

PETER BING

A NOTE ON THE NEW “MUSENANRUF” IN CALLIMACHUS’ AETIA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 74 (1988) 273–275

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## A NOTE ON THE NEW "MUSENANRUF" IN CALLIMACHUS' AETIA

I would like to raise one point in support of Arnd Kerkhecker's "Musenanruf am Anfang der Aitia des Kallimachos", *ZPE* 71 (1981) 16-24. In discussing P.Oxy. 2262, fr. 1, col. II 1-19 = fr. 1a 12-30 Pf. (in Pfeiffer's *Callimachus* vol. II, add. p. 100-101), on the basis of which he argues that Callimachus invoked the Muses prior to (and separate from) the *Somnium* (fr. 2 Pf.)<sup>1</sup> — either as the climax of the prologue in *Telchinas* or set independently between the prologue and *Somnium* — Kerkhecker limits himself to the lemmata in fr. 1 a, 24-26 Pf.<sup>2</sup> The preceding lemma, which evidently comprised fr. 1a, 19-23, is left out of account.

Yet it deserves mention, at least, that this lemma fits neatly with the proposed invocation. The text reads as follows:

|    |                   |       |
|----|-------------------|-------|
| 20 | θ[                | ]ε    |
|    | γράφεται κα[ι]    | θυμόν |
|    | ἐπήϊεν' ἀντὶ τοῦ  |       |
|    | ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἥρ- |       |
|    | χ[ε]το            |       |

Callimachus, it appears, wrote θυμόν ἐπήϊεν or, since this is a variant reading, something like it. Pfeiffer's comment, "θυμός poetae somniantis esse videtur" (ad 20 sq.), was evidently prompted by the role of the θυμός in questioning the Muses at *Aetia* fr. 31b (vol. II add. p. 108: τὸ]ς μὲν ἔφη· τὰς δ' εἶθαρ ἐμός· πάλιν εἴρητο θυμός), which he adduced in the app. crit. As regards content, therefore, he grouped this lemma — sensibly, I believe — with those that followed (i.e. with fr. 1a, 24-26).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> He thereby makes sense of the troubling coronis in the left-hand margin of fr. 1a, 30 Pf.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. esp. p. 18, section IV.

<sup>3</sup> Even apart from *Aetia* fr. 31b, the presence of θυμόν ἐπήϊεν in the general vicinity of a "Musenanruf" makes sense in light of the traditional prominence of the θυμός in a poet's prelude to a theme. Besides Callimachus' address to his θυμός in v.1 of the *Hymn to Delos* cf. e.g. *Od.* 8.45: ὄπη θυμός ἐποτρύνῃσιν αἰεῖδεν; Alcaeus *Ā* 2 (b): χαῖρε, Κυλλάννας ὁ μέδεις, σὲ γάρ μοι | θυμός ὕμνην; Ibycus *PMG* 282.10f.: [νῦ]ν δέ μοι οὔτε ξειναπάταν Π[άρι]ν | [...] ἐπιθύμιον --- | [ὕμ]νην; and especially Pindar's invocations of his θυμός when he poses as deliberating what to sing in *Ol.* 2.89: ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῶ τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ, τίνα βάλλομεν ---; or *N.* 3.26: θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἄλλοδαπὴν ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβειαι.

The good sense and force of this collocation for Kerkhecker's argument is somehow lost in the shuffle.<sup>4</sup> For why should the poet have asked his Muses only "um Erinnerung an die *Antworten*, die er von ihnen in seiner Jugend (Schol. Flor. 18: ἀ]ρτιγένειος ὄν) erhalten hat"<sup>5</sup>? The lemma at fr. 1a, 19-23 seems rather to indicate that he also beseeched them to remind him of that which "occured to (his) thymos" (θυμὸν ἐπήϊεν),<sup>6</sup> i.e. of the questions *he* had asked *them*, as Pfeiffer's reference to fr. 31b (--- τὰς δ' εἶθαρ ἐμὸς πάλιν εἶρετο θυμός) suggests.<sup>7</sup>

We may initially view an invocation for aid in recalling *questions* from an earlier dream-encounter with the Muses precisely as Kerkhecker proposes we do with one for *answers* (cf. his section V, p. 21-24), that is either (i) as having been composed to stand before the *Somnium* at the start of a first edition of the *Aetia*, or (ii) as having been added in the second edition (whether at the end of the prologue in *Telchinas*, or between prologue and *Somnium*). In the first case (i), the perspective would originally have been that of the mature poet needing help in remembering the many questions that flooded his θυμός when he was a boy (Schol. Flor. 18: ἀ]ρτιγένειος ὄν). Here, the emphasis might have been on the exuberance and boundless curiosity of the youthful questioner. Subsumed into the second edition, the perspective of the invocation would have been transformed into that of the elderly poet for whom age is as heavy a burden as the three-cornered island Sicily for Enkelados (fr. 1.35-36 Pf.). At that point in his life, the help of the "daughters of Memory" might be all the more crucial. In the second alternative (ii), the perspective would simply be that of (i) upon having been integrated into the second edition.

Another argument, however, and one not weighed by Kerkhecker, may tip the scales towards (ii): that is, the conditions behind the second edition, in particular its concern with age, give a more natural cue for what we must see as the novelty of Callimachus' invocation. For it must be stressed that Callimachus' alleged request for the Muses' aid in recalling what they had already once revealed to him *is remarkable* — an unparalleled variation, so far as I can see,

---

<sup>4</sup> He refers to it obliquely in n. 15 — but without indicating why Pfeiffer thought to connect the θυμός-gloss with those following it and with the *Somnium* (i.e. precisely because of the role of the θυμός in invoking the Muse in fr. 31b., cited above).

<sup>5</sup> Kerkhecker, op. cit. p. 20, hypothese 3 (italics mine). Cf. also p. 20, hypothese 2: "Eine Bitte des Erzählers um Erinnerung an die von den Musen empfangenen *Antworten* (ὑπο]κρίσι[ ]ς) wäre zu Beginn des Berichtes über das Traumgespräch in der Form eines Musenanrufs denkbar" (italics mine).

<sup>6</sup> As subject of θυμὸν ἐπήϊεν, we might look for some phrase equivalent to ὅσα and even consider if it would perhaps have been the object of ἀμν]ήσαιτε· ἀναμνήσαιτέ μ[ε — though the positioning of the lemmata does not allow us to be sure whether it would have stood sufficiently close to the verb of recollection so as to be able to be its object. The same might be said for ὑπο]κρίσι[ ]ς. In either case, however, the collocation is suggestive.

<sup>7</sup> The tense of the verb (ἐπήϊεν) tallies well with — indeed, might be thought to recall — Callimachus' usage in describing his questioning of the Muse in the *Aetia* (cf. Kerkhecker n. 10).

on traditional invocations. The same, of course, holds true for a request that the goddesses recollect what the poet had once asked them. Indeed, it renders the novelty all the more striking, implying as it does that the poet needs the Muses to jog his memory and remind him (ἀμν]ήσαιτε· ἀναμνήσαιτέ μ[ε fr. 1a, 25) of what he himself had already once said. This was a bold stroke — even for an Age devoted to literary experimentation, from which the Muses were hardly immune.<sup>8</sup> What, we may ask, might have prompted it? The perspective of age presumed in the prologue *in Telchinas*, at once plaintive (fr. 1.35-36 Pf.) and confident of the Muses' undiminished support (fr. 1.37f. Pf.), provides a far more compelling premise than does that assumed in alternative one (i).<sup>9</sup> We may thank Arnd Kerkhecker for pointing us toward this new and significant example of Callimachean invention.<sup>10</sup>

Cleveland  
Case Western Reserve University

Peter Bing

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. my discussion of Hellenistic conventions regarding the Muses in chapter 1 of *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Hypomnemata 90 (1988): "Poetic Inspiration and the Poet's Self-Image in Hellenistic Greece".

<sup>9</sup> From a different perspective, Kerkhecker (*per litteras* 3/22/88) now adds a further argument for alternative (ii): "Nicht nur der Inhalt des Gespräches mit den Musen, sondern auch das Gespräch selbst als Form der *Aitia* wird als Geschenk der Musen dargestellt. Die auch hierin enthaltene Zurückweisung der Telchinenkritik mag ein Argument sein, den Musenanruf genetisch als Höhepunkt des Telchinenprologs und mit diesem hinzugefügt zu betrachten."

<sup>10</sup> I am grateful to Dr. L. Pratt of Bowdoin College, who read several drafts of this paper and made many acute suggestions.