

# A NEW INTERPRETATION OF A FRAGMENT OF CALLIMACHUS' *AETIA*:<sup>1</sup>

ANTINOOPOLIS PAPYRUS 113 FR. 1 (b)

THE text as published runs:<sup>2</sup>

].ω[.....]π[  
].ω[....]μα ῥυηφενὲς ο[  
].επλ[.]ηφυλα[.]εμουσι το[  
ἐ]βάλοντο μετ[...].αι φημὶ .[  
5 ο]ὐ δῆκται τῶς κύνες εἰσὶ θ[εοί] (Eurip. fr. 555. 1 N<sup>2</sup>)  
μ]έν οὖν ἔτι μοί τι δόμοις θο[  
]μοις αἰδῶς ἔζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις  
]ιν ἐβέλεσκον ἃ μὴ μάθον ευ[...].[  
]σεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος σιπύ[η]  
10 ]νηλ[.]πεν ὄθματα σ...τοδε[  
]πῦρ ἵεναι  
].σχηήεσσαν ἐλεγμ[ήν  
μ]ελαυνομένη  
].ε...[

The elegiacs on side (a) of this fragmentary piece of papyrus are identifiable as by Callimachus, probably from the *Aetia*, and these lines too are undoubtedly by the same author, and almost certainly from the same work. Verse 5 is a surprise, for it was thought until the discovery of this papyrus to be by Euripides; however the only source for this attribution is Stobaeus (*Ecl.* 1. 3. 6), in whom it appears as the first line of a two-line quotation. It is not unusual in Stobaeus for two originally unconnected lines to be mistakenly combined (for further references and comments see John Barns, 'A new Gnomologium (II)', *CQ* n.s. i (1951), 18-19).

The fragment is not an easy one to interpret, but Prof. Lloyd-Jones has tentatively suggested some very convincing supplements:<sup>3</sup>

for vv. 6-7      [ὄφρα μ]έν οὖν ἔτι μοί τι δόμοις θο[ίνημα παρήεν  
                  [τόφρα δ' ἐ]μοῖς αἰδῶς ἔζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις

and for v. 9      ἥει]σεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος σιπύ[η]

These supplements clearly give the sort of sense required for vv. 6-9, and I shall return to them later. First, however, with this kind of context in mind I should like to consider v. 10, for a careful analysis here is productive. There is no difficulty in giving the metrical position of the fragment within the line:

| 3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10  
]νηλ[.]πενὸθματασ...τοδε[

And after only a few moments of juggling with the different possible combinations of letters a number of things become clear:

<sup>1</sup> I am most grateful to Prof. H. Lloyd-Jones, Prof. D. L. Page, Mr. P. J. Parsons, and Mr. Thomas Gelzer, who read through this article in manuscript and made a number of valuable suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> In *Antinoopolis Papyri*, vol. iii, verse 6 was mistakenly printed in the secondary transcript as: μ]έν οὖν τι μοί ἐτι δόμοις θο[.

<sup>3</sup> Reported in *Antinoop. Pap.* iii.

1. the fourth foot is, as Barns divides it, ὄθματα—not ὄθμα τασ. . which would disregard Hermann's Bridge: ὄθματα + enclitic is also impossible because of the masculine caesura (see (2) below and P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, § 93);

2. the third foot has a masculine caesura after ]νη, since ]νηλ[.]πεν is not possible, ]νηλ[.]π:εν seems to lead nowhere, and ]νηλ':.]πεν is most unlikely if only because of the elision (Maas, § 139);

3. the missing letter in the third foot can then be only an iota, as suggested in *Ant. Pap.* iii;

4. although λ[ι]π' ἐν is possible, taking ἐν as an adverb or a preverb in tmesis (cf. Call. fr. 571 αἶθε γὰρ ᾧ κούροισιν ἐπ' ὄθματα λίχνα φέροντες or Nic. Ther. 443 πίονα δ' ἐν σκυνίοισιν ὕπ' ὄθματα, νέρθε δὲ πώγων) it is very difficult to see what sort of sense it could possibly offer.

We might reasonably, therefore, divide so:

]νη λ[ι]πεν ὄθματα σ. . τοδε[

The rest follows logically.

I have demonstrated elsewhere<sup>1</sup> that in Callimachus a diaeresis before the seventh element is always accompanied by two other conditions: the bucolic diaeresis, and colon-end at either the main caesura or the bucolic diaeresis or both. Thus the diaeresis before ὄθματα in v. 10 requires not only the bucolic diaeresis after ὄθματα, but also colon-end, either at that same point or before λ[ι]πεν; almost certainly the colon-end occurs after ὄθματα, for it is extremely unlikely that λ[ι]πεν ὄθματα, with no conjunction or conjunctive particle, is the beginning of a new period. Now if there is colon-end after ὄθματα an important question arises: what is the subject of λ[ι]πεν? Clearly ὄθματα itself is not very probable, and the subject almost certainly occurred in the lost first half of the line (v. 9 looks too complete to be of any help here), ὄθματα being the object of the verb. There are few things of which it is said that they 'leave the eyes', and at this point Apollonius Rhodius helps, as often:

3. 1068 . . . δὴ γάρ οἱ ἀπ' ὀφθαλμοῦς λίπεν αἰδώς

This fits so exactly with v. 7 of the papyrus fragment, αἰδώς ἰζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις],<sup>2</sup> that a similar statement in v. 10 would be very plausible. The word αἰδώς itself probably did not appear in v. 10; Apollonius talking of Medea says:

3. 659 αἰδοῖ ἐπιφροσύνῃ τε . . .

Read therefore v. 10:

ἐπιφροσύν]νη λ[ι]πεν ὄθματα σ. . τοδε

σωφροσύν]νη too is possible but less likely, being the commoner and more prosaic word.<sup>3</sup> That αἰδώς showed itself in the behaviour of the eyes was a common

<sup>1</sup> pp. 258 ff. above.

<sup>2</sup> Barber's change of ἰδεν to ἰζεν in v. 7 needs no detailed defence of course. Callimachus is using an established Homeric expression: *Il.* 10. 26 ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροιςιν ἐφ' ἴκανε, 10. 91, Pind. *N.* 8. 2 ὦρα . . . ἐφ' ἰζοῖσα γλεφάροις, Critias 4. 10 D<sup>2</sup>, Mosch. 2. 3, Call. fr. 21. 2 ]ἐπὶ βλεφ[αρ in the same *sedes*.

Cf. Alcman 3. 72, Eupolis 94. 5 K.

<sup>3</sup> Although Musaeus 33 reads σωφροσύνῃ δὲ καὶ αἰδοῖ. For further material relevant to αἰδώς and σωφροσύνη and also αἰσχύνῃ cf. Thuc. 1. 84. 3 (and scholia ad loc.), Plato, *Charm.* 160 e and 161 a, *Laws* 6. 772 a and 2. 671 d.

enough idea in ancient Greece and needs little further illustration. The Homeric Hymn to Demeter 214 f. reads:

ἐπὶ τοι πρέπει ὄμμασιν αἰδῶς  
καὶ χάρις

(cf. *Il.* 1. 225 *κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων*). In the Hellenistic period the idea is expressed simply in A.R. 3. 93:

τυτθή γ' αἰδῶς ἔσσειτ' ἐν ὄμμασιν . . .

Cf. Call. fr. 186. 29 ]ἀναιδέος ὄθμ[α]τος ἄλκα[ρ, 368 ἀναιδέων . . . ὀφθαλμοῖσι, A.R. 2. 407 ἀναιδέα . . . ὄσσε.<sup>1</sup>

I shall return later to the last part of v. 10, but first let us consider the whole of this section of the papyrus in terms of this kind of reconstruction. The most suitable interpretation is clearly that indicated by Prof. Lloyd-Jones in his supplements to vv. 6–7: so long as food lasted the speaker was restrained (vv. 6–7), but when once hunger made itself forcibly felt (vv. 8–9), then restraint was abandoned (vv. 10–11). The syntactical shape will thus presumably be similar to that of fr. 238. 15 ff. and the Homeric passages quoted by Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, as suggested by Lloyd-Jones.

However there is a passage in one of Callimachus' *Hymns* which is particularly to the point and suggests even more precisely the organization of these lines; at vi. 111 ff. Callimachus describes the final stage of Erysichthon's deadly hunger with these words:

μέστα μὲν ἐν Τριόπαο δόμοις ἔτι χρήματα κείτο,  
μῶνων ἄρ' οἰκεῖοι θάλαμοι κακὸν ἠπίσταντο.  
ἀλλ' ὅκα τὸν βαθὺν οἶκον ἀνεξήραναν ὀδόντες,  
καὶ τόχ' ὁ τῷ βασιλῆος ἐνὶ τριόδοισι καθήστο.

In the light of this I would suggest that v. 6 might be supplemented [μέσφα μ]έν . . . : this would fill out the lacuna better than [ὄφρα μ]έν . . . (cf. the misgivings expressed by the editors on v. 6). Verse 8 might begin ἀλλ' ὅτ' (or possibly εὔτε δ'), and v. 10 could now be supplemented:

καὶ τότε ἐπιφροσύ]νῃ λ[ί]πεν ὄθματα.

I turn finally to the last part of v. 10. This is now comparatively easy to deal with. Since there is almost certainly colon-end after ὄθματα the δε[ at the edge of the papyrus is presumably a connecting particle, either δ'ε[ or δέ[, perhaps preceded by a verb as at iii. 87 or iv. 103. I would suggest σρῆτο δέ[ θυμός, comparing *Od.* 10. 484 *θυμός δέ μοι ἔσσεται ἥδη*; the infinitive in v. 11 *ιέναι*<sup>2</sup> could well be dependent on this verb. *σεύομαι* is not often used in this way but it is well documented: thus *Il.* 17. 463 *ὅτε σεύαιτο διώκειν* (cf. *Il.* 23. 198), Pind.

<sup>1</sup> For other examples cf. Sappho fr. 137. 5, Theogn. 85 f., ? Aesch. fr. 355. 21 ff. M, Aristot. *apud* Athen. 13. 564 b (fr. 96 Rose), *Orph. Arg.* 933, Longin. *De Sub.* 4. 4, Isid. *Pelus. Ep.* 5. 28, proverb *apud* Suda s.v. αἰδῶς (Adler, ii. 163). Call. fr. 80. 10–11 probably reads:

αἰδοῖ δ' ὡς φοῖ[νικι] τεὰς ἐρύθουσα παρειὰς  
ῆν' ἔπεσ ὀφ[θαλμο]ῖς ἔμπαλι. [. . .]ομεν-  
[.] [

in which Pfeiffer supplements ἔμπαλι [ισχ]ομέν[ο]ι[s. A.R. 1. 790 ff. supports him: ἡ δ' ἐγκλιδὸν ὄσσε βαλοῦσα παρθενικὴ ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας· ἔμπα δὲ τόνγε αἰδομένη μύθοισι προσένεπεν αἰμυλίοισιν.

<sup>2</sup> For Barber's suggestion διὰ πῦρ *ιέναι* cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, 171: the phrase is usually διὰ πυρός, but that is only a minor drawback. Perhaps read καὶ διὰ πῦρ *ιέναι*.

I. 8. 61 f. ἔσονται . . . κελαδῆσαι, A.R. 2. 540 σεύατ' ἔμεν πόντονδε (cf. 4. 849). Finally, σφῆτο certainly agrees with the traces that are left on the papyrus.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the structure of vv. 6–10 and some of the missing content can, I think, be suggested with some confidence; everything else is obscure. However, there seems to me to be room still for careful enquiry; even though the lacunose parts of Callimachus are notoriously unsusceptible to academic speculation, cautious discussion may still be fruitful. What follows, therefore, is offered very tentatively in the hope that if the solutions proposed are wrong the material offered may still contribute to a more accurate understanding of the fragment.

Verse 5 seems at first sight to be specific enough to yield information about the whole fragment. It is presumably the final gnomic line summarizing and possibly pushing home a longer statement: φημί in v. 4 indicates direct speech<sup>2</sup> and μ]έν οὖν in v. 6 would clearly make a suitable narrative opening (perhaps ironical) after a speech of some kind. Who has said what? The speaker, if there was one, cannot be identified: he might be the poet or his *persona*, he might be somebody else engaged in conversation, a feature common in the *Aetia*, or as Barber pointed out (see note to v. 9 in *Ant. Pap.* iii) the passage could suitably be autobiographical. If we are to have any chance of knowing what was said we must surely explain one crucial phrase—δῆκται τῶς κύνες. The first foot of v. 5, which may have contained an essential qualification or addition, has been lost; but let us consider first δῆκτης.

What does it mean? The word occurs in only two other passages, both of them post-Callimachean: in each passage the meaning is, quite unambiguously, 'biting, critical' (of words)—A.P. 16. 266. 7 (Anon.) δῆκται . . . στόματι, Plut. *Mor.* 2. 55 b λόγῳ δῆκτηι καὶ παρρησίαι κηδεμονικῇ. This is slight testimony; we should inspect related words to see if they offer any help. The only compounds of δῆκτης are too late to be of interest,<sup>3</sup> but the immediate cognates are of considerable relevance. the δηγ-/κ- cognates are all used literally, of course, and they are also found in metaphorical usage of pain, suffering. However,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. P. J. Parsons has very kindly re-examined this part of the papyrus and writes that 'σφῆτο suits the traces, as well as σεύτο'. I had at first thought to read σφῆτο, but Prof. D. L. Page pointed out to me that the -ου- contract form is much commoner. This is one of those parts of the Greek language where opinions differ as to how many verbs can be extracted from the evidence (see, e.g., LSJ s.v. σεύω, G. Curtius, *The Greek Verb* (1880), 104. Tucker ad Aesch. *Sept.* 836, Schwyzler, *Griech. Gramm.* i. 679), and MSS. are confused (cf., e.g., A.R. 2. 296, 1010; 3. 307). Homer never contracts σευ-, though the shortened -ου- form is common: in fact there are only two certain examples of σευ- contracts in the MSS. of the main Greek authors—Soph. *Trach.* 645 σεῦται, Parthenius xxvi Meineke (*Anal. Al.* p. 279 = Diehl *Anth. Lyr. Gr.* ii. 244, fr. 15) σευμένος. Elmsley's emendation σοῦται is accepted by most editors for the Sophoclean passage. σοῦ- on the other hand has the following post-Homeric backing: Aesch. *Pers.* 25, *Sept.* 31, 836, 842, Soph. *Aj.* 1414, Aristoph. *Vesp.* 209,

458, Epilycus fr. 3 K (i, p. 803) which may, however, be corrupt, and Plut. *Mor.* 2. 362 c. In Callimachus σοῦσθε occurs at v. 4, and perhaps again at fr. 7. 31–2 (see Barber and Maas, *CQ* [1950], 168). The actual form σοῦτο is not as yet attested anywhere, though Prof. Page notes Hesychius διέσοῦτο ('where Latte suggests διέσσοντο but that has its own entry below in Hesych.').

<sup>2</sup> In v. 4 if αἰ before φημί is correct then it must not be the final syllable of a word-unit: in Callimachus the eighth element is not long if word-end follows (cf. Maas, § 92). Thus καὶ φημί (see app. crit.), or αἰ φημί, would be suitable.

<sup>3</sup> According to Tzetzes κρυφιοδάκτης occurred in Hipponax fr. 65 C, κύων κρυφιοδάκτης λαίθαργος; Masson excluded κρυφιοδάκτης as a gloss and restored metrical sense to the line. Extra support for this may be found in Phrynichus Soph. who under λαίθαργος κύων in *Praep. Soph.* p. 87 B comments: τοῦτο δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ παραφθείραντες λαθροδάκτην καλοῦσιν. θηριοδάκτης also occurs in the *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* = 'morsus'.

closer analysis shows that this latter usage is restricted almost entirely to Stoic and Epicurean philosophical contexts:<sup>1</sup> whenever *δηγ-/κ-* words are used metaphorically in non-philosophical contexts the reference is on the whole to verbal criticism. Thus:

*ἄδηκτος*

*Vit. Soph.* § 1 οὐδ' ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν κωμικῶν ἄδηκτος ἀφείθη . . .

*Plut.* 864 c οὐδὲ τοῦτον ἄδηκτον παρήκεν (Herodotus).

*δηγμός*

Very often in Plutarch: 47 a, 56 a, 68 f, 69 a, 126 f, 795 b, 810 c, *Alc.* 4. 2.

*δηκτικός*

*Plut.* 81 c τῷ δηκτικῷ καὶ πικρῷ χρώνται πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς μάλιστα . . .

*Lucian Demon.* 50 ἀστεῖον δὲ κάκεινο αὐτοῦ καὶ δηκτικόν . . . εἰρημένον.

*δήξεις*

*Philodem. Über die Götter* iii, fr. 22 Diels ? = 'criticism'? (cf. Diels ii. 63);

*Plut. Lycurg.* 14 μεγαλυνόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπαίνων αἱ δὲ μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ σκωμμάτων δήξεις οὐδὲν ἀμβλύτεραι.

Other cognates are less significant as being less immediate, but the following uses of the verb are important:

*Aristoph. Ran.* 860 ff. (Euripides speaks) *έτοιμός εἰμ' ἔγωγε, κοῦκ ἀναδύομαι / δάκνειν, δάκνεσθαι πρότερος, εἰ τούτῳ δοκεῖ, / τᾶπη τὰ μέλη* (see J. Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane* (Paris, 1965), § 585);

[Demetrius] *On Style*, § 260 καὶ γὰρ γελᾶται τὸ εἰρημένον ἅμα καὶ θαυμάζεται, καὶ ἥρέμα καὶ ὑποδάκνει πως λεγόμενον (of a saying of Diogenes);

*Polyb.* 4. 87. 5 (Apelles) ὁμοίως δέ . . . Ἀλέξανδρον, ὅτε λάβοι καιρόν, **διέδακνεν**;

*Iambl. Protr.* 21 λα' αἰνίττεται οὖν ὡς οὐ δεῖ καλῶς βεβουλευμένα πράγματα καὶ δόγματα διασιλλαίνειν μηδὲ **διαδάκνειν**;

as also are Antiphanes in *A.P.* 11. 322 *γραμματικοί . . . εὐφώνων λαθροδάκναι κόριες* and *Philodem. De Ira* xii. 5-6 *δακν[ηρῶν ἐ]πῶν*.

The evidence, therefore, for the meaning of *δήκτης* is quite complex and less extensive than we might wish, but it also indicates unequivocally that except in a philosophic context, or unless there is some other very compelling reason on internal grounds, *δήκτης* in Hellenistic Greek must be assumed to mean 'biting, critical'. The exact application of this in v. 5 of our fragment depends, of course, upon the meaning of the simile *τῶς κύνες*, and I shall shortly suggest an interpretation. But first a note on the implications of v. 9.

If οὐ δῆγκται . . . εἰσὶ θεοί means '(the) gods are not critical', the question arises 'critical about what?' It is possible, I think, that the answer is given indirectly by v. 9. At first this seems to be a straightforward line: 'the food-bin sang another tune'. English idiom has 'change one's tune', and it is an easy assumption that this expression was available in Greek too, the reference here being to the difference between the dull note given by a full food-jar when struck (e.g. when removing the lid) and the clear ringing when it is empty. But closer analysis shows that, surprisingly, the metaphor does not seem to be

<sup>1</sup> The only salient exception to this is and *Lucian. δηκτήριος* is used once by *δήγμα*: of pain, once each in *Aesch.*, *Soph.*, Euripides to mean 'torturing'.

possible as it stands. The problem lies in *ῥει]σεν*.<sup>1</sup> First, *αἶδω* almost never has as its subject *things* other than musical instruments. There are hardly any exceptions:

*Od.* 21. 410–11 . . . νευρῆς / ἥ δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν αἶεσε, χελιδόνι εἰκέλη αὐδῇν.

Hippocr. *Περὶ Νουσ.* 3. 7 καὶ τὰ στήθεα αὐτῶν αἶδεν δοκεῖ καὶ βάρος ἐνεῖναι.

Theocr. 7. 26 πᾶσα λίθος πταίοισα ποτ' ἄρβυλίδεσσιν αἶδει.

Mosch. fr. 1. 8 (ὕλα) ἔνθα καὶ ἦν πνεύσῃ πολὺς ὤνεμος ἅ πῖτυς αἶδει.<sup>2</sup>

The Homeric passage will not justify the Callimachean line: . . . δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν αἶεσε/αἶδει is a cliché expression elsewhere used as normally of people (*Il.* 18. 570, *H.H. Herm.* 54, 502; cf. *Od.* 1. 155, 8. 266), here adapted. The image is anyway more specific, greatly eased by the accompanying simile. In the Hippocrates the verb is not really metaphorical: bronchial lungs do 'sing' if you listen at close quarters. The two bucolic passages are a class apart: here, where romantic imagery is so much in place, rustic stones and trees are very different from food-bins.<sup>3</sup> Thus a singing *σιπύη* would be very difficult to explain as a metaphor. What is more, the expression here is very explicit: not just the simple verb *αἶδειν*, but also *μέλος* and *ἄλλο*.

Is the expression then an idiom, as in English? The answer is No, Greek has no such idiom. Nor is there even the possibility that it is a variation on an expression 'sing the same song' (for which in any case it would be difficult to find an unstrained interpretation); whereas Latin can say *cantilenam eandem canis*,<sup>4</sup> Greek says simply *αἶδεις*, and nothing more.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is of course only a supplement, but it is very difficult to see what else the *σιπύη* could be doing to *ἄλλο μέλος*. The other obvious possible reconstruction is *σιπύη*, taking *ἄλλο μέλος* as nominative: e.g. 'another song became necessary for the food-jar', but this founders on *]σεν*, since the tense would preferably be imperfect. On *σιπύη* see now E. Masson, *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en grec* (Paris, 1967), 44–5.

<sup>2</sup> Aesch. *Cho.* 1024 f. has an abstract subject and is not very relevant: πρὸς δὲ καρδίαι φόβος / αἶδεν ἐτόιμος, ἥ δ' ὑπορχεῖσθαι κότῳ.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Eustath. 746. 3 αἱ παρὰ Θεοκρίτῳ αἰδοῦσαι λίθοι . . . βουκολικὴν ἔχουσιν ἀφέλειαν.

<sup>4</sup> Ter. *Phorm.* 695. Cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* 1. 19. 8 at crebro mihi . . . insusurret . . . cantilenam illam uam, 13. 34 haec decantata erat fabula; Sen. *Ep.* 24. 6 decantatae . . . in omnibus scholis fabulae istae sunt; Macrobi. 5. 2. 6 talia ut pueris decantata praetero. Commentators sometimes explain this idiom as a Greek one: this is incorrect.

<sup>5</sup> Documentation for this idiom may be useful since it does not appear in the paroemiographers. Examples are: Aristoph. *Av.* 39–41, fr. 7 Dem., Eupolis fr. 2 Dem., Men. *Epitrep.* 408–9. Otherwise it is documented only by the lexicographers: Photius, s.v. αἶδεν (Reitzenstein, *Anfang* . . . 48. 7 ff.) explains ἐπὶ τοῦ μᾶτῃν λέγειν, and so too

Phrynichus Soph. *Praef. Soph.* 21. 1. Orion Theb. *Etyim.* 23. 1 gives the origin: ἀδολεσχεῖν ἐγκείται τὸ αἶδεν ὅπερ λέγεται καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπαναλαμβάνειν. The full range of the expression can be seen in Plato, *Lysis* 204 d (of Hippothales the lover) καὶ ὁ ἐστὶν τούτων δεινότερον, ὅτι καὶ αἶδει εἰς τὰ παιδικὰ φωνῇ θαυμασίᾳ, ἣν ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἀκούοντας ἀνέχεσθαι, which leads to 205 b–c μηδὲν ἔχειν λέγειν ὃ οὐχὶ κἂν παῖς εἴποι, πῶς οὐχὶ καταγέλαστον; ἀ δὴ ἡ πόλις ὅλη αἶδει περὶ Δημοκράτους . . . and 205 d ἅπερ αἱ γραφαὶ αἰδοῦσι, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, ὃ Σώκρατες ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἃ οὗτος λέγων τε καὶ αἰδῶν ἀναγκάζει καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀκροᾶσθαι. A pleonastic version of this expression is found in the paroemiographers, ἄλλως αἶδεν: Zenob. 1. 72, Diogen. 2. 19, and Greg. Cypr. (Cod. Lied.) i. 47 (ii. 60) (the phrase is used literally with a possible pun on the idiom in Aristaen. 1. 27). Cf. αἶδεν = 'proclaim' in Plato, *Laus* 854 c ταῦτα ἡμῶν αἰδόντων προοίμια and 854 d . . . αἶδεν μέγα. ὕμνεῖν is the verb which is more usual in this sense of 'harp upon, repeat' (see LSJ s.v. II).

The only example of 'sing the same song' is Theophil. Com. fr. 7 (Kock ii. 475):  
 πονηρὸν υἱὸν καὶ πατέρα καὶ μητέρα  
 ἔστιν μαγαδίζειν ἐπὶ τροχοῦ καθημένους·  
 οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ταυτὸν αἴσεται μέλος.  
 but the metaphor here is not an independent one, it is an extension of *μαγαδίζειν* in the previous line.

Surely, therefore, ἤει]σεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος σιπύ[η requires further support from the text: it is too extravagantly unusual to be an independent expression. Two possibilities seem to be open: either the 'song' is a metaphorical one, picking up something said earlier in the poem, or it is real. The first possibility cannot be excluded: earlier in the poem may have come a sentence such as 'the food-bin gave a dull note', of which the metaphor in v. 9 would simply be an expansion. But the resultant repetition, both of the image and of the trivial object, makes this unlikely in Callimachus. The second possibility seems more feasible. If the μοι in v. 6 is Callimachus, or at least the *persona* of Callimachus which appears in the *Aetia*, then the hunger in this passage may well have been due to his profession as a poet (cf. *Iambus* iii, fr. 193). Why should it not have been due especially to his taste for a particular kind of Muse, the unfashionable λεπταλέην? At such a moment the food-bin might well suggest that Callimachus turn his hand to a different kind of poetry (ἄλλο μέλος), and write ἐν ᾄεσμα διηγεκές, full of sound and fury, and more marketable. This interpretation makes the expression in v. 9 comprehensible as no other interpretation seems to; it is also in harmony with what we have been able to conclude about the meaning of the important v. 5 οὐ δῆγκται . . . εἰσὶ θεοί, to which, finally, I now return.

If the whole passage is about Callimachus' poetry then a line such as 'the gods are not critical' is easily comprehensible, for Callimachus always claimed divine inspiration for the kind of poetry which he wrote.<sup>1</sup> But what is its exact application? Let us now consider the full expression οὐ δῆγκται τὼς κύνες '(the) gods are not biting like dogs'.

What sort of biting is it that is typical of dogs but not of (the) gods? I can find only one relevant answer. As long ago as 1812 C. J. Blomfield in his glossary to *Aeschylus Septem contra Thebas*, p. 132, attempting to convert v. 5 into a respectable iambic trimeter, suggested λαθροδῆγκται with reference to the idea expressed in Sophocles fr. 885 σαίνεις δάκνουσα καὶ κύων λαίθαργος εἴ (Shakespeare, *Richard III* 1. iii. 289 'O Buckingham, take heed of yonder dog! / Look, when he fawns, he bites'). The emendation cannot stand, but the reference might still be good. The idea is a semi-proverbial commonplace: it occurs again in Sophocles, *Teucer* fr. 577 ἡ δ' ἄρ' ἐν σκότῳ λήθουσά με / ἔσαν' Ἐρινὺς ἡδοναῖς ἐψευσμένον, in Hipponax fr. 65 c Diehl (66 Masson) κοῦκ ὡς κύων λαίθαργος ὕστερον τρώγει, in Aristoph. *Eq.* 1067 f. φράσσαι κυναλώπεκα, μή σε δολώσῃ, / λαίθαργον, in Eur. *Andr.* 629-30 ἀλλ', ὡς ἐσεῖδες μαστόν, ἐκβαλὼν ξίφος / φίλημ' ἐδέξω προδότιν αἰκάλλων κύνα, whose irony depends on the expression being already well established, then in the Roman comedians Plaut. *Bacch.* 1146 clam mordax canis, Ter. *Eun.* 411 mordere clanculum (cf. Juv. *Sat.* 9. 10 conviva ioco mordente facetus), and when it next appears in Greek it is in the fabulist Babrius 104. 1 λάθρη κύων ἔδακε.<sup>2</sup>

If v. 5 alludes to this expression then it fits exactly with the interpretation of the papyrus fragment suggested so far, and can have only one meaning: '(the) gods are consistent: they do not first approve (of my poetry), then later make treacherous criticism'. The relevance of this to Callimachus' hunger should by now be clear. Let us look at the passage once more from the beginning.

<sup>1</sup> This scarcely needs illustration: cf., for example, frs. 1, 2, 112, 203, 228.

<sup>2</sup> Thereafter the expression appears occasionally in the Christian writers, and via

λήθαργος in the commentators, grammarians, and lexicographers—see Blomfield, loc. cit., A. C. Pearson on Sophocles fr. 885, F. H. M. Blaydes on Aristoph. *Eq.* 1068.

] .ω[ . . . . . ] π[  
 ] .ω[ . . . . . ] μα ῥύηφενές ο[  
 ] .επλ[ . . ] ηφύλα[ . . ] .εμουσι το[  
 ε] βάλλοντο μετ[ . . . ] .αι φημί .[  
 5 ο] ὅ δῆκται τῶς κύνες εἰσὶ θ[εοί  
 [μέεφα μ] ἐν οὖν ἔτι μοί τι δόμοις θο[ύνημα παρῆεν  
 [ ἄρ' ἐ] μοῖς αἰδῶς ἴζεν ἐπὶ βλεφ[άροις  
 [ἀλλ' ὅτ' -ε] ἢ ἐβέλεσκον ἂ μὴ μάθον εὐ[ . . ] .[  
 ἦει] σεν δ' ἄλλο μέλος σιπύ[η]  
 10 [καὶ τότε' ἐπιφροσύ] νη λ[ί]πεν ὄθματα σφῦτο δέ[ θυμός  
 καὶ διὰ] πῦρ ἵεναί  
 ] . . σιγήσσαν ἐλεγμ[ήν  
 μ] ελαινομένη  
 ] .ε . . [

The papyrus starts in the middle of a statement (presumably by the poet) in reply to someone else: '... rich ... tribes<sup>1</sup> ... put ... I say ... (the) gods do not criticize like dogs (which first approve then treacherously bite).' In view of what follows this is possibly an expression of unconcern for financial matters: the gods have approved his poetry, and will continue to do so and to look after him.<sup>2</sup> These lines may even have been a refusal to write the kind of poetry which was popular merely for money: cf. fr. 222 οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω / τὴν Μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλίου νέπους. Then begins the narrative of what happened after this statement. 'Well now, <so long as> I still had something <to eat> at home, <then> a sense of shame sat on my eyelids; <but when> (? my patrons) began to want (? the kind of poetry) which I never learnt (? to write), and the food-bin sang another kind of poetry, <then reticence> left my eyes and my spirit was ready to go <even through> fire (? for the sake of food), (? and I cared nothing for) contemptuous abuse ...' How the passage continued is difficult to surmise; μ]ελαινομένη in v. 13 is very puzzling. But on this occasion too Callimachus may have learnt that poverty is a very frequent companion of poetry (fr. 193. 38-9 νῦν δ' ὁ μάργος ἐς Μούσας / ἔνευσα· τοίχα[ρ] ἦν ἔμαθα δὲν[ . . ] σω, particularly the kind of poetry which he wrote. However, speculation had better end here; perhaps before long another papyrus will be discovered which will take our knowledge and understanding of this passage a step further.

*King's College, Cambridge*

A. W. BULLOCH

<sup>1</sup> φυλα-: it may be worth remembering that in fr. 1. 7 Callimachus addresses the Telchines as φύλον: here too perhaps were mentioned the uninspired poets whose Muse was not λεπταλή.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., of course, fr. 1. 37-8 Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὄσους ἴδον ὄθματι παίδας / . . . μὴ λοξῶι, πολλοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους. Mr. Thomas Gelzer suggests to me that the 'gods' in this

passage might be Callimachus' patrons the Ptolemies. This is a very attractive suggestion, but one which needs caution, I think. Callimachus is very flattering about the Ptolemaic family, but only in his panegyric poetry does he actually identify them with the gods; in his less heightened poetry his royal patrons are usually only juxtaposed with the immortals.