

M. A. HARDER

BETWEEN “PROLOGUE” AND “DREAM” (CALL. FR. 1A, 19FF.)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 96 (1993) 11–13

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

it may be part of a final clause: "Remind me of the answers in order that others can hear them too".⁴

Kerkhecker's idea was elaborated by Peter Bing,⁵ 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[. ⁶ 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 ἐπήϊεν in the sense "occurred to my θυμός" (with the questions to the Muses as subject). He therein follows Pfeiffer, who said "θυμός poetae somniantis esse videtur" and compared passages like Il.2,171 ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἴκανε; 11,88 ἄδος τέ μιν ἴκετο θυμόν and 18,178 céβαc δέ οἱ θυμὸν ἰκέσθω.⁷ The normal Greek way of saying "occurred to", however, would rather be something like ἐπήρχετο + dat.,⁸ whereas the expression used by the scholiast is ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἤρχ[ε]το, which suggests an arrival in a much more literal sense, perhaps even implying that the subject invades the ψυχή and takes possession of it.

For such an interpretation of ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἤρχ[ε]το we may compare passages like E.HF 863 (Lyssa:) δραμοῦμαι στέρνον εἰς Ἑρακλέους; Ba. 300f. ὅταν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐc τὸ cῶμ' ἔλθῃ πολύς, | λέγειν τὸ μέλλον τοὺς μεμνηόταc ποιεῖ (with E.R.Dodds, Euripides Bacchae, Oxford 1960² ad loc.); Ar.Eccl. 882 (old woman:) Μοῦcαι δεῦρ' ἴτ' ἐπὶ τοῦμὸν cτόμα and especially Batr. 1f. χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος | ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐμὸν ἦτορ

⁴ Cf. fr.7, 14 ἴνα μοῖ πούλὸ μὲνωc[ι]ν ἔτοc. The train of thought may be compared to *h.* 3,186 εἰπέ, θεή cὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐτέροισιν ἀείω; Hes.Op. 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 1988,81 n.109. For the verb cf. fr.43, 84f. ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ [τὸ πν]θέcθαι | ἤ]θελον. 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.

⁵ P.Bing, A Note on the new "Musenanruf" in Callimachus' Aetia, ZPE 74,1988,273-275.

⁶ A.S.Hollis suggests to me that this might be a different case of θυμός 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 περιτελλομένου ἔτεoc for πρόκα τελλομένου ἔτεoc).

⁷ For more examples see LFrGrE s.v. ἰκάνω 1bβaa and s.v. θυμός B 10. For this role of the θυμός Bing also compares fr. 31b τῶ]c μὲν ἔφη· τὰc δ' εἶθαρ ἐμὸc πάλιν εἶρετο θυμός; more in Bing (n.5), 273 n.3. One may add fr. 178,21f. ὅcc[α] δ' ἐμείο c[έ]θην πάρα θυμός ἀκούcαι | ἰχαινεί, τὰδε μοι λ[έ]ξον [ἀνειρομέν]ωι.

⁸ Cf. e.g. Hdt. 1,30,2 ἴμεροc ἐπειρέcθαι μοι ἐπήλθέ cε; Pl. Crat. 428c,1; Grg. 485e, 5.

ἐπεύχομαι.⁹ 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. ἀοιδῆς | ἦν νέον ἐν δέλτοισιν ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα is reminiscent of fr.1,21sq. ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα | γούνασι]ν: 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

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

M.A.Harder

⁹ Cf. also E.Ph. 134 Ἄρη δ' Αἰτωλὸν ἐν κτέρνοισι ἔχει; Hipp. 141ff. ἔνθεος ... ἐκ Πανός; A.Se. 497 ἔνθεος Ἄρει; 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 Ἠσιόδ]ωι Μουσέων ἐμὸς ὅτ' ἦντίασεν. 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. ἄλλη τις Μοῦσα πάλαι σε ἐνοῦσα ἐλελήθει and refers to further literature on the subject; F.Pfister, Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum 4, Stuttgart 1959,955ff. and 977 (s.v. Ekstase); 5, Stuttgart 1962, 455 (s.v. Enthousiasmos).

¹² Cf. e.g. Pl. Ion 533c, 9ff.; Phdr. 245a, 1ff.; Meno 99c, 1ff.; Hor.Ars 295ff. See further e.g. E.R.Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1951,82; D.A.Russell, Criticism in Antiquity, London 1981,69ff.; id., 'Longinus' on the Sublime, Oxford 1964,113f. (on 113,2); C.O.Brink, Horace on Poetry. The Ars Poetica, Cambridge 1971, on 295ff.

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 1980,50f.; 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 θυμός is meant here or whether the words were perhaps preceded by a negation.

I wish to thank A.S.Hollis and S.L.Radt for their comments on an earlier version of this article.