

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Herausgeber:** Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 48 (2002)

**Artikel:** Callimachus : light from later antiquity  
**Autor:** Hollis, Adrian S.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660808>

#### **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:** 16.02.2026

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

## II

ADRIAN S. HOLLIS

### CALLIMACHUS: LIGHT FROM LATER ANTIQUITY

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title, “In Search of New Fragments”, might have raised hopes of quotations attributed to Callimachus in neglected or unpublished works.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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ώστε εἰ μέν τωι γέγονε θησαυρὸς ὑπνου δῶρον, οὐκ ἐν θαυμαστοῖς ἄγω· οὐδ’ εἴ τις, καταδαρθών ἄμουσος, ἐπειτα ἐντυχῶν ὄναρ ταῖς Μούσαις καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰπῶν τὰ δὲ ἀκούσας, ποιητής ἐστι δεξιός, ωσπερ δὲ καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνος ἥνεγκεν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο τῶν λίαν ἐστὶ παραδόξων.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 253 (b)

1a [†τοιάδε θνητοῖσι κακὰ κακῶν †, ἀμφί τε κῆρες]  
 1 εἰλεύνται· κινεῖ, δ' εἰσδυστις οὐδ' ἀθέρι  
 . . . υκ[.]ο . [ . . . ]. ων επιχει[  
 . . . ]γ[.].ε[. . . ]. αμμιγα[  
 . . . ]η . . . . . ο . . . . ρυ[  
 5 . . . ]γοδ . . . ο . . . . υ[  
 . . . ]υμε . . ου . . . . . [  
 . . . ]ρουχεύ . . . . . υ . . . γ[  
 . . . ]γ . . σεδαησ . . . . [  
 . . . ] . . . ἀνθρωποισε . . . [  
 10 . . . ]. εταις ἀγαπητὸν ἐνυπγ[ι  
 αἰεὶ, τοῖς μικοῖς μικκὰ διδοῦσι θεοί  
 . . . ]εω τὸν ὄνειρον .[. ε .[

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## GREGORY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>38</sup> Perhaps rather glancing at CALL. fr.471 Μοῦσαι νιν έοῖς ἐπὶ τυννὸν ἔθεντο / ⟨γούνασι⟩.

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

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

<sup>41</sup> Perhaps owing more to CALL. *Hecale* fr. 72 H. = 374 Pf. 1-2 ὄμμασι λοξὸν ὑποδράξ / ὀσσομένη.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

μέλπω δ'ού Τροίην, οὐκ εὕπλοον οἶά τις Ἀργώ,  
οὐδε συδες κεφαλήν, οὐ πολὺν Ἡρακλέα,  
οὐ γῆς εύρεα κύκλα ὅπως πελάγεσσιν ἄρηρεν  
οὐκ αὐγὰς λιθάκων<sup>54</sup>, οὐ δρόμον ούρανίων.  
75 οὐδὲ πόθων μέλπω μανίην, καὶ κάλλος ἐφήβων  
οἶσι λύρη μαλακὸν κρούετ' ἀπὸ προτέρων.  
μέλπω δ' ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν μέγαν, ηδὲ φαεινῆς  
εἰς ἐν ἀγειρομένης λάμψιν ἐμῆς Τριάδος,  
Ἀγγελικῶν τε χορῶν μεγάλους ἐριηχέας ὕμνους  
80 πλησίον ἐσταότων, ἐξ ὀπὸς ἀντιθέτου  
κόσμου θ' ἀρμονίην καὶ κρείσσονα τῆς παρεούσης,  
ἥν δοκέω, πάντων εἰς ἐν ἐπειγομένων.

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

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

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

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

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

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

μὴ καὶ σὺ μουσόπνευστος ἡμῖν ἀθρόως,  
ώσπερ λέγονται τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν τινες;  
μὴ καὶ σὲ δάφνης ἐξέμηνέ τις κλάδος·  
ἢ μαντικῶν πέπωκας ὑδάτων ἄφνω,  
ἐπειτα μέτρων ἔβλυσας ἀμετρος ὕν;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## DISCUSSION

There was almost complete agreement that the passage of Synesius, *On Dreams* referred to Callimachus, *Aetia* (Harder thought it conceivable that a more recent poet had replicated the pattern of Call.'s *Somnium*), but general reluctance either to emend  $\chi\rho\acute{\nu}\nu\acute{\circ}\varsigma$  to  $\chi\tilde{\omega}\nu\acute{\circ}\varsigma$  or to delete  $\tilde{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$  —  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\circ}\xi\omega\eta$ . Lehnus (supported by Harder) suggested that  $\chi\rho\acute{\nu}\nu\acute{\circ}\varsigma$  here might be used of a wider period, our time as opposed to other periods of the world's culture.

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

*P.J. Parsons:* Is the  $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$  stage the same as the  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\circ}\iota\varsigma$  stage?

*R. Hunter:* I have been assuming not, and we must take into account Alan Cameron's emphatically expressed view [*Callimachus and his Critics*, 131] that Callimachus does not *have* his dream when  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\circ}\iota\varsigma$ , but dreams that he *was*  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\circ}\iota\varsigma$ , thus being granted his wish of fr.1.33ff. for rejuvenation.

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

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

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

Lehnus felt that reconstructing the *Aetia*-prologue according to Gregory of Nazianzus was not such a frivolous exercise, since it shows that Gregory had learned the Prologue by heart, and enjoyed quoting and imitating it. "Surprisingly different is the case of the pagan Severianus of Damascus who simply hated Callimachus (*Test.85 Pf.*). Oddly enough he too had a dream, in which he was initiated into philosophy — and precisely the very poetic dream of driving a chariot (οχημα ελαύνειν)." 11

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

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

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

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

