

PETER E. KNOX

THE EPILOGUE TO THE AETIA: AN EPILOGUE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 96 (1993) 175–178

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



### The Epilogue to the *Aetia*: An Epilogue

The allusion to the *Iambi* in the last line of the Epilogue to Callimachus' *Aetia* has long complicated our understanding of the construction of the poem: ἀντάρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν ἔπειμι νομόν (fr. 112.9 Pf.). Rudolph Pfeiffer attempted to explain the reference as a bibliographical guide inserted by Callimachus when he re-issued *Aetia* late in life as part of a collected edition of his works, intended to precede the *Iambi* (*Hermes* 63 [1928] 339). The assumption that the Epilogue belongs to the poet's later years has persisted, even though our conception of the second edition has changed radically with the publication of fresh papyri, especially that of the *Victoria Berenices*. In his edition of this piece P. Parsons proposed a new hypothesis about the composition of the *Aetia* as a whole, arguing from the additional evidence that Callimachus published the first two books of the *Aetia* as a young man, linking the narratives by the device of a dialogue with the Muses, which he introduced in the so-called *Somnium* (fr. 2 Pf.; *ZPE* 25 [1974] 1-50, esp. 49-50). Later in life (after 246 B.C.) he added two more books, introduced by the *Victoria Berenices* (*SH* 254-69) and ending with the *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110 Pf.). To the whole work, now of four books, he then prefixed a new introduction (fr. 1 Pf.) and tacked on the Epilogue at the end. Some years ago I suggested as a slight modification of this hypothesis that the Epilogue belonged to the original edition of Books 1-2 (*GRBS* 26 [1985] 59-65). On this interpretation the allusion in the last line refers to a work in-progress, the *Iambi*, which Callimachus probably produced over a period of several years in the mid-third century. There is a sequel: I originally proposed that the poet himself moved the Epilogue to its current position at the end of Book 4; in a forthcoming book, Alan Cameron argues that this was probably done by a later editor.<sup>1</sup> As a supplement to my earlier article, I offer some additional evidence in support of Cameron's suggestion.

The Epilogue survives among the remnants of a fourth-century papyrus codex (*P. Oxy.* 1011), in which the last line of the fragment is followed by an *colophon*, thus guaranteeing that in *this* codex it came at the end of the poem. But we have other evidence about how the *Aetia* ended from the *Diegeseis* of *P. Mil. Vogl.* 18. This important work offered not a line-by-line commentary on the poem, but synopses of individual episodes, each introduced by a lemma from the first line of the episode to be summarized. The *Diegeseis* are extant for much of Book 3 and all of Book 4, and are followed by resumés of the *Iambi*, *Lyrical*, *Hecale*, and Hymns 1-2; their accuracy has never been challenged. The last summary offered for Book 4 of the *Aetia* concerns the *Coma Berenices*; there is no mention at all of the Epilogue in the place where we would expect it immediately thereafter.<sup>2</sup> It would be surprising for the Diege-

<sup>1</sup> Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton U.P.; forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pfeiffer on *Dieg.* V 40: "de Aetiorum 'epilogo' (fr. 112) silet diegetes."

tes to have ignored the conclusion of the poem. Elsewhere it seems to be precisely the sort of point that he is careful to notice: at the beginning of Book 4, for instance, when he summarizes the *Daphnephoria* he notes that this is the first episode in the Book: αὐτή πρώτη ἔλεγ[εία].<sup>3</sup> There might be many explanations for the omission of the Epilogue, but one possibility is that it was not found at the end of Book 4 by the Diegetes.

If the Epilogue was not the last entry in the Diegetes' copy of the *Aetia*, where in the poem was it? There is no reason to repeat my earlier arguments in favor of locating it at the end of Book 2, but a few additional points are suggestive, if not probative. *SH* 253 is a badly damaged scrap dated to the first century that comes from the same roll as another fragment (*SH* 252) securely identified as part of Book 2. Little can be determined of the context, but among the few words that can be made out there is mention of a dream (τὸν ὄνειρον, 12) and the Muses (Μουσέων, 13). The editors of the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* suggest that we have part of the opening of Book 2, but A. Harder argues more convincingly for the end of the book.<sup>4</sup> The surviving portion of *SH* 253.14 is especially tantalizing, ὀππότ' ἔληξε θεῆς: it was, after all, at the conclusion of the second book that Callimachus brought to an end his account of the dream and his conversation with the Muses. If Harder is correct, *SH* 253 might dovetail neatly into the Epilogue at the end of Book 2, for in it Callimachus also refers to his encounter with the Muses on Helicon (fr. 112.5-6 Pf.) as an event of the past and in the badly damaged opening line he mentions his Muse (ἐμὴ μουσα).

We have the opening lines of Book 3 in *SH* 254: it begins with the poet speaking in his own person as he introduces his epinicion to Berenice. The dialogue with the Muses was used as an organizing device only in the first two books. This must have seemed a remarkable aspect of the final four-book edition, a feature that any commentator ancient or modern would want to account for, and it may be that the Diegetes did. The Florentine Scholia of *PSI* 1219 also represent part of a summary of the whole poem episode by episode. The resemblance to the *Diegeseis* of *P. Mil. Vogl.* 18 is quite striking: each entry is headed by a lemma from the *Aetia* with the opening line of the pertinent aetion. As P. Maas saw (*PRIMI* 1 [1937] 155-160), the *Florentine Scholia* and the *Diegeseis* are surely closely related: if not perhaps direct copies of the same book,<sup>5</sup> they are at least both derived from the same work, whose prin-

<sup>3</sup> For the supplements, see Pfeiffer *ad loc.* The reference to the first episode of what is after all a single poem as an "elegy" is a bit surprising, but might still be correct. The different organization of the last two books, in which the device of a dialogue with the Muses has been dropped, would require of the Diegetes a different critical vocabulary than he had employed in summarizing Books 1-2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Harder, *ZPE* 67 (1987) 27-30. The opening of the Book has already been accounted for, if we can accept the suggestion made by J. Zetzel (*ZPE* 42 [1981] 31-3) that fr. 178 Pf. occupied that position; cf. also Zetzel, *CP* 82 (1987) 354.

<sup>5</sup> To the evidence of these fragments should be added the summaries from Book 1 contained in *P. Oxy.* 2263, found in the *addenda* to Pfeiffer's second volume. Pfeiffer once objected that the *Scholia Florentina* should be considered part of a much more extensive learned commentary; cf. "Die neuen *Διηγῆσεις* zu Kallimachosgedichten", *SBAW* (1934) 10, 1-50, but he withdrew his objections in the preface to the second volume of his edition (p. xxviii, n. 2). As E. Lobel remarks in his publication of the third set of *Diegeseis* in *P. Oxy.* 20 (1952) 125, 'there is no obvious reason why, when once such an account of the contents of the *Αἴτια* had been written, it should have been thought worth while to do the work over again ... and it is, therefore, a likely pre-

cial purpose was to provide a guide to the contents of Callimachus' poem. The organization of the *Aetia* is an important issue for the Diegetes, as we have seen in the entry for the beginning of Book 4, and it appears that the Florentine Scholiast has similar concerns. He devotes a good deal of his comparatively brief (five-line) summary of the *Somnium* to outlining the narrative function of the dialogue with the Muses, from whom Callimachus receives his aetiologies, εἰλήφοι π(αρ') αὐτ(ῶν) τ(ῆν) τ(ῶν) αἰτίων [ἐξήγησιν.<sup>6</sup> The Scholiast goes on to remark on the extent of this dialogue, but here the text is not recoverable. It appears in Pfeiffer's edition as follows:

.... ἄ]π' αὐτ(ῶν) ἄρχῆ[ν] λαβῶν ε' ος' α[.....  
] λόγου >

G. Coppola discerned traces of an iota at the beginning of the final line, and thus restored μέχρι τοῦ ἐπ]ιλόγου.<sup>7</sup> The characters at the end of the preceding line are difficult to interpret,<sup>8</sup> but the general direction of the passage is clear: the Scholiast is commenting on the extent of the dialogue with Muses, 'taking his starting point from them,' and then says something about the Epilogue. If the Epilogue was found by the Scholiast at the end of Book 2 where the dialogue ends, a comment on this peculiarity might reasonably be expected here where it begins; on the other hand, it is difficult to conceive of an appropriate context for a remark about the Epilogue at this point if it had been composed by Callimachus for the end of Book 4.

The final appearance of the four-book edition proposed here, with the Epilogue located in the middle of the work, might strike the modern reader, used to carefully re-edited works, as somewhat odd; but there is a nearly precise parallel for such an arrangement in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*. This poem, the earliest continuous Latin elegy, was profoundly influenced by Callimachus' *Aetia*, and it too was expanded for a new edition. This consisted, very much like the final edition of the *Aetia*, of the addition of a new roll to the earlier work of two books. The first two-book edition ended with an epilogue of twelve lines announcing the completion of the work (*finis adest operi*, 2.733) and ending with a *sphragis*: *Naso magister erat*, 2.744. Ovid did not trouble to remove or re-write this epilogue for the second edition; instead, at the end of Book 3, the end now of the complete enlarged edition, he added a short coda in which he quotes his original epilogue. The only alteration he made at the end of the

sumption that *PRIMI* 18 derives from the book represented by 2263 and *PSI* 1219, though it may not be a true copy of it.'

<sup>6</sup> *Schol. Flor.* 17, adopting supplements and expansion of abbreviations as in Pfeiffer. This part of the text is relatively secure.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. G. Coppola, "Il Prologo degli Aitia ed il commento di Epaphroditos", *Rend. della R. Accad. di Bologna*, Ser. III, 7 (1932/33) 19-20, and by the same author, *Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco* (Bologna 1935) 171-2. The traces visible from the plate provided by M. Norsa and G. Vitelli in the *editio princeps* in *BSAA* 28 (1933) 123-32 are consistent with an iota, but not an upsilon, eliminating the editors' later proposal, ἐξῆς το]ῦ λόγου. Cf. *PSI* 11 (1935) 148, where they concede the plausibility of a reference to the Epilogue.

<sup>8</sup> The abbreviation ος' leads one to expect ὄσων; hence M. Norsa's and G. Vitelli's ἐπ(ι) ὄσ(ων) α[ὐτὸ ἐπεῖ]; cf. K. McNamee, *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraca*, Suppl. *BASP* 3 (1981) 116. I owe this observation to Prof. Ludwig Koenen, who should not, however, be implicated in any other views offered in this paper.

second book was the addition of a couplet addressing the women who allegedly demanded a sequel in order to inform the reader that a new roll had been added: *ecce, rogant tenerae, sibi dem praecepta, puellae: | uos eritis chartae proxima cura meae*. Ovid had the whole of Callimachus' *Aetia* before him: the structure of the final edition of the *Ars* might have a special resonance if it resembled the format of his acknowledged prototype.

If the Epilogue stood at the end of the second roll of the *Aetia* in the edition summarized by the Diegetes of *P. Mil. Vogl.* 18, then it has not been omitted from the summary of the end of Book 4. It is true enough that in *P. Oxy.* 1011 the Epilogue appears in this position, but this is after all a codex put together at a substantially later date in which a number of different poems by Callimachus were gathered. To the editor who assembled this collected edition the reference to the *Iambi* in the final line of the Epilogue might well have made better sense at the end of the *Aetia*, forming a link with the poems that he copied next. My earlier suggestion that it was Callimachus himself who moved the Epilogue offers a less plausible aetiology for its position in *P. Oxy.* 1011 than the activity of an editor working at a time when the codex had become the standard format for books: an epilogue at the end of the second book would not have seemed so anomalous to a reader working with papyrus rolls as it would to one accustomed to turning the page.

University of Colorado at Boulder

Peter E. Knox