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BETWEEN "PROLOGUE" AND "DREAM" (Call.fr. 1a, 19ff.)

The scholia in Call. Aetia fr. 1a-2a (POxy. 2262) mostly refer to words from a kind of no man's land between Call.fr.1, the prologue of the Aetia (the commentary in fr.a,1-11 still refers to fr.1,36), and fr.2, which refers to Hesiod meeting the Muses on Mt.Helicon and is generally considered as part of the tale of 'Callimachus' dream in which the Muses told him the aitia. Recently some attempts have been made to use these scholia in order to discover more about the transition between prologue and dream. The relevant part of the text is Call.fr.1a,19ff.:

\[
\begin{align*}
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\end{align*}
\]

In 1988 Arnd Kerkhecker drew attention to the fact that the coronis below fr.1a,30 should get more attention than it had thus far received and that one should not accept Pfeiffer's idea that the lines preceding the coronis were already referring to the dialogue with the Muses and no longer to the prologue of the Aetia. He argued that the lemmata in fr.1a, 24-25 were part of an invocation of the Muses, which may have concluded the prologue and/or created a transition to the tale of the dream. This would have the advantage of explaining both the coronis and the contents of the lemmata: fr.1a, 24-25 could refer to a request by the speaker to the Muses, whom he asks to remind him of the answers they gave him in the past. One may add that also 26 πῦ]θωνταί fits this kind of the context very well;

---

1 The fragments are quoted from R.Pfeiffer, Callimachus 1-2, Oxford 1949-53. For fr. 1a-2a see Pfeiffer 2,100ff.
3 See Pfeiffer (n.1), 105.
it may be part of a final clause: "Remind me of the answers in order that others can hear them too".  

Kerkhecker’s idea was elaborated by Peter Bing, who argued that fr.1a, 19-23 may suggest that Callimachus did not only ask the Muses to remind him of their answers, but also of his own questions. This is less convincing. First of all one should make a cautionary remark: Bing bases his idea on a variant reading mentioned in the scholion, whereas the actual text of Callimachus in the lemma consists only of θ. Therefore we cannot be certain that the general drift of the text of Callimachus in the scholiast’s edition was similar to that of the variant and there is no way of deciding whether the variant or the edition contains the original 'right' reading. This state of affairs does not mean that we must not take the variant seriously, but one should be aware of the possibility that this was not what Callimachus wrote. Secondly, Bing ignores the interpretation of the variant which is given by the scholiast and takes θυμὸν ἐπήμεν in the sense "occurred to my θυμός" (with the questions to the Muses as subject). He therein follows Pfeiffer, who said "ἲπημὸς poetae somniantis esse videtur" and compared passages like Π.2,171 ἄχος κραδίνη καὶ θυμὸν ἰκανεν; 11,88 ὄδος τε μὲν ἰκέτο θυμὸν and 18,178 εῖβας δέ οἱ θυμὸν ἰκέκθο. The normal Greek way of saying "occurred to", however, would rather be something like ἐπήρχετο + dat., whereas the expression used by the scholiast is ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἢρχας το, which suggests an arrival in a much more literal sense, perhaps even implying that the subject invades the ψυχὴ and takes possession of it.

For such an interpretation of ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἢρχας το we may compare passages like E.HF 863 (Lyssa:) δραμοῦμαι στέρνον εἰς Ἡρακλέους; Βα. 300f. όταν γὰρ ὁ θεός ἐκ τὸ εὖμ’ ἔλθη πολὺς, ί λέγειν τὸ μέλλων τοὺς μεμηνότας ποιεῖ (with E.R.Dodds, Euripides Bacchae, Oxford 19602 ad loc.); Ar.Eccl. 882 (old woman:) Μοῦχαι δὲν ἴτε ἐπὶ τοῦμὸν κτόμα and especially Batr. 1f. χορὸν εὖ Ελικοῦνος ί ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐμὸν ἱτορ

4 Cf. fr.7, 14 ἕνα μοι· πουλὸ μένως[ν] ἐτος. The train of thought may be compared to η. 3,186 εἰπε, θεή, εὑ μὲν ἁμιν, εγὼ δ’ ἐτέρωσιν ἀείωσ; Ης.Οp. 1ff. and the familiar idea of the poet as an interpreter of the words of the Muses. See also G.O.Hutchinson, Hellenistic Poetry, Oxford 1988,1109. For the verb cf. fr.43, 84f. εἰγὼ δ’ ἐπὶ καὶ [το π]θέκθαι | ἡθέλον. There seems to be no need to take Callimachus as the subject of the verb as N.Krevans, "Invocation" at the End of the Aetia Prologue, ZPE 89,1991,19-23, esp. 19f., tries to do.


6 A.S.Hollis suggests to me that this might be a different case of θυμὸς followed by a different verb. This cannot be excluded, although it is not necessary that both words mentioned as a variant reading are different (cf. e.g. Σ AR 1,688 γράφεται καὶ περιτελλόμενον ἐτος for πρώξα τελλόμενον ἐτος).

7 For more examples see LGrE s.v. ἰκάνον 1bβα and s.v. θυμὸς B 10. For this role of the θυμὸς Bing also compares fr. 31b τὸ[ν] μὲν ἔρη· τός δ’ εἰθαρ ἐμὸς πάλιν εἰρέτο θυμός; more in Bing (n.5), 273 n.3. One may add fr. 178,21f. ὀς[α] δ’ ἐμείτι [ε]θεὶν πάρα θυμός ἀκούσατι | ἴσινει, τάδε μοι λ[ε]ξον [ἀνετρομένοι].

8 Cf. e.g. Ηdt. 1,30,2 ἵμερος ἐπειρέθαι μοι ἐπῆλθε ε; Pl. Crat. 428c,1; Grg. 485e, 5.
Between "Propogue" and "Dream" (Call.fr.1a, 19ff.)

The last passage with its request to the Muses to come to the speaker's heart could very well be inspired by a text of the Aetia which contained the variant mentioned by the scholiast or other words to the same effect. This idea wins some support from the fact that also Batr. 2f. ἄνιαδικ  ἐν νέον ἐν δέλταυκιν ἐμοὶ ἐπὶ γούναις θηκα is reminiscent of fr.1,21sq. ἐμοὶ ἐπὶ δέλταυν ἐθηκα  γούναςην: the first part of the Batrachomyomachia seems to have been written with the prologue of the Aetia in mind.

If we accept the idea of an 'arrival' in Call.fr.1a, 19ff. and on the basis of Batr.1f. take the Muses as subject,10 we get a picture of someone being invaded by the Muses, i.e. being ἔνθεος.11 This looks like a reference to the concept of poetic inspiration as being possessed by a divinity which was attributed to Democritus and favoured by Plato12 and - as far as we know - rejected by Callimachus in favour of technical skill.13 A mention of this concept of inspiration could well be part of the conclusion of the prologue to the Aetia and precede an invocation of the Callimachean Muses.14
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9 Cf. also E.Ph. 134 Ἄρης δ' Ἀιτωλῶν ἐν κτέρνοις ἐχεί; Hipp. 141ff. ἔνθεος ... ἐκ Πονός; A.Se. 497 ἔνθεος Ἀρεί; Pl.Phdr. 241e, 4f.; Hor. C. 2,19,6 pleno ... Bacchi pectore and 3,25,1f. and E.Fraenkel, Horace, Oxford 1957,199 n.1.

10 For the singular form of the verb cf. e.g. Call. fr.2,2 Ἦττιδιοι Μουσέων ἐμοὶ ὤτ' ἡντάκεν. Arrival and invocation of other goddesses (e.g. the Libyan heroines suggested by Krevans [n.4], 22) seems to me less likely, because prologue, dream and dialogue are all so closely associated with the Muses.

11 See H.Wölke, Untersuchungen zur Batrachomyomachie (Beitr. z.klass.Phil. 100), Meisenheim am Glan 1978,85f., who compares e.g. Pl. Crat. 428c, 7f. νύσση τις Μούσαι πάλαι ε ἐνούς ἐλελήηθε and refers to further literature on the subject; F.Pfister, Realllexikon für Antike und Christentum 4, Stuttgart 1959,955ff. and 977 (s.v. Ekstase); 5, Stuttgart 1962, 455 (s.v. Enthousiasmos).


13 Cf. e.g. the emphasis on τέχνη in Aetia fr.1,17 and the rejection of a distribution of genres by the gods in Ia. fr. 203,30ff. See e.g. D.L.Clayman, Callimachus Iambi, Leiden 1980,50ff.; on the development of the idea that poetry is a craft R.Harriott, Poetry and Criticism before Plato, London 1969,92ff.

14 The context of the fragment does not allow further conclusions: apart from the uncertainties as to the actual text of Callimachus (mentioned above), we do not know whose ὤνους is meant here or whether the words were perhaps preceded by a negation.
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