesure on pourrait supposer que les deux hymnes de Callimaque dont la narration est centrée sur un épisode unique de la biographie du dieu chanté reprennent la structure tripartite qui a été érigée par les critiques modernes comme le trait générique distinctif des *Hymnes homériques*: *evocatio* (brève présentation de la voix narrative dans une adresse indirecte à la divinité chantée) — *epica laus* (longue partie narrative en diction épique, introduite par le ‘relatif hymnique’) — *preces* (brève prière conclusive adressée directement à la divinité concernée dans un jeu de *do ut des*)<sup>1</sup>.

Or, même d’un point de vue structural qui devrait rendre la comparaison et l’étude des analogies particulièrement aisées, on constate que la partie d’*evocatio* de l’hymne que Callimaque consacre à Déméter consiste en fait en une suite d’indications rituelles adressées aux femmes honorant la déesse (un appel cultuel à Déméter est ainsi mis en abyme), avant qu’en guise d’introduction à la partie narrative la déesse ne soit invoquée (et non pas évoquée) directement. Quant à l’*Hymne au Bain de Pallas*, la même partie introductory d’ordre rituel occupe près de la moitié d’une composition qui, conformément à son titre, est moins focalisée sur l’éloge de la déesse que sur le culte dont sa statue est l’objet; sous la forme d’adresses répétées aux jeunes Argiennes honorant Athéna, l’*evocatio* s’y développe donc en une description du rituel qui va être accompli, chacune des phases qui le composent étant assortie d’un bref élément narratif d’ordre étiologique.

Aussi narratifs soient-ils, les deux derniers hymnes de Callimaque ne sauraient donc être assimilés à des *Hymnes homériques*. Du point de vue fonctionnel, ce ne sont pas non plus des proèmes à des récitations aédiques ou rhapsodiques qui, comme c’est le cas pour les *Hymnes homériques*, se dérouleraient en particulier à l’occasion du culte évoqué dans le poème. Non

<sup>1</sup> Voir les différentes études que j’ai mentionnées et commentées à ce propos dans “Variations énonciatives, relations avec les dieux et fonctions poétiques dans les *Hymnes homériques*”, in *MH* 52 (1995), 2-19.

contents d'assumer une couleur dialectale dorienne, sinon un rythme élégiaque, qui se distancie de l'usage lexical et formulaire de la diction homérique rhapsodique, ces deux hymnes de Callimaque brisent une loi essentielle du genre. En effet, dans les *Hymnes homériques* les plus longs, la géographie de l'épisode biographique auquel correspond le récit de l'*epica laus* présente une relation forte, d'ordre souvent étiologique, entre l'un des points d'appui du récit et l'un des lieux de culte de la divinité concernée: Eleusis pour Déméter, Délos et Delphes pour Apollon, le Mont Cylléné en Arcadie pour Hermès, Chypre pour Aphrodite. Or, dans les deux derniers hymnes de Callimaque, cette relation spatiale est l'objet d'une reformulation complète. Dans le poème adressé à Déméter, le rituel décrit est si composite qu'il est impossible de le mettre en relation avec un lieu précis, et dans le poème consacré au bain de Pallas, la relation spatiale entre le rituel argien et l'épisode narratif de Tirésias apercevant Athéna au bain sur l'Hélicon est si lâche qu'on a parfois parlé d'incohérence<sup>2</sup>. En fait, l'un et l'autre récits doivent être référencés moins au rituel que chacun d'eux est censé commenter et légitimer qu'à l'exposition indirecte de l'un des principes fondant la poétique de Callimaque lui-même: dialectique de l'éloge et de la critique pour le poème adressé à Déméter, exactitude artisanale pour le poème consacré au bain de Pallas.

On pourrait formuler des observations semblables à propos des relations complexes que les *Hymnes* de Callimaque entretiennent avec les autres formes hymniques de la poésie classique: non seulement les hymnes poétiques d'adresse directe à une divinité tel le fr. 1 Voigt de Sappho, non seulement les formes cultuelles 'littéraires' tels les *Hymnes* et les *Péans* de Pindare ou les *Dithyrambes* de Bacchylide (formes dont les dénominations elles-mêmes montrent les difficultés d'une définition homogène en termes de genre poétique), mais surtout les hymnes dits

<sup>2</sup> Voir respectivement *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*. Ed. by N. HOPKINSON (Cambridge 1984), 32-43, et *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 14-25.

‘épigraphiques’. Correspondant souvent à des péans en raison de leur consécration à Apollon, ces hymnes également poétiques décrivent en général la ‘performance’ (chorale?) dont ils sont l’objet en tant qu’actes de culte intégrés à la séquence des gestes rituels et des offrandes destinés au dieu chanté à une occasion précise, dans un sanctuaire particulier<sup>3</sup>. Ce sont en particulier ces indications d’ordre cultuel que Callimaque insère dans les plus ‘mimétiques’ de ses propres compositions hymniques pour reconstruire, par des moyens poétiques, les circonstances d’exécution rituelle dont étaient certainement coupés ces poèmes savants<sup>4</sup>. Par la combinaison de traits distinctifs empruntés à différentes formes hymniques traditionnelles, Callimaque crée donc un genre nouveau, un genre auto-référentiel, un genre conforme à sa propre poétique de poète érudit.

<sup>3</sup> Les relations entre ces hymnes de culte et les *Hymnes* de Callimaque sont explorées dans la thèse (à paraître) de M. VAMVOURI-RUFFY, *La fabrique du divin. Les Hymnes de Callimaque au carrefour des Hymnes homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques* (Lausanne 2002).

<sup>4</sup> La question des hymnes ‘mimétiques’ de Callimaque est traitée avec clairvoyance par M.R. FALIVENE, “La mimesi in Callimaco: *Inni II, IV, V, e VI*”, in QUCC 65 (1990), 103-128.



## VI

M. ANNETTE HARDER

INTERTEXTUALITY  
IN CALLIMACHUS' *AETIA*1. *Introduction*

It has long been noticed that the character of Callimachus' poetry is highly intertextual. When, for instance, one reads the modern commentaries on the *Hymns* it becomes abundantly clear that there are many reminiscences of earlier poetry. Besides, some studies have appeared recently which focus on Callimachus' reception of a particular poet or genre<sup>1</sup>. These works contain many important observations and have created a basis for further research. They present a picture of Callimachus as an ingenious and innovative poet, playing with texts and genres in a highly sophisticated and scholarly way. A drawback, however, is that if one studies the reception of one particular author or genre in Callimachus it is difficult to achieve an overall picture of what exactly the effect on the reader of all the allusions taken together could be<sup>2</sup>. In the present study I intend to address that question and to investigate whether and, if so, to what extent

<sup>1</sup> E.g. H. REINSCH-WERNER, *Callimachus Hesiodicus. Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene* (Berlin 1976); Th. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel 1992).

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of the function of generic allusions in the *Aetia* from this angle see M.A. HARDER, "Generic games" in Callimachus' *Aetia*", in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER, *Hellenistica Groningana* 3 (Groningen 1998), 95-113.

the allusions to earlier texts in the *Aetia* can be said to provide the reader with extra information, which adds to his understanding of the text, and whether one may conclude that the allusions are not just manifestations of virtuosity, but also have the purpose of steering the reader's reception<sup>3</sup>. In dealing with this question I shall focus on two aspects (which may sometimes partly overlap): (1) Callimachus' presentation of the stories: here one may wonder whether the allusions help the reader to acquire extra information about e.g. the presentation of the characters, the description or evaluation of particular situations, or the narrative sequence of the story; (2) Metapoetic and programmatic aspects: here one may investigate whether the allusions help to create a certain impression of the poet's interests and views of poetry or of his role in society. The first point to be addressed, however, is the question what one may regard as an allusion.

## 2. Criteria for allusions

Generally speaking one can speak of intertextuality whenever one text is making use of another, earlier text in some way and it has been argued by scholars like Julia Kristeva that in fact this applies to all texts at all times, because all texts are in fact a mosaic of earlier texts. This view, however, is not helpful for the present investigation and I therefore shall restrict myself here to one aspect of intertextuality, i.e. the creative use of earlier texts which may help the reader to attribute meaning to the new text, for which I shall use the term allusion<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> For reasons of space I have limited myself to the *Aetia*, but it would be useful to extend this investigation to Callimachus' other works. For some interesting observations in this respect see e.g. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 49ff.; A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of Lambi* (Oxford 1999), 261f.

<sup>4</sup> I shall not go further into the theoretical complexities of this subject here, but refer the reader to earlier treatments of it like G.B. CONTE, *The Rhetoric of*

In the *Aetia* one can distinguish several ways in which earlier texts may be alluded to: on the one hand there are allusions to specific passages in earlier authors, on the other hand there are certain aspects of literary technique which recall an earlier literary genre or author in general, without referring the reader to a specific passage (like, e.g., a Homeric simile or a Pindaric breaking off-formula). In the third place there are passages where the reader seems to be invited to consult other texts for further information on a specific point (like, e.g., a part of the story which is not told in the text). Among the criteria by which one may detect such allusions the following are important: (1) explicit references to another author; (2) quotations; (3) the use of the same (rare or unusual) words or hapaxes; (4) the use of literary devices which may be considered as typical of a certain author or genre; (5) references to material which was part of the literary or scholarly tradition. An important factor for the interpretation of the allusion is the context in which it appears in combination with the context in the intertext, which may provide a clue for interpreting the allusion in a way which adds to the meaning of the new text.

This list of criteria provides a certain guideline, but obviously an element of subjectivity cannot be excluded and one should constantly be aware of the danger of speculation or over-interpretation. Besides, because of the fragmentary state of the transmission of Greek literature many allusions may now escape our notice, so that it is hard to establish a complete picture, while, on the other hand, we may seem to detect meaningful allusions to rare words or expressions which would turn out to be much more common if we had more Greek texts.

*Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca 1986); *Genres and Readers* (Baltimore 1994), 131ff.; S. HINDS, *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge 1998). On the concept of the 'ideal reader' see the discussion at the end of this paper.

### 3. Intertextuality and the presentation of the stories in the *Aetia*

A survey of the allusions in the *Aetia* interpreted in their context shows that Callimachus often uses this means to assist the presentation of the stories. Important elements like the characterization of the main character of a story, descriptions of situations or the character's reaction to them, or even the narrative sequence are to a certain extent left to be discovered by the reader by means of his own knowledge of the texts and passages to which he is referred. Thus the reader is provided with a set of clues and invited to work hard if he wants to get access to the full story. The following examples may illustrate this point<sup>5</sup>.

#### 3.1. Characterization

In several instances we can observe that although Callimachus offers a brief description of somebody's character the picture can be completed and, in fact, turns out to be more complex if the reader takes into account the allusions to earlier texts. A good example of this technique is fr. 67,1-3:

Αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν Ἀκόντιον, δππότε καλῆι  
    ήμετο Κυδίππην παῖς ἐπὶ παρθενικῆι,  
τέχνην — οὐ γὰρ ὅγ' ἔσκε πολύχροτος —

“Eros himself taught Acontius his art, when the boy burnt  
with love for the beautiful girl Cydippe — for he was not very  
clever —”

Here we find a brief indication of what Acontius was *not*, including an allusion to earlier texts, which the reader has to remember in order to fully appreciate Acontius' character and its effects on this story. Through the use of the adjective *πολύχροτος* the reader is invited to regard Acontius as the opposite of the epic hero Odysseus, i.e. as a none too clever hero of

<sup>5</sup> Here as in the following chapters I shall discuss only some significant examples. For a more complete survey I refer to my forthcoming commentary on the *Aetia*.

an elegiac love-story, who may find it hard to help himself, because (1) it recalls *Od.* 1,1 ἀνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον (v.l. πολύκροτον according to Σ Ar.Nu. 260<sup>6</sup>), which characterizes Odysseus quite emphatically as a clever and resourceful hero at the beginning of the *Odyssey*; (2) it recalls Hes. fr. 198,3 υἱὸς Λαέρταο πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδώς, where πολύκροτος is used in a similar context of courtship to describe Odysseus' character when he tries to acquire Helen as his wife in a rather circumspect way and sends messages to Helen's brothers instead of presents, because he is aware that in that respect he cannot beat the wealthy Menelaus. The reader who recalls this passage may start wondering whether the art which Eros will teach Acontius will imply similar tricks and whether he will be successful (as Odysseus was *not* in his attempt for Helen).

The picture may be further complicated because πολύκροτος could be interpreted as 'clever' (as in Hes. fr. 198,3) or as 'noisy' (as in *Hom.b.* 19,37 πολύκροτον, sc. Pan), and thus may be related to other descriptions of Odysseus' character like E. *Cycl.* 104 κρόταλον δριμύ. At this point of Callimachus' narrative the notion of noise does not yet seem relevant, but it becomes more so when one reads on, as it turns out that the trick which Eros teaches Acontius can take place in complete silence on Acontius' part: Eros tells him to throw an apple at Cydippe with the inscription "I swear to Artemis that I shall marry Acontius" and when Cydippe has read this aloud she is bound by oath to marry Acontius, so that his eventual success is certain. Thus we see that the epithet πολύκροτος may provide the well-read reader with several clues to get a picture of Acontius' character and to develop certain expectations concerning the sequel of the story.

Elsewhere in the *Aetia* we find examples of the same technique. A good example is the characterisation of Molorus in the *Victoria Berenices*, in which allusions to specific passages as well

<sup>6</sup> As the date of this variant is not known we cannot be certain that Callimachus and his original readers could know it, but the notion that they did so is attractive. For further discussion of the adjectives and the status of the variant see A. PARDINI, "Aconzio non era πολύκροτος", in *SIFC* S.III 9 (1991), 57-70.

as generic allusions help to create a certain picture. Early in the story Molorcus seems to be related to the character of the faithful swineherd Eumaeus in the *Odyssey* by means of the description of the circumstances of Heracles' first arrival at his home in *SH* 257,15ff. This passage contains some reminiscences of *Od.* 14,5ff., where the farmyard of Eumaeus is described; for *SH* 257,15f. αὐλείην παρ' ἄχ[ερδον ... ] | ἔξέρυσ' ἐρμαίο[ν] one may compare *Od.* 14,10 (δείματο) ρύτοῖσιν λάεσσοι καὶ ἐθρίγκωσεν (sc. Eumaeus) ἀχέρδωι ("with quarried stones, and he set wild pear-wood on top" Stanford; the object is the αὐλή | ὑψηλή of *Od.* 14,5f.). But the passage and its sequel may be reminiscent of Odysseus' reception by Eumaeus in more than this respect, because e.g. (1) as Molorcus complains about the lion, who prevents him from offering Heracles a proper meal in *SH* 257,20ff., so Eumaeus utters repeated complaints about the suitors who eat his pigs and prevent him from entertaining Odysseus in a proper manner (*Od.* 14,17ff.; 37ff.; 55ff.; 80ff.); (2) as Molorcus curses the lion in *SH* 257,20f., so in *Od.* 14,68f. ὡς ὥφελλ' Ἐλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον δλέσθαι | πρόχνυ Eumaeus curses Helen as the ultimate cause of his misery. These reminiscences add an epic dimension to the story, and may serve to characterize Molorcus as a helpful and trustworthy peasant, while Odysseus on the brink of success and rehabilitation may be a foil for the young Heracles starting on his first labour.

Later in the story we find some generic allusions through which Molorcus' in his battle against the mice, who invade his cottage, acquires the dimensions of a (mock-)epic hero; cf. *SH* 259,5ff.:

ἀστὴρ δ' εὗτ'] ἄρ' ἔμελλε βοῶν ἀπὸ μέσσαβα [λύσειν  
αὔλιος], [δε δυθ] μήν εἶσιν ὅπ' ἡελίου  
]ως κεῖνος Ὁφιονίδηισι φαείν[ει  
]θεῶν τοῖσι παλαιοτέροις,  
]τηροι θύρην· δ' δ' ὅτ' ἔκλιεν ἦχ[ήν,  
ώς ὅπότ' ὄκνη]ηρῆς ἶαχ' ἐπ' οὖς ἐλάφου  
σκ]ύμνος, [μέ]λλ[ε] μὲν ὅσσον ἀκουέμεν, ἤκα δ' ἔλ[εξεν:

"And when the evening-star, who comes at sunset, was about to loosen the yoke from the oxen... <there was a noise at the door>,

and when he heard the sound, he, like when a lion's whelp roared at the ear of a frightened deer, waited just long enough to listen and then spoke softly..."

In *SH* 259,5ff. we find the kind of time-indication which is well-known from epic poetry, where the onset of evening is described in terms of the ending of the day's labour<sup>7</sup>. In many of these passages, however, the picture of rest from labour in the time-indication is contrasted with the efforts of the epic heroes, who throw themselves into the battle at that very moment. In the same way here too the rest from labour is contrasted with the efforts of Molorus, whose battle with the mice is about to begin, and thus he appears as an 'epic' hero. Immediately after this a brief Homeric simile illustrates Molorus' reaction when he hears the mice at his door: the old farmer is compared to a deer frightened by the roaring of a lion's whelp, and this recalls the deer-similes in the *Iliad*, where deer appear as the frightened victims of a stronger animal, which either fly or stand stupefied<sup>8</sup>. Therefore the simile may lead the reader to expect the same reaction from Molorus, but this turns out differently as Molorus knows very well how to fight his opponents.

### 3.2. Descriptions and evaluations of situations

Sometimes the reader of the *Aetia* may expect a description of a certain situation and the characters' reaction to it, as in the story of Acontius and Cydippe when, finally, the wedding is

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e.g. *Il.* 11,86ff. and 16,779f.; *Od.* 12,439ff.; *Hom.b.* 5,168f.; CALL. *Hec.* fr.238,19f. (= 18,5f. Hollis) and 260,63ff. (= 74,22ff. Hollis); APOLL.RH. 3,1340ff.; 4,1629ff.; HOR. *carm.* 3,6,41ff. *sol ubi... iuga demeret bobus fatigatis*. For more examples see W. BÜHLER, *Die Europa des Moschos* (Wiesbaden 1960), 210f.; H. FRAENKEL, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (München 1968), 141 and 612; A.S. HOLLIS on CALL. *Hec.* fr.74,23.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. e.g. *Il.* 4,243ff. (Agamemnon to his soldiers:) τίφθ' οὕτως ἔστητε τεθηπότες ἡὗτε νεβροί, | αἱ τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔκαμον πολέος πεδίοι θέουσαι, | ἔστασ', οὐδ' ἄρα τίς σφι μετὰ φρεσὶ γίγνεται ἀλκή; 11,113ff., where a lion kills the deer's offspring while the mother is flying.

taking place (fr. 75,42f.) and Acontius is allowed to enjoy his wedding-night. Instead of this fr. 75,44-50 contains only some speculation about Acontius' feelings during the wedding-night, which includes references to material which may have been part of the literary or scholarly tradition and seems to allow for interpretation at various levels:

οὐ σε δοκέω τημοῦτος, Ἀκόντιε, νυκτὸς ἔκεινης  
 ἀντὶ κε, τῇ μίτρης ἥψα παρθενίης,  
 οὐ σφυρὸν Ἰφικλειον ἐπιτρέχον ἀσταχύεσσιν  
 οὐδ' ἡ Κελαινίτης ἔκτεάτιστο Μίδης  
 δέξασθαι, ψήφου δ' ἀν ἐμῆς ἐπιμάρτυρες εἴτε  
 οἵτινες οὐ χαλεποὶ νήιδές εἰσι θεοῦ.  
 ἐκ δὲ γάμου κείνοιο μέγ' οὔνομα μέλλε νέεσθαι.

"I do not think, Acontius, that at that time you would have accepted the ankle of Iphiclus, who ran on top of the corn-ears, or the possessions of Midas of Celaenae instead of that night, in which you touched her maiden girdle; and witnesses in favour of my judgment would be those who are not ignorant of the harsh god. But from that marriage a grand name was to result".

Here the reader is invited to share the narrator's speculations about the feelings of Acontius during his wedding-night and as points of reference he is reminded of Iphiclus and Midas, whose fate Acontius would not prefer to his own. Callimachus' text indicates that Iphiclus was an extremely fast runner, which suggests the notion of an enviable top-sporter<sup>9</sup>, and suggests that Midas was very rich, although his words ἡ ... ἔκτεάτιστο are not explicit. The passage as a whole is reminiscent of the priamels in *Tyrt.* fr.12,1ff. West, in which a long list of qualities, including speed in 4 (οὐδ' εἰ ...) νικώιη ... θέων Θρηίκιον Βορέην and riches in 6 (οὐδ' εἰ ...) πλουτοίη ... Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,

<sup>9</sup> Iphiclus, the son of Phylacus, is first mentioned as a competent runner in *Il.* 23,636 Ἰφικλον δὲ πόδεσσι παρέδραμον ἐσθλὸν ἔντα. The fact that he could run upon the cornears without damaging them is first mentioned in *Hes.* fr.62 ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀνθερίκων καρπὸν θέεν οὐδὲ κατέκλα, | ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πυραμίνων ἀθέρων δρομάσκε πόδεσσιν | καὶ οὐ σινέσκετο καρπόν.

serves as a foil for valour in war, and Sapph. fr.16,1ff., where horsemen, infantry and ships serve as a foil for love. We cannot be certain that Callimachus alludes directly to Tyrtaeus, as it is easily conceivable that this kind of *topos* was used more often in texts now lost<sup>10</sup>, but, if he did, the transposition of two of his examples from a context of war to an erotic context and the fact that he changed the example of quickness from Boreas to Iphiclus may be of some significance. Thinking along these lines Reinsch-Werner (n.1), 368f. observed that one should perhaps bear in mind that neither Iphiclus nor Midas was an unambiguous example, as Iphiclus suffered from sterility and Midas' wish that everything he touched turned into gold threatened to kill him. It is conceivable that Callimachus' brief indications referred his readers to texts which dealt with these aspects of Iphiclus and Midas (although for Midas the evidence allows no firm conclusions<sup>11</sup>) and placed the examples in a doubtful light. Thus readers might start to question the joys of Acontius' wedding-night, as the suggestion that Acontius would not want to change it for the position of a man who was suffering from infertility or threatened by starvation would be consistent with a low standard of pleasure indeed. For this kind of reader the mention of the offspring in fr. 75,50 would come as a relief, but for the reader who accepted both examples at face-value it would appear as a logical consequence of a glorious wedding-night.

<sup>10</sup> After Callimachus cf. e.g. [THEOC.] 8,53ff. μή μοι γάν Πέλοπος, μή μοι Κροίσεια τάλαντα | εἴη ἔχειν, μηδὲ πρόσθι θέειν ἀνέμων· | ἀλλ' ... ἀπομοι ἄγκας ἔχων τυ; PROP. 1,8,33ff. etc.

<sup>11</sup> The story of Iphiclus' sterility and its cure by Melampus was probably also mentioned in the *Victoria Berenices* (SH 260A,5-6) and could therefore be fresh in the mind of a reader of a complete edition of the *Aetia*. Besides, the phrasing σφυρὸν Ἰφικλείον recalls *Od.* 11,290 βίης Ἰφικλητῆς and 296 (nom.) from the story of Melampus' acquisition of the cattle of Iphiclus and may draw the reader's attention to that story; for other earlier evidence of this story cf. e.g. PHERECYD. *FGrHist* 3 F 33 (with Jacoby *ad loc.*). The story that Dionysus rewards Midas for his hospitality to Silenus by fulfilling his wish that everything he touches turns into gold, so that he becomes rich as well as miserable, is first attested in Ov. *met.* 11,90ff.; HYG. *Fab.*191.

### 3.3. Narrative sequence

Sometimes parts of the narrative sequence are left out and the reader, who is given a very brief summary of the events, seems to be invited to consult other texts to supplement the *Aetia* and to get the complete story. For this purpose he must let himself be guided by allusions to more elaborate texts. An example of this technique is found in fr. 75,64-9:

ἐν δ' ὅβριν θάνατόν τε κεραύνιον, ἐν δὲ γόντας  
 Τελχῖνας μακάρων τ' οὐκ ἀλέγοντα θεῶν  
 ἥλεα Δημώνακτα γέρων ἐνεθήκατο δέλτ[οις]  
 καὶ γρηγὸν Μακελώ, μητέρα Δεξιθέης,  
 ἃς μούνας, ὅτε νῆσον ἀνέτρεπον εἰνεκ' ἀλ[ι]τ[ρῆς]  
 ὅβριος, ἀσκηθεῖς ἔλλιπον ἀθάνατοι·

"Into his wax-tablets the old man put *hybris* and death by lightning and sorcerers, the Telchines, and Demonax, who, foolishly, did not pay heed to the blessed gods, and the old woman Macelo, the mother of Dexitheia, who were the only ones whom the gods left unscathed when they destroyed the island because of its sinful *hybris*".

In this passage 65-6 recall *Od.* 9,275f. οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διός ... ἀλέγουσιν | οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, where the verb is used in a comparable context of lack of piety towards the gods. These words are spoken by the notoriously inhospitable Polyphemus in answer to Odysseus' request for hospitality and the allusion may therefore help the reader to complete his picture of Demonax and suggest that his lack of piety consisted of a lack of hospitality as opposed to the behaviour of his wife and daughter Macelo and Dexitheia, who, according to other sources, were the only people who offered hospitality when the gods visited Ceos<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. e.g. *Schol. ad Ov. Ib.475 Nicander dicit Macelon filiam Damonis cum sororibus fuisse; harum hospitio Iuppiter susceptus, cum Telchines (Thelonios codd.), quorum hic Damo princeps erat, corrumpentes venenis successus omnium fructuum, fulmine interficeret, servavit eas (eos codd.); sed Macelo cum viro propter viri nequitiam periit. Sed ad alias servatas cum venisset Minos, cum Dexitheia (Desitone*

Then the brief description of the destruction of Ceos in fr. 75,68-9 recalls Pi. *Pae.*4,40-5 τρέω (sc. Euxantius, the son of Dexitheia and Minos, who visited Ceos after its destruction) τοι πόλεμον Διὸς Ἐννοσίδαν τε βαρ[ύ]κτυπον, | χθόνα τοι ποτε καὶ στρατὸν ἀθρόον | πέμψαν κεραυνῷ τριύδοντί τε | ἐξ τὸν βαθὺν Τάρταρον ἐμὰν ματέρα λίποντες καὶ δλον οἶκον εὐερκέα and Bacchylides 1,19ff., the first part of which is in such a bad state that one can distinguish little more than that it is about Macelo and Dexitheia (and another sister?) and a town, and 112ff. about Minos' visit to Ceos and Dexitheia and the subsequent birth of Euxantius, which is reasonably well preserved<sup>13</sup>. The reader who remembered these poems would be reminded of the sequel of the story and, particularly, the birth of Euxantius, i.e. of the ancestor of Acontius, who was mentioned in fr. 67,7 αἴμα τὸ μὲν γενεῆς Εὔξαντίδος without further details. Here no details are given either, but the reader is invited to consult earlier texts to supply them. In doing so he may also become aware that the episode of the Telchines was probably selected as part of the summary of the Cean history of Xenomedes (fr. 75,56-74) in order to show that Acontius was a descendant of the 'good' branch of the Cean population.

An elaborate and more explicit example of the same technique can be found in fr. 57,1-4 (= SH 264,1-4):

αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο, τάμοι δ' ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῆι·  
    ὅσσα δ' ἀνειρομένωι φῆ[σ]ε, τάδ' ἔξερέω.  
‘Ἄττα γέρον, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πα[ρὼν ἐν δ]αιτὶ μαθήσει,  
    νῦν δὲ τὰ μοι πεύσηι Παλλά[ς] . . . .]

"Let him (sc. the reader?) find out for himself and cut short the poem's length; but as much as he (sc. Heracles) said to him (sc. Molorcus) in answer to his questions, these things I shall tell

codd.) concubuit, ex qua creavit Euxantium (*Eus-* codd.), unde Euxantiae (*Eus-* codd.) fuerunt. In this respect Dexitheia may well be a significant name.

<sup>13</sup> For a full discussion of Bacchylides' poem see H. MAEHLER (Ed.), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I (Leiden 1982), 2, 4ff.; for Pindar's *Paean* see I. RUTHERFORD, *Pindar's Paean* (Oxford 2001), 280ff.

at length: 'Old father, the other things you will learn when we are at dinner, but now you will hear what Pallas (said?) to me...'"

This fragment is from the *Victoria Berenices* and must probably be placed after Heracles' return to the cottage of Molorcus, when he has killed the Nemean lion. These lines clearly aim at shortening the story and thus recall the Pindaric technique of breaking off-formula's<sup>14</sup>, which would fit neatly into the epinician for Berenice. One gets the impression that the narrator wishes to leave out part of the story and to hasten towards the origin of the wreath at Nemea, which is told in fr. 59 (= *SH* 265). Meanwhile the reader seems to be left to his own resources, as he is invited to find out (*ἐπιφράσσαιτο*) what is left out for himself and thus (to help the narrator) to cut the story short. In this way, apart from Pindar, an unidentified group of texts with additional information is also evoked.

Although it is not easy to establish what exactly is left out, fr. 57,3-4 may provide a clue, because here one gets the impression that Molorcus had asked certain questions (*τὰ μὲν ἀλλα*) to which, for the time being, he receives no answer. As the information he does receive from Heracles at this point concerns Pallas' instructions about the wreath at Nemea (cf. fr. 59 = *SH* 265), the 'other things' may well have concerned Heracles' adventures with the lion and the way in which he managed to kill him. This would mean that the heroic episode, which in a real Pindaric epinician probably would have taken pride of place as contributing to the glory of the *laudandus*, would here be left out by means of a Pindaric device.

<sup>14</sup> This technique of breaking off a digression recalls a device of which early epic examples are found in *Il.* 12,176 ἀργαλέον δέ με ταῦτα θεὸν ὡς πάντ' ἀγορεύσαι and *Hes.* *Th.* 35 (although the exact interpretation of the line is disputed; see M.L. WEST *ad loc.*), and is particularly familiar from Pindar (e.g. *Pl. O.* 1,52f.; 9,35ff.; *N.* 3,26ff.) and Bacchylides (e.g. 5,176ff.) as the so-called 'Abbruchsformel', which is often used to end or shorten a section of a poem (like the telling of a myth); see on this device (and its programmatical aspects) e.g. C.M. BOWRA, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964), 312ff.; B.K. BRASWELL on *Pl. P.* 4,247-8. Other examples of the 'Abbruchsformel' in Callimachus are fr.24,20f. and 75,4ff.; *Iambi* fr.194,59; *b.* 6,17.

An interesting aspect of this passage is also that the reader, the narrator and Heracles seem to cooperate and interact in order to achieve that a certain episode is left out, with the result that the omission receives great emphasis. First the narrator invites the reader to look after himself and phrases this invitation in such a way that, in fact, the reader is to some extent taking over the narrator's role and intervening in the organisation of the poem by shortening it. Then he announces that he will tell only what Heracles answered Molorcus, and Heracles cooperates by duly telling Molorcus only about the wreath and promising to tell the rest at dinner. In fr. 59,16f. (= SH 265,16f.) the narrator offers a brief description of the meal, but it contains no information about the conversation and one gets the impression that, although the narrator could not 'control' Heracles' intentions to tell Molorcus about his first labour at dinner, he still uses his control over the actual narrative in order not to make this conversation known to his readers.

Summarizing one may say that in this passage the Pindaric device of a breaking-off formula is elaborated in a highly sophisticated way, which draws attention to the fact that a well-known part of the story, presumably the killing of the Nemean lion, is being left out and that there are other sources from which the reader may find it out. Thus Callimachus avoids a 'well-trodden path', but still brings the famous first labour of Berenice's dynastic ancestor Heracles to the reader's attention.

#### 4. *Intertextuality as a means to highlight meta-poetic and programmatic issues*

The reader of the *Aetia* does not only read the stories, but also receives all kinds of meta-poetic and programmatic information, e.g. about Callimachus' role as a (court-)poet, the use he is making of his sources and predecessors, his treatment of literary genres, his views on poetry and the quality of his own work. Here too we see that allusions are an important means to steer the reader's perception.

#### 4.1. The poet's role

In several instances we see that Callimachus makes use of allusions to draw attention to his role as a poet working in the Alexandrian Library, with a great deal of information at his disposal, and with certain responsibilities as a poet closely related to the Ptolemaic court. Thus in fr. 75,4-9 the narrator presents himself as a scholar-poet, who is almost led astray by his own garrulity and corrects himself vigorously and with, perhaps, some subtle hints of political correctness:

"Ηρην γάρ κοτέ φασι -- κύον, κύον, ἵσχεο, λαιδρέ  
 θυμέ, σύγ' ἀείσηη καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη·  
 ὄντος κάρτ' ἔνεκ' οὐ τι θεῆς ἴδες ιερὰ φρικτῆς,  
 ἐξ ἀν ἐπει καὶ τῶν ἥρυγες ἴστορίην.  
 ἢ πολυμδρείη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ  
 γλώσσης· ὡς ἐτεὸν παιᾶς ὅδε μαῦλιν ἔχει.

"For they say that once Hera — dog, dog, restrain yourself, impudent heart, you will sing even of the things which are against divine law; you are certainly lucky that you did not see the holy rites of the frightening goddess, because then you would have thrown out that story too. Surely a great amount of knowledge is a difficult evil for those who cannot control their tongues. How truly that kind of man is a child with a knife".

This passage follows a brief description of a prenuptial ritual at Naxos, which is part of the first attempt to marry Cydippe to another man than Acontius and consists of the bride sleeping with a boy whose parents are both alive (cf. fr. 75,3 *παιδὶ σὺν ἀμφιθαλεῖ*). Instead of continuing the story of the failed attempt at marriage the narrator suddenly draws the reader's attention to himself: he starts to give an explanation for the ritual and then suddenly breaks off.

There are several allusions in this passage, which seem significant, but are not altogether easy to interpret. First of all the passage again recalls the device of the Pindaric breaking-off formula (see also 3.3 about fr. 57), but the really meaningful allusions seem to be to specific passages in other authors.

Because of *schol. ad Il.* 14,294-6 διὸ καὶ μέχρι νῦν ὑπόμνημα φυλάσσεσθαι παρὰ Ναξίοις καὶ τὸν ἀμφιθαλῆ τῇ τάλι (ἀμφιθαλῆ τῇ ιτάληι codd.) συγκατατεθεῖσθαι it seems likely that Callimachus and/or others related the Naxian ritual to the clandestine prenuptial intercourse of Zeus and Hera referred to in *Il.* 14,294-6 (when Zeus saw Hera) ὡς μιν ἔρως πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν, | οἷον ὅτε πρῶτόν περ ἐμισγέσθην φιλότητι, εἰς εὐνὴν φοιτῶντε, φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας, and that a reader might expect that the tale he began to tell was about this early romance<sup>15</sup>. The reason why Callimachus should break off this story is not entirely clear, because it is not immediately apparent what is so shocking about it and it could, in fact, function as a legitimization of the brother and sister marriage of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus and Arsinoe. Therefore Roberto Pretagostini, followed by Alan Cameron<sup>16</sup>, suggested that the reader was here referred to an obscene poem by Sotades in which he spoke in an offending manner about the royal couple. He suggested that the opening line of this poem was Sotad. fr.inc.16 Powell "Ἡρην ποτέ φασιν Δία τὸν τερπικέραυνον, of which fr. 75,4 is reminiscent, and that Sotad. fr.1 Powell εἰς οὐχ ὁσίην τρυμαλίην τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς (about the marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe), which may be recalled by fr. 75,5, was part of it too. Sotades' poem then should be read against the background of attempts to justify the marriage of brother and sister by the example of Zeus and Hera: after apparently starting his poem in this fashion, Sotades then turned it into a nasty pun on the

<sup>15</sup> It is hard to see how the Naxian fertility ritual could derive from the early romance of Zeus and Hera. D.R. STUART, "The Prenuptial Rite in the New Callimachus", in *CPh* 6 (1911), 302-14, esp. 309ff. may well be right in arguing that the connection rose out of ignorance of the real purpose of the ritual, which at some stage apparently — and wrongly — was regarded as a *ἱερὸς γάμος*.

<sup>16</sup> R. PRETAGOSTINI, *Ricerche sulla poesia Alessandrina* (Roma 1984), 144ff.; A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 18ff. Callimachus himself mentioned this story in fr.48 and it appears as a kind of well-known secret in THEOC. 15,64; PLAUT. *Trin.* 207f. Evidence for this story as a means to justify the marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe is found in e.g. THEOC. 17,130 (see A.S.F. GOW *ad loc.*).

incestuous aspects of the marriage (which was said to be the cause of his execution many years later). If this is right, fr. 75,4ff. may be regarded as a kind of humorous and ‘politically correct’ criticism of Sotades’ poem.

Apart from criticizing Sotades Callimachus also seems to suggest a positive evaluation of the royal marriage by evoking a passage where the wedding of Zeus and Hera is emphatically used as an encomiastic foil, i.e. the wedding-song for Pisetaerus and Basileia in Ar. *Av.* 1731-42 “*Ἡραι ποτ’ Ὀλυμπίαι | τῶν ἡλιβάτων θρόνων | ἀρχοντα θεοῖς μέγαν | Μοῖραι συνεκοίμισαν | ἐν τοιῶιδε ὑμεναίωι | ... | ὁ δ’ ἀμφιθαλῆς “Ἐρως | χρυσόπτερος ἡνίας | ηύθυνε παλιντόνους, | Ζηνὸς πάροχος γάμων | τῆς τ’ εὐδαίμονος “Ἡρας.* Callimachus’ phrasing (especially fr. 75,4 “*Ἡρην ... κοτέ* and 3 *ἀμφιθαλεῖ*, although used in a different sense) seems to recall this passage and there might be a meaningful intertextual relation with the whole concluding part of the *Birds* (Ar. *Av.* 1706-65), in which Pisetaerus is hailed as a glorious king and successor of Zeus. If so, Callimachus would very subtly weave in a compliment to Ptolemy Philadelphus in a passage in which he criticizes the insulting poem of Sotades and show that to him the qualification *ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ | γλώσσης* (fr. 75,8-9), after all, did not apply at all.

Interpreted in this way the passage draws the reader’s attention to the delicate position of the Alexandrian poet and the way in which Callimachus viewed his own role and that of others and used the literary means at his disposal with great refinement. Thus the allusions give the reader much food for thought, but not about the bride Cydippe.

For the encomiastic use of allusions, of which we may get a glimpse in fr. 75,4ff. Callimachus’ court poetry provides some examples in the *Coma Berenices*, where the lock is characterized as a character with feminine as well as masculine characteristics in a way which reflects the personality of Berenice, whom the lock was separated from much against its will (cf. fr. 110,40 and Catull. 66,39ff.). If we confine ourselves to Callimachus’ text we find Berenice described as *μεγάθυμος* in fr. 110,26, which was

plausibly restored by Pfeiffer<sup>17</sup>. Because he thought μεγάθυμος might be too obvious Pfeiffer suggested as alternatives μεγαλήτωρ, μεγαλόφρων, μεγαθαρσής, μεγάτολμος, but, in fact, μεγάθυμος would *not* be obvious when used of a mortal woman, because in the early Greek epic the epithet is used only of heroes and goddesses, as in e.g. *Il.* 20,498 'Αχιλλῆς μεγαθύμου and *Od.* 8,520 μεγάθυμον Ἀθήνην<sup>18</sup>. Thus the use of this adjective would underline Berenice's heroic character and give a hint of a (future) divine status. On the other hand Berenice's femininity is well illustrated by fr. 110,75ff. about her use of unguents.

The same ambiguity is found in the lock, whose gender in the poem is not entirely clear: (1) it uses the masculine βόστρυχος of itself in fr. 110,8 and πλόκαμος in fr. 110,47 and 62; (2) in fr. 110,51 [v]εότμητον is undecisive, because νεότμητος is of two endings; (3) elsewhere there are some hints of femininity: the other locks are referred to as οὐδαι ... ἀδε[λφε]α in fr. 110,51, and therefore may be perceived as 'sisters'; the abduction in fr. 110,52ff. is reminiscent of stories of the abduction of young women or goddesses; the comparison with the wreath of Ariadne in fr. 110,59ff. suggests female competition; the interest in scent in fr. 110,75ff. looks like a female preoccupation; the lock's lament as a whole may be compared to those of women lamenting lost companions<sup>19</sup>. The overall impression, particularly derived from the passages in (3), is that the lock is a female rather than a male character<sup>20</sup>, but the ambiguity seems to be underlined by some of the allusions.

In several instances allusions to other texts evoke heroic male characters as a foil for the lock. Thus in fr. 110,47 τί πλόκαμοι

<sup>17</sup> See R. PFEIFFER, "Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος", in *Philologus* 87 (1932), 179-228, esp.183, who compared CATULL. 66,25f. (to Berenice) *at te ego certe | cognoram a parva virgine magnanimam*; HYG. Astr. 2,24 *Callimachus eam* (sc. Berenice) *magnanimam dixit*.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also e.g. *Od.* 13,121; HES. Th. 734.

<sup>19</sup> See K. GUTZWILLER, "Callimachus' Lock of Berenice: Fantasy, Romance and Propaganda", in *AJPh* 113 (1992), 359-85, esp.374ff.

<sup>20</sup> Apparently Catullus felt this too, and therefore choose to be less ambiguous, using feminine words throughout; CATULL. 66,8 *caesaries* and 66,93 *coma*.

ρέξωμεν the picture of a male epic or tragic hero who is forced or pretending to give in to higher powers is evoked, because the phrase recalls Agamemnon's words in *Il.* 19,90 ἀλλὰ τί κεν ρέξαιμι (in a long speech in which he makes peace with Achilles and states that it is not his fault that Achilles was offended, but the gods') and Ajax' 'conversion' to sensible behaviour in Soph. *Aj.* 669-77 καὶ γάρ τὰ δεινὰ καὶ τὰ καρτερώτατα | τιμαῖς ὑπείκει· τοῦτο μὲν νιφοστιβεῖς | χειμῶνες ἐκχωροῦσιν εὐκάρπωι θέρει· | ἔξισταται δὲ νυκτὸς αἰλανῆς κύκλος | τῇ λευκοπώλαι φέγγος ἡμέραι φλέγειν· | δεινῶν τ' ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε | στένοντα πόντον· ἐν δ' ὁ παγκρατής ὑπνος | λύει πεδήσας, οὐδ' ἀεὶ λαβῶν ἔχει. | ἡμεῖς δὲ πῶς οὐ γνωσόμεσθα σωφρονεῖν (where the priamel may have been the example for fr. 110,43ff.). In fr. 110,51 the unusual iterative form ποθέεσκον, which suggests the incessant mourning of the sister-locks, recalls *Il.* 1,492 ποθέεσκε δ' ἀντήν τε πτόλεμόν τε about Achilles, who remains in his quarters, desperately missing the turmoils of war. On the other hand, in fr. 110,63 παρ' ἀθα[νάτους] the lock's career turns out to be comparable to those of young gods being received on Olympus, particularly that of Aphrodite herself in *Hom.h.* 6,3ff. ὅθι μιν (sc. Aphrodite) Ζεφύρου μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντος | ἥνεικεν κατὰ κῦμα ... θαλάσσης (3f.), after which the Horae on Cyprus make her beautiful and ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντα περὶ χροὶ κόσμον ἔθηκαν | ἥγον εἰς ἀθανάτους (14f.).

#### 4.2. Poetic quality

A passage in which a discussion of literary issues is given coherence and more significance by a careful use of allusions is the prologue to the *Aetia* in fr. 1. This fragment has been much discussed, but a consistent intertextual reading of it may help to clarify some issues, particularly the question whether the proper style of elegy is the central issue in fr. 1, as was recently argued by Cameron (n.16). A brief survey of the allusions in the prologue will show that in fact a great number of literary genres and passages of literary criticism are brought to the reader's attention:

(1) Homer: in fr. 1,1 πολλάκι<sup>21</sup> μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀ[οιδῆ]ι the verb ἐπιτρύζουσιν is reminiscent of *Il.* 9,311 ώς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος spoken by Achilles, the epic hero *par excellence*, who refuses to take part in the battle and is surrounded by people who mutter against him. As the verb is a Homeric hapax an allusion is likely and the well-read reader would be reminded of the Homeric epic and of a hero's refusal to act in accordance with his position in the world of epic straightforwardly in the first line of the prologue. Other Homeric allusions may be detected in fr. 1,9f., where the notion of weighing, apart from Aristophanes' *Ranae* (on which see below) also recalls Zeus weighing the fates of mortals in *Il.* 8,68ff. and 22,208ff., where the scales of those destined to perish go down<sup>22</sup>, and in fr. 1,13f., which recalls *Il.* 3,3ff. about the flight of the cranes and their battle with the Pygmies;

(2) Hesiod: the notion of the friendship of the Muses in fr. 1,2 νήιδες] οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι recurs in fr. 1,37f. Μοῦσαι γ]ἀρ ὅσους ἴδον ὅθυα[τ]ι παῖδας | μὴ λοξῶι, πολιοὺς] οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους, where the phrasing is reminiscent of Hes. *Th.* 81ff. and 96ff. In fr. 1,27f. μηδ' οἴμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους | ἀτρίπτο]γς, εἰ καὶ στε[ι]γοτέρην ἐλάσεις we find the notion of two roads, one wide, one narrow, between which one must choose, which is first attested in Hes. *Op.* 286ff. in a moralizing sense. Callimachus combines this notion with the paths of poetry, which are first attested in Pindar and thus turns the dilemma into a matter of literary criticism;

(3) epic in general: at the end of fr. 1,1 ἀοιδῆι recalls the convention that forms of ἀειδω are often found at the end of the first line in the *Homeric Hymns* and also in the prooemium of Hes. *Th.* 1 Μουσάων ... ἀρχώμεθ' ἀειδειν. The word's position may therefore suggest reading fr. 1 as an epic prooemium.

<sup>21</sup> For this reading see F. PONTANI, "The First Word of Callimachus' *Aitia*", in *ZPE* 128 (1999), 57-9.

<sup>22</sup> For a discussion of the Homeric and Aristophanic allusions in this passage see T. GARGIULO, "L'immagine della bilancia in Callimaco fr.1,9-10 Pfeiffer", in *QUCC* 71 (1992), 123-8.

In fr. 1,13ff. ]ον ἐπὶ Θρήικας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτιο [πέτοιτο | αἴματ]ι Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη [γ]έρα[νος,] Μασσα]γέται [κ]αὶ μακρὸν ὁστεύοιεν ἐπ' ἄνδρα | Μήδον] the elements in the priamel may suggest subjects suitable for mythological and historical epics (the cranes may refer to a *Geranomachia* and the Massagetes have been thought to refer to Choerilus' *Persica*<sup>23</sup>), but this is rather speculative;

(4) Pindar: the fact that in fr.1,2 the Telchines are said to be unacquainted with the Muses recalls the claim in Pi. fr.\*\*198a Μούσοι με ξένον | οὐδὲ ἀδαήμονα Μοισᾶν ἐπαιδευσαν κλυτάι | Θήβαι. In fr. 1,25ff. πρὸς δὲ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἀνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἀμαξῖαι | τὰ στείβε]ιν, ἔτέρων ἵχνια μὴ καθ' ὅμα | δίφρον ἐλ]ῶν μηδ' οἴμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους | ἀτρίπτο]ὺς, εἰ καὶ στε[ι]γοτέρην ἐλάσσεις there seems to be an allusion to Pi. *Pae.*7b,10ff., where there is a demand for originality, as one should avoid the well-trodden paths of Homer and pray to the Muses for help<sup>24</sup>;

(5) tragedy (and its reception in old comedy): in fr. 1,9f. ἀλλὰ καθέλ[κει | . . . πο]λὺ. τὴν μακρὴν ὅμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς the verb recalls the notion of weighing the quality of the texts of Aeschylus and Euripides in Ar. *Ra.*1365ff. At this point in the prologue this item is no further pursued, but it recurs in fr. 1,17f. αῦθι δὲ τέχνηι | κρίνετε,] [μὴ σχοῖνωι Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην, where the idea of measuring quality recalls the use of instruments in Ar. *Ra.*799ff. and the discussion about the slender and the grand style in tragedy, with Euripides and Aeschylus as protagonists. Even so already in fr. 1,9 the scope seems to be gradually widening and the reader seems to be invited to begin to think about

<sup>23</sup> As to the cranes, see M. ASPER, *Onomata allotria. Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*, Hermes Einzelschriften 75 (Stuttgart 1997), 203ff. for discussion and evidence for this kind of epic from VI BC onwards (and also for the iconographic tradition); on Choerilus see A. BARIGAZZI, "Mimnermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel proemio degli *Aitia di Callimaco*", in *Hermes* 84 (1956), 162-82 (not entirely convincing).

<sup>24</sup> Recently the text of Pindar has been the object of some discussion, but the untrodden path seems to have survived; see RUTHERFORD (n.13), 247ff.

poetic style in general, across the boundaries of the various genres. In fr. 1,19f. μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ]τε μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδὴν | τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶ]ν οὐκ ἐμόν, [ἀλλὰ] Διός the refusal to write poetry in the grand style is phrased in a way that first of all recalls Aeschylus; cf. Ar. *Nu.*1366f., where Phidippides rejects the noise of Aeschylus and prefers in 1371ff. to quote from Euripides, and *Ra.*492, where the angry speech of the porter Aeacus is full of tragic parody, particularly of “some of Aeschylus’ most bombastic moments” (Stanford *ad loc.*; see also Dover); the reference to thunder also recalls the description of Aeschylus in Ar. *Ra.*814. After having evoked the discussion of the proper tragic style and implicitly rejected the grand style of Aeschylus Callimachus refers the reader to a passage from the ‘slender’ Euripides in fr. 1,32ff., which is strongly reminiscent of the choral ode in E. *HF* 637-700, because of (i) the treatment of the notions of the burden of old age, which is said to be heavier than Mt.*Aetna* in 637ff.: cf. fr. 1,35f. αὖθι τ]ὸ (sc. old age) δ' [έκ]δύοιμ[ι], τό μοι βάρος ὅσσον ἔπεστι | τριγ]λώ[χι]γ δλ[οῶι] νῆσος ἐπ' Ἐγκελά[δωι]; (ii) the wish to escape from old age and have a second life in 655ff.: for a similar wish cf. fr. 1,35; (iii) the devotion to the Muses and the Charites (who will be the subject of the first *aition* in fr. 3-7) in 673ff.; and (iv) the comparison of the old chorus’ song for Heracles (who will be the subject of fr. 22-25) to a swan’s song in 687ff.: cf. fr. 1,39f. πτερὸν οὐκέτι κινεῖν | ]η τ[ῆ]μος ἐνεργότατος<sup>25</sup>.

(6) elegy: in fr. 1,9ff. ἀλλὰ καθέλ[κει | πο]λὺ τὴν μακρὴν δυμνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς· | τοῦ δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, α[ὶ κατὰ λεπτὸν | ] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή a comparison

<sup>25</sup> The way in which the chorus in Euripides announces its song may also be of some interest for the question of the composition of the *Aetia*: a reader who recalled the choral song of the *Heracles* and noticed its relevance for the beginning of the *Aetia* might consider *HF* 680f. ἔτι τὰν Ἡρακλέους | καλλίνικον ἀείδω and 698ff. μοχθήσας τὸν ἄκυμον | θῆκεν βίοτον βροτοῖς | πέρσας δείματα θηρῶν (sc. Heracles) as relevant for the second half of the *Aetia* which began with the *Victoria Berenices*, in which Heracles defeated the first of the monsters threatening humanity.

between the long and short elegies of Philetas and Mimnermus may be indicated by the text, at least according to the *Florentine scholia* (p.3 Pf.), which, if rightly interpreted, seem to say that of each poet the short and long poems are being compared and the short ones are better (and probably also according to the *London scholia* [p.3 Pf.], which say that Mimnermus short poems, not his big woman show his quality). An explanation for the mention of these poets is probably that the archaic poet Mimnermus and the early Hellenistic Philetas were admired by Callimachus as predecessors in the genre in which he is writing here (just as Hipponax is mentioned as an important predecessor in *Ia.* fr. 191). Apart from that, however, the way in which their work is considered and judged indicates that they are also incorporated into the larger issues which are the subject of this passage. In this respect the omission of Antimachus<sup>26</sup> may also be significant;

(7) literary criticism: fr. 1,3 οὐχ ἐν ἀεισμα διηγεκές has often been regarded as a demand for long epic poems and 'one' has been taken as either 'one single' or 'unified'. Some scholars, e.g. Richard Hunter<sup>27</sup>, relate this to the discussion in Arist. *Po.8*, 1451a 16ff. about the episodic epic, which is not 'unified' like the poems of Homer, which have a single plot, but rather treats the lives of heroes from the beginning till the end. Although we do not know for certain that the *Poetics* were known in Alexandria Hunter's idea cannot be excluded<sup>28</sup>. In fr. 1,17f. Callimachus uses the terms τέχνη and σοφία, which are attested in

<sup>26</sup> Criticized by Callimachus in fr.398.

<sup>27</sup> See R.L. HUNTER, *The Argonautica of Apollonius. Literary Studies* (Cambridge 1993), 190ff.

<sup>28</sup> CAMERON (n.16), 342ff. suggests that Callimachus rejects the monotony of the cyclic epic, as manifested in the elegiac *Lyde* of Antimachus, which for instance told the story of the Argonauts from beginning to end, whereas Callimachus showed in fr.7,19ff. how the same story should be treated in the proper elegiac style. Thus Cameron emphasizes that it is not epic, but the epic style in elegy which is Callimachus' target in the *Aetia*-prologue. However, even though Aristotle's views could be applied to narrative elegy if one wished, readers who thought of Aristotle here must first of all have thought of epic, not elegy.

contexts of literary criticism from Pindar onwards and could be applied to a variety of literary genres. In a similar way Apollo in fr. 1,23ff. ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος δόττι πάχιστον | θρέψαι, τὴν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὴ λεπταλέην etc. operates with terms from literary criticism, 'fat' / 'florid' versus 'slender' / 'subtle', without evoking a particular genre. This is as should be expected, because the beginning poet was going to write in a number of different genres, to all of which the same criteria of quality would have to apply. In fr. 1,32 ἐγ]ω δ' εἴην οὐλ[α]χύς, δ πτερόεις the description of the poet recalls Plato, *Ion* 534a 7ff., where, however, the light and winged poet is possessed by the Muses and not relying on technical skills.

In conclusion one may say that the allusions in fr. 1 suggest that, although Cameron is right about the fact that fr. 1 is about poetic style rather than genre, his claim that fr. 1 is about the proper style of *elegy* is too narrow and that the same applies to those who want to regard the *Aetia*-prologue as concerned only with epic<sup>29</sup>. In fact the prologue of the *Aetia* refers the reader in a highly allusive manner to a variety of literary genres and some passages of literary criticism and seems to be best read as referring to poetic style and quality in general, touching on values and criteria that are applicable to a variety of poetic genres, of course including *elegy* and *epic*, but by no means restricted to them. The 'message' may well be that a poet should aim for the quality of small-scale, subtle and original poetry, and the reader seems to be invited to read this message against the background of a kaleidoscopic and allusive picture of earlier Greek poetry and earlier literary criticism. This fits in with the character of the *Aetia*, which, in spite of its being basically an elegiac catalogue poem, shows a great deal of generic variety<sup>30</sup> and alludes to many of the predecessors hinted at in the prologue.

<sup>29</sup> So e.g. E.-R. SCHWINGE, *Künstlichkeit von Kunst. Zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*, Zetemata 84 (München 1986).

<sup>30</sup> See HARDER (n.2).

### 4.3. Elegy against an Odyssean background

Elsewhere in the *Aetia* we find examples of the use of allusions to make the reader aware of the poet's literary quality and achievements against the background of a specific genre. A good example of this practice is the introduction to the story of Peleus at Icus in fr. 178, where the *Odyssey* is very prominent as an intertext<sup>31</sup>. In this introduction the primary narrator tells how he met the merchant Theogenes of Icus at a symposium at the home of the Athenian Pollis and how he asked him to tell him why there was a cult of Peleus at Icus. We may assume that this story was subsequently told by Theogenes as a secondary narrator, but before that the papyrus breaks off.

In fr. 178,5-22 the symposium is described at some length and within this framework the reader acquires a picture of the narrators, who both prefer intellectual conversation to a great deal of drink:

ἔς δαίτην ἐκάλεσσεν (sc. Pollis) ὁμηθέας, ἐν δέ νυ τοῖσι  
 ξεῖνον δς Α[ι] γύπτωι καινὸς ἀνεστρέφετο  
 μεμβλωκώς ἵδιόν τι κατὰ χρέος· ἦν δὲ γενέθλην  
 "Ικιος, δι εὑνὴν εἶχον ἐγὼ κλισίνην  
 οὐκ ἐπιτάξ, ἀλλ' αἰνος "Ομηρικός, αἰὲν ὁμοῖον  
 ὃς θεός, οὐ φευδής, ἐς τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει.  
 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θρητικίην μὲν ἀπέστυγε χανδὸν ἄμυστιν  
 ζωροποτεῖν, δλίγωι δ' ἥδετο κισσυβίωι.  
 τῶι μὲν ἐγὼ τάδ' ἔλεξα περιστείχοντος ἀλείσου  
 τὸ τρίτον, εῦτ' ἐδάην οὔνομα καὶ γενέην  
 'ῆ μάλ' ἔπος τόδ' ἀληθές, δ τ' οὐ μόνον ὕδατος αἴσαν,  
 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ λέσχης οἶνος ἔχειν ἐθέλει.  
 τὴν ἡμεῖς — οὐκ ἐγ γ[ὰ]ρ ἀρυστήρεσσι φορεῖται  
 οὐδέ μιν εἰς ἀτ[ενεῖ]ς δρφύας οἰνοχόων  
 αιτήσεις δρόω[ν] δτ' ἔλεύθερος ἀτμένα σαίνει —  
 βάλλωμεν χαλεπῶι φάρμακον ἐν πόματι,  
 Θεύγενες· ὅσσ[α] δ' ἐμεῖο σ[έ]θεν πάρα θυμὸς ἀκοῦσαι  
 ἰχαίνει, τάδε μοι λ[έ]ξον [ἀνειρομέν]ωι.

<sup>31</sup> The following discussion owes a great deal to R.L. HUNTER, "Callimachus swings (frs. 178 and 43 Pf.)", in *Ramus* 25 (1996), 18-26.

"He invited his friends to a meal, and among them a stranger, who stayed in Egypt for the first time, on some private business; he was an Ician by birth and I shared a couch with him, not by prior arrangement, but the word of Homer, that the god always brings like to like, is very true. For he too abhorred drinking wine with his mouth opened wide in large Thracian draughts, but enjoyed a small cup. To him I spoke as follows when the bowl went round for the third time, after I had learned his name and family: 'This word is very true indeed, that wine needs not only a share of water, but also of conversation. Let us throw this into the difficult drink as an antidote, Theogenes (for it is not served round in ladles and you will not ask for it, looking at the unbending eyebrows of the cup-bearers, at a time when a free man fawns upon a slave); but whatever my heart wishes to hear from you you must tell me at my asking'."

Here the setting of the symposium recalls a well-known framework for the telling of stories or for intellectual or philosophical conversation<sup>32</sup>. The explicit preference for the small cup and civilized conversation of both the narrator and Theogenes already suggests that the reader may expect a story in the refined Callimachean manner, but several allusions help to complete and extend this picture.

First of all the presentation of Theogenes contains several allusions which draw the reader's attention to Odysseus, another famous narrator at a symposium (although only one of the allusions refers directly to the Phaeacian episode).

In fr. 178,6-7 the introduction of Theogenes contains several words and phrases which may be thought to evoke Odysseus, like *A[i]γύπτωι ... ἀνεστρέφετο* which recalls *Od.*13,325f. (*Odysseus:*) *τιν' ἄλλην | γαῖαν ἀναστρέφομαι*, where the middle

<sup>32</sup> The symposium-setting for the story is an old device, the most famous poetic example being Odysseus' stories told to the Phaeacians (*Od.*8,57ff.; cf. also e.g. *Od.*3,102ff.; 4,265ff.; APOLL.RH. 2,468ff.; 759ff.). Besides, the insistence on talk over drink in fr.178,11ff. also recalls a motif from the philosophical *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon. On the symposium as a literary framework see further e.g. J. MARTIN, *Symposion. Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form* (Paderborn 1931); K. GIESEKING, *Die Rahmenerzählung in Ovids Metamorphosen* (Diss. Tübingen 1964), 67ff.; R. KANNICHT, "Thalia", in *Das Fest*, hrsg. von W. HAUG und R. WARNING (München 1989), 29-52, esp.36ff.

form of the verb is a Homeric hapax (the active is found once in *Il.*23,436)<sup>33</sup>.

In fr. 178,9-10 the proverbial expression, which is well-attested in other sources as well<sup>34</sup>, is explicitly attributed to Homer, so that the reader is referred to its first occurrence, where it refers to Odysseus, in *Od.*17,217f. (Melantheus addressing Eumaeus, who has brought the beggar Odysseus to the town:) νῦν μὲν δὴ μάλα πάγχυ κακός κακὸν ἡγηλάζει, | ὡς αἰεὶ (v.l. αἰεί τοι) τὸν ὄμοιον ἄγει θεός ὡς (v.l. ἐξ) τὸν ὄμοιον. This reminiscence may also remind the reader of the wider context in Homer, where Melantheus scolds Odysseus as a beggar and δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντήρα (220), who is asking for pieces of bread (cf. αἰτίζων in 222 and 228, to which fr. 178,19 αἰτήσεις may refer). Thus the reader may briefly wonder about the character of the guest Theogenes, whom he had just started to compare with Odysseus, and then find that there is a big contrast between Melantheus' view of Odysseus and the behaviour of the guests Theogenes and Callimachus, who are presented as an asset to the party they attend<sup>35</sup>. Besides, the reader may observe that although Callimachus takes over the Homeric phrase quite literally, he puts his own stamp upon it by the intricate word-order, in which all words change place in relation to the original phrase (aptly described as a “grammatically ‘un-Homeric’ word-order” by Hunter [n.31], 19).

<sup>33</sup> Other reminiscences are somewhat less compelling: (1) for καινός (not found in Homer, but well-attested in poetry and prose from V BC onwards) cf. EUR. *Telephus* fr.149,11f. Austin (= fr.727c,11f. K in Collard-Cropp-Lee = II,11f. Diggle) (Achilles:) μῶν καὶ σὺ καινὸς ποντίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς | ἥκεις, Ὁδυσσεῦ, although the similarity may be accidental; (2) for ιδίον τι κατὰ χρέος cf. *Od.*1,408f. (Eurymachus asking Telemachus about Mentes:) ἡέ τιν' ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοι, | ἦ ἐδὲν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδις ικάνει and 3,82 (Telemachus to Nestor about his search for news about Odysseus:) πρῆξις δ' ἡδ' ιδίη, οὐ δήμιος.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. e.g. PLAT. *Smp.*195b 5 δὲ γάρ παλαιός λόγος εὖ ἔχει, ὡς δμοιον δμοίωι πελάζει; *Grg.*510b 2ff.; ARISTAEN. 1,10,2f. δὲ γάρ παλαιός λόγος εὖ ἔχει, ὡς δμοιον δμοίωι κατὰ θεῖον ἀει προσπελάζει (about Acontius and Cydippe); adesp. *Anthol.Pal.* 15,48,5. See further e.g. C. COLLARD on EUR. *Bellerophon* fr.296.

<sup>35</sup> For this view and further observations on this passage see also HUNTER (n.31), 19-21.

From fr. 178,11 onwards the notion of excessive drinking is rejected and at the same time its dangers are illustrated by further references to the *Odyssey*. Fr. 178,11 contains the adverb χανδόν, which is first attested in *Od.*21,293f. (where Antinous rudely warns Odysseus about too much drinking:) οἶνος σε τρώει μελιηδής, ὃς τε καὶ ἄλλους | βλάπτει, ὃς ἂν μιν χανδὸν ἔληγι μηδ' αἴσιμα πίνῃ. In fr. 178,12 δλίγωι ... κισσυβίωι the noun κισσύβιον (which properly indicates a rustic bowl) again refers the reader to drinking in the *Odyssey*, as the word is attested three times in Homer: of the cup in which Eumeus mixed wine for Odysseus in *Od.*14,78 (= 16,52) ἐν δ' ἄρα κισσυβίωι κίρην μελιηδέα οἴνον and of the bowl from which Polyphemus rapidly drunk the wine offered to him by Odysseus in *Od.*9,346 κισσύβιον ... μέλαχος οἴνοιο; in the latter case the κισσύβιον was probably a large vessel (because of the size of the Cyclops). Athen. 11,477 c-e accused Callimachus of using the word inaccurately here instead of the more civilized ἄλεισον, but modern authors<sup>36</sup> have pointed to the probably programmatic<sup>37</sup> oxymoron δλίγωι ... κισσυβίωι and the deliberate contrast it seems to create between Theogenes and the Cyclops, who was destroyed by drink. This contrast seems to be emphasized by other references to Polyphemus' behaviour: cf. also (1) fr. 178,12 ἤδετο and *Od.* 9,353 ἥσατο (sc. Polyphemus after drinking), where this verb is hapax; (2) fr. 178,14 τὸ τρίτον, which refers to the third round of drinks, after which one reached the stage of immoderate drinking, and according to Hunter (n.31), 21 again points to the contrast between Callimachus and Theogenes, who began their conversation after the third round, and Polyphemus, who fatally fell asleep after three drinks (*Od.* 9,371ff.); and (3) εὗτ' ἐδάην ούνομα καὶ γενεήν, where the fact that the

<sup>36</sup> See e.g. CAMERON (n.16), 136; HUNTER (n.31), 20-1; differently A. RENAKOS, "Homerische Wörter bei Kallimachos", in *ZPE* 94 (1992), 21-47, esp. 29.

<sup>37</sup> The adjective δλίγωι may well have a programmatic connotation; so also CAMERON (n.16), 136 ("the epithet that so misdescribes the kissybion is one of those Callimachean code-words for little-and-pure"). Cf. *b.* 2,112 δλίγη λιβάς; fr.1,9 [δλ]ιγόστιχος; and for a similar idea fr.465.

information is mentioned at this point, after the third round of drinks, recalls *Od.* 9,361ff., where Odysseus tells Polyphemus his 'name' after giving him three drinks.

In fr. 178,20 the reader seems to be referred to *Od.* 4,220f. εἰς οἶνον βάλε (sc. Helen) φάρμακον, ἔνθεν ἔπινον, | νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἀπάντων, where Helen's φάρμακον, which is described at length in the following lines, helps Menelaus, Telemachus and Pisistratus to forget the miseries of the Trojan war and its aftermath, about which they have been talking. For the reader this quiet party provides a contrast with the rough and fateful drinking of Polyphemus, but at the same time the allusion seems to invite him to ponder over the subtle contrast between Helen's φάρμακον, which caused oblivion of the Trojan war, and the φάρμακον used by Callimachus and Theogenes, which consisted in remembering and retelling a story related to the Trojan war (i.e. the subsequent fate of old Peleus). Besides, the allusion may have reminded readers that there was an allegorical interpretation of Helen's φάρμακον, which explained it as eloquence<sup>38</sup>, but there is no way of establishing whether this explanation was already known to Callimachus.

At the end of the introduction, in fr. 178,21-2, the narrator formulates his question in words which are reminiscent of *Od.* 9,12f. (Odysseus to Alcinous:) σοὶ δ' ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμὸς ἐπετράπετο στονόεντα | εἴρεσθαι, which, like the beginning of the introduction, again reminds the reader of the similarities between Theogenes and Odysseus, this time particularly as sources of information<sup>39</sup>, and seems to be a signal that the story is now soon to begin, as in *Od.* 9.

Summarizing one may say that in this introduction the large amount of Odyssean reminiscences, which fit in neatly with the framework of the symposium as well as with the story about the aftermath of the Trojan war, helps to underline the

<sup>38</sup> Cf. PLU. *Quaest.conv.* 1,4, 614 B; MACR. *Sat.* 7,1,18.

<sup>39</sup> See HUNTER (n.31), 26 n.38.

fragment's programmatic aspects. When one reads the fragment at face value it indicates simply that the narrator and his source prefer intellectual discourse over much drinking. When the allusions are taken into account the reader becomes aware that he is going to be presented with a story of Odyssean qualities and that the pleasures of listening to Theogenes at the symposium of Pollis will equal those of the guests at the court of Alcinous listening to Odysseus. The notion that these pleasures are largely due to the moderate and careful behaviour of the secondary narrator, who avoids the dangers of excessive drink and puts in the right kind of φάρμακον, are brought home by the allusions to Polyphemus and Helen, which seem to be embedded as negative foils between the references to Theogenes as Odysseus. At the same time the primary narrator claims his share in these qualities by emphasizing that he is similar to Theogenes (fr. 178,9f.) and by his address of him in fr. 178,15-22: in this way he seems to suggest that the 'Odyssean' story will be so in a 'Callimachean' manner.

#### 4.4. Elegiac and epic Argonauts

A complicated example of the intertextual interaction between the *Aetia* and contemporary epic is found in the *aition* of the scurrilous ritual for Apollo Aegletes at Anaphe (fr. 7,19 — fr.21), which is the second *aition* in the first book of the *Aetia*. In this *aition* the reader is repeatedly referred to Apollonius' treatment of the same story in Apoll.Rh. 4,1694-1730, where it is the last major adventure of the Argonauts, and to the *Argonautica* as a whole. It is, however, not clear whether Callimachus' treatment was later than Apollonius' or *vice versa* or whether perhaps both versions were written during the same period of time. Therefore we cannot be sure that the intertextual relations between the two episodes can be interpreted in the same way as in the other passages discussed, i.e. as if the allusions are a means by which Callimachus may be steering the

reader's perception, but, even so, it may be worthwhile to explore the implications of such an interpretation<sup>40</sup>.

The *aition* began with the departure of the Argonauts from Colchis and an angry speech of Aeetes (fr. 7,23ff.), which may have concerned the death of Apsyrtus, which in the *Aetia* took place in Colchis (fr. 8). Then, apparently, the return-journey of the Argonauts was told: they followed the same route as on their outward journey (fr. 9) and were followed by two groups of Colchians, one of which went through the Ister and therefore did not find the Argonauts and eventually settled on the Illyrian coast (fr. 10 and 11). The other group followed the Argonauts through the Bosphorus and found them at Corcyra with the Phaeacians, where they settled, because they were not allowed to take Medea home to Colchis (fr. 12-15). During a later phase of the journey the Argonauts were hit by a sudden, complete darkness (fr. 17) and Jason prayed for help to Apollo (fr. 18), who then showed the small island of Anaphe near the Melantean rocks (fr. 19-20?). Here the Argonauts celebrated their rescue, built an altar for Apollo Aegletes and indulged in jesting with Medea and her Phaeacian servants (fr. 21), thus establishing a scurrilous ritual for Apollo.

The presentation of the story in Callimachus draws attention to its selectivity and compactness, which seems to be underlined by a number of allusions. In fr. 7,23ff. “Αἰ]γλήτην [’Ανά]φην τε,  
Λακωνίδι γείτονα Θ[ήρη], | π]ρῷτ[ον ἐνὶ μ]νήμῃ κάτθεο καὶ  
Μινύας, | ἄ[ρχμενος ως] ἥρωες ἀπ’ Αἰήταιο Κυταίου | αὔτις ἐς  
ἀρχαίνην] ἔπλεον Αίμονίην Calliope begins by indicating the

<sup>40</sup> See also M.A. HARDER, "Aspects of the Structure of Callimachus' *Aetia*", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WACKER, *Hellenistica Groningana* 1 (Groningen 1993), 99-110. For a recent discussion of the relative chronology of Callimachus and Apollonius see A. KÖHNKEN, "Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius", in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. by T.D. PAPANGHELIS and A. RENGAKOS (Leiden 2001), 73-92, esp. 77ff., where he argues that all the evidence points to Apollonius drawing on all four books of the *Aetia*. However, at least in the case of the Argonauts the evidence may well be less straightforward than it seems and the whole issue seems to demand further investigation.

subject of the following story in a very compact way and invites her audience to think of Aegletes, Anaphe and the Argonauts, starting at the moment when they returned from Colchis to Greece. In this way she immediately transports the reader to the end of the Argonauts' journey. The whole well-known epic story, as told at length by Apollonius, is thus skipped. Then Aeetes' angry speech in fr. 7,27ff. recalls A.R. 4,212ff. (with several verbal reminiscences), where Aeetes also reacts to Medea's treason and the departure of the Argonauts, and fr. 10-15 recall the Colchian episodes in A.R. 4,507ff. and 1206ff., where the Colchians settle on the Illyrian coast and, temporarily, with the Phaeacians. Besides, as far as we may judge from the fragments, the order of events in Callimachus seems to have been like that in Ps.-Apollod. 1,9,25f., where the Argonauts come to the Phaeacians (where the Colchians give up their pursuit and settle in the area) and their departure from Phaeacia is followed immediately by the story of Anaphe. In Apollonius, however, the departure from Phaeacia is followed by the Argonauts' adventures in Libya and Crete (A.R. 4,1170-1693), and only after that they arrive at Anaphe. The result of Callimachus' treatment is that his Argonautic *aition* looks like an anthology from Apollonius' fourth book, focusing on three passages from it and reminding the reader that all that preceded had been left out.

Several small-scale allusions seem to help to draw the reader's attention to Callimachus' distortion of the beginning and ending of the Argonauts' story and to the fact that he left most of it out:

(1) fr. 7,23 Αἰγλήτην [Ανά]φην τε recalls A.R. 4,1730 Αἰγλήτην Ἀνάφης τιμῆρον, where the same words in the same metrical position mark the *end* of the story of Anaphe. Like the overall arrangement of the stories of Anaphe in the *Aetia* and the *Argonautica* this similarity of opening and concluding lines too suggests a deliberate allusion, designed to draw the reader's attention to the fact that beginnings can become endings and *vice versa*;

(2) fr. 7,25f. ἀ[ρχμενος ώς] ἥρωες ἀπ' Αἴγταο ...|... ἐπλεον recalls Od.8,499-502 θεοῦ ἀρχετο, φαινε δ' ἀοιδήν, | ἐνθεν ἔλων ώς ...|... ἀπέπλειον ...| Αργεῖοι, sc. Demodocus, who sings

about the Trojan horse at the request of Odysseus. The implication of this allusion may be that, like the famous and talented singer of the Phaeacians, Callimachus and his Muse too began their story at the end (and the reader may also be reminded of the fact that the *Iliad* contained an episode of the last year of the Trojan war and that the *Odyssey* began with the last stage of Odysseus' travels). There may well be a deliberate contrast between this approach and that of Apollonius, who began his story at the beginning and drew attention to this sequence through Jason's chronological report of the events so far to Lycus in 2,762ff. and his emphasis on Lycus' delight (cf. 2,771f. ὁ δ' ἔξείνεις ἐνέποντος | θέλγετ' ἀκοῆι θυμόν, sc. Lycus);

(3) fr. 7,25f. also recalls *Od.*12,70 Ἀργώ πασιμέλουσα, παρ' Αἰγάτῳ πλέουσα, about the Argo sailing through the Planctae with Hera's help, an event which is told at length in A.R. 4,922ff., where it is part of the last stage of the journey before the Argonauts reach Phaeacia (in 4,982ff.). Although the indication is slight and we do not know the full contents of Callimachus' treatment of the Argonauts' return journey, one should bear in mind the possibility that this phrase too was meant to remind the attentive reader of what was left out of his story;

(4) fr. 12,6 καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡ[ς ἥμελλε μετὰ χρόνον ἐκτελέεσθαι (about the later migrations of the Colchians) recalls *Il.*12,34f. ὡς ἄρ' ἔμελλον (ὡς ἥμελλον Zenodotus) ὅπισθε Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων | θησέμεναι (about the destruction of the Greek wall) and A.R. 1,1309 καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς ἥμελλε μετὰ χρόνον ἐκτελέεσθαι (about the death of the Boreads) as well as 4,1216 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν στείχοντος ἄδην αἰῶνος ἐτύχθη (in the same context as fr. 12,6). An intertextual relation between the passages in Apollonius and Callimachus seems likely<sup>41</sup>, but it is not certain how this must

<sup>41</sup> See also A. ARDIZZONI on 1,1309; E. LIVREA on 4,1216; FRAENKEL (n.7), 151; differently G.W. MOONEY on 1,1309, who regards the similarity as accidental. KÖHNKEN (n.40), 77 insists that Apollonius is here alluding to Callimachus, because of the *scholion* on A.R. 1,1309 Καλλιμάχου ὁ στίχος. Although this is a valid argument, it is no 'proof', because the scholiast may have been wrongly influenced by the biographical tradition which regarded Apollonius as

be interpreted: one might think that, if Apollonius was first, Callimachus may have emphasized the fact that he 'compressed' the Argonauts' travels into the Anaphe-story and placed it early in the *Aetia* by using a line from the early part of the *Argonautica* in a situation where Apollonius had a similar line later in his work (i.e. A.R. 4,1216)<sup>42</sup>;

(5) fr. 18,1ff.

]τε τ[ Τυ]νδαρίδαι  
 ] . μνησ[ ]ς Δία πρῶτον ἵκ[ο]γτο  
 ] . ἄλλους ητεσαγ ἀ[θ]ανάτους  
 ἀοσ]σητῆρας ἐυστέιρ[ . . . ]. ελέ[.]ο . [.]·  
 ἀλλ' ὅγ' ἀνι]άζων δν κέαρ Αἰσονίδης  
 σοὶ χέρας ἡέρ]ταζεν, Ίηιε, πολλὰ δ' ἀπείλει  
 ἐς Πυθὼ πέ]μψειν, πολλὰ δ' ἐς Ὁρτυγίην,  
 εῖ κεν ἀμιχ]θαλόεσσαν ἀπ' ἡέρα νηὸς ἐλάσσηις  
 ] . δτι σήν, Φοῖβε, κατ' αἰσιμίην  
 πείσματ'] ἔλυσαν ἐκ[λ]ηρώσαντό τ' ἐρετμά  
 ]πικρὸν ἔκοψαν ὕδωρ·  
 ] . ἐπώνυμον Ἐμβασίοιο  
 ] . . εν . . Παγα[σ]αῖς

"But the son of Aeson, grieved in his heart, raised his hands to you, Ieius, and promised to send many gifts to Pytho and many to Ortygia, if you would drive the dark mist from the ship..., because according to your oracle, Phoebus, they had loosened the ropes and allotted the oars... and beaten the bitter water..."

This passage contained prayers for help by the Dioscuri and Jason, the first praying to Zeus and the other gods (1-4), the latter

Callimachus' pupil. Apollonius' use of the unhomeric ἥμελλε (attested only as a variant reading in *Il.*12,34, and not found elsewhere in Apollonius) may be accounted for as an allusion to Callimachus, but also as a means to remind the reader of one of the very few instances of 'external prolepsis' in Homer (see M.A. HARDER, "Untrodden Paths: Where Do They Lead?", in *HSCP* 93 [1990], 287-309, esp.301).

<sup>42</sup> If Callimachus was first, Apollonius may have deliberately moved the line from Callimachus' Anaphe-episode to the early part of his *Argonautica* and referred the reader to what he had done by inserting a similar line in 4,1216, thus drawing attention to his extensive and well-ordered treatment of the story of the Argonauts.

praying to Apollo in particular, promising gifts and reminding the god that he told the Argonauts to undertake this journey (5ff.). This passage is intertextually connected with several passages in Apollonius: the prayer of the Dioscuri recalls A.R. 4,588ff. (when the Argo has ordered the Argonauts to go to Circe for purification); the first part of Jason's prayer recalls the Anaphe episode in A.R. 4,1701ff. (when the Argonauts are despairing) αὐτάρι Ἰήσων | χειρας ἀνασχόμενος μεγάληι ὅπι Φοῖβον ἀύτει, | ρύσασθαι καλέων, κατὰ δ' ἔρρεεν ἀσχαλόωντι | δάκρυα· πολλὰ δὲ Πυθοῦ ὑπέσχετο, πολλὰ δ' Ἀμύκλαις, | πολλὰ δ' ἐξ Ὁρτυγίην ἀπερείσια δῶρα κομίσσειν; the whole of Jason's prayer, however, recalls his prayer to Apollo Embasius (to whom the Argonauts sacrifice in A.R. 1,402ff.), at the departure of the Argonauts in A.R. 1,411ff. κλῦθι ἄναξ, Παγασάς τε πόλιν τ' Αἰσωνίδα ναίων, | ..., ὃς μοι ὑπέστης | Πυθοῖ χρειομένωι ἀνυσιν καὶ πείραθ' ὅδοῖο | σημανέειν, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐπαίτιος ἐπλευ ἀέθλων· αὐτὸς νῦν ἄγε νῆα ... σοὶ δ' ἀν ὀπίσσω | τόσσων, ὃσσοι κεν νοστήσομεν, ἀγλαὰ ταύρων | ίρὰ πάλιν βωμῶν ἐπιθήσομεν· ἄλλα δὲ Πυθοῖ, | ἄλλα δ' ἐξ Ὁρτυγίην ἀπερείσια δῶρα κομίσσω. | νῦν δ' ἵθι, καὶ τήνδ' ἥμιν, 'Εκηβόλε, δέξο θυηλήν, | ἦν τοι τῆσδ' ἐπίβαθρα χάριν προτεθείμεθα νηὸς | πρωτίστην· λύσαιμι δ', ἄναξ, ἐπ' ἀπήμονι μοίρηι | πείσματα σὴν διὰ μῆτιν .... Again one could think of Callimachus compressing Apollonius' tale by combining elements from its beginning and end<sup>43</sup> and a discussion about size and composition of their respective Argonautic stories may well be behind these allusions. Another interesting aspect of the prayer in Callimachus is that it includes, in a nutshell, several elements from the beginning of the story: the decree of Apollo, the departure and allotment of the benches, and the sacrifice to Apollo Embasius in Pagasae. Thus Callimachus' brief episode seems to

<sup>43</sup> Alternatively one could think of either Apollonius drawing out Callimachus' tale by referring to this scene at the beginning and towards the end of his *Argonautica*. For the idea that A.R. 1,414 ἐπαίτιος indicates his debt to the *Aetia* see R.V. ALBIS, "Jason's Prayers to Apollo in *Aetia* 1 and the *Argonautica*", in *Phoenix* 49 (1995), 104-9.

encompass the whole story of the Argonauts, but not in the usual chronological order<sup>44</sup>.

In conclusion one may say that in Callimachus' Argonautic *aition* the differences between the short elegiac treatment of the journey of the Argonauts and the epic treatment as found in Apollonius' *Argonautica* become manifest through the allusions. This applies if one considers Callimachus to be reacting to Apollonius' treatment, but if Apollonius wrote after Callimachus the allusions in *his* work could also be interpreted as emphasizing the epic manner of dealing with the story, with its complete treatment of all the events and its proper chronological order<sup>45</sup>.

### 5. Conclusion

From the material discussed above we may infer that for Callimachus in the *Aetia* allusions were more than just a learned adornment, display of virtuosity or coming to terms with predecessors whose 'influence' had to be dealt with in some way. Instead of that they appear to be an important means for extending his dense and compact text on behalf of the reader. The reader who is aware of the allusions and has the relevant texts in his mind or on his bookshelves is able to acquire a great deal of extra information, on the one hand concerning the actual stories, on the other hand at a meta-poetic and programmatic level, so that he is able to situate the text he is reading in its literary and socio-cultural context.

<sup>44</sup> Similarly Callimaco. *Introduzione, traduzione e note* di G.B. D'ALESSIO (1 *Inni. Epigrammi. Ecale*; 2 *Aitia. Giambi e altri frammenti*) (Milano 1996), 2,397 n.69.

<sup>45</sup> For the notion of 'transitory intertextuality' as yet another possibility see the discussion at the end of this paper.

## DISCUSSION

*S. Stephens:* It is important to distinguish the ways intertextuality and allusion differ conceptually. The former is theoretically constructed as reader response to a text received within a specific textual environment. Hence the existence and identification of a series of intertexts within that environment allow one to talk about the effect of the text without any specific assumptions about authorial intent. Allusion is conceived of as an authorial activity *vis-à-vis* a specific audience and operates with concepts like 'ideal reader'. In our discussion we seem to be moving from one to the other without due concern for the consequences for our arguments. The advantage to casting your discussion as intertextuality is that it frees the argument from the unanswerable question of authorial intent.

*M.A. Harder:* I agree that your distinction is important and that the concept of intertextuality as you define it has the advantage of methodological purity. On the other hand, this approach, according to which a text would exist and be open to interpretation only within its *textual* environment, would, I think, make it difficult to discuss the way in which the text could function in its social and cultural context at the time when it was written. In order to be able to explore these matters the concept of 'allusion' seems to me necessary. Even though it is true that one can never answer the questions of authorial intent, I think one could at least explore what answers to such questions could be suggested by the evidence and thus form a hypothesis about Callimachus' use of allusion that may be useful for shaping the way we look at important issues in Hellenistic poetry.

*F. Montanari:* Mi piace molto l'evocazione di un 'lettore ideale' degli *Aitia* callimachei nella conclusione, un lettore che

capisce (e si sforza di capire) le allusioni e conosce i testi necessari per questo. Il lettore ideale storico, in questo senso, è dunque proprio il grammatico erudito, che legge e interpreta perché ha gli strumenti culturali per farlo. Nella parte finale del mio intervento sottolineavo come la poesia alessandrina, in particolare Callimaco, per lo spessore ricercato e 'difficile' dei suoi contenuti, certamente stimola l'esegesi e 'provoca' il lettore a cercare di capire (e a fissare delle annotazioni per capire?). Il lettore ideale di Callimaco non è forse un... Aristarco?

*L. Lehnus:* At the end of your paper you speak of a "reader who is aware of the allusions and has the relevant texts in his mind or on his bookshelves". Could you spend some more words on which kind of reader — ancient, modern, or perhaps both — you have in mind?

*M.A. Harder:* Basically the reader, whom I have described in rather concrete terms at the end of my paper, is the 'ideal reader', as constructed and evoked by the text: a reader who is able to recognize and interpret the allusions to earlier texts. As we have just seen this concept is not without problems, but the notion of the 'ideal reader' is closely linked to the concept of allusion which I have used in my paper. And, yes, if we were to look for an example in the real world of this kind of reader of Callimachus' work he might well be a scholar like Aristarchus.

*S. Stephens:* Within modern critical theory intertextuality is constructed to include all texts, not just poetry. Yet when we talk about ancient poetry, we seem to restrict intertexts to poetic models. The effect of this tendency for Hellenistic poetry is to locate its production entirely within the poetic models of the past (hence its antiquarian look) while ignoring both earlier and contemporary prose traditions, with the result that much of what might have been contemporary culture is *de facto* eliminated.

*M.A. Harder:* To a large extent this is true, but then the texts themselves seem to direct us towards their poetic models much

more than to prose traditions. Even so, we do get glimpses of other traditions in the *Aetia*: there is, e.g., the long summary of the prose-work by Xenomedes in fr. 75,54ff. and there are references to various sources in fr. 92,2f. (the 'Leandrian Tales') and fr. 103 (the κύρβις), and implicitly Timaeus may be present in the parts of the *Aetia* which deal with the Sicily and the West. I can imagine that a careful and systematic investigation of the way in which all this material has been worked in could help to place Hellenistic poetry in a broader and less confined cultural context.

*Th. Fuhrer*: I am really inclined to take the examples which illustrate Acontius' feelings during his wedding-night at 'face-value', as you call it. Is there not a certain danger to read more into the text only after Reinsch-Werner made this suggestion that we might also think of sterility and death? I would prefer to say that we are allowed to think this way, but we should be cautious to attribute these thoughts too quickly to the mind of the author.

*P.J. Parsons*: A bit more general discussion may be needed about the 'baggage' carried by mythological references. How far, or by what means, can we know that τὰ ξένω τοῦ δράματος are or should be present to the reader's mind?

*M.A. Harder*: I agree that there is no way in which we can be certain that these allusions were 'intended' by the author and that they were picked up by readers at any given time. We can only say that the text may evoke the notions of sterility and death, which are connected to Iphiclus and Midas in the tradition, and that an 'ideal reader' may pick them up (which brings us back to the questions about the concept of 'allusion' discussed earlier).

As to this specific case one might argue that at least the fate of Iphiclus may well have been known to learned Alexandrian readers (see n.11), so that in this respect the demands on the 'ideal reader' do not seem unrealistic. The fact that Reinsch-Werner was the first to point out these aspects of Iphiclus and

Midas is not, I think, a reason for assuming that the connection is too far-fetched: if the text suggests this kind of allusion to the tradition one should explore its implications (although I fully agree that one should be very careful).

*Th. Fuhrer:* The function of the break-off formula to avoid narrating heroic deeds is Pindaric as well as Callimachean: in *P.* 4,247ff. Pindar breaks off the tale of Jason's killing of the dragon and the following heroic episodes. What is specifically Callimachean then, is that the text in fr. 57,1-4 makes the reader and Heracles cooperate in taking over the narrator's role (see on this device also D. Meyer, "Die Einbeziehung des Lesers in den Epigrammen des Kallimachos", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker [Groningen 1993], 161-75).

*M.A. Harder:* I am pleased that you agree with me that the notion of the cooperation between the narrator, reader and Heracles is typical of Callimachus. Even so, I think that also in his use of the breaking-off formula to avoid telling heroic deeds Callimachus goes further than Pindar in the passage you mentioned: in *Pi. P.* 4,224ff. Jason's yoking of the oxen and the plowing of the field is told at some length and his efforts are said to be much admired by those around him, and when in 247ff. a breaking-off formula leads up to a one-line description of the killing of the dragon in 249 one feels that, indeed, after 224ff. a second, similar description of bravery would have been superfluous. Thus my impression is that here Pindar is using the breaking-off formula rather to keep the description of heroic deeds within bounds, whereas in fr. 57,1-4 Callimachus seems to leave out Heracles' heroic exploit altogether (having replaced it by Molorcus' battle with the mice).

*R. Hunter:* Some points of contact (e.g.  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ ) between *SH* 264,1-4 and [Theoc.] 25 support the view that the narrative avoided in Callimachus is that of the Nemean lion. Depending on one's view of the chronology, one poet has filled

in 'the gap' left by the other, or avoided a subject already treated at great length.

*M.A. Harder:* Thank you for adding this argument.

*S. Stephens:* Can we really imagine that the Greeks in early Alexandria were particularly scandalized by brother-sister-marriage or that a dirty epigram on the subject was the reason for Sotades' execution?

*M.A. Harder:* The Alexandrians were probably taught to accept this kind of marriage and referred to the example of Hera and Zeus as a worthy precedent. If Pretagostini and Cameron are right, Sotades gave an obscene twist to this example and I think it is conceivable that Callimachus is here dissociating himself from that. Whether or not the poem was the cause of Sotades' execution is another matter: personally I think it likely that the biographical tradition about him thus simplified a far more complex state of affairs.

*A.S. Hollis:* On Call. fr. 75,4ff. I agree that the secret marriage of Zeus and Hera does not provide an obvious *aetion* for the Naxian fertility rite. A scholar whose identity I do not know once suggested to me that the strange story in *Schol.ad Theoc.* 15,64 (p.90 Dübner) might lie behind this *aposiopesis*. Callimachus is surely teasing his erudite readers. When he says that he is lucky not to have been initiated at Eleusis, could he want us to remember the story that Aeschylus was accused of revealing the mysteries (Arist. *EN* 3,1,17, 1111a)?

*M.A. Harder:* Thank you for the reference. As to Aeschylus, yes, it is conceivable that Callimachus wanted us to remember the story about him revealing the mysteries, although, on the other hand, the risks of violating the secrecy of the Eleusinian mysteries were probably well-known, so that a reference to them would not necessarily evoke one particular story.

*P.J. Parsons:* Two other possible explanations of fr. 75,4-7, to avoid Cameron's convolutions. (1) Using the Naxian rite: ἀμφιθαλεῖ corresponds to τοκῆας in *Il.* 14,296; so παιδί refers to the age of Zeus and Hera; so it is not the marriage as such, but the precocity which is shameful. (2) What is shameful is not the marriage, but the possible voyeurism of the poet in recounting the details. So 5 τά περ οὐχ δσίη corresponds to τὰ μὴ θεμιτά in *Hymn* 5,78 and elsewhere of seeing divine nakedness?

*M.A. Harder:* Thank you for your suggestions. As to (1) I am somewhat doubtful, because I am not sure that παιδί in this kind of context could evoke the notion of precocious sex. The ritual of the bride spending the night before the wedding with a young boy whose parents were both alive did not take the form of a ritual marriage, but simply of sleeping with such a boy, because that was believed to promote fertility (see e.g. E. Kagarow, "Der Naxische Hochzeitsgebrauch", in *ARW* 26 [1928], 362, who gives parallels from other cultures). As to (2), I shall have to think about that. My first impression is that in *b.* 5,78 the emphasis is more clearly on seeing so that there can be no doubt about the notion of 'voyeurism', whereas in fr. 75,5 τά περ οὐχ δσίη "what is against divine law" seems to be more general.

*L. Lehnus:* I fully share your caution in not overstating the ambiguity of the lock's gender. It is true that at fr. 110,8 and 110,62 a masculine recurs (βόστρυχος, πλόκαμος), but in both cases the accompanying first-person pronoun makes graphically clear that the queen is speaking through her lock.

*M.A. Harder:* Thank you for your observation.

*S. Stephens:* Do you think that the metatextual opening of the *Aetia* - which consists of a series of near quotations from previous writers on the nature of poetry (Aristophanes, Hesiod, Plato, at least) — would condition or predispose a reader to a deeper or more consistently intertextual reading than usual?

(This is taking what you suggest and pushing it forward to the prologue.) Do you think Callimachus may have been the creator of this style?

*M.A. Harder:* Yes, I think it would. One could regard the emphatically metatextual prologue as a kind of key given to the reader of the *Aetia*, which showed him how he should read this work if he were not to fall into the trap into which the Telchines fell, who apparently read Callimachus' work in the 'wrong' way and therefore were not able to appreciate it.

Although intertextuality is also an important aspect of the work of poets like Apollonius and Theocritus, I have the impression that the way in which Callimachus makes use of it is typical of him and may well have been created by him. Roughly speaking one could say that the work of Apollonius and Theocritus can also be appreciated and enjoyed by readers who do not pick up the allusions, whereas in Callimachus, and particularly in the *Aetia*, such readers would miss too much and might regard the stories as flat and antiquarian.

*Th. Fuhrer:* In what sense does the imagery of the burden of old age in the *Aetia* prologue get enlightened by the allusion to the passage in Euripides' *Heracles*? In what sense can we assume that the reader would have to be conditioned?

*M.A. Harder:* This question touches upon a concrete example of what we have just discussed in more general terms. I think that the choral song in Eur. HF 637ff. elaborates the aspects of singing in old age mentioned briefly in the *Aetia*-prologue: the burden of old age, the wish to escape from it, the lasting devotion of the Muses, and the conviction that thanks to them singing like a swan is still possible are treated by Callimachus in only ca. 9 lines, but for the reader who reads the passage from the *Heracles* as well these notions are, as it were, brought to life by the old chorus' song and the impact of Callimachus' statement may be heightened by this. On the

other hand, other issues are also brought to the reader's attention: Callimachus' brevity may stand out against the longer treatment in the *Heracles* and may invite comparison, elegiac and lyric treatment of similar issues may be contrasted, the fact that the chorus will sing about Heracles may help to foreshadow the subject of some of the *aitia*. Summarizing one may say that the reader is invited to think about several issues that go beyond the surface of the text and is thus being prepared for reading the *Aetia*.

*S. Stephens:* Do the repeated evocations of the *Odyssey* tend to build up so that, again, the reader is conditioned to look for further Odyssean elements, as it were, to construct an Odyssean subtext?

*M.A. Harder:* Do you mean in fr. 178? I guess they do. It would be very interesting, in this respect, if we had the full story of Peleus at Icus, which seems to have been connected with the *nostos*-story of Neoptolemus and thus could be thought to 'invite' the construction of an Odyssean subtext.

*A.S. Hollis:* One could make a similar analysis between Callimachus' own poems (e.g. *Heracles* and *Thiodamas* in *Aetia* 1 and *Hymn* 3, talking birds and a catalogue of olives in the *Hecale* and the fourth *Iambus*). In some ways it would be more convenient for you if Apollonius' *Argonautica* pre-dated Callimachus' *Aetia*, but I do find that hard to believe with respect to *Aetia* 1-2. It seems possible that the order of precedence is not always the same: early Callimachus (*Aetia* 1-2) could influence, but late Callimachus be influenced by, Apollonius Rhodius.

*P.J. Parsons:* One should perhaps consider the notion of transitory intertextuality, if parts e.g. of Apollonius Rhodius' poem circulated on paper or by recitation before the substantive text was 'published' (cf. the evidence of the *προέκδοσις*).

*M.A. Harder:* Yes, it would certainly be worthwhile investigating the passages where Callimachus seems to refer to his own work (there are also, e.g., the interesting examples of the Hyperborean sacrifices and Apollo's killing of Python).

As to the chronology of Callimachus and Apollonius I agree that it is hard to imagine that the whole of the *Argonautica* was written before Callimachus began the *Aetia*. The notion of transitory intertextuality, at which you both hint, might indeed help here, and one should, perhaps, even bear in mind the possibility that Callimachus re-arranged or re-formulated bits of *Aetia* 1-2 as well when he combined these books with *Aetia* 3-4, perhaps in order to make the final edition of the *Aetia* into yet another chapter in an ongoing dialogue with the *Argonautica*.

*P.J. Parsons:* Is there any influence of *Pythian* 4 for narrating the end of the story of the Argonauts and for ἀρχμενος in fr.7,25?

*M.A. Harder:* There may well be, as it is striking that Pindar in *P.* 4,9ff. begins his story of the Argonauts with Medea's prophecy at Thera, towards the end of their journey, and only in 70ff. tells about the beginning of the story (starting with a question in 70f., which recalls the traditional invocations of the Muses).

*F. Montanari:* Adesso siamo certi che l'inizio degli *Aitia* è πολλάκι μοι Τελχῖνες (cfr. F. Pontani, in *ZPE* 128 [1999], 57-59). Questo mi fa venire in mente il fr. 263 Pf. = 80 Hollis dell'*Ecale*, che si suppone appartenere alla chiusa del poema. Il frammento è tramandato con πολλάκι σεῖο all'inizio del terzo verso, seguito da una piccola ma irritante lacuna di una sillaba breve: è stata avanzata la possibilità (Maas, Pfeiffer) di supporre una lacuna più ampia, pensando che il frammento sia di quattro versi e spostando πολλάκι σεῖο alla fine del (supposto) terzo verso. Dobbiamo o possiamo ripensare a questo frammento dell'*Ecale* alla luce dell'inizio degli *Aitia* e in quale senso? C'è qualche rapporto fra i due?

*L. Lehnus:* Forse la differenza tra le due sistemazioni testuali (Pfeiffer e Maas) non è così importante. Qualunque sia la posizione di *πολλάκι* (meglio ovviamente se in inizio di verso), il richiamo potenziale tra inizio degli *Aitia* e fine dell'*Ecale* è molto attraente. Tanto più che, sul piano verbale, in entrambi i casi *πολλάκι* è seguito da un pronome personale.

*M.A. Harder:* This is certainly an interesting idea, which would be worth pursuing. Just as food for further thought I would like to add that the connection would be particularly interesting if the *Hecale* preceded the *Aetia* in an edition of Callimachus' works (but one should bear in mind that the *Diegeses* suggest the order *Aetia* — *Iambi* and lyrical poems — *Hecale*): the first line of the *Aetia* could then be read as a reaction to the narrator's intention at the end of the *Hecale*; cf. *Ia*. fr. 191,1ff., where the boisterous appearance of Hipponax seems to confirm that, indeed, we have come to the 'pedestrian pastures' announced at the end of the *Aetia* in fr. 112,9.



## VII

SUSAN A. STEPHENS

## EGYPTIAN CALLIMACHUS

For over 75 years scholars have been identifying elements of Callimachus' poetry as Egyptian, that is, as having as a primary referent something that is known from pharaonic culture rather than Greek<sup>1</sup>. For the most part this has been unsystematic, but scholars like Thomas Gelzer, Reinhold Merkelbach, and, most prominently, Ludwig Koenen<sup>2</sup> increasingly have read Callimachus' poetry as a reflection of the unique environment of the Ptolemaic court. Through their efforts, the details of Ptolemaic documents have been pressed into service to illuminate Ptolemaic kingship, which was by necessity situated in two separate

<sup>1</sup> The earliest known to me is F. WASSERMANN's note in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 45 (1925), 1277 arguing that lines 86-8 from Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*: περιπρὸν γὰρ εὐρὺ βέβηκεν. | ἐσπέριος κεῖνός γε τελεῖ τὰ κεν ἦρι νοήσῃ | ἐσπέριος τὰ μέγιστα, τὰ μείονα δ', εὗτε νοήσῃ echo a famous inscription, the Kubban stele of Ramesses II: "Es gibt kein Land, das du nicht durchschritten hast", and "Wenn du nachts dir etwas geträumt hast, so ist es bei Tagesanbruch schnell gesehen".

<sup>2</sup> L. KOENEN's main contributions to the subject are: *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemaische Königsfeste*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 56 (Meisenheim am Glan 1977); his edition of an inscription relating to the Genethlia and Basileia, the appendix of which is devoted to a discussion of the Egyptian elements of the *Heracliscus*; "Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof", in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*, ed. by E. VAN'T DACK et al., Studia Hellenistica 27 (Leuven 1983), 143-90, on the Ptolemaic adaption of Egyptian ideologies of kingship, in which he treats Callimachus at length (see especially 174-90); and "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure", in *Images and Ideologies. Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. BULLOCH et al. (Berkeley 1993), 25-115, in which he reprises much of his earlier work but adds an up-to-date discussion of Ptolemaic chronology, royal titulature, and new material on the *Lock*.

cultural traditions — that of a hellenistic Greek monarch and that of an Egyptian pharaoh<sup>3</sup>. We are indebted especially to Koenen for a much clearer understanding of this Greek/Egyptian milieu in which Callimachus and Theocritus wrote. We can with some confidence date the *Heracliscus* as well as the *Hymn to Zeus* to the beginning of Philadelphus' reign<sup>4</sup>, and we have gained valuable insights into the ways in which Ptolemaic practices sometimes modelled themselves on or even translated Egyptian ideas. This Ptolemaic self-representation has frequently been characterized as 'double': W. Peremans<sup>5</sup>, for example, in 1987 wrote about the "bicephalous" nature of Ptolemaic administration and L. Koenen in 1993 wrote of "The Janus Head of Ptolemaic Kingship". Merkelbach<sup>6</sup> and Koenen, in particular, have explored the ramifications of this conceptual doubleness within writings of the Hellenistic poets. Their work is historicizing, contextualizing, and situated within the scholarly tradition of *Realien*. More recently, P. Bing, D. Selden, and I have attempted more sustained literary readings that nonetheless depend on this formulation of representational duality — of Egyptian ideas repositioned in Greek myth<sup>7</sup>.

At this date, the number of poems of Callimachus for which a partial or even extensive framework of Greek/Egyptian

<sup>3</sup> Herodotus 2.35, for example, diametrically opposes the two cultures.

<sup>4</sup> J.J. CLAUSS, "Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*", in *CLAnt* 5 (1986), 155-70, adapting the arguments for the dating of the Basileia from KOENEN 1977, argues persuasively that the *Hymn to Zeus* was (like the *Heracliscus*) written for the Basileia. G.B. D'ALESSIO (ed.), *Callimaco. 1: Inni, Epigrammi, Ecale; 2: Aitia, Giambi e altri frammenti* (Milano 1996), 72-3, n.18 expresses reservations.

<sup>5</sup> "Les Lagides, les élites indigènes et la monarchie bicéphale", in *Le système palatial en Orient, en Grèce et à Rome. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 19-22 juin 1985*, éd. par E. LÉVY, Travaux du Centre de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques 9 (Leiden 1987), 327-43.

<sup>6</sup> "Das Königtum der Ptolemäer und die hellenistischen Dichter", in *Alexandrien. Kulturgeggnungen dreier Jahrtausende im Schmelztiegel einer mediterranen Grossstadt*, Aegyptiaca Treverensia 1 (Mainz 1981), 27-35.

<sup>7</sup> My own forthcoming study (Berkeley 2002), entitled *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, treats Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius in the context of this 'double' Greek/Egyptian view of the world.

doubleness has been claimed includes the *Hymn to Zeus*<sup>8</sup>, the *Hymn to Apollo*<sup>9</sup>, and the *Hymn to Delos*<sup>10</sup>, poems that focus on the birth and youth of Zeus or Apollo and include references to contemporary monarchs. The *Lock of Berenice* has received a similar treatment by Koenen<sup>11</sup> and in greater detail by Selden<sup>12</sup>. The argument advanced in all these studies is not simply familiarity with, or occasional allusion to Egyptian ideas by Callimachus, but to a pervasive, thematic confluence of ideas and story patterns. Koenen describes this ideology of the court as follows:

“We should...look behind the appearance and draw attention to the ideas expressed in the Greek or Egyptian forms, and on that level it becomes possible that the idea belongs to the Greek or the Egyptian tradition and yet is expressed in forms and conventions that render the idea understandable for the other segment of the population”<sup>13</sup>.

Selden applies this overarching scheme specifically to Callimachus:

[The reader who approaches a poem from a strictly Hellenic point of view] compelled to make sense of the diverse data of the poem ... finds himself drawn more and more into an Egyptian order of ideas. To comprehend the piece in full, he can no longer remain securely within the horizons of Hellenic culture, but must make the transposition from one discursive system to the other<sup>14</sup>.

These are bold claims and have been met with some scepticism. Earlier critics have been quick to point out, for example, that

<sup>8</sup> S. STEPHENS, “Callimachus at Court”, in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, Hellenistica Groningana 3 (1998), 167-83.

<sup>9</sup> D.L. SELDEN, “Alibis”, in *CLAnt* 17 (1998), 326-54.

<sup>10</sup> KOENEN 1983, 174-90; 1993, 81-4; *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos*, Introduction and Commentary by W.H. MINEUR (Leiden 1984), 12-14; P. BING, *The Well-Read Muse. Past and Present in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Hypomnemata 90 (Göttingen 1988), 128-43.

<sup>11</sup> KOENEN 1993, 89-113.

<sup>12</sup> D.L. SELDEN, *art.cit.*, 326-54.

<sup>13</sup> KOENEN 1993, 29.

<sup>14</sup> SELDEN, *art.cit.*, 353.

Callimachus does not write hymns to Egyptian gods or even mention Egypt very much in his poetry, that his poems are explicable within Greek terms and, therefore, to seek an Egyptian explanation for events or details is unnecessary or overly imaginative<sup>15</sup>. It is possible to counter that if we did not possess the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, we could still understand and interpret the *Aeneid*; but the possession of these earlier texts obviously allows a different dimension to the analysis. Still, the criticisms underscore a real difficulty with an approach that reads Egyptian meanings into Greek poems. The conceptual framework of 'doubleness' requires a coherent Greek narrative to which an equally coherent but different Egyptian narrative responds. Reconstruction of the latter has necessarily focussed on explaining aspects of what must be — for the majority of classical scholars — unfamiliar Egyptian belief systems, and too little invested in exploring the ways in which Callimachus prepares his reader by creating an Egypt derived from the myths and ethnographies of earlier Greek culture.

In this paper, therefore, I want to open up the working hypotheses of Koenen and Selden by concentrating on Callimachus' positioning of Egypt in his own poetry, that is, to explore the variety of ways in which persons, places, or things Egyptian appear. 'Egypt' and 'Egyptian' manifests itself in four different ways: we find (1) an 'Egypt' as it appears in previous Greek myth; (2) the 'Egypt' of historians and ethnographers like Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera, who attempt to position native traditions and belief systems *vis-à-vis* Greek; (3) the 'Egypt' that would have been experienced by those who lived in Ptolemaic Alexandria in the first half of the third-century BC; and (4) the indigenous beliefs and practices of Egyptian culture,

<sup>15</sup> See the extensive comments of G. WEBER, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft. Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer*, Hermes Einzelschriften 62 (Stuttgart 1993), 371-88, especially 381-3, and G. ZANKER, "Current Trends in the Study of Hellenic Myth in Early Third-Century Alexandrian Poetry: The Case of Theocritus", in *A&A* 35 (1989), 91-9. Zanker is concerned with Theocritus, but his criticisms are applicable to Callimachus as well.

which may or may not have been recorded in previous Greek writings about Egypt. Throughout, I hope to demonstrate how and where Callimachus crosses from constructions of Egypt embedded in Greek thought to include ideas that are novel and essentially derived from an experience of contemporary Egypt, and the role this *Kreuzung* plays within Callimachus' fundamentally Greek texts.

The *Aetia* is a good place to begin. Even in its fragmentary state, interaction between Greece and Egypt (or Libya) is discernable on at least three different levels: the fictive narrative frame, the choice of mythological subject matter, and the inclusion of specific contemporary figures. The fictive frame begins with the narrating ego — Callimachus — attacking his critics, the so-called Telchines, and then being transported via a dream to Hesiod's Helicon, where he encounters the Muses. A late epigram in the *Palatine Anthology* (7.42.5-6) tells us that Callimachus was relocated from Libya to Helicon, that is, from a contemporary Cyrene or Egypt to mainland Greece. Although contemporary critics usually assume Libya must refer to Cyrene, it need not do so. Ancient geographers designated the continent of Africa, from the pillars of Hercules to the west bank of the Nile, 'Libya'. In the *Apotheosis of Arsinoe* (fr. 228.51 Pf.), for example, Libya includes Alexandria. Other intertextual markers in the prologue reinforce this local specificity, to which I will momentarily return. But to continue with the frame: book 2 even in its very fragmentary state appears to contain a similar geographic translation. The unplaced fr. 178 Pf. contains a description of a symposium held at the house of an Athenian named Pollis, who was a resident in Egypt, but who nevertheless celebrated Attic festivals, transposing his Athenian practice to Egypt<sup>16</sup>. Since the one securely placed fragment of book 2

<sup>16</sup> The festival he celebrates is the Aiora, the subject of the myth, Erigone, the daughter of Icarius, whose death was "most lamented by Attic women" (fr. 178.4 Pf.). (To this we might compare the opening of book 3, where Egyptian women mourn the Apis.) Erigone was the subject of a poem by Eratosthenes, about which

portrays Callimachus as repeating to the Muses what he heard at a symposium (fr. 43.12-17 Pf.), J. Zetzel has ingeniously argued that fr. 178 could begin book 2, extrapolating the following organizing principle: Callimachus himself now recollects a series of stories that he heard from the Ician guest at Pollis' symposium in his conversation with the Muses<sup>17</sup>. If Zetzel is correct, Pollis' relocation to Egypt reverses the initial (metaphorical) movement of Callimachus to Greece<sup>18</sup>. Consensus now holds that the third book opens with an elegiac epinician on the occasion of Berenice's victory at the Nemean games (fr. 383 Pf. + SH 254). The opening of this poem again foregrounds transcontinental movement, as news of the victory is brought "from the land of cow-born Danaus to Helen's island", or from a Greece (Argos) defined in terms of Egypt and to an Egypt (Pharos) defined in terms of Greece. The opening of book 4 is missing. But the fragmentary line with which the *Diegeseis* for this book opens — fr. 86 Pf.: Μοῦ]σαι μοι βασιλη[ ἀεί]δειν — echoes *Aetia* fr. 1.3, and could easily belong to a proemium. In light of the opening of book 3 and the closing of book 4, βασιλη[ might here also refer to a Ptolemy<sup>19</sup>. If so, we should again be located in Egypt. Even the epilogue, which incorporates language of the prologue and dream, makes mention of "our queen" (fr. 112.2 Pf.: ἀνάστης).

R. MERKELBACH claims that "what at first glance appears entirely Greek, is from another viewpoint wholly Egyptian", see "Tragödie, Komödie und dionysische Kulte (nach der Erigone der Eratosthenes)", in *Antaios* 5 (1963/64), 343. This is reprinted in *Hestia und Erigone. Vorträge und Aufsätze*, hrsg. von W. BLÜMEL et al. (Stuttgart und Leipzig 1996), 194. Erigone's search for her dead father, Icarius, is, in broad outline, similar to Isis' search for the murdered Osiris; and Icarius himself, as the disseminator of wine for mankind, functions as an alter-ego for Dionysus, whom Greeks equated with Osiris.

<sup>17</sup> J.E.G. ZETZEL, "On the Opening of Callimachus, *Aetia* II", in *ZPE* 42 (1981), 31-33 and see A. CAMERON's discussion, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton 1985), 133-7.

<sup>18</sup> Even if Zetzel is mistaken, wherever we locate fr. 178 Pf. in the *Aetia* it involves exchange between Greece and Egypt.

<sup>19</sup> So D'ALESSIO, *op.cit.*, 500, n.1. The arguments for equating βασιλη[ with either Zeus or Apollo are not persuasive.

The final poem, the *Lock of Berenice*, ends with a different translation, the catasterism of the lock. The severed lock moves from mortality to immortality, from the head of a Ptolemaic Egyptian queen, to the temple of Aphrodite Zephyritis, to its final location in the heavens, where the court astronomer identifies it as a new constellation. The placement of this poem at the end of the whole *Aetia* compels a contrast with the prologue. There Callimachus' wish for poetic immortality is expressed in a Greek metaphor, namely, his desire to become the cicada. The justification for his entry into this supposedly blessed state is the transformative quality of his poetry, as the *Lock* must be intended to demonstrate. The fact that, for the whole of the *Aetia*, the closing example of Callimachus' poetic skill is set within an Egyptian space gives credibility to an argument for the importance of Egypt within the poem. Moreover, if Koenen's and Selden's analyses are correct, this final poetic transformation, the catasterism of the lock, adheres closely to Egyptian models. The experience of the lock, mourned by its "sister locks" and emerging from the sea to take its place as a new constellation, closely parallels Egyptian belief that the soul of the dead emerged from the waters of the Underworld to fly up into the heavens where it became a star<sup>20</sup>. In the process of achieving immortality the lock swears an oath by the head of the queen, expressed in negatives: that it departed unwilling and did not know the unguents characteristic of the married state. Koenen has pointed out the similarity between these remarks and the confession of a blameless life stated in a series of negatives that Egyptians believed they must swear in order to gain entrance to the afterlife, to which purpose they were buried with *Books of the Dead* which contained this so-called 'negative confession'<sup>21</sup>. What begins, then, as a Greek construct of Egypt at the opening of the *Aetia*, by the final poem appears both to encompass what were fundamentally Egyptian ideas and transform

<sup>20</sup> SELDEN, *art.cit.*, 340.

<sup>21</sup> KOENEN 1993, 98-109.

them for Greek readers. We end with a triple translation: the lock to a star, which is proleptic of Berenice's own apotheosis; Egyptian into Greek; and the insignificant and mundane into a fit subject for poetry.

Exchange between Greece and Egypt is to be found throughout the prologue. The opening of the *Aetia* has a number of elements that seem to serve as intertextual reinforcements of this interchange. For example, Callimachus chooses pygmies and cranes to illustrate his point about lengthy poems: [. . .] ον ἐπὶ Θρήικας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου [ πέτοιτο | αἴματ]; Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη [γ]έφα[νος] (fr. 1.13-14 Pf.). These lines imitate the opening of *Iliad*, book 3, 3-6, though the direction of the cranes' flight is reversed from that in Homer—in Callimachus they move from Egypt to Thrace. On one level, this reinforces an Alexandrian poetics that would banish ugly sounds from Egypt<sup>22</sup>. It also reproduces the direction of the flight of cranes in Euripides' *Helen*, who as they fly over the unwatered plains of Libya are exhorted to carry the news of Helen's return to Greece<sup>23</sup>. At the opening of the *Victory for Berenice*, also, "Helen's island" draws the reader's attention to a figure who famously provided an early mythological link between Greece and Egypt. In the *Iliad* she was the unfaithful wife of Menelaus who is seduced by Paris and carried off to Troy, thus precipitating the war. From later testimony we learn that it was not Helen herself, but her image that the gods dispatched to Troy, while the 'real' Helen remained in Egypt, to be later recovered by her husband on his return from the Trojan war. In his Egypt book, Herodotus devotes several chapters to the myth (2.113-20). In his version a pious Egyptian priest of the Delta refuses to allow Paris, when blown off course for Troy, to continue his voyage with another man's wife. He insists on bringing him to the Egyptian king, Proteus,

<sup>22</sup> See N. ANDREWS, "Philosophical Satire", in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, Hellenistica Groningana 3 (Groningen 1998), 1-19 on the role of sound in hellenistic aesthetics.

<sup>23</sup> *Hel.* 1478-94. I am indebted to Benjamin Acosta-Hughes for this observation.

for judgment. Proteus immediately dispatches Paris, but keeps Helen in Egypt where she spends the war. Euripides' tragedy capitalizes on the inherently bilocal nature of the Helen myth and its attendant ambiguities. By staging his play at the moment when Menelaus returns from Troy to find the wife over whom he fought a war for ten years resident in Egypt, Euripides forces Helen constantly to confront her other mythological self. At the heart of the play is the question: which is the real Helen, the good wife (in Egypt) or a bad wife (in Troy)?

In addition to cranes leaving Egypt, the opening section mentions the Persian chain (fr. 1.18), which was a land measure in use in Egypt; it introduces an animal fable, the subject of which is the ass, the essential beast of burden in Egypt. In the Late and Graeco-Roman Periods the ass is especially identified with Seth-Typhon, who is the archenemy of Horus-Apollo<sup>24</sup>. There are also places in the prologue where a case can be made for Callimachus evoking Egypt indirectly. The first is a passage based on the *Frogs*, which Callimachus imitates with his weighing of the fictional fat ladies (fr. 1.9-12 Pf.). In Aristophanes' scene, Dionysus counsels Euripides to add something to the scale that will drag it down (*καθέλξει*), something large and powerful (1398: *καρτερόν τι καὶ μέγα*). To Euripides' final entry: "iron-weighted club" (1402), Aeschylus counters: "chariot upon chariot, corpse upon corpse" (1403). To this Dionysus replies "not even a hundred Egyptians could lift" them (1406). Egyptians are associated with strength and weight, or with the aesthetic position that Callimachus rejects<sup>25</sup>.

Secondly, the phrase ἀεισμα ἐν occurs in Herodotus 2.79 in a passage describing Egyptian song in relation to Greek:

τοῖσι [sc. the Egyptians] ἄλλα τε ἐπάξιά ἔστι νόμιμα καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀεισμα ἐν ἔστι, Λίνος, ὃς περ ἐν τε Φοινίκη ἀοίδιμός ἔστι καὶ ἐν Κύπρῳ καὶ ἄλλῃ ...· συμφέρεται δὲ ώντὸς εἶναι τὸν οἱ "Ελληνες

<sup>24</sup> See H. TE VELDE, *Seth, God of Confusion* (Leiden 1967), 14, especially n.4 and, e.g., PLUT. *De Iside et Osiride* 30, 362E-363A.

<sup>25</sup> See W. WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augsteerzeit* (Wiesbaden 1960), 115, n.1 for an extensive list of correspondences between Callimachus and the *Frogs*.

Λίνον ὄνομάζοντες ἀείδουσι. ... φαίνονται [sc. Egyptians] δὲ αἰεὶ κοτε τοῦτον ἀείδοντες· ἔστι δὲ Αἴγυπτιστὶ ὁ Λίνος καλεύμενος Μανερῶς, ἔφασαν δέ μιν Αἴγυπτοι τοῦ πρώτου βασιλεύσαντος Αἴγυπτου παῖδα μουνογενέα γενέσθαι, ἀποθανόντα δὲ αὐτὸν ἄωρον θρήνοισι τούτοισι ὑπὸ Αἴγυπτίων τιμηθῆναι, καὶ ἀοιδήν τε ταύτην πρώτην καὶ μούνην σφίσι γενέσθαι.

Herodotus makes a point in this passage that may be significant for our understanding of Callimachus: the claim that the Linus song is the only one Egyptians have and that they have always sung it fits well with the verdict on Egyptian music made by Plato. Plato, in the *Laws*, has a lengthy discussion of Egyptian aesthetic practices, and he singles out Egyptian genres for praise because of their stability and unchangeability even over long periods of time. It is their very lack of *polyeideia* that he finds admirable<sup>26</sup>. If Plato could invoke Egyptian genres to support his arguments about poetry, then it would not be extraordinary for Callimachus to insert Egypt into his own discussion of poetic values, especially since he demonstrates familiarity with Plato elsewhere in the *Prologue*. Nor is it inherently unlikely that Callimachus appropriated Herodotus' phrase to characterize the kind of verse he does *not* write. Callimachus certainly uses historical sources in the composition of the *Aetia*<sup>27</sup>. Herodotus devotes a whole book of the *Histories* to Egypt, which along with Eudoxus, Hecataeus of Abdera, and Manetho would have been among the few texts available for residents of Alexandria to read about their new country; and, significantly, the phrase occurs in a passage devoted to the topic of Egyptian song. Later in book 1, Callimachus includes his own Linus song (frs. 26, 27-28, 30, 31a Pf.), employing a phrase — ἡνεκὲς ἀείδω δειδεγμένος (fr. 26.8 Pf.) — that seems to take us back to ἐν ἀεισμα

<sup>26</sup> Leg. 2, 656 d-657 b. See A.W. NIGHTINGALE's analysis of this passage, "Plato's Lawcode in Context", in *CQ* 49 (1999), 119-122.

<sup>27</sup> See, e.g., fr. 75.54 Pf., where Xenomedes is named as the source of the story of Acontius and Cydippe. According to the *Schol. Flor.* 35ff. on fr. 7 Pf. the historians Agias and Derkylos were Callimachus' source for Argive material (see also fr. 66 Pf.). For another possible echo of Herodotus, see the discussion of the speech of the Nile in the *Sosibius*, below.

διηγενές of the Prologue. The Egyptian Linus song, as Herodotus notes, is a lament for an untimely death of a king's son. Commentators on the passage identify this with the ritual mourning for Osiris, who in Egyptian myth was cut into pieces by his brother<sup>28</sup>. In contrast, Greek myth gives us several Linus stories, and Callimachus' differs from the more familiar Greek version in which Linus is a musician and was killed either by Apollo in jealousy or killed by his pupil Heracles in a fit of rage<sup>29</sup>. In Callimachus, Linus is the child of Apollo and Psamathe, the daughter of the king of Argos. When she hides the baby among the shepherds to keep its birth secret from her father, he is torn apart by dogs<sup>30</sup>. I doubt Callimachus' Linus story is an example of *interpretatio Graeca*. I suspect it operates on two different levels: like Herodotus, Callimachus suggests the possibility for the same or similar songs existing in different cultures by telling a story that bears a ghostly resemblance to the Egyptian Linus song — untimely death, spagmos, with the resulting institution of a ritual — as a way of aligning the two distinctive narrative spaces. But it also undercuts the notion of ἔξισμα ἐν by narrating a Linus song that differs substantially from the more traditional Greek version, to which Callimachus seems to allude in fr. 23.6 Pf.<sup>31</sup>

Even if some of these elements in the Prologue are accidental, the number of potential references to Egypt is very high. Moreover, it is possible to observe that the intertextual Egyptians are ranged on one side of the equation, and adhere closely to the categories of bad taste into which Callimachus has organized Greek poetry. But what exactly does it mean for him to reject the weight, length, noise, and monotony of Egypt? This cannot

<sup>28</sup> A.B. LLOYD, *Herodotus. Book II. Introduction* (Leiden 1975), 146 and *Herodotus. Book II. Commentary 1-98* (Leiden 1976), 338.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., DIOD.SIC. 3.67.2.

<sup>30</sup> PAUS. 1.43.7 and an extended passage in Statius' *Thebais* (1.557-672) give us these details.

<sup>31</sup> Where the text reads λι. οc. I am indebted to A. Harder for this observation.

be understood as a rejection of Egypt itself, since the same aspects of Greek poetry are equally deplored. In creating an 'Egyptian' aesthetic to match the Greek one he condemns, he may be universalizing bad taste. More importantly, by virtue of these repeated allusions, Egypt has been insinuated into his poetic program, both explicitly as with the lines on noisy cranes and as a subtext. The dynamic of the opening, then, presents an Egypt already embedded in Greek literature, into which Callimachus will insert the new line of Macedonian pharaohs, the Ptolemies. But he also seems to assert that this 'Egypt' (like much of Greek poetry) needs to be revitalized. We should look to the new kind of poetry that he has chosen to write, examples of which are the *Victory of Berenice* and the *Victory of Sosibius*, to see how he has done this.

If we consider my second category more systematically, we see that several of Callimachus' mythological subjects in the *Aetia* (and elsewhere in his poetry) either explicitly or implicitly belong to a dynamic of Greek-Egyptian interaction. I have already discussed Helen, whom Greek myth situates in both cultures. Callimachus calls this to our attention at the opening of the *Victory of Berenice* when news of the Nemean victory is carried εἰς Ἐλένη[ς νησῖδ]α καὶ εἰς Παλληνέα μάντ[ιν, | ποιμένα [φωκάων] (fr. 383 Pf. + SH 254.5-6). Helen's island is Pharos, situated at the mouth of the harbor of what came to be Alexandria, and long identified in Greek texts as the residence of Proteus<sup>32</sup>. The epithet 'Pallenean' may be less familiar, but from its occurrence in Lycophron, it too points to Greek and Egyptian interchange. Proteus was married to Thracian Torone and lived with her in Pallene. When their sons began to engage in lawless behavior<sup>33</sup>, Proteus petitioned his own father, Poseidon, who opened up an underwater pathway so that his son might return

<sup>32</sup> See Menelaus' recollections of Proteus, the old man of the sea, in *Odyssey* 4.354-55 and 384-94, and Euripides' *Helena* 4-5.

<sup>33</sup> They challenged strangers to wrestle with them and killed them if they lost. They themselves were later killed by Heracles (APOLLOD. 2.5.9.14).

to Egypt. ‘Pallenean’ should not be dismissed as Callimachus’ inability to resist a recherché allusion<sup>34</sup>. The subterranean connection of the two spaces — one Greek, the other Egyptian — identifies an Egypt that was already present within Greek mythological consciousness, with which intercourse (of whatever kind) was long since taking place. Callimachus (seemingly) does no more than insert the Ptolemies into the context of this prior transcontinental exchange. But the notion of submerged, yet real connections serves to notify the reader that in Callimachus’ own poetic practice Egypt is often present just below the surface. (Callimachus makes much of another under sea pathway between the two continents — that of the river, Inopus, on Delos, and the Nile, discussed below.)

Members of the Danaid line also appear throughout the *Aetia*. In fr. 100.4 Pf. Danaus apparently dedicated the statue of Athena at Lindos; his daughters, who discover the springs and wells of Argos, are the subjects of an *ation* in book 3<sup>35</sup>. Book 3 opens with reference to the land of ‘cow-born Danaus’. Danaus and his female relatives are figures of Greek myth who have an ancient genealogical connection with Egypt. The kernel of their tale is a double migration: the Greek Io wanders to Egypt where she becomes the progenetrix of Libya, Danaus, Aegyptus, and Phoenix. Io herself, who is both woman and cow, bears a sufficiently strong resemblance to Egyptian cow-horned goddesses that she was identified with Isis as early as Herodotus, if not before<sup>36</sup>. According to the *Suda*, Callimachus wrote a poem called *The Arrival of Io*<sup>37</sup>, and in an epigram he identifies

<sup>34</sup> Th.A. SCHMITZ, “I Hate All Common Things”: The Reader’s Role in Callimachus’ *Aetia* Prologue”, in *HSCP* 99 (1999), 166, for example, cites this passage to illustrate the poet’s preference for “periphrastic, recondite expressions”.

<sup>35</sup> Frr. 65-66 Pf. and again in *SH* 260A.

<sup>36</sup> 2.41.2: τὸ γάρ τῆς Ἰσιος ἀγαλμα ἐὸν γυναικήιον βούκερών ἔστι, κατά πέρ Ελληνες τὴν Ἰοῦν γράφουσι.

<sup>37</sup> D’ALESSIO, *op.cit.*, 30 suggests that a number of these poems of Callimachus recorded in the *Suda* but otherwise unknown might in fact have belonged to the *Aetia*.

Isis as the daughter of Inachos (= Io)<sup>38</sup>, thus positioning her in both cultures. In a later generation Danaus, with his daughters, returns to Argos. For Hesiod, Danaus or his daughters are the bringers of water to a thirsty Argos (*διψιον Ἀργος*)<sup>39</sup>. There is more than one version of how the water is discovered, but the fact that members of this particular family are responsible for alleviating the aridity of a previously dry Argos, may have been an attempt within the context of earlier Greek myth to extend the genealogical link of Egypt and Greece to the geographical, by conforming the Argive landscape at least superficially to the behavior of the Nile. The Danaid family functions as an organizational template for the origins of various Mediterranean peoples — Io's descendants are the eponymous ancestors of Libya, Greece, Egypt, and Phoenicia. Greek Io may be figured as the ancestor of Egypt, and in turn, her descendant, Danaus may be figured as Egyptian as he returns to Greece with his daughters. However it plays out, the family genealogy was inextricably intertwined with Egypt. For the Ptolemies this link gains in importance because Danaus, whose descendants include Perseus and Heracles, is also the ancestor of the Macedonian line through Archelaus<sup>40</sup>.

Danaus' great granddaughter was Danae, the mother of Perseus, whose adventures took him to Egypt and Ethiopia<sup>41</sup>. In this connection, let us consider the tiny hexameter fr. 655 Pf. on the Egyptian persea tree: *καὶ τριτάτη Περσῆος ἐπώνυμος, ἡς δρόδαμον | Αἰγύπτῳ κατέπηξεν*. The persea was well known in Ptolemaic Egypt. Persea leaves crowned the victors of the Ptolemaic festival games of the Basileia, and a tall and beautiful woman called Penteteris, wearing gold jewelry and carrying a crown of persea leaves and a palm branch, was a prominent

<sup>38</sup> *Epigr.* 57.1Pf. = *Anthol.Pal.* 6.150: 'Ιναχίης ἔστηκεν ἐν "Ισιδος ἡ Θαλέω παῖς | Αἰσχυλὸς Εἰρήνης ματρός ὑποσχεσίῃ.

<sup>39</sup> Fr. 128 M.-W., and see APOLLOD. 2.1.4.6-7.

<sup>40</sup> See, e.g., the prologue to Euripides' *Archelaus*. I am indebted to A. Harder for this observation.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. HDT. 2.91.

participant in the procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus<sup>42</sup>. So far, this looks Greek. Callimachus could easily be referring to these events, perhaps providing an *aition* to account for this use persea leaves. However, the persea tree also plays an important role in Egyptian mythology. The goddess Seshat, who measured time, was prominent in the royal festival of renewal, carrying the palm and leaves of the persea tree on which the years of the king's reign were inscribed<sup>43</sup>. (It would be exceeding the limits of coincidence if this were not the proximate cause for Penteris carrying these accoutrements in the Ptolemaia.) The persea was planted in temple precincts, and its breast-shaped fruits are often shown nourishing the king. The tree itself could be imagined as a goddess and represented with arms. Callimachus appropriates this tree, with its weight of Egyptian religious signification, and gives it a Greek pedigree, thus hellenizing it even in its native Egyptian environment. According to Callimachus, it is a Greek, Perseus, who not only brings the tree to Egypt, but on whom it depends for its name.

But to return to 'cowborn Danaus'. The epithet 'cowborn' is carefully calculated to link Greeks to Egyptians in hereditary terms. A few lines later, Callimachus describes Egyptian women as "knowing how to mourn the bull with the white marking"<sup>44</sup>. This refers to the thoroughly Egyptian cult of the Apis bull. The Apis was a specially marked bull, who was worshipped as the incarnate manifestation of Osiris. His death, like that of Osiris, was a time of great ritual lamentation throughout Egypt<sup>45</sup>. Callimachus' reference to this event, I would argue, functions to reposition the alien cult object — the Apis — in

<sup>42</sup> ATHEN. 5.198b, and PFEIFFER's notes *ad loc.*

<sup>43</sup> W. HELCK, *Lexikon für Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden 1984-present), vol. 5, 884-8, and M.-L. BUHL, "The Goddesses of the Egyptian Tree Cult", in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6 (1947), 89. In Egyptian the tree is the *isid*. I am indebted to Robert Ritner of the Oriental Institute in Chicago for this information.

<sup>44</sup> Fr. 383.16 Pf. + SH 254.16 (30): εἰδ[νῖ]αι φαλιὸν τ[α]ῦρ[ον ἵηλεμίσαι].

<sup>45</sup> For Apis and Osiris, see Ph. BORGEAUD — Y. VOLOKHINE, "La formation de la légende de Sarapis: une approche transculturelle", in *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000), 37-76. Tibullus makes the point explicit in his imitation of

terms of the familiar Greek myth. Since we have just been reminded of the descendants of Io, Apis, whom the Greeks identified with Io's son Epaphus<sup>46</sup>, too begins to lose his otherness and to be incorporated into the allusive matrix of what has become an extended Greco-Egyptian mythological family. This technique of allusion to an Egypt already embedded in Greek consciousness is a central means by which Callimachus creates a discursive field that can serve to accommodate an Egyptian cultural logic. By moving the reader from the Greek cowborn descendant of Io (Danaus) to the Egyptian (Apis), Callimachus occludes the differences and draws the unknown into the comfortable orbit of Greek myth.

The inclusion of incidents from the adventures of the Argonauts, I think, fulfils a function similar to that of the Danaids, in so far as they belong to a narrative of Greek colonization of North Africa that serves to establish a prior Greek mythological claim to this region. Pindar's *Pythian 4*, written for Arcesilaus of Cyrene, to commemorate his victory in the chariot-race at the Pythian games in 462 BC, embeds the tale of Jason and the Argonauts in the history of the imperial house. The link between this contemporary political frame and the myth of the search for the golden fleece is the figure of Euphemus. He was a member of the crew of the Argo, but he was also the ancestor of the Battails of Cyrene. In Pindar's account, Euphemus is given a clod of Libyan soil by Triton (in human guise) as a guest gift, which is a token of his descendants' claim, in the future, to this region of North Africa (19-40). The entire adventure of the Argonauts unfolds as an *aition*, the specific rhetoric of which is the manifest destiny of this clod of Libyan earth, even when, or especially when, the human instruments do not understand the process. Pindar's poem moves from a moment shrouded in the mists of the past (the time of the guest-gift of the clod) to

this line: *te (sc. the Nile) canit atque suum pubes miratur Osirim | barbara, Memphiten plangere docta bovem* (1.7.27-28).

<sup>46</sup> HDT. 2.153: ὁ δὲ Ἀπις κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνην γλῶσσαν ἐστιν Ἐπαφος.

the island of Lemnos where the Argonauts plant the fertile Lemnian women with the seed of future heroes<sup>47</sup>, who will migrate to Thera. On Thera Medea prophesies about these future events and the clod that will eventually wash up on this island. From Thera Battus, on the instructions of Apollo, sets out for Libya. The foregrounding of Apollo the 'Gleamer', Anaphe, and Spartan Thera at the opening of the *Aetia* (fr. 7.23-24 Pf.) similarly positions Callimachus' Argo story *vis-à-vis* this colonizing myth. It provides a mythological beginning to his narrative, which will subsequently include (among others) *aitia* associated with Danaus and his descendants, especially Heracles, to achieve its manifest destiny in the contemporary world with the Ptolemies. Apollonius ends his epic at these same locations — Anaphe and Thera (4.1740-81) — where, to reinforce their importance for the (future) Greek colonization of Libya, he includes an incident in which Euphemus dreams of the clod in language (4.1734: δαιμονίη βῶλαξ) that recalls the βώλακα δαιμονίγν of Pindar's narrative (37)<sup>48</sup>.

An additional feature of the adventure of the Argonauts is that Colchians were identified as the descendants of Egyptians, from the dim period of antiquity when an Egyptian king, Sesostris, conquered the eastern Mediterranean and left veterans to settle in that isolated region. Herodotus is our earliest source for this, but it seems to have been a commonplace in the Hellenistic period<sup>49</sup>. Apollonius acknowledges the connection in

<sup>47</sup> The language is adapted from *Pythian* 4.255-7.

<sup>48</sup> See my discussion of the significance of these events for the end of the *Argonautica* in "Writing Epic in the Ptolemaic Court", in *Hellenistica Groningana* 4 (2000), 195-215. See also, above HARDER, 217-223. Euphemus dreams that he is lactating and nursing the clod as if a child. The clod announces that she is the daughter of Triton and Libya, the land destined for his descendants (4.1731-45). To this compare the discussion of the lactating Nile below.

<sup>49</sup> HDT. 3.103-5. In his ethnographic argument Herodotus says that both cultures practice circumcision, that their techniques of weaving are the same, as is their entire lifestyle (2.105). See also, Hecataeus of Abdera (*FGrHist* 264 F 25.28.2 = DIOD.SIC. 1.28.2) and Lycophron 1312: [Jason] δέ εἰς Κύταιαν τὴν Λιβυστικὴν μολών.

*Argonautica*, 4.271-8, as does Callimachus in the opening of *Aetia*, book 3 (fr. 383 Pf. + SH 254.12-6), where Colchian and Egyptian women are linked in techniques of weaving:

καὶ πάρος Ἀργεῖ[  
καιρωτοὺς τε[  
Κολχίδες η̄ Νείλω[ι  
λεπταλέους ἔξυσαν .[  
εἰδ[η̄]αι φαλιὸν τ[α]ῦ[ρον ἴηλεμίσαι]

The precise point here is lost in the lacuna. Parsons suggests “Callimachus may intend a simple parallel: formerly an Egyptian king (Danaus) ruled in Argos; now an Egyptian queen triumphs in the Argive games”<sup>50</sup>. Richard Thomas proposes a comparison between the weaving of Argive women for Hera and Colchian or Egyptian women<sup>51</sup>, and would implicate fr. 66 Pf., in which “the women who were to weave the holy robe for Hera” first pour the waters of the Amymone on their heads (3-5). Fr. 66 Pf., in fact, contextualizes the weaving of the robe for Hera in terms of Io and the four daughters of Danaus who were the discoverers of the Argive wells or springs. Thus, the cluster of weaving women — Argive, Colchian, and Egyptian — should all be related. Egypt provides an ancestor for both, the Greek mythological Io for the Argive heroines, soldiers of the Egyptian king, Sesostris of Greek legend, for the Colchians. It is difficult to carry the argument further, though the three related groups in the context of the opening evocation of Danaus, Apis, and Io, are all apparently characterized by the subtlety of their weaving, which is often a metaphor for poetic composition<sup>52</sup>.

Frr. 44, 45 Pf., SH 252 (+ frr. 46-47 Pf.) give us another Egyptian, Busiris, who also descends from Io and Epaphus<sup>53</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> P. PARSONS, “Callimachus: Victoria Berenices”, in *ZPE* 25 (1977), 10.

<sup>51</sup> R.F. THOMAS, “Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry”, in *CQ* 33 (1983), 107.

<sup>52</sup> A. Harder makes the attractive suggestion that the three might constitute a priamel as a foil for the poet’s own composition, viz., women in Argos, etc. wove beautiful garments, but I wove this poem.

<sup>53</sup> According to Apollodorus, he was the grandson of Epaphus (2.5.11.6).

We have only a few lines from this *aition*, which seems to have been imitated by Ovid. In Ovid the story is briefly told and, along with that of Phalaris, intended to provide two examples of those who are caught in a web of their own design:

*dicitur Aegyptos caruisse iuvantibus arva  
imbribus atque annos sicca fuisse novem,  
cum Thrasius Busirin adit monstraque piari  
hospitis adfuso sanguine posse Iovem.  
illi Busiris fies Iovis hostia primus'  
inquit 'et Aegypto tu dabis hospes aquam.'* (*Ars* 1.647-52).

There are two points to note here: to judge from Ovid, Callimachus' version does not relate the familiar story of Heracles, one of Busiris' potential victims, who is portrayed on many Athenian vases as killing the king and putting his retenue to flight. Rather we have the prequel in which Busiris secures the prosperity of Egypt by propitiating the god with a human sacrifice in order to reverse the ravages of nine years of drought<sup>54</sup>. The absence of Heracles from a story to which he provides the expected *dénouement*, coupled with the presence of Heracles in many other episodes of the *Aetia*, including the slaying of the Nemean lion in book 3, may function for the reader as a reminder of what is not there — especially since Heracles was a publicly cultivated ancestor of the Ptolemies, who had good Egyptian credentials by virtue of his slaying of this particular tyrant.

But there could be more to the coupling of Busiris and Phalaris than we learn from Ovid. Two writers knowledgeable about Egypt — Herodotus and Diodorus — reject the story of Busiris sacrificing strangers. The latter makes the historically accurate claim that 'Busiris' was not the name of a person but of the burial place of Osiris (= Abusir). In a passage generally thought to be from Hecataeus of Abdera's *Aegyptiaca*, written under Soter, Diodorus provides the following explanation for the Apis bull: "Some say that when Osiris was killed by Typhon,

<sup>54</sup> Compare fr. 44 Pf.: Αἴγυπτος προπάροιθεν ἐπ' ἐννέα κάρφετο ποίας.

Isis gathered up his body parts and placed them in a βοῦν ξυλίνην, wrapped with fine linen (βυσσίνα), and for this reason the city was named Bousiris<sup>55</sup>. The hollow wooden sarcophagus of the Apis, whether of a bull or cow (as Diodorus has it), was a familiar feature of Osirian ritual<sup>56</sup>. The point is not that Callimachus would have told this story, but that the hollow bronze bull of Phalaris, in proximity to a figure that is connected to a hollow wooden bull, would allow the knowledgeable reader to recall the double and contested tradition for Busiris — as an Egyptian tyrant slain by Heracles, as a manifestation of the dead Osiris<sup>57</sup>.

My third category is the location of contemporary Egyptians throughout the text. The Ptolemies figure in a number of places: Berenice opens book 3 and Berenice and her husband, Euergetes, close book 4. If D'Alessio is right, another Ptolemy could have appeared at the opening of book 4. A scholion suggests that Arsinoe was the tenth Muse in the earlier books<sup>58</sup>. The inclusion of even the non-royal Pollis, the Athenian transplanted to Alexandria, suggests that Callimachus frequently reinforced the impression of a contemporary Egyptian context. Moreover, when Callimachus introduces Berenice at the opening of book 3, he identifies her by the peculiarly Egyptian custom of brother-sister marriage: κα[σιγνή]των ἱερὸν αἴμα θεῶν (fr. 383 Pf. + SH 254.2)<sup>59</sup>. The significance of this should not be overestimated.

<sup>55</sup> FGrHist 264 F 25.85.5 = DIOD.SIC. 1.85.5. STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βούσιρις has the same information.

<sup>56</sup> See A. BURTON, *Diodorus Siculus. Book I. A Commentary* (Leiden 1972), 246-7.

<sup>57</sup> HDT. 2.45 and DIOD.SIC. 1.88.4-6.

<sup>58</sup> Fr. 2a.5-15 Pf., *Addenda*, II p.102, and see CAMERON, *op.cit.*, 141-2. Note also that Callimachus wrote a poem on the marriage of Arsinoe (fr. 392 Pf.). Only one line survives, but if elegiac, it might have appeared in the *Aetia*. See D'ALESSIO, *op.cit.*, 694-5.

<sup>59</sup> See T. GELZER, "Kallimachos und das Zeremonielle des ptolemäischen Königshauses", in *Aspekte der Kulturoziologie. Aufsätze zur Soziologie, Philosophie, Anthropologie und Geschichte der Kultur. Zum 60. Geburtstag von Mohammed Rassem*, hrsg. von J. STAGL (Berlin 1982), 13-30, esp. 16-8.

To insist upon this is to locate Berenice within an Egyptian tradition that had been embraced by her predecessors, Philadelphus and Arsinoe II. Callimachus' poetics, as adumbrated in the Prologue, therefore, is not geographically untethered. It is not an abstract panhellenic aesthetics. While it (apparently) takes its inspiration from Greek poetics of Hesiod, it is seen to operate throughout the *Aetia* as locally inspired in Egypt. Within this framework, Callimachus inserts native Egyptian ideas like the Apis or practices like brother-sister marriage into Greek texts where they begin to take on a semblance of familiarity.

I wish to turn to the *Victory of Sosibius* (fr. 384 Pf.) for my final observations. Our understanding of this poem has been much advanced by Therese Fuhrer's study contextualizing it in terms of choral lyric<sup>60</sup>, and the Egyptian elements I want to discuss are particularly appropriate to this encomiastic frame<sup>61</sup>. Sosibius was apparently a native Alexandrian who had during the course of his life won a series of athletic victories that ranged from the *diaulos* as a child in the Ptolemaia or the Basileia, to wrestling in the Panathenaia, to the twin chariot victories in the Nemean and Isthmian games that the poem's opening celebrates. Like the *Victory of Berenice*, the *Sosibius* opens by evoking the bicontinental aspect of the victor and the events, and the poem itself explicitly operates within a framework of geographical doubleness: the Isthmian victory is won with Asbystian horses; Poseidon is paired with the Nile, the Panathenaia with the Ptolemaic festival; the putative auditors in Alexandria and on the banks of the Kinyps immediately follow the two children whose deaths the Isthmian and Nemean games commemorate; dedications in the Argive Heraion seem to be supplanted by that at Pelusium.

<sup>60</sup> Th. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 23 (Basel 1992), 139–204.

<sup>61</sup> Note that KOENEN 1993, 84 already claimed for the *Hymn to Delos* that "the old Pindaric vision of unity of government and music reappears in a new poetic and social context".

Let us consider a few details more closely. Callimachus begins with ‘Asbystian’ horses<sup>62</sup> and a little later lactating nurses (Hypsipyle) and nurturing landscapes (the Nile), images that also figure in opening of *Pythian 4*. In that poem, Libya is described as “a white breast” (line 8: ἀργινόεντι μαστῷ), the nurturer of future Greek heroes. Then Medea prophesies that the destined colonizers of Libya will be known for “chariot teams of storm-footed horses” (17-18). At lines 25-26: ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ παιδί,  
καστιγνήτῳ τε Λεάρχου | καὶ τὸ Μυριναῖον τῷ γάλα θησαυρένῳ, Callimachus identifies the games of the twin victories in a way that locates us in the myth of the Argonauts. The brother of Learchos was Melicertes, whose mother Ino plotted against her stepchildren, Phrixus and Helle, setting off the chain of events that led to the expedition to Colchis and, through Euphemus, ultimately to the settlement of Cyrene. “The Murinian milk” refers to Lemnian Hypsipyle. It was in Lemnos that the heroes sowed the seeds of the descendants who return to colonize North Africa. Whether or not Callimachus is deliberately recalling Pindar, he is recalling the myth of the colonization of Libya. Thus, we are reminded that the recipients of news of Sosibius’ victory, who are imagined as ranging from Alexandria to the Kinyps in the west, or over the whole of Greek-colonized North Africa, are also the descendants of Pindar’s Greek heroes.

This is the North Africa of Greek imagining. But into this picture, Callimachus introduces a set of motifs that, while tightly joined to similar Greek ideas, also functions to invoke Egyptian. In lines 26-27 the Nile is described thus: Θηλύτατον καὶ Νεῖλο[ς ἄ]γων ἐνιαύσιον ὕδωρ, and he addresses Sosibius as Θρεπτός. Θηλύτατον and Θρεπτός help to construct the god’s image — ‘nourishing’, but also female, and ‘nursling’, not in the vague sense of child, but as one nourished at a breast, like

<sup>62</sup> ‘Asbystian’ like ‘Libyan’ seems to have been geographically rather fluid. The epithet is used in the *Hymn to Apollo* 75-76, where the subject is the foundation of Cyrene, but in Lycophron *Alex.* 848 = φεῦθρον Ἀσβύσταο is the Nile, the context Menelaus and Helen.

the child who suckles at the breast of Hypsipyle in the line that immediately precedes. The image created here, I submit, is of the Egyptian Nile god, Hapy, who was portrayed as male but with pendulous breasts. A colossal statue of Hapy was recently discovered in the now submerged city identified as Heracleion-Thonis on Aboukir bay, approximately 15 miles to the east of Alexandria. Since the Canopic mouth of the Nile emptied into this bay, it was an obvious location for the god's statue. The site can be dated to Saite and Ptolemaic periods, thus providing a good example of the ways in which Egyptian divinities adorned the landscape and what would have been familiar to Greeks resident in Egypt.

As the passage continues, the Nile expresses his delight at his 'nursling's' victory in this way in lines 31-34:

κ]αὶ πουλύς, δν οὐδ' ὅθεν οἱ, δεν ὁδεύω  
 θητὸ,ς ἀνήρ, ἐνὶ γοῦν τῷδ' ἔα λιτότερος  
 κε[ίνω]ν, οὖς ἀμογητὶ διὰ σφυρά λευκὰ γυναικῶν  
 κ[αὶ πα]ῖς ἀβρέκτῳ γούνατι πεζός ἔβη.

The Nile begins by referring to the fact that no mortal knows his source. The source of the Nile was, of course, much debated by Greeks<sup>63</sup>, but the hiddenness of the Nile was equally an important trope in Egyptian texts. A famous Nile hymn, for example, proclaims: "Come to nourish Egypt! | Of secret ways" and somewhat later: "No one knows the place he's in, | His cavern is not found in books"<sup>64</sup>.

Then there is the Nile's characterization of other rivers. This resembles rather closely a passage of Herodotus — Cyrus' angry speech to the Babylonian river, Gyndes, after one of his horses is drowned in its torrents. Cyrus threatens that "he will make him so weak that in future even women would easily ford him

<sup>63</sup> See, e.g., HDT. 2.28.

<sup>64</sup> M. LICHTHEIM, *Ancient Egyptian Literature. A Book of Readings*. Vol. 1: *The Old and Middle Kingdoms* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1973), 205, 207, and compare the search for the hidden recesses of the Nile in Famine stèle from the Ptolemaic period, Vol. 3: *The Late Period* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1980), 96-7.

without wetting their knees”<sup>65</sup>. If the Nile is appropriating Cyrus’ boastful language, he is also speaking ironically, since his remark reproduces a trope found in Egyptian literature to describe a low Nile, namely, the insultingly easy means of crossing. The following passage, for example, comes from the *Prophecies of Neferti*: “Dry is the river of Egypt | One crosses the water on foot; | One seeks water for ships to sail on, | Its course having been turned into shoreland”<sup>66</sup>, or again in *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*: “Is crossing the river in sandals a good crossing? No!”<sup>67</sup> The Nile’s speech, I suspect, is meant to conjure up an authentically Egyptian Nile, who utters Egyptian sentiments, but a Nile who is simultaneously conversant with Greek texts. In this way Callimachus reverses the allusive direction of lines 25-26, which if prodded deeply enough reveal a Greek myth that defines Ptolemaic North Africa. In the speech of the Nile, Callimachus recasts other rivers in Egyptian terms. This is not the only place in Callimachus where this happens<sup>68</sup>. The river Inopus is described as Egyptian in *Hymn to Artemis* 171: ἀγχόθι πηγάδων Αἰγυπτίου Ἰνωποῖο, an allusion that is clearer in *Hymn to Delos* 206-8:

ἔξετο δ' Ἰνωποῖο παρὰ ὁρὸν ὃν τε βάθυστον  
γαῖα τότ' ἔξαντήσιν, ὅτε πλήθοντι ὁρέθρῳ  
Νεῦλος ἀπὸ κρημνοῖο κατέρχεται Αἰθιοπῆος<sup>69</sup>.

Koenen and Bing have already noted the significance of the passage<sup>70</sup>. Callimachus arranges the birth of Apollo on Delos to

<sup>65</sup> HDT. 1.189. Cyrus goes on to break up the force of the river by diverting it into 180 channels. Similar language is found in Xenophon *Anab.* 3.2.22, but that may not be independent of Herodotus. It is also possible that this was a common expression in Greek for shallow rivers.

<sup>66</sup> LICHTHEIM 1973, 141.

<sup>67</sup> LICHTHEIM 1973, 177 (l. 200).

<sup>68</sup> In the *Hymn to Zeus*, also, Callimachus describes the condition of Arcadia, which is dry before Zeus’ birth, in terms similar to the Nile’s depreciation of other rivers: “the Melas carried many wagons on its surface... and a man walked on foot over the Crathis” (lines 23-27), where I have argued we are meant to draw a parallel with the Nile (STEPHENS 1998, 177).

<sup>69</sup> See also line 263 and Lycophron *Alex.* 575 for the same idea.

<sup>70</sup> KOENEN 1983, 175; BING, *op.cit.*, 136-8.

occur precisely at the time when the Inopus, which has a subterranean connection with the Nile, begins to swell. By this device, the birth of Apollo is inserted into the same frame of reference as the Egyptian god, Horus, whose birth occurred at the beginning of the inundation, and with whom Apollo was identified.

I believe the final section of the poem (53-56) includes the same gesture again interwoven with traditional epinician sentiments:

καὶ τὸν ἐφ' οὗ νίκαισιν ἀειδομεν, ἄρθμια δήμῳ  
εἰδότα καὶ μικρῶν οὐκ ἐπιληθόμενον,  
παύριστον τό κεν ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀφνειῷ τις ἴδοιτο  
φτινι μὴ κρε[τ]ισσων ἦ νόος εὐτυχίης·

Führer and D'Alessio have pointed to several parallels from Pindar,<sup>71</sup> which include Hieron's mildness towards the demos, a mind above wealth, and measured praise. But there are subtle differences in Callimachus. He is not praising a king, so the parallel with Hieron is not exact. Also, epinician focuses on the proper use of wealth to discourage hybristic behavior in the victor and to ease his reintegration into his community. It is not interested in charity or good works. The opposite is true in an Egyptian context. Care for the poor, explicitly articulated, is an essential component of the prolific Egyptian genre of instruction or wisdom literature, elements from which were frequently incorporated into dedicatory inscriptions that catalogued the virtues of the dead man. A few examples from the late hieroglyphic inscriptions will make the point clear. The commemorative stele of Udjahorresne, erected in the time of Darius I, states: "I am a man who is very good in his town ... I defended the weak against the strong. I rescued the timid man when misfortune came to him"<sup>72</sup>. Another Late Period autobiography claims: "The people reckoned me as openhanded, | For I despised the piling up of riches"<sup>73</sup>. Finally, the autobiographical

<sup>71</sup> FUHRER, *op.cit.*, 201; D'ALESSIO, *op.cit.*, 689 n.26.

<sup>72</sup> LICHTHEIM 1980, 39 (ll. 33-7).

<sup>73</sup> LICHTHEIM 1980, 15.

inscription of Wennofer, who served under Soter, praises him as follows:

“I was praised in my own town, | Beneficent in his nome, | Gracious to everyone. | I was well-disposed, popular, | Widely loved, cheerful. ... I was a good shelter for the needy | One on whom every man could lean”<sup>74</sup>.

Callimachus' emphasis in his hymn on friendliness towards the people and not overlooking the poor man, I suspect, is meant to reflect these standard elements of Egyptian autobiography.

Finally, there are a number of features of the *Victory of Sosibius* that do not comfortably fit the epinician frame: there is no myth (unless we count the Indian ants); the hymnic address to Poseidon can be paralleled, but is not common; there is a speaking part for the Nile and perhaps also for Sosibius; and the poem commemorates all of Sosibius' athletic achievements (and dedications?) even while it ostensibly celebrates a specific victory. Many of these features could be accounted for if Callimachus was incorporating elements of Egyptian praise texts — particularly the autobiographical inscription — into Greek epinician. In texts like the commemorative stele for Wennofer the subject usually speaks, reciting his own accomplishments, and hymn-like addresses to relevant deities are not unusual. Wennofer's biographical inscription, for example, begins by praising Osiris and ends with a speech placed in the mouth of the god, Atum, who praises Wennofer<sup>75</sup>. The parallels are not exact — any more than they are to a traditional Greek epinician — but the overall effect would be of blending compatible parts not straightforward imitation. In terms of Greek epinician, Callimachus' inclusion of native Egyptian elements would make good sense. Pindar, too, customized his victory odes, selecting appropriate local myths as part of the broad canvass on which he paints the symbolic significance of victory. As a native Cyrenean,

<sup>74</sup> LICHTHEIM 1980, 55.

<sup>75</sup> LICHTHEIM 1980, 55-7.

Callimachus would have learned this lesson easily: Pindar's Cyrenean epinicia recount Apollo's conquest of the nymph Cyrene (*Pythian* 9); the adventures of the Argonauts, in which the ancestor of Cyrene, Euphemus, participates (*Pythian* 4), and Battus's foundation of the city (*Pythian* 5). For Sosibius, Callimachus seems to have customized the epinician for time and place, by selecting elements to bind Greek and Egyptian together, elements recognizable as deriving from each discrete culture, but which are nonetheless capable of complementing each other. Further, just as we saw with the *Aetia*, the momentum of the poem would seem to move from an Egypt and North Africa of Greek myth, possibly through allusion to a mediating text like *Pythian* 4, to end with an authentically Egyptian expression for this native son.

What do these readings mean for a broader understanding of Callimachus' poetry? Certainly, they suggest an extensive range of intertextual Egypts from obvious allusions like "Helen's island", to the more complex like "Pallenean prophet", to Egyptian practices like Apis bull worship, than is usually presupposed. They also suggest a poetics not only dependent on previous Greek poetic antecedents, but one that deliberately incorporated forms and story patterns from traditional elements of Egyptian culture. Beliefs like the catasterism of the soul after death or the tropes used in the speech of the Nile were likely to have been familiar to the local Greek populations of Egypt, but would not have belonged to their inherited Greek literary traditions. On one level Callimachus' behavior can be read as *aemulatio* — as the incorporation of something new as a part of a necessary rivalry with the poetry of the past. More fundamentally, it undercuts the notion that Callimachus' poetry is deliberately obscure and almost random in his use of allusions, or that he has recourse to shards of the literary past for no other purpose than to alleviate the barrenness of the literary present. On the contrary, his allusive strategies are both coherent and consistent: in order to integrate the new Egyptian world into the Greek mythic past Callimachus can be seen devising a flexible idiom

in which to praise the Ptolemaic court, which straddled Greek and Egyptian symbolic spaces. It also served to domesticate the unfamiliar world of Egypt in which immigrant Greeks found themselves.

## DISCUSSION

*Th. Fuhrer:* What does 'Egyptian' mean? Are we to think of the hellenized notion of it? Isn't your idea of 'doubleness' really only from one direction? Would, then, an Egyptologist say that these examples are not really Egyptian?

*S. Stephens:* Certainly, the mythological framework of Callimachus' poetry is a hellenized notion of Egypt. Figures like Danaus and Busiris are not Egyptian nor do they have any close parallels in native Egyptian myth. But, other elements of Callimachus' poetry — Apis cult or the Nile god, Hapy — belong to native belief and would be so recognized by any Egyptologist. That said, Callimachus does construct both Greek and 'Egyptian' parts of his narrative, so you are right that the 'doubleness' is from one direction. With respect to Egyptologists: they are not particularly concerned with Greek poetry for their own understanding of late Egyptian culture. However, several with whom I have discussed these ideas have been quite receptive. I can point by way of example to the information about the relationship of the persea and the Ptolemaia, which came from an Egyptologist (as noted above).

*P.J. Parsons:* Is it desirable to distinguish sharply between 'real' Egypt and the constructed Egypt which descends from Herodotus and would be called 'orientalist' by Said?

*S. Stephens:* I don't think one can. From the point of view of post-colonial discourse, which is where Said's *Orientalism* should be situated, all western attempts to write about or position cultures that fall outside of the west are necessarily 'orientalizing', so if we take Greek as western and Egypt as oriental, then Callimachus no less than Herodotus is orientalizing. Within that

discourse, though, both Herodotus and Callimachus demonstrate knowledge of genuinely Egyptian ideas. While it is true that Herodotus constructs Egypt as the polar opposite of Greece, and Callimachus appears to proceed by analogy and to blur distinctions between Greek ideas of Egypt and native practices that exist and have histories outside of Greek culture, both habits of mind are essentially Greek ways of appropriating Egypt, which is a distinctly non-Greek space.

*L. Lehnus:* I wonder whether you should say more about the Athenian Pollis "reinforcing the interpretation of a contemporary Egyptian context" — which is not completely clear to me. Callimachus went to Egypt, but (may I ask) how deeply did he get in touch with the country (which is perhaps not to be identified *tout court* with Alexandria)? He was not simply the foreign conqueror, but he does not seem to me comparable to a, say, Hecataeus of Abdera, with his openly ethnological interest.

*S. Stephens:* It is interesting that Callimachus himself describes Pollis not as residing in Alexandria, which is what we all assume, but in Egypt (fr. 178.6 Pf.). We tend to make a sharp distinction between Cyrene and, later, Alexandria, which we consider 'really' Greek, and Egypt proper or the *chora*, but I am not sure that is correct. Cyrene was, after all, a city in North Africa, in which assimilated cults like that of Isis and dedications to Horus-Apollo were already in evidence in the fourth century BC. And Libyan Ammon was the ram-headed divinity of Egyptian Thebes, who was only partially assimilated to Zeus by Greeks. And if the discoveries in the harbor are any indication, the city of Alexandria from its foundation would have had a strongly Egyptian visual dimension with its imported sphinxes, obelisks, and colossal statues, many of which would have been inscribed in hieroglyphics. And we know of an Isis temple built there very early, as well as the inclusion of Isis and Horus in the cult of Sarapis.

As to whether Callimachus would have had the same interests as a Hecataeus, I think the very fact that Hecataeus wrote

under Soter and was familiar with Egyptian monuments outside of Alexandria (as was Callimachus) creates a very high *a priori* expectation that under the early Ptolemies there was strong interest in the native culture. It is important to remember that Soter began his rule in Memphis, the religious capital of old Egypt and that all of the early surviving Ptolemaic inscriptions are in hieroglyphics, they are not bilingual. The usual assumption has been that after moving to Alexandria, the Ptolemies withdrew from interest in or cultivation of the native practices, but the introduction of brother-sister marriage under Ptolemy II runs counter to this assumption. If we adjust for the differences in genre and vagaries of transmission, I suspect Hecataeus and Callimachus often see the same things and react to them in similar ways.

*R. Hunter:* Do you think that your reading of the *Victory of Sosibius* can help with the problem of its date, or (to put it another way) would you feel any happier with your reading if we knew whether the poem belonged to the early or later part of Callimachus' career?

*S. Stephens:* This is a slippery slope. It is possible to adduce evidence in support of either date: the way that Callimachus characterizes the Nile is an element that I think also appears in the *Hymn to Zeus*, which is quite early. The geographical movement from Greece to North Africa and Egypt is an element shared with the *Victory for Berenice*, which is quite late. I am still struggling to construct persuasive arguments for a 'real' Egyptian presence in Callimachus' poetry and would not like to complicate it by attempting to construct a chronology of his Egyptianizing.

*R. Hunter:* My impression is that one of the problems for classicists who are unfamiliar with the Egyptian material and who must rely on translations and the interpretations of others is the (presumably unconscious) temptation to treat ancient Egypt as a time-free zone, so that a text of, say, 2000 BC can

shed as much light on Callimachus as one of, say, 250 BC. Clearly it is the case — or seems to a non-expert, such as myself — that Egyptian documents are characterized by repetition of style and subject over many centuries, but it is also the case that if the Greek and Egyptian material is to be put together in an enlightening way, then change over time in *both* cultures must be respected.

*S. Stephens:* Yes, I think your point is quite valid. There is a strong temptation when constructing a set of parallels between Greek and Egyptian stories or ideas to forget that most readers are not able to distinguish those elements of cultivated sameness — the pharaonic motif of 'smiting the foe', for example, is virtually unchanged in pictorial representation for three millennia — from elements that may have altered substantially over time. Classicists themselves, however, are guilty of the same habit. They regularly use data from Roman Egypt to make assertions about Ptolemaic practice, particularly in discussions of complex subjects like 'ethnicity', even though the Roman experience of Egypt, particularly after Cleopatra, would have been considerably different from that of Callimachus.

*P.J. Parsons:* Would it be useful to indicate briefly who might know what about Egyptian realities? E.g., we can't decide whether Ptolemy II really saw himself as pharaoh (as opposed to doing acts or authorizing buildings which would make him look like a pharaoh to the native Egyptians); we can ask what sorts of Egyptian ritual he and his court might have participated in.

*S. Stephens:* To state the obvious, Callimachus must have been familiar with at least one Egyptian cult, that of the lamentation for the Apis. Since mourning for the Apis took place all over Egypt, it suggests either these rituals also took place in Alexandria or that Callimachus had travelled outside of Alexandria (or both). Also, since Apis worship is linked to kingship — witness Alexander's worship of the Apis in Memphis — we might infer

that there was at least some Ptolemaic activity *vis-à-vis* the Apis. We do not have much concrete evidence but what we do have suggests that the Ptolemies were present for temple dedications and for important rituals throughout the year. We do know that shortly after his accession Philadelphus visited a number of Egyptian sanctuaries, that he was present at the dedication of a temple in the Delta (279 BC, according to the Pithom stele), that he attended the dedication of the cult of the ram god, Banebdjedet, in Mendes (264 BC), and that at the end of the second Syrian war he travelled to Memphis where he acted as pharaoh and performed the usual sacrifices to the gods. These events must have been complex to stage, so at a minimum the members of the royal entourage and, therefore, anyone in Alexandria who had connections with this entourage, would have been aware of them. Since festivals that celebrated events in the story of Isis and Osiris were seen by Herodotus in various parts of Egypt, and there was an Isis temple in the native style within Alexandria, many Egyptian rites were probably staged within the city itself. Finally, there is the strong possibility that festivals like the Basileia and the Ptolemaia coopted Egyptian elements, like the persea leaves, in order to appeal to the entire populace, in a way analogous to the introduction of the Sarapis cult.

*L. Lehnus:* How rewarding your approach can be is clearly shown by the solution you propose for the Busiris fragment (*Aetia II*), which is more perfectly understood in its linkage with Phalaris. All the same, I deem your treatment of the Sosibius poem not only to be convincing in itself, but also to provide (so I feel) further evidence for a later (and more Egyptian) date.

*S. Stephens:* Thank you.

*R. Hunter:* I wonder whether Diodorus 1.85.5 (p. 254 above) sheds any light on the apparent reference to "fine garments" woven by women "who lament Apis" in the opening of the *Victory of Berenice*?

*S. Stephens:* It does seem a potentially fruitful line of thought.

*Th. Fuhrer:* Your suggestion that Callimachus' notion of an ἀεισμα ἐν might come from the Herodotean passage on the song of Linus seems to me to point to an interesting way of interpretation, although I don't think it's necessary to assume a direct allusion to Hdt. 2.79. Knowing Herodotus', Plato's, and certainly others' comments on Egyptian songs and/or poetry surely also the Alexandrian scholars and scholar poets made up their minds about their country's (i.e., Egypt's) poetical production. The images of the Persian chain and the ass seem to suggest that Egyptian standards were not considered to be sufficient, but served — among other metaphors — as a negative foil for the highly refined Callimachean ideal.

*S. Stephens:* Yes, I take your point.

*P.J. Parsons:* Would it be worth asking whether Callimachus' treatment of things Egyptian is different in kind from Pindar's treatment of Sicily (also linked by an underground river to old Greece) and Cyrene (emphasis on foundation)? Are they both concerned to draw a society on the periphery into a presumed old Greek geographic/mythical centre?

*S. Stephens:* In many respects Callimachus' treatment of Egypt is very like Pindar's poetic habit. I hadn't thought of it before, but upon reflection, it looks as if the opening of *Nemean 1*, with its underground river (Alpheus) surfacing on the island of Ortygia in the Syracusan harbor is being imitated by Callimachus when he writes of "Helen's isle" and alludes to the subterranean passage that brought Proteus back to Egypt at the opening of the (*Nemean*) *Victory for Berenice*. In both, I think, we can see the poets capitalizing on what must have been pre-existing local attempts to draw the periphery into, as you say, an old Greek geographic/mythical centre. But the link between the Inopus and the Nile operates quite differently. Here, Callimachus

assimilates or perhaps even redefines the birth of Apollo (old Greece?) by linking it not to a previous Greek myth but to the Egyptian myth of Horus. I would further note that in the *Hymn to Zeus* Callimachus actually moves the centre. In a passage that closely follows the Hesiodic narrative of the birth of Zeus and the origins of the Delphic omphalos, Callimachus relocates the omphalos to Crete (lines 44-45), so that it now lies midway between the centre for old Greece (Delphi) and Egypt.

*A.S. Hollis:* With respect to interpreting in terms of both the Greek and the Egyptian tradition (your 'seeing double'): similar issues arise in the interpretation of Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue* as R.G.M. Nisbet has argued in "Virgil's Fourth Eclogue: Easterners and Westerners", reprinted in his *Collected Papers*. And a strong Egyptian element in Tibullus 1.7 (*The Triumph of Messala*) has been transferred from Callimachus (mainly from *VB* and *VS*).

*S. Stephens:* Thank you, that is very helpful.

*Th. Fuhrer:* If we consider the way that in Augustan poetry Egyptian culture is read as a means of polemic (Cleopatra, Anthony, and their armies and gods are designed as barbarians) we may say that in Callimachus' poems there are no such negative notions. May we, therefore, say that the Egyptian culture was considered a highly developed civilization (and of course it was part of the Ptolemaic politics of legitimization)?

*S. Stephens:* Yes, I think that is a fair assessment.

*A.S. Hollis:* Encomia (in particular the praise of royalty) are natural places to search for Egyptian elements. Both Richard Hunter and I thought of the picture in Theocritus 17 of Ptolemy II "set up" (like a colossal statue?) in the plains (line 102), single-handedly repelling Egypt's enemies might reflect an Egyptian source or parallel.

*S. Stephens:* I had not thought of that, but think it very likely. The context in which the sentiment occurs in the *Ptolemy* does have excellent, contemporary Egyptian parallels, as Richard Hunter has, I think, pointed out in his forthcoming edition of the poem.

*A.S. Hollis:* On the integration of Hellenistic kings with local religious traditions, how close a parallel is there between the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Babylon (on which Amelie Kuhrt has recently written much)?

*S. Stephens:* Clearly there are great similarities in that both the Ptolemies and the Seleucids were required to adapt their monarchies in some measure to native practices. It is not, perhaps, coincidental that Berossus was writing about Babylon for the Seleucids about the same time that Manetho was writing about Egypt for the Ptolemies. Both dynasts had the same need to learn as much as they could about the indigenous culture. Amélie Kuhrt's work is an excellent example of what can and should be done when one reads the native language as well as Greek. Willy Clarysse's and Dorothy Thompson's current work with Greek and Demotic documents will be similarly enlightening for the early Ptolemaic period<sup>1</sup>.

*A.S. Hollis:* I was glad that in the discussion you mentioned the recent discoveries in the Harbour at Alexandria. If it turns out that, already in the third century BC, Alexandria had a much more Egyptian aspect than one might have thought, that could affect our view of Callimachus.

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, *Hellenism in the East*, ed. by A. KUHRT and S. SHERWIN-WHITE (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1987) and D. THOMPSON, "Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt", in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. by Alan BOWMAN and G. WOLFF (Cambridge 1994), 67-83.

GUIDO BASTIANINI

## FRAMMENTO INEDITO DI GLOSSARIO A UN TESTO POETICO ELLENISTICO

La sigla *PSI* inv. 3191 (*olim CNR* 80) individua un gruppo omogeneo di frammenti, provenienti da acquisto, che appartengono ad un unico rotolo<sup>1</sup>. Questi frammenti presentano, sul *recto*, un testo documentario redatto in una elegante scrittura cancelleresca di modulo ampio, assegnabile alla seconda metà del I sec. d.C., il cui contenuto non è per ora precisabile con sicurezza (sembra di poter riconoscere un'elencazione di nomi di persona), mentre sul *verso* mostrano, redatto in una semili-braria del I/II sec. d.C., un testo letterario che risulta essere un glossario relativo ad un testo poetico.

La ricongiunzione diretta tra alcuni dei frammenti e la trascrizione complessiva del *verso* si devono alla dr. Giovanna Menci, la quale, durante il XXI Congresso Internazionale di

<sup>1</sup> Del medesimo lotto di acquisto fanno parte anche altri frammenti di vari rotoli, tutti caratterizzati da un identico aspetto di conservazione (estrema fragilità e colorazione scura, dovuta all'impiego di sostanza oleosa), dei quali alcuni sono già stati pubblicati:

- *Od.* β 269 ss. (*PSI Od.* 4: *PSI* inv. 3774, *olim CNR* 69 [*LDAB* 1998.1356]);
- *Od.* δ 519 ss. (*PSI Od.* 5: *PSI* inv. 3772, *olim CNR* 66-67 [*LDAB* 1998.1446]);
- Apollonio Rodio, I 332 ss. (*PSI XV* 1478 = M. MANFREDI, *Dai Papiri della Società Italiana. Estratto* [Firenze 1966], 1-7: *PSI* inv. 2410, *olim CNR* 78 [*LDAB* 1998.294]);
- Gnomologio a sezioni tematiche (*PSI XV* 1476, parzialmente edito da V. BARTOLETTI, in *Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* [Milano 1966], 1-14 = V. BARTOLETTI, *Scritti 1933-1976*, I.2 [Pisa 1993], 535-548, cfr. *CPF I* \*\*\* 85, 636-638: *PSI* inv. 2408, *olim CNR* 71-77 [*LDAB* 1998.1056]);
- frammento di fisica epicurea (M. MANFREDI, in *Studi in onore di Francesco Adorno* [Firenze 1996], 31-38: *PSI* inv. 3192, *olim CNR* 81 [*LDAB* 1998.4300]).

Papirologia, tenutosi a Berlino nell'agosto del 1995, in sede di *workshop* presentò il testo con il corredo di uno *handout* comprendente la fotocopia dell'originale con il testo del *verso* e alcune note di commento<sup>2</sup>.

Il testo del glossario risulta disposto nel modo usuale, in colonne non molto ampie: di regola al lemma, allineato sulla sinistra, dopo uno spazio bianco segue sulla destra la glossa corrispondente; talvolta invece il lemma è seguito da una spiegazione che occupa anche il rigo o i righi successivi, rientranti in *eisthesis*. In taluni casi, si ha l'impressione che un nuovo lemma, con la relativa glossa, sia scritto di seguito alla fine di una glossa precedente, oppure che il lemma sia costituito da più parole consecutive, che occupano tutto il rigo, cui seguva la spiegazione nel rigo o nei righi successivi. Poiché non è riscontrabile nessun criterio di successione alfabetica, sembra lecito affermare che i singoli lemmi si susseguono secondo l'ordine in cui si trovavano nel testo poetico.

A Giovanna Menci si deve l'aver individuato che la sequenza in fr. B 7, cioè ήμισυ δ' Ασσύριοι, rimanda a Callimaco, fr. 506 Pf. (*inc.sedis*): per quanto, allo stato attuale, non si possa avere certezza assoluta, sembra che queste parole appartengano effettivamente a un lemma e dunque al testo poetico oggetto del glossario. Il frammento è tramandato dall'*Etym. Gen.* in questa forma: ήμισυ μὲν Πέρσαι†, ήμισυ δ' Ασσύριοι. La *crux* è dovuta all'intollerabile iato, cfr. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*: “anaphorae figura hiatus non excusatur, potius alias casus pro nominativo substituendus, si re vera Callimachi est pentameter”. In effetti, nel papiro le tracce prima di ήμισυ non sembrano conciliarsi con αι; sembra, anzi, che una lettura plausibile possa essere ]ηγ, il che farebbe pensare a un accusativo singolare Πέρσηγ, ήμισυ δ' Ασσύριον e il nostro frammento attesterebbe la lezione giusta.

<sup>2</sup> Cfr. *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.-19.8.1995*, hrsg. von B. KRAMER, W. LUPPE, H. MAEHLER, G. POETHKE (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997), I p.xxix: Donnerstag, 17. August 1995, Workshop 2: Diskussion neuer Texte.

Da ciò deriva l'interesse ‘callimacheo’ del nuovo testo, tanto più che, come ha già visto Giovanna Menci, vi compaiono glosati anche altri termini non banali (cosa ovvia, in un glossario) che risultano attestati in Callimaco: ἀζωστος in fr. A II 12 (cfr. Call. fr. 620a Pf.) e προχάνη in fr. A II 17 (cfr. Call. Cer. 73). Nel loro complesso, i lemmi sembrano far intravedere un testo poetico in distici elegiaci: difficile dire quale fosse l'argomento, ma l'impressione è che ci troviamo in un contesto agonistico e che, più precisamente, si parli di gare equestri a Olimpia.

Il glossario sarà pubblicato da Giovanna Menci il più presto possibile.

## DISCUSSION

*F. Montanari*: Credo utile ricordare che abbiamo un frammento di glossario a Callimaco, restituito da *POxy.* 3328, del II sec. d.C. (dunque cronologicamente vicino a questo papiro inedito): riguarda un'opera conservata, cioè *Inno 3, Dian.*, e la parte rimasta copre i vv.2-12.

Nel *PSI* inv. 3191, fra gli elementi che suggeriscono Olimpia noterei: in fr. A I 21 ] $\psi$  Ταραξίππο[ $\psi$ ; in fr. A II 5 il possibile [Π]ισσα, glossato con χωριον τ. $\tau$ . (Pisa stava sul corso del fiume Alfeo: cfr. ποταμός al precedente r. 4; e il βασιλεύς del successivo r. 6 potrebbe essere Zeus Olimpico Πισσιος, cfr. Call. fr. 76,2; fr. 196 Pf.); anche in fr. A I 11-13 la menzione del Peloponneso. È vero che sono citate anche altre aree geografiche, come la Messenia (probabile in fr. A I 8: non lontana da Olimpia) e la Persia (in fr. D+E+F+G 4-5), per non parlare degli Assiri di fr. B 7 (vedi sopra) per cui si è indirizzato il sospetto su Callimaco: ma questi riferimenti risultano meno collegabili al contesto agonistico che sembra emergere. Cfr. frr. 84-85 Pf. per una elegia dedicata a Euticle di Locri, vincitore a Olimpia, alla fine del libro III degli *Aitia*.

*L. Lehnus:* Se l'autore oggetto del glossario è davvero Callimaco e l'opera è un'elegia, il riferimento più vicino è senz'altro la *Victoria Sosibii* (fr. 384 Pf.). Evidentemente fr. B 7 evoca Callimaco fr. 506 Pf. (tanto più se cade il problema dello iato), come pure ἄζωστος in fr. A II 12 e προχάνη in fr. A II 17: a questi confronti già segnalati aggiungerei anche che μολύβδαινα in fr. A II 2 potrebbe trovare un parallelo nel fr. 512 Pf. μολυβδίς, e anche nel fr. 31 d, 5 Pf. (*Addenda* vol. II p.109), dove si suggerisce la lettura e integrazione μ]ολύβδ[ινος. Tuttavia, non sono davvero certo che si tratti di Callimaco (l'onomastica non mi

sembra sufficientemente ricercata, ma questa è solo un'impres-  
sione). Si potrebbe prospettare la possibilità che si tratti di un  
autore 'callimacheo' della seconda metà del III o del II sec. a.C.,  
o anche di un contemporaneo come, per fare un nome, Alessandro Etolo (Franco Montanari menziona anche Riano e nota  
il possibile o probabile Με]στηνίας di fr. A I 8). Ricordo che  
Attalo I (in fr. A II 6 potremmo avere ]λοῦ βασιλέως, invece di  
]σροῦ) e gli Attalidi ebbero più legami con il Peloponneso che  
non i Tolemei, ed ebbero scontri con 'Persiani' (cfr. fr. D+E+  
F+G 4-5) e 'Assiri', cioè i Seleucidi.

Alcuni suggerimenti: fr. A II 10 επισ... εγγον.[, cfr. Call. fr.  
dub. 735 γόνου... ἔπισσα; frr. D+E+F+G 3 εὐπ[π-?; frr. D+E+  
F+G 9 πλ[ηθυν]τικῆς?

*R. Hunter:* Fr. A II 15: in view of the gloss διακτωρ.[, the  
lemma κόσμος might be 'judge, controller' (κοσμητής), cfr.  
LSJ s.v. κόσμος III.

Frr. D+E+F+G 10: lemma χιραλεοι: the horses rather than  
the jockeys? Gloss τρα[χεῖς vel τρα[υμα(τα)? The gloss in Hesychius  
(χιραλέους· τοὺς πόδας κατειργασμένους) needs further  
thought.

*F. Montanari:* In fr. A II 3 lemma [ ].μελανδρυος: probabile  
il riferimento a un pesce, una specie di tonno; è attestato anche  
l'aggettivo ὑπομελανδρυώδης, che forse potrebbe in qualche  
modo spiegare le lettere mancanti all'inizio del lemma nel nuovo  
rigo. In questo caso, si può immaginare un buon collegamento  
con μολύβδαινα, al precedente r. 2, nel senso di "piombino della  
lenza".

Alcuni suggerimenti. In fr. A II 9 pare che ci sia χλωρόν glos-  
sato con νέον, dunque nel senso di "fresco, giovane, fiorente":  
potrebbe avere un legame con επισ... nel seguente r. 10, ricordato  
prima da Lehnus, che vuol dire "nato in seguito, discendente",  
riferito a persona giovane. Frr. D+E+F+G 7: dalla fotografia,  
non sembra che nella glossa ci sia spazio bianco dopo τοιχυτης:  
parrebbe dunque possibile τῆς τοιχυτης ψλη[ς].



## CONCLUSIONS

May I indulge in some highly rhapsodic conclusions. As it is well known, *ars longa, vita brevis*; and few things happen to be 'longer' — I mean more bulky, entangled, many-sided, and mobile like shifting sands — than the traditions concerning Callimachus.

He was by birth a Greek from Cyrene, but he came to be a subject of the new Egyptian kingdom of the Ptolemies. Professor Stephens has shown us what this meant in terms of com-penetration of cultures, happening as it did at the very beginning (or close to it) of the creation of what the late Claire Préaux used to call "l'entité hellénistique". Callimachus appears to have flourished contemporarily at the margin of a world (I mean: the geographical and chronological margin of 'old Greece') and in its very core, and this was a puzzling and potentially productive situation. Speaking of forms of contact, we should never forget how tightly in contact was Callimachus with his own roots and with the literary world he belonged to.

Professor Fuhrer and Professor Hunter have jointly reminded us of that easily forgotten truth, that is that *after all* Callimachus wrote *Hymns* (and we happen to have them), and that they are to be collated with Greece's first hymnographic collections: the *Homeric Hymns* and the *Pindaric Hymns* (fragmentary as they are). It is this linkage that, if considered from the point of view of a Callimachean audience, helps us to detect in Callimachus' *Hymns* the gradual construction of a true poetic theology, which worked within the frame of the new dynastic *realia* and was somehow to be substituted to the Hesiodic one.

Theologic intertextuality easily brings us to narrative intertextuality. A bounty of penetrating parallels to the *Aetia* drawn from preceding literature has been lavished upon us by Professor Harder. Indeed, far from being sheer parallels, these passages

prove to have been the tool by which Callimachus used to enroll his readers into his own narrative construction while providing them with further information on his personal poetic procedures.

Many-sided Callimachus means surviving works along with lost and fragmentary ones. Trying to show how various and complex an operation collecting Callimachus' fragments was, I have suggested that archival material coming from the great age of twentieth century Callimachean scholarship (I am thinking chiefly of the encounter of the exile school of Wilamowitz with British papyrology) might be still summoned to help contemporary editors.

Professor Montanari has provided us in turn with a tasty example of the kind of work Alexandrian scholars were soon to do on, and with the help of, the text of Callimachus and of other early Hellenistic poets. He showed how early that work began and how crucial it must have been for the transmission of the text of Callimachus.

What we ourselves are expected to do to elicit more Callimachean relics from later Greek authors (and among them from the entire Gregory of Nazianzus) has been apparent from Mr. Hollis' contribution, where *inter alia* Gregory's own "Prologue to the *Aetia*" has miraculously resurfaced. Needless to say, this raises hopes for further rich increments.

We are now left with the *Epigrams*, perhaps the most elusive among Callimachus' works. In this case we not only do not have the original book, but we are barely able to imagine by which ways what survives was produced and preserved and what has not survived was equally produced but lost. Professor Parsons has put to us a large number of healthy though sometimes embarrassing questions. By a detailed examination of all the epigrammatic collections extant in papyri, various and scattered as they are, he has been able to direct us to a wealth of possible and valuable solutions.

Bringing with him straight from Florence photographs and transcription of a new Callimachus-related papyrus, Professor Bastianini has generously allowed us the thrill of a whole

afternoon out working "on the field". Scraps of a brand-new lexicon containing Callimachean quotations among other material have been illustrated and submitted to us. We remained tantalized, as it was not clear how far the new piece is directly connected with Callimachus and under what category it falls; but we came out with intimations of future advancements. That was quite a Callimachean atmosphere — feeling that the future is at hand while remaining bound to the past.

Luigi LEHNUS



## INDEX

### A. CALLIMAQUE

- Aitia*: X-XI, 2-3, 5, 12-13, 16-17, 27, 31, 37, 48-49, 51, 53, 55, 69, 77, 94, 101-102, 124, 128, 137-141, 178-179, 181, 189-192, 197-198, 201, 209, 212, 218, 223-224, 230-233, 241, 244, 277.  
*prol.*: 2, 6, 16, 37, 53, 210-211, 241, 244-245, 255.  
I: 54, 101, 179, 217, 244.  
I-II: 14, 17, 38, 231-232.  
II: 41, 50, 57, 239-240, 267.  
III: 13, 25, 35, 76-77, 97, 239, 247, 252-253, 274.  
III-IV: 14, 30, 139, 232, 240, 254.  
IV: 41.  
*fragmenta* (Pfeiffer)  
1: 140, 206-207, 211.  
1,1: 17, 207.  
1,1 sqq.: 42.  
1,1-6: 43.  
1,2: 207-208.  
1,3: 210, 240.  
1,4: 44.  
1,7: 43, 56.  
1,8: 43.  
1,9: 44, 207-208, 215.  
1,9 sq.: 207-208.  
1,9 sqq.: 209.  
1,9-12: 243.  
1,11: 18, 33.  
1,13-14: 207, 242.  
1,13 sqq.: 208.  
1,17: 17, 44.  
1,17 sq.: 208, 210.  
1,18: 40, 44, 243.  
1,19 sq.: 209-210.  
1,21: 23.

- 1,21-22: 43-44, 55.  
 1,23 sqq.: 211.  
 1,25 sqq.: 208.  
 1,27-28: 44, 207.  
 1,31: 44.  
 1,32: 211.  
 1,32 sqq.: 209.  
 1,33 sqq.: 55.  
 1,34: 44.  
 1,35: 209.  
 1,35-36: 44, 209.  
 1,37: 26, 44.  
 1,37-38: 42, 44, 55, 207.  
 1,39 sq.: 209.  
 2: 15, 27, 48.  
 2,1-2: 38.  
 2a, 5-15 (*add. et corr.* II p.102 Pf.): 254.  
 3-7: 209.  
 7,12: 5.  
 7,19 sqq.: 210.  
 7,19-21: 217.  
 7,19-23: 141.  
 7,20: 45.  
 7,23: 219.  
 7,23-24: 251.  
 7,23 sqq.: 218.  
 7,25: 220, 232.  
 7,25 sq.: 219.  
 7,27 sqq.: 219.  
 8-15: 218.  
 10-15: 219.  
 12,6: 60, 220.  
 17-21: 218.  
 17,3: 26.  
 18,1 sqq.: 221.  
 18,1-4: 221.  
 18,5 sqq.: 222.  
 22: 45.  
 22-23: 44.  
 22-25: 209.  
 23,1 (= 7,23 Pf.): 9.  
 23,3-4: 49.  
 23,6: 45, 245.

- 23,15: 26.  
 24,20-21: 21.  
 24,20 sqq.: 200.  
 24-25 (= 26-27 Massimilla): 26, 45.  
 26,8: 43, 244.  
 26-28: 244.  
 30-31a: 244.  
 31b-e: 22.  
 31 d 5 (*add. et corr.* II p.109 Pf.): 274.  
 32 (= 39 Massimilla): 21.  
 43: 38, 212.  
 43,12-17: 240.  
 43,13: 5.  
 44: 253.  
 44-47: 252.  
 45-46: 57.  
 45-47: 41.  
 46: 41.  
 48: 203.  
 51: 50.  
 57: 202.  
 57,1-4 (= *SH* 264,1-4): 199, 227.  
 57,3-4: 200.  
 59 (= *SH* 265): 200.  
 59,5 sqq.: 46.  
 59,16 sq. (= *SH* 265,16 sq.): 201.  
 59,23 (= *SH* 265,23): 26.  
 61: 22-23.  
 63: 36.  
 64: 129.  
 65-66: 247.  
 66: 244, 252.  
 66,3-5: 252.  
 67,1-3: 192.  
 67,7: 199.  
 67-75: 13.  
 75,3: 202.  
 75,3-4: 204.  
 75,4-5: 36, 203.  
 75,4 sqq.: 200, 204, 228.  
 75,4-7: 229.  
 75,4-9: 202.  
 75,5: 162.

- 75,8-9: 204.  
 75,42 sq.: 196.  
 75,43: 163.  
 75,44-50: 196.  
 75,45: 45.  
 75,50: 197.  
 75,54: 140, 226, 244.  
 75,56-74: 199.  
 75,57: 22.  
 75,64-69: 198.  
 75,65-66: 198.  
 75,68-69: 199.  
 75,70: 18, 33.  
 75-76: 17.  
 76,1: 13.  
 76,2: 14, 30, 274.  
 76-77a: 13.  
 84-85: 274.  
 86: 240.  
 90: 20.  
 92,2 sq.: 226.  
 97: 24, 139.  
 98-99: 130.  
 100,1: 22.  
 100,4: 247.  
 100-101: 141.  
 103: 226.  
 110 (*coma Beren.*): 5-6, 21, 30, 130, 139, 157, 237, 241.  
 110,8: 205, 229.  
 110,26: 204.  
 110,40: 204.  
 110,43 sqq.: 206.  
 110,47: 205.  
 110,49: 20.  
 110,51: 205-206.  
 110,52 sqq.: 205.  
 110,59 sqq.: 205.  
 110,62: 205, 229.  
 110,63: 206.  
 110,75 sqq.: 205.  
 112: 17, 41.  
 112,2: 240.  
 112,9: 139, 233.

- 113,3: 23.  
 114: 130.  
 114,18: 30-31.  
 114,18-25 (= 64,18-25 Massimilla): 25.  
 115: 26.  
 115,5: 23.  
 115,9: 25.  
 123,2: 26.  
 166: 25.  
 166,2-4: 24-25.  
 168,6: 25.  
 168,8: 25.  
 177,5-6 (= SH 259,5-6): 52.  
 177,13 (= SH 259,13): 23.  
 177,29 (= SH 259,29): 23.  
 177,35 (= SH 259,35): 23.  
 178: 38, 212, 231, 239-240.  
 178,4: 239.  
 178,5-22: 212.  
 178,6: 264.  
 178,6-7: 213.  
 178,8: 15.  
 178,9-10: 214, 217.  
 178,11: 213, 215.  
 178,11 sqq.: 213.  
 178,12: 215.  
 178,14: 215.  
 178,15-22: 217.  
 178,19: 214.  
 178,20: 216.  
 178,21: 215.  
 178,21-22: 216.  
*fragmenta* (Massimilla)  
 26-27 (= 24-25 Pf.): 26, 45.  
 39 (= 32 Pf.): 21.  
 58: 20.  
 64,18-25 (= 114,18-25 Pf.): 25.  
 120 (= 470 Pf.): 69.  
*fragmenta* (*Supplementum Hellenisticum*)  
 239: 41, 42.  
 239,8: 42.  
 239,9: 39.  
 239,13: 43.

- 252: 41, 57, 252.  
 253 (b): 41.  
 253,1: 51.  
 253,7: 42.  
 253,10-13: 42.  
 253,11: 40.  
 257,15 sqq.: 193.  
 257,20 sqq.: 193.  
 257,29: 52.  
 258,29: 52.  
 259,5 sqq.: 193, 195.  
 259,5-6 (= 177,5-6 Pf.): 52.  
 260A: 247.  
 260A,5-6: 197.  
 264,1-4 (= 57,1-4 Pf.): 199, 227.
- Epica et elegiaca minora, fragmenta* (Pfeiffer)  
 380: 102.  
 383 (= SH 254, *vict. Beren.*): 25, 52, 102, 130, 138-139, 193, 209,  
 240, 242, 246, 255, 265, 267-268.  
 383,2 (= SH 254,2): 254.  
 383,5-6 (= SH 254,5-6): 246.  
 383,9 (= SH 254,9): 26.  
 383,12-16 (= SH 254,12-16): 252.  
 383,14 (= SH 254,14): 26.  
 383,16 (= SH 254,16[30]): 249.  
 384 (*vict. Sosib.*): 14-15, 17, 138, 244, 246, 255, 260, 265, 267,  
 274.  
 384,15: 20.  
 384,23-24: 23.  
 384,24: 24, 53.  
 384,25-26: 258.  
 384,25-27: 256.  
 384,31-34: 257.  
 384,53-56: 259.  
 385-391: 17.  
 392 (*nupt. Ars.*): 254.
- Epigrammata* (Pfeiffer): 2, 5-6, 8, 11, 68, 99, 101, 137.  
 1: 129.  
 1-2: 100.  
 2: 103, 107.  
 [3]: 100, 105, 125.  
 5: 107-108, 124.  
 5-6: 100.

- 6: 104, 121.  
8: 124.  
9: 107.  
10: 107.  
11: 105, 107, 125.  
12: 107.  
13: 107.  
15: 107.  
16: 102, 107.  
18: 107.  
19: 102, 114.  
20: 107.  
21 (= 21 Wil. = *anthol. Pal.* 7,525): 17, 37, 44, 101, 113.  
21,1-2: 103.  
21,4: 17, 37.  
22: 107.  
23: 103.  
24: 107.  
27: 103-104, 121.  
28: 140.  
29: 108.  
30: 107.  
34: 107, 129.  
35 (= 35 Wil.): 17, 101, 113, 129.  
35,1: 16.  
35,2: 104.  
[36]: 100, 108, 112.  
37: 107.  
37-40: 100, 126.  
39: 107.  
41: 102.  
42: 103.  
45: 107.  
46: 56, 107.  
48: 55, 108.  
49: 107, 124.  
50: 108.  
51: 124.  
54: 108, 112, 125.  
55: 108.  
56: 124.  
57,1 (= *anthol. Pal.* 6,150): 248.  
60: 107.

- 61: 107. 101-10  
 62: 107. 101-10  
 [63]: 100. 101-10  
*fragmenta* (Pfeiffer) 101-10  
 393-402: 100. 101-10  
 395: 126. 101-10  
 398: 210. 101-10  
 399: 126. 101-10  
 399-402: 126. 101-10  
 401: 127-128. 101-10  
*Fragmenta grammatica* (Pfeiffer) 101-10  
 428: 105. 101-10  
 441: 111. 101-10  
 465: 215. 101-10  
*Fragmenta incertae sedis* (Pfeiffer) 101-10  
 470: 69. 101-10  
 470 b: 68. 101-10  
 471: 44. 101-10  
 479: 100. 101-10  
 497: 60. 101-10  
 506: 272, 274. 101-10  
 507: 14. 101-10  
 509: 3. 101-10  
 510: 22. 101-10  
 512: 274. 101-10  
 514: 24. 101-10  
 516: 100. 101-10  
 554: 100. 101-10  
 567: 22. 101-10  
 575: 22. 101-10  
 602: 53, 57. 101-10  
 602,3: 37. 101-10  
 620a: 273. 101-10  
 621: 100. 101-10  
 631 (= SH 297,7-8): 22. 101-10  
 632: 82. 101-10  
 633: 60. 101-10  
 635: 100. 101-10  
 637: 71. 101-10  
 650: 49. 101-10  
 655: 248. 101-10  
 665: 13. 101-10  
 691: 22. 101-10

- 715: 100.  
 716: 16.
- Fragmenta incerti auctoris* (Pfeiffer)  
 735: 22, 275.  
 742: 24.  
 756 (= *Hec.* fr. inc. 166 Hollis): 25.  
 760: 24.  
 761: 100.  
 767: 52.  
 771: 24.  
 782: 100.
- Hecale*: 3-5, 8, 14, 16-17, 20, 27, 31, 35, 46, 48-50, 69, 101, 137, 178, 231-233.
- fragmenta* (Hollis)  
 1 (= 230 Pf.): 17.  
 2,2: 46.  
 13 (= 345 Pf.): 15.  
 17,1: 51.  
 18,5 sq. (= 238,19 sq. Pf.): 195.  
 23,2 (= 238d,2 Pf.): 25.  
 24 (= 311 Pf.): 25.  
 26: 46.  
 36: 115.  
 41-42: 47.  
 47: 47.  
 47,10-11: 46-47.  
 48,3: 52.  
 49,10: 49.  
 72 (= 374 Pf. 1-2): 44.  
 74,22 sqq. (= 260,63 sqq. Pf.): 195.  
 77 (= 326 Pf.): 21.  
 78 (= 371 Pf.): 21.  
 80 (= 263 Pf.): 232.  
 82-83: 50.  
 116: 51.  
 134: 32.  
 147 (= 360 Pf.): 21.  
 156 *inc. sed.* (= 619 Pf.): 52.  
 166 *inc. sed.* (= 756 Pf.): 25.
- Hymni* (Pfeiffer): X-XI, 2, 5-6, 8, 11, 14, 16-17, 27, 49, 99, 101, 137-138, 143-187, 189, 277.
- 1 (*Zeus*): 153, 161, 165-170, 175, 184, 236-237, 265.  
 1,1-3: 169.

- 1,2: 170, 172. 001 : १८५  
 1,3: 170. १०१ : १८७  
 1,4-9: 170. (महात्मा) गांधी नवाज़ अंसरुल्ला  
 1,5-6: 172. १८८ : १८९  
 1,7: 172. १८९ : १९०  
 1,8: 170. १९० : १९१  
 1,11: 172. १९१ : १९२  
 1,23-27: 258. १९२ : १९३  
 1,44-45: 269. १९३ : १९४  
 1,57-65: 170. १९४ : १९५  
 1,65: 173. १९५ : १९६  
 1,85-90: 153. १९६-१९७, १९८-१९९, १९१, १९२, १९३, १९४, १९५, १९६, १९७  
 1,86: 168. १९७ : १९८  
 1,86-88: 235. (गिरिजा) नवाज़ अंसरुल्ला  
 1,87-88: 170. १९८ : १९९  
 1,92-93: 173. १९९ : २००  
 2 (*Apoll.*): 146-147, 149-150, 160, 162, 165-166, 178, 180, 237.  
 2,1-5: 154. १५१ : १५२  
 2,4: 154. १५१-१५२ प्र-१५२, १५३-१५४  
 2,4-5: 150. १५२-१५३ स.१५३-१५४  
 2,9: 152. १५३-१५४ १५४-१५५  
 2,20: 163. १५४-१५५ १५५-१५६  
 2,20-24: 153. १५५-१५६ १५६-१५७  
 2,21: 163. १५६-१५७ १५७-१५८  
 2,22-27: 162. १५७-१५८ १५८-१५९  
 2,25: 163. १५८-१५९ १५९-१६०  
 2,26-7: 153, 163. १५९-१६० १६०-१६१  
 2,27: 157. १६०-१६१ १६१-१६२  
 2,32: 155. १६१-१६२ १६२-१६३  
 2,34-35: 152, 162-163. १६२-१६३ १६३-१६४  
 2,42: 155. १६३-१६४ १६४-१६५  
 2,45-46: 154. १६४-१६५ १६५-१६६  
 2,47: 155. १६५-१६६ १६६-१६७  
 2,55: 155. १६६-१६७ १६७-१६८  
 2,59: 162. १६८-१६९ १६९-१७०  
 2,60-63: 161. १६९-१७० १७०-१७१  
 2,65: 155. १७०-१७१ १७१-१७२  
 2,65-96: 155. १७१-१७२ १७२-१७३  
 2,69-70: 152, 163. १७२-१७३ १७३-१७४  
 2,71-72: 156. १७३-१७४ १७४-१७५  
 2,75-76: 256. १७४-१७५ १७५-१७६  
 2,85-96: 154-155. १७५-१७६ १७६-१७७  
 2,97: 149. १७७-१७८ १७८-१७९

- 2,97-104: 155.  
2,100-104: 154.  
2,104: 150.  
2,105-112: 154.  
2,105-113: 151.  
2,106: 152.  
2,108-109: 152.  
2,108-110: 152.  
2,112: 215.  
2,166-7: 152.  
2,177-178: 152.  
3 (*Dian./Artem.*): 148, 150, 154, 161-162, 164-165, 175, 180-181,  
183, 231.  
3,1-2: 161.  
3,2-12: 274.  
3,6-9: 163.  
3,24-5: 164.  
3,121-37: 182.  
3,137-9: 163.  
3,140-169: 162.  
3,171: 258.  
3,250: 162.  
3,260-67: 161.  
4 (*Del.*): 150, 154, 165, 237, 255.  
4,1: 162.  
4,93: 22.  
4,206-208: 258.  
4,216-239: 165.  
4,228-9: 164.  
4,249-55: 150.  
4,263: 258.  
4,316-324: 148.  
5 (*Athen./Pall.*): 146-149, 154, 157, 159, 164, 177, 184-186.  
5,55-56: 158.  
5,56: 159.  
5,78: 229.  
6 (*Cer./Dem.*): 147-149, 154, 157, 159, 164, 184-186.  
6,17: 200.  
6,17-23: 158.  
6,18: 159.  
6,50-52: 49.  
6,73: 273.  
6,106: 25.

- 6,116-117: 46.  
 6,122: 49.  
 6,135: 52.
- Iambi* (Pfeiffer): 2, 4, 14, 16-17, 48, 138-139, 233.  
 1: 9.  
 2: 21, 49.  
 4: 48, 231.  
 5-7: 17.  
 6: 124.  
 13: 48.
- fragmenta* (Pfeiffer)  
 191: 210.  
 191,1 sqq.: 233.  
 191,30: 23.  
 191,33: 49.  
 191,61: 9.  
 192: 21, 49.  
 193: 14.  
 193,1 (= 342 Schn. [?] = *dieg.* VI 33): 14.  
 193,26: 23.  
 194,1: 48.  
 194,17: 26.  
 194,46: 49.  
 194,59: 200.  
 194,98-100: 23.  
 196: 274.  
 200a,1-3: 26.  
 202,42: 26.  
 202,49: 26.  
 202,59: 21.  
 203: 48.  
 203,38: 23.
- Lyrica, fragmenta* (Pfeiffer)  
 226-229: 14.  
 227,7: 23.  
 227,8: 28.  
 227-228: 17.  
 228: 15.  
 228,10: 23.  
 228,51: 23, 239.  
 229,4: 52.

*Diegeseis Callimachi*: 6, 9, 13-14, 16, 30, 233.

*dieg.* II 29 (= fr. 90 Pf.): 20.

*dieg.* VI 33 (= fr. 193,1): 14.

*dieg.* VI 22-23 (= fr. 192): 21.

*dieg.* XI 3-4: 50.

*Scholia ad Callimachum*

*schol. Flor.*: 77.

*schol. Flor.* (vol.I p.3 Pf.): 210.

*schol. Flor.* 5 *ad fr.* 1: 109.

*schol. Flor. ad fr.* 2 (vol.I p.11 Pf.): 15.

2, l. 16 (vol.I p.11 Pf.): 38.

2, l. 18 (vol.I p.11 Pf.): 27, 43.

2, l. 32 (vol.I p.13 Pf.): 38.

*schol. Flor. ad fr.* 6 (vol.I p.13 Pf.): 54.

*schol. Flor. ad fr.* 7, l. 35 sqq. (vol. I p.13 sqq. Pf.): 244.

*schol. Flor. ad fr.* 24-25, l. 52 (vol. I p.31 Pf.): 26.

*schol. Lond.* (vol.I p.3 Pf.): 56, 210.

*Testimonia* (Pfeiffer)

1 (*Hesychius Illustrus*): 16.

4 (= *Strabo* 17,3,21, p.837): 16.

23: 16.

24: 16, 100, 137.

25a: 27.

27: 15.

45: 68.

76 (= *Quint. inst.* 10,1,58): 16.

85: 27, 56.

## B. AUTEURS ET TEXTES ANTIQUES

Adaeus Mytilenaeus, *anthol. Pal.* 7,305,4: 21.

Aelianus, *nat. anim.* 11,8 (cl. 5,17): 22.

Aeschines: 66.

Aeschylus: 208-209.

*Ag.* 160-83: 175.

Agatharchides, *ap. Phot. bibl. cod.* 250, §63: 102.

Agis: 141, 244.

*Argolika:* 149, 178.

Alcaeus: 9.

Alcaeus Messenius, *anthol. Pal.* 9,588: 124.

Alcman, *PMG* 98: 167.

Alexander Aetolus: 275.

Ammonius: 69.

352 Nickau: 68.

Anacreon, *anthol. Pal.* 6,138: 111, 124.

Anecdota Graeca (Bachmann, I,228,35): 81.

Anthologia Palatina: 99-100, 102, 105, 117, 122, 138, 140.

5,53 (= 3 HE Gow & Page): 106.

5,181: 125.

5,193 (= 4 HE Gow & Page): 106.

5,215: 106.

6,135: 111, 124.

6,138: 111.

6,150: 248.

6,266: 106.

7,11: 121.

7,42: 15.

7,42,1: 40.

7,42,5-6: 239.

7,170 (= Posidippus 21 HE Gow & Page): 100.

7,305,4: 21.

7,320 (= Hegesippus 8 HE): 100.

7,344: 100.

7,344b: 100.

7,525 (= Call. *epigr.* 21 Pf.): 17, 37, 44.

9,67: 100.

9,149-150: 106.

9,359: 106.

- 9,391 (= Diotimus 8 *HE*): 100.  
 9,434: 104.  
 9,588: 124.  
 9,746-54: 123.  
 9,752: 123.  
 11,21: 106.  
 11,186: 123.  
 11,328: 106.  
 12,19: 106.  
 12,46: 120.  
 12,242: 106.  
 13: 100, 111, 124-125, 127.  
 13,16: 111, 124.  
 13,23: 127.  
 15,48,5: 214.  
 16,68: 124.
- Anthologia Planudea*: 100, 124.  
 101,3: 45.
- Schol. Bern. ad Plan.*: 100.
- Antimachus: 70, 210.
- Lyde*: 210.
- Antipater Sidonius: 104, 112, 118.  
 42 *HE* (= *Inscr. Délos* 2549): 112, 118.
- Antipater Thessalonicus, *anthol. Pal.* 9,149-150: 106.
- Antisthenes Paphius: 112.
- Apollodorus: 71.  
 2,1,4,6-7: 248.  
 2,5,9,14: 246.  
 2,5,11,6: 252.
- Ps.-Apollodorus, 1,9,25 sq.: 219.
- Apollonius Rhodius: 2, 27, 60, 64-65, 68, 71, 85-87, 91, 101, 218, 220, 230, 236.
- Argonautica*: 100, 217, 223, 231-232.  
 1,332 sqq.: 271.  
 1,402 sqq.: 222.  
 1,411 sqq.: 222.  
 1,414: 222.  
 1,1211-19: 45.  
 1,1214-1215: 45.  
 1,1217: 45.  
 1,1309: 220.  
 2,468 sqq.: 213.  
 2,669-719: 154.

- 2,679-80: 154.  
 2,759 sqq.: 213.  
 2,762 sqq.: 220.  
 2,771 sq.: 220.  
 3,446: 46.  
 3,633: 25.  
 3,1340 sqq.: 195.  
 4,212 sqq.: 219.  
 4,271-8: 252.  
 4,507 sqq.: 219.  
 4,588 sqq.: 222.  
 4,746: 50.  
 4,922 sqq.: 220.  
 4,982 sqq.: 220.  
 4,1170-1693: 219.  
 4,1206 sqq.: 219.  
 4,1216: 220-221.  
 4,1629-30: 52.  
 4,1629 sqq.: 195.  
 4,1694-1730: 217.  
 4,1701 sqq.: 222.  
 4,1730: 219.  
 4,1731-45: 251.  
 4,1734: 251.  
 4,1740-81: 251.  
*schol. ad* Apoll. Rh. 1,1309: 87, 220.  
 2,1052: 85.
- Aratus: 27, 49, 78-80, 82, 95, 100, 121.  
*phaenomena*: 78, 84, 104, 184.  
 4: 175.  
 21: 94.  
 26-44: 81, 84.  
 26 sqq.: 83.  
 27: 83.  
 28: 84-85.  
 28-29: 96.  
 42-44: 83.  
 43: 83.  
 132: 46.  
 134-135: 36.  
 226-7: 83.  
 299: 46.  
 637: 159.

- 945: 94.  
*Schol. ad Arat.*: 73, 80.  
*Schol. ad phaen.* 23 (p.68,15-69,6 Martin): 78.  
 28 (p.78,9 Martin): 81, 84-85.  
 254-55 (p.204,2-3 Martin): 81.
- Archibius: 102.  
 Archilochus: 72, 112.  
 Ariphon, *PMG* 813: 167.  
 Aristaenetus: 18-19, 57.  
 1,10,2 sq.: 214.  
 Aristarchus: 65, 67-68, 71-73, 75, 77, 80-82, 84-88, 93, 95-97, 225.  
 Aristonicus: 67, 69, 82.  
 Aristophanes Byzantinus: 63, 67, 71, 87, 95, 171.  
 Aristophanes comicus: 3, 229.  
*av.* 1122: 164.  
 1706-65: 204.  
 1731-42: 204.  
*nu.* 260: 193.  
 1366 sq.: 209.  
 1371 sqq.: 209.  
*ra.*: 207.  
*ra.* 492: 209.  
 799 sqq.: 208.  
 814: 209.  
 1365 sqq.: 208.  
 1398: 243.  
 1402-1403: 243.  
 1406: 243.
- Aristoteles  
*eth. Nic.* 3,1,17, 1111a: 228.  
*hymn. Aret.*: 180.  
*po.* 8, 1451a 16 sqq.: 210.
- Artemidorus: 65, 95.
- Asclepiades: 103, 106-107, 117, 121, 127.  
*anthol. Pal.* 5,181: 125.  
*anthol. Pal.* 7,11: 121.  
*anthol. Pal.* 9,752: 123.  
*anthol. Pal.* 12,46: 120.  
*anthol. Pal.* 16,68: 124.
- Asclepiades Myrleanus: 65, 85.
- Athenaeus: 2, 100, 124.  
 3,125c (= Callistr., *FGrHist* 348 F 3): 104, 112.  
 5,198b: 249.

- 10,436d, 442e (= frr. 79-80 Preller): 112.  
 10,456c (= Chamael. fr. 34 Wehrli): 112.  
 11,477 c: 15.  
 11,477 c-e: 215.  
 13,585b: 108.  
 14,656c (= Chamael. fr.33 Wehrli): 104.  
 15,668c: 23.  
 15,669b (= Call. *test.* 41 Pf.): 102.  
 15,692f-693c: 167.  
 Attalus: 80.
- B**abrius: 18.  
 75,11: 23.
- Bacchylides: 143.  
*dithyr.*: 186.  
 1,19 sqq.: 199.  
 1,112 sqq.: 199.  
 5,176 sqq.: 200.
- Berosus: 270.
- Boethus Sidonius: 80.
- C**aesius Bassus: 127.
- Callistratus  
 $\sigma\bar{\nu}\mu\mu\kappa\tau\alpha$ , *FGrHist* 348 F 3, *ap.* Athen. 3,125c: 104, 112.  
*Carmina Anacreonta* 17,10 (West 1993): 36.
- Catullus: 101, 127-128.  
 66,25 sq.: 205.  
 66,39 sqq.: 204.  
 66,77: 21.  
 66,93: 205.  
 68,8: 205.
- Catulus: 102.  
*fr.* 1 Courtney (= p. 43 Morel): 103.
- Chamaeleon  
*de Simonide*, *fr.* 33 Wehrli (= Athen. 14,656c): 104.  
*fr.* 34 Wehrli (= Athen.10,456c): 112.
- Chares: 81, 85.
- Choerilus Samius  
*Persica*: 208.  
*SH* 317,1: 46.
- Christodorus: 19.
- Cicero  
*Archia* 8: 104.

*de orat.* 3,194: 104.

*Tusc.* 1,84: 103.

Cinna, *fr.* 11 Courtney (= Morel): 103.

Cleanthes, *hymn. Zeus*: 175, 180, 184.

Clemens Alexandrinus: 2.

Cornelius Gallus: 127.

Crates: 80-81.

*anthol. Pal.* 9,359 (Plato comicus?, Posidippus?): 106.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus: 57.

**D**amascius, *phil. hist.* 108: 28.

Demetrius Chlorus: 70.

Demosthenes: 66.

Dercylus: 141, 244.

*Argolika*: 149, 178.

Didymus: 66-67, 70.

Dinarchus: 66.

Diodorus Siculus: 253.

1,28,2 (= Hecat. Abder., *FGrHist* 264 F 25,8,2): 251.

1,85,5 (= Hecat. Abder., *FGrHist* 264 F 25,85,5): 254, 267.

1,88,4-6: 254.

3,67,2: 245.

Diogenes Laertius: 100, 127, 129.

1,39: 127.

1,63: 127.

Dionysius Periegeta: 53.

*lithica*: 47.

Dionysius Scytobrachion: 184.

Dionysius Thrax, *techne* 1: 67.

Dioscorides: 103.

*anthol. Pal.* 5,53 (= 3 HE Gow & Page): 106.

5,193 (= 4 HE Gow & Page): 106.

Dioscorus Aphroditous: 57.

Diphilus, *fr.* 59 *PCG* V 86: 75.

**E**nnius: 27, 39, 42.

*ann. lib.* 1: 39-40.

*ann. lib.* 7: 39.

*ann.* 206-210 (Skutsch): 39.

209: 39.

211-212: 40.

Eratosthenes: 239.

- Etymologica*: 51.
- Etymologicum Genuinum*: 11-12, 68, 272.
- A-B: 14.
- Etym. Gen.* 551 (= *Etym.M.* 960 [72,12 Gaisford] = vol. I 342-343 Lasserre-Livadaras): 68.
- Etym. Gen.* I p.342 Lasserre-Livadaras (Call. test. 45 Pf.): 68, 102.
- Etymologicum Gudianum*: 21.
- Etym. Gud.* d ad fr. 514 Pf.: 24.
- Etymologicum Magnum*: 2.
- Etym. M.* 358,24 Gaisford: 81.
- Eubulus, fr. 94,2 (= *PCG* 93,3): 167.
- Eudoxus: 244.
- Euphorion: 70-71.
- fr. 75 Powell: 46.
- Euripides: 12, 208-209.
- Archel.* prol.: 248.
- Ba.* 347: 104.
- Bellerophon* fr. 296: 214.
- Cycl.* 104: 193.
- Hel.*: 243.
- Hel.* 4-5: 246.
- 1478-94: 242.
- Herc. f.*: 231.
- Herc. f.* 637-700: 209, 230.
- 637 sqq.: 209, 230.
- 655 sqq.: 209.
- 673 sqq.: 209.
- 680 sq.: 209.
- 687 sqq.: 209.
- 698 sqq.: 209.
- Telephus* fr. 149,11 sq. Austin (= fr. 727c,11 sq. K in Collard-Cropp Lee = II,11 sq. Diggle): 214.
- Tr.* 884-8: 173.
- Eustathius: 3, 19, 21, 40.
- ad *Il.*: 12.
- ad *Od.*: 12.
- ad *Od.* 14,212 [p.1759,27]: 14.
- F**ronto, *epist. ad M. Caes.* 1,4,7: 37-38.
- FGE* (= *Further Greek Epigrams*)
- pp. 11-123 (*sylloge Simonidea*): 111.
- p. 252: 112.
- pp. 336-337: 104.

**GP** (= *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip*)  
II,72 sq.: 106.

Gregorius Nazianzenus: 18-19, 36, 39, 53, 56, 278.

*anthologia Palatina*

8,125,1: 43.

8,152,3: 44.

*Patrologia Graeca*

35 col. 545: 46.

35 col. 636 (or. 4): 37.

35 col. 640 (or. 4): 37, 44-45.

35 col. 661: 45.

35 col. 1194: 45.

36 col. 592: 46.

36 col. 617: 45.

37 col. 105,18: 44.

37 col. 471,14: 43-44.

37 col. 471,15-16: 44.

37 col. 515,10: 43.

37 col. 576,715: 46.

37 col. 582,50: 43.

37 col. 591,167: 44.

37 col. 602,302: 46.

37 col. 604,333: 46.

37 col. 616,485-486: 46.

37 col. 675,99: 45.

37 col. 765,32: 46.

37 col. 774,118: 43.

37 col. 904,272: 45.

37 col. 907,309-10: 46.

37 col. 1001,425: 44.

37 col. 1156,1806: 44.

37 col. 1234,87: 43.

37 col. 1277,72: 43.

37 col. 1312-1313,71-82: 47.

37 col. 1335,82-3: 48.

37 col. 1339,1-2: 48.

37 col. 1340,15-19: 48.

37 col. 1343-1344,60-65: 49.

37 col. 1369,229: 46.

37 col. 1386,13-14: 44.

37 col. 1392,95: 43.

37 col. 1409,8-9: 43.

37 col. 1410,16: 44.

- 37 col. 1433,6: 45.  
 37 col. 1459,111: 44.  
 37 col. 1474,324: 43.  
 37 col. 1494,198-199: 46.  
 37 col. 1519,177: 44.  
 37 col. 1519,184: 43.  
 37 col. 1537,215: 44.  
 37 col. 1573,278: 45.  
 37 col. 1575,304: 44.  
 38 col. 88,2: 46.  
 38 col. 122,3: 46.  
 38 col. 400: 45.

- H**ecataeus Abderita: 184, 238, 244, 253, 264-265.  
*FGrHist* 264 F 25,28,2 (= Diod. Sic. 1,28,2): 251.  
*FGrHist* 264 F 25,85,5 (= Diod. Sic. 1,85,5): 254.
- Hedylus Samius: 68-69, 102, 106, 117.  
 3 *HE*: 108.  
 4 *HE*: 124.
- Hegesippus: 121.  
*anthol. Pal.* 6,266: 106.
- Heraclides Milesius: 14.
- Ps.-Heraclitus, *probl.* 41,5: 174.
- Herennius Philo: 69.  
 132 p.202 Palmieri: 68.
- Herodas 3: 55.
- Herodianus: 82.
- Herodotus: 67, 74, 96, 141, 184, 238, 244-245, 253, 263-264, 267.  
*hist.*: 244.  
 1,189: 258.  
 2,28: 257.  
 2,35: 236.  
 2,41,2: 247.  
 2,45: 254.  
 2,79: 243-244, 268.  
 2,91: 248.  
 2,105: 251.  
 2,113-120: 242.  
 2,153: 250.  
 3,103-5: 251.  
 7,228,3: 110.
- Hesiodus: 36-37, 72, 180, 229, 239, 248, 277.  
*fr.* 62: 196.

- fr.* 128 M.-W.: 248.  
*fr.* 198,3: 193.  
*op.* 197 sqq.: 36.  
225-47: 182.  
286 sqq.: 207.  
345: 25.  
*scut.* 388: 83.  
*theog.*: 167, 169, 171.  
1: 207.  
22-28: 173.  
35: 200.  
80-103: 168.  
81 sqq.: 207.  
82: 42.  
94-103: 153.  
96 sqq.: 207.  
734: 205.  
820: 170.  
901-6: 171.
- Hesychius (Latte): 19, 35, 49, 51.  
 $\alpha\text{-o}$ : 12.  
 $\alpha$  4132: 51.  
 $\alpha$  5073: 52.  
 $\alpha$  8709: 52.  
 $\delta$  2570: 52.  
 $\varepsilon$  1579: 53.  
 $\varepsilon$  5376: 52.  
 $\eta$  19: 52.  
 $\times$  2752: 52-53.  
 $\pi$  157: 53.  
 $\pi$  158: 53.  
 $\pi$  1304: 53.
- Hipparchus: 80, 96.  
Hipponax: 210, 233.  
Ps.-Hipponax, *fr.* 216 Degani<sup>2</sup>: 20.  
Homerus: X, 28, 36, 60, 63, 69, 71-74, 81-87, 93, 95, 110, 140, 166, 180, 208, 210, 221.  
*hymni*: 143-144, 146, 148, 152, 157, 167-168, 173, 179, 184-186, 277.  
1 (*Dion. frg.*): 173, 177.  
1-7: 172.  
8-9: 172.  
2 (*Dem.*): 159, 173.  
3 (*Apoll.*): 144, 150, 153, 161, 173.

- 3,1-13: 162.  
 3,1-181: 150.  
 3,2: 154.  
 3,16: 164.  
 3,19-27: 158.  
 3,131: 152.  
 3,165-177: 151.  
 3,169-176: 158.  
 3,173: 151.  
 3,182-206: 152.  
 5,168 sq.: 195.  
 6,3 sqq.: 206.  
 6,14 sq.: 206.  
 9 (*Artem.*): 161.  
 19 (*Dion.*): 161.  
 19,37: 193.  
 23 (*Zeus*): 167.  
 27 (*Artem.*): 161.  
 II: 168, 220, 238.  
 1,27: 21.  
 1,492: 206.  
 2,156-168: 62.  
 3,3 sqq.: 207.  
 3,3-6: 242.  
 4,243 sqq.: 195.  
 8,37 (= 8,468): 51.  
 8,68 sqq.: 207.  
 9,15: 83.  
 9,311: 207.  
 11,62: 52.  
 11,86 sqq.: 195.  
 11,113 sqq.: 195.  
 12,34 sq.: 220-221.  
 12,176: 200.  
 13,547: 83.  
 14,33: 104.  
 14,294-296: 203.  
 14,296: 229.  
 15,187-193: 173.  
 15,191-3: 174.  
 16,779 sq.: 195.  
 17,676: 83.  
 18,487: 83.

- 18,487-489: 82.  
 18,488: 83.  
 19,90: 206.  
 20,498: 205.  
 22,29: 83.  
 22,208 sqq.: 207.  
 23,436: 214.  
 23,636: 196.  
 24,602-17: 163.  
*Od.*: 212, 220, 231, 238.  
 1,1: 193.  
 1,408 sq.: 214.  
 2,50: 35, 71.  
 2,136-137: 70.  
 2,269 sqq.: 271.  
 3,82: 214.  
 3,102 sqq.: 213.  
 4,220 sq.: 216.  
 4,265 sqq.: 213.  
 4,354-5: 246.  
 4,384-94: 246.  
 4,519 sqq.: 271.  
 5,273-275: 82.  
 5,468: 52.  
 8,57 sqq.: 213.  
 8,499-502: 219.  
 8,520: 205.  
 9: 216.  
 9,12 sq.: 216.  
 9,275 sq.: 198.  
 9,346: 215.  
 9,353: 215.  
 9,361 sqq.: 216.  
 9,371 sqq.: 215.  
 11,290: 197.  
 11,296: 197.  
 12,70: 220.  
 12,439 sqq.: 195.  
 13,121: 205.  
 13,325 sq.: 213.  
 14,5 sqq.: 193.  
 14,10: 193.  
 14,17 sqq.: 193.

- 14,37 sqq.: 193.  
 14,55 sqq.: 193.  
 14,68: 193.  
 14,78 (=16,52): 215.  
 14,80 sqq.: 193.  
 16,52 (= 14,78): 215.  
 17,217 sq.: 214.  
 17,220: 214.  
 17,222: 214.  
 17,225: 81.  
 17,228: 214.  
 18,74: 81.  
 21,293 sq.: 215.  
 23,218-224: 69.  
*Scholia ad Homerum*: 173.  
*schol. ad Il.*: 4, 12, 82-84.  
 2,156-169: 62-63.  
 2,161 $\alpha$ : 63.  
 2,783 (= *POxy* 1086): 72.  
 12,34: 87.  
 14,294-296: 203.  
 18,487-489: 82, 84.  
 18,488: 83.  
 18,488 b: 83.  
 18,488 c: 84.  
 23,79, vol. V p.380 Erbse: 36.  
 23,679 $\alpha$ : 72.  
*schol. ad Od.*: 12.  
 2,50: 35, 71.  
 5,273: 82.  
 17,225: 81.  
 18,74: 81.  
 23,218: 69.  
 Horatius: 171.  
   *carm.* 3,1,6-7: 170.  
   3,2,27-29: 46.  
   3,6,41 sqq.: 195.  
   4,3,1-2: 42.  
   *epist.* 2,2,51-52: 39.  
 Hyginus: 5.  
   *astr.* 2,24: 205.  
   *fab.* 191: 197.  
 Hyperides: 66.

***IEG*** (= *Iambi et elegi Graeci*)

adesp. eleg. 27, II p.12: 104.

*Inscriptiones*

Bernard no. 112: 104.

***CEG*** (= *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*)

I 66: 115.

I 313: 111.

I 393: 130.

I 399: 130.

II 532: 113.

II 533: 115.

II 548: 115.

II 648: 115.

II 656: 112.

II 674: 112.

II 819: 112.

II 819,13: 118.

II 820: 111.

***GVI*** (= *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*)

102: 128.

112 (= Bernard no. 92 = Véritlac no. 6): 115.

286-301: 115.

298: 115.

314: 115.

661: 102, 114.

971,1: 27.

1751 (= *TAM* III 689): 115.1924,52-3 (= *IG* XIV 2012): 103.

2036,11-12: 103.

*Inscr. Délos* 2549 (= Antipater Sid. 42 *HE*): 112, 118.***IG*** (= *Inscriptiones Graecae*)IV<sup>2</sup> I 121,2 A 7 sqq.: 113.IV<sup>2</sup> I 123,123 sqq.: 113.IX<sup>2</sup> I 17,24: 103.***IGUR*** (= *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*)

III (1979), p. 189: 103.

***SEG*** (= *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*)

39,1334: 128.

***SGO*** (= *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*)

II p.136: 102.

II 09,01,03: 114.

Ion Chius: 117.

*CEG* II 819,13: 118.

- Ion Samius: 112.  
 Isaeus: 66.  
 Isidorus  
     *hymn. Is.*: 180.  
     *hymn. Is.* 2: 150.  
     *hymn. Is.* 4: 150.  
 Isocrates: 66.  
**L**exicon Ambrosianum: 12, 35.  
 Libanius, *epist.* 217,6 (vol.10, p.199 Foerster): 54.  
 Lycophron: 36, 49, 71, 246.  
     *Alex.* 2-3: 50.  
     575: 258.  
     848: 256.  
     1312: 251.  
**M**acho 433: 108.  
 Macrobius, *Sat.* 7,1,18: 216.  
 Manetho: 244, 270.  
 Marianus: 16, 100-102, 137-138.  
 Martialis: 27, 104, 106-107.  
     1,2,1: 101.  
     1,3,2: 101.  
     1,10,1: 106.  
     4,23 (= Call. *test.* 75 Pf.): 102.  
     6,60,2: 101.  
 Meleager: 100-101, 109, 112, 115, 125, 127.  
     *anthol. Pal.* 5,215: 106.  
 Menander: 12, 27.  
 Michael Choniates (Lambros): 19, 36, 48.  
     I p.14: 36.  
     I p.81: 36.  
     I p.113,11: 50.  
     I p.206,10-11: 49.  
     I p.210,24: 49.  
     I p.232: 37.  
     I p.283,3-4: 51.  
     I p.284,21-24: 51.  
     I pp.286-287: 40.  
     I p.319,7-9: 50.  
     I p.346,14-15: 51.  
     I p.349,22-2: 49.  
     II p.208,25-26: 49.  
     II p.249,10-11; 16: 51.

- II p.281,1 sqq.: 50.  
 II p.341,7: 50.  
 II p.350,12-13: 49.  
 II p.353,24: 49.  
*Theano*: 50.  
 325-6: 50.  
**Mimnermus**: 210.  
**Mnasalkes**: 121.
- N**aevius: 40.  
**Nicander**: 70-71.  
*alexiph.*: 101.  
*theriaca*: 100-101.  
 265: 46.  
 319: 52.  
 449: 53.  
**Nicarchus**: 122.  
*anthol. Pal.* 11,328: 106.  
**Nicias Mallotes**, *FGrHist* 60: 69.  
**Nicolaus Damascenus**, *FGrHist* 90 F 52: 26.  
**Nonnus Panopolitanus**: 18, 53-54, 56.  
*Dion.* 18,266: 170.
- O**ppianus Anazarbensis: 18.  
**Oppianus Apameensis**: 18.  
*Orphica*: 180.  
**Ovidius**: 144.  
*ars* 1,647-52: 253.  
*Ibis*: 15.  
*met.* 11,90sqq.: 197.  
*Scholia ad Ovidium*  
*schol. ad Ib.*: 12-13.  
*schol. ad Ib.* 475: 198.
- P**apyri  
*BGU* (= *Berliner griechische Urkunden*)  
 IV: 109.  
*BKT* (= *Berliner Klassikertexte*)  
 V (II) p. 62: 104.  
 V I p.75: 101.  
*CPF* (= *Corpus papiri filosofici*)  
 I 1\*\*\* 85, pp. 636-638 (= *PSI* inv. 2408 = *CNR* 71-77 [*LDAB* 1998. 1056]): 271.

- CPR* (= *Corpus papyrorum Rainieri*)  
XVIII p.1: 109, 118-119.
- PSI* (= *Papiri greci e latini*)  
1216: 17.  
1219 fr. 1,1-15: 16.  
inv. 3191 (= *CNR* 80): 13, 271.  
*verso, fr. A I* 8: 274-275.  
*verso, fr. A I* 11-13: 274.  
*verso, fr. A I* 21: 274.  
*verso, fr. A II* 2: 274.  
*verso, fr. A II* 2-3: 275.  
*verso, fr. A II* 4-6: 274.  
*verso, fr. A II* 6: 275.  
*verso, fr. A II* 9-10: 275.  
*verso, fr. A II* 12: 273, 274.  
*verso, fr. A II* 15: 275.  
*verso, fr. A II* 17: 273, 274.  
*verso, fr. B* 7: 272, 274.  
*verso, fr. D+E+F+G* 3: 275.  
*verso, fr. D+E+F+G* 4-5: 274-275.  
*verso, fr. D+E+F+G* 7: 275.  
*verso, fr. D+E+F+G* 9-10: 275.  
inv. 3192 (= *CNR* 81 [*LDAB* 1998.4300]): 271.
- Od. 4* (= *PSI* inv.3774 = *CNR* 69 [*LDAB* 1998.1356]): 271.
- Od. 5* (= *PSI* inv.3772 = *CNR* 66-7 [*LDAB* 1998.1446]): 271.
- XV 1476 (= Bartoletti 1-14): 271.
- XV 1478 (= Manfredi 1-7 = *PSI* inv. 2418 = *CNR* 78 [*LDAB* 1998.294]): 271.
- PAmb.* 12: 67, 96.
- PBerol.* inv. 11629: 2.
- PBerol.* inv. 13417: 2, 17.
- PCairoZen.* IV 59,532 (= *SH* 977): 104.
- PDidot:* 97, 109, 124.
- PGuéraud-Jouguet:* 97, 109.
- PHeid.* I 190: 105.
- PKöln* 204: 106.
- PKöln V* 204: 121.
- PLille* (= *SH* 254-265): 76-77, 93, 96-97.  
v. 2 & 9: 77.
- PLouvre* inv. 7733 *verso* (= *SH* 983-984): 74, 96-97.  
vv. 5-6: 75.  
rr.25-29 ; 30-39 ; 40-41 sqq.: 75.
- PMil. Vogl.* I 18: 13.

- col. I 3: 13.  
 col. VI: 16.  
 col. VI 33 (= fr. 193,1 Pf.): 13.  
*PMil. Vogl.* VIII 309: 99-101, 105, 109, 111, 113, 116-118, 120,  
 122-123, 128, 130, 138-139, 141.  
 I: 116.  
 I 1- III 7: 123.  
 I 14: 123.  
 I 20-23: 104.  
 I 36: 123.  
 II 3: 123.  
 II 39: 123.  
 III 28: 125.  
 IV-V: 116.  
 IV 8- VI 8: 123.  
 IV 8 sqq.: 105.  
 IV 14: 105.  
 IV 20: 105.  
 IV 30: 123.  
 IV 36: 105.  
 IV 40: 105.  
 V 6: 123.  
 V 12: 105.  
 V 16: 123.  
 V 20: 105, 123.  
 V 26: 123.  
 V 32: 123.  
 VI 1: 105, 123.  
 VI 1-4: 104.  
 VI 5: 123.  
 VI 10- VII 8: 123.  
 VI 30: 108.  
 X 8- XI 19: 124.  
 XI: 116.  
 XI 20- XIV 1: 15.  
 XI 21- XIV 1: 124.  
 XI 33: 125.  
 XII 20: 125.  
 XII 20- XIII 14: 124.  
 XII 34-39: 130, 139.  
 XIII 31-4: 111.  
 XIII 31- XIV 1: 124.  
 XIV 28: 108.

- XIV 29- XV 22: 125.  
 XIV 30-37: 113.  
 XIV 38- XV 2: 113.  
 XV 11-14: 113.  
 XV 24-27: 105.  
 XV 24- XVI 17: 125.  
*PMil. Vogl.* [IX] 320-4: 116.  
*PMil. Vogl.* inv. 28b: 13.  
*PMil. Vogl.* inv. 1006: 13.  
*POxy.* IV 662 (= *PLitLond* 62): 101, 121.  
*POxy.* 1011: 6, 14, 16, 30.  
 fol. I: 17.  
 fol. I(→) 78: 13.  
 fol. II↓: 16.  
 fol. II↓ 81-90: 17.  
*POxy.* 1086 (= *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 2,783): 72.  
*POxy.* 1362: 17.  
*POxy.* 1793: 24.  
*POxy.* 1793 coll. I-V ; VI-X: 17.  
*POxy.* 2170-2173: 9.  
*POxy.* 2171-2172: 17.  
*POxy.* 2210: 17.  
*POxy.* 2212: 17, 30.  
*POxy.* 2213: 25.  
*POxy.* 2216: 51.  
*POxy.* 2258: 14, 17, 24, 76.  
*POxy.* 2258A: 178.  
*POxy.* 2433: 111.  
*POxy.* 2463: 35.  
*POxy.* XLVII 3324: 121.  
*POxy.* 3328: 274.  
*POxy.* 3723: 128.  
*POxy.* LIV 3724: 121-122.  
*POxy.* LIV 3725: 121.  
*POxy.* 3726: 104.  
*POxy.* LXIII pp. 2-3: 129.  
*POxy.* LXVI 4501-2: 121.  
*POxy.* 4502, vv. 9-10: 106.  
*PPetrie* F134: 105, 120, 128.  
*PSorbonne* Inv. 2248: 51.  
*PTebt* I 3: 124.  
*PTebt* III 703,158: 115.  
*PVindob.* G 40611: 99-100, 105, 109, 118-120, 122, 125-126, 128.

- I 14: 120.  
 IV: 119.  
 V-VII: 119.  
 114: 108.  
*PRainerCent.* 47-49: 119.  
*Tabula Vindobonensis:* 14.  
 Parthenius, *fr.* 9 Lightfoot: 46.  
*fr.* 28: 46.  
 Paulus Silentarius, *S. Sophia* 757: 36.  
 768: 20.  
 Pausanias, 1,43,7: 245.  
 Persius: 40.  
*prol.* 2-3; 10-11: 39.  
 Phalaecus: 127.  
 Pherecydes: 160.  
*FGrHist* 3 F 33: 197.  
 Philicus: 126.  
 Philitas: 75, 210.  
 Philodemus: 121.  
 Photius, *bibl. cod.250*, §63: 102.  
 Pindarus: 3, 36, 72, 139, 143, 166, 177, 179-180, 200, 202, 207, 259.  
*fr.* 29 Sn.-M.: 171.  
*fr.* 30 M.: 171.  
*fr.* 89a Sn.-M.: 171.  
*fr.* 91 Maehler: 21.  
*fr.* 169a,36 Maehler: 25.  
*fr.* \*\*198a M.: 208.  
*hymni:* 186, 277.  
*hymn. Zeus:* 171, 177.  
*Nem.*  
 1: 268.  
 1,50: 25.  
 3,26 sqq.: 200.  
*Ol.*  
 1,52 sq.: 200.  
 9,35 sqq.: 200.  
 12: 130.  
*Pae.*: 186.  
 4,40-45: 199.  
 7b,10 sqq.: 140, 208.  
 20,14-15: 25.  
*Pyth.*  
 1: 168.

- 4: 156, 250, 256, 261.  
 4,8: 256.  
 4,9 sqq.: 232.  
 4,17-18: 256.  
 4,19-40: 250.  
 4,37: 251.  
 4,70 sqq.: 232.  
 4,224 sqq.: 227.  
 4,247-248: 200.  
 4,247 sqq.: 227.  
 4,249: 227.  
 4,255-7: 251.  
 5: 261.  
 5,71-81: 156.  
 9: 261.
- Plato: 229, 268.  
*Gorg.* 510b 2 sqq.: 214.  
*Ion* 534a 7 sqq.: 211.  
*leg.* 2,656 d-657 b: 244.  
*symp.* 195b 5: 214.
- Plato comicus, *anthol. Pal.* 9,359 (Posidippus?, Crates?): 106.
- Plautus  
*Stich.* 454-5: 105.  
*trin.* 207 sq.: 203.
- Plinius maior, *nat.* 37,4: 123.
- Plinius minor, *epist.* 4,3,3-4 (= Call. *test.* 77 Pf.): 102.
- Plutarchus, *Ant.* 70: 100.  
*I. et Osir.* 30, 362E-363A: 243.  
*quaest. conv.* 1,4, 614 B: 216.  
*quaest. Graec.* 37: 36.  
*Theseus* 14: 50.
- Ps.-Plutarchus: 51.
- PMG* (= *Poetae melici Graeci*)  
 98: 167.  
 813: 167.  
 884-886: 167.  
 917: 104.
- Polemo Iliacus: 112.
- Pompilius, p.51 Courtney: 39.
- Porphyrius Tyrius, *abst.* 3,16: 21.
- Posidippus: X, 103, 106, 109, 117-118, 128, 137-138.  
*anthol. Pal.* 9,359 (Plato comicus?, Crates?): 106.  
 8 HE: 108.

- 11-12 *HE*: 110, 118.  
 12-13 *HE*: 108, 124.  
*SH* 705: 125.  
*SH* 705,5: 118.  
*SH* 961 (Posidippi?): 106, 117.  
 cf. *PMil. Vogl.* VIII 309.
- P**ropertius: 47.  
 1,8,33 sqq.: 197.
- Q**uintilianus  
*inst.* 10,1,54: 68, 95.  
*inst.* 10,1,58 (= Call. *test.* 76 Pf.): 16.
- Q**uintus Smyrnaeus: 56.
- R**hianus: 275.
- S**appho: 146.  
 fr. 1 Voigt: 186.  
 fr. 16,1 sqq.: 196.
- Severianus Damascenus: 27, 56.
- Simonides: 100, 112, 124, 143.  
 fr. *eleg.* 22 (*hymn. Ach.*) West: 150.
- Solon, fr. 4,37: 182.
- Sophocles: 3, 72.  
*Ajax* 669-677: 206.  
*Ant.* 224: 164.  
 fr. 966a Radt: 75.  
*Trach.* 1278: 175.
- Sotades: 204.  
 fr. 1 Powell: 203.  
 fr. *inc.* 16 Powell: 203.
- Statius, *Theb.* 1,557-672: 245.
- Stephanus Byzantius: 254.
- Stobaeus: 3, 42.
- Strabo: 100.  
 14,1,21: 182.  
 17,3,21, p.837: 16.
- S**trato, *anthol. Pal.* 11,21: 106.
- S**uda: 4, 21, 35, 51, 247.  
 A 4105 (= Call. *test.* 44 Pf.): 102.  
 E 2269: 81.  
 K 227 (= Call. *test.* 1 Pf.): 102.  
 M 194 (= Call. *test.* 24 Pf.): 100, 102.  
 Z 74: 60.

- Sulpicius Maximus: 103.
- Supplementum Hellenisticum (= SH)*
- 12: 126.
  - 254-261: 102.
  - 254-265 (= *PLille*): 76.
  - 255, 2 & 9: 77.
  - 705,5: 118.
  - 711: 126.
  - 961: 106, 109, 117, 120, 125.
  - 978-979: 110.
  - 983: 102, 109.
  - 983-984 (*PLouvre inv. 7733 verso*): 74.
  - 985: 105, 109, 121.
- Synesius: 18, 38, 40, 43, 46, 48.
- de somn.* 4, *Opuscula* pp.150-151 Terzaghi: 37, 55.
  - Dion* 14, *Opuscula* p.270 Terzaghi: 37.
  - ep.* 5 (p.12 A. Garzya): 37.
  - 131 (p.225 A. Garzya): 37.
  - provid.* 2,5, *Opuscula* p.123 Terzaghi: 36.
  - Opuscula* pp. 123, 124, 180, 209 Terzaghi: 36.
- Theocritus: 3, 27, 69, 100-101, 127, 144, 180, 218, 230, 238.
- 1,72: 49.
  - 6: 176.
  - 11: 56, 176.
  - 14: 104, 176.
  - 15,64: 203.
  - 15,110: 169.
  - 17: 166, 168, 182.
  - 17,102: 269.
  - 17,130: 203.
  - 18,27: 49.
  - 22: 179.
  - 24(*Heracl.*): 236.
  - 24,36: 25.
  - 26: 157.
  - Ps.-Theocritus 8,53 sqq.: 197.
  - 25: 227.
  - Scholia ad Theocritum*
  - 15,64 (p.90 Dübner): 228.
- Theodoridas Syracusanus: 75.
- fr.* 743 *SH*: 76.
- Theodorus: 57.

Theon: 65-67, 69, 77, 80, 85, 94-95.

Thucydides: 67.

Tibullus: 249.

1,7: 269.

1,7,27-28: 250.

Tyrtaeus: 197.

*fr.* 12,1 sqq. West: 196.

*fr.* 12,4 West: 196.

*fr.* 12,6 West: 196.

Tzetzes, Ioannes: 117, 123.

Vergilius: 95.

*Aen.*: 238.

3,73-98: 154.

*ecl.*

4: 269.

9,51-52: 103.

*georg.*

1,387: 94.

3,115: 53.

3,312: 53.

Xenomedes: 140-141, 226, 244.

Xenophon

*Ages.* 9,6: 111.

*anab.* 3,2,22: 258.

Zenodotus: 59-64, 67, 80, 86-87, 93.

## C. AUTEURS MODERNES

- Acominato, M.: 27.  
Adler, A.: 35.  
Agosti, G.: 56.  
Albis, R.V.: 222.  
Allen, T.W.: 173.  
Andrews, N.: 242.  
Aphorop, M.J.: 88.  
Ardizzoni, A.: 220.  
Argentieri, L.: 103, 115, 132.  
Arnold, E.: 10.  
Arrighetti, G.: 12.  
Asper, M.: 152, 208.  
Athaniassidi, P.: 28.  
Austin, C.: 116, 132.
- Bacchielli, L.: 149.  
Bachmann, L.: 81.  
Bagnall, R.S.: 108, 132.  
Bain, D.: 105, 132.  
Barbantani, S.: 107-108, 130, 132.  
Barber, E.A.: 1, 10-11, 14, 20, 22.  
Barchiesi, A.: 144, 154, 171, 173.  
Barigazzi, A.: 208.  
Bartoletti, V.: 271.  
Bastianini, G.: 18, 105, 109, 116, 132.  
Benedetto, G.: 4, 6, 69, 88.  
Bentley, R.: 3, 5, 27-28.  
Bernard, E.: 104, 115, 132, 150.  
Bing, P.: 114, 161, 165, 167, 236-237, 258.  
Birt, Th.: 101, 132.  
Blanchard, A.: 116.  
Blomfield, C.J.: 3-4.  
Blümel, W.: 240.  
Blum, R.: 59, 88.  
Böckh, A.: 5.
- Boll, Fr.: 8-9.  
Borgeaud, Ph.: 249.  
Borgonovo, P.: 25.  
Bowman, A.: 270.  
Bowra, C.M.: 200.  
Braswell, B.K.: 200.  
Bremer, J.M.: 146.  
Bruneau, Ph.: 164.  
Buchwald, W.: 10.  
Bühler, W.: 6, 195.  
Buhl, M.-L.: 249.  
Bullock, A.W.: 17, 149, 159, 186, 190, 235.  
Burkert, W.: 155.  
Burton, A.: 254.
- Calame, C.: 143, 154.  
Calder III, W.M.: 7.  
Cambiano, G.: 28.  
Cameron, A.: X, 16, 18, 28, 37-38, 41-43, 66, 76-77, 88, 97, 100, 102, 104, 106, 115, 120-121, 125-126, 132, 147, 157, 166, 168, 203, 206, 210-211, 215, 228-229, 240, 254.  
Canfora, L.: 28.  
Cappelletto, P.: 25.  
Carrière, J.: 168.  
Cavallo, G.: 76.  
Clarysse, W.: 149, 270.  
Clauss, J.J.: 168, 236.  
Clay, J.: 168.  
Cobet, C.G.: IX, 4.  
Coco, L.: 99, 132.  
Collard, C.: 214.  
Colonna, G.: 27.  
Conte, G.B.: 190.

- Courtney, E.: 39.  
 Crusius, O.: 6, 28.
- D**'Alessio, G.B.: 25, 74, 84, 88, 99, 132, 223, 236, 240, 247, 254, 259.  
 Decreus, F.: 114, 132.  
 Del Fabbro, M.: 74, 77, 89.  
 Depew, M.: 143, 147-148, 158, 164-165, 171.  
 Diels, H.: 6.  
 Dilthey, A.K.: 5-6.  
 Di Marco, M.: 9.
- E**bert, J.: 124, 133.  
 Ecker, U.: 133.  
 Erbse, H.: 60, 72, 89, 111, 133.  
 Erler, M.: 182.  
 Ernesti, J.A.: 2, 4.
- F**abian, Kl.: 104, 133.  
 Fabing, S.: 113, 134.  
 Fabri [= Dacier], A.: 2-3.  
 Falivene, M.R.: 187.  
 Fantuzzi, M.: 86, 89, 149.  
 Ferrari, F.: 104, 133.  
 Foerster, R.: 54.  
 Fraenkel, Ed.: 24.  
 Fraenkel, H.: 195, 200.  
 Fraser, P.M.: 99, 102-103, 107, 115, 133.  
 Fritz, K.von: 7.  
 Führer, R.: 61, 64, 89.  
 Fuhrer, Th.: 130, 133, 143, 156, 159, 189, 255, 259.  
 Funghi, M.S.: 18.  
 Furley, W.D.: 146-147, 158.
- G**abathuler, M.: 121, 133.  
 Gallavotti, C.: 23.  
 Gallazzi, C.: 105, 109, 116, 132.  
 Gargiulo, T.: 207.  
 Gelzer, Th.: 235, 254.
- Gentili, B.: 104, 133.  
 Gerretzen, J.G.: 3.  
 Giesecking, K.: 213.  
 Girone, M.: 125, 133.  
 Goldhill, S.: 170.  
 Gow, A.S.F.: 60, 99-101, 126, 131, 203.  
 Graevius, J.G.: 3.  
 Graevius, Th.: 3.  
 Griffiths, A.: 172.  
 Gutzwiller, K.J.: 17, 101, 104, 115, 123, 133, 205.
- H**alliday, W.R.: 36, 173.  
 Hansen, P.A.: 131.  
 Harder, M.A.: 4, 19, 41-42, 145, 147, 168, 189, 211, 218, 221, 227, 251.  
 Hardie, A.: 104, 133, 144.  
 Harrauer, H.: 118, 120, 133.  
 Harvey, A.E.: 143.  
 Haslam, M.W.: 89, 145, 151, 162, 174.  
 Haug, W.: 213.  
 Hecker, A.: 4, 15, 31-32, 106, 134.  
 Helck, W.: 249.  
 Hemsterhuis, T.: 4.  
 Henrichs, A.: 157.  
 Hereward, D.: 26.  
 Herter, H.: 71.  
 Herzog, R.: 113, 125, 134.  
 Heyworth, S.J.: 170.  
 Hinds, St.: 144, 169, 191.  
 Hokwerda, H.: 19.  
 Hollis, A.S.: 14, 19, 21, 25, 195.  
 Hopkinson, H.: 46.  
 Hopkinson, N.: 99, 134, 149, 170, 186.  
 Hose, M.: 129, 131.  
 Hunter, R.L.: 144, 150, 154, 159-160, 164, 166-167, 169, 210, 212, 214-216.  
 Hutchinson, G.O.: 130, 139.

- Jacoby, F.: 33, 128, 134.  
 Jahn, O.: 5.  
 Janko, R.: 60, 89.
- Käppel, L.: 143.  
 Kaibel, G.: 6.  
 Kagarow, E.: 229.  
 Kannicht, R.: 213.  
 Kassel, R.: 105, 134.  
 Kerkhecker, A.: 14, 17, 21, 26, 109,  
     134, 145, 166, 190.  
 Kidd, D.: 78, 80-82, 89, 94, 159.  
 Kirstein, R.: 105, 139.  
 Kissel, W.: 39.  
 Knight, V.: 145.  
 Knox, P.: 41.  
 Köhnken, A.: 170, 218, 220.  
 Koenen, L.: 235-238, 241, 255,  
     258.  
 Kofler, W.: 156.  
 Koster, S.: 154.  
 Kozloff, A.P.: 113, 134.  
 Kramer, B.: 272.  
 Kristeva, J.: 190.  
 Kroll, W.: 70.  
 Krumbacher, K.: 28.  
 Krummen, E.: 156.  
 Kuhrt, A.: 270.
- Lanza, D.: 28.  
 La Penna, A.: 18.  
 Laronde, A.: 149.  
 Lasserre, F.: 74.  
 Lausberg, M.: 6.  
 Lefkowitz, M.R.: 156.  
 Lehnus, L.: 5, 12-13, 20-21, 28,  
     99-100, 102, 128, 134.  
 Lehrs, K.: 89.  
 Lévy, E.: 236.  
 Lichtheim, M.: 257-260.  
 Lightfoot, J.L.: 46.  
 Livrea, E.: 35, 50, 220.  
 Lloyd, A.B.: 245.
- Lloyd-Jones, H.: 14, 51, 117, 131.  
 Lobel, E.: 9-12, 17, 20, 23, 35.  
 Loraux, N.: 160.  
 Lossau, M.J.: 66.  
 Ludwich, A.: 62-63, 89.  
 Lüddecke, K.: 171.  
 Lührs, D.: 89.  
 Luppe, W.: 272.  
 Luzac, J.: 5.
- Maas, P.: 5-7, 9-11, 20-26, 28,  
     33, 232-233.  
 Maehler, H.: 67, 90, 199, 272.  
 Maltomini, F.: 105, 121, 134.  
 Manfredi, M.: 271.  
 Maniaci, M.: 116, 134.  
 Marcovich, M.: 74.  
 Martin, J.: 78, 80, 82, 90, 213.  
 Massimilla, G.: 14, 17, 26, 43, 69,  
     90.  
 Masson, O.: 11.  
 Matthaios, S.: 60, 90.  
 Meillier, C.: 76, 107, 134, 168, 183.  
 Meincke, W.: 167.  
 Meineke, A.: 5.  
 Mejer, J.: 127, 134.  
 Menci, G.: 271-273.  
 Mensching, E.: 7.  
 Mercier, J.: 18.  
 Merkelbach, R.: 131, 235-236, 240.  
 Meyer, D.: 227.  
 Miller, A.: 146.  
 Mineur, W.H.: 148, 237.  
 Mitten, D.G.: 113, 134.  
 Mommsen, Th.: 8.  
 Montanari, F.: 60, 63, 65, 67, 70-  
     71, 74, 86-87, 89-90, 102.  
 Mooney, G.W.: 220.  
 Morelli, A.M.: 127, 134.  
 Morelli, G.: 100, 135.  
 Moretti, L.: 131.  
 Most, G.W.: 4.  
 Müller, K.O.: 5.

- Munafò, P.F.: 134.  
 Murray, O.: 103, 135.
- N**aeke, A.F.: 5, 18.  
 Nagy, G.: 60, 90-91.  
 Nansius, F.: 18.  
 Nardelli, J.-F.: 60, 64, 91.  
 Newman, J.K.: 172, 174.  
 Nickau, K.: 62-63, 68-69, 80, 91.  
 Nicolai, R.: 155.  
 Nightingale, A.W.: 244.  
 Nisbet, R.G.M.: 269.  
 Nisetich, F.: 16.  
 Nock, A.D.: 36.
- O**ates, J.F.: 131.  
 Obbink, D.: 51, 57, 143, 171.
- P**aap, A.H.R.E.: 67.  
 Pace, N.: 12.  
 Page, D.L.: 36, 60, 131.  
 Palmieri, V.: 68-69.  
 Palumbo Stracca, B.M.: 100, 135.  
 Papanghelis, T.D.: 218.  
 Pardini, A.: 193.  
 Parsons, P.J.: 14-15, 51, 61-62, 68,  
     74-76, 91-92, 128, 131, 135,  
     252.  
 Pasquali, G.: 6, 91.  
 Pearson, L.: 67.  
 Peek, W.: 131.  
 Peremans, W.: 236.  
 Pestman, P.W.: 104, 135.  
 Petrarca, Fr.: 8.  
 Pfeiffer, R.: X, 1, 6-16, 18-28, 43-  
     44, 53-54, 57, 59-60, 67-69,  
     80, 91, 111, 135, 157, 170-171,  
     177, 205, 232-233, 249.  
 Pierson, J.: 18.  
 Pietsch, S.: 174.  
 Plassart, A.: 183.  
 Poethke, G.: 272.  
 Pontani, F.: 35, 71, 91, 207.
- Préaux, Cl.: 277.  
 Pretagostini, R.: 12, 203, 228.  
 Puelma, M.: 117, 129, 135.  
 Puglia, E.: 121, 135.
- R**ace, W.H.: 158.  
 Radt, S.L.: 5.  
 Rea, J.: 129.  
 Redondo, J.: 114, 135.  
 Regel, W.: 19.  
 Reinsch-Werner, H.: 167, 189, 197,  
     226.  
 Reitzenstein, R.: 106, 137.  
 Rengakos, A.: 60, 70-74, 86-87,  
     91-92, 215.  
 Regtuit, R.F.: 4, 145, 168, 189, 218,  
     227.  
 Richardson, N.: 144.  
 Riedweg, C.: 135.  
 Robert, L.: 26, 108, 135.  
 Rosén, H.B.: 67.  
 Rossi, L.: 100, 104, 111, 114, 126,  
     128, 135.  
 Ruhnkenius, D.: 4.  
 Rutherford, I.: 143, 147, 163-164,  
     167, 199, 208.
- S**bardella, L.: 74.  
 Schenkeveld, D.M.: 67, 92.  
 Schiano, C.: 80.  
 Schironi, F.: 70, 92.  
 Schmidt, M.: 61, 64, 66, 89, 92.  
 Schmitz, Th.A.: 247.  
 Schneider, O.: 2, 3, 5, 10.  
 Schoors, A.: 149.  
 Schwartz, Ed.: 6.  
 Schwinge, E.-R.: 211.  
 Selden, D.L.: 155, 163, 169, 236-  
     238, 241.  
 Severyns, A.: 72, 92.  
 Sherwin-White, S.: 270.  
 Sider, D.: 121, 135.  
 Sikes, E.E.: 173.

- Sisam, K.: 8.  
 Skutsch, O.: 39, 41.  
 Smiley, M.T.: 11, 20, 23, 156.  
 Smits, E.R.: 19.  
 Snell, B.: 171.  
 Spanheim, E.: 3.  
 Stagl, J.: 254.  
 Stauber, J.: 131.  
 Stefano [= Estienne], E.: 2.  
 Stegemann, V.: 9.  
 Steinby, E.M.: 103, 135.  
 Stephens, S.: 67, 168, 172, 237,  
     258.  
 Stinton, T.C.W.: 159.  
 Stuart, D.R.: 203.  
 Susemihl, F.: 70, 92.  
 Sutcliffe, P.: 8.  
 Swinnen, W.: 107, 136.
- T**erzaghi, N.: 36, 37.  
 Te Velde, H.: 243.  
 Thiel, H. van: 92.  
 Thomas, R.F.: 252.  
 Thompson, D.J.: 110, 136, 149,  
     270.  
 Tissoni, F.: 19.  
 Tittmann, J.A.H.: 4.  
 Tolkihn, J.: 69.  
 Traill, D.A.: 152.  
 Treu, M.: 10.  
 Trypanis, C.A.: 10, 20.  
 Tulli, M.: 12.  
 Turner, E.G.: 61-62, 76, 92.
- U**hrmeister, V.: 161.
- V**alckenaer, L.C.: 4-5, 69.  
 Valk, M. van der: 92.

- Vamvouri-Ruffy, M.: 187.  
 Van Minnen, P.: 13.  
 Van't Dack, E.: 235.  
 Véritac, A.-M.: 102-103, 114-115,  
     136.  
 Versnel, H.S.: 146.  
 Vestrheim, G.: 148, 174.  
 Vian, Fr.: 45.  
 Vitelli, G.: 9.  
 Volokhine, Y.: 249.  
 Vulcanio, B.: 2.
- W**akker, G.C.: 4, 145, 168, 189,  
     218, 227.  
 Warning, R.: 213.  
 Wassermann, F.: 235.  
 Waszink, J.H.: 39.  
 Weber, G.: 109, 136, 144, 238.  
 Welcker, Fr.G.: 5.  
 West, M.-L.: 36, 53, 61, 64, 92,  
     172, 200.  
 West, S.: 144.  
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U.von:  
     2, 5-6, 11, 14-15, 28, 33, 43,  
     56, 114, 136, 278.  
 Willems, H.: 149.  
 Williams, F.: 15, 28.  
 Wimmel, W.: 103, 136, 243.  
 Wirth, P.: 19.  
 Wissmann, J.: 110.  
 Woesthuis, M.M.: 19.  
 Wolff, G.: 270.  
 Wolff, H.-J.: 102, 136.  
 Wouters, A.: 120, 136.  
 Wyttenbach, D.: 4.

- Z**anker, G.: 238.  
 Zetzel, J.: 38, 240.

De la mi-février à la fin d'octobre, la Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique accueille pour des séjours d'étude de deux à quatre semaines comme hôtes des spécialistes des sciences de l'Antiquité. Pour une somme journalière modique, ils sont logés et nourris, et ont accès à une riche bibliothèque spécialisée. Les intéressés trouveront des informations et les conditions d'admission sur le site internet de la Fondation:

<http://fondationhardt.isuisse.com>







# DÉPOSITAIRES

## LIBRAIRIE DROZ S.A.

11, *rue Massot,*  
CH-1206 Genève  
Tél.: (+41-22) 346 66 66  
Fax: (+41-22) 347 23 91  
E-mail: droz@droz.org  
Web: www.droz.org

DR. RUDOLF HABELT GMBH,  
*Am Buchenhang 1, Postfach 150104,*  
D-53040 Bonn  
Telefon: (+49-228) 923 83-0  
Telefax: (+49-228) 923 83-6  
E-mail: info@habelt.de  
Internet: <http://www.habelt.de>  
*pour l'Allemagne et les régions  
de langue allemande*

# ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Les volumes I, III à V, VII, VIII, X, XI, XIX sont épuisés.

Volumes réimprimés en 1999:

- II (1956) L'INFLUENCE GRECQUE SUR LA POÉSIE LATINE DE CATULLE À OVIDE. *Six exposés et discussions par J. Bayet, A. Rostagni, V. Pöschl, Fr. Klingner, P. Boyancé, L.P. Wilkinson,*  
VI (1960) EURIPIDE. *Sept exposés et discussions par J.C. Kamerbeek, A. Rivier, H. Diller, A. Lesky, R.P. Winnington-Ingram, G. Zuntz, V. Martin.*  
XIII (1967) LES ORIGINES DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE ROMAINE. *Neuf exposés suivis de discussions par E. Gjerstad, F.E. Brown, P.J. Riis, J. Heurgon, E. Gabba, K. Hanell, A. Momigliano, A. Alföldi, F. Wieacker. Avec la participation de J.H. Waszink et D. van Berchem.*

Volume réimprimé en 2001 par les Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma:

- XXVII (1981) LE SACRIFICE DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ. *Huit exposés suivis de discussions par J.-P. Vernant, G.S. Kirk, W. Burkert, H.S. Versnel, A. Henrichs, G. Piccaluga, U.W. Scholz, R. Turcan. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Jean RUDHARDT et Olivier REVERDIN.*

Volumes disponibles:

- IX (1963) VARRON.  
XII (1966) PORPHYRE.  
XIV (1969) L'ÉPIGRAMME GRECQUE.  
XV (1970) LUCAIN.  
XVI (1970) MÉNANDRE.  
XVII (1972) ENNIUS.  
XVIII (1972) PSEUDEPIGRAPHA I.  
XX (1974) POLYBE.  
XXI (1975) DE JAMBlique à PROCLUS.  
XXII (1976) ALEXANDRE LE GRAND, IMAGE ET RÉALITÉ.  
XXIII (1977) CHRISTIANISME ET FORMES LITTÉRAIRES DE L'ANTIQUITÉ TARDIVE EN OCCIDENT.  
XXIV (1978) LUCRÈCE.  
XXV (1979) LE CLASSICISME À ROME AUX I<sup>er</sup>s SIÈCLES AVANT ET APRÈS J.-C.  
XXVI (1980) LES ÉTUDES CLASSIQUES AUX XIX<sup>e</sup> ET XX<sup>e</sup> SIÈCLES.  
XXVII (1982) ÉLOQUENCE ET RHÉTORIQUE CHEZ CICÉRON.  
XXIX (1983) SOPHOCLE.  
XXX (1984) LA FABLE.  
XXXI (1985) PINDARE.  
XXXII (1986) ASPECTS DE LA PHILOSOPHIE HELLENISTIQUE.  
XXXIII (1987) OPPOSITION ET RÉSISTANCES À L'EMPIRE D'AUGUSTE À TRAJAN.  
XXXIV (1989) L'ÉGLISE ET L'EMPIRE AU IV<sup>e</sup> SIÈCLE.  
XXXV (1990) HÉRODOTE ET LES PEUPLES NON GRECS.  
XXXVI (1991) SÉNÉQUE ET LA PROSE LATINE.  
XXXVII (1992) LE SANCTUAIRE GREC.  
XXXVIII (1993) ARISTOPHANE.  
XXXIX (1993) HORACE.  
XL (1994) LA PHILOLOGIE GRECQUE À L'ÉPOQUE HELLENISTIQUE ET ROMAINE.  
XLI (1996) PAUSANIAS HISTORIEN.  
XLII (1996) LES LITTÉRATURES TECHNIQUES DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ ROMAINE.  
XLIII (1997) MÉDECINE ET MORALE DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ.  
XLIV (1998) LA BIOGRAPHIE ANTIQUE.  
XLV (1999) HERMANN DIELS (1848-1922) ET LA SCIENCE DE L'ANTIQUITÉ.  
XLVI (2000) LA RÉVOLUTION ROMAINE APRÈS RONALD SYME. BILANS ET PERSPECTIVES *par F. Millar, J. Scheid, S. Demougin, M.A. Speidel, K.M. Girardet, T. Hoelscher, A. Wallace-Hadrill. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Adalberto Giovannini.*  
XLVII (2001) L'HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRE IMMANENTE DANS LA POÉSIE LATINE *par J.P. Schwindt, A. Kerckhecker, E.A. Schmidt, A. Deremetz, E. Fantham, S. Hinds, M. Citroni, A. Barchiesi. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Ernst A. Schmidt.*  
XLVIII (2002) CALLIMAQUE *par L. Lehnus, A.S. Hollis, F. Montanari, P.J. Parsons, T. Fuhrer, R. Hunter, M.A. Harder, S. Stephens. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Luigi LEHNUS et Franco MONTANARI.*  
XLIX (À paraître en 2003) GALIEN ET LA PHILOSOPHIE *par J. Barnes, R.J. Hankinson, V. Barras, M. Frede, T. Tillemans, D. Manetti, J. Jouanna, V. Boudon, G. Strohmaier. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Jacques Jouanna et Jonathan Barnes.*

ISBN 2-600-00748-2



9 782600 007481