

Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 79 (2022)

Heft: 2

Artikel: Callimachus on Aratus : Epigram 56 G.-P. and the Aetia

Autor: Hardie, Alex

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1035081>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 09.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Callimachus on Aratus

Epigram 56 G.-P. and the *Aetia*

Alex Hardie, Edinburgh

Abstract: Two names, Hesiod and Aratus, frame Callimachus' *Phaenomena* epigram (AP 9.507 = 56 G.-P.). This essay traces the steps that lead from the archaic founder of inspired *didaxis* to his contemporary successor, with three aims in view. First, to clarify the evolving drama, humour and *pointe* of Callimachus' compliment to a fellow-connoisseur of Hesiod. Second, to relate the personified λεπταὶ ῥήσεις ("subtle utterances") of *Phaenomena* (3–4) to the Muses who inspired Hesiod and Aratus. And third, to assess "Ἡσιόδου τόδ' ἄεισμα" as a Callimachean manifesto statement, with combined reference to the *Aetia* Prologue (fr. 1–1e Ha.) and the *Somnium* (fr. 2–2j Ha.). My conclusions focus on Callimachus' dual role as poet and critic and on Muses' role in sustaining continuity within the "genre" of literary *didaxis*.

Keywords: Callimachus, Aratus, Muses, Linus-song, generic continuity, poet-critic.

I The Time of Writing

Callimachus' epigram on Aratus' *Phaenomena* (56 G.-P. = AP 9.507) is a witness of unusual interest for early Hellenistic literary history. In it, the foremost figure in the third-century revival of Hesiod pays tribute to the Hesiodic credentials of a poem that participates in that same movement, but does so in a quite distinct way. In this essay, on the basis of a substantial overlap of critical terminology, I aim to show that *Epigram* 56 G.-P. was written with the critical programme set out in the *Aetia* Prologue and *Somnium* in view and not, as is sometimes supposed, before publication of those passages.¹ On this reading, Callimachus will be seen to use the appearance of *Phaenomena* to restate his credentials as a new Hesiod and to align Aratus' work with his own. The argument will thus pivot on a contested area of literary chronology, the relative dating of the Prologue, *Phaenomena* and the epigram. In what follows, the main areas of uncertainty are summarised.

* I am most grateful to Francis Cairns and Damien Nelis for comments and help with bibliography; neither should be assumed to agree with all my conclusions.

The following abbreviations are used in footnotes:

Cameron: A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton NJ 1995).

G.-P.: A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 Vols (Cambridge 1965).

Harder: A. Harder, *Callimachus Aetia*. 2 Vols. (Oxford 2012).

Kidd: D. Kidd, *Aratus: Phaenomena* (Cambridge 1997).

Sens: A. Sens, *Hellenistic Epigrams: A Selection* (Cambridge 2020).

¹ Relative dating: Cameron, 323 (on the now-problematic) supplement κατὰ λεπτὸν at *Aetia* fr.1.11 Ha., which he assumed to be later than λεπταὶ ῥήσεις. Cf. G.O. Hutchinson, "The *Aetia*: Callimachus' Poem of Knowledge", *ZPE* 145 (2003) 47–59 at 58, on our epigram as intertext.

That *Phaenomena* was composed in Macedonia following Antigonus Gonatas' accession in 277/276 is stated in Aratus' ancient *Vitae* and has generally been assumed in modern studies of the poet.² The assumption is not quite secure, for these were turbulent times at Pella. Antigonas withdrew from his capital following Pyrrhus' invasion in 274, and Aratus' whereabouts in the subsequent period, to 272, are unclear.³ Yet the proven or suspected influence of *Phaenomena* on Theocritus and Apollonius offers little support for efforts to push completion and dissemination back to the lower 260's or later.⁴ It seems likely that *Idyll* 22 (*Dioscurei*) was written with Aratus in view;⁵ and the consensus (modern and ancient) that the *Encomium to Ptolemy* (*Idyll* 17), published in 269 at the latest, echoes the opening of *Phaenomena* cannot easily be set aside.⁶ There seems thus to be no compelling reason to challenge the view that Aratus' poem was in circulation by the late 270's. Callimachus' epigram might reasonably be supposed to have followed soon afterwards, a contemporary reaction from Alexandria to the appearance of a Hesiodic masterpiece from Pella. Here again however the time of writing is not quite certain.

Dating of *Aetia* relative to *Phaenomena* and the epigram is seriously complicated by uncertainty as to the timeframe in which its two halves (Books I–II and III–IV) were promulgated, and by the dating of the Prologue itself. Alan Cameron concluded that *Phaenomena* “was published not long before publication of *Aetia* I–II ca 270”.⁷ At the same time, he advanced the case for reading Prologue and *Somnium* as an integrated introduction to *Aetia* I–II.⁸ Without explicitly addressing the issue of date, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens subsequently observed further connections between Callimachus' Apolline initiation and Hesiod's encounter with the

² Composition in later 270's: Kidd, 4–5.

³ An attested sojourn at Seleucia might be dated any time up to Antiochus' death in 262: R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 121; L. Di Gregorio, “L'Arato perduto”, *Aevum* 88 (2014) 59–98, at 64–65 (n. 22, with bibliography), 70–71.

⁴ L. Cazzadori (“Nuove feste a Ramnunte (SEG XLI 75; Arat. *Phain.* 96–136; Call. fr. 110.71Pf.)”, *Studi Ellenistici* 29 [2015] 111–144) argues for a date in the 240's (my thanks to Dr Cazzadori for sending this article).

⁵ *Id.* 22 and *Phaenomena*: M. Pendergraft, “Aratean Echoes in Theocritus”, *QUCC* 24 (1986) 47–54; A. Sens, “Hellenistic Reference in the Proem of Theocritus, *Idyll* 22”, *CQ* 44 (1994) 66–74; *Idem*, *Theocritus: Dioscurei* (*Idyll* 22) (Göttingen 1997) 31–32. *Phaenomena* and Apollonius: P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) I.635–636; II.896–897 (n. 153); Kidd, Index 2 s.v. Apollonius Rhodius.

⁶ M. Fantuzzi, “Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα: Arat. *Phain.* 1 e Theocr. XVII.1”, *MD* 5 (1980) 163–172; Kidd, 162–163; R. Hunter *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley, etc. 2003) 96–99. Theocritus (*Id.* 17.128–130) refers to the living Arsinoe, who may have died in July 268 not 270 (Cameron, 160–61; B. van Oppen, “The Death of Arsinoe II Philadelphus: The Evidence Reconsidered”, *ZPE* 174 (2010) 139–150).

⁷ Cameron, 327, 341.

⁸ Cameron, 104–132, esp. 129–132; cf. e.g. F. Nisetich, *The Poems of Callimachus* (Oxford 2001) 231.

Muses.⁹ Acosta-Hughes himself went on to offer a revisionist view of the Prologue as a transition from the hexameter *Hecale* to elegiac *Aetia*.¹⁰ The view that the Prologue was composed in the 240's for an enlarged edition that included Books III–IV nevertheless continues to enjoy support.¹¹ The reading advanced in this essay would better suit the hypothesis of an early date for the Prologue: indeed, if accepted it might go some way to support Cameron's chronology.¹² Yet Callimachus was scarcely incapable of composing a wholly new, four-book, prologue that re-programmed themes from the "Hesiodic" Books I–II;¹³ and though in my view much less likely, a later timeframe, whereby the Aratus epigram entered circulation a quarter of a century after the poem it praises, cannot yet be ruled out.

II Naming and Framing

Here is the text of the Codex Palatinus, with a prosaic translation:

Ἡσιόδου τόδ' ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος οὐ τὸν ἀοιδόν
 ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὁκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
 τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε λεπταί
 ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη.

1 τό τ' Blomfield | ἀοιδῶν POxy 4648 | 4 σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης Ruhnken σύντομος Stewart

Hesiod's is this song-subject – and its mode. Not the singer to his extremities as model-mould, but I fear the honey-sweetest element of his verses has the man from Soli skimmed off. Salutations, you subtle utterances, Aratus' high-strung work of wakefulness!

The epigram is in three parts. A short statement identifies song-subject and style as "Hesiod's" or "Hesiodic". A long second sentence, occupying half the quatrain (line 1, 5th foot to line 3, 4th foot), expands on the first, but in complex, even puzzling, terms. Finally, in a move that will surely have astonished readers, Callimachus names Aratus and apostrophises his personified "utterances".

⁹ B. Acosta-Hughes/S.A. Stephens, "Rereading Callimachus' *Aetia* Fragment 1", *Classical Philology* 97 (2002) 238–255, at 240–241, 249, 253.

¹⁰ B. Acosta-Hughes, "A Gift of Callimachus", *SIFC* 10 (2012) 24–39.

¹¹ Harder, I.2–8 (against Cameron, 104–109); II.7–9. Harder suggests (II.100) that Callimachus' reference to Pegasus/Hippocrene in the *Somnium* (fr. 2.1 Ha.) may be indebted to *Phaen.* 216–210.

¹² See §V below.

¹³ G. Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996) 199; Hutchinson, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) 47–48, 49; Harder, I.2–3, 21–22. For the suggestion that the "old poet" *persona* projected at fr. 1.33–36 Ha. is consistent with composition in the poet's fifth decade (i.e. by 270), see T.A. Schmitz, "I Hate All Common Things": The Reader's Role in Callimachus' *Aetia* Prologue", *HSCP* 99 (1999) 151–178, at 161–162.

I retain the transmitted reading τόδ' (1). Emendation to τό τ' loses the deictic incipit and leaves no focal point for what follows. Callimachus' readers, misled by the first three words as transmitted, might initially understand a "song by Hesiod" to signal an edition-*epigraphē*.¹⁴ Such a reading is of course undercut by καὶ ὁ τρόπος, for any song "by Hesiod" would necessarily be in his "mode" — that is, in its "style and metrical technique" (Cameron). Ἡσιόδου τόδ' ἄεισμα might provisionally be re-read "this song-subject is Hesiodic". In the second couplet, we may infer from the delayed revelation of ethnic and poet (ὁ Σολεύς and Ἀρήτου) that the work resting in the speaker's hand already carries an *epigraphē* certifying its authorship. In all that precedes, the speaker appears to be exploring the work as if reading it for the first time, and reacting as a κριτικός as he does so. As a "new Hesiod" himself, Callimachus is of course sufficiently familiar with that poet's œuvre to make a critical assessment of the poem's subject matter and style.

The suggestion of active appraisal is marked in the second sentence by ὀκνέω μὴ ("I fear that"). As the critic's run of thought unfolds, his opening confidence dissipates. He appears to change direction, with the mid-sentence intrusion of personal hesitation and with a seeming shift in the figurative reference of ἀπεμάξατο from the visual arts (see below) to the action of "skimming off" a liquid.¹⁵ Awkwardness is syntactically underscored in the indicative verb following ὀκνέω μὴ. We sense a speaker wrestling with conflicted feelings.¹⁶ Scholarly approaches to this challenging sequence are sharply divided. On one interpretation, conditioned by older debates as to Homeric modelling and encouraged by the variant reading αἰοιδῶν, Callimachus is denying that Aratus imitates Homer.¹⁷ Yet any attempt to bring Homer into the epigram, other possibly than by allusion to the Contest with Hesiod (see below), arguably places an intolerable strain on syntax and sense.¹⁸ Cameron's demolition of the notion remains (in my view) definitive, and in what follows αἰοιδόν is retained, with Hesiod as sole archaic model.¹⁹

οὐ τὸν αἰοιδόν / ἔσχατον, read with ἀπεμάξατο, qualifies the opening Ἡσιόδου τόδ' ἄεισμα: the song may derive (in whatever sense) from Hesiod, but any sugges-

¹⁴ Cf. Sens, 156–157.

¹⁵ For "skimmed," see Cameron, 378–379; followed by Nisetich (*loc. cit.* [n. 8] 183). As an ancient reading, it is supported by Vergil's derivative *despumat* (*Georg.* 1.296), well observed by J. Henkel, "Nighttime *Labor*: a Metapoetic Vignette Alluding to Aratus at *Georgics* 1.291–296", *HSCP* 106 (2011) 179–198, at 187.

¹⁶ For the anomaly (indicative mood for subjunctive), G.-P., II.208. T. Gärtner ("Zur Deutung des kallimacheischen Epigramms über die *Phainomena* des Arat", *L'Ant. Class.* 76 [2007] 157–162) rightly highlights commentators' difficulties, but pursues an unpersuasive solution through emendation.

¹⁷ R. Hunter, *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days* (Cambridge 2014) 294–295, citing D. Obbink.

¹⁸ Succinctly observed by H.H. Koning, *Hesiod: The Other Poet. Ancient reception of a Cultural Icon* (Leiden 2010) 334, n. 144. Sens, 157 rightly reads Hesiod as sole point of reference.

¹⁹ Cameron, 374–377.

tion that “the singer whole and entire” has been appropriated is rejected.²⁰ ἀπεμάξατο initially figures Hesiod, identified with his poetic œuvre, as the subject of a sculptor or painter who exactly renders the entire physical form, down to the extremities (“to the finger nails”, as it were).²¹ Two statue-epigrams illustrate the sense.²² The first, attributed to Asclepiades, describes Lysippus’ Alexander (43.1–2 G.-P. = *APL* 120) τόλμαν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ ὅλαν ἀπεμάξατο μορφάν / Λύσιππος (“Lysippus has caught Alexander’s panache and his form entire”): relevant for Aratus’ sky-watching, the king is said to have been depicted as if looking up to, and addressing, Zeus (3–4). The second is Posidippus’ tribute to Hecataeus’ statue of Philitas, a representation “down to the tip of the toes” (2) and “equal in all respects” (1) to the heroised poet-scholar, in which the sculptor “has represented with all his skill the elder who was devoted to perfection” (τὸν ἀκρομέρινον ὅλ[η] κ[α]τεμάξατο τέχνη / πρ[ι]έσβυν). With Callimachus’ ἔσχατον of physical extremities, we might compare Aratus’ ἔσχατος οὐρή, “the tip of the tail”, at *Phaenomena* 628. The epithet represents the “entire poet” figured as statue-subject.²³ But a possible objection arises: the statue analogy is alien to the relationship between poet and literary model, where creative re-working is at a premium. After all, when Callimachus applies the craftsman image of “moulding” to his own work of innovative imitation within a generic tradition at *Iamb* 13.49, he uses ἀναπλάσσω (“form anew, refashion”) to describe his re-presentation of Hipponax.²⁴ And in such contexts, it may be recalled, the imputation of plagiarism is rarely far away.²⁵ But Callimachus’ point lies partly in rejection of the analogue: in doing so, he may be resisting any suggestion of literary theft as an explanation of the Hesiodic imprint of the present work.

Ἀρήτου, spelled thus, recalls Aratus’ play on his own name at *Phaenomena* 1–2 ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ’ ἄνδρες ἐῷμεν / ἄρρητον (“Let us begin from Zeus, whom we men never leave unspoken”).²⁶ Aratus himself echoes Hesiod’s opening summons to the Muses to sing of Zeus, ὃν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ... / ῥήτοί τ’

²⁰ ἀπεμάξατο of textual re-working: cf. Arist. *Frogs* 1040–1042 (Aeschylus/Homer); Hunter, *loc. cit.* (n. 17) 293.

²¹ Cf. esp. Posidipp. 63.1–2 A.-B. τόνδε Φιλίτα [χαλ]κὸν [ἴ]σον κατὰ πάνθ’ Ἐκ[α]ταῖος / ἀκ[ρ]ιβῆς ἄκρους [ἐπλ]ασεν εἰς ὄνυχας. A. Hardie, “The Statue(s) of Philitas (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 Col. X.16–25 and Hermesianax fr. 7.75–78 P.)”, *ZPE* 143 (2003) 27–36, at 34–35. For the sculptural figure in Latin, see A. D’Angour, “*Ad unguem*.” *AJP* 120 (1999) 411–427.

²² For Asclepiades, see Hunter *loc. cit.* (n. 17) 293 with n. 28; also A. Sens, 2011. *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments* (Oxford 2011) 295. On Posidipp. 63 A.-B. and its imitation of Asclepiades, see Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 21) 35.

²³ For the analogy cf. esp. Hermesianax fr. 3.88 L., on Pythagoras ἀποπλασσόμενον the entire cosmos in a small model sphere.

²⁴ See B. Acosta-Hughes, *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley, etc. 2002) 93–94.

²⁵ For visual arts as analogy in discussion of literary plagiarism, cf. [Longinus] *Subl.* 13.3–4 (Plato/Homer), with Russell’s commentary.

²⁶ P. Bing, “A Pun on Aratus’ Name in Verse 2 of the *Phaenomena*?”, *HSCP* 93 (1990) 281–285; cf. J. T. Katz, “Vergil Translates Aratus: *Phaenomena* 1–2 and *Georgics* 1.1–2”, *MD* 60 (2008) 105–123.

ἄρρητοί (*WD* 3–4, “through whom mortal men ... are spoken of and unspoken”). Callimachus’ juxtaposed ῥήσιες and Ἀρήτου thus look through Aratus to recall Hesiod’s ῥητοί τ’ ἄρρητοί. Here, connecting the two names, is a thread that leads back to Hesiod’s Muse-inspired opening hymn to Zeus. At the same time, in a move that touches on the divine character of the cosmos and religious constraints on public disclosure, Callimachus acknowledges Aratus’ insistence on uttering the name of the demiurgic deity, his “ineffability” notwithstanding.²⁷

But “Aratus” is preceded by a prior clue to the author’s identity in ὁ Σολεύς (3, “the man from Soli”). When Callimachus foregrounds an ethnic in this way (as for example at *Epigram* 55.1 G.-P. τοῦ Σαμίου, of Creophylus) something more specific than personal identity may be in play.²⁸ Soli had acquired notoriety for *soloikismos* (“solecism”) in speech, through its settlers’ linguistic deviation from *hellenismos* into *barbarismos*; and here, in a context where the quality of Aratean ῥήσιες (“utterances”) is at issue, it is perhaps worth recalling a scholium on Lucian to the effect that Aratus was admired as a Σολεύς who “made such progress in Hellenic culture that he composed the *Phaenomena* in the Greek tongue”.²⁹ However nugatory this notice as literary criticism, it may help pinpoint Callimachean teasing: if plagiarism of Hesiod is indeed dismissed in οὐ τὸν ἀοιδόν / ἔσχατον (1–2), then σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη may sustain the joke with reference to the proverbial night-time activity of the thief.³⁰ Aratus’ linguistic achievement is effected not through “theft” but – at one level – through intense sleepless labour of a different sort, observation of the night sky.³¹

27 Similarly, Cleanthes (fr. 1.1–3 Powell) salutes Zeus by name (Ζεῦ ... χαῖρε) and claims *themis*: σὲ γὰρ πάντεσσι θέμις θανάτοισι προσαιδᾶν. Ineffability: Plat. *Tim.* 82c; Cic. *Nat.* 1.30 with Pease’s commentary. With ἄρρητον, cf. Lydus *De ostentis* 16 οὐδὲ τὸ περὶ τὴν τῶν ἀστέρων θεωρίαν διασχολεῖν ἔξω θεοσεβείας ποιεῖ ἀλλ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὴν πάνσοφον ἔστι διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν θεωρῆσαι πρόνοιαν τοῦ πάντων ἀρρήτου πατρός.

28 Creophylus and Samos: A. Hardie, “Callimachus *Epigram* 55: Ptolemaic Perspectives on the Divine Homer”, *Eranos* 111 (2021) 55–81, at 61–63.

29 Solecism: the main sources are Σ Plat. *Rep.* 599c; Σ Dion. Thrax. I.446.31–447.3. See esp. E. Irwin, “Solecising in Solon’s Colony”, *BICS* 43 (1999) 187–193. Aratus: Σ Lucian *Pisc.* 19 ὅτι Σολεύς Ἄρατος ὦν Ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία τοσοῦτον διήνεγκεν, ὥστε τὰ Φαινόμενα Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ γράψας ἔθαυμάσθη. On the underlying linguistic issues, cf. J.M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago/London 2002) 191–192.

30 Thieving by night: *Il.* 3.11 (on mist) κλέπτῃ δέ τε νυκτὸς ἀμείνω; *HH* 4.97 ἐπικούρος ... νύξ (sc. for Hermes’ thieving); Eur. *IT* 1026 (Orestes) κλεπτῶν γὰρ ἢ νύξ; Diphilus fr. 32.13 K.; Plut. *Mor.* 585b; Plaut. *Trin.* 863 *dormitator*; Justinian *Inst.* 4.1 (*furtum a furvo*) *quod clam et obscure fit et plerumque nocte*; Epictetus *Diss.* 1.29.21 ἐν τῷ ἀγρυπνεῖν μου κρείσσων ἦν ὁ κλέπτῃς. Cf. Hesiod’s thieving “day-sleeper” (ἡμερόκοιτος, *WD* 605) with Σ: ὁ κλέπτῃς, ὁ τὴν ἡμέραν μὲν ὑπνῶν, τὴν δὲ νύκτα ἀγρυπνῶν.

31 For plagiarism as “theft” (κλοπή, κλέπτω; also λωποδύτης), see K. Ziegler, “Plagiat”, in *RE* 20 (1950) 1956–1997, at 1957–1959; cf. esp. *AP* 11.130 (Pollianus). For a possible forerunner, combining theft, sleeplessness, “night-writing” and lucubration, cf. Plut. *Dem.* 11.6 (presumably in general circulation by the early CIII). The general topic is treated by Henkel (*loc. cit* [n. 15]) with reference to Call. *Ep.* 56 G.-P. as a model for Verg. *Georg.* 1.291–296.

III The Epigram, the *Somnium* and the Muses

The first word, Ἡσιόδου, has a single Callimachean parallel, in the first pentameter of the *Somnium* (fr. 2.2 Ha.): Ἡσιόδῳ Μουσέων ἔσμος ὅτ' ἦντιάσεν ("when the swarm of the Muses came to meet Hesiod").³² He there refers to Hesiod's self-naming at *Theogony* 22 (Ἡσιόδον) as the shepherd taught song by the Muses. His neo-Hesiodic scenario, with its blurred distinction between dream and waking, bears on Aratus' "wakefulness" through the hours of darkness, for there, at all events, the poet's inspiration cannot have been mediated through a dream encounter.

Aratus had addressed the Muses as μειλίχαι μάλα πᾶσαι ("winsome one and all," 17), with reference to the ἔπεα μείλιχα that Hesiod attributes to the Zeus-nurtured king on whose tongue the Muses, acting in the "Calliope" ("beautiful voice") aspect of their choric identity, have poured sweet honey-dew.³³ τὸ μελιχρότατον / τῶν ἐπέων (2–3) exploits the etymological association of μειλίχιος with μέλι ("honey"), and it looks through Aratus' Muse-address to its Hesiodic model, in the king's honeyed and persuasive ἔπη.³⁴ "The sweetest part of his [Hesiod's] verses," as an antithesis to "[not] the poet whole and entire", appears also to embrace *Works and Days* (WD).³⁵ Aratus' subject matter, celestial and meteorological *phaenomena*, can readily be identified with the section of WD that deals with constellations and agriculture ("The farmer's year": 381–617), since in the opening lines (383–387), and there alone in WD, Hesiod deploys the verb φαίνονται (387): he is summarising the appearance of the Pleiades, and offering "the most basic rule he knows, a rule giving the times both for sowing and for reaping [ἀρότιοιο]" (West).³⁶ Hesiod selected it in response to King Panoides' command that he and Homer perform τὸ κάλλιστον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ποιημάτων ("the finest passage from their own poems").³⁷

The Muses' absence from our epigram might suggest that the foregoing emphasis on their roles in *Theogony*, *Aetia* and *Phaenomena* has only limited relevance, at least as concerns direct reference to the Prologue and *Somnium*. Yet

³² The Muses take the initiative at *Theog.* 22–34; similarly at AP 9.64 (probably Archias; but ambiguous as to dream or wakefulness). For ancient debate as to whether Hesiod was awake or asleep, thus as to the "dream" status of his own initiation, see Fronto *Ad M. Caesar* 1.4 (I p. 94–95 Haines), with M.L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1965) 158–159. See further R. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge 2006) 21–22.

³³ *Theog.* 79–84. Cf. Chr. Fakas, *Der hellenistische Hesiod: Arats Phainomena und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik* (Wiesbaden 2001) 61–62.

³⁴ Fakas, *loc. cit.* (n. 33) 60, n. 176. For the etymological nexus, see A. Hardie, "The *Georgics*, the Mysteries and the Muses at Rome", *PCPS* 48 (2002) 175–208, at 192–193.

³⁵ This is essentially the antithesis read by G. Kaibel, "Aratea", *Hermes* 29 (1894) 82–123, at 121–123, followed by G.-P., 209 and Cameron, 379.

³⁶ M.L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 252 and 254.

³⁷ *Cert.* 177–189; P. Bassino, *The Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi: A Commentary* (Berlin 2019) 164–167. The reference is noted by Hunter, *loc. cit.* (n. 17) 300–301.

“subtle utterances” (λεπταὶ ῥήσεις) appear to rehearse and re-word τὸ μελιχρότατον / τῶν ἐπέων, a phrase that certainly echoes Hesiod’s Muse-inspired ἔπη; and their bold personification in apostrophe offers a *prima facie* analogue for Aratus’ Muse-salutation (*Phaen.* 16–18), hence also a response to the ἀμουσία playfully implicit in ὁ Σολεύς.³⁸ This should encourage exploration of some closer associations: the intertextual linkage of Callimachus’ epigram with the *Phaenomena* both as “Hesiodic” and as the product of Aratus’ Muse-inspiration.³⁹ A clue to Muse-valences in this area is vouchsafed within the salutation: in the address χαίρετε λεπταὶ ῥήσεις, as will be seen (below, §IV), Callimachus shifts dramatic register from the objectivity of the κριτικός to the subjectivity of the inspired singer: as though suddenly enthused by the very text he is appraising, he addresses its component “sayings” as if they were Aratean “Muses”.

Callimachus’ salutation appears also in an anonymous fragment recorded in Proclus’ comments on *WD* (Σ Prol. [d]). Taken together with Aratus, this remarkable text will help us see how the address to λεπταὶ ῥήσεις might be taken to embrace Hesiod’s Muses too. It will also show how the two epigrams exemplify the textual transmission of Muse-inspiration from the founder of poetic *didaxis* to successor poets working in the same generic domain.⁴⁰

ἄρνειῶν καλέειν εὐαδεν, ἀλλὰ βροτῶν.
 χαῖρ’ Ἑλικῶν ὃς τοῖον ἐθρέψας, **χαίρετε λεπταὶ**
ῥήσεις Ἡσιόδου μουσοπνόνων στομάτων.

it is the pleasure of [] to call [?the Ascrean] [the shepherd no longer] of lambs but of mortals. Hail Helicon, that nurtured such as him, hail subtle utterances of Hesiod’s Muse-inspired/Muse-breathing lips.

The fragment is close in spirit to epigrams honouring Hesiod on the Hellenistic Stēlē of Euthycles at Thespiae, in particular an “oracle” uttered by “Helicon” predicting *eunomia* to mortals obeying Hesiod’s precepts.⁴¹ If composed for that context with Callimachus in view, it would be testimony to the interest of the latter’s

³⁸ Cf. Sens, 158.

³⁹ Cf. Hedylus 5.1–2 G.-P. (ap. Athen. *Deipn.* 472f), where inspiration lies in drinking (sc. μελί-χρον) wine, appropriating Callimachus’ terms: ... τι παρ’ οἶνον / εὐροίμ’ ἄν λεπτόν καὶ τι μελιχρόν ἔπος.

⁴⁰ Hes. Fr. Spur. 379 M-W; West supplements ᾠχεῖ γέρον Ἀσκραῖε τὸν οὐκέτι ποιμένα Μούσαις (also idem, *ZPE* 57 [1984] 33). West and Koning (*loc. cit.* [n. 18] 335 n. 150) both connect with Call. *Ep.* 56 G.-P.

⁴¹ Euthycles’ stēlē (*IG* 7.4240; Roesch *IThesp.* 274): A. Hurst, “La stèle de l’Hélicon”, in A. Hurst/A. Schachter (eds.), *La montagne des Muses* (Geneva 1996) 57–71. Cf. esp. lines 6–7 (epigram b.3–4) πειθόμενοισι βροτοῖς ὑποθήκαις Ἡσιόδοιο / εὐνομία χ[ώ]ρα τ’ ἔσται /καρποῖς βρύουσα (and cf. *Theog.* 902–903, on the Horai).

Hesiodic programme for Thespiean devotees of the poet.⁴² Be that as it may, as a literary epigram available to Proclus, these lines were presumably in general circulation. Two immediate observations are in order. First, the epigrammatist is representing *WD* as an ethical and political work inspired by the Heliconian Muses, very much as Callimachus does in the fragmentary opening of the *Somnium*.⁴³ Second, μουσοπνόων στομάτων combines Hesiod's "Muse-breathing" mouth with the Muses' own "breathing" upon him, yielding an elegant continuum of inspiration and voiced performance observable also in Aratus and Callimachus (below, §§IV, IV).⁴⁴ As to chronological priority, it seems likely, in view of the Aratean resonance of λεπταί and the nameplay in ῥήσιες Ἀρήτου, that χαίρετε λεπταί / ῥήσιες Ἡσιόδου borrows from Callimachus and not the other way round. If so, χαῖρ' Ἑλικῶν ... χαίρετε may also re-work Aratus' double salutation to Zeus and the Muses (*Phaen.* 15–16). Assuming reader-recognition of such a citation, Aratus' λεπταί ῥήσιες are here implicitly claimed for Hesiod's Heliconian Muses.

We now return to Callimachus' seemingly conflicted reactions and his expression of "fear" (ὀκνέω μή, 2). Gow-Page observe that the verb "hardly differs in meaning from φοβοῦμαι μή" (a sense rarely reflected in translations of our epigram). They helpfully cite Plato's use of ὀκνῶ μή (plus subjunctive) in *Phaedrus*, where it registers the speaker's rueful acknowledgement that a cherished literary-artistic assessment is being overturned. Following Socrates' prayerful palinode to the inspiring Eros, the astonished Phaedrus is moved to renounce his earlier, uncritical, admiration for Lysias' speech on the same subject (257c): ὀκνῶ μή μοι ὁ Λυσίας ταπεινὸς φανῇ, ἐὰν ἄρα καὶ ἐθέλῃ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄλλον ἀντιπαρατεῖναι ("I fear Lysias will seem humbled if indeed by way of response he should really wish to extend another [speech] for comparison with it [sc. Socrates' palinode]").⁴⁵ Callimachus was certainly familiar with *Phaedrus*;⁴⁶ and if ὀκνέω μή carries similar force in *Epigram* 56 G.-P., then a new reading enters the frame: Callimachus, we infer, is faced with a fellow connoisseur whose critical judgment of Hesiod's finest ἔπη, he concedes, rightly privileges *WD* as model over his own focus on *Theogony*. Of course, there is no "real" reluctance, and Callimachus is here acting out a part

⁴² On the society of "those who sacrifice to to the Muses of Hesiod", see *IG* 7.1785, with *SEG* 32.506, 55.563.

⁴³ *Aetia* fr. 2.5–6 Ha. with Harder II.104–105.

⁴⁴ *Theog.* 31–32 ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν / θέσπιν. Cf. Alcaeus of Messene 12.5–6 G.-P. (= *AP* 7.55.5–6) τοίην γὰρ καὶ γῆρυν ἀπέπνεεν ἑννέα Μουσέων / ὁ πρέσβυς καθαρῶν γευσάμενος λιβάδων. Dioscorides 18.3 G.-P. (= *AP* 7.407.3) makes Pieria and Helicon honour Sappho with the Muses ἴσα πνεύουσιν ἐκείναις. For programmatic πνεῖω in Callimachus, see Acosta-Hughes, *loc. cit.* (n. 24) 80, on *Iamb.* 13.15. στομάτων is paralleled at *Theog.* 97 γλυκερὴ οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδή. For the plural, also of voiced divine inspiration, cf. Emped. fr. 3.2 D.-K.

⁴⁵ For translation and interpretation see H. Yunis, *Plato: Phaedrus* (Cambridge 2011) 170.

⁴⁶ For Callimachus and Plato, see R. Hunter, "Winged Callimachus", *ZPE* 76 (1989) 1–2 (on references to *Ion* and *Phaedrus* in the Prologue); B. Acosta-Hughes/S.A. Stephens *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets* (Cambridge 2012) 31–47 (36–39 on *Phaedrus*); J.L. Lightfoot, "Review Article: Callimachus", *JHS* 113 (2013) 147–157, at 156–157.

in a mini-drama. His deep respect for Aratus is explicit in *Pros Praxiphanen* (fr. 460 Pf.) and is implicit in an allusion in the *Hymn to Delos*, with probable name-play (ἀρητόν, 205) to Aratus' own treatment of the island.⁴⁷

IV The Epigram and the *Phaenomena*

λεπταὶ ῥήσιες (“subtle utterances”), in Callimachus’ apostrophe reflects the Aratean λεπτότης embedded in *Phaenomena* 783–787. This introduces description of the waxing moon as a prominent weather sign for the coming month, opening λεπτή μὲν καθαρή τε (“slender and translucent”), continuing with λεπτή (784) and yielding a celebrated acrostic, λ-ε-π-τ-η over all opening letters of the lines that constitute this drawn-out (λεπτός) sentence, and as it were initialling the equivalence of text and sky-signs, and thus our readings of both.⁴⁸

Aratus’ acrostic highlights the inscribed presence of signs which the sky-watcher, as learned reader, is urged to “mark as evidence” (τεκμαίρεο/ τεκμήριο, 801–802) and “excogitate through observation” (σκέπτεο, 778, 799). Graphic analogy, sky to text, though hardly visible (λεπτός again), extends to the preamble to the λεπτή-passage: “different evenings paint [ἐπιγράφει] her in a different light” (779, trans. Kidd), he says, with reference to the moon’s shifting μορφαί (780, “shapes,” “forms”).⁴⁹ The account of colour, shape and inclination of the moon that follows, and of the weather portended by each variant, offers an extended word-painting that exemplifies verbal λεπτότης and unifies variegated lunar/meteorological phenomena.⁵⁰ To pursue this programmatic unity-in-variety a step further, the marking of variegation (ἄλλοτε ... ἄλλη ... ἄλλοτε ... ἄλλοιαι, 779–780) recalls the opening lines (19–20) οἱ μὲν ὁμῶς πολέες τε καὶ ἄλλυδις ἄλλοι ἔόντες / οὐρανῷ ἔλκονται ... (“the numerous stars, scattered in different directions, sweep all alike across the sky ...” trans. Kidd); and there, variegation is complemented by the harmonising role of the “fixed axis” (ἄξων ... ἄρηρεν, 21), “maintaining the earth at

47 Achill. Vit. Arat. 4 (praise of Aratus as “highly learned and an excellent poet”). *HDelos* and nameplay: A. Hardie, “Callimachus at the Mouseion (the *Hymn to Delos*)”, *PLLS* 16 (2016) 39–153, at 120–121, with n. 306.

I am not persuaded by K. Tsantsanoglou, “The λεπτότης of Aratus”, *Trends in Classics* 1 (2009) 55–89 that our epigram is critical of Aratus. For the epigram as praise, M. Asper, *Onomata allotria. Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos* (Stuttgart 1997) 178–179.

48 On λεπτότης and the acrostic, Kidd, 445–446; Bing, *loc. cit.* (n. 26) 106–107; Asper, *loc. cit.* (n. 47) 182–184 (a valuable summary of literary-historical issues, with reference to *Ep.* 56 G.-P.); Harder II.62. The effect of “drawing out” a fine-spun sentence is replicated by Horace in the verb *deduxisse* (*Odes* 3.30.14), with two five-line sentences (1–5, 10–15). For the figure, see K. Gutzwiller, “Under the Sign of the Distaff: *Aetia* 1.5, Spinning and Erinna”, *CQ* 70 (2020) 177–191.

49 Kidd, 445 (though not connecting with μορφαί, 780).

50 For the craft-analogue in μορφαί, cf. 375 μορφώσας, of the first star-namer figured as forming the stars into figures; see E. Gee, *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid’s Fasti* (Cambridge, 2000) 86.

the centre, all in equilibrium” (ἔχει δ’ ἀτάλαντον ἀπάντη / μεσσηγὺς γαῖαν, 21), and rotating the *ouranos* around itself.⁵¹ This is a harmonised cosmos, the component parts of which “fit together”. Personified “evening as painter” (μιν [sc. σελήνην] ἐπιγράφει ἔσπερος, 779), we infer, figures the textual artistry through which the poet, the painter in words, replicates the unity of diverse celestial *phaenomena*.⁵² And so *Phaenomena* replicates the harmony of the cosmos it maps. Similarly, Aratus’ interlocking analogies of craftsman and poet articulate the ordering of diverse materials into a unified poem/artefact. “Fitted together harmony” reappears in his analogy between the three celestial circles plus ecliptic, “fastened together” (467, ἀρηρότες ἀλλήλοισι) and a craftsman’s armillary sphere, the bands of which are shaped round the artefact, as the ethereal bands are “fitted together” (συναρηρότα, 532).

Callimachus’ progression from visual arts to λεπταὶ ῥήσιες parallels, and in my view re-works, Aratus’ “evening” (*hesperos*) as cosmic “painter” representing the celestial λεπτότης of the moon’s phases. Why then does Callimachus personify Aratus’ “utterances” (χαίρετε λεπταὶ / ῥήσιες, 3–4)? How might the salutation resolve the “barbarian” paradox and ἀμουσία implied in ὁ Σολεύς? And again, how might it help in relating Aratus’ “harmonious” *ouranos*, his visual subject matter, to his literary model? To pursue these questions, in what must be a cumulative, step-by-step, line of argument, I turn first to Aratus’ Muse-address (*Phaen.* 16–18):

χαίροιτε δὲ Μοῦσαι,
μειλίχαι μάλα πᾶσαι· ἐμοὶ γε μὲν ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν
ἧ θέμις εὐχομένῳ τεκμήρατε πᾶσαν ἀοιδήν.

And I would greet you, Muses, winsome one and all. Aye, and to me as I pray, so far as is proper, to speak the stars, vouchsafe signs to guide all my song, to its end.

The cardinal insight belongs to Christos Fakas: the salutation links the Zeus-hymn to the body of the poem, and does so through the Muses’ implicit response to ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν (“speak the stars”, 17), conveyed in the bold lead-off οἱ μὲν ὁμῶς ... / οὐρανῷ ἔλκονται (“they [sc. the stars] are drawn all alike across the sky ...”). As Fakas saw, the Muses have “taken the stage” in response to the poet’s plea, in

⁵¹ For Aratus’ verbal and thematic cross-referencing, see Gee, *loc. cit.* (n. 50) 76–81. For the etymology of ἀρμονία from ἀραρίσκω, see G. Kirk, *Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments* (Cambridge 1954) 207–221, and below, n. 79.

⁵² Aratus the “artist”: see Gee, *loc. cit.* (n. 50) 84–90, but without reference to *Hesperos* and *leptotes*. For nature as harmonising painter in diversity, cf. Cic. *Arat.* 161 *vario pinxit distinguens lumine formas*. Behind Callimachus’ sequence and its Aratean model lies Hellenistic literary theory on the relationship between poetry and the visual arts, and its bearing both on the character of *mimesis* and on the organic coherence of the parts of a work of art or poetry: thus, *ut pictura poesis* (Hor. *Ars.* 361); cf. C.O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: The ‘Ars Poetica.’* (Cambridge 1971) 368–370.

order “themselves to voice the star-science that follows”.⁵³ Aratus’ utterances are voiced by the Muses. The progression from proem and salutation to the Muses’ entrance into Aratus’ text as singers has its Hesiodic model at the corresponding juncture in *Theogony*.⁵⁴ Again like Hesiod, Aratus greets the Muses as though they are already present, without summoning them from elsewhere. Didactic practice varies in this respect:⁵⁵ in *WD*, the Pierian Muses are summoned to hymn Zeus; and Empedocles makes two cletic appeals to the Muse/“Kalliopeia” (both verbally referenced by Aratus: see below). Elsewhere, as here, omission of the conventional κλητικὸς ὕμνος can signify the singer’s assumption he is already in the presence of the Muses.⁵⁶ Thus, the Heliconian Muses are assumed already to be present on their holy mountain, and to require no *kletikon*; and there also the salutation χαίρετε signals the speaker’s acknowledgement of the goddesses’ presence.⁵⁷

Aratus offers no obvious reference to the location of his encounter with the Muses or to its character, whether visual or auditory. The omissions, which are unusual in accounts of the mortal experience of divine epiphany, invite inspection of the astronomical poet’s dramatic scenario. Saluted in parallel to “father Zeus” (χαῖρε ... χαίροιτε, 15–16), these Muses are members of the “earlier family” (sc. Zeus’ divine offspring) hailed in καὶ προτέρη γενεῇ (16), and the goddesses share Zeus as common “father” (cf. τοῦ ... γένος εἰμέν, 5) with mankind.⁵⁸ Mythic genealogy is combined with reference, through μειλίχαι μάλα πᾶσαι, to the Muses as paradigmatic divine χόρος, credited with the power to propitiate and persuade.⁵⁹ Crucially, this power is implied to be a facet of the benign regime of Zeus, in two distinct dimensions. First, man’s preceding propitiation of Zeus (ἰλάσκονται, 14) for his seasonal guidance on planting and growth recalls Hesiod’s Muse-favoured king, the harmonising, winsome speaker (thus, ἔπεα μείλιχα) who is propitiated with reciprocal μειλίχαι by his people (ἰλάσκονται / αἰδοῖ μειλίχῃ, *Theogony* 81–92). This intertextual nexus yields allusion to Zeus Meilichios, the benign father-

53 Fakas, *loc. cit.* (n. 33) 58. Muses’ entry *propriis personis* was first hypothesised (for Propertius 4.6) by F. Cairns, “Propertius and the Battle of Actium (4.6)”, in *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, ed. A.J. Woodman and D.A. West (Cambridge 1984) 129–168 and 229–241 = F. Cairns *Roman Lyric* (Berlin/Boston 2007) 220–261.

54 West, *loc. cit.* (n. 32) 191 (on *Theog.* 114–115): “it is as if the poet at this point hands over to the Muse.”

55 West, *loc. cit.* (n. 36) 138 (on δεῦτε, *WD* 2).

56 Cf. esp. Arist. fr. 334: μήτε Μούσας ἀνακαλεῖν ... / μήτε Χάριτας βοᾶν εἰς χόρον Ὀλυμπίας / ἐνθάδε γάρ εἰσιν, ὡς φησιν ὁ διδάσκαλος. For cletic hymns to Muses, see A. Hardie, “An Augustan Hymn to the Muses (Horace *Odes* 3.4): Part I”, *PLLS* 13 (2008) 55–118, at 80–86 with n. 38.

57 For χαῖρε/χαίρετε in epiphanic contexts, see A.W. Bulloch, *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge 1985) 245–246 (on *Call. Hymn* 5.140–141); M. Dickie, “Divine Epiphany in Lucian’s Account of the Oracle of Alexander of Abonuteichos”, *ICS* 29 (2004) 159–182, at 173–174.

58 On προτέρη γενεῇ, see Kidd, 172–173.

59 Fakas, (*loc. cit.* [n. 33] 60–61), takes πᾶσαι as a correction of Empedocles’ Calliope alone as inspiring Muse.

god who combines regal sovereignty with provision of abundant food;⁶⁰ the cult epithet is transferred in turn to the daughter-Muses as his musical agents, thus as the intermediary powers who can communicate the annual workings of the *ouranos* to the poet.⁶¹

The second Zeus-dimension, signalled by salutation of the god as μέγα θαῦμα (“great object of wonderment”, Kidd), is the visible sky-god and his signs: the choric Muses are evidently conceived as, in some sense, the musical articulation of Zeus as sky, immanent within the visible cosmos and governing the harmonies that determine both its stable equilibrium and the eternal, wheeling, star-movements that we observe from earth.⁶² It is in this sense, through the visible cosmos, as though in a vast temple of Zeus, that Aratus can greet the Muses as present divinities, in parallel to salutation of their father (15–16). Again, while stars and constellations are more or less visible to the mortal observer’s eye, their eternal inner workings can only be understood through the Muses communicating the musical character of Zeus’ cosmos to the favoured terrestrial singer. Aratus’ appeal to these celestial Muses underscores the poet’s requirement for guidance in mapping an ever-mobile sky-scape, within the constraints on public disclosure of the divine: thus, in appealing to the Muses to “guide my entire song to the end” (τεκμήρατε πᾶσαν ἀοιδίην, 18), Aratus picks up “way” imagery associated with mystery initiation and applies it figuratively to his own poem-journey as an exploration of the stars’ paths across the *ouranos*.⁶³ Within this reading, the metaphysical conception of the cosmic Muse(s) has its most powerful antecedents in Empedocles’ *Physika* (below), in Pindar’s account of the Muses in the first *Hymn*, and in Plato’s foregrounding of the Muse Ourania in *Phaedrus* as inspiration for philosophical discourse on the subject of the heavens.⁶⁴ Overall support for the reading is to be found in Vergil’s derivative prayer, towards the end of the second *Georgic*, that the Muses accept him and reveal “the ways of the heavens and the stars” (477), again

⁶⁰ A.B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion* Vol. II (Cambridge 1925) 1091–1160 (esp. 1106, figg. 942–943; sceptre and cornucopia). At Athens (*Diasia*): R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford 2005) 424–425. Food-supply underlies *Phaen.* 13 (Zeus gives seasonal signs) ὅφρ’ ἐμπεδα πάντα φύωνται.

⁶¹ For such transfers of epiclerosis, see Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 47) 62–66 (Zeus and Apollo as *Kynthios*).

⁶² Kidd, 171, comparing μέγα θαῦμα of the visual effect of the constellation Dracon at 46. For Zeus as sky, see Kidd, 11 (*Phaen.* 224, 259, 756); Gee, *loc. cit.* (n. 50) 76.

⁶³ On “way” imagery in these texts, see D. Nelis, “Georgics 2.458–542: Virgil, Aratus and Empedocles”, *Dictynna* 1 (2004) n. 39, with further refs. A key parallel for τεκμήρατε, as Nelis has shown (*ibid.*, n. 29), is the Apollonian Orpheus’ account of the stars’ fixed paths, *Arg.* 1.499 τέκμαρ ἔχουσιν / ἄστρα.

⁶⁴ Empedocles: A. Hardie, “Empedocles and the Muse of the *Agathos Logos*”, *AJP* 134 (2013) 209–224; Pindar: A. Hardie, “Pindar’s ‘Theban’ Cosmogony (the First Hymn)”, *BICS* 44 (2000) 19–40. Ourania: *Phaedrus* 259d, with Yunis *loc. cit.* (n. 45), 176–177; her personality may be uppermost within the Muses’ choric identity in the foregrounded οὐρανῶ (*Phaen.* 20).

with reference to the mysteries, and again with philosophical reference to Empedocles.⁶⁵

To return to Callimachus: χαίρετε λεπταὶ ῥήσιες / Ἀρήτου acknowledges Aratus' successful representation in poetry of the celestial λεπτότης which he identifies and embeds within the text at *Phaenomena* 783–787. The problematic σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη, placed in apposition to λεπταὶ ῥήσιες, must be read as, in some sense, an extension of the same complex of ideas. Attempts to remove the bold apposition by emending the epithet are in my view unnecessary.⁶⁶ As may be inferred from echoes of our epigram in Latin poetry, ἀγρυπνίη incorporates the notion of night-work (plainly, the effort of star-gazing through an entire year) and applies it to Aratus' actions in “speaking the stars” (*Phaen.* 17).⁶⁷ In addition, Thomas Gärtner has documented the medical associations (Galen and later) of σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη. Here, however, the phrasing may owe something to a kind of “scholarly syndrome” known to the (Coan) Hippocratic school, preserved – not without humour – by Aretaeus of Cappadocia and arguably (the point cannot be fully explored here) connecting with anecdotes about the Coan Philitas' notorious λεπτότης and the νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἐσπέριοι of his faux-epitaph (Athen. *Deipn.* 401e).⁶⁸ Such associations would be very much at home in our epigram and indeed in the *Aetia* Prologue as well: they would supply a piquant linkage of insomnia, under-nourishment (ὀλιγοσιτίη), and medically over-zealous yearning for “divine learning” to the (?Philitan) ideal of ὀλιγοσιτική (*Aetia* fr. 1.9 Ha.) and ultimately to the thin gruel enjoined by Apollo to render the Μοῦσα herself “spare” (λεπταλέη, *ibid.*, 24). With further investigation of near-contemporary texts, a case may yet emerge for associating Callimachean and Aratean λεπτότης with Philitas.

σύντονος can also lead us back to the Aratean conception of celestial harmony in diversity adumbrated earlier. The epithet qualifies variations of the standard

⁶⁵ Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 34).

⁶⁶ σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη is defended by A. Cameron, “Callimachus on Aratus' Sleepless Nights”, *CR* 22 (1972) 169–170, citing J. Robert, “Épigramme de Chios”, *REG* 80 (1967) 282–291, at 286–287; also by M. Hose, “Σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη (Kallimachos Epigramm 27 Pf.)”, *Glotta* 72 (1994) 196–199; Gärtner, *loc. cit.* (n. 16) 160–161; cf. M. Asper, *Kallimachos: Werke* (Darmstadt, 2004) 488. σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης is usually printed: see Kaibel, *loc. cit.* (n. 35) 121; Pfeiffer's edn. (*Ep.* 27); Nisetich, *loc. cit.* (n. 8) 183; Hunter, *loc. cit.* (n. 17) 292; and it is well advocated by Sens, 158. S. Stewart (“Emending Aratus' Insomnia: Callimachus *Epigr.* 27”, *Mnemosyne* 61 [2008] 586–600) proposes σύντομος; but if apposition is accepted, emendation is unnecessary.

⁶⁷ Helvius Cinna's *multum vigilata ... carmina* (fr. 13 Hollis) re-works the apposition, activating the effort implicit in Callimachus' phrase. *labor* is later explicit at *Ciris* 46 *dona meo multum vigilata labore*; cf. also *Lucr.* 1.141–142 *efferre laborem ... noctes vigilare*).

⁶⁸ Gärtner, *loc. cit.* (n. 16) 161–162. But add Aretaeus *SD* 2.6.6, on physical symptoms that might attend τοῖσι ἐς παιδείην πονεῦσι ... οἷσι θεῖης μὲν μαθήσιος ποθή, ὀλιγοσιτίη δὲ καὶ ἀγρυπνίη καὶ μελεδώνη λόγων τε καὶ πραγμάτων σόφων. Aretaeus' Hippocratic writings were known to Galen and almost certainly earlier (see *Brill's New Pauly*, s.v. Aretaeus [Nutton]). If a medical/Philitan dialogue is in play, might medical σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη (not in Aretaeus) derive from our epigram?

“harmonies”; and in less theoretical contexts it is attached to “tunes” (μέλη), or “the Muse” in the sense “high-pitched”, occasionally paired with λεπτός.⁶⁹ σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη can therefore be understood to allude to Aratus’ nightly representation of celestial harmony. Given the Stoic affinities of the portrayal of Zeus, it is also worth observing that συντονία is an attested Stoic term applied by Chrysippus to the unitary relationship of the celestial and the terrestrial.⁷⁰

It remains in this section to substantiate the suggestion that the Muses are embedded within the personified λεπταὶ ῥήσιες. The notion is implicit in Fakas’ perception of the Muses’ entry as singers at *Phaenomena* 19. But to outline what is proposed more fully, the “subtle utterances” that represent celestial λεπτότης within Aratus’ text are the epiphany-in-voice of the Muses who have inspired them and who are themselves a musical projection of the *harmonia* that governs the workings of the cosmos. The primary didactic antecedent is Empedocles, whom Aratus has in view as he prays to the Muses: thus, with ἢ θέμις εὐχομένω (*Phaen.* 18) cf. Empedocles fr. 131.3 D.-K., εὐχομένω ... παρίστασο, and fr. 3.4 ὦν θέμις ἐστὶν ἐφημερίοισιν ἀκούειν.⁷¹ Again, we have a likely poet-and-title reference to the Empedoclean Περὶ Φυσέως in the Zeus-hymn (13): ὄφρ’ ἔμπεδα πάντα φύωνται (“that all may grow without fail”).⁷² Now, Empedocles’ named Muse “Kalliopeia” transcends lyric and epic antecedents to emerge as an agent of the cosmic “sacred mind” (*phrēn hierē*) and of the *harmonia* associated with “Love” (Φιλία): she is integrated with the poet’s innovatory physiological framework, and operates through his mental processes (*phrontides*), yet at the same time is still depicted in her anthropomorphic identity.⁷³ Additionally, in a development of special significance for the relationship between Muse, sung performance and transmitted poem, she retains her etymological associations with “beautiful voice” and “beautiful *epos*” in such a way as – quite literally – to be identified with the inspired poem as she/it emerges, in audible *epiphaneia*, from the singer’s lips.⁷⁴ Callimachus himself varies Empedocles’ epiphanic identification of Calliope and song at *Aetia* fr. 75.76–77 Ha. (Book III), with reference to a story from a prose source

69 Aristot. *Pol.* 1342a22–28 (comparison of unnaturally warped souls of audiences to highly-strung Phrygian harmony) οὕτω καὶ τῶν ἀρμονιῶν παρεκβάσεις εἰσὶ καὶ τῶν μελῶν τὰ σύντονα καὶ παρακεχρωσμένα κτλ Aristot. *Aud.* 804a28–29 τῶν ὀργάνων τὰ λεπτὰ καὶ σύντονα. Eur. *Bacch.* 126; Timoth. *Persae* 169–170; Eur. *Or.* 1384–1385, with *Etym. Magn.* p. 147 K.

70 Diog. Laert 7.140 (= SVF II.543, Chrysippus): τοῦτο γὰρ [sc. the unity of the cosmos] ἀναγκάζειν τὴν τῶν οὐρανίων πρὸς τὰ ἐπίγεια σύμπνοια καὶ συντονίαν. We might also recall Heraclitus’ παλίντονος ἀρμονίη (fr. 51 Kirk). For complementary comment on Stoic influences, including cosmic (gods and mortals) harmony, see Gee, *loc. cit.* (n. 50) 70–84, esp. 76–78.

71 Fakas, *loc. cit.* (n. 33) 60–61; Nelis, *loc. cit.* (n. 63) para. 23.

72 Nelis, *loc. cit.* (n. 63) n. 29, with earlier references; cf. Emped. fr. 26.10, 17.11 D.-K.; also Nic. *Ther.* 4 ἔμπεδα φωνήσαιμι.

73 Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 64, *AJP*) esp. 220–227.

74 Epiphany of Muse within song: Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 64, *AJP*) 216–220; also Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 56) 71–79.

that “ran down into our Calliope”.⁷⁵ On this basis, we may return to the “continuum” of Muse-inspiration and voiced performance identified earlier in the epigram cited by Proclus (above, §III): within Hesiod’s “breathed” utterances, we hear the Muses themselves in sound-epiphany; and again, if the anonymous epigrammatist intended active recall of the Aratus-epigram, we may infer transmission of the Hesiodic poem-Muses’ divinity (akin to the “divine power” that Plato adapts to his theory of transmitted θεῖα δύναμις at *Ion* 533d) from Hesiod to the Muses’ favoured successor.

In our epigram the salutation to Aratus’ personified λεπταὶ ῥήσιες implies the equivalence of voiced utterances and audible Muse(s). As such, to anticipate discussion of the Prologue (below, §V), they may be understood to instantiate the λεπταλέη Μοῦσα (“slender Muse”) enjoined on the young Callimachus by Apollo (fr. 1.24 Ha.). Again, as the generic representation of the “sweetest of [Hesiod’s] verses (τὸ μελιχρότατον / τῶν ἐπέων, 2–3), and through the etymological relationship between μελιχίος (“winsome”) and μελιχρός (“sweet”), these “utterances” represent Aratus’ “winsome Muses” hailed at *Phaenomena* 16–17 (μελιχίαι μάλα πᾶσαι).⁷⁶ The latter, we infer, are heard within the performance they have inspired, and (in a further sophistication) are transmitted through Aratus’ text to Callimachus, who hears the poet’s voice anew as he reads the poem. To summarise this part of the argument: in addressing the λεπταὶ ῥήσιες, Callimachus is acknowledging the ἐπιφάνεια of Φαινόμενα itself, the epiphany-in-sound of the Muses within a new *divinum carmen*; and the song – he claims – derives its power and identity through generic succession and divine favour from Hesiod’s *Helikoniades*.

V ᾄσμα, Prologue, Linus-Song and Genre

Four terms in *Epigram* 56 G.-P. are directly paralleled in the *Aetia* Prologue: ᾄσμα (*Ep.* 56.1, *Aet.* 1.3), αἰδόν (1)/αἰοιδῆ (1) and αἰοιδέ (23), μελιχρότατον (2)/μελιχρότεραι (16), and ἐπέων (3)/ἔπος (5), plus a fifth parallel between λεπταὶ (3) and λεπταλέην (24).⁷⁷ To assess this striking overlap, and the issue of chronological priority, I start with ἐπέων (3) and ᾄσμα (1): each term will be considered within its programmatic context, drawing selectively on current scholarship on the Prologue.

⁷⁵ Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 64) 220, 241.

⁷⁶ Etymology: Hardie, *loc. cit.* (n. 34) 192–193 (on Verg. *Georg.* 2.475, *dulces ante omnia Musae*).

⁷⁷ Were Rostagni’s supplement ῥήσιες (printed by Massimilla, *loc. cit.* [n.13]) correct at *Aetia* fr.1.12 Ha., we should have a further parallel, but Cameron’s objections (p. 321) seem decisive; rejected also by Harder II.41–42. Asper’s discussion of λεπταὶ ῥήσιες (*loc. cit.* [n. 47] 179 is predicated on the now-discarded restoration αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν at *Aetia* fr. 1.11 Ha.

ἐπέων (*Ep.* 56.3) evidently embraces the metre of the *Phaenomena*.⁷⁸ Hesiod's Muses had taken the initiative in addressing him in hexameters (*Theog.* 26–28), and their characterisation as ἀρτιέπειαι (*Theog.* 29) was later glossed as “deploying even verses” (ἀρτίοις ἔπεσι χρώμεναι).⁷⁹ On this view of his initiation, Hesiod composed hexameter ἔπη because that was the medium in which the Heliconian Muses themselves sang; and it is to this classic framing of didactic *epos* that Aratus has adhered. It is of course with respect to metre that Aratus' “mode” (τρόπος, 1) differs most immediately from the ἔλεγχοι of *Aetia*; and unsurprisingly, ἔπος and ἔπη are foregrounded in Callimachus' report of the Telchines' grounds for attack on his attitude to (sc. traditional) epic poetry. Were Acosta-Hughes right in reading *Aetia* fr. 1.1–6 Ha. as the Telchines' critique of the hexameter *Hecale* and simultaneously as programmatic transition to the elegiac *Aetia*, hexameter back-reference from our *Phaenomena*-epigram will carry still greater metrical relevance.⁸⁰ ἐπέων of hexameter verses is actually suppressed at *Aetia* fr. 1.4 Ha., πολλαῖς ... χιλιάσιν (“in many thousands [sc. of verses]”);⁸¹ but it is “virtually” echoed in the singular ἔπος (5) and the near-homophone τῶν ἐτέων (6, of the poet-speaker's many “years”).⁸² Callimachus turns the tables in reporting the Telchines' accusation that “I twist a modest poetic utterance” (ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τύτθον ἐλ[ίσσω]: the god whose instructions he goes on to cite, Lycian Apollo, is already a Homeric intertextual presence in τυτθὸν ἐλ[ίσσω (5, as restored): the phrase echoes his battlefield intervention in *Iliad* 5, where Diomedes falls “back a little”, τυτθὸν ὀπίσσω (443, same *sedes*) in obedience to the god's command.⁸³ The iliadic Lycian Apollo is being re-invented as a critical authority on the art of poetry, as the poet passes to the god's Pythagoras-like ἀκούσματα, itself a short divine ἔπος (εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος, 22), from the poet's didactic model, vouchsafed to him in childhood in

78 ἔπη of elegy is archaic (*Theogn.* 20, 22). For translation “the sweetest of hexameter verses”, Hunter *loc. cit.* (n. 17) 294. For recent discussion, see esp. K. Gutzwiller, *loc. cit.* (n. 48) 181–182 (n. 20).

79 Σ. ad loc. and *Etym. Magn.* p. 150 K. Cf. *LSJ* s.v. II. For derivation of the ἀρ- root from ἀραρίσκω, see C. Calame, “Die Komposita mit ἀρτι- im frūgriechischen Epos”, *MH* 34 (1977) 209–220, at 212–215 (with Kirk *loc. cit.* [n. 51]). ἀρτίοις equates to Latin *pares*, against *impares versus* of elegy: McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.1.3–4; Brink *loc. cit.* (n. 52) 166, on *Hor. Ars* 75; Hunter, *loc. cit.* (n. 32) 32–33. For even/uneven steps and the cognate ἀπαρτίζω, cf. Aesch. *Septem* 374.

80 Acosta-Hughes, *loc. cit.* (n. 10). Against Cameron's view (pp. 263–267) that only elegy is in view, see Harder II.10–11; 20. Propertius (2.1.14) tellingly re-works χιλιάσιν as *longas* ... *Iliadas* (after *causas mille* (I), 12).

81 Suppressed ἐπέων: Massimilla, *loc. cit.* (n. 13) 204. For the related sound-effect of ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ in line 5 (cf. also Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ᾠοδῇ 1), see Acosta-Hughes/Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 11) 241.

82 Interplay of ἔπη/ἔπος, ἔτη and πολλός is echoed in the prefatory prayer (fr. 7.14–15 Ha.) that the Charites “wipe their hands” on the *Aetia* ἔλεγχοι: ἴνα μοι πούλῳ μένωσιν ἔτος. Contrast, here, ἔλλατε (“favour”, 7.14, Charites) and ἔλλετε (1.18, “begone”, Telchines). Interplay of “years” and “verses” is underscored by the age-motif, contrasting τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἢ δεκάς οὐκ ὀλίγη (7) and ὀλιγοστίχος (9).

83 For Lycian Apollo, cf. *Il.* 5.105 (Pandaros, sent from Lycia by the archer-god) with Kirk ad loc. For the god at *Aetia* fr. 1.22 Ha., see Harder II.57–59.

elegiac couplets (23–28). Moreover, within the metrical/generic interplay of epic/elegy and hexameters, ἔπος and ἔπη, the Telchines’ flawed adherence to a single epic song (ἓν, 3) accomplished in multiple (πολλαῖς) verses is refuted by the god whose very name, Ἀπόλλων, conveys singularity (alpha-privative and πολλοί = “not many”). Apollo becomes the divine, didactic, champion of “Hesiodic elegy”: and in this generic context, the ἓν ἄεισμα (1; “single song-subject”) is coloured by its Platonic association through the mono-focus of the citharode Ion on Homer alone.⁸⁴

A more immediate context for ἓν ἄεισμα is however available. The unusual Ionic form of ἄσμα offers the single most valuable pointer to the relationship between our epigram and Prologue and it will repay close investigation. It is attested earlier only in Herodotus’ reference (2.79) to Linus as “sole [subject of] song”, ἄεισμα ἓν, in Egypt and Susan Stephens has well drawn attention to the relevance of this notice for Callimachus’ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές (“one continuous song”).⁸⁵ She adduces echoes, in programme-language and the poet’s child-*persona*, with Homer’s reference to a child singing a Linus-song λεπταλέη φωνῇ in the *vindemia* portrayed on Achilles’ shield (*Il.* 18.569–570). She also traces thematic and verbal connections with the treatment of another “Linus”, the Argive son of Apollo, at *Aetia* fr. 25e–31b Ha.⁸⁶ Noting the association of both Linus figures, and of elegy, with lamentation, she suggests that the Herodotean reference suits the Egyptian context of the Prologue and “introduces a poetic model that ... has generic affinities closer to elegy than epic”.⁸⁷ If so, then *elegeia* itself must be the aboriginal song-metre in the Mediterranean world.

Herodotus was questioning the origins of the Egyptians’ “first and sole αἰοιδή” which, he had been informed, had primordial and indigenous roots, albeit under the name “Maneros”, mourning the death of the son of the first king, Aegyptus, but which in his view was essentially the same as that known to the Greeks as “Linus”.⁸⁸ The passage testifies to fifth-century awareness of cross-cultural generic

⁸⁴ Apollo: Macrob. *Sat.* 1.17.7, citing Chrysippus (SVF II.1095). For the sound-play, cf. e.g. *Il.* 18.454; Pind. *Pyth.* 2.15–16 (πολλάκις); Arist. *Lys.* 465–456, *Plut.* 987; Plat. *Crat.* 404e, *Rep.* 394a. Ion and “one author”: Plat. *Ion* 534c εἰ περὶ ἑνὸς τέχνη καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν. Callimachus returns to *Ion* in the “winged” poet at 32–34: Hunter, *loc. cit.* (n. 46).

⁸⁵ S.A. Stephens, “Linus Song”, *Hermathena* 173/4 (2002/3) 13–28, at 22 with n. 44. For the “Egyptian” echo of Hdt. 2.79 at *Aetia* fr. 1.3 Ha., see her remarks *ibid.*, 17–18, 24–25; and cf. also Pausanias 9.29.8–9 on Homer’s awareness of this ἄσμα Ἑλληνισιν. For the place of this notice in the “generification” of the Linus song, see A. Ford, “Linus: The Rise and Fall of Lyric”, in M. Foster et al. (eds.), *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry: Theories and Models* (Leiden, etc. 2020) 57–81, at 74; see also below.

⁸⁶ Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 85) 13–16, 19–22. Cf. also *Aetia* fr. 23.6 Ha., where Harder, unlike Massimilla (*loc. cit.* [n. 13]), does not commit to restoration of “Linus”.

⁸⁷ Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 85) 24–26. For a re-statement, see Acosta-Hughes/Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 46) 103–104.

⁸⁸ Hdt. 2.79 ... ὥστε πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα ἀποθωμάζειν με τῶν περὶ Αἴγυπτον ἐόντων, ἐν δὲ καὶ τὸν Λίνον ὁκόθεν ἔλαβον τὸ οὔνομα. The term αἰοιδή and its cognates appear five times.

affinity: within the Prologue, it supplies an *aition* for an Egyptian song-type common to the Greeks and the Near Eastern lands; indeed, the historian arguably offers nothing less than the programme-incipit for an aetiological elegy composed for the world of Alexander's successors.⁸⁹

Stephens' identification of the Herodotean intertext for ἄεισμα may now be supplemented from two separate directions. First, Kathryn Gutzwiller has advanced a compelling re-interpretation of ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλίσσω (*Aetia* fr. 1.5 Ha.), the phrase highlighted earlier for its epic-Apolline resonances, as a figure taken from spinning thread.⁹⁰ In two of the passages she cites for ἐλίσσω in this sense, the verb governs λίνον ("flax") as a standard term for "thread".⁹¹ An attraction of the new reading, well documented by Gutzwiller, is the congruence of thread as a finely-spun artefact (that is, λίνον λέπτον) with the Callimachean ideal of λεπτότης, represented at *Aetia* fr. 1.24 Μοῦσαν ... λεπταλέην.⁹² To her insights may be added play between ἐλίσσω (5), ἔπος figured as λίνον, and ἐν ἄεισμα διηνεκές (3) song subject as Λίνος).⁹³ Prologue intra-play along these lines is arguably put beyond doubt by a further combined reference to sung lament and thread-work in the *Victoria Berenices*, the opening poem of *Aetia* III. A fragmentary passage from the proem to that *epinikion* (now fr. 54.11–18 Ha.) alludes, again through Herodotus (2.105), to the distinctive, but shared, skills of Egyptian and Colchian λίνον-workers.⁹⁴ Smoothed-off cloths are there "finely woven" and (tellingly) λεπταλέους (15); and the Egyptian weavers, for their part, "know how to sing the lament for the white-marked bull" (εἰδυῖται φαλὶὸν ταῦρον ἡλεμίσαι, 16), where the Greek *ialemos*-lament is adapted to Egyptian Nilotic-Apis bull rituals, thereby matching the Linus/"Maneros"-ἄεισμα, as also, by figurative extension, Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην.⁹⁵

⁸⁹ For a conceptual parallel for primordial Egyptian song, cf. esp. Hedyllus 4.7–8 G.-P. (an epigram that engages with Callimachean programme language) Νεῖλος ὁκοῖον ἄναξ / ... εὔρε μέλος θεῶν πάτριον ἐξ ὑδάτων. See esp. A. Sens, "Hedyllus (4 and 5 Gow-Page) and Callimachean Poetics", *Mnemosyne* 68 (2015) 40–52 for context (and observe Ionicism ὁκοῖον). With the prose-poetry intersection, cf. Hutchinson, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) 48.

⁹⁰ Gutzwiller, *loc. cit.* (n. 48) esp. 179–182. Her reading of ἔπος (181–182, n. 20) does not in itself invalidate Acosta-Hughes' proposal (*loc. cit.* [n. 10] to refer to *Hecale*).

⁹¹ Eur. *Orestes* 1431–1433 (cf. 1435); Arist. *Frogs* 1346–1349.

⁹² Gutzwiller, *loc. cit.* (n. 48) 182, 183–185. For a parallel discussion of the Homeric Linus-song (*Il.* 18.571) and λίνον/"thread", see Ford, *loc. cit.* (n. 85) 77–78. Gutzwiller's account partially supercedes the standard treatment, R. Reitzenstein, "Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos", in *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein* (Leipzig/Berlin 1931) 23–69.

⁹³ Spun thread is "continuous", and as such it may bear comparison/contrast with "Persian *schoinos*" (18).

⁹⁴ R.F. Thomas, *Reading Virgil and his Texts. Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor 1999) 89–91, 96–97; Harder II.410–413.

⁹⁵ *Ialemos* and Linus as laments: cf. Pind. fr. 128c.6–10 Ma. (with Hymenaeus: cf. *Aetia* fr. 2b.5 Ha.).

Stephens' insight should also be read with Andrew Ford's recent account of the Linus-song as an exemplar of lyric genre-development.⁹⁶ He traces the various ancient aetiologies that might be referenced within Hellenistic treatments of "Linus" (one of which associates the name/song with an original "flax" string of the lyre).⁹⁷ He also documents the "representation in Greek lyric of how song genres arise, claim authority, and are modified". Extrapolating from Ford's formulations, *ᾄσμα* as Linus-song (*Aetia* 1.3 Ha.) might be said to signal that "the primordial form of this [sc. Linus] song is about to reappear". Continuity is a key to this literary-generic process, through constant renewal of a song (or song-type) which, in the case of Linus, is personified in the person of its harvest-time subject, and its putative kinship with Near Eastern work-song.⁹⁸ On this basis, we may take the Herodotus intertext a step further, to connect it ultimately with the Muses, and their transmitted inspiration. His stress on continuity of Egyptian song performance (φαίνονται δὲ αἰεὶ κοτε τοῦτον ἀείδοντες, "they have evidently always sung this figure"), involves conventional word-play, as highlighted.⁹⁹ Callimachus' *ᾄσμα διηνεκές* (3), when read with *Aetia* fr. 26.8 Ha. (the Argive myth of Linus, with yet further metaliterary play on "weaving") *ἦνεκές ἀείδω*, may well carry similar colouring, with the intrinsic sense "a song continuously sung".¹⁰⁰ Thus the Telchines, in levelling the charge "you, Callimachus have failed to compose an *ᾄσμα διηνεκές*" (sc. in their sense of that term, a long continuous epic poem about *βασιλεῖς*), have once again had the tables turned through revelation of their own ignorance (*νήιδες*): they are "ignorant", that is, of the Herodotean resonances of *ἔν ᾄσμα διηνεκές*, hence also – and crucially – of the aetiology of Egyptian *ᾄοιδή* in lament for the son of the very first Egyptian *βασιλεύς*. The Telchines' absence of knowledge of the new – Near East and Egyptian – generic input into the common song-patterns is underscored by a negative (alpha-privative) version of *ᾄοιδός* etymologised from *οἶδα* ("he who knows many things"), a derivation associated with

⁹⁶ Ford, *loc. cit.* (n. 85) 73–81 (see also 73–74 on Hdt. 2.79). He cites Stephens' article (*loc. cit.* [n. 85]) at 78, n. 46 for "Linus as a figure of *leptotes* in Alexandrian poetics".

⁹⁷ Ford, *loc. cit.* (n. 85) 76–77.

⁹⁸ Cf. Theocritus' elegiac "Lityerses" song (*Id.* 10.41, sung by the reaper Milon) ταῦτα τὰ τῷ θεῷ Λιτυέρσῃ: not literally by the hero, but re-creating his variant of a primordial harvest-lament. For the generic relationship to Maneros, Linus and others, see Gow ad loc. Resemblances to Hesiodic wisdom poetry (relevant also to Linus/Hesiod) are observed in Hunter's commentary: *Theocritus: A Selection* (Cambridge 1999) 199–215.

⁹⁹ Cf. (e.g.) *Od.* 1.341, 343; Hes. *Theog.* 34; *AP* 7.518.4 (Callimachus) αἰὲν ἀείσομεθα; Phanocles fr. 1.3–5 Powell; Theocr. *Id.* 16.1–4. *AP* 9.514.2 (Crinagoras).

¹⁰⁰ For the nuance of continuity, see Harder II.269–70, citing i.a. Emped. fr. 17.35 D.-K. ἦνεκές αἰὲν. Cf. Cleanthes fr. 1 Powell (*SVF* I.121–123, *Hymn to Zeus*) 6 σὸν κράτος αἰὲν ἀείσω with 37 ὑμνοῦντες τὰ σὰ ἔργα διηνεκές. Metaliterary weaving: *Aet.* fr. 26.5 Ha. μῦθον ὑφαινόμενον, with Harder II.268; and for rhapsodic origins, Acosta-Hughes/Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 46) 47.

knowledge imparted to mortals by the omniscient Muses.¹⁰¹ To the Telchines, neither “born beloved of the Muse”, nor “become her friends” (2), the Muse-inspired knowledge of literature (including Herodotean historiography) is denied.¹⁰² They live, in short, in a state of what Greeks called ἀμουσία:¹⁰³ ethically flawed, all that this lamentable tribe “knows” (ἐπιστάμενον, 8) is how to consume its own liver (sc. with self-defeating/self-devouring envy). Again, detached as they are from the Muses, the Telchines are incompetent judges of poetry, and for that reason are urged to “judge poetry by art, not by the Persian rope-measure” (αὔθι δὲ τέχνῃ / [κρίνετε] μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην, 17–18, as supplemented). Above all, they are blind to the Muses’ embedded role within the transmission and creative renewal of the primordial song-genres. Significantly, the knowledgeable Apis-lamentation of the Egyptian weavers in the *Victoria Berenices*, εἰδυῖαι ... ἠλεμίσαι (see above) responds to ἀοιδῇ/νήιδες of the ignorant Telchines, yielding a positive integration of indigenous song-type and ritual. Here, a modern view of generic foundation as a process of ritual re-enactment, or genre as the product of ritual utterance, is relevant:¹⁰⁴ and indeed it is tempting to read Callimachus’ εἰδυῖαι (16), his “knowledgeable” lament-singers, as a sound-echo of εἶδεν (10) with reference to εἶδος connoting aboriginal “song-type” or “genre”.

VI Provisional Conclusions

ἄεισμα (*Aetia* 1.3) is a rare term selected for its historiographical reference and the programme-perspectives it brings to a revolutionary poem, composed in Egypt with a Near-Eastern compass in view. The same term in the Aratus-epigram is most unlikely to have preceded this seminal deployment; and the combined ἄεισμα – ἀοιδόν (1), parallel to the sequence ἀοιδῇ – ἀοιδῇ in *Aetia* fr. 1.1–3 Ha., supports the hypothesis of self-reference. Thus – in my view – the quatrain is not to be read as an earlier programme-statement, independent of the Prologue: rather, it illuminates Callimachus’ central, most extended and explicit, statement of his poetic programme – whether or not the Prologue is read with, Acosta-Hughes, as a transition from *Hecale* hexameter to *elegia*: it associates the sacral songs and

¹⁰¹ A. Hardie, “The Ancient “Etymology” of ΑΟΙΔΟΣ”, *Philologus* 144 (2000) 163–175; Eustathius on *Il.* 1.1 εὖ εἰδότε τὰ πάντα ἐκ Μουσῶν. On the “knowledge” motif, see Hutchinson, *loc. cit.* (n. 1) 49 with n. 8, and *passim*.

¹⁰² For the two senses, see Harder II.17–18.

¹⁰³ On the cultural, ethical and literary resonances of ἀμουσία, see S. Halliwell, “Amousia: Living without the Muses”, in I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen (eds.), *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden, etc. 2012) 15–45. I accept Harder’s objections (II.30–31) to the supplement φύλον ἄμουσον at 7; her preferred supplement ἀήνές, with its etymological nuance of αἰαῖ, well suits Callimachus’ “lament” subtext. The allusion to Eur. *HF* 637–39 at *Aetia* fr. 1.35–36, in the context of the Muses’ lifelong love for Callimachus may also recall the chorus’ wish never to live μετ’ ἀμουσίας (676).

¹⁰⁴ *HHApoll.* 163 (the chorus of Deliades) μιμεῖσθ’ ἴσασιν, has been advanced as an example of generic foundation: see Ford, *loc. cit.* (n. 85) 71 with further references.

song-rituals of the Greek-speaking world with their extension to Egypt and beyond.

With the Graeco-Egyptian “Linus/Maneros-ἄεισμα” as Callimachus’ aetiological analogue, drawn from Near-East song-patterns, Ἡσιόδου τόδ’ ἄεισμα brings together the opening lines of both Prologue and *Somnium*, and of course it directs us to Hesiod first and foremost. He was the singer identified with the Greek terrain of Boeotia and Helicon, thus also with the landscape Muses who had inspired his panhellenic song. And it is those same Muses who sustain continuous re-creation within the “genre” of didactic *epos*: or to be more exact, generic continuity is transmitted to a favoured successor through the divine power of the ἔπη they have inspired. It is on this generic basis, I have suggested, that the epigram cited by Proclus transfers Callimachus’ λεπταὶ ῥήσεις from Aratus to Hesiod, and attaches them to the Heliconian Muses. Herein too lies the inspirational rationale for the astonishing shift as our speaker-critic moves from initially cautious, even conflicted, appraisal of a rival for the title of “new Hesiod” to enthusiastic salutation of his personified λεπταὶ ῥήσεις. As he explores the “Hesiodic” ἄεισμα in his hand, he finds himself vicariously inspired by its revelatory utterances, and in that state of mind Callimachus-the-poet echoes Aratus’ own salutation to the Muses. Professional “envy” (φθόνος) may playfully be trailed in the teasing ὁ Σολεύς, but if so, it is effaced as Aratus’ ἀγρυπνίη is identified not with thieving, plagiarism and barbarian ἀμουσία, but with sky-watching. Dramatic progression combines the voice of the critic with that of the poet. And a generous “inspired” tribute differentiates Callimachus’ knowledgeable response – itself vicariously Muse-inspired – to the new ἄεισμα from that of the jealous Telchines to his own song-subject (arguably, *Hecale*) as recorded in the Prologue. His reactions – part objective appraisal, part inspired response – are grounded in the musical awareness transmitted by the Heliconian Muses through Hesiod’s text to Aratus, and thence to his own person as favoured recipient, but here (in this respect like Philitas before him) doubling as ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός.¹⁰⁵

In all this, it should be added, Empedocles has disappeared from view, and Zeus is relegated to the background. While there will be limits to what might be packed into twenty-six words and a four-line epigram, contrasts with the tribute to *Phaenomena* generally ascribed to Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 9.25 = 101 G.-P.) are striking: Aratus is there praised as second to Zeus as a kind of demiurgic creator (καμῶν ἔργον μέγα, 5), terms so plainly at variance with Callimachus’ programme (Zeus; μέγα) that we might wonder whether Planudes’ attribution to Antipater (sc. of Sidon) is correct after all.¹⁰⁶ Whoever wrote this epigram was arguably contesting Callimachus’ alignment of *Phaenomena* with the ideals set out in the Prologue.

¹⁰⁵ Pfeiffer, *loc. cit.* (n. 3) 89.

¹⁰⁶ G.-P. I.138 print the epigram among Leonidas’ Incerta: it has features in common with Antipater’s anti-Callimachean epigram on Pindar (*AP* 7.409 = 66 G.-P.), on which see F. Cairns, *Hellenistic*

The case for reading Callimachus' epigram in the light of the *Aetia* Prologue has been set out on the basis of a concentrated overlap of critical terminology, and through what each text has to say about the role of the Muses in creating, transmitting and renewing didactic poetry. To this account may now be added recent insights into Callimachus' re-appraisal of *technē*, inspiration and *sophia* in response to Plato's *Ion*.¹⁰⁷ Socrates had challenged the capacity of the rhapsode to speak knowledgeably about Homer, on the grounds that he is simply an intermediate link in the chain of divine, inspirational power that links Muse to inspired poet, reciter and audience.¹⁰⁸ He appends, but leaves undeveloped, the notion of an "art of poetry in its entirety" (ποιητική [sc. τέχνη] ... τὸ ὅλον, 532c), that might embrace both the critic and the poet. Callimachus' response, as I understand it, is to bring poetry and criticism together through the medium of Muse-given knowledge, and with the ignorant, Muse-less Telchines as counter-examples of ἀμουσία. It is for this reason that at the end of the Prologue, and again deploying disjointed syntax, the critic "recreate[s] his passing into an ecstatic state".¹⁰⁹ The same movement I submit – the passage from critic to inspired poet – informs the Aratus epigram, and confirms its conceptual alignment with the Prologue.

Correspondence:

Alex Hardie
School of History,
Classics and Archaeology
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH8 9AG
(Great Britain)
sandy.hardie@ed.ac.uk

Epigram: Contexts of Exploration (Cambridge 2016) 145–150; Cairns (*ibid.* 154) takes Leonidas' epigram on Erinna (AP 7.43 = 98 G.-P.) to "indicate [his] Callimacheanism".

¹⁰⁷ See esp. Acosta-Hughes/Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 46) 40–47.

¹⁰⁸ On the unresolved dichotomy between interpreter/critic and performing rhapsode see S. Halliwell, *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus* (Oxford 2012) 169–179.

¹⁰⁹ Acosta-Hughes/Stephens, *loc. cit.* (n. 46) 43.