The Programmatic Use of Rare Homeric Words in the Epigrams of Callimachus

by

Brian William Moss
B.A., University of Victoria, 2004

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Greek and Roman Studies

© Brian William Moss, 2006
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

The Programmatic Use of Rare Homeric Words in the Epigrams of Callimachus

by

Brian William Moss
B.A., University of Victoria, 2004

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Laurel M. Bowman, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Supervisor

Dr. Ingrid E. Holmberg, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Dr. Cedric A. Littlewood, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Dr. Iain M. Higgins, (Department of English)
Outside Member

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Laurel M. Bowman, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Supervisor

Dr. Ingrid E. Holmberg, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Dr. Cedric A. Littlewood, (Department of Greek and Roman Studies)
Departmental Member

Dr. Iain M. Higgins, (Department of English)
Outside Member

Abstract

This thesis examines the programmatic use of rare Homeric words in the epigrams of Callimachus. Particular interest is taken in *hapax legomena*, words that occur only once in the Homeric corpus. The initial task of the thesis is to establish context for the epigrams by placing Callimachus in his historical and cultural milieu. Then a detailed study of five key epigrams, 1, 2, 3, 34 and 54 Gow-Page (*AP* 12.102, 12.43, 12.150, 7.80 and 7.89), is undertaken. In each of these poems, Callimachus uses allusion to Homer in order to express his literary aesthetic. Callimachus explores ideas such as the tension between his role as both a scholar and a love poet, the concept of immortality through poetry, and the importance of originality and concision in the creation of poetry. These ideas are more than just themes in Callimachus' poetry; they also serve as programmatic statements for his epigrams.

Table of Contents

Title Page i

Supervisory Committee ii

Abstract iii

Table of Contents iv

Acknowledgments v

Epigraph vi

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: The Life and Times of Callimachus 3

Chapter 2: Callimachus and the Alexandrian Aesthetic 15

Chapter 3: The Hellenistic Literary Epigram 23

Chapter 4: On the Programme of Callimachus' *Epigrams*: Cohesion and Collection 33

Chapter 5: Hunting for Homer 49

Chapter 6: Against the Commonplace 54

Chapter 7: The Cures for Love 63

Chapter 8: For Heraclitus 71

Chapter 9: Marriage Advice 81

Conclusion 94

Bibliography 96

Acknowledgments

This work represents a year of engagement with the poetry of Callimachus and Homer. The experience has been one of the great journeys of my life, and I could not have reached the destination on my own. The greatest thanks and intellectual debt is owed to my supervisor, Dr. Laurel Bowman, without whose advice, both in scholarship and life, this work would not have been possible. To the other members of my committee, Dr. Ingrid Holmberg, Dr. Cedric Littlewood and Dr. Iain Higgins, many thanks are owed for their time and numerous helpful suggestions.

Thanks are due to the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada and the Department of Greek and Roman Studies at the University of Victoria for their generous financial support.

A special thank you to Tina, who started her M.A. with me, finished her M.A. with me and shared a few high-fives along the way. Thank you to my fellow graduate students: Leah, Liz, Sarah, Jamie, Milo, Gillian, Derek and Richard. You have all made the experience much more enjoyable. I would also like to thank my family for enduring years of declamations on ancient topics, my wonderful, beautiful and talented girlfriend Liz for putting up with me when no one else would and, finally, Katie the dog, *sine qua non*.

As usual, all errors are mine. Except perhaps for a few by Katie.

Callimachi manes et Chii sacra Homeri,
in uestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.

Introduction

Hellenistic poetry has a reputation for extreme erudition, and it has often been criticised for sacrificing art and emotion to learning. Callimachus is considered one of the most accomplished of Hellenistic poets, and his reputation and emulation through antiquity certainly signify his importance to succeeding generations of authors. He is also considered to be one of the most refined and punctilious poets of his generation. This style of writing has led many critics to dismiss his work as nothing more than exercises in learning, lacking human depths. Recently, several critics have begun to re-evaluate the poetry of Callimachus, and the study of Hellenistic literature in general has experienced a resurgence. I hope that this study will encourage readers to enjoy Callimachus, looking beyond obscure place names and abstruse mythical references, as it demonstrates how Callimachus provides meaning and context for his poetry by allusion to Homer.

Hapax legomena are, literally, words that occur only once. Callimachus, like many other Hellenistic authors, was intimately familiar with the work of Homer. Callimachus was well aware of Homeric diction, employing both common and rare words from the epic poet when it suited his needs. Some of these words became common in later usage, and are thus not significant when used by Callimachus. Others, however, are extremely rare in the Hellenistic period and in Callimachus' work. This thesis explores Homeric *hapax legomena*, and other rare Homeric words, in the *Epigrams* of Callimachus. Once identified, the relevant passages in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* are closely examined for ideas and themes that affect our reading of Callimachus' epigrams.[1]

This approach yields important insight not only into individual epigrams, but also into Callimachus' epigrams as a group and his overarching literary programme.

A programme is a prescribed plan. In the case of Callimachus, this plan is literary. In the epigrams discussed in this thesis, we see two major themes: love and death. These themes are different from Callimachus' programme in that they recur as motifs in his work, but do not necessarily direct his creative output. His poetic programme, on the other hand, is not necessarily presented in all of his work, but the aesthetic and literary preferences that his programme entails direct his poetic efforts. In the case of this thesis, I am interested in the manner in which Callimachus uses allusion to Homer in order to enunciate this poetic plan in the epigrams.

Before the poems can be approached, however, Callimachus and his work must be placed in their historical and literary context. Chapter One examines Callimachus' biography, touching on the relevant elements of his life that shaped his poetry. Chapter Two reviews the literary environment in which Callimachus worked, paying particular attention to the role of Alexandrian aesthetics in Hellenistic poetry. Chapter Three concludes the background discussion with an overview of the development of the Hellenistic literary epigram and its traditions. In Chapter Four, Callimachus' epigrams are directly addressed as a group with an investigation into programmatic themes in the poems. Chapters Five through Nine deal with individual epigrams that rely on Homeric allusion to fulfil their author's programmatic intentions.

[1] All translations are mine with the exception of Homer, translated by Richmond Lattimore.

Chapter 1: The Life and Times of Callimachus

Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα Καλλιμάχου με
ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὁ μέν ποτε πατρίδος ὅπλων
ἦρξεν, ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης.

You, whoever passes by this monument, know that I
am the son and father of Callimachus of Cyrene.
You must know them both: the one once led the soldiers
of his fatherland, and the other sang beyond envy.

- Callimachus *Ep.* 29

In the introduction to his book *Hellenistic Poetry*, Gregory Hutchinson has stern words for the aspiring scholar who would address Hellenistic literature by establishing its historical context:

> the character of the evidence, and of the literature and of other aspects of the time, seems to discourage attempts to approach the literature by constructing the period. Perhaps, indeed, the very notion of a unified period does not suit a time so heterogeneous and, one might think, so unconscious of itself.
>
> (9-10)

He concludes that our approach to Hellenistic literature "cannot be directed by the context of history" (10). If we abandon the contemporary setting, however, our interpretation of the texts will inevitably be sadly limited in meaning and scope. An understanding of the time, place and culture that produced any work, insofar as it can be ascertained, is essential for further literary study. This is, perhaps, nowhere so true as when discussing Hellenistic poetry. To deprive Apollonius of his context is to deprive him of the epic tradition, a rash technique that would negate so much of our

understanding of and appreciation for the *Argonautica*. Callimachus is no different from his junior contemporary. Should we encounter the immense learning of Callimachus' lines while ignoring his familiarity with the great library of Alexandria? No. Our biographical knowledge of Callimachus is limited and must always be sifted for truth, but it should not be rejected altogether. The poet and his work are a product of their time; these elements can not be divorced.

Therefore, before I begin my detailed analysis of his poetry, I consider it crucial to take a moment to briefly examine Callimachus' historical background. For the Hellenistic period I use the convenient and generally accepted dates from the death of Alexander in 323 BCE to the suicide of Cleopatra in 30 BCE. It was a period of expanded frontiers for Greek speakers, as Alexander had opened Greece to the cultural, social and political influences of Asia. It was into this new world that Callimachus was born.

Aside from terse comments found in scholia and later authors, the most complete account of Callimachus' life comes from the *Suda*:

> Callimachus, son of Battus and Mesatma, of Cyrene, grammarian, pupil of Hermacrates of Iasos, the grammarian, married the daughter of Euphraeus of Syracuse. His sister had a son, Callimachus the younger, author of an epic *On Islands*. He was so industrious that he wrote poems in every meter as well as a large number of prose works: the books he wrote add up in all to more than eight hundred. He lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Before his introduction to that king he was a teacher of grammar in Eleusis, a small suburb of Alexandria. He survived into the reign of Ptolemy named Euergetes and Olympiad 127, in the second year of which Ptolemy Euergetes began to reign.[1]

This entry is both late and unreliable, notably wrong in one element, and likely incorrect

in two others; on the other hand, it provides information we would otherwise be lacking.[2] Nonetheless, it provides us with a starting point for better understanding Callimachus' background. Despite Ferguson's assertion that "there is no reason to doubt the *Suda*'s statement that [Callimachus] spent a period grinding away at the work of school-teaching in the suburbs of the capital till such time as he was able to attract the emperor's attention",[3] several scholars consider this to be an unlikely occupation for someone of Callimachus' social rank, as the elementary schoolteacher was a very low position socially.[4] As Alan Booth has demonstrated, calling someone an elementary teacher was actually an insult in both the Greek and Roman periods. In addition, such accusations were usually false.[5] Given this evidence, it seems inappropriate that the grandson of a general (if Callimachus' *Ep*. 29 is to be believed) would be reduced to such an occupation. While the speaker in many of Callimachus' epigrams professes to poverty, these revelations invariably occur in amatory poems, where poets often lack money, having spent it all on gifts for their lovers, and are now left with nothing more to offer than their verse.[6] Nonetheless, some scholars have attempted to read biographical detail into such poetic tropes, suggesting that these claims of poverty reflect his family falling on hard times, or that Callimachus was attempting to make his own way in Alexandria, without the aid of his family.[7] With this example, we can see the difficulties and great dangers of attempting to extrapolate biographical details from a poet's work. Certainly in a poet as learned in the themes and tropes of classical literature, any self-revealing "fact" must be approached with extreme caution. Even when cross-referenced with other biographical data, we must still be wary, as ancient biographers were often guilty of constructing their lives by relying on literary evidence.[8]

As stated in the *Suda* and elsewhere, Callimachus appears to have been born in Cyrene, a town described by Ferguson as being "uneasily in the Egyptian sphere of influence" due to hostile relations between their respective rulers (23). Estimates of his birthdate range from 320 to 310 BCE, and there is little evidence to suggest a more accurate date. His death is usually placed around 235 BCE, meaning that he lived to at least seventy-five and perhaps even longer.[9] Most of this life was spent in the cultural Mecca of the Hellenistic period, Alexandria. The city excelled in size and intellectual vigour, one anonymous ancient writer stating that "'the other cities are cities in relation to the surrounding countryside, but villages in relation to Alexandria, which is the city of the world.'"[10] The centre of an Alexandrian academic's world was, of course, the Museum and its accompanying library.[11] For Callimachus as well the Museum was a major part of his intellectual life, and we know from the titles of several prose works, now lost, that he was involved in the cataloguing of the libraries' immense collection.[12] This type of work was no doubt crucial in the development of the Alexandrian style of poetry with its constant allusion and ostentatious display of obscure knowledge. Nonetheless, we should not identify the Museum and the library as necessarily determining factors on the creation of Callimachus' poetry.[13] Certainly the environment there had some influence on his writing, but he undoubtedly drew inspiration from many different sources. Despite his pre-eminence as a poet and scholar, Callimachus was never actually the chief librarian in Alexandria. This is clear from the evidence of *Oxyrhynchus* 1241, which provides a list of the chief librarians through this period. Some scholars see a conspiracy in this fact, perhaps projecting their experiences as modern academics into the ancient world, and blame his exclusion on "academic politics" (Ferguson 19). That

Callimachus was deliberately kept from the position reads too much into the scant evidence. It is surely just as likely that Callimachus had no interest in the position, which required a large amount of administration, and included the duty of teaching the royal children. Without such burdens, Callimachus produced a vast number of books both in prose and verse.

Although the *Suda*'s claim that he produced more than 800 books is almost certainly hyperbole, we do know that he published extensively. As with most ancient authors, however, we now possess only a small portion of that output. Lombardo estimates that "perhaps a tenth, no more, of his poetry survives: six hymns (his only work to survive in an independent manuscript tradition), sixty-four epigrams, and fragments of elegiac, narrative, lyric, and satiric verse. Some of the fragments can be supplemented by informed conjecture and comparison with versions done by Roman poets; the rest is in tatters" (XVII). This concern with poetic detail has caused consternation to generations of scholars, and has garnered Callimachus a reputation of impenetrable difficulty. More recently, however, Hellenistic poetry has enjoyed a surge in popularity, at least among Greek scholars, as the literature yields poetic joys beyond ostentatious erudition. Despite the fact that Callimachus takes great pains to give his work an air of difficulty with the use of rare words and challenging periphrasis, it is an increasingly popular opinion that he is not as difficult to read as his reputation suggests. In fact, his work was already being published with basic commentaries for mass consumption by readers of limited education by the end of the third century BCE (Hutchinson 6-7). There is even evidence that suggests his work was studied in schools, and explanations of poetry by commentators were nothing new to a generation familiar with scholiastic commentary.[14]

Two main pieces of evidence suggest that Callimachus was in Alexandria and associated with the court from a young age. First, there is his excellent education. There is nothing to suggest that such a level of literary training was possible in fourth-century Cyrene.[15] In addition, at Alexandria Callimachus would have had the opportunity to meet the pre-eminent scholars of the day who gathered at the court and toiled in the Museum. Second, Callimachus' sister appears to have been married to a man of some importance in Alexandria. Thus it seems highly probable that Callimachus and his sister were both members of the Alexandrian court, and that their family was of reasonably high social rank.[16] Although an association with the royal court was an excellent way for a writer to further his career, it was not without obligations. Unlike the relative freedom enjoyed by writers such as Aristophanes in democratic Athens, a writer in Hellenistic Egypt always needed to be conscious of the king's temperament.[17] The influence of the court on Callimachus' poetry can be seen clearly in *Epigram* 54, which is discussed in Chapter Eight.

Having covered the very basics of Callimachus' life (although it should be noted that we know little more with any certainty), we must turn our attention to the cultural climate in which the author worked. The atmosphere in Alexandria has already been briefly touched upon, but some important cultural elements must be further explored. As previously mentioned, the great Museum and library in Alexandria attracted many scholars who created a community where minds could meet and resources were gathered. The library had the important task of collecting and organising the great texts of the ancient world, and Callimachus' *Pinakes*, a scholarly and ambitious project cataloguing all of Greek literature in 120 rolls, no doubt was only made possible by his access to the

first serious library in the ancient world.[18] Not everyone was enamoured of this new "ivory tower". Apollonius, who would become chief librarian, left Alexandria for a period after the initial poor reception of his epic; no doubt his failure was difficult to face among his learned friends. Another writer, Timon of Phlius, derides the Museum and its inhabitants: "*πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ / βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται ἀπείριτα δηριόωντες / Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ*"(Many bookish scribblers are fed in populous Egypt, forever squabbling in the birdcage of the Muses).[19] Even modern scholars have perpetuated this stereotype, with Richard Hunter suggesting that Alexandrian poets were "a marginal and privileged elite writing for their own amusement" (1992b: 33) and Claire Préaux writing that "not only the poets but also the readers of their poems" were only to be found in the courts and libraries (674-675). Despite this preponderance of opinion, it is clear, as Cameron states, that "it was certainly not in the library that Callimachus found his wit, his personal style and the original and influential narrative mode of his longer poems" (1995b: 30n.36).

Even if Callimachus found inspiration outside of his academic circle, was it possible for his difficult style of poetry to find an audience outside the literati? There is no direct evidence that allows us to identify the original, intended audience of the authors writing in most Hellenistic genres. Although Cameron argues that there "is abundant evidence that lesser poets continued to perform their work publicly, and many passages in the major poets *imply* that they did the same" (1995b: 30). The general impression among scholars has been that poetry this sophisticated could not have been performed publicly, and that it was, by design and necessity, meant to be read.[20] In response to this view, Cameron points out how "countless new agonistic festivals were established both

by and in honour of the Hellenistic kings, and literary and musical events became much commoner at all sorts of festivals".[21] It seems very likely that public performance remained an extremely important part of poetic production in the Hellenistic period. Certainly the story of Apollonius above indicates that public approval was important, and there are several depictions of poetry being performed, such as in Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, where a public festival culminates with a song praising Adonis, or in Callimachus' *Epigram* 58, where a poet prays for victory in a competition. Even for works not presented to the public at large, the symposium was still an important venue for performance.[22] It is also worth noting that the most popular metres in use by Hellenistic poets were those still suitable for performance in that period. Metres such as Sapphics, Alcaics and Pindaric strophes, which were no longer employed in public performances, were no longer being written.[23]

Nonetheless, most kinds of poetry were still being written in the Hellenistic period. Epic and drama were produced in large amounts. That we possess only fragments of these works, however, is undoubtedly an indication of their appeal to the librarians: while they may have been popular, they were not worthy to be copied through the generations. In addition to these established genres, new styles emerged in the Hellenistic period to challenge the traditional modes of artistic expression. The epyllion, a short epic focused on one less significant part of a greater myth, came to prominence among the intellectuals.[24] Epics more traditional in theme were produced, like the *Argonautica*, but these were shorter and much more intensely learned than regular epic fare. Theocritus more or less invented the genre of pastoral with his *Idylls*. All manner of history, aetiology, anthropology and cataloguing was carried out in prose works, some

of incredible length and detail. The period also saw the emergence of literary epigram as a full-fledged and very popular genre. This is the type of poetry that concerns us in the present work, and its qualities will be examined in greater detail in a following chapter.

Hellenistic poets were very conscious of their place in literary evolution, perhaps more so than any preceding generation. Already in the time of Aristophanes there was a feeling that the golden age of literature had passed:

> *Ἆ μάκαρ, ὅστις ἔην κεῖνον χρόνον ἴδρις ἀοιδῆς,*
> *Μουσάων θεράπων, ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών·*
> *νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχναι,*
> *ὕστατοι ὥστε δρόμου καταλειπόμεθ', οὐδέ πηι ἔστι*
> *πάντηι παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἅρμα πελάσσαι.*
>
> Blessed indeed was the man skilled in song in that time,
> a servant of the Muses when the meadow was still undefiled.
> Now, everything is allotted, and the arts have reached their limits.
> We are thus left behind in the race, and one looks everywhere in vain
> for a place to drive a newly yoked chariot.[25]

We are sadly lacking in literary material from the fourth century, but it is clear that a sense of decline persisted in the minds of many ancient scholars from the Classical period into the Hellenistic, and this view has remained popular among modern academics.[26] Yet this view is overly simplistic. While it is true that we do not have any great playwrights from the Alexandrians, revered in the manner of Sophocles or Aeschylus, that does not mean that drama was not being written, only that it was not passed down to us. It may also mean that the Hellenistic writers did not attempt to copy their predecessors, and instead chose to produce something different, as mentioned above. This tendency is not a sign of decline, unless one would also accuse the Classical period of literary poverty because it failed to produce Homeric-style epics that were preserved for posterity. Despite these new directions in Hellenistic poetry, however, it is clear from the poets'

engagement with previous works that the older traditions were very much in mind, and were not intended to be forgotten.

This chapter has touched on some of the important elements that inform an understanding of Hellenistic literary culture. Putting Callimachus in his historical and cultural context is a crucial first step towards appreciating his poetry. A modern scholar can pursue veiled allusions and hidden pieces of knowledge in Callimachus' work more confidently knowing that the author's immediate, contemporary audience of academics and poets would have been closely attuned to such nuances. Of the influences on, and the influence of Callimachus' work, John Ferguson writes that Callimachus was "a man of many parts, grammarian and teacher, librarian and bibliophile, scholar, poet…. All [his contemporary] poets made their individual contributions to poetic style, but Callimachus, more than any other, stands as representative of his age" (28-29).

Endnotes Chapter 1

[1] See Pfeiffer xcv for the relevant Greek text.

[2] Cf. Ferguson 23.

[3] Ferguson 24. Bulloch agrees with this view (549).

[4] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 5-6.

[5] For more on the social rank of school teachers, see Booth. Ancient evidence for this abounds. Callimachus himself makes a judgmental comment to a school teacher in his fifth *Iamb*: *ἐπεί σε δαίμων ἄλφα βῆτ[α* (since Fate [has decreed that] you [teach] the ABCs)" (3-4). Callimachus' contemporary, Aratus, expresses similar feelings: "*αἰάζω Διότιμον, ὃ ἐν πέτραισι κάθηται / Γαργαρέων παισὶν βῆτα καὶ ἄλφα λέγων* (Poor Diotimus, who sits on the rocks teaching the children of Gargara their ABCs)". There is also a line from comedy that remarks: "*ἤτοι τέθνηκεν ἢ διδάσκει γράμματα*" (he's either dead or teaching grammar) *Com. adesp.* 20 (iii. 401 K).

[6] Cameron 1995b: 5. A similar erroneous biographical tendency is to ascribe love poetry to a poet's early years. Cameron eloquently denounces this custom: "It is also to mistake genre for autobiography to assume that erotic epigrams are inevitably products of a passionate youth" (9).

[7] For example, see Ferguson 24.

[8] On this issue, see Lefkowitz.

[9] These dates are arrived at through mostly anecdotal evidence (eg. it is mentioned that Callimachus is slightly younger than Aratus). However, more concrete evidence is found in a decree by Ptolemy Soter that set up a new constitution for Cyrene. For a discussion, see Cameron 1995b: 7.

[10] Quoted from Ferguson 17. The original text is found in *Berliner Klassikertexte* Fasc. 7: 17, 28. Theocritus offers an insight into the hectic bustle of Alexandria during a festival in his fifteenth Idyll.

[11] The Museum was founded by Ptolemy Soter in 300 BCE and was maintained by his successors.

[12] See Lombardo XVI-XVII.

[13] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 24.

[14] See Hutchinson 7n.9 for discussion of a papyrus that appears to have been commercially produced, perhaps for use in schools.

[15] Cameron 1995b: 9. See also Laronde 129.

[16] See Cameron 1995b: 8-9. For more on the relationship between poets and patrons, see Gold 1987.

[17] Sotades, who was either executed by drowning or imprisoned for many years for his verses criticising Ptolemy II, is an example of a writer who was not sufficiently careful (Athenaeus. 620f-621a and Plutarch *Mor.* 11a).

[18] Cameron 1995b: 24. Lombardo (XVI-XVII) suggests that is was cataloguing efforts at the library like that of Callimachus' that led to the creation of canonical literary texts.

[19] Timon of Phlius *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 786. As much as these lines are meant to caricature the scholars at the Museum, they may also be intended to comment on the style of literature, full of intertextual references and often with an emphasis on concision, that was being produced there. For more on the style of poetry being produced, see Chapter Two. For a discussion of Timon's text, see Cameron 1995b: 31ff.

[20] Gelzer 144. Grant also sees Hellenistic poetry occurring in a book culture. He argues that by the third century BCE, people "were reading much more than they were sitting and listening" (260).

[21] Cameron 1995b: 44. Cf. Jones, Ringwood and Sifakis.

[22] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 71ff.

[23] Cameron 1995b: 46. For more on the Hellenistic audience and performance see Cameron 1995b: 47ff.

[24] An archetypal example can be found in Catullus 64. For more on epyllion, see Merriam.

[25] Choerilos of Samos. Text from Hopkinson 1.

[26] Cf. Lombardo XV. Whether ancient writers actually believed in a decline or merely used it as a literary *topos* is uncertain.

Chapter 2: Callimachus and the Alexandrian Aesthetic

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν οὐδε κελεύθῳ
χαίρω τὶς πολλοὺς ὧδε και ὧδε φέρει·
μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός· ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς ἠχώ φησί τις "ἄλλος ἔχει".

I hate the circular poem, nor do I rejoice in
the path that carries many people this way and that;
I also hate the wandering beloved, and I don't
drink from the common spring; I loath all public things.
Lysanias, you are indeed beautiful, beautiful; but before
Echo can say this clearly, someone says "another has you".[1]

- Callimachus *Ep.* 2

Having considered the role that Callimachus' biographical background may have played in the formation of his poetry, it is important to now examine in more detail the literary atmosphere in which Callimachus worked, as the new Alexandrian style of poetry strongly influenced Callimachus' literary style.

Callimachus, more than any other Greek poet, was excruciatingly "concerned with matters of style, taste and technical acumen" (Lombardo XVII). Lombardo says that Callimachus' poetry is not "for everyone's taste, nor is it meant to be. Without the most prodigious capacity for learning, patience, and complete emotional discrimination, the general reader is apt to be dismissed with contempt, along with everything else that smacks of the mass market" (XX). Carne-Ross goes so far as to say that "Callimachus' is a dry poetry, a poetry of the surface…, hinting at no resonant or beguiling deeps" (Lombardo IX). Some scholars, however, have come to realise that there is more to

Callimachus than obscure references and precise metre. To properly approach Callimachus' work, a reader must appreciate both the minutiae of the poetic art and the holistic effect of the text. For the modern reader, the approach to Callimachus is filled with pit-falls: difficult Greek, ostentatious displays of arcane knowledge, fragmentary texts and frustratingly incomplete insight into the author's contemporary context. Nonetheless, the attempt must be made in order to begin understanding the poetry. Hutchinson feels that there is value in making the effort, and argues that there is more in Callimachus than "a frivolous pedant, obsessed with the abstrusest details of mythology and cult, and uninterested in serious human emotions" (25-26). Certainly, the complaint of pedantry is easily rebuked, as one would have to reject any work, such as *Paradise Lost* or *Faust*, that displays excessive learning.

We must be cautious that we are not bedazzled by learning and misled into false interpretations of a given poem or its context. For example, although it is obvious that the erudite would be able to appreciate certain aspects of Callimachus' poetry more than a less learned reader, we cannot assume that only the most well-read understood or enjoyed his poetry.[2] It should also be noted that what we consider to be the unnecessary inclusion of obscure facts may not have seemed that way to the original audience. While we might only have a scrap of papyrus hinting at a certain ritual mentioned by Callimachus, that ritual may have been everyday knowledge in the Hellenistic period.[3] Although Grant states correctly that Hellenistic poets "ransacked the most recherché myths and legends, antiquarian histories and obscure points of local topography for whatever titillating details and psychological angles they might be able to provide" (261), this intense interest in history and myth was nothing new.[4] Aetiology had long been a

feature of ancient poetry, dating back to Homer and no doubt beyond. The only difference between the Alexandrians and their predecessors is that the more recent generations had access to the massive collection of works contained in the Library. Where archaic writers relied on their own extensive knowledge of the oral tradition, supplemented by written texts when they were available, Callimachus and his colleagues had a vast store of catalogued works. For example, when Callimachus wanted to find a suitable topic for an epyllion, he could simply search through books on Athenian myth until he came across Hecale. All of these stories, at some point, were of sufficient importance to a group of people that the story survived to be recorded in Alexandria: Hecale might seem insignificant to us, but surely she wasn't to the people living in the *deme* named after her (the naming of which this story tells).[5] For the audience, it is always exciting and pleasing to have one's land or customs appear in popular culture, and Callimachus included many different areas and peoples in his work. The result appears contrived today, and may have even in the ancient world, but it seems safe to assume that this approach was popular with his contemporary readers.

Thus we can justify Callimachus' displays of mythical and geographical erudition, but his poetry is still often charged with dispassionate exactitude of form and diction. Like many great poets, Callimachus did write poems that are clearly exercises in playing with conventions or formal ideas. Such work is not, however, the limit of his writing. Yet if Callimachus is more than just a well-versed scholar, we must ask why he used a literary style that leads the modern reader to that initial conclusion. To answer this question, however, we must first discover *what* Callimachus' literary tastes are (insofar as it is possible to reconstruct them from textual evidence). Meleager's description in this

regard is short and cryptic:

ἡδύ τε μύρτον
Καλλιμάχου στυφελοῦ μεστὸν ἀεὶ μέλιτος

and the sweet myrtle
of Callimachus, always full of harsh honey.
(1.21-22 G-P)

Some traditional readings might balk at ascribing any redeeming sweetness to his poetry. Recent scholarship has, however, begun to rescue Callimachus from this impression.

Ferguson initially paints Callimachus' literary taste in one colour: "Callimachus stood for a distinctive literary viewpoint. It is familiarly expressed in one of the most famous anecdotes of antiquity, recorded by Athenaeus (2,72 A): 'Callimachus the schoolteacher used to say that a big book is equivalent to a big evil'" (Ferguson 26-27). Athenaeus is not, however, a uniformly reliable source for information on Callimachus,[6] and there is no real evidence in Callimachus' own work that suggests that he subscribes to such an aesthetic. The prologue of the *Aetia* and end of Callimachus' second *Hymn* are used to substantiate this view. Both of these passages are, of course, crucial to our understanding of Callimachus' literary tastes. Unfortunately, commentators have often been misled by these passages. Let us look first at the *Aetia* prologue:

Οἶδ' ὅτ]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῇ,
νήιδες οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,
εἵνεκεν οὐχ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[η
......]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν
......]ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω
παῖς ἅτε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκὰς οὐκ ὀλίγη.
...
ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος· αὖθι δὲ τέχνῃ
κρίνετε,] μὴ σκοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην·
...
... Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος·
".........] ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·

πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι
τὰ στείβειν, ἑτέρων δ' ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά
δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις.

(I know that) the Telchines, who are ignorant and not
friends to the Muse, grumble at my poetry,
because I did not accomplish one continuous poem
of many thousands of lines on … kings or …
heroes, but like a child I roll out a short story,
though the decades of my years are not few.
…
Begone, you baneful race of Jealousy! hereafter judge poetry
by (the canons) of art, and not by the Persian chain.
…
… Lycian Apollo said to me:
"… poet, grow the victim most fat but,
good man, make the Muse slender.
And I command you: tread the path unopened
by wagons; do not drive your chariot upon
the common tracks of others, nor along a wide road,
but on unworn paths, even if your way is more narrow."
(1-28)[7]

Although the aesthetic statement seems clear enough, there has nonetheless been great debate over the exact meaning of this passage. Ferguson's interpretation initially appears correct: "having established his first point, concision, the poet passes to a second, originality, neatly expressed by imagery from travel" (34). He erroneously equates, however, concision with length. Callimachus' preference is for short, *good* poetry over long, *bad* poetry, and he is defending the *Aetia* on those grounds. Cameron picks up on this difference, but he takes his interpretation to the opposite extreme, arguing that Callimachus had nothing against his contemporary epic writers. He suggests that Callimachus was actually only inveighing against a particular work by a particular writer, the *Lyde* of Antimachos (1995b: 303-361). I side with Schmitz, however, in not being convinced that Callimachus' aesthetic statement in the Prologue can be judged in such a

narrow fashion (152). I believe that Hutchinson may have the correct approach, as he finds a very plausible middle ground, seeing a statement about the art of poetry in general, but not necessarily an indictment of any particular genre. The point of the passage is to highlight Callimachus' artistic skill (Hutchinson 79). Originality, then, and concision, appear to be the guiding principles of Callimachus' work.

This view is strengthened by the end of *Hymn 2* to Apollo:

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὔατα λάθριος εἶπεν·
"οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει."
τὸν Φθόνον ὡπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδέ τ' ἔειπεν·
"Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει.
Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι Μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον."

Envy spoke secretly in Apollo's ear:
"I do not admire the poet who sings things unlike the sea."
Apollo drove off Envy with his foot and spoke thus:
"the stream of the Assyrian river is great, but in its water
it carries much filth from the earth and much refuse.
And not from every water do the Bees carry to Deo,
but from the trickling steam that springs from a holy fountain,
pure and undefiled, the best water."
(2.105-112)

This passage further defines the literary views of Callimachus. Apollo does not say that a work equal to the sea or the Euphrates is bad because of its size, but because of its lack of purity. A long work can achieve such clarity: surely Callimachus would have given Homer this distinction; but such talent is rare.[8] Callimachus will instead attempt something new by writing brief, pure poetry in all genres save epic and drama.[9] Of course, originality is itself a common claim, and should not be weighted too strongly.[10] Both the passage from the *Aetia* and that from the *Hymns* suggest that Callimachus had been criticised for his failure to produce a long epic. There is no indication that he was

against epic generally, but simply that he preferred other genres for his own poetry. As Cameron points out, "but for this obsession with epic, it would have been seen long ago that Callimachus is comparing styles, not genres" (1995b: 329). Clearly, Callimachus wants his worked judged by artistic merit, not great length, nor is there an implication that brevity should be placed ahead of art.[11]

The most important element for Callimachus, then, is quality. In the poet's eyes, what makes for quality in a poem? A work that spares us unnecessary length, obviously, and with some claim to originality. Judging by Callimachus' own writing, careful attention to metre, diction and allusion are also central concerns. When I discuss his individual epigrams in Chapters Five through Nine, these poetic concerns are taken as the starting point for my analyses and should be kept in mind for any reader evaluating Callimachus' poetry.

So what genre could fit all of these requirements? What sort of poetry demands a concise, intense manner, where every word must be selected and placed with exacting precision, and allusion is of paramount importance for fleshing-out stark bones sketched in a few lines? What genre could still make claim to some modicum of originality, and provide a medium not yet muddied by centuries of use?

Endnotes Chapter 2

[1] Although this poem obviously has bearing on the current discussion, I will delay a thorough examination of it until later in this work.

[2] Cf. Hutchinson 7.

[3] There are countless modern parallels. Consider the image evoked by the Bee Gees. An entire phenomenon, disco, can be imagined by reference to that single group. Now imagine a poem referencing the Bee Gees being read 2000 years from now. People might wonder how an entire festival could be conducted on roller-skates and what part the disco ball played in the sacrifice. What is nothing more than contemporary common knowledge has become obscure through the passage of time.

[4] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 42ff.

[5] For a brief discussion of the plot of the *Hecale* and Callimachus' source, see Trypanis 176-179.

[6] See Ch. 1, where I have argued against the view that Callimachus was a school-teacher.

[7] For a narratological assessment of this poem, see Harder.

[8] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 358. One is reminded of Horace's Satire 1.1.54-60, where the poet advises against drinking from a raging river when a small stream will serve just as well.

[9] Although written in dactylic hexameter, the *Hecale* cannot be considered an epic in the traditional sense. It is quite clearly an example of epyllion. One should consider the evidence of *Iambus* fr. 203, in which it appears as though Callimachus is discussing the mixture of various genres and styles.

[10] Cf. Hutchinson 81ff.

[11] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 357. It should be noted that many Roman writers adhereing to neo-Callimachean aesthetics do place epic in opposition to small-scale poetry in the name of Callimachus.

Chapter 3: The Hellenistic Literary Epigram

Σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξεῖνος, ὃ καὶ στίχος οὐ μακρὰ λέξων
Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρὴς ἐπ' ἐμοὶ δολιχός.

The stranger was brief, and the verse describing him not long:
"Theris, son of Aristaios, a Cretan" – this is lengthy for me.

- Callimachus *Ep*. 34

Having examined the Alexandrian aesthetic and its influence on Callimachus' poetry, a brief study of the evolution of the literary genre of epigram and its conventions should complete our investigation into the historical and literary contexts necessary to begin understanding Callimachus' epigrams.

The epigram's origins are evident in its name; the genre began with inscriptions of various types.[1] Although epitaph is the most obvious predecessor of the literary epigram, inscriptions on offerings, statues and walls could all be considered of the same lineage. Over time these epigraphs became more complex and the art of the message became almost as important as the content. Eventually, professional poets were being hired to write epitaphs for the dearly departed.[2] At this point, the evolution of epigraph into literary epigram was the next logical step. By the end of the fifth century and down through the fourth, it became increasingly common to copy inscriptions into various documents. These copied epigrams were separated from their original function and location, and began to be seen as texts of literary value in their own right.[3]
Although the groundwork for epigram as a literary genre was laid during this period, it was not until the Hellenistic age that the form came into its own.

As mentioned in the previous two chapters, the Hellenistic poets were searching for a new means to express themselves, a medium whose possibilities had not yet been fully explored by previous generations. This desire for novelty coupled with a new aesthetic favouring artistic concision over length, at least in the case of Callimachus and those who shared his tastes, led to an explosion in the popularity of the literary epigram. Richard Hunter succinctly states the importance of this style of poetry in the Hellenistic period: "kein literarischer Genos ist für das hellenistische Zeitalter kennzeichnender als das Epigramm" (1997b: 265).

The genre of epigram can be divided into three main categories: erotic, sepulchral and dedicatory. I would, however, agree with Gutzwiller that a fourth division would be useful for describing certain of the epigrams that deal with literary matters, and do not fit easily into the three standard partitions.[4] Often a poet would attempt to maintain the illusion that his poem is actually written on an object, using the convention as a template, and employing his poetic abilities to work within the traditional restrictions of the genre. It was also common to play deliberately with the conventions in order to achieve certain effects. At times, even the pretence of inscription was entirely set aside. This deviation from tradition is particularly obvious in amatory epigrams, where such simulation was often tenuous to begin with. Nonetheless, it is usually important for the discerning reader to consider the traditions of the genre, even with poems that do not overtly appear to maintain epigraphic conventions.[5]

Most epigrams were written in elegiac couplets although there are exceptions, such as Callimachus' 17th, 19th and 20th epigrams, which were written in other metres.[6] This is, of course, the metre of elegy, and the influence of that genre has been mentioned

by Gutzwiller, among others.[7] There is also a marked influence of lyric, although there has been no substantial work done on the topic.[8]

Funerary

Ranging from the sublime, for example Callimachus' farewell to Heraclitus (*Ep.* 34, discussed in Chapter Eight), to the amusingly ridiculous, such as Anyte's mock-epitaph for a cock killed by a predator (*AP* 7.202), the funerary epigram has a long and rich history.[9] As mentioned above, it must always be kept in the reader's mind that these poems should be read as though on a tombstone. In 1991, George Walsh published a very important article discussing the influence of epitaph on Callimachus' funerary epigrams. He persuasively argues that "Callimachean epigram captures thought in motion, often unfolding the elements of mental life one by one in a dramatic progression", and that the poet "was strongly influenced by the rhetorical constraints and the contrivances of epitaph". Ultimately, Walsh concludes, all styles of Callimachean epigram "make the acquisition of knowledge both a topic and a structural principle" (77-78). I certainly agree with Walsh regarding the importance of epitaph to Callimachus' work, but I am not convinced that we can paint *all* of his epigrams with such a broad brush. Nonetheless, I have difficulty with Gutzwiller's complaint regarding the article. She argues that Walsh places too great an emphasis on inscribed epitaph, and fails to account for the difference between the "fictive reader (the imaginary reader of the stone) and the implied reader (a construct based upon the author's evident assumptions about the circumstances of reading), who, for Callimachus' epigrams in their collected form, was clearly a book reader".[10]

While the connection between epigram and epitaph is quite secure, the argument that these poems were only read in a book form is contentious, and will be discussed later in more detail. Still, the literary aspect of the epigrams is worth considering. Gutzwiller points out that although Callimachus' epigrams were based on epitaphic conventions, "the majority of Callimachus' epigrams do assume a reading context in which both the stone and its reader belong to the fictive realm of literature" (196). Several of his poems, in fact, rely upon this play between fictive and actual setting. Cameron, among others, has strenuously (and persuasively in my opinion) argued that "the principal forum for the epigram in the early third century…was the symposium", going so far as to call epigram "the new sympotic poetry of the age".[11] I believe that the intended audience of the poet must have included both book readers and people enjoying live performances. Unfortunately, we have no certain evidence to resolve the matter one way or the other.[12]

Dedicatory

These epigrams are similar to their sepulchral genre-mates in that they grew out of a strong tradition of physical inscription. Prayers, curses and vows were all commonly incised in various materials ranging from potsherds to statues for almost every reason imaginable. Like epitaphs, these inscriptions often had certain formulae that were followed. In some cases, these conventions were more closely followed then in epitaphic writing, as a prayer or vow needed to be recorded perfectly in order to be effective. Within this sub-genre as well, the epigrammatists took liberties with conventions. Callimachus' *Epigrams* 16 and 25, for example, feature speakers who are dedicated objects, and plays with the traditional rhetoric of this type of epigram.[13] That the

dedicated objects speak is not strange; a very early Greek epigram on a bronze statuette reads, "Manticlus dedicated me to the Far-Darter" (326 *CEG*). Svenbro disputes an animist explanation for these speaking objects, arguing that the ego in the poem lacks "any psychological depth". He suggests that this style of dedication displays the "hereness" of the inscribed object as opposed to the "thereness" or absence of the inscriber (41-43). With Callimachus, Gutzwiller sees a similar effect in play, but one altered by the nature of literary epigram versus inscribed object. She suggests that Callimachus, by having his dedication speak, makes the audience aware of its absence, and in turn brings their attention to the absence of the epigrammatist's own voice in the poem (192-193). I do not, however, believe that that these dedications were only ever read off the page, but it is likely that they were also performed. As in reading one of these poems from a book, a performance of a dedicatory epigram would also be lacking the object being dedicated, so Gutzwiller's approach is still valid. In addition, the poet may actually be present at the performance, further enhancing his presence in the poem at the expense of the absent object.

Amatory

This is, perhaps, the type of epigram that is least related to the genre's epigraphical beginnings, although it may be linked to short notes written by lovers (assuming they could read) or to dedications asking a deity's aide in obtaining the object of one's affection. In many ways, this type of poem has more in common with elegy than with inscriptions, but here I think that length is a deciding factor. Most epigrams are fewer than ten lines long, but it is rare to find such brevity in elegy. In addition, there are

certain conventional differences between the two genres, and stylistic differences also separate the two forms.[14] Although these seem the most likely style of epigram to have been performed regularly in convivial company, it would be rash to suggest that the other types of epigrams were less frequently performed in such settings due to their subject matter.[15]

Gutzwiller pushes for a common theme in this style of epigram, stating that the amatory poems "form a coherent group in which Callimachus represents himself as a lover of boys. In doing so, he inscribes himself within the Theognidean tradition of erotic elegy" (213-214). I am again troubled by an interpretation that relies on the poems being in an author-ordered or collected unit. Gutzwiller goes on to suggest that "Callimachus' erotic epigrams, addressed to an ever-changing series of boys, are marked by the individualized voice of a distinct poetic ego" (214). She argues that the speaker in these poems represents Callimachus' rational side. He is not consumed by passion, but is reflecting upon passion. Tension within the poems can be found in the interaction of passion with reason, as each one struggles with the other. In this way, Callimachus unites and explores his poetic role as a scholar and a lover.[16]

While I can agree that Callimachus does not always present himself as a lover bereft of all rational thought, Gutzwiller's idea that Callimachus was attempting to provide his collection with unity through a persistent poetic voice is less convincing.[17] Why would an author who so consciously and meticulously varies his subject matter, metre and style throughout his corpus limit himself to one persona in his amatory epigrams? The extant texts do not support such a reading, and we do not know what sort of voices Callimachus may have adopted in the epigrams that are now lost. Gutzwiller's

conclusion that "the reserve that defines Callimachus as lover is also characteristic of Callimachean poetics, and it is this unity of Callimachus' artistic and erotic selves that helps to integrate the amatory section with the other portions of the *Epigrammata*" (218) is too strong for the available evidence. Nonetheless, I do believe that there is a broader poetic programme at work in Callimachus' poetry that can also be detected in certain of his erotic epigrams, such as epigrams One, Two and Three, which are discussed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven respectively.

The Epigrams of Callimachus

I would now like to turn more specifically to the epigrams of Callimachus, an author who Ferguson describes as "the real creator of the Hellenistic epigram" (138). There are 64 surviving epigrams of Callimachus and a few desultory fragments.[18] It will suffice to say here that what text we have is generally good, but problems do exist and they will be treated when they arise. While it is likely that Callimachus made a collection of his works at some point, it is by no means certain that he did so with all of his poems. There is no discussion in the ancient sources of the position of a book of Callimachean epigrams in his corpus, and there are no epigrams in the papyri of Callimachus.[19] All our epigrams by Callimachus come from later anthologies, whose selections were subject to the whims of their editors. The order of the epigrams is also highly suspect.[20] In light of these difficulties, Gow and Page see no reason to adhere to this random order and instead group the poems according to their subjects: "*Ἐρωτικά* (I-XIII), *Ἀναθηματικά* (XIV-XXVIII), *Ἐπιτάφια* (XXIX-LIII), *Ἐπιδεικτικά* (LIV-LXI) " (153). Although Gutzwiller argues that "Callimachus uses arrangement to suggest his own poetic presence within the

heterogeneity of the collection" (179), I must agree with Gow and Page that there is little evidence to support our reading the poems in any particular order.[21] While I agree that an author-ordered collection would be a joy to analyse, I do not believe that Callimachus' epigrams as we have them is such a collection. This is not to say that we should ignore the intertextual play among his epigrams, but that we should avoid making arguments and drawing conclusions that rely upon an uncertain ordering of the poems.

In Callimachus epigrams, we find the brevity that is a trademark of the genre. This concision makes each change in subject, speaker or theme marked.[22] This is one reason why Callimachus uses allusion to expand his work, since the generic brevity of epigram demands that the poet establish social, historical or literary contexts in his epigrams in order to flesh-out the poems.[23] Callimachus managed to apply a combination of variety, brevity, allusion and wit that came to characterise the literary epigram.[24] It is on allusion to Homeric themes in the *Epigrams* of Callimachus that this paper will focus.

Endnotes Chapter 3

[1] If the reader wishes to pursue the evolution of epigram as an art form in more depth than I can provide here, I highly recommend Kathryn Gutzwiller's *Poetic Garlands*: *Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (1998). This book covers a great deal of material ranging from a discussion on manuscript traditions to the performance settings of epigrams. Also extremely useful and very recent is Doris Meyer's *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen* (2005).

[2] See Lattimore 17-20 for a discussion of authorship and inscription methods in epitaph.

[3] Cf. Gutzwiller 47. For more on the movement from stone to book, see Gutzwiller 47ff.

[4] Tarán also uses four categories, calling the fourth "epideictic". I think that such a title is too restrictive to encompass all the subject matter covered by poems not included in the traditional three sub-genres. See Tarán 1979: 3.

[5] For an excellent example of the manipulation of epigraphic convention in Callimachus, see Walsh 1991.

[6] Poems 17 and 19 are in catalectic iambic dimeter, and poem 20 has two catalectic iambic dimeters followed by a dactylic tetrapody + ithyphallicus.

[7] Cf. Gutzwiller 5. The line between epigram and elegy in love poetry is fluid and depends mostly on length. An amatory epigram written in elegiacs could be considered a short elegy intended for a sympotic setting. Dedicatory and funerary epigrams often maintain the illusion that they are written on objects, and may be thus distinguished from elegy, which usually appears designed for performance.

[8] For a brief account, see Cameron 1992: 305-12.

[9] See Lattimore for common themes in epitaph.

[10] Gutzwiller 196. Giagrande also subscribes to this view (1968: 93n.1).

[11] Cameron 1995b: 79 and 76. He states quite emphatically that "there is no ancient literary form of which it can be said with less plausibility that it was written *for* the book" than Hellenistic epigram (76-77).

[12] The question of audience in Hellenistic literature and art is addressed by Zanker 2004, and Cameron 1995b: 24-70. With the advent of book publication, the question of reading epitaphs becomes more complex. Traditionally, a single epitaph would be read from a single stone. A book presents the reader with several poems, and may therefore affect their approach to individual epigrams. The performance context of literary epigrams should also be considered, as hearing an epigram performed is an experience distinct from reading one. Further deliberation of these issues is beyond the scope of the current project, but such considerations should not be entirely ignored when reading Callimachus' epigrams.

[13] Cf. Gutzwiller 192.

[14] Cf. Cameron 1992.

[15] Lyric poetry, most certainly performed in friendly settings, draws inspiration from all manner of subject, including love and death. It should be stressed that all three types of epigram should not be taken as presenting any historical fact, despite the seemingly personal nature of the subjects used and the factual nature of actual epitaphs and dedications. One common error, for example, is to assume that erotic epigrams were produced during a writer's youth, when such feelings are supposedly more intensely

present. Cameron argues strongly against this, however, pointing out that "it is also to mistake genre for autobiography to assume that erotic epigrams are inevitably products of a passionate youth" (1995b: 9).

[16] Cf. Gutzwiller 214.

[17] "the speaker's reflection about his erotic experience works to associate Callimachus the lover with Callimachus the scholar-poet, and so, once again, to integrate the collection as a whole" (Gutzwiller 214).

[18] For a detailed description of the manuscript tradition of the *Garland* of Meleager, see Gow and Page (xiii-xliv) and Gutzwiller (15-46).

[19] Cf. Gow and Page 153.

[20] The order of the epigrams is the result of "the accident that the epigrams numbered 1-25 by Pfeiffer were collected by Nicodemus Frischlin in 1577, and successive additions were placed after this collection as more epigrams became known from the Palatine ms of the *Anthology* and its apographa. Frischlin's arrangement left something to be desired; the order resulting from the subsequent accretions was chaotic, and though retained by Wilamowitz, Cahen, and Pfeiffer, as with minor variations it had been by Schneider and Meineke, it was admitted by them to be so" (Gow and Page 153).

[21] Cf. Gow and Page 153-154 and Gutzwiller 183ff.

[22] Cf. Hutchinson 75.

[23] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 77.

[24] Cf. Cameron 1995b: 77-79. The ability to find variation in a well defined genre was a chief characteristic of Hellenistic epigram and has received attention from several scholars including Tarán (1979 and 1985) and Gutzwiller (227ff.).

Chapter 4: On the Programme of Callimachus' *Epigrams*: Cohesion and Collection

Μικρή τις, Διόνυσε, καλὰ πρήσσοντι ποιητῇ
ῥῆσις· ὁ μὲν 'νικῶ' φησὶ τὸ μακρότατον,
ᾧ δὲ σὺ μὴ πνεύσῃς ἐνδέξιος ἤν τις ἔρηται
'πῶς ἔβαλες;' φησί, 'σκληρὰ τὰ γιγνόμενα'.
τῷ μερμηρίξαντι τὰ μὴ ἔνδικα τοῦτο γένοιτο
τοὔπος, ἐμοὶ δ', ὦναξ, ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη.

For the happily successful poet, Dionysus, is the short speech:
at the most he says, 'I win'.
But on whom you do not breathe favourably, if someone asks,
'How did you fare?' He says 'things are going badly'.
For him brooding unjust things let this be the phrase,
But for me, o lord, the short syllable.

- Callimachus *Ep.* 58

Recent Views

In the following chapters, I will examine Homeric allusion in individual epigrams by Callimachus that inform our understanding of Callimachus' aesthetic programme. Before adding my voice to the discussion of programs in the particular epigrams that appear in the following chapters, however, it is important to discuss the various stances taken by modern scholars regarding the programmatic theme, or lack thereof, in Callimachus' epigrams.

The first opinion to review is that of Gregory Hutchinson. For him, the greatest concern in Callimachus' epigrams is their allusive, intertextual play:

> Callimachus' *Epigrams* are strongly connected with the brief tradition of literary epigram, and show many links with Asclepiades in particular. But they also look behind, to the conventions and concepts of the inscriptional poems and the love-poetry from which literary epigram derives. With these conventions Callimachus plays more continually and more disconcertingly than his predecessors

> and contemporaries. The play is made possible by the genre; but the effects fit the nature of the poet.
> (71)

Using *Epigram* 37 as an example, Hutchinson argues that even the most heartfelt of these poems find much of their expression in their relation to traditional forms (74). The epigrammatic convention of brevity is also important, where the author plays self-consciously and even explicitly with the length restraints of the genre.[1] Due to their short length, movements within a poem can often seem drastic. It is the skill of the author that turns these potentially disconcerting shifts into poetic emotion.[2] In the epigrams, Hutchinson sees the involvement of Callimachus' larger poetical "concerns" through recurring themes, including "play with genre and with personality, the exploitation of scholarship and of religion, [and] the handling of different levels of poetry and different levels of narrative" (77). Attention to form is also a central element for Callimachus. Hutchinson believes that all of these factors shape Callimachus' poetry and are enhanced by the limiting features of the epigrammatic genre (77).

Although he identifies these recurring themes and mentions Callimachus' overarching literary interests, Hutchinson denies the existence of a programme in the epigrams. He argues that Callimachus was merely guided by "instinct" to write in the manner that appealed to him, and that the author had no set programme that guided his writing. Hutchinson even doubts that a clearly defined programme would illuminate the poems very much at all, and he considers Callimachus' remarks on his own poetry to be detrimental to our interpretation rather than an important element to be considered (77). Despite his own argument, however, Hutchinson nonetheless falls into the same trap as other scholars, taking evidence from Callimachus' other work and extrapolating those

themes into the epigrams. As do many others, Hutchinson uses the evidence of the *Aetia* and the *Hymn to Apollo* to discuss themes found in the epigrams, and his reading of the *Epigrams* is biased by the themes he identifies in these other poems. This approach must be taken cautiously. It is dangerous to assume that a theme or programme crosses genre or is carried from poem to poem. When there are common themes, these should certainly be pointed out, but one must not identify themes in one poem simply because another poem suggests a certain idea. In short, Hutchinson argues that the epigrams have no programme, only recurrent themes, but he still pursues a single unifying theme in the epigrams, Callimachus' literary aesthetic, through evidence from other genres (77ff.).

Marco Fantuzzi and Richard Hunter examine the history of epigrams being produced in book format. They suggest that collections of inscriptions in book form may have acted as models for later collections by authors such as Callimachus (or those who collected his work after his death), but they do not specifically address the question of a programme for Callimachus' epigrams (289). Instead, they focus their attention on themes more specific to the different sub-genres of epigrams and do not address the poems as a group.

Sonya Tarán also does not directly address the question of programme. She does describe one aspect concerning the provenance of Callimachus' epigrams that has bearing on Gutzwiller's argument (which I will discuss in more detail shortly) that one should approach Callimachus' epigrams as an author-ordered collection. Tarán points out that Meleager's *Garland* is arranged to indicate links between earlier epigrams and later variations. Planudes' later *Anthology* also appears to follow this convention (1979: 2). Therefore, it is useless to use the order of poems in these sources to suggest a certain

order of Callimachus' poems in an author-published book of epigrams.

John Ferguson also sees difficulty in using poem sequence as evidence: it is "fairly certain that the anthologists were – ultimately, since the Anthology grew out of earlier anthologies – using selectively a collection of the poet's epigrams. We cannot be certain that these formed a section of his corpus of works as he planned to publish them, or whether he regarded them as trivial and some pious disciple brought them together" (138). Looking at the poems as a group, Ferguson sees Callimachus' literary views, favouring brevity and originality, as the uniting, even programmatic, feature of the epigrams, although he does not use the word programme (131ff.).

Stanley Lombardo, on the other hand, speaks explicitly of "Callimachus's literary program" (XVIII). He identifies Callimachus as "a poet who values most what is most likely to escape ordinary notice, the small and recondite, the nuances of peripheral vision, and the fine cords of attention that try to keep them in place" (XIX). Lombardo takes a theme that occurs several times in Callimachus' poems and applies it as a blanket programme for all of the poet's work. This approach is obviously flawed. The order and intent of Callimachus' poems in different genres makes such generalisations difficult from the very outset. It is also demonstrable that not every poem is intended to comment on a fixed programme. Callimachus wrote in a learned, concise style, but this is a far different thing from a literary programme.

Alan Cameron argues that

> a published book was...an extension of the poet's performance rather than something entirely different. It was aimed at essentially the same audience and arose out of the same social circumstances. In effect poets continued to write for people they knew, not strangers. Since books had

> been a fixture of intellectual life for centuries and live performance continued unabated, there is little reason to believe that books would in themselves provoke or foster a different sort of poetry.
>
> (1995b: 78)

He further argues that early in the third century BCE, the publication of epigram books was secondary to performance, and was intended more for the preservation of the poems than as a medium for which epigrams were written.[3] Despite this view, Cameron does believe that the collection of poems into book form resulted in important literary effects, as the poet would no doubt attempt to arrange his work as artfully as possible. Nonetheless, he maintains that it is a "pure assumption" to think that the poems were originally composed for book publication.[4] Like Fantuzzi and Hunter, Cameron does not identify a programme in Callimachus' epigrams. He does suggest that thematic variation is central concern to the epigrammatists, and he stresses the influence of the symposiastic venue for performance on these themes and their variations in epigram (1995b: 79). Instead of a programme, Cameron identifies "organizational devices" employed by book forms, such as grouping similar or contrasting poems together, that would alter the manner in which individual poems were read (1995b: 103). So, Cameron agrees with Gutzwiller that the collection of epigrams into a book can inform a reader's experience, but he is hesitant to push this conclusion to the extremes taken by Gutzwiller.

The final author whose views I would like to examine at some length is Kathryn Gutzwiller.[5] For Gutzwiller, everything revolves around the epigram book, for she believes that Hellenistic poets were "self-consciously aware that their epigrams would ultimately reside with other poetry in a written context" (6). Thus, she argues, the study of Hellenistic epigram is the study of epigrammatic books. She acknowledges the

difficulties posed by anthologising for the scholar who wishes to approach Callimachus' epigrams as a book, and she points out how classicists have tended to avoid discussions dependent on the order of the poems (6). Despite these reservations, Gutzwiller believes that the literary epigram's close association with its inscribed model suggests that authors were very conscious of these poems as written, rather than recited, works (3). Unlike inscribed poems being read in isolation, Gutzwiller suggests that literary epigrams were meant to be read in the book context, along with other epigrams. In order to grasp their significance, we should approach the poems "*as if* we knew their place in historical collections" (Gutzwiller 6-7). Despite this claim, however, Gutzwiller must admit that there is no way in which these lost poetry books can be reconstituted. The collections that we now possess are anthologies of anthologies with random additions from other sources. Our main early source, Meleager, probably only selected a small percentage of Greek epigrams, and only those that he personally felt were worth retaining. Gutzwiller believes that Meleager would have anthologised key poems from earlier collections, including unique themes and programmatic pieces, but she admits that his goal was to illustrate similarities and interconnections between different poems and poets, not to maintain the order of any of the original collections (X). Even with this intellectual caveat, Gutzwiller nonetheless wants to reconstruct Hellenistic epigram books, arguing that "to comprehend more fully the appeal of epigram for Hellenistic readers, we need to reconstruct the historical contexts in which these poems were read – above all, the collections compiled or approved by the authors themselves" (6). I question this approach, however, as I find it difficult to read Callimachus' epigrams as if in a collection when we know nothing of the original collection; we are not even certain that

one existed.

The question of a book of Callimachus' epigrams aside, Gutzwiller does identify some important elements that should be considered for short poetry produced in book form. She points out that reading a book of poetry is very different from reading an individual poem. The reader would be dealing with different themes within each poem, but would also be confronted with the cohesive design of the book as a whole. Gutzwiller believes that such structural tension was a "hallmark of the Hellenistic literary aesthetic" (8-9). I believe that Gutzwiller goes too far when she suggests that the persona of the Hellenistic epigrammatist fully emerged as "a direct result of the collection of epigrams into books" (11). Although consistent "personalities" often seem apparent in any group of similar poems by an author, I think that Gutzwiller gives too little credit to the poet's ability to create a persona within a single poem, even if it is of epigrammatic length. She argues that this effect can only be encountered through collections of poetry: "the reader tends to synthesize a collection's themes, tonalities, and principles of order into a conception of the author's poetic message, heard in no one poem but perceivable by reading across the boundaries of individual poems" (12). Certainly, recurrent themes may give an overall impression of a particular poet's work, but the importance of the individual poem must not be discounted. When reading Gutzwiller, one gains the impression that *all* meaning in epigrams comes from their role in a collection:

> Hellenistic epigram books encouraged a variety of interpretative approaches: as indices of poets' conceptions about their personal experiences and social relationships; as a means of focusing on certain classes of individuals and modes of living so as to make ideological statements; as vehicles for conveying a poet's literary personality and for placing the poet's achievements within the context of

> literary tradition. Once we recognize that such larger messages may be conveyed by the briefest of poems when gathered into collections, we can see that part of the attraction of the epigram book for early Hellenistic poets was to rival in length and function traditionally longer works while yet working within a genre of brief compass and low rank.
>
> (12-13)

These insights would be very useful if the existence and ordering of a book of epigrams organised by Callimachus could be conclusively demonstrated. Even if the author had collected his epigrams at some point, they would very likely have been collected long after composition. Far from conceiving the idea of a book and writing a hundred or so poems for it, the text, even one artfully arranged, would have consisted of poems written separately from one another. Gutzwiller recognises this, and backs off from her more extreme position that order imparts all meaning: "even if the editor did little to create cohesiveness beyond organizing the epigrams into sections, the reader may yet find a unifying focus in the peculiarities of the author's style and tone" (28). She does not, however, succeed in demonstrating that Callimachus was responsible for an ordered collection of epigrams. A later editor might have any manner of selection criteria or personal bias resulting in a skewed representation of poems being passed onto us.

Gutzwiller speaks of how the "surviving sequences from the epigram books of Callimachus…show the presentation of individual epigrams, each of which is by nature specific and final, not as a repetitive catalogue, but in associative patterns that point up similarities and contrasts and so encourage the reader to extract larger poetic meanings" (46). She assumes this sequence demonstrates the existence of a Callimachean epigram book, and that its ordering was maintained, at least partially, by Meleager in his *Garland*.

She then employs this assumption in order to tease meaning out of a run of 5 poems by Callimachus that occur one after the other in the *Garland*. This approach is dangerously circular.

Gutzwiller provides a few examples of these sequences, and here I would like to engage briefly with her arguments regarding them. 7.515-519 are interesting due to the speaker(s) being mourners, but there is nothing to indicate that Callimachus ordered these poems.[6] It is just as reasonable (if not more so) that an anthologist (Meleager or a predecessor) put these poems together because they had similar speakers, and not because they were together in any original collection. Gutzwiller also identifies another sequence of sepulchral epigrams, but there are problems here as well. She finds meaning in the shifting series of speakers in a run of five epigrams:

7.520 tombstone (or poet?) speaks
7.521 tombstone speaks
7.522 passerby speaks
7.523 tombstone speaks
7.524 tombstone and passerby hold a dialogue

(39)

As Gutzwiller points out, 7.523 is a simple couplet that holds little interest for the literary reader. She suggests that Callimachus deliberately alternates the passerby and tombstone as speakers in this sequence, culminating in 7.524, where the two converse with each other. There are three main difficulties with this interpretation. First, one would expect 7.520 to be a passerby speaking, so that the sequence would possess symmetry. Otherwise, the sequence is a mere three poems long, and 7.523, the tombstone's solo speech, is a simple inscription, nothing more. If one could show that 7.523 is an interpolation, and the actual sequence should be 7.521, 7.522, 7.524, then this would be a

much more interesting theory. As it is, Gutzwiller can only suggest that 7.523 is a place-holder designed to highlight the dialogue of 7.524. The second difficulty is Gutzwiller's view that 7.524 is a dialogue between a passerby and a tombstone. The passerby does ask the tombstone if Charidas lies beneath it, and the tombstone replies affimatively, but after this exchange the tombstone is silent while the passerby converses with Charidas. To say that this poem is a dialogue between a passerby and a tombstone is inexact when four of its six lines are actually dialogue between the passerby and Charidas. Finally, it is difficult to say how this possible sequence informs our reading of these poems. If Gutzwiller means simply to highlight Callimachus' use of variation within his sepulchral epigrams, I do not think that a discussion of sequence is necessary to make her point. One simply needs to look at any selection of the poet's epigrams to see evidence of variation within his work. In conclusion, I see no convincing evidence that these poems should be considered a sequence produced by Callimachus rather than by the anthologists.

Gutzwiller's argument that all Hellenistic epigrammatists were book writers may be influenced by her identification of Anyte as a producer of epigram collections who Gutzwiller believes may have been one of the first epigrammatists to present a distinct literary persona.[7] Gutzwiller identifies Anyte as the inventor of epigram books, and she also points out Nossis as an early producer of the same.[8]

Gutzwiller argues that the male epigrammatists were influenced by Anyte's model to produce epigram books themselves. As she acknowledges, however, the female experience was quite different from the male experience in the Hellenistic period. While men had other, long-established avenues for the presentation of their work (symposia,

competitions, command performances), the ability of women to reach wider audiences was restricted. It certainly stands to reason that popular female poets reached their audience through the written word more than through public performance, but the same should not be assumed for men of the period. This is not to say that these female poets were not innovators nor influential, merely that a direct comparison (Anyte wrote books of epigrams so Callimachus must have too) must be substantiated by literary or historical evidence to be fully convincing.

Gutzwiller's approach is not without appeal. Certainly, it appears as if the *Aetia* and the *Iambi* were ordered by Callimachus, so it is possible that he did the same for the epigrams. I would, however, argue that it is a different type of poetry from the outset. The genre requires such short poems that in a single book one could easily have hundreds of epigrams. It seems unlikely that they would all be written and organised in the same manner as a poem such as the *Aetia* that is conceived from its inception as a longer, connected piece. Even the *Iambi* come in forms and number that lend themselves more easily to careful ordering. Obviously a poet could carefully order 100 epigrams, but to conceive of such a project from the beginning seems unlikely. In addition, it should be noted that we only have 64 of Callimachus' epigrams out of possible hundreds. There is no reason to assume that the anthologists made any effort to keep sequences of Callimachus' epigrams together. Gutzwiller takes the evidence of these other works and projects their structure onto the epigrams. She argues that there is an "observable connection" between the genre of epigram and Callimachus' other poetry books, and that these links allow us to uncover aesthetic statements and structural principles in the epigrams based upon those found in the *Aetia* and the *Iambi* (188). Gutzwiller sums up

her approach: "while Callimachus' epigrams run the gamut from what appear to be simple inscriptions to overt statements of poetic creed, it is largely through arrangement, the juxtaposition of poem with poem, that Callimachus melds theory with practice and brings to bear the force of his personality, his self-reflection on himself and his art, to the epigram book as whole" (189-190). The major flaw with her argument, however, is that it predicates an epigram book for which we have very little evidence. If the simple existence of such a book is questionable, then the structure and content of that book must remain purely hypothetical.

Using this approach, Gutzwiller feels confident enough to identify *Epigram* 54 as the programmatic, first poem in Callimachus' collection. I will discuss her arguments in more detail in Chapter Nine. For the time being, I will simply suggest that Gutzwiller has made an interesting and educated guess, but I fear it can be considered nothing more.

Conclusion

Most interpretations of Callimachus' epigrams depend on a contextual frame of some kind. This list shows a few of the different approaches taken by scholars to the question of context for the epigrams of Callimachus:[9]

Allusion to previous literature (e.g. Homer)
Allusion to contemporary literature or performance context
Allusion to author's own work
Author's work as presented in book form
Allusion to author's biography or current events

As I have already discussed, I cannot subscribe to Gutzwiller's approach without more concrete evidence for an author-ordered collection of epigrams. Even if I could be swayed by her arguments for the existence of such a book, I cannot believe that the order

of that book is at all accessible to us. Hutchinson, although he denies the existence of a programme specifically for the epigrams, nonetheless identifies recurrent themes throughout Callimachus' work that he believes inform our reading of the epigrams. I like this approach much more than Gutzwiller's, as we actually possess other work by Callimachus, and we even know something of the order in which some of these works were produced. Cameron has taken another approach by looking for intertextual play between the poems of Callimachus and those of his contemporaries. Again, this approach is reasonably sound, as we possess a fair amount of other Hellenistic literature with which to conduct such a comparison. Other scholars have approached Callimachus' poetry by searching for context in the poet's life. This approach can occasionally reveal useful insight or an amusing anecdote, but it is usually a flawed method of reading ancient poetry. Too little is known with certainty of the biographies of ancient authors, Callimachus being no exception, for this technique to be consistently useful. Scholars who use this approach are also often guilty of creating biographical fact out of poetic fiction, then taking that "fact" and using it to argue for their interpretation of a poet's work.[10]

All of these scholars are attempting to place Callimachus' epigrams in context through various means. For poems of this brevity, context can be of great importance to interpretation, and all of these studies have added something to our understanding of Callimachus' epigrams.

I would now like to offer my contribution to this project of placing Callimachus and his poetry in context, but I would like to do so by examining the literary heritage of his work. For the present project, I will focus on the earliest tradition for which we still

have substantial evidence: Homeric epic. It has long been remarked that the Hellenistic poets, and Callimachus in particular, saw Homer as their most important predecessor.[11] His influence can be detected throughout all periods and genres of Greek poetry. I propose to examine the influence of Homer in Callimachus' epigrams, with the specific aim of extracting elements in the epigrams that seem to support the author's poetic programme (insofar as a programme can be discerned).

First and foremost, I must state that I do not believe that we can identify a programme specific to the epigrams as a defined collection. If we had an author-ordered book of epigrams, such a task might be possible. As the poems stand, though, we must approach the epigrams as having disparate origins. When I speak of a programme, then, I mean a broader, poetic programme that is discerned by looking at Callimachus' epigrams and finding common, recurrent themes. I want to examine key epigrams individually, and discover if a poem has themes that link it with themes in other poems. I do not want to approach the epigrams with a preconceived notion of what programme I am searching for, as that would undoubtedly colour my interpretation. I am of the opinion that throughout his work, Callimachus maintains a poetic programme. This programme is not always evident in every poem he writes, but he comments on it often enough to create a framework with which the reader can approach Callimachus' poetry. The exact nature of this programme will be made clear in the following chapters, as I examine individual epigrams. My task is to see how that programme manifests itself in the epigrams through allusion to Homeric epic. I believe that this approach will not only allow for a close, perhaps even novel, reading of specific epigrams, but will also, by focussing on the application of this poetic programme within a single genre, provide insight into the

programme and its relation to the Callimachean corpus.

Endnotes Chapter 4

[1] Cf. Hutchinson 75. He cites *Ep.* 6 and 35 as examples.

[2] Cf. Hutchinson 75. He provides *Ep.* 4 as an example.

[3] Cameron 1995b: 78. See Lattimore 17-20 for a discussion of professional inscribers using books of stock poems from which clients could select appropriate sentiments for their dedication or dearly departed.

[4] Cameron 1995b: 78. Cameron uses Callimachus' self-epitaphs as an example where modern scholars have read much into the ordering of the two epigrams without being able to prove that either poem was composed with the other in mind .

[5] For a recent survey of the scholarship on the possibility of a Callimachean epigram book and the role of performance and reading in his poetry, including a discussion of Gutzwiller's views, see Meyer 127-224.

[6] Cf. Gutzwiller 39. I use the *AP* numbering here in order to maintain the order on which Gutzwiller is basing her examination. I would again point out, however, that this ordering is not maintained by editors such as Gow and Page. 7.520-7.524 = GP 33, 43, 40, 39 and 31.

[7] Gutzwiller 55. In Anyte's collection, Gutzwiller believes that "Anyte 16 and 18 seem to have functioned programmatically, by inviting the reader, figured as a weary traveler, to experience an epigram book, represented as a cool and enticing grove" (73).

[8] For Anyte see Gutzwiller 54ff. For Nossis see 74ff.

[9] Laurel Bowman, private communication. These categories and the ascription of different authors to them are not intended to be absolute, as both approaches and scholars often incorporate multiple methods.

[10] One classic example is the common view that Sappho was a lesbian because some of her poetry appears to suggest that orientation. Over time, however, this view has become so prevalent that people take it for fact and begin to see homoerotic references in poems that do not ostensibly submit to such a reading. This is not to say that she may not have had a lesbian poetic persona, or that some of her poetry isn't homoerotic, but one must be very careful not to take such ideas as biographical fact when looking at her poetry. Another example is the supposed feud between Apollonius and Callimachus that resulted in the former leaving Alexandria to revise the *Argonautica*. See Lombardo XIV-XV.

[11] Cf. Hopkinson 7-10.

Chapter 5: Hunting for Homer

Epigram 1

ὡψρευτής, Ἐπίκυδες, ἐν οὔρεσι πάντα λαγωόν
διφᾷ καὶ πάσης ἴχνια δορκαλίδος
στίβῃ καὶ νιφετῷ κεχρημένος· ἢν δέ τις εἴπῃ
'τῆ, τόδε βέβληται θηρίον', οὐκ ἔλαβεν.
χοὐμὸς ἔρως τοιόσδε· τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα διώκειν
οἶδε τὰ δ' ἐν μέσσῳ κείμενα παρπέταται.

The hunter, Epikudes, in hills all over searches after the hare
and the footprints of every deer, exposed
to the hoarfrost and the snowstorm; but lo, when someone says,
"Take it, this beast is struck", he does not take it.
My love, too, is such a kind; although it knows how to pursue
fleeing things, it flies past the goods in hand.

I will begin my analysis of the poems proper with *Epigram* 1. This discussion is reasonably brief, but it will admirably demonstrate the effect that Callimachus' use of rare Homeric words can have on our understanding of a poem and its aesthetic statement.

In Callimachus 1, the speaker is lamenting his fickle heart: the moment he wins the object of his affections, he begins to look elsewhere.[1] This poem has several links to Homer. *Λαγωός* (hare), an epic form of *λαγώς*, occurs three times in Homer. In *Iliad* 10, Dolon dresses in a wolf skin and spies on the Greek camp. Odysseus is wise to the plot, and having enlisted the help of Diomedes, the pair harry the man like hounds after prey:

> *ὡς δ' ὅτε καρχαρόδοντε δύω κύνε εἰδότε θήρης*
> *ἢ κεμάδ' ἠὲ λαγωὸν ἐπείγετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεὶ*
> *χῶρον ἀν' ὑλήενθ'.*
>
> just as two dogs that have sighted a wild beast,
> a young deer, or a hare (*λαγωόν*), and go after it, eagerly, always
> through the spaces of the woods.
>
> (*Iliad* 10.360-362)

Although describing dogs hunting rather than humans, there are several ties between this passage and Callimachus' epigram. The words "beast" (*θηρίον / θήρης*) and "deer" (*δορκαλίδος / κεμάδ'*) occur in both Homer and Callimachus. The next occurrence of "hare" comes in *Iliad* 22.310. In this passage, Hector charges Achilles for the last time, and he is likened to an eagle that is swooping down to snatch a "shivering hare":

> *οἴμησεν δὲ ἀλεὶς ὥς τ' αἰετὸς ὑψιπετήεις,*
> *ὅς τ' εἶσιν πεδίονδε διὰ νεφέων ἐρεβεννῶν*
> *ἁρπάξων ἢ ἄρν' ἀμαλὴν ἢ πτῶκα λαγωόν.*
>
> and gathering
> himself together, he made his swoop, like a high-flown eagle
> who launches himself out of the murk of the clouds on the flat land
> to catch away a tender lamb or a shivering hare.
> (*Iliad* 22.308-310)

Unfortunately for the Trojans, Achilles is the victor of this final clash between the two heroes. It is worth noting that this time *λαγωόν* occurs in the same position in Homer's line as it does in Callimachus' epigram.

The final occurrence of *λαγωός* in Homer is at *Odyssey* 17.295, part of a description of Argos, the dog that has waited 20 long years for his master, Odysseus, to return home. Although the word is again in the ultimate position in the line, it is now a plural accusative:

> *τὸν δὲ πάροιθεν ἀγίνεσκον νέοι ἄνδρες*
> *αἶγας ἐπ' ἀγροτέρας ἠδὲ πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγωούς.*
>
> In the days before, the young men had taken him
> out to follow goats of the wild, and deer, and rabbits.
> (*Odyssey* 17.294-295)

We are told that in his heyday, Argos chased not only hares, but also deer (*πρόκας* - 295). Argos is also described as "very clever at tracking", and "never / could any wild animal, in the profound depths of the forest, escape, once he pursued" (315-317). Unfortunately

for the old hound, "now he had been put aside, with his master absent / and lay on the deep pile of dung" (296-297). The message for the lover is a warning: if he continues to throw away lovers as soon as he gets them, he will end up alone when his youth and beauty fade.

The next link to Homer involves the word *νιφετῷ*, which appears twice in the Homeric epics.[2] In four words (*στίβῃ καὶ νιφετῷ κεχρημένος*) Callimachus attempts to capture an image of the intense weather conditions through which the hunter will persevere in order to make his kill. This image is insufficient, however, and Callimachus in effect provides his audience with the full version by referring to *Iliad* 10, where Agamemnon is described as having a "beating turmoil in his bosom / from the deep heart, and all his wits were shaken within him" (9-10), an emotion strikingly similar to that felt by a lover. This feeling is further illustrated by comparison with a storm:

> *ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀστράπτῃ πόσις Ἥρης ἠυκόμοιο,*
> *τεύχων ἢ πολὺν ὄμβρον ἀθέσφατον ἠὲ χάλαζαν*
> *ἢ νιφετόν, ὅτε πέρ τε χιὼν ἐπάλυνεν ἀρούρας,*
> *ἠέ ποθι πτολέμοιο μέγα στόμα πευκεδανοῖο.*
>
> as when the lord of Hera the lovely-haired flashes his lightning
> as he brings on a great rainstorm, or a hail incessant,
> or a blizzard (*νιφετόν*), at such time when the snowfall scatters on
> ploughlands,
> or drives on somewhere on earth the huge edge of tearing battle.
> (*Iliad* 10.5-8)

Like a lover, Agamemnon cannot sleep due to his anguish: "*οὐκ.../ ὕπνος ἔχε γλυκερός, πολλὰ φρεσὶν ὁρμαίνοντα* (no sweet sleep held [him], as he pondered much in his mind)" (*Iliad* 10.3-4. My translation).

Continuing this theme of a hunter (or lover) who struggles through all kinds of anguish to reach his goal, the second occurrence of *νιφετός* in Homer comes in *Odyssey*

4.566. Here the ideal outcome for the hunter/lover is presented. Menelaus, having gone across the seas hunting for Helen (his love) and having endured the storm of war, is promised everlasting happiness in the Elysian Field after he dies. This paradise is perfect:

> *τῇ περ ῥηίστη βιοτὴ πέλει ἀνθρώποισιν·*
> *οὐ νιφετὸς, οὔτ' ἂρ χειμὼν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος.*
>
> there is made the easiest life for all mortals,
> for there is no snow (*νιφετός*), nor much winter there, nor is there ever rain.
>
> (*Odyssey* 4.565-566)

Callimachus, having established through this allusion that the ideal outcome for a lover who wins his love is to then spend eternity with that person, comes to the heart of his problem: once the beast is slain, he no longer wants it (*Ep.* 1.4).

So what does it all mean? What we see in this epigram is Callimachus using Homeric references to flesh out what is a necessarily bare-bones account of hunting. This use of allusion to provide context for the events in an epigram is commonly employed by Callimachus. Alluding in this manner provides fuller details in a genre that is characterised by brief details and scenes painted with minimal brush strokes. These allusions also cleverly warn the lover of the penalties for inconstancy, and the rewards for the steadfast, loyal lover. In literary terms, Callimachus suggests that the poet who is faithful to his craft and perfects one genre will be successful and win eternal fame. As this sentiment occurs in an epigram, the reader would assume that Callimachus has chosen this genre for his mastery. The slightly better-read audience would know, however, that Callimachus wrote in several genres. Perhaps he felt like the lover, moving on to the next thing as soon as he grasped the previous interest.

Endnotes Chapter 5

[1] Although it is by no means necessary that the speaker of this poem and the poems discussed in the following chapters is Callimachus, I will refer to the speaker by his name. However, it is always important to remember that this poetic persona should not be confused with the historic Callimachus. Given the short nature and variable content of the epigrammatic form, it is also difficult to assume that Callimachus adopts any single persona throughout the poems. Indeed, it is clear in several poems (most obviously in the dedicatory and funerary styles) that Callimachus does not intend his audience to consider him the speaker, but instead the speaker is another person, perhaps named in the poem, or is an inanimate object such as a tombstone or a dedicated object. Sometimes a poem has two speakers engaged in conversation. Nonetheless, it is worth considering the poet's voice in the poems, especially if Gutzwiller is correct in suggesting that the epigrams were published as a book by Callimachus. In this circumstance, the reader would be very aware that the was reading the poet's words and not someone else's.

[2] The word also occurs in Simonides (6.217 line 1), but that poem does not appear to be related to Callimachus' epigram. It is also found twice in Apollonius (3.69 and 3.1359), neither occurrence is significant to *Epigram* 1. Otherwise, *νιφετός* appears rarely in poetry.

Chapter 6: Against the Commonplace

Epigram 2

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω τὶς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει·
μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός· ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς ἠχώ φησί τις 'ἄλλος ἔχει'.

I hate the circular poem and I do not rejoice in
the path that carries many people this way and that;
I also hate the wandering beloved, and I don't
drink from the common spring; I loath all public things.
Lysanias, you are indeed beautiful, beautiful; but before Echo
says this clearly, someone says "another has him".

Epigram 2 is much more obviously linked with literary criticism than *Epigram* 1. The ostensible point of this epigram is the speaker's distaste for sharing a lover, but many commentators see a statement of literary aesthetics being made. Some scholars have had difficulty with the lines, and have suggested various emendations. Giangrande is one such critic, stating that "we cannot be so uncritically blind as not to see that the epigram, in its present textual state, is meaningless, or…that the final couplet is irrelevant to the previous statements made by Callimachus" (1969: 34). Cameron, on the other hand, argues that "the poem must be studied as a whole. For it is much more than a statement of Callimachus's poetic creed. It is a subtle erotic poem – too subtle indeed for most critics and commentators, who (when they do not ignore) make heavy weather of the last couplet, some actually deleting it as an interpolation" (1995b: 388). Recently, Henrichs' reading of the poem as a negative priamel has formed the basis of most interpretation.[1] He suggests that Callimachus' does not ask what he likes best, but rather what is worst.

Seen in this way, the pattern is easy to follow:

> I dislike (*ἐχθαίρω*) "cyclic" (bad) epic poetry
> I dislike (*οὐδὲ...χαίρω*) the trodden path
> I dislike (*μισέω*) the male prostitute
> I dislike (*οὐδὲ...πίνω*) the public well
> I dislike (*σικαίνω*) "pleasures shared by the mob"
> But I do like Lysanias, however...[2]

Although Henrichs was the first to label this progression as a priamel, he acknowledges that previous scholars employed the structure subconsciously in their analyses of the poem (212). He concludes his examination of Callimachus 2 by saying with certainty "that in writing this epigram Callimachus wrote his personal credo, which is that of an extremely self-conscious man who cultivated his privacy and exclusive taste" (212). But what is this "personal credo" of which Henrichs speaks?

Gutzwiller, an adherent to Henrichs' negative priamel theory, suggests that Callimachus exercises reserve both as a lover and as a poet. She believes that this erotic and artistic unity integrates the amatory epigrams with the other sections of Callimachus' collection. She also suggests that *Epigram* 2 is programmatic in this way, and possibly stood at the beginning of the amatory section (218). She goes on to say that the poem's message lies in the imperfect echo of line six. Having just made an aesthetic judgement of Lysanias' beauty, Callimachus is thrown into doubt over the boy's fidelity by an echo of his words. Through this shift, the audience can see the manner in which Callimachus' refinement affects his amatory relationships. In this case, Callimachus' doubts obstruct his ability to enjoy his love of Lysanias.[3]

Many scholars see a more pointed statement of aesthetics than Gutzwiller. Most commonly, commentators have seen this poem as evidence that Callimachus completely

rejects the imitation of Homeric poetry.[4] Thomas agrees with this view, but finds evidence to include another genre against which Callimachus allegedly inveighs. In this poem he sees "a summary of the poet's major polemical poetic theory; the genres of epic and drama were those which he found most unacceptable" (187). Goldhill also sees a rejection, but believes it is a more general statement. He calls this poem a "(public) turning away from the public poetry of the fifth century" and a "a gesture of withdrawal from the persona of the public *sophos*, who speaks out to the citizen body" (223). Goldhill is thus in general agreement with Thomas, for drama and epic are certainly among the most public of genres.

Cameron rejects the idea that this poem involves drama, although he does see a statement made about cyclic poetry (1995b: 388-389). His comments are brief on the topic, however, and limited to the idea that Callimachus does not like cyclic poetry, and "that he was as fastidious about literature as he was about love" (1995b: 393). Cameron's view is that this epigram begins by "misdirecting us to literature" when it is actually about love.[5] He agrees with Henrichs that the first four lines are a negative priamel, with the final couplet stating what the speaker does like. The twist, however, is that Lysanias too is a common commodity, and he becomes another example of what Callimachus does not like. For those who would still condemn the final couplet as an interpolation, Cameron points to *Epigram* 1, where four lines on hunting serve as the prelude to the final couplet linking the metaphor to love. Cameron goes on to offer an excellent review of criticism on the second epigram, and he discusses the arguments for the poetic statement that Callimachus appears to be making in this poem before concluding that "the primary purpose of the poem is surely erotic rather than literary, the

point being the disparity of the successive objects of his dislike rather than any particular sort of poetry" (1995b: 399).

Having introduced the varying views held by scholars regarding this poem, I would like to add my own voice with some new evidence gleaned from a careful examination of the diction in this epigram.

In the very first phrase of this poem Callimachus states his hatred for "*τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν*" (the circular poem). It is generally held that the "circular poem" refers to epic poetry.[6] This is not a strange statement for Callimachus to make, or at least the audience should not take it as such, for we have heard from Callimachus before that his aesthetic does not favour long, continuous poetry.[7] In addition to his preference for brevity, the next phrase suggests that Callimachus does not like to redo things have been previously done; he does not like "the path that carries many people this way and that". Callimachus chooses not to write epic poetry himself, and likely would have condemned any peers who merely imitated their models in a slavish manner. This is not to say that he is against epic poetry in and of itself.[8] Callimachus was clearly well-versed in epic, particularly Homer, and he thought so highly of Homer's work as to make constant allusion to him. As such, it is likely that the "circular poem" refers not to epic poetry in general, but to the hackneyed imitation of Homer by Callimachus' contemporaries. His rejection of epic may also be a form of *recusatio*. Instead of suggesting that he is not equal to the task (as Horace does in *Epodes* 2.245ff.) or that some Muse is directing his work (Ovid *Amores* 1.1) or that his subject is impious (Callimachus *Aetia fr.* 75),[9] Callimachus chooses to avoid epic on aesthetic grounds. He will never merely imitate the greatest of Greek poets, like so many others, but will produce something original.

It is worth noting that Callimachus emphasises his originality with the very words that he uses to describe this common style of poetry, as both "*ποίημα*" and "*κυκλικὸν*" occur only here in Callimachus and nowhere in Homer or Hesiod.[10] Thus Callimachus rejects commonality both in content and diction. Callimachus also uses the same technique to reinforce his aesthetic sentiments, only he does it in the opposite manner. The word "*ἐχθαίρω*" (I hate), for example, occurs only here in the Callimachean corpus, although it is reasonably common in Homer.[11] It should also be noticed that the word for "path" that Callimachus chooses, "*κέλευθος*", also occurs often in Homer. These words are common in the circular poetry that Callimachus professes to dislike. It would seem as though the poet is playing with his subject, both rejecting epic and displaying his knowledge of it.

In line three, the word "*περίφοιτος*" (wandering) is a common enough word in Greek literature, although it only occurs twice in Callimachus' work.[12] This word is important, however, because it is most decidedly un-Homeric, appearing nowhere in his corpus. This should be striking to the reader as the figure of Odysseus is *the* wandering character of Greek literature. That Callimachus does not choose to use a Homeric word to describe the wandering lover, for instance a word such as *πολύτροπος* (*Od.* 1.1), is telling. Why? Line 4 reveals the answer when Callimachus takes his rejection of his poetic forebears one step further with the use of the word "*σικχαίνω*" (I loath). This relatively rare word occurs once in Callimachus and elsewhere only in prose.[13] Thus Callimachus has rejected not only common, epic poetry, but all poetic diction.

Finally, in lines 5-6, Callimachus begins to move from his hatred in a more positive direction. Lysanias is "*καλὸς*" (beautiful). Unfortunately for Callimachus, Echo

barely has time to repeat this observation before someone tells the author that another already has Lysanias. Here Lysanias figures Callimachus' ideal poetry. The poet must act now in order to assert ownership of this style of poetry before he loses his chance at claiming originality. Unfortunately, by the time he identifies this poetry, it is already too late. What is this style of poetry? It is beautiful, and it is achieved through speaking *σαφῶς* (clearly, plainly, distinctly), a word that is only here in Callimachus and nowhere in Archaic epic. This word is important for two reasons. First, it tells us how Callimachus intends to write his original style of poetry. It is not a coincidence that the poet is writing an epigram, the genre ostensibly intended to portray key information in a clear and concise manner. Indeed, it is not simply clarity, but also brevity that the poet strives for in his work. Callimachus refuses to write a cyclic poem as long as the Persian chain he rejects in the *Aetia*. His use of epigram, a generically brief form, emphasises this aesthetic preference. Within the epigram, Callimachus is extraordinarily clear and compact in his message to Lysanias, using just four words in line five to tell him how he feels: "*σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς*" (you are indeed beautiful). This is, of course, a joke, and it leads me to my second point. Despite his claims of clarity and brevity, Callimachus has, in fact, used five lines to get to the ostensible point of his poem: his desire for Lysanias.[14] If Callimachus were truly *σαφῶς*, this poem would be one line long. In addition, the underlying message of this poem is anything but obvious and clear. Instead, it relies on a very careful, scholarly reading to fully grasp. Even within the genre of epigram, Callimachus has managed to play with the concepts of clarity and brevity.

Throughout this poem, Callimachus progresses from using common Homeric diction (*κέλευθος*), to a common word not found in Homer (*περίφοιτος*), to a word not

found elsewhere in poetry at all (*σικχαίνω*). He also tells us that he will speak clearly (*σαφῶς*). Through his careful choice of vocabulary, Callimachus emphatically makes his point: originality and brevity are of the utmost importance and everything else is just common reiteration. Callimachus proves in this poem that he can reject epic and common poetic diction. He does this by writing an epigram, arguably the poetic antithesis of an epic, and by incorporating non-poetic language into his work.

Hutchinson suggests that Callimachus' distaste for common things implies "Callimachus' own originality; but it is striking that he should now present his feeling as a matter of personal and peculiar temperament, not as a categorical imperative. Callimachus has turned the authoritative 'I hate' of classical poets into a statement of admirable but individual predilection. What he is inviting us to contemplate is not the aesthetic principle but himself" (83). Although Hutchinson has the stated goal of redeeming Callimachus from his reputation as a poet of impenetrable erudition, here I think that he is perhaps too caught up in the emotions of reading Callimachus' poetry. The ancient poet was an extremely refined scholar and it would be foolish to approach his poetry purely at face value. I agree that the poet's learning should not be a barrier to enjoying his work, but I believe that much of the enjoyment comes from an appreciation of Callimachus' refined and scholarly approach to his art. Finally, I strongly disagree with the idea that Callimachus intends his audience to think not of an aesthetic principle, but of himself. The statement must be modified to say that the *speaker* of the poem wants the audience to think of himself as well as an aesthetic principle. Although the styles of literature written by Callimachus and the literary evidence of his poetry strongly suggest that the historical Callimachus held the aesthetic values expressed in *Epigram* 2,

we can really assert no more than that the poetic persona of Callimachus appears to hold these values.

Endnotes Chapter 6

[1] Although some scholars disagree, they are now in the minority. Hübner, for example, writes "das vierzeilige Epigram 28 is kein Priamelgedicht. Es steht aber, wie manche Priameln, in der Tradition der Aufzahlung provozierend heterogener Gieder, die den Maniersiten aller Zeiten kostbar gewesen ist" (229).

[2] Henrichs 208-209. This table is slightly adapted from Henrichs' table.

[3] Cf. Gutzwiller 222.

[4] Cf. Matthews 47, for example.

[5] Cameron 1995b: 39. Hübner concurs, suggesting "daß sie endlich denjenigen schön findet, der schon vergeben ist, ist die komisch-hämische Pointe dieser Poesie" (226). Like Cameron, however, Hübner also sees a literary point: "die Autoren der kyklischen Poesie aber trifft eine gezielte Beleidigung" (229).

[6] This meaning seems clear from the beginning of an epigram of Pollianus (*A.P.* 11.130): "*τοὺς κυκλίους τούτους, τοὺς αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα λέγοντας / μισῶ, λωποδύτας ἀλλοτρίων ἐπέων*". In this poem, Pollianus expresses his preference for elegiacs rather than for imitations of Homer. It is also interesting to note that Pollianus uses the phrase "*θὴρ οὐατόεις*" in his poem, a phrase that is borrowed from Call. *fr.* 1.31, a passage in which Callimachus states his preference for brevity and originality in poetry. See G+P 155.

[7] See Chapter Two.

[8] Cf. Hutchinson 79n.104.

[9] Cf. Hutchinson 28-29.

[10] *ποίημα* reasonably rare in poetry, but is more common in prose. *κυκλικὸν* is extremely rare in poetry and prose.

[11] Occurring at Call. *Ep.* 2.1, *H.* 3.222; Hes. *Opera et dies* 300; Hom. *Il.* 17.270, *Od.* 3.215, 4.105, 4.692, 15.71, 16.96.

[12] Here and at *Ep.* 20.2.

[13] Gow and Page 156. A conjecture also puts this word in Euphorio *fr.* 21, who flourished after Callimachus.

[14] I read the final lines of this epigram to mean that Callimachus would like to be with Lysanias, but is denied because another person already has him. This poem could also be read as Callimachus resisting the temptations of Lysanias because the boy has been with several other people, and is thus too common for Callimachus. In poetic terms, Callimachus is resisting the urge to write in a genre that has already been made common by another author.

Chapter 7: The Cures for Love

Epigram 3

ὡς ἀγαθὰν Πολύφαμος ἀνεύρατο τὰν ἐπαοιδάν
τὠραμένῳ· ναὶ Γᾶν, οὐκ ἀμαθὴς ὁ Κύκλωψ.
αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, Φίλιππε·
ἦ πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον ἁ σοφία.
τοῦτο, δοκέω, χὰ λιμὸς ἔχει μόνον ἐς τὰ πονηρά
τὠγαθόν· ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον.
ἔσθ' ἁμῖν † χ' ακαστας † ἀφειδέα ποττὸν Ἔρωτα
τοῦτ' εἶπαι, 'κείρευ τὰ πτερά, παιδάριον·
οὐδ' ὅσον ἀττάραγόν τυ δεδοίκαμες, αἱ γὰρ ἐπῳδαί
οἴκοι τῶ χαλεπῶ τραύματος ἀμφότεραι.'

How excellent the charm that Polyphemus discovered for the lover;
yes, Earth, the Cyclops was not unlearned.
The Muses made the desire waste away, Philippus.
Indeed, poetry is the all-healing drug of all ills.[1]
In addition to this, I think only hunger is good for painful matters;
it eradicates the youth-loving sickness.
For us both there is this against remorseless Eros,
so that one should say, 'get your wings cut, little boy;
we don't fear you so much as a crumb, for both enchantments
are in the house of the grievously wounded.'

In *Epigram* 3, Callimachus employs a familiar erotic motif: poetry and hunger are the only cures for love. Strangely, this poem has received very little critical attention, though Meyer has suggested that it possesses a "programmatische Äußerung (*δοκέω*)" (156). The scholars who do discuss it usually do so in the context of erotic themes. The few who have gone into more detail inevitably focus on Callimachus' allusions to the contemporary writers Theocritus and Philoxenus. I do not doubt that Callimachus was aware of these other works, especially Theocritus' *Idyll* 11,[2] and he may well have been basing his work on those texts, but I think that there is more going on in these lines than previous commentators suggest. In particular, there are three allusions to Homer through

hapax legomena that illuminate the meaning of the poem. This poem is programmatic, insofar as it discusses one of the author's views on poetry.

The theme of poetry possessing curative effects for the lover is a common one. In *Epigram* 3, Callimachus adds that poverty can cure love as well, thus Callimachus, a poor poet, is doubly safe.[3] Moving beyond this basic reading, Meyer sees in *Epigram* 3 "ein Gegensatz zwischen literarischer *σοφία* und erotischem Leiden", but she offers no more discussion (166). Fantuzzi picks up on this same conflict and examines the idea more closely. He points out that Hellenistic poets often condemned amatory passion as a fall into the irrational. Callimachus explores the contradiction that an intellectual poet such as himself could be affected by the irrationality of love (and hence write love poetry) when he should be more resistant to such passion than an average person.[4] As examples of this poetic motif in action, Fantuzzi provides Theocritus' *Idyll* 11 and Callimachus' *Epigram* 3. The intellectual poet, having identified the conflict between love and rational thought, must somehow reconcile these two apparently contradictory poetic elements.

Focussing more specifically on *Epigram* 3, Fantuzzi argues that Callimachus performs this reconciliation through recognition of love's symptoms and cures. By asserting psychological insight into love, Callimachus implicitly suggests to his audience that he has some measure of control over the emotion. He also claims his love-poetry is an intellectual cure for love, rather than an uncontrollable production of his passion. This use of poetry as a palliative, according to Callimachus, is, in Fantuzzi's words, "the exclusive prerogative of the poet-intellectual…and thus allows him again to exhibit and enjoy his superiority" (343-344). Other scholars mention the cure of love poetry, but discussion of the Cyclops' role is lacking. At best, some critics, such as Lombardo, link

Callimachus' Polyphemus with the one depicted in Theocritus, also suggesting that Callimachus' Philippus is an analogue for the physician Nicias in Theocritus: "in Theokritos' Idyll 2 the Cyclops Polyphemos solaces his love for Galatea with a song. Theokritos addressed that idyll to his friend Nikias, a physican [sic]. Philip, the addressee of this epigram, is unknown, but one suspects that he is parallel to Nikias and that this accounts for the medical terminology in the poem".[5] Despite these links, Hutchinson believes that Callimachus is not merely imitating his contemporary. He suggests instead that Callimachus uses Theocritus' poem as a foil.[6] I would suggest that Callimachus' inclusion of hunger as a cure for love is a key element in differentiating his poem from Theocritus'. Despite this role, however, I don't think that hunger actually points toward the programmatic nature of the poem.

What, then, is the programmatic nature of the poem? I believe allusion to Homeric *hapax legomena* illuminates the answer; Polyphemus is, after all, a very important figure in the *Odyssey*. The first *hapax legomenon* is *ἐπαοιδάν* (charm/incantation). It occurs in line one of Callimachus' poem and is relatively rare in Greek literature. In Homer, the word is found in *Odyssey* 19.457:

> *τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Αὐτολύκου παῖδες φίλοι ἀμφεπένοντο,*
> *ὠτειλὴν δ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος ἀντιθέοιο*
> *δῆσαν ἐπισταμένως, ἐπαοιδῇ δ' αἷμα κελαινὸν*
> *ἔσχεθον, αἶψα δ' ἵκοντο φίλου πρὸς δώματα πατρός.*
>
> The dear sons of Autolykos were busy to tend him,
> and understandingly they bound up the wound of stately
> godlike Odysseus, and singing an incantation (*ἐπαοιδῇ*) over it
> stayed the black blood, and soon came back to the house of their loving father.

Odysseus is in need of these ministrations after being wounded while hunting a boar. The wound heals, but leaves a scar. This telling is actually a flashback describing the

scar by which Odysseus' nurse Eurykleia recognises her master while washing his feet. The context of the scene in Homer is significant. Odysseus' wound, although healed, leaves a mark that is clear even twenty years later to one who knows where to look. In the context of love, this suggests that although Callimachus claims to know remedies for love's pains, the healing ritual of song (*ἐπαοιδάν)* is not effective at removing the traces of love entirely. For one who can recognise the signs, the situation is clear.

The ties of this line in the epigram to the *Odyssey* are strengthened by the mention of Polyphemus. The role of the Cyclops in this epigram bears closer investigation than most scholars have afforded it. Most glaringly, in a line that alludes to the hero who defeats Polyphemus, why is the monster depicted as a poet? In line two, Callimachus goes out of his way to point out that despite common belief, "*οὐκ ἀμαθὴς ὁ Κύκλωψ*"(the Cyclops was not unlearned). Callimachus' depiction of Polyphemus is directly opposite to that of Homer, where Odysseus' foe is "*ἄγριον, οὔτε δίκας εὖ εἰδότα οὔτε Θέμιστας*"(wild, with no true knowledge of laws or any good customs) (*Odyssey* 9.215). The reason for this difference may lead back to Fantuzzi's analysis of the poet's attempt to rationalise and therefore control love. The Cyclops is patently unsuccessful in his attempt to love, and in Theocritus song is as much a symptom of love as it is a cure.[7] In *Epigram* 3, the Cyclops is the opposite of Callimachus, the poet-intellectual. They both employ the same method to ease their love pains, but Callimachus professes to be keenly aware of the whole situation in a way that the Cyclops is not. The allusion to Homer in this line, however, questions the effectiveness of the remedy.

In short, Callimachus wants to point out that the Cyclops *was* unlearned, and did not really know what he was doing by singing about love. Callimachus *is* learned, but

despite his claim to know the cures for love, he is nonetheless "grievously wounded".

The next important allusion to Homer occurs at the end of line four. The word, *σοφία* (skilled thing/art/poetry), is a Homeric *hapax legomena*, and it arises in a simile at *Iliad* 15.412:

> *ἀλλ' ὥς τε στάθμη δόρυ νήϊον ἐξιθύνει*
> *τέκτονος ἐν παλάμῃσι δαήμονος, ὅς ῥά τε πάσης*
> *εὖ εἰδῇ σοφίης ὑποθημοσύνῃσιν Ἀθήνης,*
> *ὣς μὲν τῶν ἐπὶ ἶσα μάχη τέτατο πτόλεμός τε.*
>
> But as the chalkline straightens the cutting of a ship's timber
> in the hands of an expert carpenter, who by Athene's
> inspiration is well versed in all his craft's subtlety (*σοφίης*),
> so the battles fought by both sides were pulled fast and even.

This simile describes the Trojans and the Greeks locked in an immovable line of combat by the ships. In this case, I do not believe that the battle context of the simile is important, except perhaps as a metaphor for struggling with love. The simile itself, however, is particularly pertinent to Callimachus' poem. Instead of drawing inspiration from Apollo, as is usual for a poet, or being under the coercion of Eros, as is often the case of the love poet, the carpenter is inspired by Athena. Through this allusion, Callimachus also claims inspiration for his work from Athena, who is the epitome of rational thinking, and who is never affected by love. Thus Callimachus, who is "well versed in all his craft's subtlety", can claim a rational victory over love that eludes the poet who is being driven to write by Eros.

The third Homeric *hapax* ties in with the first allusion made in line one. The word is "*ἀφειδέα*"(remorseless), and it appears in line seven of this epigram.[8] In Homer, the word is actually used by Odysseus as a pseudonym for his father in 24.305 of the *Odyssey*:

εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος, ὅθι κλυτὰ δώματα ναίω,
υἱὸς Ἀφείδαντος Πολυπημονίδαο ἄνακτος·
αὐτὰρ ἐμοί γ' ὄνομ' ἐστὶν Ἐπήριτος· ἀλλά με δαίμων
πλάγξ' ἀπὸ Σικανίης δεῦρ' ἐλθέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα.

I am from Alybas, where I live in a famous dwelling,
and am the son of Apheidas, son of the lord Polypemon.
My own name is Eperitos; now the divinity
drove me here on my way against my will, from Sikania.

In this passage, Odysseus lies about his identity to his father Laertes for the last time before revealing himself. The names he gives are all descriptive of his travels: he says he is from a "*Ἀλύβαντος*" (wandering place), his grandfather is "*Πολυπημονίδαο*" (distress), his father is "*Ἀφείδαντος*" (remorseless) and his own name is "*Ἐπήριτος*" (division/strife).[9] By alluding to this passage, Callimachus is strengthening the tie between the experience of love and Odysseus' travels. A few lines after this passage Odysseus finally reveals himself to his father, who in turn demands evidence that Odysseus is indeed his son. The first proof that Odysseus offers is the scar from the hunting excursion on Mount Parnassus. Callimachus thus returns to where he started with his allusion in line one. Despite his poetry and his hunger, Callimachus' love-scar remains an inescapable and key component of his poetic identity.

It is also worth noting that the hunting incident takes place on Mount Parnassus, which is the traditional source of inspiration for poets. Although Callimachus tries to link his inspiration to rational thought (*σοφία*) and by allusion to Athena mid-way through the epigram, he returns to the influence of Parnassus at the end of his poem by allusion to Odysseus.

By tying his rational poetry together with the irrational poetry of love, Callimachus makes a programmatic statement about his persona as a intellectual poet. In

a way, love is still the motivation to write poetry, but instead of writing at the behest of Eros, the poet is writing in defence against him. Odysseus himself is often considered to be a poet, but his talents do not cure his difficult homeward journey, they merely ease certain aspects of it.[10] Odysseus' travel, as characterised by the names he uses when speaking to his father, is a metaphor for love. Odysseus often covers his true identity and history with clever tales, but his scar remains a sure sign of past injury. So with Callimachus. Despite his claims to understand love and know how to cure himself of the effects of Eros, Callimachus' intellect ultimately fails to rid the poet of his amatory passion.

Endnotes Chapter 7

[1] For the translation of *σοφία* as "poetry", see page 67.

[2] The subject matter and the dialect (Doric), are the major links between the two poems.

[3] Cf. Hutchinson 197 and Gutzwiller 216.

[4] Cf. Fantuzzi 180.

[5] Lombardo 113. For more on the identity of Philippus, see Gow and Page 157 and Hutchinson 197.

[6] Hutchinson 198. No one has mentioned the possibility that Philippus is the object of Callimachus' affections. The aural similarity of *Φίλιππε* to *φιλόπαιδα* is suggestive.

[7] Cf. Hopkinson 149.

[8] The word is rare in poetry, although it is often used in classical prose. It is uncommon among Hellenistic authors with the exception of Apollonius, who uses verbal forms of the word six times and the adjectival form twice. Callimachus' only other use of this word (in the hymn 6.127 to Ceres) must clearly be with the meaning of lavish/generous, not remorseless, as from its context in a prayer to Demeter who brings all good things it cannot be construed otherwise.

[9] Merry suggests that the name Odysseys gives for his father refers to the meaning of the word "*Ἀφεῖδαντος*" as generous, as he is speaking of Laertes, but I do not think that that interpretation fits well with the other names that Odysseus provides (375).

[10] Cf. recently Mackie.

Chapter 8: For Heraclitus

Epigram 34

Εἶπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ
ἤγαγεν, ἐμνήσθην δ' ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
ἠέλιον λέσχηι κατεδύσαμεν· ἀλλὰ σὺ μέν που,
ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδιή·
αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ᾗσιν ὁ πάντων
ἁρπακτὴς Ἀίδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ.

Someone spoke, Heraclitus, of your fate, and brought me to tears,
and I remembered how often we both
sank down the sun in conversation; but you, I suppose,
friend from Halicarnassus, four ages ago were ash;
but your nightingales live, upon which Hades,
stealer of all things, will not lay his hand.

This chapter is an examination of Callimachus 34 (*AP* 7.80), the funerary epigram for Heraclitus written by Callimachus. Although this poem has been subject to academic interest, there has been little scholarship on Homeric allusion in this epigram. In his *Hellenistic Anthology*, Neil Hopkinson neatly elucidates the difficulties of reading this poem, saying:

> classical scholars have approved this poem as a heartfelt expression of grief miraculously untainted by Callimachus' usual learned predilections. It is therefore important to note that even so 'sincere' a poem as this depends for full appreciation on a knowledge of etymology and of the Homeric lexicon. To the learned Hellenistic reader the poem's appeal lay not in its 'emotional' strength alone, but in the combination of that aspect with the telling use of etymology and Homeric words and phrases to produce a complex and sophisticated whole.
>
> (249)

Despite this advice, however, commentators on this poem, including Hopkinson, have done no more than point out the presence of Homeric *hapax legomena*. Callimachus uses

these specific Homeric references to effectively link Heraclitus with two Homeric heroes, Odysseus and Hector, and to introduce another layer of meaning into this short memorial for a dead friend.

The first Homeric *hapax legomenon* that Callimachus uses, *λέσχη*, occurs in line three of his epigram.[1] The word can mean either a place where people converse or a conversation.[2] In Callimachus, the word seems best translated as "conversation", although in Homer it is clearly used as a "place of conversation". The word occurs in *Odyssey* 18. The disguised Odysseus has just told the serving women to go wait on Penelope instead of cavorting with the suitors, and one of the women, Melantho, responds with these words. She is telling Odysseus to go to some other "*λέσχην*" (place of conversation) instead of hanging around the palace telling the women what to do:

> *ξεῖνε τάλαν, σύ γέ τις φρένας ἐκπεπαταγμένος ἐσσὶ,*
> *οὐδ' ἐθέλεις εὕδειν χαλκήιον ἐς δόμον ἐλθὼν,*
> *ἠέ που ἐς λέσχην, ἀλλ' ἐνθάδε πόλλ' ἀγορεύεις,*
> *θαρσαλέως πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδέ τι θυμῷ*
> *ταρβεῖς·*
>
> Wretched stranger, you must be one whose wits are distracted,
> when you will not go where the smith is at work, and sleep there,
> or to some public gathering place (*λέσχην*), but staying here speak out
> boldly and at length among many men, and your spirit
> knows no fear.
>
> (*Odyssey* 18.327-332)

Odysseus finally puts the women to flight by threatening to tell Telemachus about their actions. There are important similarities between this situation and the one described in Callimachus' poem that make it clear that Callimachus used this Homeric *hapax* deliberately. For example, the scene in the *Odyssey* begins with the arrival of night to the partygoers: "*τοῖσι δὲ τερπομένοισι μέλας ἐπὶ ἕσπερος ἦλθεν*" (and dark evening came upon

those enjoying themselves) (18.306 – my translation). In the epigram, the two friends enjoy talking past the setting of the sun. In addition, Odysseus says that he could keep the fire going all night long, for he is very enduring:

> *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τούτοισι φάος πάντεσσι παρέξω.*
> *ἤν περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλωσιν ἐΰθρονον Ἠῶ μίμνειν,*
> *οὔ τι με νικήσουσι· πολυτλήμων δὲ μάλ' εἰμί.*
>
> But I myself will provide the light for all these people.
> And even if they wish to keep at it until the high-throned
> dawn, they will not wear me out. I am very enduring.
> (*Odyssey* 18.317-319)

In similar fashion, the two friends continue talking long into the night, an event that Callimachus can no longer enjoy due to the death of his friend. This, then, puts Heraclitus in the role of Odysseus, for they both "provide the light" required for enjoyable pastimes. Without the "light" provided by the company of his friend, Callimachus is alone in the darkness.

There are other similarities between Odysseus and Heraclitus. In line 4 of his epigram, Callimachus refers to Heraclitus as the "*ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ*" (stranger/guest-friend from Halicarnassus). These words serve to explain to the audience some of the background to the relationship between Callimachus and Heraclitus and why their previous discussions have lasted well into the night (each time they may have had years to catch up on). The two men may have visited more in their youths, thus the "*ὁσσάκις*" in line 2, but recently they have travelled less often (we can perhaps assume their age from the fact that Callimachus does not lament an early or unexpected death for his friend). It is also interesting to note that Odysseus is often called *ξεῖνος* by many of the people that he meets during his travels. Indeed, in the passage above, Melantho refers to him as

"*ζεῖνε τάλαν*" (wretched stranger). Although *ξεῖνος* is a common enough word in ancient Greek, the connection made between Heraclitus and Odysseus through Homeric *hapax legomena* argues for this further association.

Another common characteristic of Heraclitus and Odysseus is that they are both *ἀοιδοί*, singers or bards. Heraclitus is identified as such by his enduring "*ἀηδόνες*" (nightingales), a Homeric *hapax legomenon* occurring at *Odyssey* 19.518:

> *ὡς δ' ὅτε Πανδαρέου κόρη, χλωρηὶς ἀηδὼν,*
> *καλὸν ἀείδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱσταμένοιο,*
> *δενδρέων ἐν πετάλοισι καθεζομένη πυκινοῖσιν,*
> *ἥ τε θαμὰ τρωπῶσα χέει πολυηχέα φωνὴν,*
> *παῖδ' ὀλοφυρομένη Ἴτυλον φίλον, ὅν ποτε χαλκῷ*
> *κτεῖνε δι' ἀφραδίας, κοῦρον Ζήθοιο ἄνακτος,*
> *ὥς καὶ ἐμοὶ δίχα θυμὸς ὀρώρεται ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.*
>
> As when Pandareos' daughter, the greenwood nightingale,
> perching in the deep of the forest foliage sings out
> her lovely song, when springtime has just begun; she, varying
> the manifold strains of her voice, pours out the melody, mourning
> Itylos, son of the lord Zethos, her own beloved child,
> whom she once killed with the bronze when the madness was on her;
> so my mind is divided and starts on way, then another.
> (*Odyssey* 19.518-524)

Although the word *ἀηδών* is a *hapax* in both Homer and Callimachus, it occurs over fifty times elsewhere in Greek literature, making it reasonably common. Of particular note, it occurs three times in both Theocritus and Lycophon, two Hellenistic poets, and it is common throughout both comic and tragic drama. In addition, the context in which the word occurs in Homer is not fully paralleled in Callimachus. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope uses the nightingale in a simile describing the anxiety and pain she experiences as she lies awake at night worrying about what course of action she should take. She is uncertain whether to continue waiting for Odysseus to return, to marry a suitor or to return to her

father's house. Neither Callimachus nor Heraclitus face any kind of decision in *Epigram* 34 that suggests late-night anxiety. There are some similarities, however, as Callimachus continues to mourn the long dead Heraclitus in the same way that Penelope mourns Odysseus, who has been missing for twenty years:

> *αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ πένθος ἀμέτρητον πόρε δαίμων·*
> *ἤματα μὲν γὰρ τέρπομ' ὀδυρομένη, γοόωσα,*
> *ἔς τ' ἐμὰ ἔργ' ὁρόωσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.*
>
> The divinity gave me grief beyond measure.
> The day times I indulge in lamentation, mourning
> as I look to my own tasks and those of my maids in the palace.
> (*Odyssey* 19.512-514)

In both poems, *ἀηδών* appears in the context of grief, and strengthens the link between Heraclitus and Odysseus. It also links Callimachus and Penelope as the singers who are left behind to mourn and keep the memories of their loved ones alive. Due to its common appearance in Greek literature, however, this allusion to Homer cannot be given greater weight in the analysis of *Epigram* 34.

The suggestion has been made that "nightingales" was the title of a collection of poems by Heraclitus, but the theory has remained speculative for a lack of evidence. Poets are often described as nightingales (the word is related to *ἀείδω*, to sing), although it appears as though this is the first time that the word is used to refer explicitly to *poems*. Perhaps the most important reason for using the word here is that the nightingale is the only bird that sings after dark. Thus the nocturnal conversations of line three that are stolen by the death of one of the participants, are in a way restored by the image of a bird/poems that conquer the darkness of death. As regards Homer, Odysseus is identified as an *ἀοιδος* by the stories that he tells, so much so that Hilary Mackie describes Odysseus

as "the *Odyssey*'s central storyteller".[3] This aspect of Odysseus' character is most clearly seen when he recounts his travels to his Phaiacian hosts in *Odyssey* 9-12. Upon hearing his tale, Alkinoös, the Phaiacian king, says:

> *σοὶ δ' ἔπι μὲν μορφὴ ἐπέων, ἔνι δὲ φρένες ἐσθλαί,*
> *μῦθον δ' ὡς ὅτ' ἀοιδὸς ἐπισταμένως κατέλεξας,*
> *πάντων τ' Ἀργείων σέο τ' αὐτοῦ κήδεα λυγρά.*
>
> You have
> a grace upon your words, and there is a sound sense within them,
> and expertly, as a singer would do, you have told the story
> of the dismal sorrows befallen yourself and all the Argives.
> (*Odyssey* 11.367-369)

Odysseus is again likened to a singer in *Odyssey* 17, this time by the shepherd Eumaios, with whom he has been staying:

> *οἷ' ὅ γε μυθεῖται, θέλγοιτό κέ τοι φίλον ἦτορ.*
> *τρεῖς γὰρ δή μιν νύκτας ἔχον, τρία δ' ἤματ' ἔρυξα*
> *ἐν κλισίῃ· πρῶτον γὰρ ἔμ' ἵκετο νηὸς ἀποδράς·*
> *ἀλλ' οὔ πω κακότητα διήνυσεν ἣν ἀγορεύων.*
> *ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνὴρ ποτιδέρκεται, ὅς τε θεῶν ἒξ*
> *ἀείδῃ δεδαὼς ἔπε' ἱμερόεντα βροτοῖσι,*
> *τοῦ δ' ἄμοτον μεμάασιν ἀκουέμεν, ὁππότ' ἀείδῃ·*
> *ὣς ἐμὲ κεῖνος ἔθελγε παρήμενος ἐν μεγάροισι.*
>
> Such stories he tells, he would charm out the dear heart within you.
> Three nights I had him with me, and for three days I detained him
> in my shelter, for he came first to me. He had fled from a vessel;
> but he has not yet told the story of all his suffering.
> But as when a man looks to a singer, who has been given
> from the gods the skill with which he sings for delight of mortals,
> and they are impassioned and strain to hear it when he sings to them,
> so he enchanted me in the halls as he sat beside me.
> (*Odyssey* 17.514-521)

A similar ability to tell tales is shown throughout *Odyssey* 19, where Odysseus continues to fabricate the story of his beggar disguise.

Through poetry, the story of Odysseus lives on long after the hero, fictional or otherwise, perished. Heraclitus' poems, memorials of the poet himself, live on after their

composer's death. Moreover, both Heraclitus and Odysseus were such fascinating conversation partners that they could keep people entertained through all hours of the night. Heraclitus was enthralling after the setting of the sun in "*λέσχῃ*" (conversation), and Odysseus' tale inspires Alkinoös to say:

> *νὺξ δ' ἥδε μάλα μακρὴ ἀθέσφατος· οὐδέ πω ὥρη*
> *εὕδειν ἐν μεγάρῳ· σὺ δέ μοι λέγε θέσκελα ἔργα.*
> *καί κεν ἐς ἠῶ δῖαν ἀνασχοίμην, ὅτε μοι σὺ*
> *τλαίης ἐν μεγάρῳ τὰ σὰ κήδεα μυθήσασθαι.*
>
> Here is
> a night that is very long, it is endless. It is not time yet
> to sleep in the palace. But go on telling your wonderful story.
> I myself could hold out until the bright dawn, if only
> you could bear to tell me, here in the palace, of your sufferings.
> (*Odyssey* 11.373-376)

By linking Heraclitus and Odysseus as guest-singers, *ξεῖνοι ἀοιδοί*, Callimachus elevates his friend to the level of heroic bard in a subtly allusive manner only accessible to one intimately familiar with Homer. Thus Callimachus is able to maintain the memory and reputation of Heraclitus among learned scholars.

The third *hapax legomenon* I would like to discuss is *σποδιή* in line 4. Though *σποδιή* is a *hapax* in Homer, it is fairly common in Hellenistic and earlier epigrams, so its use by Callimachus is not as marked. However, Callimachus would have known that *σποδιή* only occurs once in Homer; and the context of *σποδιή* in the *Odyssey* works so well with Callimachus' theme here that it is worthy of some investigation. In the *Odyssey*, Homer uses the word in book 5 as part of an extended metaphor describing how a person, alone in the middle of nowhere, banks a burning log in ashes in order to keep the fire alive:

> *Ὀδυσσεὺς,*

> *ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσση λέκτο, χύσιν δ' ἐπεχεύατο φύλλων.*
> *ὡς δ' ὅτε τις δαλὸν σποδιῇ ἐνέκρυψε μελαίνῃ*
> *ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιῆς, ᾧ μὴ πάρα γείτονες ἄλλοι,*
> *σπέρμα πυρὸς σώζων, ἵνα μή ποθεν ἄλλοθεν αὔῃ,*
> *ὣς Ὀδυσεὺς φύλλοισι καλύψατο.*
>
> Odysseus lay down in the middle, and made a pile of leaves over him.
> As when a man buries a burning log in a black ash (*σποδιῇ*) heap
> in a remote place in the country, where none live near as neighbors,
> and saves the seed of fire, having no other place to get a light
> from, so Odysseus buried himself in the leaves.
> (*Odyssey* 5.486-491)

This allusion seems to serve two purposes. First, it emphasises just how distant the two friends, Callimachus and Heraclitus, have become, as Callimachus can no longer get fire/light from his friend. Second, it points toward the theme of the following lines in the epigram. Namely, from the ashes of his dead friend, Callimachus keeps the fire of memory burning through Heraclitus' poetry. Heraclitus is likened to a flame that is nearly out: only his poetry remains to keep him alive. Callimachus thus underlines the connection between Heraclitus and Odysseus, as the metaphor in which *σποδιή* is used describes Odysseus keeping himself alive, just as Heraclitus is being kept alive by his poetry.

The final Homeric *hapax legomenon* I would like to examine is *ἁρπακτής*, which occurs in the last line of the epigram.[4] In *Iliad* 24, Priam reminisces about his dead sons, then uses this word when he is rebuking his surviving sons:

> *Ἕκτορά θ', ὃς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ ἐῴκει*
> *ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάϊς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο.*
> *τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται,*
> *ψεῦσταί τ' ὀρχησταί τε, χοροιτυπίῃσιν ἄριστοι,*
> *ἀρνῶν ἠδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἁρπακτῆρες.*
>
> and Hektor, who was a god among men, for he did not seem like
> one who was child of mortal man, but of a god. All these
> Ares has killed, and all that are left me are the disgraces,

> the liars and the dancers, champions of the chorus, the
> plunderers (ἁρπακτῆρες)
> of their own people in their land of lambs and kids.
> (*Iliad* 24.258-262)

Callimachus applies ἁρπακτής to Hades, and perhaps the allusion only goes so far as to give added weight to the author's description of Death. However, a far more interesting issue arises if one examines the context. Until this point in the poem, Heraclitus is linked with Odysseus, a singer who endures fantastic journeys eventually to arrive home alive to his family and friends. With this allusion to Homer's martial poem, Callimachus moves from the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*. So why has Callimachus suddenly shifted epics here?

By alluding to Priam's speech to his sons, Callimachus links Hades with these despicable, surviving children. In doing so, however, he also invites us to compare Heraclitus with Hector, as they are both men who have recently died, and whose *kleos* will live on in song: Heraclitus in his ἀηδόνες (nightingales) and Hector in the *Iliad*. Unlike Odysseus, who survives his journeys, Heraclitus and Hector, although remembered through poetry, are dead. Their only feat now is to be mourned by the living. Even as Priam is aware that his surviving sons are poor substitutes for those who have died in battle, Callimachus knows that with Heraclitus dead, the living poets who remain are second-rate disgraces. The programmatic element of this poem is found in Callimachus' belief that poetry can provide immortality. One can either be featured in a poem, like Hector, or write poetry, like Homer; both are paths to everlasting *kleos*. By writing a poem about Heraclitus and his poems, Callimachus has doubly immortalised his friend, and left his own name for future generations as well.

Endnotes Chapter 8

[1] The noun is uncommon in Greek literature, and all forms of the word are rare in the Hellenistic period. In addition to Homer and Callimachus, it occurs in Hesiod (*Opera et dies* 493 and 501), Aeschylus (*Choephoroe* 665) and Sophocles (*Antigone* 160), but not otherwise in verse.

[2] Cf. Gow and Page 191 n.3.

[3] Mackie 94. See also my Chapter Seven page 69.

[4] This word is very rare in Greek verse, occurring elsewhere only in Hesiod (*Opera et dies* 320 and 684) and Lycophron (*Alexandra* 147 and 157). None of these instances appear related to Callimachus' epigram.

Chapter 9: Marriage Advice

Epigram 54

ξεῖνος Ἀταρνείτης τις ἀνείρετο Πιττακὸν οὕτω
τὸν Μιτυληναῖον, παῖδα τὸν Ὑρράδιον·
"ἄττα γέρον, δοιός με καλεῖ γάμος· ἡ μία μὲν δή
νύμφη καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ γενεῇ κατ' ἐμέ,
ἡ δ' ἑτέρη προβέβηκε. τί λώιον; εἰ δ' ἄγε σύμ μοι
βούλευσον ποτέρην εἰς ὑμέναιον ἄγω".
εἶπεν· ὁ δὲ σκίπωνα γεροντικὸν ὅπλον ἀείρας·
"ἠνίδε κεῖνοί σοι πᾶν ἐρέουσιν ἔπος".
(οἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ πληγῇσι θοὰς βέμβικας ἔχοντες
ἔστρεφον εὐρείῃ παῖδες ἐνὶ τριόδῳ.)
"κείνων ἔρχεο", φησί, "μετ' ἴχνια". χὠ μὲν ἐπέστη
πλησίον, οἱ δ' ἔλεγον "τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα".
ταῦτ' ἀίων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐφείσατο μείζονος οἴκου
δράξασθαι παίδων κληδόνα συνθέμενος·
τὴν δ' ὀλίγην ὡς κεῖνος ἐς οἰκίον ἤγετο νύμφην,
οὕτω καὶ σύ, Δίων, τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα.

A stranger from Atarneus asked of Pittacus,
the Mitylenan, son of Hurras:
"Aged father, two marriages appeal to me;
the one girl equals me in both wealth and birth,
the other surpasses me. Which is better? Come, advise me
which I should marry".
He spoke; and lifting his staff, the old man's weapon,
Pittacus replied, "Behold, they will speak the best advice to you".
(They were boys in a wide crossroads who spun
their swift tops with blows).
"Go in their footsteps", the sage said. And the stranger stood near,
and the boys said "keep to your own course".
Hearing these things the stranger refrained from looking on
the greater estate and having put the saying of the boys in his heart
he led the meagre girl to his house.
Thus you also, Diōn, keep to your own course.

This poem has been of particular interest to several scholars for various reasons. Some see it as programmatic, while others consider it to be barely an epigram at all. I believe that this poem serves both as an aesthetic statement and as marriage advice, and

Homeric allusion is important to both of these readings.

Epigram 54 is longer than any of Callimachus' other epigrams, and is described by Gow and Page as having "no claim to be called an epigram at all" on the grounds that it is "neither inscriptional nor epideictic" (205). Wilamowitz considers this poem to be "nur noch äußerlich ein Epigramm" (179). Fraser calls it "an epigram only by reason of its elegiac meter" (593). Jacobs questions the attribution of the poem, suggesting that without the ascription to Callimachus by Diogenes Laertius, no one would consider such a straightforward anecdote to be the work of the author.[1] On the other side of this spectrum, Gutzwiller considers this poem to be of crucial importance to Callimachus' epigram book. She believes it is programmatic and occupied the initial position in his collection. I prefer a more moderate approach. I am content that this poem should remain classified as an epigram. Its length and subject are certainly not outside the bounds of those found in work by other epigrammatic authors. I therefore disagree with the discomfort evinced by Gow and Page. I do not, however, believe that this poem necessarily occupied any position of specific importance in a possible collection of Callimachus' epigrams. Although the poem may be programmatic in a larger sense, I believe that its initial purpose is to provide a bit of advice to the Egyptian ruler, Ptolemy II. In this chapter I will examine all of these possibilities and demonstrate how a Homeric allusion argues in favour of interpreting this poem both as marriage advice for a king and as an aesthetic statement.

Epigram 54 is a miniature story about the sage Pittacus, who is asked for marriage advice by a stranger. According to Diogenes' life of Pittacus, the man could offer his opinion from personal experience, having married a woman of higher standing and

finding the experience to be a bitter one (1.79ff.). The advice that Pittacus ultimately offers the stranger comes from boys playing with tops at a crossroads (a place used as an unambiguous metaphor for decision making). As the boys play, they shout out "keep to your own course". The stranger accepts the advice and marries within his own rank, taking home the "meagre girl".[2] The poem appears to be a generalised piece of stock advice, but the inclusion of the proper name Diōn in the final line places the poem in a contemporary context that I shall discuss later.[3]

The argument that this poem does not fit with the other epigrams is a thin one. Although this poem could be seen as elegiac, so could any epigram written in elegiac couplets. That this one is a bit longer than most is inconclusive one way or the other. We no longer possess all of Callimachus' epigrams, and it is entirely likely that some of his lost epigrams were longer than those that have been preserved by later collections, who tended to favour shorter examples from this genre. Even in the meagre collection we have from Callimachus, epigrams of 10 and 12 lines appear.[4] As for the subject matter, while it is true that none of Callimachus' other epigrams appear to tell such an anecdote, some of his epigrams do contain didactic generalisations.[5]

I would now like to turn to Gutzwiller's analysis of Callimachus 54. As we have seen, Gutzwiller is concerned with epigram books. If such an author-ordered book existed for Callimachus' epigrams, then the initial poem would have been of great importance as it would have established the theme that unites the rest of the poems. Thus, having argued strenuously for a collection of Callimachean epigrams, Gutzwiller is delighted to find in this poem several elements that she suggests demonstrate that this poem is programmatic and was the first epigram in Callimachus' epigram book:

> at sixteen lines it is the longest of Callimachus' epigrams, and we know…that ancient epigram books did sometimes commence with longer elegiac poems. The second-person address in the final line is also an indication that this poem had a unique function within the collection…. A parallel for such a generic second-person address in a programmatic context is offered by the concluding epigram in Nossis' collection (*ἴϑι*, 11.4 G-P). In addition, the poem consists of an anecdote about Pittacus that is reminiscent of a tale concerning the Seven Sages in the first *Iambus*…. The parallel with the first *Iambus* shows clearly that the Pittacus anecdote is just the sort of introduction that Callimachus was likely to have given his *Epigrammata*.
>
> (225)

As I pointed out above, length is not necessarily a good indicator of a poem's role. For that matter, simply because other authors sometimes began their collections with longer, elegiac poems does not mean that Callimachus did. The second-person address in the last line of the poem is a disputed reading and I believe that *γ' ἰὼν* is textually the weaker reading.[6] I will discuss this point in some detail later in this chapter, as I believe that the reading *Δίων* leads us to the correct interpretation of this poem. Gutzwiller's last point is more persuasive, however, as the first *Iambus* does show us the author opening a selection of poetry with a similar device. Given Callimachus' penchant for deliberate variation, however, it is dangerous to assume that the poet would use the same device twice. Gutzwiller goes on to suggest that this poem was perfect for the introduction to a series of epigrams consisting of different types (amatory, funerary and dedicatory), because it was none of these. Its message, to "follow one's own path", introduces pretty much any kind of poetry that a poet happens to place after it. Gutzwiller writes that Callimachus "begins his epigram collection, then, not with the announcement of any one theme, but with the suggestion that his philosophy of restraint, of refined choice, will be

the glue that holds together the many and diverse poems that constitute the *Epigrammata*" (226).

My reasons for disagreeing with Gutzwiller's approach hinge in large part on the reading of the last line. I would not put it past Callimachus both to give advice to the Ptolemies, thereby dedicating his collection to them, and also to establish the unifying theme for his book. I think that Gutzwiller must account for the arguments towards marriage advice and justify her reading of *σύ γ' ἰών* in the final line to make her argument convincing. In her defence, I do believe that Callimachus might present a programme that is, in a sense, not a programme. Thus he could cleverly avoid the difficulties of finding a single unifying theme among a multitude of poems written at varying times for diverse situations on different topics. Certainly, I find the advice to select a bride of "meagre means" evocative of Apollo's injunction to cultivate a "slender muse".

Enrico Livrea's reading of this passage is similar to Gutzwiller's, but he differs in two important ways. First, he does not talk about the poem as part of a collection, and second, he maintains the reading of *Δίων* in the final line. Like some of the previously mentioned scholars, Livrea finds this poem lacking, but he sees a literary statement in it that rescues the epigram from its surface reading: "the only way we can avoid foisting on Callimachus a banal platitude which is quite unworthy of him is to include this text among the other well-known passages where he declares his wish to defend his own literary principles" (479-480). After a detailed study of the poem's provenance and the top-spinning game played by the children, Livrea concludes that "Callimachus *ep.* 1 [=GP 54], far from being a humdrum piece of narrative, has every right to be included among the most important texts in which Callimachus proclaims his conscious awareness

of the originality of his art. From now on, we might speak of the poetics of *τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα*, to indicate the same complex of ideas and images which are expressed so magisterially in the *Prologue* to the *Aitia* and elsewhere" (480). Having carefully examined the manuscript tradition, however, Livrea cannot accept the reading of the final line that Gutzwiller allows to pass with a cursory footnote, despite the fact that it would strengthen his own argument. He fantasises about the possibility that "Diōn was a fellow-poet…wondering whether to compose according to the precepts of Callimachean poetics", but in the end he is unconcerned with this person's identity: "we may pass over as unimportant the question of the identity of the mysterious *Δίων*, to whom Callimachus addresses this lofty poetic manifesto; indeed, the variant *σύ γ' ἰών*, if it were acceptable, would actually allow us to invest the poem with all the weighty significance of an address by the poet to himself" (480).

Livrea's slightly more cautious approach to this poem lends his conclusion more weight that Gutzwiller's. In particular, his examination of the manuscript evidence and his conclusion that *Δίων* must be the preferred reading despite the fact that the alternate reading would better suit his conclusion lends argument greater weight. We are still, however, confronted with the enigmatic figure of Diōn. If Callimachus wanted to make a universal statement about poetry addressed to the reader as Gutzwiller and Livrea suggest, presumably he would have done so. So why does he write Diōn?

The manuscript argument for maintaining the reading Diōn is relatively simple. The name is provided by Diogenes Laertius in his manuscript, but an alternate reading, *γ' ἰών*, is given in the *Palatine Anthology* and by Planudes. The latter reading is preferred by several editors and also by Gutzwiller, who relies on the generalisation provided by

such a reading for her argument towards the programmatic nature of this poem.[7] It should be noted, however, that this epigram appears in a sequence of poems in the *Palatine Anthology* on various sages and philosophers, all but three of which are derived from Diogenes. Given that the version of the epigram that occurs in the *Palatine Anthology* and in Planudes' *Anthology* derives from Diogenes, it is bad practice to accept the later reading when its earlier source has the *lectio difficilior*.[8]

To resolve the difficulty that many scholars have had with the address to Diōn, I would like to turn to Pamela Bleisch's article on the *Aeneid* and Callimachus 54. Although her paper's ultimate focus is on Virgil's use of Callimachus' epigram, she nonetheless provides a brilliant exegesis of the latter's text.[9] As I mentioned earlier, it is the final line of the poem, and its addressee, that provides the needed clues to place this epigram in its context. The poem is not a simple bit of didactic story-telling, but is actually addressed to a specific individual. Bleisch argues that "the final line conceals a clever anagram: *houtō kai su, Diōn* contains the vocative dual form *Diōnusiakō*".[10] Callimachus' anagram is more complex than a simple jumbling of letters. In order to properly read the line, one must first read Diōn forward, then read the previous two and a half words letter for letter backwards. This process comes naturally for the reader who has read the name Diōn and then reads backwards to see who this person is. Although the root *Διονυσιακ-* occurs frequently in Greek, and *Διωνυς-* is common, especially in Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns, *Διωνυσιακ-* is found no where else. As for the dual ending, this is also a deliberate archaism.[11] So, Callimachus directs his advice to a pair of Dionysians.

Who, then, are these Dionysians? None other than the royal siblings Ptolemy II

and Arsinoe. Several pieces of evidence support this identification. Despite there being no extant example of the honorific "Dionysians" being used of the Ptolemies, it is a reasonable form of address. Ptolemy II and his sister Arsinoe, along with other Ptolemies, claimed descent from Dionysus as a means to strengthen their association with Alexander and the Argead royal house, which traced its lineage to Herakles.[12] Dionysus also occupied a prominent position in the great procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus, indicating his close association with the god. Bleisch points out that both Ptolemy II and Arsinoe were devotees of the theatre, "conferring on the actors the title 'the Artists of Dionysus and of the Theoi Adelphoi.' In view of this patronage of drama, Callimachus' use of the adjective *diōnusiakos* is particularly appropriate, since it connotes both 'belonging to Dionysus' and 'related to the Dionysia'" (463). The fact that the children who offer the advice of "keeping to your own" in this passage are playing with tops may also be evocative of Dionysus, as tops were sacred objects in the Dionysian mysteries and were sometimes given as votive offerings to the god.[13]

The advice given to the Philadelphoi, then, is to "keep to your own". Due to his royal blood, Ptolemy II has no equal other than another member of his family. He and Arsinoe do, of course, follow Callimachus' advice to the letter. It is interesting to note, however, that the stranger's question in Callimachus' epigram is suggesting a choice between an equal and a better. As already mentioned, a king can have no better…at least not among mortals. So Callimachus is suggesting that Ptolemy actually does have another choice, and one that is above his station. The only woman of better birth than Ptolemy? A goddess. Such a union, however, would be the ultimate in *hubris*, and ancient literature is rife with warnings against such marriages. Thus Callimachus advises

his king to marry his equal, Queen Arsinoe-Aphrodite, and not the goddess Aphrodite.[14]

There is one more element to Callimachus' advice, and it is a somewhat propagandising one. As discussed in my biography of Callimachus, the author was dependant (at least to some degree) on the good will of Ptolemy. Certainly his position at court and in the library required the favour of the king. Thus it was in Callimachus' best interests to support the king and use his poetic output on behalf of his patron. By portraying an incestuous, Egyptian-style marriage as the logical outcome from traditional Greek wisdom, Callimachus approves Ptolemy's marriage for both his Greek and Egyptian subjects.[15]

In support of Bleisch's reading of this epigram as marriage advice directed at Ptolemy is a Homeric *hapax legomenon* that has gone unnoticed by critics of this poem. Homer was clearly in the poet's mind, as in addition to this allusion Callimachus also makes a reference to the Homeric scholia.[16] The subject of *Epigram* 54 is marriage, and it is testament to Callimachus' skill that he should employ a particularly fitting allusion to Homer with the word "*ὑμέναιος*" (marriage) in line six. The word occurs at *Iliad* 18.493, and nowhere else in the Homeric corpus, not even in a derivative form. The word is marked for Callimachus, he uses it only one other time, and it is actually reasonably rare in Hellenistic literature.[17]

In the *Iliad*, the word appears in the description of the city at peace during the *ekphrasis* on Achilles' shield:

> *ἐν τῇ μέν ῥα γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίναι τε,*
> *νύμφας δ' ἐκ θαλάμων δαΐδων ὕπο λαμπομενάων*
> *ἠγίνεον ἀνὰ ἄστυ, πολὺς δ' ὑμέναιος ὀρώρει.*

And there were marriages in one, and festivals.

> They were leading the brides along the city from their maiden chambers
> under the flaring of torches, and the loud bride song (*ὑμέναιος*) was arising.

The link between this line and Callimachus' is strengthened by the fact that the words occupy the same, penultimate position in their respective lines. They are also used metrically in identical fashion. If *Epigram* 54 was written on the occasion of Ptolemy's marriage, then the reference to a city filled with celebration would have been of contemporary relevance. More importantly, the Homeric passage also includes a political note, as a dispute between two men is being decided by a circle of judges in orderly fashion, with a prize of gold to be given to the one who provides the best judgement. In contrast to the city at war also depicted on Achilles' shield, Callimachus is pointing out that Ptolemy's rule maintains a peaceful, prosperous Alexandria. Further, Callimachus is suggesting that incestuous marriage will maintain peace for Alexandria, as it will prevent another family from rivalling the king's in power. Callimachus might also be proposing, in a subtle manner, that the poet who so eloquently defends his king's marriage deserves some reward for his politically savvy approval of his king's betrothal.

This careful use of allusion further strengthens the argument that this poem is, in fact, offering marriage advice, political advice, and an artistic statement. Although I remain sceptical of Gutzwiller's arguments for this poem as the initial poem in a book of Callimachus' epigrams, I find such a conclusion more compelling, and its programmatic content emphasised, if this poem is read as an address to Ptolemy. To begin a book with a dedication, some advice, and a programme…I can believe that Callimachus is just that clever.

So what does this work say about literature? Simply that one should keep to

one's own course. When choosing between writing a popular, potentially lucrative work such as drama or epic and another, less marketable form, one should choose that which appeals most to the author, avoiding goals too lofty. This may also function as something of a *recusatio*, whereby Callimachus excuses himself from writing high verse, saying that the poet should choose the medium equal to himself, and for Callimachus this is a shorter, "lower" style. Nonetheless, Callimachus uses an allusion to Homer through a *hapax legomenon* to direct his advice to Ptolemy and to curry favour. It is a bit tongue-in-cheek, however, as the marriage advice is linking together two royals, the closest mortals to the gods. So one must ask if Callimachus is really suggesting that his chosen genre is lesser. Perhaps, he merely does not want to compete with Homer, the epic god.

Endnotes Chapter 9

[1] See Gow and Page 205.

[2] Cf. *Erga* 700, where Hesiod suggests that one marry the "girl next door". See Bleisch 460.

[3] Cf. *Ep*. 9, where the addressee's name is delayed until the penultimate line.

[4] *Epigrams* 3 and 14.

[5] For example 44 ("*δαίμονα τίς δ' εὖ οἶδε τὸν αὔριον*" – who knows tomorrow's fortune well?) and 11 ("*λέγουσιν ἀληθέα τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι / ὅρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐς ἀθανάτων*" – they say truly that oaths among lovers are not able to reach the ears of the immortals), among others.

[6] Her discussion of this issue is confined to a brief footnote naming those who agree with her. See Gutzwiller 225n.84.

[7] Pfeiffer and Gow and Page print *Δίων*, while Jacobs, Stadtmüller, Cahen, Waltz, Beckby and Paton all prefer *γ' ἰών*.

[8] For an in depth study of this poem's manuscript tradition, see Livrea's comprehensive article. The approximate dates of the sources concerned are: Diogenes Laertius 3rd C C.E., Palatine (compiled by Cephalas) 10thC C.E., Planudes *c*.1300 C.E. The latter two (and possibly also Diogenes) are based partially on Meleager's *Garland*, which was compiled in the 1st C. BCE, but which we no longer possess.

[9] Although it should be noted that Bleisch accepts without argument the theory that Callimachus produced his own book of epigrams, and she adduces no evidence to support this view (468n.29).

[10] Bleisch 462. Cameron cautions on the dangers of looking too hard to find non-existent anagrams in ancient literature (1995a). I do not believe, however, that he would argue with Bleisch's interpretation here.

[11] "The dual died out in the living speech of Attica by 300B.C. Aeolic has no dual, and Ionic lost it very early. In Homer the dual is used freely, and often in conjunction with the plural" (Smyth 269 (#999)).

[12] See Fraser 201-207, 211 and 218.

[13] Cf. Hirst.

[14] Cf. Bleisch 464.

[15] Bleisch 466. She also suggests that this epigram may have been in response to such criticisms as Sotades' scurrilous verse on Ptolemy's marriage, "*εἰς οὐχ ὁσίην τρυμαλίην τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς*" (You are thrusting your prick into an unholy opening) (Athen. 621a; frag. 1 Pow.; Diehl).

[16] When badly wounded by his enemy, Hector is compared to a top in *Iliad* 14.413. This simile led to a great deal of comment and attempted explanation by the scholiasts. Livrea points out that "Callimachus' view of the solution to this Homeric problem is shown by the wording of his epigram, which has no fewer than three verbal elements in common with the scholion D ad loc (ii p, 55 Dindorf), *ὡς ῥόμβον περιφερῆ· λέγει δὲ τὸν καλούμενον βέμβικα. δίκην οὖν στρόμβου ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν στρέφεσθαι, σφοδρῶς πλήξας*" (477).

[17] The un-compounded noun occurs only 15 times in the 4th C BCE and 5 times in the 3rd C. BCE). It only occurs one other time in the Callimachean corpus, in the fourth hymn, *In Delum*, line 296. In earlier centuries it is common in drama, but is rare in other verse.

Conclusion

As we have seen, Callimachus wrote poetry of great technical precision and acumen. I hope that I have convincingly argued that there is more going on in many of Callimachus' *Epigrams* than simple displays of knowledge. There is a wit and intelligence beyond mere book learning that makes his poetry a joy to read. Whenever one thinks that a poem has been exhausted of meaning, it usually pays to look a little closer. By allusion to the greatest of Greek poets, Homer, Callimachus infuses his poetry with meaning and provides context for otherwise sparse lines. Callimachus uses Homeric allusion to establish his aesthetic program, but it is a program that restrains him from attempting anything on Homer's scale.

In Chapter One, I examined Callimachus' biography in order to establish a preliminary background for his work. Chapter Two discussed his role as an Alexandrian poet, and the influence that his contemporary culture had on his work. Chapter Three was concerned with the genre of epigram, and provided the necessary information to understand this type of poetry as Callimachus presents it. Chapter Four began a close look at the epigrams themselves, and dealt with the problem of Callimachus' epigrams as a collection, as well as addressing the question of context for the poems. In chapter Five, the discussion of the epigrams began in earnest with a discussion of *Epigram* 1, where Callimachus suggests that a poet should work at one genre until it is perfected, rather than chasing after every new poetic fad. Chapter Six dealt with *Epigram* 2, in which Callimachus argues that originality and concision are two of the most important considerations when writing poetry. Chapter Seven looks at *Epigram* 3, which addresses

the paradox of the scholar-love poet and names poetry as the (im)perfect cure for love. Chapter Eight demonstrates how *Epigram* 34 is concerned with the ability of poetry to immortalise poets and their subjects. Finally, Chapter Nine shows how *Epigram* 54 urges poets to keep to their own poetic path and questions whether the epigrammatic genre is truly inferior to epic.

All of these conclusions were drawn from Homeric allusions made by Callimachus through *hapax legomena* and other rare words. Each of the epigrams studied offers an opinion about poetry and/or poets themselves. In this way, these poems fulfil programmatic functions in Callimachus' epigrammatic corpus that allow us to better understand the motivations and influences that he exhibits throughout his epigrams.

Callimachus can be difficult for many reasons, but he is a poet who repays the reader's efforts, for his *ars latet arte sua*. It is hoped that this preliminary investigation into the programmatic aspects of Callimachus' epigrams will encourage others to delve more deeply into this collection of short poems, and to explore fully the aesthetic notions contained therein. During the research for this thesis, it became clear that Homer is not the only archaic source upon which Callimachus draws. Hesiod and the lyric poets also influence Callimachus' poetry, and I believe that a study of the epigrams' allusions to these earlier writers should be the next port-of-call in our journey to understand the poetry of Callimachus.

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists*. ed. Charles Gulick. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Bleisch, Pamela R. "On Choosing a Spouse: *Aeneid* 7.378-84 and Callimachus' Epigram 1." *The American Journal of Philology*. 117.3 (1996): 453-472.

Boegehold, Alan L. "Kallimachos Epigram 28: What Does Echo Echo?" *New England Classical Journal*. 31.2 (2004) 121-123.

Booth, Alan. "The Appearance of the Schola Grammatici." *Hermes*. 106. (1978): 117-125.

Bowman, Laurel. "Nossis, Sappho and Hellenistic Poetry." *Ramus*. 27.1. (1998): 39-59.

Bowman, Laurel. "The 'Women's Tradition' in Greek Poetry." *Phoenix*. 58.1-2. (2004): 1-27.

Bulloch, A. W. "Hellenistic Poetry." *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I: Greek Literature*. Eds. Easterling, P. E. and B. M. W. Knox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 541-621.

Callimachus. *Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and other Fragments*. ed. C. A. Trypanis. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Callimachus. *Hymni et Epigrammata*. ed. Rudofus Pfeiffer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Callimachus. *Hymni et Epigrammata*. ed. Udalricus de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Berlin: Druck von C. Schulze & Co., 1925.

Cameron, Alan. "Ancient Anagrams." *The American Journal of Philology*. 116.3 (1995a): 477-484.

Cameron, Alan. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1995b.

Cameron, Alan. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Cameron, Alan. "Genre and Style in Callimachus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 122. (1992): 305-312.

Campbell, David. ed. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1982.

Cartledge, Paul, Peter Garnsey and Erich Gruen. *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Couat, Auguste. *La Poésie Alexandrine sous les Trois Premiers Ptolémées*. Paris: Culture et Civilisation, 1882 (reprinted 1968).

Diogenes Laertius. *Vitae Philosophorum*. ed. H. S. Long. vols. 1-2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Edwards, W. M. "Callimachus, Epigram 46." *The Classical Review*. 52.4. (1938): 119.

Erskine, Andrew. ed. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Fantuzzi, Marco and Richard Hunter. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Ferguson, John. *Callimachus*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980.

Fowler, Barbara Hughes. *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Fraser. P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Furness, Robert Allason. trans. *Poems of Callimachus*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1931.

Garner, Richard. *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Gelzer, Thomas. "Transformations." *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*. Eds. Bulloch, A. W. et al. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Giangrande, Giuseppe. "Callimachus, Poetry and Love." *Eranos*. 67. (1969): 33-42.

Gold, Barbara K. *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Goldhill, Simon. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Gow, A.S.F and D.L. Page. eds. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams.* Vols. 1-2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Grant, Michael. *From Alexander to Cleopatra: The Hellenistic World.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd., 1982.

Green, Peter. ed. *Hellenistic History and Culture.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Hansen, Peter Allan, ed. *Carmina epigraphica Graeca saeculorum VII-V a. Chr. n.* Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1983.

Harder, M. Annette. "Untrodden Paths: Where Do They Lead?" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* 93. (1990): 287-209.

Henrichs, Albert. "Callimachus *Epigram* 28: A Fastidious Priamel." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* 83 (1979): 207-212.

Hesiod. *Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum et Fragmenta Selecta.* eds. Friedrich Solmsen, R. Merkelbach and M.L. West. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Hirst, Gertrude. "Note on Vergil *Aeneid* VII.376-384" *Classical Quarterly.* 31.2 (1937) 65-66.

Homer. *Ilias.* ed. Martin West. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1998.

Homer. *Iliad.* trans. Richmond Lattimore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Homer. *Odyssey.* ed. W. W. Merry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.

Hopkinson, Neil. ed. *A Hellenistic Anthology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Hübner, Ulrich. "Kallimachos' 28. Epigramm Ohne Lysanias." *Philologus.* 140.2 (1996): 225-229.

Hunter, Richard. "Callimachus and Heraclitus." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici.* 28. (1992a): 113-123.

Hunter, Richard. "(B)ionic man: Callimachus' Iambic Programme." *Proceedings of the*

Cambridge Philological Society. 43 (1997a): 41-52.

Hunter, Richard. "Hellenismus." *Einleitung in die Griechische Philologie*. eds. Walter Ameling et al. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1997b.

Hunter, Richard. "Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus, Hymn to Athena." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*. 29. (1992b): 9-34.

Hutchinson, G. O. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1988.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Greek City*: *From Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Laronde, André. *Cyrène et la Libye* Hellénistique: *Libykai Historiai*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1987.

Lattimore, Richmond. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962.

Laurens, Pierre. *L'Abeille Dans L'Ambre: Célébration de l'épigramme de l'époque alexandrine à la fin de la Renaissance*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989.

Lefkowitz, Mary R. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London: Duckworth, 1981.

Lehnus, Luigi. *Bibliografia Callimachea: 1489-1988*. Genova: Monotipia Erredi, 1989.

Livrea, Enrico. "From Pittacus to Byzantium: The History of a Callimachean Epigram." *Classical Quarterly*. n.s. 45.2 (1995): 474-480.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons et al. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1983.

Lombardo, Stanley and Diane Rayor. *Callimachus: Hymns, Epigrams, Select Fragments*. Baltmore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Mackie, Hilary. "Song and Storytelling: An Odyssean Perspective." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 127. (1997): 77-95.

MacQueen, J. G. "Death and Immortality: A Study of the Heraclitus Epigram of Callimachus." *Ramus*. 11 (1982): 48-56.

Mair, A. W. *Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus*. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1960.

Matthews, V. J. "Antimachean Anecdotes." *Eranos*. 77 (1979): 43-50.

Merriam, Carol U. *The Development of the Epyllion Genre Through the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.

Meyer, Doris. *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2005.

Mulroy, David. *Early Greek Lyric Poetry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Page, D. L., ed. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Page, D. L., ed. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Préaux, Claire. *Le Monde Hellénistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1978.

Propertius. *Elegies I-IV*. ed. Lawrence Richardson. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977.

Reinsch-Werner, Hannelore. *Callimachus Hesiodicus: Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene*. Berlin: Verlag Nikolaus Mielke, 1976.

Reitzenstein, Richard. *Epigram und Skolion*: *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Alexandrinischen Dichtung*. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1893 (reprinted 1970).

Ringwood, Irene Cecile. *Agonistic Features of Local Greek Festivals Chiefly from Inscriptional Evidence*. New York: Columbia University, 1927.

Rissman, Leah. *Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1980.

Schmitz, Thomas A. "'I Hate All Common Things': The Reader's Role in Callimachus' *Aetia* Prologue." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 99 (1999): 151-178.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Segal, Charles. *Orpheus*: *The Myth of the Poet*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Sifakis, G. M. *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*. London: The Athlone Press, 1967.

Sinko, Thaddaeus. "Ad Callimachi epigramma 1 (de uxore eligenda)." *Eos*. 20 (1914) 5-12.

Skiadas, Aristoxenos. ed. *Kallimachos*. Darmstadt: Wissenshaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975.

Snell, Bruno. *Dichtung und Gesellschaft*. Hamburg: Claassen Verlag, 1965.

Svenbro, Jesper. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Tarán, Sonya Lida. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.

Tarán, Sonya Lida. "*ΕΙΣΙ ΤΡΙΧΕΣ*: An Erotic Motif in the *Greek Anthology*." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 105 (1985): 90-107.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, CD-ROM Disk E. Irvine: University of California, 2000.

Thomas, Richard F. "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 83 (1979): 179-206.

Thomson, J. A. K. "Eipe Tis Hrakleite Teon Moron." *The Classical Review*. 55.1 (1941): 28.

Trypanis, C. A. *Callimachus: Fragments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

van Thiel, Helmut. "Der Homertext in Alexandria." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. 115 (1997): 13-36.

Walsh, George B. "Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram." *Arethusa*. 24.1 (1991): 77-105.

Walsh, George B. "Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry." *Classical Philology*. 85.1 (1990): 1-21.

Webster, T. B. L. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1964.

West, M.L. ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1924.

Zanker, Graham. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

Zanker, Graham. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.