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

Artikel: Intertextuality in Callimachus' Aetia
Autor: Harder, M. Annette
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660906

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: 01.12.2025

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

VI

M. ANNETTE HARDER

INTERTEXTUALITY IN CALLIMACHUS' *AETIA*

1. *Introduction*

It has long been noticed that the character of Callimachus' poetry is highly intertextual. When, for instance, one reads the modern commentaries on the *Hymns* it becomes abundantly clear that there are many reminiscences of earlier poetry. Besides, some studies have appeared recently which focus on Callimachus' reception of a particular poet or genre[1]. These works contain many important observations and have created a basis for further research. They present a picture of Callimachus as an ingenious and innovative poet, playing with texts and genres in a highly sophisticated and scholarly way. A drawback, however, is that if one studies the reception of one particular author or genre in Callimachus it is difficult to achieve an overall picture of what exactly the effect on the reader of all the allusions taken together could be[2]. In the present study I intend to address that question and to investigate whether and, if so, to what extent

[1] E.g. H. REINSCH-WERNER, *Callimachus Hesiodicus. Die Rezeption der hesiodischen Dichtung durch Kallimachos von Kyrene* (Berlin 1976); Th. FUHRER, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel/Kassel 1992).

[2] For a discussion of the function of generic allusions in the *Aetia* from this angle see M.A. HARDER, "'Generic games' in Callimachus' *Aetia*", in *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER, Hellenistica Groningana 3 (Groningen 1998), 95-113.

the allusions to earlier texts in the *Aetia* can be said to provide the reader with extra information, which adds to his understanding of the text, and whether one may conclude that the allusions are not just manifestations of virtuosity, but also have the purpose of steering the reader's reception[3]. In dealing with this question I shall focus on two aspects (which may sometimes partly overlap): (1) Callimachus' presentation of the stories: here one may wonder whether the allusions help the reader to acquire extra information about e.g. the presentation of the characters, the description or evaluation of particular situations, or the narrative sequence of the story; (2) Metapoetic and programmatic aspects: here one may investigate whether the allusions help to create a certain impression of the poet's interests and views of poetry or of his role in society. The first point to be addressed, however, is the question what one may regard as an allusion.

2. *Criteria for allusions*

Generally speaking one can speak of intertextuality whenever one text is making use of another, earlier text in some way and it has been argued by scholars like Julia Kristeva that in fact this applies to all texts at all times, because all texts are in fact a mosaic of earlier texts. This view, however, is not helpful for the present investigation and I therefore shall restrict myself here to one aspect of intertextuality, i.e. the creative use of earlier texts which may help the reader to attribute meaning to the new text, for which I shall use the term allusion[4].

[3] For reasons of space I have limited myself to the *Aetia*, but it would be useful to extend this investigation to Callimachus' other works. For some interesting observations in this respect see e.g. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Ed. by A.W. BULLOCH (Cambridge 1985), 49ff.; A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi (Oxford 1999), 261f.

[4] I shall not go further into the theoretical complexities of this subject here, but refer the reader to earlier treatments of it like G.B. CONTE, *The Rhetoric of*

In the *Aetia* one can distinguish several ways in which earlier texts may be alluded to: on the one hand there are allusions to specific passages in earlier authors, on the other hand there are certain aspects of literary technique which recall an earlier literary genre or author in general, without referring the reader to a specific passage (like, e.g., a Homeric simile or a Pindaric breaking off-formula). In the third place there are passages where the reader seems to be invited to consult other texts for further information on a specific point (like, e.g., a part of the story which is not told in the text). Among the criteria by which one may detect such allusions the following are important: (1) explicit references to another author; (2) quotations; (3) the use of the same (rare or unusual) words or hapaxes; (4) the use of literary devices which may be considered as typical of a certain author or genre; (5) references to material which was part of the literary or scholarly tradition. An important factor for the interpretation of the allusion is the context in which it appears in combination with the context in the intertext, which may provide a clue for interpreting the allusion in a way which adds to the meaning of the new text.

This list of criteria provides a certain guideline, but obviously an element of subjectivity cannot be excluded and one should constantly be aware of the danger of speculation or over-interpretation. Besides, because of the fragmentary state of the transmission of Greek literature many allusions may now escape our notice, so that it is hard to establish a complete picture, while, on the other hand, we may seem to detect meaningful allusions to rare words or expressions which would turn out to be much more common if we had more Greek texts.

Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets (Ithaca 1986); *Genres and Readers* (Baltimore 1994), 131ff.; S. HINDS, *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge 1998). On the concept of the 'ideal reader' see the discussion at the end of this paper.

3. *Intertextuality and the presentation of the stories in the* Aetia

A survey of the allusions in the *Aetia* interpreted in their context shows that Callimachus often uses this means to assist the presentation of the stories. Important elements like the characterization of the main character of a story, descriptions of situations or the character's reaction to them, or even the narrative sequence are to a certain extent left to be discovered by the reader by means of his own knowledge of the texts and passages to which he is referred. Thus the reader is provided with a set of clues and invited to work hard if he wants to get access to the full story. The following examples may illustrate this point[5].

3.1. Characterization

In several instances we can observe that although Callimachus offers a brief description of somebody's character the picture can be completed and, in fact, turns out to be more complex if the reader takes into account the allusions to earlier texts. A good example of this technique is fr. 67,1-3:

> Αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν Ἀκόντιον, ὁππότε καλῆι
> ἤιθετο Κυδίππηι παῖς ἐπὶ παρθενικῆι,
> τέχνην — οὐ γὰρ ὅγ' ἔσκε πολύκροτος —

> "Eros himself taught Acontius his art, when the boy burnt with love for the beautiful girl Cydippe — for he was not very clever —"

Here we find a brief indication of what Acontius was *not*, including an allusion to earlier texts, which the reader has to remember in order to fully appreciate Acontius' character and its effects on this story. Through the use of the adjective πολύκροτος the reader is invited to regard Acontius as the opposite of the epic hero Odysseus, i.e. as a none too clever hero of

[5] Here as in the following chapters I shall discuss only some significant examples. For a more complete survey I refer to my forthcoming commentary on the *Aetia*.

an elegiac love-story, who may find it hard to help himself, because (1) it recalls *Od.*1,1 ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον (v.l. πολύκροτον according to Σ Ar.*Nu.* 260[6]), which characterizes Odysseus quite emphatically as a clever and resourceful hero at the beginning of the *Odyssey*; (2) it recalls Hes. fr. 198,3 υἱὸς Λαέρταο πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδώς, where πολύκροτος is used in a similar context of courtship to describe Odysseus' character when he tries to acquire Helen as his wife in a rather circumspect way and sends messages to Helen's brothers instead of presents, because he is aware that in that respect he cannot beat the wealthy Menelaus. The reader who recalls this passage may start wondering whether the art which Eros will teach Acontius will imply similar tricks and whether he will be successful (as Odysseus was *not* in his attempt for Helen).

The picture may be further complicated because πολύκροτος could be interpreted as 'clever' (as in Hes. fr. 198,3) or as 'noisy' (as in *Hom.h.* 19,37 πολύκροτον, sc. Pan), and thus may be related to other descriptions of Odysseus' character like E. *Cycl.* 104 κρόταλον δριμύ. At this point of Callimachus' narrative the notion of noise does not yet seem relevant, but it becomes more so when one reads on, as it turns out that the trick which Eros teaches Acontius can take place in complete silence on Acontius' part: Eros tells him to throw an apple at Cydippe with the inscription "I swear to Artemis that I shall marry Acontius" and when Cydippe has read this aloud she is bound by oath to marry Acontius, so that his eventual success is certain. Thus we see that the epithet πολύκροτος may provide the well-read reader with several clues to get a picture of Acontius' character and to develop certain expectations concerning the sequel of the story.

Elsewhere in the *Aetia* we find examples of the same technique. A good example is the characterisation of Molorcus in the *Victoria Berenices*, in which allusions to specific passages as well

[6] As the date of this variant is not known we cannot be certain that Callimachus and his original readers could know it, but the notion that they did so is attractive. For further discussion of the adjectives and the status of the variant see A. PARDINI, "Aconzio non era πολύκροτος", in *SIFC* S.III 9 (1991), 57-70.

as generic allusions help to create a certain picture. Early in the story Molorcus seems to be related to the character of the faithful swineherd Eumaeus in the *Odyssey* by means of the description of the circumstances of Heracles' first arrival at his home in *SH* 257,15ff. This passage contains some reminiscences of *Od.*14,5ff., where the farmyard of Eumaeus is described; for *SH* 257,15f. αὐλείην παρ' ἄχ[ερδον ...] | ἐξέρυσ' ἑρμαίο[υ one may compare *Od.*14,10 (δείματο) ῥυτοῖσιν λάεσσι καὶ ἐθρίγκωσεν (sc. Eumaeus) ἀχέρδωι ("with quarried stones, and he set wild pear-wood on top" Stanford; the object is the αὐλὴ | ὑψηλή of *Od.*14,5f.). But the passage and its sequel may be reminiscent of Odysseus' reception by Eumaeus in more than this respect, because e.g. (1) as Molorcus complains about the lion, who prevents him from offering Heracles a proper meal in *SH* 257,20ff., so Eumaeus utters repeated complaints about the suitors who eat his pigs and prevent him from entertaining Odysseus in a proper manner (*Od.*14,17ff.; 37ff.; 55ff.; 80ff.); (2) as Molorcus curses the lion in *SH* 257,20f., so in *Od.*14,68f. ὡς ὤφελλ' Ἑλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον ὀλέσθαι | πρόχνυ Eumaeus curses Helen as the ultimate cause of his misery. These reminiscences add an epic dimension to the story, and may serve to characterize Molorcus as a helpful and trustworthy peasant, while Odysseus on the brink of success and rehabilitation may be a foil for the young Heracles starting on his first labour.

Later in the story we find some generic allusions through which Molorcus' in his battle against the mice, who invade his cottage, acquires the dimensions of a (mock-)epic hero; cf. *SH* 259,5ff.:

ἀστὴρ δ' εὖτ'] ἄρ' ἔμελλε βοῶν ἄπο μέσσαβα [λύσειν
αὔλιος], [ὃς δυθ]μὴν εἶσιν ὕπ' ἠελίου
]ῳς κεῖνος Ὀφιονίδηισι φαείν[ει
]θεῶν τοῖσι παλαιοτέροις,
]τηρι θύρην· ὁ δ' ὅτ' ἔκλυεν ἠχ[ήν,
ὡς ὁπότ' ὀκν]ηρῆς ἴαχ' ἐπ' οὖς ἐλάφου
σκ]ύμνος, [μέ]λ[ε] μὲν ὅσσον ἀκουέμεν, ἦκα δ' ἔλ[εξεν:

"And when the evening-star, who comes at sunset, was about to loosen the yoke from the oxen... <there was a noise at the door>,

and when he heard the sound, he, like when a lion's whelp roared at the ear of a frightened deer, waited just long enough to listen and then spoke softly..."

In *SH* 259,5ff. we find the kind of time-indication which is well-known from epic poetry, where the onset of evening is described in terms of the ending of the day's labour[7]. In many of these passages, however, the picture of rest from labour in the time-indication is contrasted with the efforts of the epic heroes, who throw themselves into the battle at that very moment. In the same way here too the rest from labour is contrasted with the efforts of Molorcus, whose battle with the mice is about to begin, and thus he appears as an 'epic' hero. Immediately after this a brief Homeric simile illustrates Molorcus' reaction when he hears the mice at his door: the old farmer is compared to a deer frightened by the roaring of a lion's whelp, and this recalls the deer-similes in the *Iliad*, where deer appear as the frightened victims of a stronger animal, which either fly or stand stupified[8]. Therefore the simile may lead the reader to expect the same reaction from Molorcus, but this turns out differently as Molorcus knows very well how to fight his opponents.

3.2. Descriptions and evaluations of situations

Sometimes the reader of the *Aetia* may expect a description of a certain situation and the characters' reaction to it, as in the story of Acontius and Cydippe when, finally, the wedding is

[7] Cf. e.g. *Il.* 11,86ff. and 16,779f.; *Od.* 12,439ff.; *Hom.h.* 5,168f.; CALL. *Hec.* fr.238,19f. (= 18,5f. Hollis) and 260,63ff. (= 74,22ff. Hollis); APOLL.RH. 3,1340ff.; 4,1629ff.; HOR. *carm.* 3,6,41ff. *sol ubi... iuga demeret bobus fatigatis.* For more examples see W. BÜHLER, *Die Europa des Moschos* (Wiesbaden 1960), 210f.; H. FRAENKEL, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (München 1968), 141 and 612; A.S. HOLLIS on CALL. *Hec.* fr.74,23.

[8] Cf. e.g. *Il.* 4,243ff. (Agamemnon to his soldiers:) τίφθ' οὕτως ἔστητε τεθηπότες ἠΰτε νεβροί, | αἵ τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔκαμον πολέος πεδίοιο θέουσαι, | ἑστᾶσ', οὐδ' ἄρα τίς σφι μετὰ φρεσὶ γίγνεται ἀλκή; 11,113ff., where a lion kills the deer's offspring while the mother is flying.

taking place (fr. 75,42f.) and Acontius is allowed to enjoy his wedding-night. Instead of this fr. 75,44-50 contains only some speculation about Acontius' feelings during the wedding-night, which includes references to material which may have been part of the literary or scholarly tradition and seems to allow for interpretation at various levels:

οὔ σε δοκέω τημοῦτος, Ἀκόντιε, νυκτὸς ἐκείνης
ἀντί κε, τῆι μίτρης ἥψαο παρθενίης,
οὐ σφυρὸν Ἰφίκλειον ἐπιτρέχον ἀσταχύεσσιν
οὐδ' ἃ Κελαινίτης ἐκτεάτιστο Μίδης
δέξασθαι, ψήφου δ' ἂν ἐμῆς ἐπιμάρτυρες εἶεν
οἵτινες οὐ χαλεποὶ νήιδές εἰσι θεοῦ.
ἐκ δὲ γάμου κείνοιο μέγ' οὔνομα μέλλε νέεσθαι·

"I do not think, Acontius, that at that time you would have accepted the ankle of Iphiclus, who ran on top of the corn-ears, or the possessions of Midas of Celaenae instead of that night, in which you touched her maiden girdle; and witnesses in favour of my judgment would be those who are not ignorant of the harsh god. But from that marriage a grand name was to result".

Here the reader is invited to share the narrator's speculations about the feelings of Acontius during his wedding-night and as points of reference he is reminded of Iphiclus and Midas, whose fate Acontius would not prefer to his own. Callimachus' text indicates that Iphiclus was an extremely fast runner, which suggests the notion of an enviable top-sporter[9], and suggests that Midas was very rich, although his words ἃ ... ἐκτεάτιστο are not explicit. The passage as a whole is reminiscent of the priamels in Tyrt. fr.12,1ff. West, in which a long list of qualities, including speed in 4 (οὐδ' εἰ ...) νικώιη ... θέων Θρηίκιον Βορέην and riches in 6 (οὐδ' εἰ ...) πλουτοίη ... Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,

[9] Iphiclus, the son of Phylacus, is first mentioned as a competent runner in *Il.* 23,636 Ἴφικλον δὲ πόδεσσι παρέδραμον ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα. The fact that he could run upon the cornears without damaging them is first mentioned in Hes. fr.62 ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀνθερίκων καρπὸν θέεν οὐδὲ κατέκλα, | ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πυραμίνων ἀθέρων δρομάασκε πόδεσσιν | καὶ οὐ σινέσκετο καρπόν.

serves as a foil for valour in war, and Sapph. fr.16,1ff., where horsemen, infantry and ships serve as a foil for love. We cannot be certain that Callimachus alludes directly to Tyrtaeus, as it is easily conceivable that this kind of *topos* was used more often in texts now lost[10], but, if he did, the transposition of two of his examples from a context of war to an erotic context and the fact that he changed the example of quickness from Boreas to Iphiclus may be of some significance. Thinking along these lines Reinsch-Werner (n.1), 368f. observed that one should perhaps bear in mind that neither Iphiclus nor Midas was an unambiguous example, as Iphiclus suffered from sterility and Midas' wish that everything he touched turned into gold threatened to kill him. It is conceivable that Callimachus' brief indications referred his readers to texts which dealt with these aspects of Iphiclus and Midas (although for Midas the evidence allows no firm conclusions[11]) and placed the examples in a doubtful light. Thus readers might start to question the joys of Acontius' wedding-night, as the suggestion that Acontius would not want to change it for the position of a man who was suffering from infertility or threatened by starvation would be consistent with a low standard of pleasure indeed. For this kind of reader the mention of the offspring in fr. 75,50 would come as a relief, but for the reader who accepted both examples at face-value it would appear as a logical consequence of a glorious wedding-night.

[10] After Callimachus cf. e.g. [THEOC.] 8,53ff. μή μοι γᾶν Πέλοπος, μή μοι Κροίσεια τάλαντα | εἴη ἔχειν, μηδὲ πρόσθε θέειν ἀνέμων· | ἀλλ' ... ἄισομαι ἀγκὰς ἔχων τυ; PROP. 1,8,33ff. etc.

[11] The story of Iphiclus' sterility and its cure by Melampus was probably also mentioned in the *Victoria Berenices* (*SH* 260A,5-6) and could therefore be fresh in the mind of a reader of a complete edition of the *Aetia*. Besides, the phrasing σφυρὸν Ἰφίκλειον recalls *Od.* 11,290 βίης Ἰφικληείης and 296 (nom.) from the story of Melampus' acquisition of the cattle of Iphiclus and may draw the reader's attention to that story; for other earlier evidence of this story cf. e.g. PHERECYD. *FGrHist* 3 F 33 (with Jacoby *ad loc.*). The story that Dionysus rewards Midas for his hospitality to Silenus by fulfilling his wish that everything he touches turns into gold, so that he becomes rich as well as miserable, is first attested in OV. *met.* 11,90ff.; HYG. *Fab.*191.

3.3. Narrative sequence

Sometimes parts of the narrative sequence are left out and the reader, who is given a very brief summary of the events, seems to be invited to consult other texts to supplement the *Aetia* and to get the complete story. For this purpose he must let himself be guided by allusions to more elaborate texts. An example of this technique is found in fr. 75,64-9:

ἐν δ' ὕβριν θάνατόν τε κεραύνιον, ἐν δὲ γόητας
Τελχῖνας μακάρων τ' οὐκ ἀλέγοντα θεῶν
ἠλεὰ Δημώνακτα γέρων ἐνεθήκατο δέλτ[οις
καὶ γρηὺν Μακελώ, μητέρα Δεξιθέης,
ἃς μούνας, ὅτε νῆσον ἀνέτρεπον εἵνεκ' ἀλ̣[ι]τ̣[ρῆς
ὕβριος, ἀσκηθεῖς ἔλλιπον ἀθάνατοι·

"Into his wax-tablets the old man put *hybris* and death by lightning and sorcerers, the Telchines, and Demonax, who, foolishly, did not pay heed to the blessed gods, and the old woman Macelo, the mother of Dexithea, who were the only ones whom the gods left unscathed when they destroyed the island because of its sinful *hybris*".

In this passage 65-6 recall *Od.* 9,275f. οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διός ... ἀλέγουσιν | οὐδὲ θεῶν μακάρων, where the verb is used in a comparable context of lack of piety towards the gods. These words are spoken by the notoriously inhospitable Polyphemus in answer to Odysseus' request for hospitality and the allusion may therefore help the reader to complete his picture of Demonax and suggest that his lack of piety consisted of a lack of hospitality as opposed to the behaviour of his wife and daughter Macelo and Dexithea, who, according to other sources, where the only people who offered hospitality when the gods visited Ceos[12].

[12] Cf. e.g. *Schol. ad* Ov. *Ib.*475 *Nicander dicit Macelon filiam Damonis cum sororibus fuisse; harum hospitio Iuppiter susceptus, cum Telchines (Thelonios* codd.*), quorum hic Damo princeps erat, corrumpentes venenis successus omnium fructuum, fulmine interficeret, servavit eas (eos* codd.*); sed Macelo cum viro propter viri nequitiam periit. Sed ad alias servatas cum venisset Minos, cum Dexithea (Desitone*

Then the brief description of the destruction of Ceos in fr. 75,68-9 recalls Pi. *Pae.*4,40-5 τρέω (sc. Euxantius, the son of Dexithea and Minos, who visited Ceos after its destruction) τοι πόλεμον Διὸς Ἐννοσίδαν τε βαρ[ύ]κτυπον,| χθόνα τοί ποτε καὶ στρατὸν ἀθρόον | πέμψαν κεραυνῶι τριόδοντί τε | ἐς τὸν βαθὺν Τάρταρον ἐμὰν ματέρα λίποντες καὶ ὅλον οἶκον εὐερκέα and Bacchylides 1,19ff., the first part of which is in such a bad state that one can distinguish little more than that it is about Macelo and Dexithea (and another sister?) and a town, and 112ff. about Minos' visit to Ceos and Dexithea and the subsequent birth of Euxantius, which is reasonably well preserved[13]. The reader who remembered these poems would be reminded of the sequel of the story and, particularly, the birth of Euxantius, i.e. of the ancestor of Acontius, who was mentioned in fr. 67,7 αἷμα τὸ μὲν γενεῆς Εὐξαντίδος without further details. Here no details are given either, but the reader is invited to consult earlier texts to supply them. In doing so he may also become aware that the episode of the Telchines was probably selected as part of the summary of the Cean history of Xenomedes (fr. 75,56-74) in order to show that Acontius was a descendant of the 'good' branch of the Cean population.

An elaborate and more explicit example of the same technique can be found in fr. 57,1-4 (= *SH* 264,1-4):

αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο, τάμοι δ' ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῆι·
ὅσσα δ' ἀνειρομένωι φῆ[σ]ε, τάδ' ἐξερέω·
'Ἄττα γέρον, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πα[ρὼν ἐν δ]ᾳιτὶ μαθήσει,
νῦν δὲ τά μοι πεύσηι Παλλά[ς . . . . .] . . [

"Let him (sc. the reader?) find out for himself and cut short the poem's length; but as much as he (sc. Heracles) said to him (sc. Molorcus) in answer to his questions, these things I shall tell

codd.*) concubuit, ex qua creavit Euxantium (Eus-* codd.*), unde Euxantiae (Eus-* codd.*) fuerunt.* In this respect Dexithea may well be a significant name.

[13] For a full discussion of Bacchylides' poem see H. MAEHLER (Ed.), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* I (Leiden 1982), 2, 4ff.; for Pindar's *Paean* see I. RUTHERFORD, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford 2001), 280ff.

at length: 'Old father, the other things you will learn when we are at dinner, but now you will hear what Pallas (said?) to me…'."

This fragment is from the *Victoria Berenices* and must probably be placed after Heracles' return to the cottage of Molorcus, when he has killed the Nemean lion. These lines clearly aim at shortening the story and thus recall the Pindaric technique of breaking off-formula's[14], which would fit neatly into the epinician for Berenice. One gets the impression that the narrator wishes to leave out part of the story and to hasten towards the origin of the wreath at Nemea, which is told in fr. 59 (= *SH* 265). Meanwhile the reader seems to be left to his own resources, as he is invited to find out (ἐπιφράσσαιτο) what is left out for himself and thus (to help the narrator) to cut the story short. In this way, apart from Pindar, an unidentified group of texts with additional information is also evoked.

Although it is not easy to establish what exactly is left out, fr. 57,3-4 may provide a clue, because here one gets the impression that Molorcus had asked certain questions (τὰ μὲν ἄλλα) to which, for the time being, he receives no answer. As the information he does receive from Heracles at this point concerns Pallas' instructions about the wreath at Nemea (cf. fr. 59 = *SH* 265), the 'other things' may well have concerned Heracles' adventures with the lion and the way in which he managed to kill him. This would mean that the heroic episode, which in a real Pindaric epinician probably would have taken pride of place as contributing to the glory of the *laudandus*, would here be left out by means of a Pindaric device.

[14] This technique of breaking off a digression recalls a device of which early epic examples are found in *Il.* 12,176 ἀργαλέον δέ με ταῦτα θεὸν ὡς πάντ' ἀγορεῦσαι and HES. *Th.* 35 (although the exact interpretation of the line is disputed; see M.L. WEST *ad loc.*), and is particularly familiar from Pindar (e.g. PI. *O.* 1,52f.; 9,35ff.; *N.* 3,26ff.) and Bacchylides (e.g. 5,176ff.) as the so-called 'Abbruchsformel', which is often used to end or shorten a section of a poem (like the telling of a myth); see on this device (and its programmatical aspects) e.g. C.M. BOWRA, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964), 312ff.; B.K. BRASWELL on PI. *P.* 4,247-8. Other examples of the 'Abbruchsformel' in Callimachus are fr.24,20f. and 75,4ff.; *Iambi* fr.194,59; *h.* 6,17.

An interesting aspect of this passage is also that the reader, the narrator and Heracles seem to cooperate and interact in order to achieve that a certain episode is left out, with the result that the omission receives great emphasis. First the narrator invites the reader to look after himself and phrases this invitation in such a way that, in fact, the reader is to some extent taking over the narrator's role and intervening in the organisation of the poem by shortening it. Then he announces that he will tell only what Heracles answered Molorcus, and Heracles cooperates by duly telling Molorcus only about the wreath and promising to tell the rest at dinner. In fr. 59,16f. (= *SH* 265,16f.) the narrator offers a brief description of the meal, but it contains no information about the conversation and one gets the impression that, although the narrator could not 'control' Heracles' intentions to tell Molorcus about his first labour at dinner, he still uses his control over the actual narrative in order not to make this conversation known to his readers.

Summarizing one may say that in this passage the Pindaric device of a breaking-off formula is elaborated in a highly sophisticated way, which draws attention to the fact that a well-known part of the story, presumably the killing of the Nemean lion, is being left out and that there are other sources from which the reader may find it out. Thus Callimachus avoids a 'well-trodden path', but still brings the famous first labour of Berenice's dynastic ancestor Heracles to the reader's attention.

4. *Intertextuality as a means to highlight meta-poetic and programmatic issues*

The reader of the *Aetia* does not only read the stories, but also receives all kinds of meta-poetic and programmatic information, e.g. about Callimachus' role as a (court-)poet, the use he is making of his sources and predecessors, his treatment of literary genres, his views on poetry and the quality of his own work. Here too we see that allusions are an important means to steer the reader's perception.

4.1. The poet's role

In several instances we see that Callimachus makes use of allusions to draw attention to his role as a poet working in the Alexandrian Library, with a great deal of information at his disposal, and with certain responsibilities as a poet closely related to the Ptolemaic court. Thus in fr. 75,4-9 the narrator presents himself as a scholar-poet, who is almost led astray by his own garrulity and corrects himself vigorously and with, perhaps, some subtle hints of political correctness:

> Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι -- κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρέ
> θυμέ, σύγ' ἀείσηι καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη·
> ὤναο κ̣άρτ̣' ἕνεκ' οὔ τι θεῆς ἴδες ἱερὰ φρικτῆς,
> ἐξ ἂν ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἤρυγες ἱστ̣ορίην.
> ἦ πολυιδρείη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ
> γλώσσης· ὡς ἐτεὸν παῖς ὅδε μαῦλιν ἔχει.
>
> "For they say that once Hera — dog, dog, restrain yourself, impudent heart, you will sing even of the things which are against divine law; you are certainly lucky that you did not see the holy rites of the frightening goddess, because then you would have thrown out that story too. Surely a great amount of knowledge is a difficult evil for those who cannot control their tongues. How truly that kind of man is a child with a knife".

This passage follows a brief description of a prenuptial ritual at Naxos, which is part of the first attempt to marry Cydippe to another man than Acontius and consists of the bride sleeping with a boy whose parents are both alive (cf. fr. 75,3 παιδὶ σὺν ἀμφιθαλεῖ). Instead of continuing the story of the failed attempt at marriage the narrator suddenly draws the reader's attention to himself: he starts to give an explanation for the ritual and then suddenly breaks off.

There are several allusions in this passage, which seem significant, but are not altogether easy to interpret. First of all the passage again recalls the device of the Pindaric breaking-off formula (see also 3.3 about fr. 57), but the really meaningful allusions seem to be to specific passages in other authors.

Because of *schol. ad Il.* 14,294-6 διὸ καὶ μέχρι νῦν ὑπόμνημα φυλάσσεσθαι παρὰ Ναξίοις καὶ τὸν ἀμφιθαλῆ τῆι τάλι (ἀμφιθαλῆν τῆι ἰτάληι codd.) συγκατατεθεῖσθαι it seems likely that Callimachus and/or others related the Naxian ritual to the clandestine prenuptial intercourse of Zeus and Hera referred to in *Il.* 14,294-6 (when Zeus saw Hera) ὥς μιν ἔρως πυκινὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν,| οἷον ὅτε πρῶτόν περ ἐμισγέσθην φιλότητι, εἰς εὐνὴν φοιτῶντε, φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας, and that a reader might expect that the tale he began to tell was about this early romance[15]. The reason why Callimachus should break off this story is not entirely clear, because it is not immediately apparent what is so shocking about it and it could, in fact, function as a legitimation of the brother and sister marriage of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus and Arsinoe. Therefore Roberto Pretagostini, followed by Alan Cameron[16], suggested that the reader was here referred to an obscene poem by Sotades in which he spoke in an offending manner about the royal couple. He suggested that the opening line of this poem was Sotad. fr.inc.16 Powell Ἥρην ποτέ φασιν Δία τὸν τερπικέραυνον, of which fr. 75,4 is reminiscent, and that Sotad. fr.1 Powell εἰς οὐχ ὁσίην τρυμαλίην τὸ κέντρον ὠθεῖς (about the marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe), which may be recalled by fr. 75,5, was part of it too. Sotades' poem then should be read against the background of attempts to justify the marriage of brother and sister by the example of Zeus and Hera: after apparently starting his poem in this fashion, Sotades then turned it into a nasty pun on the

[15] It is hard to see how the Naxian fertility ritual could derive from the early romance of Zeus and Hera. D.R. STUART, "The Prenuptial Rite in the New Callimachus", in *CPh* 6 (1911), 302-14, esp.309ff. may well be right in arguing that the connection rose out of ignorance of the real purpose of the ritual, which at some stage apparently — and wrongly — was regarded as a ἱερὸς γάμος.

[16] R. PRETAGOSTINI, *Ricerche sulla poesia Alessandrina* (Roma 1984), 144ff.; A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 18ff. Callimachus himself mentioned this story in fr.48 and it appears as a kind of well-known secret in THEOC. 15,64; PLAUT. *Trin.* 207f. Evidence for this story as a means to justify the marriage of Philadelphus and Arsinoe is found in e.g. THEOC. 17,130 (see A.S.F. GOW *ad loc.*).

incestuous aspects of the marriage (which was said to be the cause of his execution many years later). If this is right, fr. 75,4ff. may be regarded as a kind of humorous and 'politically correct' criticism of Sotades' poem.

Apart from criticizing Sotades Callimachus also seems to suggest a positive evaluation of the royal marriage by evoking a passage where the wedding of Zeus and Hera is emphatically used as an encomiastic foil, i.e. the wedding-song for Pisetaerus and Basileia in Ar. *Av.* 1731-42 Ἥραι ποτ' Ὀλυμπίαι | τῶν ἠλιβάτων θρόνων | ἄρχοντα θεοῖς μέγαν | Μοῖραι συνεκοίμισαν | ἐν τοιῶιδε ὑμεναίωι | ... | ὁ δ'ἀμφιθαλὴς Ἔρως | χρυσόπτερος ἡνίας | ηὔθυνε παλιντόνους,| Ζηνὸς πάροχος γάμων | τῆς τ' εὐδαίμονος Ἥρας. Callimachus' phrasing (especially fr. 75,4 Ἥρην ... κοτέ and 3 ἀμφιθαλεῖ, although used in a different sense) seems to recall this passage and there might be a meaningful intertextual relation with the whole concluding part of the *Birds* (Ar. *Av.* 1706-65), in which Pisetaerus is hailed as a glorious king and successor of Zeus. If so, Callimachus would very subtly weave in a compliment to Ptolemy Philadelphus in a passage in which he criticizes the insulting poem of Sotades and show that to him the qualification ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ | γλώσσης (fr. 75,8-9), after all, did not apply at all.

Interpreted in this way the passage draws the reader's attention to the delicate position of the Alexandrian poet and the way in which Callimachus viewed his own role and that of others and used the literary means at his disposal with great refinement. Thus the allusions give the reader much food for thought, but not about the bride Cydippe.

For the encomiastic use of allusions, of which we may get a glimpse in fr. 75,4ff. Callimachus' court poetry provides some examples in the *Coma Berenices*, where the lock is characterized as a character with feminine as well as masculine characteristics in a way which reflects the personality of Berenice, whom the lock was separated from much against its will (cf. fr. 110,40 and Catull. 66,39ff.). If we confine ourselves to Callimachus' text we find Berenice described as μεγάθυμος in fr. 110,26, which was

plausibly restored by Pfeiffer[17]. Because he thought μεγάθυμος might be too obvious Pfeiffer suggested as alternatives μεγαλήτωρ, μεγαλόφρων, μεγαθαρσής, μεγάτολμος, but, in fact, μεγάθυμος would *not* be obvious when used of a mortal woman, because in the early Greek epic the epithet is used only of heroes and goddesses, as in e.g. *Il.* 20,498 Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου and *Od.* 8,520 μεγάθυμον Ἀθήνην[18]. Thus the use of this adjective would underline Berenice's heroic character and give a hint of a (future) divine status. On the other hand Berenice's femininity is well illustrated by fr. 110,75ff. about her use of unguents.

The same ambiguity is found in the lock, whose gender in the poem is not entirely clear: (1) it uses the masculine βόστρυχος of itself in fr. 110,8 and πλόκαμος in fr. 110,47 and 62; (2) in fr. 110,51 [ν]εότμητον is undecisive, because νεότμητος is of two endings; (3) elsewhere there are some hints of femininity: the other locks are referred to as κόμαι ... ἀδε[λφεαί in fr. 110,51, and therefore may be perceived as 'sisters'; the abduction in fr. 110,52ff. is reminiscent of stories of the abduction of young women or goddesses; the comparison with the wreath of Ariadne in fr. 110,59ff. suggests female competition; the interest in scent in fr. 110,75ff. looks like a female preoccupation; the lock's lament as a whole may be compared to those of women lamenting lost companions[19]. The overall impression, particularly derived from the passages in (3), is that the lock is a female rather than a male character[20], but the ambiguity seems to be underlined by some of the allusions.

In several instances allusions to other texts evoke heroic male characters as a foil for the lock. Thus in fr. 110,47 τί πλόκαμοι

[17] See R. PFEIFFER, "Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος", in *Philologus* 87 (1932), 179-228, esp.183, who compared CATULL. 66,25f. (to Berenice) *at te ego certe | cognoram a parva virgine magnanimam*; HYG. *Astr.* 2,24 *Callimachus eam* (sc. Berenicen) *magnanimam dixit.*

[18] Cf. also e.g. *Od.* 13,121; HES. *Th.* 734.

[19] See K. GUTZWILLER, "Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice*: Fantasy, Romance and Propaganda", in *AJPh* 113 (1992), 359-85, esp.374ff.

[20] Apparently Catullus felt this too, and therefore choose to be less ambiguous, using feminine words throughout; CATULL. 66,8 *caesaries* and 66,93 *coma*.

ῥέξωμεν the picture of a male epic or tragic hero who is forced or pretending to give in to higher powers is evoked, because the phrase recalls Agamemnon's words in *Il.* 19,90 ἀλλὰ τί κεν ῥέξαιμι (in a long speech in which he makes peace with Achilles and states that it is not his fault that Achilles was offended, but the gods') and Ajax' 'conversion' to sensible behaviour in Soph. *Aj.* 669-77 καὶ γὰρ τὰ δεινὰ καὶ τά καρτερώτατα | τιμαῖς ὑπείκει· τοῦτο μὲν νιφοστιβεῖς | χειμῶνες ἐκχωροῦσιν εὐκάρπωι θέρει·| ἐξίσταται δὲ νυκτὸς αἰανὴς κύκλος | τῆι λευκοπώλωι φέγγος ἡμέραι φλέγειν·| δεινῶν τ' ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε | στένοντα πόντον· ἐν δ' ὁ παγκρατὴς ὕπνος | λύει πεδήσας, οὐδ' ἀεὶ λαβὼν ἔχει.| ἡμεῖς δὲ πῶς οὐ γνωσόμεσθα σωφρονεῖν (where the priamel may have been the example for fr. 110,43ff.). In fr. 110,51 the unusual iterative form ποθέεσκον, which suggests the incessant mourning of the sister-locks, recalls *Il.* 1,492 ποθέεσκε δ' ἀυτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε about Achilles, who remains in his quarters, desperately missing the turmoils of war. On the other hand, in fr. 110,63 παρ' ἀθα[νάτους the lock's career turns out to be comparable to those of young gods being received on Olympus, particularly that of Aphrodite herself in *Hom.h.* 6,3ff. ὅθι μιν (sc. Aphrodite) Ζεφύρου μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντος | ἤνεικεν κατὰ κῦμα ... θαλάσσης (3f.), after which the Horae on Cyprus make her beautiful and ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντα περὶ χροὶ κόσμον ἔθηκαν | ἦγον εἰς ἀθανάτους (14f.).

4.2. Poetic quality

A passage in which a discussion of literary issues is given coherence and more significance by a careful use of allusions is the prologue to the *Aetia* in fr. 1. This fragment has been much discussed, but a consistent intertextual reading of it may help to clarify some issues, particularly the question whether the proper style of elegy is the central issue in fr. 1, as was recently argued by Cameron (n.16). A brief survey of the allusions in the prologue will show that in fact a great number of literary genres and passages of literary criticism are brought to the reader's attention:

(1) Homer: in fr. 1,1 πολλάκ⸢ι[21] μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀ[οιδῆι the verb ἐπιτρύζουσιν is reminiscent of *Il.* 9,311 ὡς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος spoken by Achilles, the epic hero *par excellence*, who refuses to take part in the battle and is surrounded by people who mutter against him. As the verb is a Homeric hapax an allusion is likely and the well-read reader would be reminded of the Homeric epic and of a hero's refusal to act in accordance with his position in the world of epic straightaway in the first line of the prologue. Other Homeric allusions may be detected in fr. 1,9f., where the notion of weighing, apart from Aristophanes' *Ranae* (on which see below) also recalls Zeus weighing the fates of mortals in *Il.* 8,68ff. and 22,208ff., where the scales of those destined to perish go down[22], and in fr. 1,13f., which recalls *Il.* 3,3ff. about the flight of the cranes and their battle with the Pygmies;

(2) Hesiod: the notion of the friendship of the Muses in fr. 1,2 νήιδε]ς οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι recurs in fr. 1,37f. Μοῦσαι γ]ὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄθμα[τ]ι παῖδας | μὴ λοξῶι, πολιοὺς] οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους, where the phrasing is reminiscent of Hes. *Th.* 81ff. and 96ff. In fr. 1,27f. μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους | ἀτρίπτο]υ̣ς, εἰ καὶ στε[ι]ν̣οτέρην ἐλάσεις we find the notion of two roads, one wide, one narrow, between which one must choose, which is first attested in Hes. *Op.* 286ff. in a moralizing sense. Callimachus combines this notion with the paths of poetry, which are first attested in Pindar and thus turns the dilemma into a matter of literary criticism;

(3) epic in general: at the end of fr. 1,1 ἀοιδῆι recalls the convention that forms of ἀείδω are often found at the end of the first line in the *Homeric Hymns* and also in the prooemium of Hes. *Th.*1 Μουσάων ... ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν. The word's position may therefore suggest reading fr. 1 as an epic prooemium.

[21] For this reading see F. PONTANI, "The First Word of Callimachus' *Aitia*", in *ZPE* 128 (1999), 57-9.

[22] For a discussion of the Homeric and Aristophanic allusions in this passage see T. GARGIULO, "L'immagine della bilancia in Callimaco fr.1,9-10 Pfeiffer", in *QUCC* 71 (1992), 123-8.

In fr. 1,13ff.]ρν ἐπὶ Θρήϊκας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτοιο [πέτοιτο | αἵματ]ι Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη [γ]έρα[νος,| Μασσα]γέ̣τ̣αι [κ]αὶ μακρὸν ὀϊστεύοιεν ἐπ' ἄνδρα | Μήδον] the elements in the priamel may suggest subjects suitable for mythological and historical epics (the cranes may refer to a *Geranomachia* and the Massagetes have been thought to refer to Choerilus' *Persica*[23]), but this is rather speculative;

(4) Pindar: the fact that in fr.1,2 the Telchines are said to be unacquainted with the Muses recalls the claim in Pi. fr.**198a M οὔτοι με ξένον | οὐδ' ἀδαήμονα Μοισᾶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταί | Θήβαι. In fr. 1,25ff. πρὸς δὲ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι | τὰ στείβε]ιν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμὰ | δίφρον ἐλ]ᾷν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους | ἀτρίπτο]υ̣ς, εἰ καὶ στε[ι]γ̣οτέρην ἐλάσεις there seems to be an allusion to Pi. *Pae.*7b,10ff., where there is a demand for originality, as one should avoid the well-trodden paths of Homer and pray to the Muses for help[24];

(5) tragedy (and its reception in old comedy): in fr. 1,9f. ἀλλὰ καθέλ[κει | . . . . πο]λ̣ὺ . τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς the verb recalls the notion of weighing the quality of the texts of Aeschylus and Euripides in Ar. *Ra.*1365ff. At this point in the prologue this item is no further pursued, but it recurs in fr. 1,17f. αὖθι δὲ τέχνηι | κρίνετε,] [μὴ σχοί]νωι Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην, where the idea of measuring quality recalls the use of instruments in Ar. *Ra.*799ff. and the discussion about the slender and the grand style in tragedy, with Euripides and Aeschylus as protagonists. Even so already in fr. 1,9 the scope seems to be gradually widening and the reader seems to be invited to begin to think about

[23] As to the cranes, see M. ASPER, Onomata allotria. *Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*, Hermes Einzelschriften 75 (Stuttgart 1997), 203ff. for discussion and evidence for this kind of epic from VI BC onwards (and also for the iconographic tradition); on Choerilus see A. BARIGAZZI, "Mimnermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel proemio degli Aitia di Callimaco", in *Hermes* 84 (1956), 162-82 (not entirely convincing).

[24] Recently the text of Pindar has been the object of some discussion, but the untrodden path seems to have survived; see RUTHERFORD (n.13), 247ff.

poetic style in general, across the boundaries of the various genres. In fr. 1,19f. μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ]τε μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδὴν | τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶ]ν οὐκ ἐμόν, [ἀλλὰ] Διός the refusal to write poetry in the grand style is phrased in a way that first of all recalls Aeschylus; cf. Ar. *Nu.*1366f., where Phidippides rejects the noise of Aeschylus and prefers in 1371ff. to quote from Euripides, and *Ra.*492, where the angry speech of the porter Aeacus is full of tragic parody, particularly of "some of Aeschylus' most bombastic moments" (Stanford *ad loc.*; see also Dover); the reference to thunder also recalls the description of Aeschylus in Ar. *Ra.*814. After having evoked the discussion of the proper tragic style and implicitly rejected the grand style of Aeschylus Callimachus refers the reader to a passage from the 'slender' Euripides in fr. 1,32ff., which is strongly reminiscent of the choral ode in E. *HF* 637-700, because of (i) the treatment of the notions of the burden of old age, which is said to be heavier than Mt.Aetna in 637ff.: cf. fr. 1,35f. αὖθι τ]ὸ (sc. old age) δ' [ἐκ]δύοιμ[ι], τό μοι βάρος ὅσσον ἔπεστι | τριγ]λῴ[χι]ν ὀλ[οῶι] νῆσος ἐπ' Ἐγκελά[δωι; (ii) the wish to escape from old age and have a second life in 655ff.: for a similar wish cf. fr. 1,35; (iii) the devotion to the Muses and the Charites (who will be the subject of the first *aition* in fr. 3-7) in 673ff.; and (iv) the comparison of the old chorus' song for Heracles (who will be the subject of fr. 22-25) to a swan's song in 687ff.: cf. fr. 1,39f. πτερὸν οὐκέτι κινεῖν |]η τ[ῆ]μος ἐνεργότατος[25].

(6) elegy: in fr. 1,9ff. ἀλλὰ καθέλ[κει | πο]λὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς·| τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, α[ἶ κατὰ λεπτὸν |] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή a comparison

[25] The way in which the chorus in Euripides announces its song may also be of some interest for the question of the composition of the *Aetia*: a reader who recalled the choral song of the *Heracles* and noticed its relevance for the beginning of the *Aetia* might consider *HF* 680f. ἔτι τὰν Ἡρακλέους | καλλίνικον ἀείδω and 698ff. μοχθήσας τὸν ἄκυμον | θῆκεν βίοτον βροτοῖς | πέρσας δείματα θηρῶν (sc. Heracles) as relevant for the second half of the *Aetia* which began with the *Victoria Berenices*, in which Heracles defeated the first of the monsters threatening humanity.

between the long and short elegies of Philetas and Mimnermus may be indicated by the text, at least according to the *Florentine scholia* (p.3 Pf.), which, if rightly interpreted, seem to say that of each poet the short and long poems are being compared and the short ones are better (and probably also according to the *London scholia* [p.3 Pf.], which say that Mimnermus short poems, not his big woman show his quality). An explanation for the mention of these poets is probably that the archaic poet Mimnermus and the early Hellenistic Philetas were admired by Callimachus as predecessors in the genre in which he is writing here (just as Hipponax is mentioned as an important predecessor in *Ia.* fr. 191). Apart from that, however, the way in which their work is considered and judged indicates that they are also incorporated into the larger issues which are the subject of this passage. In this respect the omission of Antimachus[26] may also be significant;

(7) literary criticism: fr. 1,3 οὐχ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές has often been regarded as a demand for long epic poems and 'one' has been taken as either 'one single' or 'unified'. Some scholars, e.g. Richard Hunter[27], relate this to the discussion in Arist. *Po.*8, 1451a 16ff. about the episodic epic, which is not 'unified' like the poems of Homer, which have a single plot, but rather treats the lives of heroes from the beginning till the end. Although we do not know for certain that the *Poetics* were known in Alexandria Hunter's idea cannot be excluded[28]. In fr. 1,17f. Callimachus uses the terms τέχνη and σοφία, which are attested in

[26] Criticized by Callimachus in fr.398.

[27] See R.L. HUNTER, *The Argonautica of Apollonius. Literary Studies* (Cambridge 1993), 190ff.

[28] CAMERON (n.16), 342ff. suggests that Callimachus rejects the monotony of the cyclic epic, as manifested in the elegiac *Lyde* of Antimachus, which for instance told the story of the Argonauts from beginning to end, whereas Callimachus showed in fr.7,19ff. how the same story should be treated in the proper elegiac style. Thus Cameron emphasizes that it is not epic, but the epic style in elegy which is Callimachus' target in the *Aetia*-prologue. However, even though Aristotle's views could be applied to narrative elegy if one wished, readers who thought of Aristotle here must first of all have thought of epic, not elegy.

contexts of literary criticism from Pindar onwards and could be applied to a variety of literary genres. In a similar way Apollo in fr. 1,23ff. ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον | θρέψαι, τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην etc. operates with terms from literary criticism, 'fat' / 'florid' versus 'slender' / 'subtle', without evoking a particular genre. This is as should be expected, because the beginning poet was going to write in a number of different genres, to all of which the same criteria of quality would have to apply. In fr. 1,32 ἐγ]ὼ δ' εἴην οὐλ[α]χύς, ὁ πτερόεις the description of the poet recalls Plato, *Ion* 534a 7ff., where, however, the light and winged poet is possessed by the Muses and not relying on technical skills.

In conclusion one may say that the allusions in fr. 1 suggest that, although Cameron is right about the fact that fr. 1 is about poetic style rather than genre, his claim that fr. 1 is about the proper style of *elegy* is too narrow and that the same applies to those who want to regard the *Aetia*-prologue as concerned only with epic[29]. In fact the prologue of the *Aetia* refers the reader in a highly allusive manner to a variety of literary genres and some passages of literary criticism and seems to be best read as referring to poetic style and quality in general, touching on values and criteria that are applicable to a variety of poetic genres, of course including elegy and epic, but by no means restricted to them. The 'message' may well be that a poet should aim for the quality of small-scale, subtle and original poetry, and the reader seems to be invited to read this message against the background of a kaleidoscopic and allusive picture of earlier Greek poetry and earlier literary criticism. This fits in with the character of the *Aetia*, which, in spite of its being basically an elegiac catalogue poem, shows a great deal of generic variety[30] and alludes to many of the predecessors hinted at in the prologue.

[29] So e.g. E.-R. SCHWINGE, *Künstlichkeit von Kunst. Zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*, Zetemata 84 (München 1986).

[30] See HARDER (n.2).

4.3. Elegy against an Odyssean background

Elsewhere in the *Aetia* we find examples of the use of allusions to make the reader aware of the poet's literary quality and achievements against the background of a specific genre. A good example of this practice is the introduction to the story of Peleus at Icus in fr. 178, where the *Odyssey* is very prominent as an intertext[31]. In this introduction the primary narrator tells how he met the merchant Theogenes of Icus at a symposium at the home of the Athenian Pollis and how he asked him to tell him why there was a cult of Peleus at Icus. We may assume that this story was subsequently told by Theogenes as a secondary narrator, but before that the papyrus breaks off.

In fr. 178,5-22 the symposium is described at some length and within this framework the reader acquires a picture of the narrators, who both prefer intellectual conversation to a great deal of drink:

ἐς ᾗ̣ίτην ἐκ̣ά̣λ̣εσσεν (sc. Pollis) ὁμηθέας, ἐν δέ νυ τοῖσι
ξεῖνον ὃς Α[ἰ]γύπτωι καινὸς ἀνεστρέφετο
μεμβλωκὼς ἴδιόν τι κατὰ χρέος· ἦν δὲ γενέθλην
Ἴκ̣ιος, ὧι ξυνὴν εἶχον ἐγὼ κλισίην
οὐκ ἐπιτάξ, ἀλλ' αἶνος Ὁμηρικός, αἰὲν ὁμοῖον
ὡς θεός, οὐ ψευδής, ἐς τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει.
καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θρηϊκίην μὲν ἀπέστυγε χανδὸν ἄμυστιν
ζωροποτεῖν, ὀλίγωι δ' ἥδετο κισσυβίωι.
τῶι μὲν ἐγὼ τάδ' ἔλεξα περιστείχοντος ἀλείσου
τὸ τρίτον, εὖτ' ἐδάην οὔνομα καὶ γενεήν·
'ἦ μάλ' ἔπος τόδ' ἀληθές, ὅ τ' οὐ μόνον ὕδατος αἶσαν,
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ λέσχης οἶνος ἔχειν ἐθέλει.
τὴν ἡμε̣ῖ̣ς — ο̣ὐ̣κ̣ ἐ̣ν̣ γ[ὰ]ρ ἀρυστήρεσσ̣ι φορεῖται
οὐδέ μι̣ν ε̣ἰς ἀ̣τ̣[ενεῖ]ς ὀφρ̣ύας οἰνοχόων
αἰτήσεις ὁρόω[ν] ὅ̣τ̣' ἐλεύθερος ἀτμένα σαίνει —
βάλλωμεν χαλεπῶι φάρμακον ἐν πόματι,
Θεύγενες· ὅσσ[α] δ̣' ἐμεῖο σ[έ]θεν πάρα θυμὸς ἀκοῦσαι
ἰχαίνει, τάδε μοι λ[έ]ξον [ἀνειρομέν]ωι·

[31] The following discussion owes a great deal to R.L. HUNTER, "Callimachus swings (frr.178 and 43 Pf.)", in *Ramus* 25 (1996), 18-26.

"He invited his friends to a meal, and among them a stranger, who stayed in Egypt for the first time, on some private business; he was an Ician by birth and I shared a couch with him, not by prior arrangement, but the word of Homer, that the god always brings like to like, is very true. For he too abhorred drinking wine with his mouth opened wide in large Thracian draughts, but enjoyed a small cup. To him I spoke as follows when the bowl went round for the third time, after I had learned his name and family: 'This word is very true indeed, that wine needs not only a share of water, but also of conversation. Let us throw this into the difficult drink as an antidote, Theogenes (for it is not served round in ladles and you will not ask for it, looking at the unbending eyebrows of the cup-bearers, at a time when a free man fawns upon a slave); but whatever my heart wishes to hear from you you must tell me at my asking'."

Here the setting of the symposium recalls a well-known framework for the telling of stories or for intellectual or philosophical conversation[32]. The explicit preference for the small cup and civilized conversation of both the narrator and Theogenes already suggests that the reader may expect a story in the refined Callimachean manner, but several allusions help to complete and extend this picture.

First of all the presentation of Theogenes contains several allusions which draw the reader's attention to Odysseus, another famous narrator at a symposium (although only one of the allusions refers directly to the Phaeacian episode).

In fr. 178,6-7 the introduction of Theogenes contains several words and phrases which may be thought to evoke Odysseus, like A[ἰ]γύπτωι ... ἀνεστρέφετο which recalls *Od.*13,325f. (Odysseus:) τιν' ἄλλην | γαῖαν ἀναστρέφομαι, where the middle

[32] The symposium-setting for the story is an old device, the most famous poetic example being Odysseus' stories told to the Phaeacians (*Od.*8,57ff.; cf. also e.g. *Od.*3,102ff.; 4,265ff.; APOLL.RH. 2,468ff.; 759ff.). Besides, the insistence on talk over drink in fr.178,11ff. also recalls a motif from the philosophical *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon. On the symposium as a literary framework see further e.g. J. MARTIN, *Symposion. Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form* (Paderborn 1931); K. GIESEKING, *Die Rahmenerzählung in Ovids Metamorphosen* (Diss. Tübingen 1964), 67ff.; R. KANNICHT, "Thalia", in *Das Fest*, hrsg. von W. HAUG und R. WARNING (München 1989), 29-52, esp.36ff.

form of the verb is a Homeric hapax (the active is found once in *Il.*23,436)[33].

In fr. 178,9-10 the proverbial expression, which is well-attested in other sources as well[34], is explicitly attributed to Homer, so that the reader is referred to its first occurrence, where it refers to Odysseus, in *Od.*17,217f. (Melantheus adressing Eumaeus, who has brought the beggar Odysseus to the town:) νῦν μὲν δὴ μάλα πάγχυ κακὸς κακὸν ἡγηλάζει,| ὡς αἰεὶ (v.l. αἰεί τοι) τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ὡς (v.l. ἐς) τὸν ὁμοῖον. This reminiscence may also remind the reader of the wider context in Homer, where Melantheus scolds Odysseus as a beggar and δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντήρα (220), who is asking for pieces of bread (cf. αἰτίζων in 222 and 228, to which fr. 178,19 αἰτήσεις may refer). Thus the reader may briefly wonder about the character of the guest Theogenes, whom he had just started to compare with Odysseus, and then find that there is a big contrast between Melantheus' view of Odysseus and the behaviour of the guests Theogenes and Callimachus, who are presented as an asset to the party they attend[35]. Besides, the reader may observe that although Callimachus takes over the Homeric phrase quite literally, he puts his own stamp upon it by the intricate word-order, in which all words change place in relation to the original phrase (aptly described as a "programmatically 'un-Homeric' word-order" by Hunter [n.31], 19).

[33] Other reminiscences are somewhat less compelling: (1) for καινός (not found in Homer, but well-attested in poetry and prose from V BC onwards) cf. EUR. *Telephus* fr.149,11f. Austin (= fr.727c,11f. K in Collard-Cropp-Lee = II,11f. Diggle) (Achilles:) μῶν καὶ σὺ καινὸς ποντίας ἀπὸ χθονὸς | ἥκεις, Ὀδυσσεῦ, although the similarity may be accidental; (2) for ἴδιόν τι κατὰ χρέος cf. *Od.*1,408f. (Eurymachus asking Telemachus about Mentes:) ἠέ τιν' ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοιο,| ἢ ἑὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδ' ἱκάνει and 3,82 (Telemachus to Nestor about his search for news about Odysseus:) πρῆξις δ' ἥδ' ἰδίη, οὐ δήμιος.

[34] Cf. e.g. PLAT. *Smp.*195b 5 ὁ γὰρ παλαιὸς λόγος εὖ ἔχει, ὡς ὅμοιον ὁμοίωι ἀεὶ πελάζει; *Grg.*510b 2ff.; ARISTAEN. 1,10,2f. ὁ γὰρ παλαιὸς λόγος εὖ ἔχει, ὡς ὅμοιον ὁμοίωι κατὰ θεῖον ἀεὶ προσπελάζει (about Acontius and Cydippe); adesp. *Anthol.Pal.* 15,48,5. See further e.g. C. COLLARD on EUR. *Bellerophon* fr.296.

[35] For this view and further observations on this passage see also HUNTER (n.31), 19-21.

From fr. 178,11 onwards the notion of excessive drinking is rejected and at the same time its dangers are illustrated by further references to the *Odyssey*. Fr. 178,11 contains the adverb χανδόν, which is first attested in *Od.*21,293f. (where Antinous rudely warns Odysseus about too much drinking:) οἶνος σε τρώει μελιηδής, ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους | βλάπτει, ὃς ἄν μιν χανδὸν ἕληι μηδ' αἴσιμα πίνηι. In fr. 178,12 ὀλίγωι ... κισσυβίωι the noun κισσύβιον (which properly indicates a rustic bowl) again refers the reader to drinking in the *Odyssey*, as the word is attested three times in Homer: of the cup in which Eumaeus mixed wine for Odysseus in *Od.*14,78 (= 16,52) ἐν δ' ἄρα κισσυβίωι κίρνη μελιηδέα οἶνον and of the bowl from which Polyphemus rapidly drunk the wine offered to him by Odysseus in *Od.*9,346 κισσύβιον ... μέλανος οἴνοιο; in the latter case the κισσύβιον was probably a large vessel (because of the size of the Cyclops). Athen. 11,477 c-e accused Callimachus of using the word unaccurately here instead of the more civilized ἄλεισον, but modern authors[36] have pointed to the probably programmatic[37] oxymoron ὀλίγωι ... κισσυβίωι and the deliberate contrast it seems to create between Theogenes and the Cyclops, who was destroyed by drink. This contrast seems to be emphasized by other references to Polyphemus' behaviour: cf. also (1) fr. 178,12 ἥδετο and *Od.* 9,353 ἥσατο (sc. Polyphemus after drinking), where this verb is hapax; (2) fr. 178,14 τὸ τρίτον, which refers to the third round of drinks, after which one reached the stage of immoderate drinking, and according to Hunter (n.31), 21 again points to the contrast between Callimachus and Theogenes, who began their conversation after the third round, and Polyphemus, who fatally fell asleep after three drinks (*Od.* 9,371ff.); and (3) εὖτ' ἐδάην οὔνομα καὶ γενεήν, where the fact that the

[36] See e.g. CAMERON (n.16), 136; HUNTER (n.31), 20-1; differently A. RENGAKOS, "Homerische Wörter bei Kallimachos", in *ZPE* 94 (1992), 21-47, esp.29.

[37] The adjective ὀλίγωι may well have a programmatic connotation; so also CAMERON (n.16), 136 ("the epithet that so misdescribes the kissybion is one of those Callimachean code-words for little-and-pure"). Cf. *h.* 2,112 ὀλίγη λιβάς; fr.1,9 [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος; and for a similar idea fr.465.

information is mentioned at this point, after the third round of drinks, recalls *Od.* 9,361ff., where Odysseus tells Polyphemus his 'name' after giving him three drinks.

In fr. 178,20 the reader seems to be referred to *Od.*4,220f. εἰς οἶνον βάλε (sc. Helen) φάρμακον, ἔνθεν ἔπινον,| νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων, where Helen's φάρμακον, which is described at length in the following lines, helps Menelaus, Telemachus and Pisistratus to forget the miseries of the Trojan war and its aftermath, about which they have been talking. For the reader this quiet party provides a contrast with the rough and fateful drinking of Polyphemus, but at the same time the allusion seems to invite him to ponder over the subtle contrast between Helen's φάρμακον, which caused oblivion of the Trojan war, and the φάρμακον used by Callimachus and Theogenes, which consisted in remembering and retelling a story related to the Trojan war (i.e. the subsequent fate of old Peleus). Besides, the allusion may have reminded readers that there was an allegorical interpretation of Helen's φάρμακον, which explained it as eloquence[38], but there is no way of establishing whether this explanation was already known to Callimachus.

At the end of the introduction, in fr. 178,21-2, the narrator formulates his question in words which are reminiscent of *Od.* 9,12f. (Odysseus to Alcinous:) σοὶ δ' ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμὸς ἐπετράπετο στονόεντα | εἴρεσθαι, which, like the beginning of the introduction, again reminds the reader of the similarities between Theogenes and Odysseus, this time particularly as sources of information[39], and seems to be a signal that the story is now soon to begin, as in *Od.* 9.

Summarizing one may say that in this introduction the large amount of Odyssean reminiscences, which fit in neatly with the framework of the symposium as well as with the story about the aftermath of the Trojan war, helps to underline the

[38] Cf. PLU. *Quaest.conv.* 1,4, 614 B; MACR. *Sat.* 7,1,18.
[39] See HUNTER (n.31), 26 n.38.

fragment's programmatic aspects. When one reads the fragment at face value it indicates simply that the narrator and his source prefer intellectual discourse over much drinking. When the allusions are taken into account the reader becomes aware that he is going to be presented with a story of Odyssean qualities and that the pleasures of listening to Theogenes at the symposium of Pollis will equal those of the guests at the court of Alcinous listening to Odysseus. The notion that these pleasures are largely due to the moderate and careful behaviour of the secondary narrator, who avoids the dangers of excessive drink and puts in the right kind of φάρμακον, are brought home by the allusions to Polyphemus and Helen, which seem to be embedded as negative foils between the references to Theogenes as Odysseus. At the same time the primary narrator claims his share in these qualities by emphasizing that he is similar to Theogenes (fr. 178,9f.) and by his address of him in fr. 178,15-22: in this way he seems to suggest that the 'Odyssean' story will be so in a 'Callimachean' manner.

4.4. Elegiac and epic Argonauts

A complicated example of the intertextual interaction between the *Aetia* and contemporary epic is found in the *aition* of the scurrilous ritual for Apollo Aegletes at Anaphe (fr. 7,19 — fr.21), which is the second *aition* in the first book of the *Aetia*. In this *aition* the reader is repeatedly referred to Apollonius' treatment of the same story in Apoll.Rh. 4,1694-1730, where it is the last major adventure of the Argonauts, and to the *Argonautica* as a whole. It is, however, not clear whether Callimachus' treatment was later than Apollonius' or *vice versa* or whether perhaps both versions were written during the same period of time. Therefore we cannot be sure that the intertextual relations between the two episodes can be interpreted in the same way as in the other passages discussed, i.e. as if the allusions are a means by which Callimachus may be steering the

reader's perception, but, even so, it may be worthwhile to explore the implications of such an interpretation[40].

The *aition* began with the departure of the Argonauts from Colchis and an angry speech of Aeetes (fr. 7,23ff.), which may have concerned the death of Apsyrtus, which in the *Aetia* took place in Colchis (fr. 8). Then, apparently, the return-journey of the Argonauts was told: they followed the same route as on their outward journey (fr. 9) and were followed by two groups of Colchians, one of which went through the Ister and therefore did not find the Argonauts and eventually settled on the Illyrian coast (fr. 10 and 11). The other group followed the Argonauts through the Bosporus and found them at Corcyra with the Phaeacians, where they settled, because they were not allowed to take Medea home to Colchis (fr. 12-15). During a later phase of the journey the Argonauts were hit by a sudden, complete darkness (fr. 17) and Jason prayed for help to Apollo (fr. 18), who then showed the small island of Anaphe near the Melantean rocks (fr. 19-20?). Here the Argonauts celebrated their rescue, built an altar for Apollo Aegletes and indulged in jesting with Medea and her Phaeacian servants (fr. 21), thus establishing a scurrilous ritual for Apollo.

The presentation of the story in Callimachus draws attention to its selectivity and compactness, which seems to be underlined by a number of allusions. In fr. 7,23ff. "Αἰ]γλήτην [Ἀνά]φην τε, Λακωνίδι γείτονα Θ[ήρηι, | π]ρῶτ[ον ἐνὶ μ]νήμηι κάτθεο καὶ Μινύας, | ἄ[ρχμενος ὡς] ἥρωες ἀπ' Αἰήταο Κυταίου | αὖτις ἐς ἀρχαίην] ἔπλεον Αἱμονίην Calliope begins by indicating the

[40] See also M.A. HARDER, "Aspects of the Structure of Callimachus' *Aetia*", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. HARDER, R.F. REGTUIT, G.C. WAKKER, Hellenistica Groningana 1 (Groningen 1993), 99-110. For a recent discussion of the relative chronology of Callimachus and Apollonius see A. KÖHNKEN, "Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius", in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. by T.D. PAPANGHELIS and A. RENGAKOS (Leiden 2001), 73-92, esp. 77ff., where he argues that all the evidence points to Apollonius drawing on all four books of the *Aetia*. However, at least in the case of the Argonauts the evidence may well be less straightforward than it seems and the whole issue seems to demand further investigation.

subject of the following story in a very compact way and invites her audience to think of Aegletes, Anaphe and the Argonauts, starting at the moment when they returned from Colchis to Greece. In this way she immediately transports the reader to the end of the Argonauts' journey. The whole well-known epic story, as told at length by Apollonius, is thus skipped. Then Aeetes' angry speech in fr. 7,27ff. recalls A.R. 4,212ff. (with several verbal reminiscences), where Aeetes also reacts to Medea's treason and the departure of the Argonauts, and fr. 10-15 recall the Colchian episodes in A.R. 4,507ff. and 1206ff., where the Colchians settle on the Illyrian coast and, temporarily, with the Phaeacians. Besides, as far as we may judge from the fragments, the order of events in Callimachus seems to have been like that in Ps.-Apollod. 1,9,25f., where the Argonauts come to the Phaeacians (where the Colchians give up their pursuit and settle in the area) and their departure from Phaeacia is followed immediately by the story of Anaphe. In Apollonius, however, the departure from Phaeacia is followed by the Argonauts' adventures in Libya and Crete (A.R. 4,1170-1693), and only after that they arrive at Anaphe. The result of Callimachus' treatment is that his Argonautic *aition* looks like an anthology from Apollonius' fourth book, focusing on three passages from it and reminding the reader that all that preceded had been left out.

Several small-scale allusions seem to help to draw the reader's attention to Callimachus' distortion of the beginning and ending of the Argonauts' story and to the fact that he left most of it out:

(1) fr. 7,23 Αἰ]γλήτην [Ἀνά]φην τε recalls A.R. 4,1730 Αἰγλήτην Ἀνάφης τιμήορον, where the same words in the same metrical position mark the *end* of the story of Anaphe. Like the overall arrangement of the stories of Anaphe in the *Aetia* and the *Argonautica* this similarity of opening and concluding lines too suggests a deliberate allusion, designed to draw the reader's attention to the fact that beginnings can become endings and *vice versa*;

(2) fr. 7,25f. ἄ[ρχμενος ὡς] ἥρωες ἀπ' Αἰήταο ...|... ἔπλεον recalls *Od.*8,499-502 θεοῦ ἄρχετο, φαῖνε δ' ἀοιδήν,| ἔνθεν ἕλων ὡς ...|... ἀπέπλειον ...| Ἀργεῖοι, sc. Demodocus, who sings

about the Trojan horse at the request of Odysseus. The implication of this allusion may be that, like the famous and talented singer of the Phaeacians, Callimachus and his Muse too began their story at the end (and the reader may also be reminded of the fact that the *Iliad* contained an episode of the last year of the Trojan war and that the *Odyssey* began with the last stage of Odysseus' travels). There may well be a deliberate contrast between this approach and that of Apollonius, who began his story at the beginning and drew attention to this sequence through Jason's chronological report of the events so far to Lycus in 2,762ff. and his emphasis on Lycus' delight (cf. 2,771f. ὁ δ' ἑξείης ἐνέποντος | θέλγετ' ἀκοῆι θυμόν, sc. Lycus);

(3) fr. 7,25f. also recalls *Od.*12,70 Ἀργὼ πασιμέλουσα, παρ' Αἰήταο πλέουσα, about the Argo sailing through the Planctae with Hera's help, an event which is told at length in A.R. 4,922ff., where it is part of the last stage of the journey before the Argonauts reach Phaeacia (in 4,982ff.). Although the indication is slight and we do not know the full contents of Callimachus' treatment of the Argonauts' return journey, one should bear in mind the possibility that this phrase too was meant to remind the attentive reader of what was left out of his story;

(4) fr. 12,6 κ̣α̣ὶ̣ τ̣ὰ̣ μὲν ὡ̣[ς ἤμελλε μετὰ χρόνον ἐκτελέεσθαι (about the later migrations of the Colchians) recalls *Il.*12,34f. ὡς ἄρ' ἔμελλον (ὡς ἤμελλον Zenodotus) ὄπισθε Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων | θησέμεναι (about the destruction of the Greek wall) and A.R. 1,1309 καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς ἤμελλε μετὰ χρόνον ἐκτελέεσθαι (about the death of the Boreads) as well as 4,1216 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν στείχοντος ἄδην αἰῶνος ἐτύχθη (in the same context as fr. 12,6). An intertextual relation between the passages in Apollonius and Callimachus seems likely[41], but it is not certain how this must

[41] See also A. ARDIZZONI on 1,1309; E. LIVREA on 4,1216; FRAENKEL (n.7), 151; differently G.W. MOONEY on 1,1309, who regards the similarity as accidental. KÖHNKEN (n.40), 77 insists that Apollonius is here alluding to Callimachus, because of the *scholion* on A.R. 1,1309 Καλλιμάχου ὁ στίχος. Although this is a valid argument, it is no 'proof', because the scholiast may have been wrongly influenced by the biographical tradition which regarded Apollonius as

be interpreted: one might think that, if Apollonius was first, Callimachus may have emphasized the fact that he 'compressed' the Argonauts' travels into the Anaphe-story and placed it early in the *Aetia* by using a line from the early part of the *Argonautica* in a situation where Apollonius had a similar line later in his work (i.e. A.R. 4,1216)[42];

(5) fr. 18,1ff.

]τε ṭ[Τυ]νδαρίδαι
] . μνης[ ]ς Δία πρῶτον ἵκ[ο]ṇτọ
] . ἄλ̣λ̣ους ητεσαṇ ἀ[θ]ạνάτoụς
ἀοσ]σητῆρας ἐυστείρ[. . . .] . ελέ[.]ο . [.]·
ἀλλ' ὅγ' ἀνι]άζων ὃν κέαρ Αἰσονίδης
σοὶ χέρας ἠέρ]ταζεν, Ἰήιε, πολλὰ δ' ἀπείλει
ἐς Πυθὼ πέ]μψειν, πολλὰ δ' ἐς Ὀρτυγίην,
εἴ κεν ἀμιχ]θαλόεσσαν ἀπ' ἠέρα νηὸς ἐλάσσῃς
] . ὅτι σήν, Φοῖβε, κατ' αἰσιμίην
πείσματ'] ἔλυσαν ἐκ[λ]ηρώσαντό τ' ἐρετμά
]πικρὸν ἔκὀψαν ὕδωρ·
] . . ἐπώνυμον Ἐμβασίοιο
] . . . εν . . Παγα[σ]αῖς

"But the son of Aeson, grieved in his heart, raised his hands to you, Ieius, and promised to send many gifts to Pytho and many to Ortygia, if you would drive the dark mist from the ship..., because according to your oracle, Phoebus, they had loosened the ropes and allotted the oars... and beaten the bitter water..."

This passage contained prayers for help by the Dioscuri and Jason, the first praying to Zeus and the other gods (1-4), the latter

Callimachus' pupil. Apollonius' use of the unhomeric ἤμελλε (attested only as a variant reading in *Il.*12,34, and not found elsewhere in Apollonius) may be accounted for as an allusion to Callimachus, but also as a means to remind the reader of one of the very few instances of 'external prolepsis' in Homer (see M.A. HARDER, "*Untrodden Paths*: Where Do They Lead?", in *HSCP* 93 [1990], 287-309, esp.301).

[42] If Callimachus was first, Apollonius may have deliberately moved the line from Callimachus' Anaphe-episode to the early part of his *Argonautica* and referred the reader to what he had done by inserting a similar line in 4,1216, thus drawing attention to his extensive and well-ordered treatment of the story of the Argonauts.

praying to Apollo in particular, promising gifts and reminding the god that he told the Argonauts to undertake this journey (5ff.). This passage is intertextually connected with several passages in Apollonius: the prayer of the Dioscuri recalls A.R. 4,588ff. (when the Argo has ordered the Argonauts to go to Circe for purification); the first part of Jason's prayer recalls the Anaphe episode in A.R. 4,1701ff. (when the Argonauts are despairing) αὐτὰρ Ἰήσων | χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενος μεγάληι ὀπὶ Φοῖβον ἀύτει,| ῥύσασθαι καλέων, κατὰ δ' ἔρρεεν ἀσχαλόωντι | δάκρυα· πολλὰ δὲ Πυθοῖ ὑπέσχετο, πολλὰ δ' Ἀμύκλαις,| πολλὰ δ' ἐς Ὀρτυγίην ἀπερείσια δῶρα κομίσσειν; the whole of Jason's prayer, however, recalls his prayer to Apollo Embasius (to whom the Argonauts sacrifice in A.R. 1,402ff.), at the departure of the Argonauts in A.R. 1,411ff. κλῦθι ἄναξ, Παγασάς τε πόλιν τ' Αἰσωνίδα ναίων,| ..., ὅς μοι ὑπέστης | Πυθοῖ χρειομένωι ἄνυσιν καὶ πείραθ' ὁδοῖο | σημανέειν, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐπαίτιος ἔπλευ ἀέθλων· αὐτὸς νῦν ἄγε νῆα ... σοὶ δ' ἂν ὀπίσσω | τόσσων, ὅσσοι κεν νοστήσομεν, ἀγλαὰ ταύρων | ἱρὰ πάλιν βωμῶι ἐπιθήσομεν· ἄλλα δὲ Πυθοῖ, | ἄλλα δ' ἐς Ὀρτυγίην ἀπερείσια δῶρα κομίσσω. | νῦν δ' ἴθι, καὶ τήνδ' ἧμιν, Ἑκηβόλε, δέξο θυηλήν, | ἥν τοι τῆσδ' ἐπίβαθρα χάριν προτεθείμεθα νηὸς | πρωτίστην· λύσαιμι δ', ἄναξ, ἐπ' ἀπήμονι μοίρηι | πείσματα σὴν διὰ μῆτιν .... Again one could think of Callimachus compressing Apollonius' tale by combining elements from its beginning and end[43] and a discussion about size and composition of their respective Argonautic stories may well be behind these allusions. Another interesting aspect of the prayer in Callimachus is that it includes, in a nutshell, several elements from the beginning of the story: the decree of Apollo, the departure and allotment of the benches, and the sacrifice to Apollo Embasius in Pagasae. Thus Callimachus' brief episode seems to

[43] Alternatively one could think of either Apollonius drawing out Callimachus' tale by referring to this scene at the beginning and towards the end of his *Argonautica*. For the idea that A.R. 1,414 ἐπαίτιος indicates his debt to the *Aetia* see R.V. Albis, "Jason's Prayers to Apollo in *Aetia* 1 and the *Argonautica*", in *Phoenix* 49 (1995), 104-9.

encompass the whole story of the Argonauts, but not in the usual chronological order[44].

In conclusion one may say that in Callimachus' Argonautic *aition* the differences between the short elegiac treatment of the journey of the Argonauts and the epic treatment as found in Apollonius' *Argonautica* become manifest through the allusions. This applies if one considers Callimachus to be reacting to Apollonius' treatment, but if Apollonius wrote after Callimachus the allusions in *his* work could also be interpreted as emphasizing the epic manner of dealing with the story, with its complete treatment of all the events and its proper chronological order[45].

5. *Conclusion*

From the material discussed above we may infer that for Callimachus in the *Aetia* allusions were more than just a learned adornment, display of virtuosity or coming to terms with predecessors whose 'influence' had to be dealt with in some way. Instead of that they appear to be an important means for extending his dense and compact text on behalf of the reader. The reader who is aware of the allusions and has the relevant texts in his mind or on his bookshelves is able to acquire a great deal of extra information, on the one hand concerning the actual stories, on the other hand at a meta-poetic and programmatic level, so that he is able to situate the text he is reading in its literary and socio-cultural context.

[44] Similarly *Callimaco. Introduzione, traduzione e note* di G.B. D'ALESSIO (1 *Inni. Epigrammi. Ecale*; 2 *Aitia. Giambi e altri frammenti*) (Milano 1996), 2,397 n.69.

[45] For the notion of 'transitory intertextuality' as yet another possibility see the discussion at the end of this paper.

DISCUSSION

S. Stephens: It is important to distinguish the ways intertextuality and allusion differ conceptually. The former is theoretically constructed as reader response to a text received within a specific textual environment. Hence the existence and identification of a series of intertexts within that environment allow one to talk about the effect of the text without any specific assumptions about authorial intent. Allusion is conceived of as an authorial activity *vis-à-vis* a specific audience and operates with concepts like 'ideal reader'. In our discussion we seem to be moving from one to the other without due concern for the consequences for our arguments. The advantage to casting your discussion as intertextuality is that it frees the argument from the unanswerable question of authorial intent.

M.A. Harder: I agree that your distinction is important and that the concept of intertextuality as you define it has the advantage of methodological purity. On the other hand, this approach, according to which a text would exist and be open to interpretation only within its *textual* environment, would, I think, make it difficult to discuss the way in which the text could function in its social and cultural context at the time when it was written. In order to be able to explore these matters the concept of 'allusion' seems to me necessary. Even though it is true that one can never answer the questions of authorial intent, I think one could at least explore what answers to such questions could be suggested by the evidence and thus form a hypothesis about Callimachus' use of allusion that may be useful for shaping the way we look at important issues in Hellenistic poetry.

F. Montanari: Mi piace molto l'evocazione di un 'lettore ideale' degli *Aitia* callimachei nella conclusione, un lettore che

capisce (e si sforza di capire) le allusioni e conosce i testi necessari per questo. Il lettore ideale storico, in questo senso, è dunque proprio il grammatico erudito, che legge e interpreta perché ha gli strumenti culturali per farlo. Nella parte finale del mio intervento sottolineavo come la poesia alessandrina, in particolare Callimaco, per lo spessore ricercato e 'difficile' dei suoi contenuti, certamente stimola l'esegesi e 'provoca' il lettore a cercare di capire (e a fissare delle annotazioni per capire?). Il lettore ideale di Callimaco non è forse un... Aristarco?

L. Lehnus: At the end of your paper you speak of a "reader who is aware of the allusions and has the relevant texts in his mind or on his bookshelves". Could you spend some more words on which kind of reader — ancient, modern, or perhaps both — you have in mind?

M.A. Harder: Basically the reader, whom I have described in rather concrete terms at the end of my paper, is the 'ideal reader', as constructed and evoked by the text: a reader who is able to recognize and interpret the allusions to earlier texts. As we have just seen this concept is not without problems, but the notion of the 'ideal reader' is closely linked to the concept of allusion which I have used in my paper. And, yes, if we were to look for an example in the real world of this kind of reader of Callimachus' work he might well be a scholar like Aristarchus.

S. Stephens: Within modern critical theory intertextuality is constructed to include all texts, not just poetry. Yet when we talk about ancient poetry, we seem to restrict intertexts to poetic models. The effect of this tendency for Hellenistic poetry is to locate its production entirely within the poetic models of the past (hence its antiquarian look) while ignoring both earlier and contemporary prose traditions, with the result that much of what might have been contemporary culture is *de facto* eliminated.

M.A. Harder: To a large extent this is true, but then the texts themselves seem to direct us towards their poetic models much

more than to prose traditions. Even so, we do get glimpses of other traditions in the *Aetia*: there is, e.g., the long summary of the prose-work by Xenomedes in fr. 75,54ff. and there are references to various sources in fr. 92,2f. (the 'Leandrian Tales') and fr. 103 (the κύρβις), and implicitly Timaeus may be present in the parts of the *Aetia* which deal with the Sicily and the West. I can imagine that a careful and systematic investigation of the way in which all this material has been worked in could help to place Hellenistic poetry in a broader and less confined cultural context.

Th. Fuhrer: I am really inclined to take the examples which illustrate Acontius' feelings during his wedding-night at 'face-value', as you call it. Is there not a certain danger to read more into the text only after Reinsch-Werner made this suggestion that we might also think of sterility and death? I would prefer to say that we are allowed to think this way, but we should be cautious to attribute these thoughts too quickly to the mind of the author.

P.J. Parsons: A bit more general discussion may be needed about the 'baggage' carried by mythological references. How far, or by what means, can we know that τὰ ἔξω τοῦ δράματος are or should be present to the reader's mind?

M.A. Harder: I agree that there is no way in which we can be certain that these allusions were 'intended' by the author and that they were picked up by readers at any given time. We can only say that the text may evoke the notions of sterility and death, which are connected to Iphiclus and Midas in the tradition, and that an 'ideal reader' may pick them up (which brings us back to the questions about the concept of 'allusion' discussed earlier).

As to this specific case one might argue that at least the fate of Iphiclus may well have been known to learned Alexandrian readers (see n.11), so that in this respect the demands on the 'ideal reader' do not seem unrealistic. The fact that Reinsch-Werner was the first to point out these aspects of Iphiclus and

Midas is not, I think, a reason for assuming that the connection is too far-fetched: if the text suggests this kind of allusion to the tradition one should explore its implications (although I fully agree that one should be very careful).

Th. Fuhrer: The function of the break-off formula to avoid narrating heroic deeds is Pindaric as well as Callimachean: in *P.* 4,247ff. Pindar breaks off the tale of Jason's killing of the dragon and the following heroic episodes. What is specifically Callimachean then, is that the text in fr. 57,1-4 makes the reader and Heracles cooperate in taking over the narrator's role (see on this device also D. Meyer, "Die Einbeziehung des Lesers in den Epigrammen des Kallimachos", in *Callimachus*, ed. by M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker [Groningen 1993], 161-75).

M.A. Harder: I am pleased that you agree with me that the notion of the cooperation between the narrator, reader and Heracles is typical of Callimachus. Even so, I think that also in his use of the breaking-off formula to avoid telling heroic deeds Callimachus goes further than Pindar in the passage you mentioned: in Pi. *P.* 4,224ff. Jason's yoking of the oxen and the plowing of the field is told at some length and his efforts are said to be much admired by those around him, and when in 247ff. a breaking-off formula leads up to a one-line description of the killing of the dragon in 249 one feels that, indeed, after 224ff. a second, similar description of bravery would have been superfluous. Thus my impression is that here Pindar is using the breaking-off formula rather to keep the description of heroic deeds within bounds, whereas in fr. 57,1-4 Callimachus seems to leave out Heracles' heroic exploit altogether (having replaced it by Molorcus' battle with the mice).

R. Hunter: Some points of contact (e.g. αἰνολέων) between *SH* 264,1-4 and [Theoc.] 25 support the view that the narrative avoided in Callimachus is that of the Nemean lion. Depending on one's view of the chronology, one poet has filled

in 'the gap' left by the other, or avoided a subject already treated at great length.

M.A. Harder: Thank you for adding this argument.

S. Stephens: Can we really imagine that the Greeks in early Alexandria were particularly scandalized by brother-sister-marriage or that a dirty epigram on the subject was the reason for Sotades' execution?

M.A. Harder: The Alexandrians were probably taught to accept this kind of marriage and referred to the example of Hera and Zeus as a worthy precedent. If Pretagostini and Cameron are right, Sotades gave an obscene twist to this example and I think it is conceivable that Callimachus is here dissociating himself from that. Whether or not the poem was the cause of Sotades' execution is another matter: personally I think it likely that the biographical tradition about him thus simplified a far more complex state of affairs.

A.S. Hollis: On Call. fr. 75,4ff. I agree that the secret marriage of Zeus and Hera does not provide an obvious *aetion* for the Naxian fertility rite. A scholar whose identity I do not know once suggested to me that the strange story in *Schol.ad* Theoc. 15,64 (p.90 Dübner) might lie behind this *aposiopesis*. Callimachus is surely teasing his erudite readers. When he says that he is lucky not to have been initiated at Eleusis, could he want us to remember the story that Aeschylus was accused of revealing the mysteries (Arist. *EN* 3,1,17, 1111a)?

M.A. Harder: Thank you for the reference. As to Aeschylus, yes, it is conceivable that Callimachus wanted us to remember the story about him revealing the mysteries, although, on the other hand, the risks of violating the secrecy of the Eleusinian mysteries were probably well-known, so that a reference to them would not necessarily evoke one particular story.

P.J. Parsons: Two other possible explanations of fr. 75,4-7, to avoid Cameron's convolutions. (1) Using the Naxian rite: ἀμφιθαλεῖ corresponds to τοκῆας in *Il.* 14,296; so παιδί refers to the *age* of Zeus and Hera; so it is not the marriage as such, but the precocity which is shameful. (2) What is shameful is not the marriage, but the possible voyeurism of the poet in recounting the details. So 5 τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη corresponds to τὰ μὴ θεμιτά in *Hymn* 5,78 and elsewhere of seeing divine nakedness?

M.A. Harder: Thank you for your suggestions. As to (1) I am somewhat doubtful, because I am not sure that παιδί in this kind of context could evoke the notion of precocious sex. The ritual of the bride spending the night before the wedding with a young boy whose parents were both alive did not take the form of a ritual marriage, but simply of sleeping with such a boy, because that was believed to promote fertility (see e.g. E. Kagarow, "Der Naxische Hochzeitsgebrauch", in *ARW* 26 [1928], 362, who gives parallels from other cultures). As to (2), I shall have to think about that. My first impression is that in *h.* 5,78 the emphasis is more clearly on seeing so that there can be no doubt about the notion of 'voyeurism', whereas in fr. 75,5 τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη "what is against divine law" seems to be more general.

L. Lehnus: I fully share your caution in not overstating the ambiguity of the lock's gender. It is true that at fr. 110,8 and 110,62 a masculine recurs (βόστρυχος, πλόκαμος), but in both cases the accompanying first-person pronoun makes graphically clear that the queen is speaking through her lock.

M.A. Harder: Thank you for your observation.

S. Stephens: Do you think that the metatextual opening of the *Aetia* - which consists of a series of near quotations from previous writers on the nature of poetry (Aristophanes, Hesiod, Plato, at least) — would condition or predispose a reader to a deeper or more consistently intertextual reading than usual?

(This is taking what you suggest and pushing it forward to the prologue.) Do you think Callimachus may have been the creator of this style?

M.A. Harder: Yes, I think it would. One could regard the emphatically metatextual prologue as a kind of key given to the reader of the *Aetia*, which showed him how he should read this work if he were not to fall into the trap into which the Telchines fell, who apparently read Callimachus' work in the 'wrong' way and therefore were not able to appreciate it.

Although intertextuality is also an important aspect of the work of poets like Apollonius and Theocritus, I have the impression that the way in which Callimachus makes use of it is typical of him and may well have been created by him. Roughly speaking one could say that the work of Apollonius and Theocritus can also be appreciated and enjoyed by readers who do not pick up the allusions, whereas in Callimachus, and particularly in the *Aetia*, such readers would miss too much and might regard the stories as flat and antiquarian.

Th. Fuhrer: In what sense does the imagery of the burden of old age in the *Aetia* prologue get enlightened by the allusion to the passage in Euripides' *Heracles*? In what sense can we assume that the reader would have to be conditioned?

M.A. Harder: This question touches upon a concrete example of what we have just discussed in more general terms. I think that the choral song in Eur. *HF* 637ff. elaborates the aspects of singing in old age mentioned briefly in the *Aetia*-prologue: the burden of old age, the wish to escape from it, the lasting devotion of the Muses, and the conviction that thanks to them singing like a swan is still possible are treated by Callimachus in only ca. 9 lines, but for the reader who reads the passage from the *Heracles* as well these notions are, as it were, brought to life by the old chorus' song and the impact of Callimachus' statement may be heightened by this. On the

other hand, other issues are also brought to the reader's attention: Callimachus' briefness may stand out against the longer treatment in the *Heracles* and may invite comparison, elegiac and lyric treatment of similar issues may be contrasted, the fact that the chorus will sing about Heracles may help to foreshadow the subject of some of the *aitia*. Summarizing one may say that the reader is invited to think about several issues that go beyond the surface of the text and is thus being prepared for reading the *Aetia*.

S. Stephens: Do the repeated evocations of the *Odyssey* tend to build up so that, again, the reader is conditioned to look for further Odyssean elements, as it were, to construct an Odyssean subtext?

M.A. Harder: Do you mean in fr. 178? I guess they do. It would be very interesting, in this respect, if we had the full story of Peleus at Icus, which seems to have been connected with the *nostos*-story of Neoptolemus and thus could be thought to 'invite' the construction of an Odyssean subtext.

A.S. Hollis: One could make a similar analysis between Callimachus' own poems (e.g. Heracles and Thiodamas in *Aetia* 1 and *Hymn* 3, talking birds and a catalogue of olives in the *Hecale* and the fourth *Iambus*). In some ways it would be more convenient for you if Apollonius' *Argonautica* pre-dated Callimachus' *Aetia*, but I do find that hard to believe with respect to *Aetia* 1-2. It seems possible that the order of precedence is not always the same: early Callimachus (*Aetia* 1-2) could influence, but late Callimachus be influenced by, Apollonius Rhodius.

P.J. Parsons: One should perhaps consider the notion of transitory intertextuality, if parts e.g. of Apollonius Rhodius' poem circulated on paper or by recitation before the substantive text was 'published' (cf. the evidence of the προέκδοσις).

M.A. Harder: Yes, it would certainly be worthwhile investigating the passages where Callimachus seems to refer to his own work (there are also, e.g., the interesting examples of the Hyperborean sacrifices and Apollo's killing of Python).

As to the chronology of Callimachus and Apollonius I agree that it is hard to imagine that the whole of the *Argonautica* was written before Callimachus began the *Aetia*. The notion of transitory intertextuality, at which you both hint, might indeed help here, and one should, perhaps, even bear in mind the possibility that Callimachus re-arranged or re-formulated bits of *Aetia* 1-2 as well when he combined these books with *Aetia* 3-4, perhaps in order to make the final edition of the *Aetia* into yet another chapter in an ongoing dialogue with the *Argonautica*.

P.J. Parsons: Is there any influence of *Pythian* 4 for narrating the end of the story of the Argonauts and for ἄρχμενος in fr.7,25?

M.A. Harder: There may well be, as it is striking that Pindar in *P.* 4,9ff. begins his story of the Argonauts with Medea's prophecy at Thera, towards the end of their journey, and only in 70ff. tells about the beginning of the story (starting with a question in 70f., which recalls the traditional invocations of the Muses).

F. Montanari: Adesso siamo certi che l'inizio degli *Aitia* è πολλάκ͵ι μοι Τελχῖνες (cfr. F. Pontani, in *ZPE* 128 [1999], 57-59). Questo mi fa venire in mente il fr. 263 Pf. = 80 Hollis dell' *Ecale*, che si suppone appartenere alla chiusa del poema. Il frammento è tramandato con πολλάκι σεῖο all'inizio del terzo verso, seguito da una piccola ma irritante lacuna di una sillaba breve: è stata avanzata la possibilità (Maas, Pfeiffer) di supporre una lacuna più ampia, pensando che il frammento sia di quattro versi e spostando πολλάκι σεῖο alla fine del (supposto) terzo verso. Dobbiamo o possiamo ripensare a questo frammento dell'*Ecale* alla luce dell'inizio degli *Aitia* e in quale senso? C'è qualche rapporto fra i due?

L. Lehnus: Forse la differenza tra le due sistemazioni testuali (Pfeiffer e Maas) non è così importante. Qualunque sia la posizione di πολλάκι (meglio ovviamente se in inizio di verso), il richiamo potenziale tra inizio degli *Aitia* e fine dell'*Ecale* è molto attraente. Tanto più che, sul piano verbale, in entrambi i casi πολλάκι è seguito da un pronome personale.

M.A. Harder: This is certainly an interesting idea, which would be worth pursuing. Just as food for further thought I would like to add that the connection would be particularly interesting if the *Hecale* preceded the *Aetia* in an edition of Callimachus' works (but one should bear in mind that the *Diegeseis* suggest the order *Aetia* — *Iambi* and lyrical poems — *Hecale*): the first line of the *Aetia* could then be read as a reaction to the narrator's intention at the end of the *Hecale*; cf. *Ia.* fr. 191,1ff., where the boisterous appearance of Hipponax seems to confirm that, indeed, we have come to the 'pedestrian pastures' announced at the end of the *Aetia* in fr. 112,9.