

DEE L. CLAYMAN

CALLIMACHUS' *IAMBI* AND *AITIA*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 74 (1988) 277–286

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CALLIMACHUS' *IAMBI* AND *AITIA*

The concluding line of the epilogue of Callimachus' *Aitia* (fr. 112.9 Pf.)¹ is rightly understood as an introduction to the *Iambi* that follow it directly in *P.Oxy.* 7.1011 and the *Diegeseis*.² The poet's deliberate linking of these two collections invites us to read the *Iambi* as a specific development of the *Aitia*, yielding new explanations for some of the more bizarre and intractable *Iambi* while illuminating an attractive side of Callimachus' personality, and suggesting several points about the date and composition of the *Iambi* and *Aitia*.

At the conclusion of *Aitia* 4 Callimachus announces his departure to the "foot-pasture of the Muses,"

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν (fr. 112.9 Pf.).

In *P.Oxy.* 1011, this verse is followed immediately in the same column by a *subscriptio*, identifying the preceding as *Aitia* 4, and a new title, "Iamboi" followed in turn by the opening verse of *Iamb* 1 (ft. 191). Thus, there can be no doubt that fr. 112.9 is the closing line of the *Aitia*.

Although the position of the verse is firmly established, its interpretation is not. In particular, the meaning of the "Muses' foot-pasture" has been much disputed, and although I have just stated unequivocally that it was intended to introduce the *Iambi*, it is not always read in this way. A.S. Hunt, the first editor of *P.Oxy.* 1011, understood it as an allusion to Callimachus' scholarly work in the Library (introd. p.18). At the conclusion of the *Aitia* the poet was announcing his intention to concentrate his attention on prose, especially, the *Pinakes*. Von Amim, writing that same year (*Sb. Wien*, Phil. hist. Kl. 164 [1910] 10), argued that the "Muses' foot-pasture" is not prose as compared with poetry, but poetry in an unheroic, unpretentious style. Μουσέων νομός refers to the pasture where the Muses appeared to Hesiod, and where the poet plans to return in the future. Herzog elaborated this argument the next year (*Berl. Phil. Wochenschr.* 31 [1911] 29-30), and followed it to its

¹ Texts of the fragments of Callimachus are from R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1949 and 1953) unless otherwise noted. An earlier version of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association in San Antonio, Dec. 28, 1986.

² The *Diegeseis* = *P.Med.* 18, M. Norsa and G. Vitelli (eds.), *Διηγήσεις di poemi di Callimaco in uno papiro di Tebtynis*, Papyri della R. Università di Milano (Firenze 1934); A. Vogliano, *Papyri della Regia Università di Milano (PRIMI I 1937)*, with additional fragments (reprinted 1966).

logical conclusion. If the "foot-pasture of the Muses" is poetry of a modest sort, it must refer to Callimachus' own *Iambi*, on the authority of Horace who calls his *Satires* "musa pedestris," (*Sat.* 2.6.17) and "sermones repentis per humum," (*Epist.* 2.1.250-251). Since the *Iambi* follow the *Aitia* in the principal papyrus, it stands to reason that Callimachus deliberately arranged the two poems one after the other, and linked them together. He was not only their author, but also their editor.

When the *Diegeseis* were published, with their summaries in precisely the same order, a *subscriptio of Aitia* 4 followed in the same column by the first words of *Iamb* 1, Herzog's thesis seemed ever more plausible (*PRIMI* I [see n.2] 73 and 98-99).

Despite the literary and physical evidence, the notion that Callimachus willfully connected two poems of distinctly different genres has not met with universal acceptance, and the number and prestige of the scholars associated with both sides of the issue is about equal.³ Discussion has centered on five issues.⁴

1. Whether "the foot pasture of the Muses" should be interpreted as literary style in general (von Arnim, 10; Cessi, 103); prose in general (Pohlenz, 325-326); or the *Pinakes* in particular (Hunt, 18); poetry without music (Torraca, 104-105); or the *Iambi* in particular (Herzog, 29-30; Pfeiffer [1949] n. on fr. 112.9; Puelma, 68; Baragazzi, 105).

2. Whether or not the transition between the two genres is artistically acceptable (Pohlenz, 325; Wilamowitz [1924] 210); and whether or not it is logical (Cessi, 103; Coppola, 75; Kapsomenos, 30).

³ Some representative supporters of Hunt (P. Oxy. 7.1011) include U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über Griechische Lyriker* (Berlin 1913) 299 n. 1 and *Die Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* I (Berlin 1924, repr. 1962) 210; A. Koerte, *Die Hellenistische Dichtung* (orig. pub. 1925, rev. by P. Haendel, Stuttgart 1960) 82; I. Kapp, *Philol.* 84 (1929) 173-178; M. Pohlenz, *Hermes* 68 (1933) 313-327; G. Coppola, *Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco* (Bologna 1935) 74-79; E. Eichgrün, *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios* (diss. Berol. 1961) 67-68.

Some of the more influential supporters of Herzog (*Berl. phil. Wochenschr.* 31 [1911] 29-30) include R. Pfeiffer, first in "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos," *Hermes* 63 (1928) 302-341, later in "BEPENIKHΣ ΠΛΟΚΑΜΟΣ," *Philol.* 87 (1932) 179-228, and finally in *Callimachus* ii (above, n. 1) xxxvi-xxxvii; H. Herter, *RE Supp.* 5 (1931) 425, and with bibliography in *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 225 (1937) 65-226, esp. 144-145; B. Lavagnini, *SFIC* 12 (1935) 111-118; S.G. Kapsomenos, *BNJ* 16 (1939) 1-32; M. Puelma, *Philol.* 101 (1957) 247-268, reprinted in D. Skiadas (ed.), *Kallimachos* (Darmstadt 1975) 43-69; G. Capovilla, *Callimaco*, 2 (Roma 1967) 376-377; L. Torraca, *Il prologo dei Telchini e l'inizio degli Aitia di Callimaco*, *Collana di Studi Greci* 48 (Napoli 1969) 104-105; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* II (Oxford 1972) 720 and notes 11-12; A. Barigazzi, *Prometheus* 7 (1981) 97-107.

⁴ For bibliographical references in this section see above n. 3 and p. 1f. for Hunt, von Arnim, Herzog; also C. Cessi, *Aegyptus* 9 (1928) 97-105; P. Knox, *GRBS* 26 (1985) 59-62.

3. Whether or not the order of the poems in the papyri is relevant (Wilamowitz [1924] 210; Pfeiffer (1949) xxxvi-vii; Kapsomenos, 31).

4. Whether or not the linkage of the two poems has chronological significance, and if so, what? (Heiter [1931] 425; Barragazzi 105; Lavagnini 115; Pfeiffer [1949] xxxvi-vii).

5. Whether or not poems of different genres could be formally linked if they did not follow one another in a single papyrus roll (Wilamowitz [1924] 210; Knox 62-62).

It seems unlikely that the controversy can be advanced by new pronouncements on any of these issues which already have articulate advocates on all sides.⁵ The "foot-pasture of the Muses" is elusive and ambiguous no matter what Callimachus intended by it, and however dramatic the physical evidence, it is weakened by the fact that the earlier of the two papyri was made some three or four centuries after Callimachus' autograph. Worst of all, there are no precise parallels for supra-generic composition in Greek or in Latin, and no one has ever demonstrated why the *Aitia* should have anything at all to do with the *Iambi*, or the *Iambi* with the *Aitia*.

It is surprising that this last difficulty, the need to explain why Callimachus might have implied that the two poems are related, has never been addressed, since the question is by no means intractable. Unlike the issues listed above, it is not answered by making deductions from a single puzzling verse, a method which has not, and perhaps cannot, solve the problem to everyone's satisfaction. In contrast, focusing attention on what Callimachus was pointing at by suggesting that the two poems were linked, allows us to approach a solution by examining the texts as a whole, inquiring, as far as their fragmentary nature permit, whether the *Iambi* have anything to do with the *Aitia*. Thus, it is assumed below, for the sake of the argument, that linkage between the two poems is a fact, and the implications of the relationship are investigated. If this approach produces new insights into either poem, we can say that the assumption on which it rests is useful; and if it is useful, we will be all the more persuaded of its truth.

The linkage of the *Aitia* and *Iambi* invites us to read the *Iambi* as a specific development of the *Aitia*, using the Muses themselves as an indication of how to proceed. They appear in the epilogue of the *Aitia* not only in the foot-pasture in the final line (fr. 112.9), but also just above in fr. 112.5-6 where they are accompanied by verses repeated from *Aitia* 1 fr. 2, the "Somnium," where Callimachus describes Hesiod's encounter with the Muses on Mt. Helicon. An anonymous epigram *A.P.* (7.42) tells us that Callimachus imagined himself another Hesiod, transported by a dream from Libya to Helicon and this is confirmed by

⁵ The barrenness of this approach is illustrated in a recent article by P. Knox (see n. 4).

Schol. Flor. 16-18. Extant fragments clearly show that the poet's fancied conversation with the Muses served as a frame for organizing the various *aitia* of books 1 and 2.

Callimachus' source in Hesiod, of course, is *Theogony* 22-34 where the Muses appear to Hesiod and give him the gift of song. They conclude their interview by ordering the poet to celebrate the race of blessed gods who are forever, and always to sing of themselves first and last (*Theog.* 33-34). Hesiod himself neglects the second part of this advice, and the *Theogony*, as we have it, ends without them (see M.L. West's commentary [Oxford 1966]). Callimachus' interpretation of this passage is more literal. He invokes the Muses at both ends of the *Aitia*, claiming and then reclaiming Hesiod as a literary predecessor, and the dream as a metaphor for poetic inspiration. The first *Iamb* (fr. 191) immediately follows the second reminiscence of the dream with the ghost of Hipponax announcing his arrival from Hades with a new kind of iamb. Hipponax is addressing an unruly crowd of *philologoi* outside the great Serapeum in Alexandria. Temples of Sarapis, like those of Asclepius, were the sites of healing cults that specialized in incubation therapy (P.M. Fraser, *Ptol. Alex.* [see n.3]). Thus, Callimachus seems to imply the *philologoi* have come for a dream cure, and their prayers are answered by a vision of Hipponax.⁶ The metaphor of the dream of inspiration has been transformed into a parody of itself with Hipponax appearing in the unlikely role of the Muses, and the inmates of the Museum, as dreamers.⁷ And just as Hesiod and the Muses appear at both the beginning and end of the *Aitia*, Hipponax links the first and last *Iamb*, where those who want to write choliambos are directed to Ephesus for inspiration (fr. 203.11-14).

At the very beginning of the *Iambi*, then, we are invited to look for specific parodies of the *Aitia*, or for *topoi* from the *Aitia* recast in iambic form. The first example to emerge from the fragments involves the Muses themselves who appear at the beginning and end of the *Iambi*, framing this set of poems as they did the *Aitia*. In the first *Iamb* we find them towards the end of the poem, in a description of a poet who "alone chose the Muses who pastured on green figs" (fr. 191.92-93), and in the thirteenth, they do "not associate with common types (φάυλοις); they flew past, trembling themselves lest they get a bad

⁶ See D.L. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden 1980) 11f. L. Koenen adds to this line of argument that Hipponax calls the 'credulous' (line 7) *philologoi* to the temple of Parmenion outside the city walls, a place connected with the name of babbling Euhemerus; there the vision proper of Hipponax takes place. It is significant that the temple cannot be identified with that of the large Serapeum that housed the library (and therefore would have been a likely place for the *philologoi* to gather) since - chronological problems aside - this temple did not lie outside the city walls (Fraser, *op. cit.* I 270f.; in *Callimachus' Iambi* 11 n. 2, however, I have accepted the identification; for the temple library of the Serapeum *ibid.* 323f.; for Euhemerus and the temple 735f. and II 453 n. 824).

⁷ In the vision, Hipponax tells them: *σιωπῆ γενέσθω καὶ γράφεσθε τὴν ῥῆσιν*; cf. Apollo addressing Callimachus *ὅτε πρότιςτον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα | γούνασιν* (*Aitia* fr. 1.21f.)

reputation; wherefore each one scrapes off nothing rich with his fingertips, but meager bits, as from the olive that gave rest to Leto," (fr. 203.58-62).

The poor, hungry, fearful Muses seem to parody the more dignified Muses of the *Aitia*, who inspired a more successful poet, but, in fact, they have a specific prototype in the *Aitia*, in *SH* 253 and 239, two badly damaged fragments of Book 2 that appear to be closely connected.⁸ *SH* 253 links the Muses (13) again with the dream (12) and poverty (11), a theme developed at greater length in *SH* 239:

2] ω[...]μα ῥυηφενὲς ο[
] επλ[] ηφυλα[] εμουσιτο
 4]βαλαντομετ[...] αιφημι [
 ο]ὐ δῆκται τὼς κύνες εἰς θεοί
 — ∪ μ]έν οὖν ἔτι μοί τι δόμοις θεο[
 — ∞]μοις αἰδὼς ἴζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις
 8]ιν ἐθέλεσκον ἄ μὴ μάθον ευ[..] [
]κεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος κτύπη[
]νη λίπεν ὄθματα σ .. τοδε[
] πῶρ ἰέναι
 12] κηχέεσσαν ἐλεγμ[ην
 μ]ελαινομένη

3 φῦλα τ]ρέμονσι

Here the "tribes" of Muses (?) tremble.⁹ There is a complaint that the gods do not bite like dogs (5), i.e. that they are slow to punish,¹⁰ a wrongdoing, one assumes, though the extant fragments do not explain. Then a narrator laments, "[as long as] I [had] some [meal] at home, shame sat on my eyelids, and I did not wish [to sing (?)] what I had not learned, ... but the foodbox [sang] (or "requested") another song" (69),¹¹ i.e. hunger reduced him to desperation and forced him to do something he knew was wrong.

⁸ On the likelihood of their belonging to one poem see H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin and New York 1983) 99; A. Harder, *ZPE* 67 (1987) 21-30.

⁹ The likelihood that the Muses are the subject here depends in part on the connection with *SH* 253. See *Aitia* fr. 2.2 for the "tribe" (ἐκμὸς) of Muses and *Iamb* 13 (fr. 203.59) for "trembling" Muses. For [τ]ρέμονσι as a possible reading on line 4 see Harder 22; the only alternative is [β]ρέμονσι (see the editors and Harder, *loc. cit.* [n. 8] notes 10 and 12).

¹⁰ R. Kassel in *SH*, *ad loc.* p. 91; Harder, *loc. cit.* 23.

¹¹ 6-7 ὄφρα μ]έν οὖν ἔτι μοί τι δόμοις θεο[ινῆμα παρῆεν, | τόφρα δ' ἐ]μοίς αἰδὼς ἴζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις in Lloyd-Jones' reconstruction; then 10-11 οὐδ' ἄ]δε]ιν ἐθέλεσκειν ἄ μὴ μάθον. εὐ[τε ∪ ∞ ἥ]ει]κεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος κτύπη] with the suggestions of the editors. One also could think of ἥ]τη]κεν instead of ἥ]ει]κεν (Koenen). For 9-10 Koenen compares the empty chest (χηλός) of Theocr. XVI, to which the bare-footed Charites return from an idle visit to a possible sponsor (lines 8-12), itself an adaption from Simonides (Stob. 3. 10. 38; Gow *ad loc.*; R. Merkelbach, *Rh. Mus.* 95, 1952, 312ff.; see also Call. fr. 222).

There is not enough text remaining to explain the context of these fragments, or the situation of the narrator, who is apparently an impoverished and angry poet, perhaps, Callimachus himself. A. Harder has recently argued that this passage contains a number of elements typical of Callimachus' programmatic passages and locates both fragments at the very end of *Aitia* 2 where they would balance *Aitia* frgs. 1 and 2 (*loc. cit.* [n. 8] 28). The reappearance of the hungry Muses at the beginning and end of the *Iambi* supports this view and suggests that Callimachus put great stock in the message embodied in these images. All the more powerful, then, is Callimachus' subversion of them in *Iamb* 3.

We learn from the *Diegeseis* (VI 34-37) that *Iamb* 3 (fr. 193) begins like a typical Hellenistic moralizing poem against *aischrokerdeia*,¹² "He blames the times as making more of wealth than of *arete*, and approves of the old days when values were the opposite" (*Dieg.* VI 34-37). It soon becomes apparent, however, that the moralizing has no general application, but is aimed at a certain Euthydemos, who has been introduced to a rich man by his mother and is wasting his youth for profit (*Dieg.* VI 37-40). Lines 26-33 of the text suggest that the narrator was personally aggrieved by this, apparently because he had had a relationship with Euthydemos himself.¹³ Thus, *Iamb* 3 is not at all what it appears to be at the outset, but uses the language and strikes the attitudes of moralizing choliambic poems in service of values such poems usually criticize. At another level, the language in which the narrator of *Iamb* 3 expresses his distress bears more than a passing resemblance to *SH* 239. The contrast of wealth and poverty (*SH* 239.2 and 6-9, *Dieg.* VI 34-35); the gods' tardiness or unwillingness to act (*SH* 239.5 and fr. 193.32); and the narrator's claim to rely on the moral standards he had been taught earlier (*SH* 239.7-8 and fr. 193.30-31) are prominent features of both poems. While it might appear that these are only standard formulas for expressing anger, a more specific relationship between the poems is indicated by the conclusion of *Iamb* 3, where the narrator invokes the key images of *SH* 239 while simultaneously coming to terms with his sexual frustrations:

34] ν μοι τοῦτ' ἄν ἦν ὀνήϊc[το]ν
]υ[] [] K[υβή]βη τὴν κόμην ἀναρρίπτειν
 36 Φρύγ[α] πρ[ὸς] ἀλὸν ἢ ποδῆρες ἔλκοντα
 Ἄδω[ν]ιν αἰαῖ, τῆς θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον,
 ἠλεμίζειν· γῦν δ' ὁ μάργος ἐc Μούcαc
 ἔνευcα· τοίγα[ρ] ἦν ἔμαξα δει[] cω.

¹² Examples in G. Gerhard, *Phoenix von Kolophon* (Leipzig 1909) 4-7 and 11-155. For a general description see D. Clayman *op. cit.* (n. 6) 66-70.

¹³ Fr. 193.26-33. See C. Dawson, *AJP* 67 (1946) 1-15.

"This would have been best for me: ... to toss my hair for Cybele, to the sound of the flute in a Phrygian mode; or to cry "aiai" for Adonis in his trailing robes, the lover of the goddess. But now, a glutton, I nodded to the Muses, and therefore, must eat the bread I kneaded."¹⁴ (193.34-39)

Iamb 3, then, concludes with the Muses, poverty and food. Whatever the original context of this constellation in the *Aitia*, it was surely nothing like this. Like the dream of the Muses turned into a nightmare of Hipponax, the poet's programmatic statements in the *Aitia* become the cries of a rejected lover in the *iamb*, leaving no doubt that we are in rapid descent from the heights of Helicon to the Muses' foot-pasture.¹⁵

Other examples of *Aitia* parodies in the *Iambi* reinforce this perception. One involves fr. 114 of the *Aitia*, unplaced, but found twice among fragments of book 3. It records an interview with the statue of Apollo at Delos by an anonymous interlocutor. The poem takes the form of a dialogue epigram with a series of short questions and answers. The statue is asked about its name (fr. 114.4) and appearance (fr. 114.6-7) including its height, clothing and accoutrements: a bow in its left hand and a group of Charities in its right (fr. 114.8-9). The text that follows (fr. 114.10-15) is quite fragmented, but Pfeiffer demonstrates convincingly that it is an allegorical explanation of Apollo's equipment: "... in order [to punish] fools for their insolence, [I have the bow ... but] to good people I stretch out [my hand with the Graces. In the left hand I carry the bow, because I am slower to] chastise [mortals; the Graces in the right] hand, [as I am] always disposed [to distribute] pleasant things."¹⁶

Fr. 114 may be usefully compared to two of Callimachus' more bizarre *Iambi*. In form it closely resembles *Iamb* 9 (fr. 199) which records a conversation between an ithyphallic statue of Hermes and a passerby, described by the *Dieg.* as a lover of the handsome youth Philetadas. As in *Aitia* 114, the statue is asked about details of its appearance, and offers an explanation. Only two lines of the *Iamb* are extant, but judging from these and the summary in *Dieg.* VIII 33-40, the main object of interest was the Hem's erection and the explanation of his appearance was a mystic story of Tyrhennian origin, probably obscene. The ninth *Iamb*, then, is constructed like a classic parody: the form of its target, fr. 114, is preserved, but the contents have been replaced with their ethical opposite.

Iamb 6 (fr. 196) also has links with fr. 114. Here Callimachus describes the famous statue of Zeus at Olympia, setting out precise measurements of the length, height and width of the pedestal, throne, footstool, statue, and associated figures together with a cost estimate

¹⁴ For the meaning of 193.39 see C. Dawson, *YCS* 11 (1950) 38.

¹⁵ An ironic twist is added. The poet has now become a glutton (μάργος) by nodding to the Muses; in Hesiod, the poet had been abused by the Muses as glutton (*Theog.* 26, ἄγραυλοι ... γακτέρες οἶον).

¹⁶ R. Pfeiffer, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 15 (1952) 26-27.

(*Dieg.* VII 25-31). It has always struck its commentators as a curious and unsatisfactory piece, iambic in no sense except metrical, showing, in Dawson's words, "*techne* rather than *enthusiasm*" (Dawson, *loc. cit.* [n. 14] 72). Seen in the light of *Aitia* 114, however, it looks rather different. The description of physical detail that takes up at most 8 lines in fr. 114 is magnified here to fill the poem, requiring at a minimum, five times as much space, at least 45 verses with measurements, apparently accurate, of every major line and surface. Once again we see Callimachus using a classic technique of parody, focusing on a single aspect of his target and exaggerating it to the point of absurdity.

Another *aition* that receives similar treatment in the *Iambi* is fr. 64, the Sepulchre of Simonides, which is securely placed in the third book. Like fr. 114, it takes the form of an extended epigram, in this case, presenting a monologue delivered by Simonides as if from his tomb. He begins with a proverb to emphasize the enormity of the evil that is bound to befall a certain Phoenix who had removed the poet's tombstone at Acragas and built it into the tower of a rampart (fr. 64.1-7). Simonides underlines his point by singing his own praises, quoting from the original epitaph that had described some of his most important accomplishments (fr. 64.7-10), and telling the famous story of how the Dioscuri called him out from a banquet just as the palace collapsed on his hosts, the Scopadae (fr. 64.11-15).

Iamb 11 (fr. 201) has a similar form and Sicilian locale, but in this case the voice from the tomb belongs to Connidas, a wealthy pimp from Selinus, and the proverb, "the goods of Connidas are anyone's prey" is explained as a clause in his will meaning that anyone was welcome to his prostitutes (*Dieg.* VII 20-23). Once again Callimachus has taken the form of a favorite *aition* and filled it with comic content.

Other *Aitia* and *Iambi* are also similar in form or content, though in these cases the fragmentary state of both texts prevents us from seeing the precise nature of their relationship. E.g. The eighth *Iamb* is an epinicion like the "Victoria Berenices" (*SH* 254-269) that introduced *Aitia* book 3 (P.J. Parsons, *ZPE* 26 [1977] 1-50). Both recount the heroes and the myths that explained the founding of the contest. In *Iamb* 8 the founders were the Argonauts who also appear in two other *Aitia*, fr. 108-109, located towards the end of book 4, and fr. 7.19-21, that connects their return with unusual sacrifices, the subject of *Iamb* 10 (fr. 200a and b). *Iamb* 7 (fr. 197), like fr. 100 of *Aitia* 4, is about a primitive wooden statue of a god, and like *Aitia* fr. 31b (Addendum), it tells how the statue, or part of the statue, was recognized as a divine object. Finally, *Iamb* 12 (fr. 202), and fr. 43 and 178 from *Aitia* 2, all report what happened and what was said at parties attended by the poet.¹⁷

The fragmentary nature of all these texts makes it impossible to establish the parodic nature of the version in the *Iambi*, but the fact remains that *Iambi* 1, 3 and 6 - 13 can be seen

¹⁷ On symposia in the *Aitia* see J. Zetzel, *ZPE* 42 (1981) 31-33. For more details on the iambic fragments in general see Dawson, *loc. cit.* (n. 14) n. and Clayman, *op. cit.* (n. 6).

as borrowing their form and/or subject matter from the *Aitia*. Where evidence is available, the *Iambi* appear to be comic developments of the *Aitia* originals, reflecting the previous poem back on itself through a distorted lens, like a satyr play on a tragedy. This goes a long way towards explaining what talking statues, tales of the Argonauts and discussions of religious practices are doing in a book of *Iambi*, and gives it a kind of whacky sense, revealing Callimachus as a comic poet of great distinction who is unafraid to turn his wit against himself.

Understanding the *Iambi* in this way suggests a few points about the date and composition of the book. The fixed order of the poems in *P.Oxy.* 1011 and in the *Diegesis*, and the link between the *Aitia* and the *Iambi* in fr. 112 convinced Pfeiffer that Callimachus must have arranged a second edition of the collection of his own works late in life.¹⁸ The *Aitia* prologue (fr. 1, "Against the Telchines") in which the poet portrays himself as an old man and the "Coma Berenices" (fr. 110), which must be dated late in Callimachus' lifetime (after 246 B.C.), were added to the *Aitia* at this time, along with the epilogue linking them with the *Iambi* (fr. 112). The discovery of the "Victoria Berenices" and the necessity of locating it at the beginning of *Aitia* 3 lead Parsons to propose a modification of this theory.¹⁹ In this scheme, the young Callimachus wrote books 1 and 2 of the *Aitia*, introduced and connected by conversations with the Muses, and in old age added the prologue, epilogue and all of *Aitia* books 3 and 4, beginning and ending with Berenices.

The *Iambi* can now be fitted to this scenario. *Iambi* 1, 3 and 6 - 13, which depend specifically on the *Aitia*, and especially on portions of books 3 and 4, must have been written after the *Aitia* was complete. That is, the book of *Iambi* must follow the final edition of the *Aitia* chronologically as well as physically.

It was late in life, then, that Callimachus conceived the notion of relating two poetry books in different genres. Fr. 112.9 Pf. is the first clue the reader is given to the nature of the complex relationship between the two, but it is not the poet's last word on the subject. This can be found, suitably enough, in the last *Iamb*, ft. 203, which begins with an invocation to the Muses and Apollo recalling the double prologues of *Aitia* 1,²⁰ and contains a defense of Callimachus' poetics akin in form and spirit to the first prologue "Against the Telchines" (fr. 1). Here he quotes his critic's complaints that he has interwoven something, babbled in various dialects (ft. 203.17-18), and composed in too many different genres (*Dieg.* IX 33-36). Callimachus defends himself against this last charge by denying that the gods as-

¹⁸ Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* II xxxvi s.; for some literature see G. Crane, *ZPE* 66, 1986, 275 n. 24.

¹⁹ Parsons, *ZPE* 26 (1977) 49-50; see also C.A. Faraone, *ZPE* 63 (1986) 55.

²⁰ It would also recall the epilogue of the *Aitia* if Puelma is correct in projecting Apollo's presence there, *loc. cit.* (n. 3) 68; the epilogue (fr. 112.5-6) quotes the somnium (fr. 2.12); see Faraone, *loc. cit.* (n. 19).

signed each poet a single genre (fr. 203.30-34) and by citing the example of Ion of Chios, (*Dieg.* IX 36) whose prodigious literary output included many different genres, and whose well-documented interest in Pythagoreanism, with its doctrine of the transmigration of souls, gave Callimachus the opportunity to recall *Iamb* 1 (fr. 191.59-61) and the metaphor of literary rebirth.²¹

The final section of this last *Iamb* is taken up with Callimachus' concerns about the terrible effects of rivalry among poets: one poet locks horns with another, furious (fr. 203.52-53); one brands another a slave (fr. 203.55-56); the Muses fly past afraid of getting a bad reputation (fr. 203.58-59); the poets can barely scrape together a living (fr. 203.60-62). Here, at the conclusion of the *Iambi*, Callimachus recalls the professional backbiting that introduces the *Aitia*, making the thirteenth *Iamb* more than a conclusion to the book of *Iambi* with many precise links to *Iamb* 1 that have been described elsewhere,²² but also, a fitting conclusion to a literary masterwork that includes both the *Aitia* and the *Iambi*.

The fusion of two poetry books in different genres has no parallel in Greek or Latin literature, but the absence of a predecessor or successor is not fatal to the argument. The view of literature underlying such a creation would be uniquely Callimachean, based on a lifetime of cataloging and arranging literature, as he composed the *Pinakes*.²³ Of all Greek poets, Callimachus was the one most likely to understand the limits of generic distinctions and to seek ways of transcending them. Many of his techniques involving experiments with meter, dialect and *topoi* are well-known and well-documented. They are the manifestation on a small scale of what was also happening in the larger scheme. After defining categories for other people's poems, Callimachus found a way, in his own poetry, to subvert them. The *Aitia* may be elegies, like those of Mimnermus or Philetas; and the *Iambi* belong in the same category as the poetry of Archilochus and Hipponax; but the two linked together, as they are, in a multitude of ways, to form a complex diptych presenting contrasting views of a single literary vision, complicate the question of genre almost unbearably, taxing its definitions to the furthest limits. If the Romans did not reproduce Callimachus' experiment on a similar scale, it may be that the issue was a personal one for the poet, and that in this one major effort, he exhausted it.

Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center,
City University of New York

Dee L. Clayman

²¹ It may also have inspired *Ennius'* curious interpretation of the dream metaphor in the prologue of his *Annales*, fr. 2-10, 0. Skutsch, *The Annals of Ennius* (Oxford 1985).

²² Clayman, *op. cit.* (n. 6) 44-47 and *Hermes* 104 (1976) 29-35.

²³ On the *Pinakes* see P. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 126-134.

**Corrections to D.L. Clayman, "Callimachus *Iambi* and *Aitia*"
(ZPE 74, 1984, 277-286)**

Dee L. Clayman's article was haunted by the demon of misprints, and the responsible editor apologizes to the author as well as to the readers.

- p. 278, last line of indented paragraph # "1.", read: Barigazzi (instead of Baragazzi)
2nd line of indented paragraph # "2.", read: Wilamowitz (instead of Wilamowith)
- p. 279, 2nd line of indented paragraph # "4.", read: Barigazzi (instead of Barragazzi)
n. 5, read: barrenness (instead of barreness)
- p. 280 n. 7, read $\omega\pi\eta$ (instead of $\epsilon\omega\pi\eta$)
- p. 281, line 1 of *SH* 239, read] (instead of])
line 5 of *SH* 239, read: $\omicron\grave{\upsilon}$ (instead of $\omicron\grave{\upsilon}$), and: $\theta\iota\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota$ (instead of $\theta[\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota$
app.: $\tau\grave{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ (instead of $\tau\grave{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota$)
n.11. The first sentence should run: 6-7 ὄφρα μὲν οὖν ἔτι μοί τι δόμοις θεοῖν ἴνῃμα
παρῆεν, | τόφρα δ' ἐ]μοῖς αἰδῶς ἴζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις in Lloyd-Jones' reconstruction; then
8-9 οὐδ' ἄδε]ιν ἐθέλεσκον ἄ μὴ μάθον. εὐ[τ(ε) ~ - - | - ∞ ἦει]κεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος κυύ-
[η with the suggestions of the editors.
- p. 282, last line of first paragraph, read: Callimachus' (instead of Callimchus)
n. 12, read: *Phoinix* (instead of *Phoenix*)
- p. 283, 6th line of third paragraph, read: Charites (instead of Charities)
7th line of fourth paragraph, read: Tyrrhenian (instead of Tyrhennian)
- p. 285, last word of second paragraph, read: Berenice (instead of Berenices)

The author also wishes to seize the opportunity and to add that, with regard to her brief discussion of *Aitia* fr. 114, the reader may find useful a reference to R. Kassel's article on "Dialogue mit Statuen", *ZPE* 51, 1983, 1-12, especially 8ff.

L.K.