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

Artikel: Callimachus and the Hellenistic epigram
Autor: Parsons, Peter J.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660810

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: 28.11.2025

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

IV

PETER J. PARSONS

CALLIMACHUS AND THE HELLENISTIC EPIGRAM

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

I. *Epigrams and audiences*

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

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

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

[2] Modern scholars have doubted the authenticity of 3, 36 and 63.

[3] On *AP* 13 see PALUMBO 1984; MORELLI 1985; CAMERON 1993, 137-45; ROSSI 2001, 77-9.

[4] GOW in *HE* II 153 doubts whether frr.399-401 really derive from epigrams. But see below n.112.

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

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

800 lines, perhaps 150-200 poems at standard lengths, enough for a slim volume[7].

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

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

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

[8] See most recently GUTZWILLER 1998, 188ff.

[9] GUTZWILLER 1998, 211-3.

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

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

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

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

[12] *Suda* K 227 (T1 Pf.).

[13] *Etym.Gen.* s.v. ἀλυτάρχης, I p.342 Lasserre-Livadaras (οὕτως Μεθόδιος A) (T45).

[14] *Suda* A 4105 (T44).

[15] *Suda* M 194 (T24), see n.6.

[16] *SH* 254-261.

[17] See MONTANARI [this volume].

[18] ATHEN. 15.669b (T41).

[19] 4.23 (T75).

[20] *Epist.* 4.3.3-4 (T77).

[21] *GVI* 661; VÉRILHAC 1978-82, I no.164; *SGO* II p.136.

[22] Anon., in PHOT.*Bibl.* cod.250, §63, doubtfully attributed to Agatharchides. See FRASER 1972, II 782 n.199.

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

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

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

[23] P.43 Morel; fr.1 Courtney. See in general WIMMEL 1960.

[24] *Tusc.* 1.84.

[25] Fr.11 Morel, Courtney.

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

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

[28] Thus *GVI* 2036.11-12 models itself on *Epigr.* 21.1-2 (FRASER 1972, II 821 n.185).

[29] *IG* IX^2 1.17.24, 264/3 BC.

[30] FRASER 1972, I 575-6.

[31] ARGENTIERI 1998, 5-7.

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

[32] *P.CairoZen.* IV 59.532, one of the few literary items in an extensive archive (PESTMAN 1981, I 189); texts and commentary in *SH* 977.

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

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

[35] GENTILI 1968; CAMERON 1995, 71-6.

[36] *BKT* V (II) p.62: *IEG* Adesp.Eleg.27, II p.12; *PMG* 917. Texts republished with commentary by FERRARI 1989; further notes in FABIAN 1991.

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

again by versifying the jokes about personal appearance which earlier circulate in prose[38].

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

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

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

[39] R. KIRSTEIN, "Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram", to be published in the proceedings of the Fifth Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry.

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

[41] BASTIANINI and GALLAZZI 2001, 155.

[42] New edition: MALTOMINI 2001.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[46] FRASER 1972, II 826 n.221.
[47] SWINNEN 1970; BARBANTANI 2001, 32-3.
[48] FRASER 1972, I 369-70.
[49] MEILLIER 115-128 seeks to expand the circle.

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

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

[50] ROBERT 1960, 153-5; BAGNALL 1976, 142-3; BARBANTANI 2001, 53.
[51] See n.61.

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

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

[52] *Schol.Flor.* 5 on *Aet.* fr.1.
[53] Below p.130.
[54] Below p.124.
[55] WEBER 1993, 8ff. On the concept see KERKHECKER 1997.
[56] See n.32.
[57] *CPR* XVIII p.1. See p.119.
[58] BASTIANINI and GALLAZZI 2001, 3-5. See p.116.
[59] Published in *BGU* IV.

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

II. *A historical context: the inscribed epigram*

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

[60] See n.36.

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

[62] HDT. 7.228.3.

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

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

[63] Rossi 2001, 98-9.

[64] Call. fr.441. On the *Sylloge Simonidea*, *FGE* pp.119-23; Erbse 1998. No specimen of such a collection has yet appeared among the papyri; the Σιμωνιδείων ὑπ(όμνημα) of *POxy* 2433 most likely expounded Simonides' dicta, see Pfeiffer 1968, 222 n.6.

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

[66] See most recently Rossi 2001, 3-13.

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

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

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

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

[69] ATHEN. 3.125c = CALLISTR., *FGrHist* 348 F 3; ATHEN. 10.456c = CHAMAEL. fr.34 Wehrli.

[70] ATHEN. 10.436d, 442e = frr.79-80 Preller.

[71] For the Elephantine material see n.36; for joke-books, n.38.

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

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

[72] *IG* IV^2 I 121.2 A 7ff (HERZOG 1931, p.8).

[73] Above p.108.

[74] Mil. XIV 38-XV 2; *IG* IV^2 I 123.123ff.

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

[76] Mil. XV 11-14.

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

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

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

[79] See p.104.

[80] Above p.105. ROSSI 2001, 10-11.

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

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

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

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

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

[83] See FRASER 1972, II 823 n.195.

[84] *GVI* 112 = BERNAND 1969, no.92 = VÉRILHAC no.6.

[85] For surveys of the papyrological material, see CAMERON 1993, 1-18; ARGENTIERI 1998; GUTZWILLER 1998, 20-36.

(i) The Milan Papyrus (*P.Mil.Vogl.* VIII 309).[86]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[86] G. BASTIANINI and C. GALLAZZI, *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi* (Milano 2001). Some addenda and corrigenda: AUSTIN 2001.

[87] BLANCHARD, in MANIACI 1993, 37-9.

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

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

[88] So PUELMA 1997, 196 n.28.

[89] H. LLOYD-JONES (review forthcoming in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*).

[90] See H. LLOYD-JONES, *ibid.* for the suggestion that the Milan Papyrus actually contains the Soros.

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

Metre. All the poems are in elegiacs.

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

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

(ii) The Vienna Papyrus (*P.Vindob* G 40611)[95].

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

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

[91] *CEG* II 819.13; *SH* 705.5.

[92] *Inscr.Délos* 2549 = Antipater Sid. 42 *HE*.

[93] POSIDIPP. 11-12 *HE*. See n.61.

[94] See n.36.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Annotation. At least 17 incipits have ευ written to their left, without any mark of abbreviation. It might be taken as εὖ; but given the use of ἐπιζητούμενα in the heading, εὗρον or εὑρημένον seems more appealing.

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

Title. The first column begins with the heading τὰ ἐπιζητούμενα τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἐν τῆι ᾱ βύβλωι.

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

Metre. Not all the incipits would scan as hexameters.

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

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

(iii) Other papyri illustrate other possibilities[98]:

PPetrie F134 (earlier III BC?)[99], a three-line poem (or excerpt), apparently in hendecasyllables, mentioning a bald man and "wine, love and the lyre"; then ἄλλο, as often in collections of epigrams, to introduce the next poem, though the rest of the papyrus is blank.

SH 961 (mid III BC?), with the back-title σύμμεικτα ἐπιγράμματα, then, on another line and indented, Ποσειδίππου. Lasserre read other names after this; I couldn't see them, but the placing of the first name does seem to suggest that others

[96] HARRAUER 1981, 51 mentions a further poem of 52 lines, but the reading of the figure is doubtful.

[97] Contra CAMERON 1993, 10.

[98] See n.85.

[99] Published in WOUTERS 1977.

originally stood there, i.e. this was not 'Mixed Epigrams of Posidippus' but 'Mixed Epigrams by Posidippus and…'.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[100] See the valuable reedition in MALTOMINI 2001.
[101] See CAMERON 1993, 380-1; SIDER 1997, 203-25; PUGLIA 2000.

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

IV. *Schools of epigram?*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[102] See GUTZWILLER 1995.

[103] The other items collected (*AP* 9.746-54) are all later.

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

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

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

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

[105] Examples collected in EBERT 1972.

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

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

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

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

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

[106] Examples conveniently collected in HERZOG 1931; GIRONE 1998.
[107] CAMERON 1993, 12-15, 26.
[108] Something on the lines of Asclepiades *AP* 5.181?

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

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

[109] Cf. *SH* 12; 711.

[110] Cameron 1993, 137ff.

[111] See most recently Rossi 2001, 75-80.

[112] Gow in *HE* II 153 doubt whether frr.399-401 come from epigrams at all. *AP* 13 describes fr.399 and then fr.400 as ἐπίγραμμα; I don't think that guesses

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

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

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

[113] See on this work MEJER 1978, 46-50.

[114] See in general MORELLI 2000.

but chance survivors on papyrus, the Petrie scolion[115], and on stone, the dedication of Dionysodorus[116]. The chances increase that Callimachus' παῖς κατάκλειστος (fr. 401, stichic Pherecrateans) stands among Catullus' models.

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

V. *Epigrams and elegies*

Jacoby argued that the Roman love-elegy did not imitate a hellenistic love-elegy, it amplified the hellenistic love-epigram[119].

[115] See n.99.

[116] See n.118.

[117] Most recently, Rossi 2001, 47.

[118] Now *SEG* 39.1334. Parsons 1992, 15; Lehnus 1996; Rossi 2001, 79-80.

[119] Jacoby 1905. No certain example of a hellenistic love-elegy has accrued since. The curious elegy *POxy* 3723 has been argued to be a Roman imitation of a hellenistic text, or indeed a hellenistic text itself (that would be excluded, if we

That assumes that epigram and elegy occupied separate worlds (and book-rolls). Were there ambiguities? It is not clear at what point the two terms were distinguished enough to mark, as they do for us, a clear generic boundary[120]. In any case, the sympotic user of the *Theognidea* will have found longer and shorter elegiac passages juxtaposed for the same function. Length is an objective criterion; but it may be that matter and immediate literary context were more important.

That emerges when we look at Callimachus' epigrams in relation to his other works as they have been gradually reconstructed. Recent finds may suggest that, in the third century, the skies rained epigrams like tadpoles — a genre produced, it seems, in bulk, and read more widely than the larger achievements of contemporary poetry (the business of counting papyri is notoriously unreliable; but, with that reservation, epigram rivals New Comedy in its circulation). *Epigr.* 35 ostensibly opens a divide between ἀοιδή and the opportunist wit of the symposium (classifiable presumably as παίγνια). But in fact there are clear interactions in Callimachus between the epigram tradition and his other poetry, especially the *Aetia*.

Thus *Epigr.* 1 is an αἶνος in sixteen lines, which Diogenes Laertius certainly found among the epigrams; its interest in the origins of a proverbial phrase might have qualified it for the *Aetia*, its personal (hostile?) application for the *Iambi*. Contrast the *Sepulchrum Simonidis* (fr. 64), which stands securely in the *Aetia*: this is an elaborate re-working of the funerary tradition, in which the dead epigrammatist speaks his own epitaph at more than traditional length and in more than traditional detail[121].

Similarly with other types. The dialogue with the god-dedicatee (*Epigr.* 34) expands in the *Aetia* to a full-scale conversation

accept the enticing suggestion of John REA, *POxy* LXIII pp.2-3, that the poem refers to the death of Antinous); HOSE 1994 argues the contrary case that it represents a Greek imitation of the Latin elegy.

[120] See PUELMA 1997.

[121] Professor G.O. Hutchinson observes that, although the dead man speaks, the poem avoids indicating that it is inscribed.

(fr. 114, on the image of Apollo on Delos). The dedication of a lock of hair, a familiar epigrammatic theme, rises to new heights (like the lock itself) in the *Coma Berenices.* The Milan Papyrus shows how widespread were dedications by victors, including royal victors; it is a dedication by royalty, and a dedication to royalty, that are elaborated at the unusual length of 14 lines. Callimachus takes the historical victor Euthymus, whose original epigram could be seen at Olympia (*CEG* I 399), and celebrates his legend in elegy (*Aetia* frr. 98-99). For the new Nemean victory of Berenice II, probably one of those celebrated by 'Posidippus' (Mil. XII 34-9?), he went further. Pindar's victors could commission both an epigrammatic dedication and an epinician ode: so the Cretan long-runner Ergoteles (*CEG* I 393; *Ol.* 12). The *Victoria Berenices* combines the two[122], in a poem which represents both an elegiac mutation of the epinician and a grandiose expansion of the epigram, with a glance perhaps at the victory-elegy with which the New Simonides has just acquainted us[123].

[122] See FUHRER 1992, 1993.

[123] On hellenistic developments see BARBANTANI 2001. On Latin poets' play with epigram and elegy, G.O. HUTCHINSON, "The New Posidippus and Latin Poetry", in *ZPE* 138 (2002), 1-10.

ABBREVIATIONS

Publications of papyri are referred to be the standard abbreviations listed in J.F. OATES et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, 5th edition, BASP Supplement 9 (2001).

CEG P.A. HANSEN (Ed.), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, I-II (Berlin & New York 1983-1989).

FGE D.L. PAGE (Ed.), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981).

GP A.S.F. GOW and D.L. PAGE (Eds.), *The Greek Anthology*: *The Garland of Philip*, I-II (Cambridge 1968).

GVI W. PEEK (Hrsg.), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften.* Bd. I: *Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin 1955).

HE A.S.F. GOW and D.L. PAGE (Eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, I-II (Cambridge 1965).

IGUR L. MORETTI (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, I- (Roma 1968-).

SGO R. MERKELBACH and J. STAUBER (Hrsgg.), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, I (Stuttgart 1998); II (München-Leipzig 2001).

SH H. LLOYD-JONES and P. PARSONS (Edd.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin & New York 1983).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARGENTIERI 1998 — L. ARGENTIERI, "Epigramma e libro", in *ZPE* 121 (1998), 1-20.

AUSTIN 2001 — C. AUSTIN, "Paralipomena Posidippea", in *ZPE* 136 (2001), 22.

BAGNALL 1976 — R.S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976).

BAIN 1978 — D. BAIN, "Another occurrence of φίκις?", in *ZPE* 30 (1978), 36.

BARBANTANI 1993 — S. BARBANTANI, "I poeti lirici del canone alessandrino nell' epigrammatistica", in *Aevum Antiquum* 6 (1993), 5-97.

BARBANTANI 2000 — S. BARBANTANI, "Epinici distici di età ellenistica", in *Studium atque Urbanitas. Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris*, ed. M. CAPASSO and S. PERNIGOTTI, Papyrologica Lupiensia 9 (Lecce 2000).

BARBANTANI 2001 — S. BARBANTANI, Φάτις νικήφορος (Milano 2001).

BASTIANINI and GALLAZZI 2001 — G. BASTIANINI and C. GALLAZZI (edd.), *Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi* (Milano 2001).

BERNAND 1969 — E. BERNAND, *Inscriptions métriques de l' Égypte gréco-romaine* (Paris 1969).

BIRT 1882 — Th. BIRT, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Litteratur* (Berlin 1882).

CAMERON 1993 — A. CAMERON, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993).

CAMERON 1995 — A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995).

COCO 1988 — L. COCO (ed.), *Callimaco. Epigrammi* (Manduria-Bari-Roma 1988).

D'ALESSIO 1996 — G.B. D'ALESSIO (ed.), *Callimaco*. I: *Inni Epigrammi Ecale* (Milano 1996).

DECREUS 1986 — F. DECREUS, "Le poème 85 de Catulle et les épigrammes 28, 35 et 19 (Pf.) de Callimaque", in

Hommages à Jozef Veremans, éd. par F. DECREUS & C. DEROUX (Bruxelles 1986), 48-56.

EBERT 1972 — J. EBERT, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin 1972).

ECKER 1990 — U. ECKER, *Grabmal und Epigramm. Studien zur frühgriechischen Sepulkraldichtung* (Stuttgart 1990).

ERBSE 1998 — H. ERBSE, "Zu den Epigrammen des Simonides", in *RhM* 141 (1998), 213-30.

FABIAN 1991 — Οἰνηρὰ τεύχη. *Studi triestini di poesia conviviale*, a cura di Kl. FABIAN et alii (Alessandria 1991).

FERRARI 1989 — F. FERRARI, "*P.Berol.* inv. 13270: I canti di Elefantina", in *SCO* 38 (1988), 181-227.

FRASER 1972 — P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I-III (Oxford 1972).

FUHRER 1992 — Th. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel 1992).

FUHRER 1993 — Th. FUHRER, "Callimachus' Epinician Poems", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER (Groningen 1993), 79-97.

GABATHULER 1937 — M. GABATHULER, *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*, Diss. Basel (Leipzig 1937).

GENTILI 1968 — B. GENTILI, "Epigramma ed elegia", in *L'Épigramme grecque*, Entretiens Hardt 14 (Vandœuvres-Genève 1968), 39-81.

GIRONE 1998 — M. GIRONE (ed.), Ἰάματα. *Guarigioni miracolose di Asclepio in testi epigrafici* (Bari 1998).

GUTZWILLER 1995 — K.J. GUTZWILLER, "Cleopatra's Ring", in *GRBS* 36 (1995), 383-98.

GUTZWILLER 1998 — K.J. GUTZWILLER, *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley 1998).

HARDIE 1983 — A. HARDIE, *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, Patrons, and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Liverpool 1983).

HARRAUER 1981 — H. HARRAUER, "Epigrammincipit auf einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr., P.Vindob. G 40611. Ein Vorbericht", in *Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Papyrology* (Chico 1981), 49-53.

HECKER 1852 — A. HECKER, *Commentationis criticae de Anthologia Graeca pars prior* (Lugduni Batavorum 1852).

HERZOG 1931 — R. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion* (Leipzig 1931).

HOPKINSON 1988 — N. HOPKINSON (Ed.), *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge 1988).

HOSE 1994 — M. HOSE, "Die römische Liebeselegie und die griechische Literatur", in *Philologus* 138 (1994), 67-82.

JACOBY 1905 — F. JACOBY, "Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie", in *RhM* 60 (1905), 48-67 = *Kleine philologische Schriften* (Berlin 1961), II 73-89.

KASSEL 1956 — R. KASSEL, "Reste eines hellenistischen Spassmacherbuches auf einem Heidelberger Papyrus?", in *RhM* 99 (1956), 242-5 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin-New York 1991), 418-21.

KERKHECKER 1997 — A. KERKHECKER, "Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ. Dichter und Dichtung am Ptolemäerhof", in *A&A* 43 (1997), 124-44.

KOZLOFF et al. 1988 — A.P. KOZLOFF, D.G. MITTEN, S. FABING, *The Gods delight. The human figure in classical bronze* (Cleveland, Ohio c.1988).

LEHNUS 1996 — L. LEHNUS, "On the metrical inscription found at Pergamum (SEG 39.1334)", in *CQ* 46 (1996), 295-7.

LEHNUS 2000 — L. LEHNUS, *Nuova bibliografia callimachea* (Alessandria 2000).

MALTOMINI 2001 — F. MALTOMINI, "Nove epigrammi ellenistici rivisitati (PPetrie II 49b)", in *ZPE* 134 (2001), 55-66.

MANIACI 1993 — *Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques*, a cura di M. MANIACI & P.F. MUNAFÒ, I, Studi e Testi 357 (Città del Vaticano 1993).

MEILLIER — C. MEILLIER, *Callimaque et son temps* (Lille n.d.).

MEJER 1978 — J. MEJER, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*, Hermes Einzelschriften 40 (Wiesbaden 1978).

MORELLI 2000 — A.M. MORELLI, *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo* (Cassino 2000).

MORELLI 1985 G. MORELLI, "Origini e formazione del XIII libro dell'Antologia Palatina", in *RFIC* 113 (1985), 257-96.

MURRAY 1985 O. MURRAY, "Symposium and Genre in the poetry of Horace", in *JRS* 75 (1985), 39-50.

PALUMBO 1984 B.M. PALUMBO STRACCA, "Le note metriche di A.P. XIII e la genesi del libro", in *BollClass* 5 (1984), 61-85.

PARSONS 1992 P. PARSONS, "Poesia ellenistica: testi e contesti", in *Aevum Antiquum* 5 (1992), 9-19.

PESTMAN 1981 P.W. PESTMAN (Ed.), *A Guide to the Zenon Archive (P.L.Bat. 21)* (Leiden 1981).

PFEIFFER 1968 R. PFEIFFER, *History of Classical Scholarship*, I (Oxford 1968).

PUELMA 1997 M. PUELMA, "Epigramma: osservazioni sulla storia di un termine greco-latino", in *Maia* 49 (1997), 189-213.

PUGLIA 2000 E. PUGLIA, "Considerazioni bibliologiche e testuali sulla raccolta di epigrammi di POxy 3724", in *Studium atque Urbanitas. Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris*, a cura di M. CAPASSO & S. PERNIGOTTI, Papyrologica Lupiensia 9 (Lecce 2000), 359-380.

REDONDO 1987/8 J. REDONDO, "Calímaco A.P. VII 453 y 523", in *Habis* 18/19 (1987/8), 87-91.

RIEDWEG 1994 C. RIEDWEG, "Reflexe hellenistischer Dichtungstheorie im griechischen Epigramm", in *ICS* 19 (1994), 123-150.

ROBERT 1960 L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* 11-12 (Paris 1960).

ROSSI 1999 L. ROSSI, "Lamentazioni su pietra e letteratura 'trenodica': motivi topici dei canti funerari", in *ZPE* 126 (1999), 29-42.

ROSSI 2001 L. ROSSI (Ed.), *The Epigrams ascribed to Theocritus* (Leuven 2001).

SIDER 1997 D. SIDER (Ed.), *The Epigrams of Philodemos. Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (New York & Oxford 1997).

STEINBY E.M. STEINBY (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, I-V (Roma 1993-1999).

SWINNEN 1970 W. SWINNEN, "Herakleitos of Halikarnassos, an Alexandrian Poet and Diplomat?", in *AncSoc* 1 (1970), 39-52.

THOMPSON 1987 D. THOMPSON, "Ptolemaios and the 'Lighthouse': Greek Culture in the Memphite Serapeum", in *PCPhS* 33 (1987), 105-21.

VÉRILHAC 1978-82 A.-M. VÉRILHAC, Παῖδες ἄωροι. *Poésie funéraire* (Athènes 1978-1982).

WEBER 1993 G. WEBER, *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart 1993).

WILAMOWITZ 1924 U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, I-II (Berlin 1924).

WIMMEL 1960 W. WIMMEL, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960).

WOLFF 1978 H.J. WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Aegyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaeer und des Prinzipats*, II, HAW 10, 5, 2 (München 1978).

WOUTERS 1977 A. WOUTERS, "Two Unedited Literary Petrie Papyri", in *AncSoc* 8 (1977), 209-15.

DISCUSSION

L. Lehnus: You say that one should perhaps distinguish two schools of Greek epigram in the third century, one conservative (short elegiac epigrams only), perhaps represented by Posidippus, one more adventurous (some longer poems, some rarer metres) to which perhaps Callimachus' original collection belonged. By this I do not think you are prepared simply to revive Reitzenstein's ancient distinction between 'Peloponnesian' and 'Ionian' schools of epigram. Couldn't we imagine that 'conservative' were those epigrammatists who had smaller (or less continuous) access to the Alexandrian Museum, and 'more adventurous' those who enjoyed a deeper and more professional truck with its treasures? We find Posidippus wandering through continental Greece, while Callimachus seems to have hated navigation…

May I also ask you your opinion about Marianos of Eleuheropolis' iambic metaphrasis (test. 24 Pf.) of Callimachus' epigrams? I simply do not understand what it might have meant. — Let us for a moment imagine that numbers matter in this kind of thing. Marianos paraphrased *Hecale* and *Hymns* and *Aitia* (say, as a very long shot, 6000 verses) and *Epigrams* in 6810 iambics. Callimachus' 63 or so preserved epigrams account for 297 lines. One could fancy that ca. 800 lines would equal ca. 170 epigrams. Given that all that precedes is mere speculation, if not a joke, 170 is a rather reasonable number, isn't it?

P.J. Parsons: No, indeed, I didn't have Reitzenstein's distinction in mind, only a much vaguer and more empirical pair of poles or rather tendencies, corresponding perhaps to the tralatician distinction between 'Callimachean' poets and 'traditional' poets (though no doubt we would all treat that distinction too

with scepticism). The tendencies might be a matter, as you say, of learned ambience; though they might perhaps also correspond to professional and economic circumstances — how far, say, Posidippus relied more than Callimachus on small commissions from conservative patrons for functional epigrams of traditional type. The Pergamum dedication [above n.118] may illustrate the contrary case: its unusual metre and convoluted syntax suit the sophisticated taste of a grandee who dedicates an art-work to a monarch.

I had failed to take Marianos seriously, but of course you are absolutely right: most of his paraphrases [above n.6] show approximately the same line-total as the original paraphrased, so that may be true for Callimachus too. Certainly c. 800 lines would make a plausible book-roll (the Milan papyrus has c. 600, but the end of the roll is lost). If the calculation is right, the survival rate of Callimachus' epigrams, at nearly 40%, or just over 30% if one counts only the *Anthology*, is remarkably high — a tribute to his standing?

Th. Fuhrer: The Hellenistic Age was obviously a time when poetry books were put together just to put the collected material together (esp. lyric poetry): but there were collections of other poets' pieces, put together by scholars or scholar-poets. Surely, we do have the collection of the *Aetia*, the *Iambi*, and perhaps of the *Hymns*, but since we are on no certain ground with the epigrams, we might allow the assumption that, in the 3rd century, the obligation to compose poetry books was not yet as strong as in the 1st century BC.

I'm a bit hesitant to call a poem like the *Victoria Berenices* an extended (or expanded?) epigram since it contains a — probably — large part of mythical narrative. I'd rather say that it contains elements of victory epigrams in its first part, i.e. it uses the genre of the epigram in the genre of the epinician which is, though, written in the form of the former (the epigram). One could say the same thing of the *Sosibiou Nike* although it doesn't contain a myth.

P.J. Parsons: Yes, I agree that we should be careful about assuming that all poets put all their own works together in books, by way of giving them equal status with the 'collected works' of classical poets which were then being confected. Most of us, I suppose, would agree that fr. 112.9 represents an authorial link between (collected) *Aetia* and (collected) *Iambi*. No such link exists to prove that Callimachus left a collection of epigrams as part of his collected works.

Yes, I agree that it is a very partial truth to see *Victoria Berenices* as a hypertrophied epigram. It would be better, perhaps, to see it as amalgamating the two forms of celebration, the epinician and the epigram, available to victors like Ergoteles in the age of Pindar. Of these the epigram continued to flourish in the fourth century, as the epinician (at least in the present state of our knowledge) died out. The Milan papyrus shows the epigram still popular in the third century, even for royal victors; in another sense, the *Victoria Berenices* is a mutated epinician which trumps any epigram for the same occasion (Mil. XII 34-39?).

M.A. Harder: There will be an article by Robert Kirstein on pairs of epigrams in the Proceedings of the Groningen workshop on epigram.

There are quite a number of epigrammatic *aitia* in *Aetia* 3-4: apart from your original examples, to which the *Coma* must be added, consider possibly fr. 97, which may be compared with epigrams on destroyed monuments and cities.

P.J. Parsons: Thank you for expanding the range of connections! These no doubt provide the precedents for various expansions and insertions of epigram-material in the Roman elegists [now discussed, in the light of the Milan papyrus, by Professor G.O. Hutchinson, in *ZPE* 138 (2002), 9].

R. Hunter: I wonder (entirely idly) whether *kuklikon poiema* would not be a good description of the banal kind of epigram that 'does the rounds' at a symposium.

P.J. Parsons: In itself, why not? Contemporary Homeric scholarship recognised not only οἱ κυκλικοί (which is normally invoked to explain the phrase in *Epigr.* 28) but ἡ κυκλική, 'the text in common circulation'; and a sympotic context would mediate the sudden emergence of 'handsome Lysanias' later in the poem. But in a flat-footed moment I'd be inclined to put weight on the second line, where it's so tempting to relate the 'path which carries many people' to the 'carriage road' of fr. 1, and so to Homer (Pind. *Pae.* 7b.11) and other earlier epic.

S. Stephens: From what you have given us we have a much clearer sense of what early/near contemporary collections of epigrams would have looked like. A much more complicated question (as you say) is how this translates from the formal to the interpretative level. Can we discern what is typical or untypical in these collections? How does Callimachus' collection compare? Does contemporary practice allow any inferences about authorial intent, in the broad sense of what is or is not a 'collection' as opposed to a random set of 'collected' texts. Can arguments be made about positionality in these early collections? To what extent do you think Callimachus' experiments with the narrative potential of epigram collections influenced the *Aetia*?

Although we usually discuss Callimachus' Greek sources or antecedents in terms of poetry, there can be no doubt that he would also have had a rich tradition of prose writers at his disposal. Local historians of various regions, like Xenomedes, whom he mentions as a source for the story of Acontius and Cydippe (fr. 75.54 Pf.), might well have been the source for some regional inscriptions and/or occasional descriptions of local monuments and dedications.

P.J. Parsons: Authorial intent is notoriously slippery; and particularly when our only guide to the ordering of Callimachus' epigrams in an original (authorial? editorial?) collection is the assumption that fragments of an ordered corpus survive intact in the *Anthology* — an assumption about which I myself feel

sceptical. The Milan papyrus shows a formal system of ordering in subject-sections, e.g. *On statues*. In one way that illustrates what the *Aetia* does not do, since there the various poems on statues are not put all together; on the other hand, the Milan papyrus contains other epigrams centred on statues which come under other headings. Within the subject-sections, more subtle orderings can be detected (as the editors show, pp.25-26), and those might provide a better model for the thematic pairings still visible here and there in the *Aetia* (e.g. the Anaphean and Lindian rites, fr. 7.19-23; the two statues of Hera on Samos, frr. 100-101).

As to prose authors, you must certainly be right. Callimachus makes a point of mentioning Xenomedes (because Xenomedes was a particularly choice find?). But it is just chance that we know from scholia that he drew on Agias and Dercylus for at least three episodes of the *Aetia* (and for the *Baths of Pallas*?)? Such local historians may well have quoted local inscriptions; Herodotus had set the precedent, though in a larger context.