Journal of Hellenic Studies 133 (2013) 147–157 doi:10.1017/S0075426913000098

REVIEW ARTICLE: CALLIMACHUS

JANE L. LIGHTFOOT
*University of Oxford**

In memoriam A.S. Hollis

Abstract: This paper discusses a new edition of Callimachus' *Aitia* by Annette Harder and a monograph, *Callimachus in Context*, by Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Susan Stephens. A 'contextual' focus is common to both works, the edition no less than the monograph, which tackles the poem on what Harder calls the micro-, macro- and meso-levels, in order, not only to establish readings, explicate *Realien* and clarify detail, but also to explore literary techniques, structure and the degree to which the poem reflects the society and culture in which it was written. Recent interpretations have seen catalogue technique and organization as fundamental to the *Aitia*'s poetics, and the review considers aspects of both the poem's structure and its contemporaneity – as well as the limitations of an excessively Alexandria-centric approach.

Keywords: Callimachus, Alexandria, aetiology, Ptolemies, catalogue

HARDER (A.) **Callimachus, *Aetia***. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 362, 1061. £225. 9780199581016.[1]

ACOSTA-HUGHES (B.) and STEPHENS (S.A.), **Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. xi +328. £60. 9781107008571.

> 'In art as in science there is no delight without the detail, and it is on details that I have tried to fix the reader's attention.'
>
> Vladimir Nabokov[2]

It is not the fact that both were 'displaced persons', nor their aristocratic hauteur, but a certain intellectual affinity that suggests prefacing an essay on Callimachus with a quotation from Nabokov. As a scientist, as a lepidopterist, he would have understood the fascination of the Alexandrian: the myriad detail of which his work is composed, the capacity of the Callimachean aesthetic to condense a world into an exquisite, tiny compass, the unpredictable swerves that make it so difficult to reconstruct, its compaction out of knowledge and its demands upon our own, its seductions 'into the shaded lanes that lead from the main road ... to the lovely and little known nooks of special knowledge', the infinite pains and care needed for its explication and the felicity of the scholar who, with minute dexterity, establishes a new reading or pieces together a new connection or 'hit[s] upon some scrap of knowledge referring to [the] subject that has not yet become common knowledge'.[3]

The Callimachean critic is compelled to an almost painful near-sightedness in the attempt to wrest every last trace of significance from papyrological traces. But she cannot fail to heed Gregory Hutchinson's plea[4] for an appreciation of the fragmentary works that finds a middle

* jane.lightfoot@new.ox.ac.uk.

[1] The editions of the *Aitia* by G. Massimilla (*Callimaco:* Aitia. *Libri Primo e Secondo* (Pisa 1996); *Libri terzo e quarto* (Pisa 2010)) and A. Harder are cited throughout as Massimilla i.100 and Harder ii.200, etc. Fragment numbers are cited from the latter.

[2] Quoted from B. Boyd, *Vladimir Nabokov: The American Years* (London 1991) 340.

[3] Quoted from Boyd (n.2) 110.

[4] G. Hutchinson, 'The *Aetia*: Callimachus' poem of knowledge', *ZPE* 145 (2003) 58 = *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*

ground between disjointed minutiae and the generalities (which Nabokov would have deplored) that sometimes seem the only possible response to those large ruined swathes of the *Aitia* or *Iambi* where, at best, only the Diegesis survives. In their different ways, that is what both works under review here try to do. The dust-jacket of Harder's commentary, incidentally, an image called 'Autumn Chain', seems to represent a spider's web hung with droplets of water struck by light in such a way that each becomes a half-sphere of light and a half-sphere of dark. Each microcosm, each tiny filament, together making up a world: it seems an image just as appropriate to Nabokov as to Callimachus.

Let us begin with the technicalities. Harder's edition follows the second volume of Massimilla's by a couple of years, not long enough for significant new papyrological discoveries to have accrued. This edition's only papyrological novelty with respect to Massimilla is in *fr*. 21.6–14 (*P.Mich*. (Cairo) inv. 5475c), overlapping with and slightly extending *P.Oxy*. 2209A, 1–12; it provides some improved readings in lines 9 and 11–12, and traces of two further lines (13–14). Her edition is based on standard and/or most recent editions of the book fragments (whence new readings in *fr*. 11.5 μὲν "Φυγαδῶνά" κ' ἐνίσποι; *fr*. 43.41 μείλια πεμφίγων) and papyri (of which the most important is *fr*. 1.11 αἱ γ' ἀ̣π̣αλαί[, from Bastianini's rereading of the London scholia), as well as on digital reproductions and personal inspections of the latter where possible/necessary; the result is a good deal less reverent towards Pfeiffer and *Supplementum Hellenisticum* than Massimilla's, with many small adjustments to papyrus readings, the exercise of independent preference among restorations and a few new conjectures (for example *fr*. 67.7 Προμήθ̣[ου; others suggested in the apparatus). In any case, the accessible and attractive presentation of state-of-the-art evidence is a service in itself. As in Pfeiffer, the apparatus of a long fragment appears in a lower register on the relevant page, rather than being consigned *en masse* to the end; it remains in Latin. There is an English translation of the text itself, commentaries and the Diegesis, but not scholia; that means we get renderings of the Florentine but not the London or Oxyrhynchus scholia on the *Aitia* prologue. Harder's numeration is based on Pfeiffer's (it is slightly perverse that the comparative numeration converts between the present edition and Pfeiffer's but not Massimilla's), but Pfeiffer's sequence is expanded, not only by reordered and fresh fragments, but also by ancillary material (scholia and commentaries), which now receives separate numeration. That is not the case in Massimilla, though Harder follows his practice of assigning independent fragment numbers to lemmata deduced from commentaries. Since the overriding principle is to maintain Pfeiffer's numeration as far as possible, expansions to his sequence (*frr*. 1a, 1b, etc.) do not necessarily imply subordination under the same general heading (*fr*. 1); it may mean only that *frr*. 1a, 1b etc. intervene at some point between *frr*. 1 and 2. But renumeration has proved unavoidable where new evidence has come to light, above all for the *Victoria Berenices* and the patch of uncertainty that follows it at the beginning of the third book, and to take into account the new consensus over the arrangement of Onnes and Tottes and the statue of Delian Apollo (*frr*. 113e–f, 114).

Harder's view of the history of the *Aitia* does not dissent from the two-edition theory of Parsons,[5] but she gives reasons to believe that the final, four-volume edition, was thoroughly revised so as both to achieve a satisfying internal rhythm and to participate in some sort of dialogue with Apollonius' *Argonautica*. Not all, but many, of her arguments are persuasive, and if she is right, further effort will have to be made to establish how this is compatible with the hypothesis that, in the putative second edition, books 1–2 were probably left little altered (i.3), the *aitia* gummed, as it were, into the dialogue with the Muses which left little room for

(Oxford 2008) 63: 'It [sc. the *Aitia*] has mostly been considered by scholars either in small pieces or in its broadest structural outline. But so enterprising and imaginative a creation merits a fuller range of critical attention'.

[5] P.J. Parsons, 'Callimachus: *Victoria Berenices*', *ZPE* 25 (1977) 1–50.

adjustment. Are we to suppose that the elements fell happily into a sequence (the Anaphe episode early in book 1) which would only achieve its true fulfilment (the Cyzicene altar late in book 4) and *telos* a quarter of a century later on, after unknown intermediate stages of dialogue with Apollonius? Ring composition and structural devices encompassing all four books (i.5–6) must also raise the question what the first two books might have looked like before incorporation into this structure. Speculation is liable to founder, but if the 'merciful Athens' fragment (*fr*. 51) concluded the second book, did it provide resolution for the murder of Androgeos with which the first opened (*fr*. 7a.5), just as the 'hero at the stern' (i.e. Androgeos) (*fr*. 103) might have provided resolution and closure towards the end of the final edition?[6] And if *fr*. 178 opened *Aitia* 2, did it parallel the dialogue with the Muses (however it is to be reconciled with it), not only, as Harder suggests, in the question-and-answer format embedded in a circumstantial setting, but also in twin λέσχαι (*frr*. 2b.6, 178.16), the dream-traveller contrasted with the stay-at-home, and (shortly afterwards) the two harangues to Clio (*frr*. 7a, 43.28–55) preceding the specific answer to his own question?

Her commentary is generous yet selective (selective especially with regard to parallels of *nexus* and metrical *sedes*, and uptake by Roman imitators; her introduction makes clear that Roman reception is not among her interests), but there are some fine, delicate insights (for example on the use of apostrophe, *fr*. 18.6–13; on parentheses, *fr*. 23.6, *cf*. *fr*. 100.3). The space saved on parallels is expended on more interpretative discussion, especially on relating the part to the whole. Massimilla's commentaries open with a general discussion, followed if appropriate by line-by-line comment; Harder's introductions are subdivided into a range of flexible categories from which she makes selections appropriate to each *aition* (contents; the *aition*; programmatic aspects / programmatic and topical aspects / function and topical aspects; genre / generic aspects; date; arrangement of the fragments; position in the *Aetia*; presentation; narrative technique; other fragments connected with this *aition*). 'Position in the *Aetia*', in particular, is a catch-all category which extends from the pragmatic business of placement and order to matters of patterning, theme and even programmatic aspects and topicality (which may also be dealt with under headings of their own). But despite the slight conceptual fog about the category, this interest in structure and in relating the part to the whole is essential to the interpretation of a 'continuous' (or 'discontinuous'?) poem, a virtuoso instantiation of catalogue technique and the most sophisticated response to the Hellenistic fascination with the organization of what Gregory Hutchinson calls 'parallel entities'.[7] The Diegesis suggests patterns and the distribution of certain motifs and themes; as evidence accumulates, no doubt some of Harder's suggestions will be confirmed and others disproved.

She points to the acknowledged instances of ring composition (Muses and Graces; the Argonauts; Berenice) and advances (or re-advances)[8] the hypothesis that Busiris and Phalaris stood at the end of the second book, which could thus be framed (if *fr*. 178 began it) by the figures of the good and the bad hosts, and the first and second books by the motif of 'hoist with your own petard' (*frr*. 2.5, 46.1–2). She is inclined to accept the placement of Onnes, the Statue of

[6] A.S. Hollis, 'Attica in Hellenistic poetry', *ZPE* 93 (1992) 7; Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 178. Slightly wounding to the optimism of this interpretation is that the Athenians have apparently forgotten the identity of the hero to whom the monument was erected and have to be reminded.

[7] G. Hutchinson, 'The metamorphosis of metamorphosis', *ZPE* 155 (2006) 74. The prologue remains enigmatic, for apart from the Telchines' snipe at Callimachus' failure to write 'one continuous poem' it does not pursue issues of organization or arrangement, but rather of aesthetic quality, especially of the aesthetics of sound, as well as τέχνη and its relationship to inspiration. The texts on which it draws, including Homer, Aristophanes, Plato, Euripides and Sappho (Harder ii.10–11), combine to produce a generalized statement of aesthetic principle which contrasts with the manifesto with which the *Iambi* conclude, apparently much more directed towards the particular concerns of that collection of poems.

[8] ii.372–73, 946, 957 (despite Massimilla's scepticism, i.361).

Delian Apollo, and an Unknown Thracian Story (*frr*. 113e–14a) in the third book (Massimilla printed them among the *incerta* at the end of book 1), probably at the beginning after the *Victoria Berenices*, although prudence this time inhibits further speculation about the book's structure. In 2006 Bulloch proposed both a linear reading and an analysis of book 3 in terms of ring composition; this was based on the hypothesis that *Phrygius and Pieria* stood (as it may have done in the Diegesis) in antepenultimate rather than penultimate position, and further that *frr*. 113e–14a followed *Acontius and Cydippe* in the remaining area of uncertainty in the centre of the book before the evidence of the Diegesis takes over; but the papyrological basis for his reconstruction has been thrown into serious doubt by Cecchi.[9] Yet even on the traditional view of the placement of *Phrygius and Pieria*, and on the hypothesis that *frr*. 113e–14a did indeed stand at the beginning, ingenuity could no doubt devise alternative rings. If two stories about panhellenic victors frame it (*Victoria Berenices* ~ *Euthycles of Locri*), the story of Onnes and Tottes, which tells of the resolution of hostility between the cities of Miletus and Assesus, could balance *Phrygius and Pieria*, on the resolution of strife between Miletus and Myus; and the dialogue with Delian Apollo would then correspond with Diana Lucina. It is difficult to trace any sequence far beyond that (the Unknown Thracian Story would seem to match the Hospes Isindius), but there seem to be advantages in pairing Delian Apollo with his sister (rather than with Acontius and Cydippe, as on Bulloch's analysis); the one was apparently a snappy dialogue of 14 lines, the other a showpiece, whereas the *aitia* concerning both Diana Lucina and Delian Apollo describe permanent aspects of their characters rather than peculiarities of local ritual or cult that arose from specific events. Moreover, the oracle of Apollo in the *Onnes* story (which showed the people of Assesus the way eventual relief would come) would correspond in *Phrygius and Pieria* to the festival of Artemis (which showed the way to the eventual resolution, since it was how the lovers met). These thoughts are offered, less as a serious proposition (for one thing, the placement of *frr*. 113e–14a remains hypothetical, and I see no way of demonstrating, even if they stood at the beginning of the book, that *Onnes* immediately followed the *Victoria Berenices*; any intervening material might introduce quite different patterns) and more as a thought-experiment which demonstrates how readily the poem lends itself to fragile constructions which new evidence could easily shatter.

An aspect of Callimachus that is growing increasingly familiar is Callimachus the fashioner of cultural memory, the artificer of identity in a foreign climate – in short, the colonial Callimachus. Ludwig Koenen introduced us to a Callimachus who playfully represented in a Greek idiom Pharaonic themes that the Ptolemies had assimilated.[10] Then Daniel Selden presented the voice of displaced persons,[11] and since then we have met Callimachus the architect of a defensively Greek tradition (both archivist of local tradition and creator of a panhellenic identity for Egypt's diverse immigrant community)[12] as well as Callimachus the multiculturalist, one who kept his ear open to Ptolemaic assimilations of native Egyptian themes.[13] Harder and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens are all, broadly speaking, multiculturalists; in the third chapter of their monograph, 'Changing places', the latter offer a particularly subtle and stimulating

[9] A. Bulloch, 'The order and structure of Callimachus' *Aetia* 3', *CQ* 56 (2006) 496–508; C. Cecchi, 'La sequenza finale del libro III degli «Aitia» a partire da Call. frr. 80–83 Pf.', *Eikasmos* 21 (2010) 175–95.

[10] L. Koenen, 'Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof', in E. van 't Dack, P. van Dessel and W. van Gucht (eds), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24–6 May 1982* (Louvain 1983) 174–90; 'The Ptolemaic king as a religious figure', in A.W. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long and A. Stewart (eds), *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1993) 81–84.

[11] D. Selden, 'Alibis', *CA* 17 (1998) 290–412.

[12] M. Asper, 'Dimensions of power: Callimachean geopoetics and the Ptolemaic empire', in B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus and S. Stephens (eds), *Brill's Companion to Callimachus* (Leiden 2011) 155–77.

[13] For example, S. Stephens, *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley 2003).

discussion of the whole issue. The essential idea is that Callimachus is the spider at the centre of the web that is Alexandria, drawing the material in to himself and refitting it for the new context. This means that his material is never merely antiquarian. Their argument has both spatial and temporal dimensions. Spatially, we see myths being selected and sometimes reshaped to bring them closer to Alexandria and Cyrene or to other areas of Ptolemaic interest, such as the shrine of Didyma near Miletus. The *Aitia* and other poems not only exploit existing Graeco-Egyptian myth, but also exhibit a tendency for Greek mythological themes to drift towards new bases or focuses in North Africa, as well as implying circular routes that draw Egypt into international cultural networks (for example, from Greece to Egypt, with Io, and her descendants' return, directly, like Danaus, or indirectly, like Cadmus, via Phoenicia). Temporally, we see traditional themes being appropriated and updated, always because they are reusable in their new context, never with the dead hand of revivalism (a contrast is drawn with the Nashville Parthenon). The argument has other ramifications as well: the authors note the use of doublets to create analogies and insinuate patterns, and the presence of themes whose tensions tend to be resolved as the poem progresses towards amelioration, improvement and cultural advance in modern Egypt.

In crafting the *Aitia*, Callimachus devised the ultimate temptation for the critic to construct and superimpose patterns (an invitation which its fragmentary state has only enhanced); patterns, on the other hand, invite their own deconstruction. And that is the case with Acosta-Hughes and Stephens' monograph. It does not follow at all that taking up the challenge means doing so in a hostile spirit. On the contrary, it is all part of the *Aitia*'s game.

To begin with geography. Alexandria is indeed the new centre. The first, second and third books begin with the narrator in Alexandria (or Cyrene: a Libyan location for the dream is established by *AP* 7.42, though not the degree of emphasis Callimachus laid on it) and Alexandria is where the fourth book returns home. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens provide example upon example of material being sucked in to the new city. Myths are selected for their genealogical or geopolitical interest to the Ptolemies and perhaps imply an increasingly centripetal movement as the poem proceeds. The heightened interest in Asia Minor and Thrace in the third and fourth books very plausibly echoes Ptolemy III's territorial interests and gains in the Third Syrian War,[14] though it seems that Philadelphus already inherited significant interests in Asia Minor from his father and extended them on his own account, without *Aitia* 1 and 2 having much to show for it except a reference to Mallos in Cilicia (*fr.* 38) – a sign of the greater sensitivity of the second half of the poem to the wider political context? But the question inevitably arises – how does one know when to stop? If the *Aitia* is to reflect live cultural and political interests, then almost anywhere in the Mediterranean can be pressed into service to make the pattern fit.[15] And as for circular patterns, some of them are vertiginous indeed (p. 150: from Egypt to Colchis, thence to Illyria, Macedon and from Macedon back to Egypt; p. 182: from Io and Epaphus to Cadmus, thence to Oedipus, the colonists of Thera and eventually Cyrene) and look more like a reflection of the interconnectedness of Greek mythology than a pattern envisaged or intended by Callimachus himself. Nevertheless, one can accept the broadly centripetal principle, especially, obviously, when the *Coma Berenices* sets the coping stone on the whole structure.

[14] K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* IV.2 (Leipzig 1927) 333–49; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* 1 (Princeton 1950) 94–99.

[15] Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 176: 'Sicily, Italy, and the Adriatic in the west, the Peloponnese (Argos, Arcadia), Attica, Boeotia, Sicyon, Thessaly, and Thrace, the Ionian coastline (Ephesus, Myos [*sic*], Miletus), and the Greek islands (Paros, Ceos, Naxos, Anaphe), Cyrene and Egypt'. Proper names and other names, incidentally, are vulnerable throughout the monograph: *cf.* 88 n.10 *Callixinus*, 138 *kottybos*, 156 and 163 'the pure springs of Dio'(!), 178 *Acontidae*, 184 *Augeus*, 188 *Metanaera*; 'descendants' fluctuates with 'descendents' throughout and *cf.* 193 'discernable'.

If there is a problem, it could be that the centripetal principle has been overstressed at the expense of the centrifugal – or, rather, at the expense of the poem's international dimension, its role as repository of a panhellenic heritage. Is *everything* to be related to Alexandria? Or might the poem, *en route* to its ineluctably Alexandrian climax, have paused to survey the totality of Greek culture, no less appreciative of its traditional centres than of the new one? You might wonder, for example, about the choice of gods. True, the pantheon has opened its arms to some Ptolemies, especially the queens; the Muses may have been augmented with Arsinoe as the Graces were with Berenice. But a good deal of the poem's divine world does not seem to have been particularly Ptolemaic in focus. One finds little correlation with the Ptolemies' naked self-promotion as it appeared in the staged *pompe* described by Callixeinos: for example, although Dionysus is scattered throughout the poem (though it is hard to gauge his true importance when some of the references could be casual asides), there is little sign of his triumphal return from India or exuberant followers, nor of the patron of theatre.[16] Perhaps we have no right to expect tidy correlation, nor Callimachus to reproduce Ptolemaic propaganda; but if we believe that he reflects the ideology that equated the Pharaoh with Horus, why should this very public theme not have been more strongly reflected in the *Aitia*?

What one finds in the *Aitia*, instead, is a good deal of Zeus, Hera and, especially, of Apollo and Artemis, who seem to have enjoyed a good deal less royal support in Alexandria itself than Aphrodite, Demeter and Dionysus.[17] No cults of Apollo are attested there (as opposed to in Cyrene) and the best we can do is a handful of Apollonian demotics among the city's tribes.[18] But the god is enormously prominent throughout the *Aitia* – especially, but not exclusively, in the second half. If he is to be given a Ptolemaic dimension it is presumably with reference to his assimilation with Horus[19] or to the Ptolemies' interest in Delos and the Nesiotic League; the Ptolemies led the latter for a while and retained their strong interest in Delos even when their naval power slipped.[20] Perhaps the point is that Callimachus here has alighted upon a theme which happily matches the Ptolemies' *Aussenpolitik* but also speaks to the interests of every cultured Greek, in every land, at all times. Heracles is another case in point – certainly a potential dynastic interest, but also a universal Greek hero around whom all participants in Greek culture could unite.[21]

The centripetal approach seems to me most problematic when an attempt is made to conjure an Egyptian dimension for some of the *Aitia*'s myths (Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 187–91). Daniel Selden showed the way in his interpretation of the *Coma Berenices*, but whatever its merits – and Callimachus would be without doubt a great trophy if multiculturalism could carry him off – it is not clear that the same method works equally well for Icarius and Erigone in *fr.* 178.3–4.[22]

[16] Where, incidentally, are the aetiologies of musical instruments and innovations which we might have expected from a poem so interested in human culture? They certainly interested other writers: *cf.* J.H. Hordern, *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford 2002) 230–31.

[17] P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1 (Oxford 1972) 193–212 (Olympian deities in Alexandria).

[18] Fraser (n.17) 44, *cf.* 196–97.

[19] Harder (ii.145 and 712) suggests this for Anaphe and the Delphic Daphnephoria, though how one can judge where it is likely to be a factor and where not, is a moot point.

[20] P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris 1970) 516–45.

[21] Adrian Hollis' reconstruction of the *Victoria Berenices* ('The composition of Callimachus' *Aetia* in the light of P.Oxy. 2258', *CQ* 36 (1986) 467–71) – namely, that the story of Molorchus once stood at the end of book 3 in connection with the aetiology of the Nemean games, immediately after Euthycles of Locri, and as a pendant to the foundation of the Olympic Games in the Elean marriage rite; only later, after Berenice's chariot victory, was it given a royal prologue and moved into the limelight at the beginning of the third book – has not aroused much enthusiasm. Of course, we know nothing about the poem in its putative earlier form, but the reconstruction at least raises the possibility that a story about Heracles, Nemea and Molorchus could have stood in the collection, if not without, then at least with a significantly less overt, Ptolemaic connection than in the position in which it now stands.

For one thing, *cui bono?* The celebrant of the festival is a passionate Athenophile, his guest, the narrator, avid for antiquarian details about old Greece; the 'message' to any readership who noted the similarities with the Isis myth proposed here (Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 189–90) could hardly be more than the banal point that certain Greek and Egyptian myths were broadly alike. So too the angry goddess in the Thesmophoria Attica (*fr*. 63; *cf*. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 188–89): the parallel with Isis in Plut. *Is*. 17 is testimony, I should say, rather to the international flotsam of a well-documented story-type than to a genuinely native Egyptian tradition with which Callimachus' Greek story would happily converge.[23] And Medea's *chleuasmos* on Anaphe (*fr*. 21.9; Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 188) is unpersuasive as an instance of 'intercultural poetics': Callimachus seems to compare it to the practice at Eleusis, and it is true that the Danaids, according to Herodotus 2.171, brought the rites of Demeter (but not explicitly *chleuasmos*) to Greece (but not explicitly Eleusis); but the ritual on Anaphe is anyway for Apollo. It is unlikely to be possible to formulate universally-acceptable criteria for when links are present and when they are not, but in order to convince they do need to be more precise than this.

Such readings are in danger of leaving the *Aitia* in a kind of swimming-bath acoustic of Egyptian echoes, drowning out the Greekness of the Greek material. An alternative account could be given in which the first three books (at least) begin with an Egyptian or Cyrenean location, but use it as a springboard into the common Greek patrimony. Adrian Hollis noted that there is something on Athens in every book – in contrast to the deployment of Argive themes, with their Egyptian dimension (through Io, Epaphus, Danaus and his daughters), which, however striking, are more bunched and more concentrated in those passages with a dynastic focus.[24] Acosta-Hughes and Stephens tend to deal with Athens by treating it as a past to the Ptolemaic present. They see Athens as a power that the Ptolemies have relegated to the past, just as Athens' own *thalassocratia* pushed memories of Minos into the mythical period; this applies not only to the *Aitia* but underpins their rather tendentious reading of the *Hecale* as well. For them, *Hecale* is an epicized tragedy: the tragic background provides the subject-matter, but epic an antiquarian sensibility.

> He chooses to write about Athens' central hero, Theseus, but moves him to the margins. He foregrounds instead a new type of hero, Hecale, whose signal heroism is in the form of hospitality, a social value that comes to displace the polis-centred virtues of the citizen-soldier in the world of the Diadochs ... Epic is by nature a narrative of the past: its events are mythic but its heroic characters ... no longer exist ... By epicizing a traditional set of Athenian tragic stories, Callimachus returns them to the past, to the stuff of legends but not of contemporary life (Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 197, 202).

[22] R. Merkelbach ('Tragödie, Komödie und Dionysische Kulte nach der Erigone des Eratosthenes', *Antaios* 5 (1963) 325–43 = *Hestia und Erigone: Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Stuttgart 1996) 180–97) finds an Egyptian dimension to Eratosthenes' poem – but regards Eratosthenes as a pioneer (196: 'Indem er nach dem suchte, was die Völker verbindet, wurde er gleichzeitig der erste Vertreter der neuen griechisch-ägyptischen, griechisch-orientalischen Mischkultur').

[23] *Mor*. 357d–e; J. Gwyn Griffiths (*Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride* (Cardiff 1970) ad loc.) produces no evidence for an Egyptian background.

[24] The most important recent accretion to the poem, *fr*. 54a (*PSI* inv. 1923 + *PSI* inv. 2002 = *PSI* 1500) contains references to the Inachidae, Amymone the Argive spring, Danaus, Aegyptus, the Nile and Proetus. To be noted is the skill with which Callimachus deploys material relevant *both* to the general location of the victory, if not to the specific site (Danaus, settler in Argos), *and* to mainstream Graeco-Egyptian mythology (the Danaid myth goes back at least to Aeschylus' *Supplices*) *and* to the religious culture of Egypt (Io, Epaphus, the Apis bull: *frr*. 54.16, *cf*. 66.1 with Lehnus' supplement) *and* ultimately to the dynastic claims of the royal family (Danaus again, as *Stammvater* of the Macedonian royal family, *cf*. Euripides *Archelaus fr*. 1.1). Yet even here, the Egyptianizing material is kept within limits. Danaus and his daughters were not the main subject of the *aition*. Harder (ii.415) suggests that the Graeco-Egyptian material was deployed in a section in which various topics were discarded before the main subject was selected, but how to square that with the fact that *fr*. 54a.1–10 was evidently part of a speech? Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (186) suggest an internal narrator like the Nile in the *Victoria Sosibii*, but not how the transition was effected from these myths to Heracles and Molorchus.

But it is an obvious rejoinder that Hecale, too, is celebrated in the epic idiom and that hospitality is the epic virtue *par excellence*.[25] Antiquarianism is the stuff of the *Hecale*, but it is far from clear that Theseus was made the bearer of obsolete values as opposed to Hecale's contemporary ones (let alone that for Callimachus 'antiquarian' meant *passé* anyway).

Where Acosta-Hughes and Stephens are strong is in their analysis of theme – an increasing focus of interest in scholarship on the poem, since Bulloch back in 2006 noted its relative dearth.[26] They have very interesting remarks on the use of narrative doublets, which reinforce patterns of behaviour across time and place, suggest prefigurations and recapitulations and (though with the reservations expressed above) cross-cultural parallels. They, and Harder, discuss obviously prominent themes, such as entertainment, hospitality and anti-hospitality in the second book; sexuality, marriage and childbearing in book 3; and the cluster of scapegoat rituals, human sacrifice and killing in book 4. Perhaps more of a sense of sequence emerges from a reading of the fragments themselves than from Acosta-Hughes and Stephens' discussion, which tends to take things out of order. For instance, we seem to be able to watch the hospitality develop from the opening symposium or λέσχη in Alexandria (assuming *fr*. 178 stood at the beginning of the book), which possibly contained a contrasting inset narrative by Theugenes about Peleus' humble welcome on Icos (Harder on *fr*. 181, ii.988); then continuing in the (somehow) resumed dialogue with the Muses where Callimachus quizzes them about feasts and festivals for Sicilian city-founders (including the distinctly inhospitable daughters of Cocalus and culminating with the peculiar nameless sacrificial meal at Zancle; note *fr*. 43.55 εἰλαπίνην, 82 δαῖτα, possibly 37 δημοσίην); and then apparently developing further in the next sequence, on the Cretan festival of Theodaesia, another festival involving a ritual meal (*fr*. 43b.3 ἑορτή; Harder i.360–61). Note, also, the exquisitely appropriate choice of a narrator who, on the one hand, despises the coarseness of gourmandizing and, on the other, is all agog for the antiquarian details of festivals; who disdains the scented wreaths (*fr*. 43.13) but is greedy for knowledge about στυρόν (*fr*. 43b.5).

It is harder to watch the 'feminine' theme unfold across the third and fourth books (already delicately insinuated by Berenice-as-νύμφα and the Pindaric ἔδνον motif in *fr*. 54.1–2, and wittily concluded by the *Coma*), though Harder attractively suggests that the *Fontes Argivi* might be seen as an introduction to the *Acontius and Cydippe*, which in turn obviously balances *Phrygius and Pieria*.[27] A sense of sequence seems to return – or at least the Diegesis gives the illusion of one – with the cluster of scapegoat rituals and human sacrifice at the beginning of book 4: the atonement festival of the Delphic Daphnephoria (Hesych. σ 456 σεπτηρία· καθαρμός) segues into the Abderan *pharmakos* (*fr*. 90a.3 καθάρσιον) and thence from human sacrificial ritual (Melicertes) to one-off sacrifice (Theodotus), execution (Leimonis) and the just punishment of a vainglorious boaster (Venator Gloriosus). One is struck by the frequency of myths of violence, usually preceding restitution or some form of recuperation: tyrants are brought down (Phalaecus), offenders against civilized values (Isindius Hospes), sacrosanct persons (Simonides) or the gods (Venator Gloriosus) punished; acts of violence are the prelude to cults, rituals and festivals. But that, perhaps, is the nature of aetiological myth itself, and it is also striking how often Callimachus' focus is on divergence and dissonance (*silent* sacrifice; ritual abuse; the failure to

[25] C. Watkins (*How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford 2001) 386–87) draws attention to the figure of Axylos in *Il*. 6.12–15, 'a "brewy", in the Hiberno-English tradition ... the rich person whose societal obligation is to dispense hospitality to all wayfarers'. Aspects of Hecale correspond to this typology (compare her obituary notice in *fr*. 80.2–3 Hollis πολλάκι σεῖό <γε>, μαῖα, φιλοξείνοιο καλιῆς | μνησόμεθα· ξυνὸν γὰρ ἐπαύλιον ἔσκεν ἅπασιν with Axylus', *Il*. 6.14–15 φίλος δ' ἦν ἀνθρώποισι | πάντας γὰρ φιλέεσκεν ὁδῶι ἔπι οἰκία ναίων), save that she, of course, is female, poor (unusual aspects of her situation, as noted by Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 200) and not obligated.

[26] Bulloch (n.9) 503.

[27] *Diana Lucina*, on Artemis as goddess of childbirth, preceding *Phrygius* creates a piquant effect, since Phrygius and Pieria's was a one-night stand and, unlike Acontius' marriage, did not found a dynasty.

name a city-founder; hatred surviving death, in the sundered flames of a funeral pyre; the murders of Theodotus in Lipara, of Pasicles in Ephesus and still more disturbingly the killing of Leimonis in 'merciful' Athens).[28] The ultimate reading of the poem by both Harder and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens is the 'progressivist' one;[29] but there is much to upset the pattern along the way.

Another aspect of the 'contextualizing' approach that now prevails in Callimachean studies is the emphasis on the poet's connections with performance culture (the world of the public reading, of the symposium; the evocation of genres that historically were performed). It is unfortunate, perhaps, that the over-emphasis on books and bookishness that dominated the field for so long has led to the risk of overstating the other side of the argument, since the *Aitia* itself seems to go out of its way to present scenarios for the elicitation of knowledge that run all the way from the traditional to the contemporary, the 'popular' to the learned and the oral to the written. The poet parades his scholarly credentials (exegetical parentheses; interjected internal comparisons, like footnotes saying '*cf.*'; variants; source-citations) and yet at the same time the citations of textual authority seem regularly to use the language of orality (*fr.* 75.53–5 ἐκλύομεν ... ἐνὶ μνήμηι κάτθετο μυθολόγωι; *fr.* 92.2–3 Λε]ανδρίδες εἴ τι παλαιαί | φθ[έγγ]ονται ... ἱστορίαι; *fr.* 103 ἐπεὶ τόδε κύρβις ἀείδει). Again: the *viva voce* exchange with the Muses is complemented by the cultured conversation of Pollis' banquet, which in turn duets with the scholarly *Acontius* story, whose respective narrators seem to counterpoint one another – both avid for their material, both a bit intemperate (yearning for information in *fr.* 178.22, spilling it out incontinently in *fr.* 75.4–9), both in dialogue with a source who is both like (*fr.* 178.9–10) and unlike them, a conversational traveller as opposed to an antiquarian tract. The first encounter stages the stay-at-home versus the ship's captain, the second an elderly prose source versus his excitable, indeed priapic, adaptor. The complementarity adds to Harder's case for a thorough revision of the parts once the whole poem was assembled.

Alan Cameron's brilliant *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995) was immediately recognized for the ground-breaking work it was, but it took some time for scholarship to absorb it. Many of the essays in the new *Brill Companion to Callimachus* at long last testify to the assimilation of some of its ideas; the interesting thing about Acosta-Hughes and Stephens' second chapter, 'Performing the text', is that they have essentially adopted and, indeed, advanced the Cameron approach, but seem to be slightly sheepish about owning up to it. While they restate some of his positions, they look back to him as to one who 'worked within the standard oppositions' (86 n.4), which by implication they have surmounted; of the two works cited 'for a more nuanced view of the complex interrelationships of performance and text', Peter Bing's is in fact a polemical restatement of the traditional case of the élitists and littérateurs, which seems hardly to be the mast they want to nail their own colours to.[30] Some of what they offer is a meander through evidence Cameron has already reviewed (for example, Callimachus and the culture of

[28] It is unclear what the stories of Theodotus (*frr.* 93–93b) and Pasicles (frr. 102–102a) explained; Leimonis (*frr.* 94–95c) apparently explained a place-name, but in none of these cases is it clear that what emerged from the killing was something of communal benefit, nor that that sanguine model can be applied to them.

[29] Harder i.6, 19, ii.213–14, 720, 756, 908, al.; Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 178, 192–93 (while also noting the 'darker tone' of the *Aitia* of the last book, 174). There are other examples of the rectification of wrong. The details of Callimachus' treatment of the *pharmakos*-like Locrian maidens are elusive (*frr.* 34–35) (ongoing but mitigated?), though the *pharmakos* in the outlying city of Abdera (*fr.* 90) seems to be treated in the ethnographical present; but the sacrifice to Melicertes is obsolete (*frr.* 91–2) and Euthymus has terminated a vindictive practice in Temesa (*fr.* 99) which dates, like the Locrian maidens, to the end of the Trojan War. If the analysis of B. Currie ('Euthymos of Locri: a case study in heroization in the Classical period', *JHS* 122 (2002) 24–44) is right, it also reverses the pattern. To an atonement for sexual violence that enforces virginity in the first book would correspond, in the last, sexual violence transformed into a prenuptial rite; but Currie's article is very speculative.

[30] P. Bing, *The Scroll and the Marble. Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* (Ann Arbor 2009) 106–15.

the symposium). Where they advance *beyond* Cameron is in the claim that Callimachus represents himself as a performer by choosing as models figures who are 'particularly characterized by their roles as performers' (90) and by incorporating into his works various song-types, sometimes including mini generic histories, but setting them up as performances that transcend any specific moment.

The case is well-motivated but sometimes overstated. What interests Callimachus about his self-proclaimed models Ion of Chios and Hipponax is, respectively, *polyeideia* and voice and personality; antiquity did not exactly remember them as 'performers'.[31] Obviously the *Aitia* does evoke some performance genres, such as epinician and cult hymn, and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens make an interesting, if complex, case for Callimachus' self-representation as a rhapsode, indeed as heir of the ancient Argive 'lamb-singers'.[32] They see *fr*. 26.8 as an allusion to the performance practice of rhapsodes, producing a 'continuous' fabric out of discontinuous excerpts and thus wrong-footing the Telchines (as well as implying the derivation of rhapsody from ῥάπτειν which rivals the one from ῥάβδος which he actually gives three lines before). But it is not clear that the 'slender' Muse of the proem is an attempt to insinuate a lyric voice (103–04); when the Homeric scholia discuss the epithet, they do so with reference to a singer's vocal qualities, in which case it would rather belong with the prologue's other reflections on the aethetics of sound, the cicada and donkey, the μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδήν, and so on.[33] And it is even less clear that Callimachus can be made into an heir of the New Musicians. This suggestion, like Lucia Prauscello's essay in the *Brill Companion*,[34] is essentially an attempt to haul Callimachus onto the bandwaggon of sexily politicized readings of the culture of μουσική in the late fifth century, but it fails to persuade. Interest in mimesis and *ethopoia* is too widespread to be distinctive or characteristic; Callimachus' *Iambi* experiment with metre and dialect and content but not with μέλος; his stichic and epodic metres do not bear comparison with the polymetry of the New Musicians, whose compositions anyway are astrophic rather than 'stichic' (Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 98); extravagant new compounds are not characteristic of his style; and the expressionism and emotionalism associated with the New Music are the last thing one expects from Callimachus. The most one might want to claim is that he, like Timotheus, uses Apollo to flaunt the novelty of his poetics;[35] so does Boiscus, *SH* 233, so perhaps it was a *topos*.

So the second and third chapters of Acosta-Hughes and Stephens extend and develop features of a Callimachus who is already partly familiar: Callimachus the performance artist, Callimachus the fashioner of cultural memory. So does the first. Here we meet Callimachus the Platonist. We already knew him from the *Aitia* prologue, where the cicadas and the light, winged poet seemed to point to the cicada-men of the *Phaedrus* (259b5–d8) and the light, winged poet of the *Ion* (534b3–4);[36] and from the end of the *Iambi*, where the insistence that a poet is entitled to compose in as many genres as he likes seems to be a response to the *Ion*, where precisely that

[31] It would be more precise to say that (i) mime is an 'occasion-bound' genre (M. Depew, 'Ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν: genre, occasion, and imitation in Callimachus fr. 191 and 203 Pf.', *TAPA* 122 (1992) 321–23, 328) and there are examples of *Rollenpoesie* among Archaic iambus (A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford 1999) 34, 61–62); (ii) Ion had musicological interests (*fr*. 32 W.), is associated with the world of the symposium (*frr*. 26–27, 31, *fr*. 106* Leurini) and composed dithyrambs (*PMG* 745). But these are not quite the same thing.

[32] Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 119–26, reviving (without acknowledgement) a suggestion by W. Burkert (*Homo Necans* (Berkeley 1983) 108). Harder is more cautious (*ad frr*. 26.5, 26.8). It cannot be proven that Callimachus alluded to the ἀρνωιδοί, nor that what was 'received' (or 'welcomed') in 26.8 was the Linus story.

[33] *Fr*. 1.24 λεπταλέην, apparently looking to the boy lyre-player in *Il*. 18.569–72; *cf*. ∑ **b** *Il*. 18.570c2/d2 on the Linus song μετ' ἰσχνοφωνίας αἰδόμενος. Neither is it clear that Achilles singing to the lyre in *Il*. 9.186 is a figure for lyric if the lyre is also the instrument of the bards Phemius and Demodocus.

[34] 'Digging up the musical past: Callimachus and the New Music', in Acosta-Hughes *et al*. (n.12) 289–308.

[35] *PMG* 791.202–05; *cf*. the anecdote in Artemon of Cassandrea, ap. Athen. 14.636e.

[36] R.L. Hunter, 'Winged Callimachus', *ZPE* 76 (1989) 1–2.

ability is in question. These passages receive considerable attention. The authors show, convincingly, that the cicada imagery insinuates a claim to inspiration alongside the Prologue's obvious demand for τέχνη; they also make bold claims for the importance of the *Phaedo*'s reflections on old age and immortality, though here they are less successful in making the pieces fit (Socrates is confronting death and looking forward to the soul's immortality; Callimachus is confronting old age and wants to be free of it).[37] Their interpretation of the Platonic background of *Iambus* 13 is subtle. The challenge posed by the Socrates of the *Ion* (and of *Symp.* 223d3–6, but not *Rep.* 3.394d–395a) evaporates when it is remembered that Socrates did *not* say 'one poet, one genre', only that this was the prerogative of the ἔντεχνος ποιητής, which is of course precisely what Callimachus is.[38] But there is another challenge, from Plato's prescriptivism and insistence on the specialization of functions, to which the versatile Ion is an excellent response.

Where Acosta-Hughes and Stephens are less persuasive is in some of their claims for Platonic allusions elsewhere, for instance in *Iambus* 1 (57–64) or in *Aitia* 2, with its references to Minos, Rhadamanthys, Busiris and Phalaris (69–72). Callimachus is supposed to be rejecting the cleaned-up and ameliorated images of these lawgivers in the philosophers, but (for example) his reference to Rhadamanthys breathes not a word of fratricide; on the contrary, we read of lawgiving and a piece of wisdom, presumably one of his laws (*fr.* 43b.8–9). Improving discourse at the table may reasonably evoke the *Symposium*, but it is hard to believe that the host's name, Pollis ('a good if rare Athenian name')[39] is intended to evoke the Spartan ambassador who reputedly received Plato from the incensed tyrant Dionysius with orders to sell him into slavery (77); again, *cui bono*? What would such an allusion achieve? 'Historical verisimilitude' (78)? But verisimilitude to what? We are not supposed to be in Plato's Sicily, and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens in any case *also* need Pollis to represent Athens in order for their analogy with the participants in Plato's *Laws* to work. In sum: the quest for Plato tends to produce most interesting results in programmatic passages.[40] Other allusions certainly exist; a Platonic thread seems to run through the *Iambi* alongside more popular types of wisdom such as *ainoi* and fables, riddles and allusions to the Seven Sages, though they look like mischievous appropriations of famous *dicta* until the more challenging attempt at engagement in the closing poem. But there is also perhaps a danger, once a Platonic theme is spotted, of getting carried away with it and using it to lending false weight to other passages where the Platonic element is slight.

The more closely one studies Callimachus' work, the more detail discovers itself, but also the greater the temptation to compensate for gaps by erecting hypotheses and by discovering or superimposing new patterns. Harder's massive new commentary provides the material out of which new hypotheses are created as well as destroyed and generates a good number of new hypotheses itself; good ideas and others in need of more precise formulation tumble out of Acosta-Hughes and Stephens' always stimulating monograph. Butterflies are just about the one thing Callimachus seems not to have touched upon, but I suspect Nabokov would have found him congenial. And I suspect that he whose own study of *Eugene Onegin* was so formidably buttressed with learning and precise illustrative detail would have found much to commend in the new Oxford commentary.

[37] Though intimations of immortality are introduced by the intertextual connection with the new Sappho, on the interpretation of C. Geissler, 'Der Tithonosmythos bei Sappho und Kallimachos: Zu Sappho fr. 58 V., 11–12 und Kallimachos, *Aitia* fr. 1 Pf.', *GFA* 8 (2005) 105–14.

[38] Depew (n.31) 326–7; Kerkhecker (n.31) 261. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens perhaps formulate the opposition between Socrates and Callimachus too agonistically at 50–51. But they are good on how Callimachus shifts the terms of debate on *mimesis*, from levels of reality to prestige literary models from the past.

[39] A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995) 134.

[40] The pattern may extend to συρφετός at the end of *Hymn* 2 (*Tht.* 152c, *Gorg.* 489c4–6, ps.-Plat. *Hipp. maj.* 288d4; no other documented occurrences before Callimachus). It is slightly disconcerting that in each case (including ps.-Plato) the word is used ironically, whereas Callimachus' speaker, Apollo, is indeed lordly, but his doctrines are not to be ironized away.