KONSTANTINOS SPANOUDAKIS

CALLIMACHUS FR. 1.9–12 AGAIN


© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn
CALLIMACHUS FR. 1.9–12 AGAIN*

G. Bastianini showed that Rostagni’s *κατὰ λεπτῶν* in the text of Scholia Londiniensia on Callimachus fr. 1.11 is an impossible reading and W. Luppe\(^1\) after a careful re-examination of the papyrus established the following text (on vv. 9–12):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{9} & \text{ ήτοι πολύ καθέλκει& ή τ(ή)ρ πολύ μακρήν} & | \\
\text{10} & \text{έδιδαξαν άι ἀπαλαί(α)ι | ούκ ἐδίδαξεν ή} & | \\
& \text{μεγάλη} & | \text{λέγει ότι γλυκύς} & \text{ὁ Μιμ(νερμός)} & | \\
\end{align*}
\]

11 \(\alpha_{\alpha\lambda}\, \text{pap., superscriptum esse vid. } \mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\).

The Callimachean lines had then to be restored as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{10} & \text{... πολύ τήρ μακρήν ὑπίνα Θεσμοφόρος} & | \\
\text{11} & \text{τοῖν δὲ} \text{ διὸν Μιμνερμός ὅτι γλυκός, άι γ’ ἀπαλάι τοι} & | \\
& \text{.......} & | \text{μεγάλη δ’ οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή.}
\end{align*}
\]

As the passage is articulated in contrasting pairs of bad and good, Luppe hazarded the rare \(νῆιες\) (> \(νὴιες\)) which would fit the space available in the papyrus, to match the \(μεγάλη . . . γυνή\) in the same line.\(^2\) Similarly, after M. Puelma’s\(^3\) Κωραι, which involves a harsh hiatus (Pfeiffer on fr. 535), Archibald Allen, who was still reading ω[ of \(κατὰ λεπτῶν\)/ in v. 11, proposed κωραί γ’] as “maidens” who are supposed to be “recognisable as poetical writings” of Mimnermus.\(^4\) At any rate, the new reading renders the possibility that we are here dealing with young, delicate ladies highly likely.

Whether the comparison is internal as the Scholia Florentina understand it, or external, has remained a lingering dispute. Vv. 11–12 indicate that the question is of the follow-up of a tradition established by – or attributed to – Mimnermus. \(τοῖν δὲ\) \(διὸν\) suggests that the subjects touched upon in the previous couplet are resumed. Mimnermus’ sweetness is demonstrated by the delicate ladies of the \(ὑπίνα \ Θεσμοφόρος\), not the “big woman” corresponding to \(τήρ \ μακρήν\) of v. 10. In the highly cryptic

\* The following abbreviations are used:


\(\text{HHD} =\) *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.


\(\text{2}\) Although τοῖν is never attested to conclude a Callimachean hexameter, his supplement γ’ . . τοι/ in v. 11 \(\text{fin.}\) is fitting as a lively address to his readership: the statement is correct “beyond any doubt”. Μεν, which would be answered with the following δ’, is clausular in Callimachus only in *Hecale SH* 287.19 = 49.4 Hollis.

\(\text{3}\) *Philologus* 101 (1957), 90ff.

language employed in this passage. Scholia Florentina help decode ὠμπνία Θεσμοφόρος as a reference to Philetas’ *Demeter*. The long (μακρὴ) poem to which *Demeter* is contrasted, is only a subject of speculation. Nevertheless, that the μεγάλη . . . γυνὴ is related to it, as the ἄπολαἱ ladies to *Demeter*, seems an obvious deduction.

*Demeter* was the most celebrated poetical work of Philetas, the content of which seems to be epitomised in the Scholion on Theocritus 7.5–9f (79.6–8 Wendel), telling us about the Coan kings Chalcon and Antagoras οὕτωι δὲ εἴσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἡρακλεὼς πολλορίας τὴν Κῷ κατοικῆσαντες καὶ ὑποδεδεγμένοι τὴν Δήμητραν, καθ’ ὄν καρφόν περιήτ ἡν Κόρην ζητοῦσα. Demeter’s adventures were a common subject of local poetry, but the unrivalled archetype was the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* circulating those days with the name of Homer. It may be that the Coan adapted basic features of the archaic hymn to the requirements of his native island.

It is arguable that the delicate ladies with a good taste of poetry in Callimachus can be identified with Coan Nymphs. This may have been a memorable scene in *Demeter*.

In broad lines, Demeter and Nymphs share a cultic affinity due to their common association with vegetation, water and springs. More specifically, Nymphs were broadly worshipped in Cos and a tradition surviving through Pliny *NH* 5.134 held that one of the island’s previous names was *Nymphaea*. In local religion a link seems to have been established early enough; as S. Sherwin-White observed, “the link between the Nymphs and Demeter in Cos may be of considerable antiquity since the archaic sanctuary of Demeter and Core was centred on a spring-house”.

In literary terms, Nymphs appear as Persephone’s companions in *HHD* 5 and along with the Graces in the reconciliation scene in Philicus *SH* 680.31–2, 51. In *Od*. 17.208f. Nymphs figure in Ithaca in a *locus amoenus* with poplars and flowing water:

```latex
\text{άμφι δ’ ἄρ’ αἰγείρων ἱδιοτρεφέων ἣν ἅλος,}
\text{πάντωσε κυκλοτέρες, κατὰ δὲ φυκρὸν ρέουν ὕδωρ}
\text{ὑψόθεν ἐκ πέτρης· βομὸς δ’ ἐφύσερε τέτυκτο}
\text{Νυμφῶν, ὥθη πάντες ἐπιρρέεσκον ὀδηταί.}
```

Then Nymphs come up in similar surroundings and in a Demeter-ambience in Cos in Theocritus 7.92, 136–7 . . . αἰγείρων πτελέα τε· τὸ δ’ ἐγγύθεν ἱερῶν ὕδωρ / Νυμφῶν ἐξ ἀντρου κατεβόμενον κελάρως, 154, and in Demeter’s grove in Callimachus *Hymn to Demeter* 37–8 ὡς δὲ τις ἀγείροις, μέγα δενθρεών αἰθέρα κύροιν, / τῷ ἔτι ταῖς νύμφαι ποτὶ τῶν ἔφωντο (whence *Ovid Met*. 8.746f.). The sceneries in Theocritus 7.131f. and Callimachus *Hymn to Demeter* 24f. bear a strong resemblance. The flora are in both almost identical; running water and Nymphs close to poplars and

---

5 Luppe, *l.c.*, 53 read μετὰ above αἰγεῖροι, as an interlinear gloss μετὰ[φορά possibly abbreviated as μεταφορ' σε μεταφ'.


elms are there too. One is prompted to the idea of a common source first connecting Demeter with a locus amoenus set up with these constituents.  

Strikingly, in Theocritus 7.91f. Simichidas attributes to the Coan Nymphs a function that would resemble the one in the Aetia-prologue:  

\[ \text{πολλά μὲν ἄλλα} \\
\text{Νύμφαι κήμε δίδαξαι ἄν' ὧρα βουκολέωντα} \\
\text{ἐσθλά, τά ποι καὶ Ζηνός ἐπὶ θρόνον ἀγαγέ φάμα:} \\
\text{ἄλλα τόγ' ἐκ πάντων μεγ' ὑπείροχον etc.} \]

Nymphs, inclusive of those in Cos, are known to be musical creatures.  

If those in Callimachus Hymn to Demeter and Theocritus 7 hark back to Philetas’ Demeter, Callimachus, who wrote a treatise Περί Νυμφῶν (fr. 413), may be aptly taking them up as conveyors of Philetas’ new poetic credo.  

One last possibility needs to be entertained. It has been suggested that ὀμπνία Θεσμοφόρος is picked up from the opening verse (or verses) of Demeter following a well documented practice of referring to a poem by a couple of striking words near its beginning. Indeed, this is an unCallimachean way to refer to Demeter. ὀμπνία occurs only here for the traditional πότνια (fr. 63.8, Hymn to Demeter 10, 49, 59) and the occurrences of Δημήτηρ (12x) and Δῆα (7x) outnumber those of Θεσμοφόρος, employed only here and fr. 63.10, an aetia for the exclusion of maidens from the Thesmophoria in Athens – in both cases no other alternative seems possible. Whether the same can be said for this postulated νήμες (or indeed for ἀπαλαὶ . . . νήμες) should remain a possibility. The exquisite vocabulary describing the good short poems is in any case markedly contrasted to the plain diction employed for the bad ones.
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---

10 The celebrated Coan spring Bourina and the locality around it may have played a role here. Scholia on Theocritus 7.6 (79.20–80.1 Wendel) attest a Philetan line (fr. 24 Powell) νάσσαστα δ’ ἐν προχοῇ μελαμπέτρου Βούρινης, which G. Knaack apud Susemihl (see n. 6) had ascribed to Demeter. Nymphs frequent ideal landscapes, see G. Schönbeck, Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz, Heidelberg 1962, 34f., West on Hesiod Theog. 130.

11 This would only be another affinity between the Aetia-prologue and Theocritus 7. Cf. A. W. Bulloch in P. E. Easterling – B. M. W. Knox (edd.), The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I: Greek Literature, Cambridge 1985, 576: “the passage [sc. 7.43f.] is very similar to the Prologue of the Aetia . . . where Callimachus speaks of Homer as the divine king of poetry, not to be imitated (l. 20 ‘thunder is not my part, that is for Zeus’); and as Theocritus compares cocks crowing and, earlier in l. 41, frogs croaking against the grasshopper, so Callimachus contrasts the braying of the ass with the clear voice of the cicada (ll. 29–32”). See also A. S. F. Gow, Theocritus I, Cambridge 1952, xxii, S. Goldhill, An unnoticed allusion in Theocritus and Callimachus, ICS 12 (1987), 1–6 (on σχοῖνος in Theoc. 7.133 and Call. fr. 1.17–8).


13 A character called Φιλητᾶς in Longus’ novel is closely associated with Nymphs (2.3.2, 17.1), but it is doubtful whether this bears any significance for the work of the Coan poet.


15 Cf. the lively Lemnian νεῖραξ in Apollonius Rhodius 1.1843 with the connotations of that passage. For ἀπαλαὶ cf. Statius Silvae 5.3.291 mitis . . . nympha.