

INSUBSTANTIAL VOICES: SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE HYMNS OF CALLIMACHUS¹

1. 'MIMETIC' AND 'NON-MIMETIC' HYMNS

The hymns of Callimachus are generally divided into two groups: the 'mimetic' hymns (2, 5 and 6), which seem to be enactments of ritual scenes, and the 'non-mimetic' hymns (1, 3 and 4), which seem to follow the pattern of the Homeric hymns.² Occasionally this distinction has been challenged, for instance by pointing to an element of mimesis in *H.* 1,³ but on the whole the division into two groups has been adhered to rather rigidly. A drawback of this distinction is that it seems to prevent further insight into an important aspect of Callimachus' poetic technique. I think that there is in fact a subtle play with various aspects of diegesis and mimesis⁴ which pervades the whole collection of hymns and gives it a certain unity, because it draws attention to the way in which narratives or descriptions are presented in the hymns. Although the emphasis on mimesis or diegesis may vary, none of the hymns can be regarded as diegetic in all its aspects and there is a great deal of fluctuation between the two modes of presentation both within the collection and within the individual hymns.

Frequent fluctuations between diegetic and mimetic modes are also glimpsed in Callimachus' other works, where, however, they have attracted much less attention and are more difficult to analyse because of the fragmentary state of the material. Such fluctuations are, again, to be observed within collective works as well as within single poems. An example of the first category is provided by the last two books of the *Aetia*.⁵ An example of the second category is provided by e.g. *Ia.* fr. 191 (mimetic

¹ I want to thank Ilse Reijgwart for her comments on an earlier version of this article. For the title cf. N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 3, who thus describes the voice in *H.* 6.

² As to all the hymns of Callimachus it has been established long ago and is now generally agreed that these hymns are *not* cult-hymns or otherwise meant for serious religious performance. Cf. e.g. Ph.-E. Legrand, 'Problèmes alexandrins I: Pourquoi furent composés les *hymnes* de Callimaque?', *REA* 3 (1901), 281–312; U. von Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung*² (Berlin, 1924), p. 15. On the mimetic hymns see the discussions – and references to earlier literature – in A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 4f. and Hopkinson (n. 1), p. 37. The most recent work on this subject is W. Albert, *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988). For a survey of the elements of the Homeric hymns see e.g. R. Janko, 'The Structure of the Homeric Hymns', *Hermes* 109 (1981), 9–24; on the distinction between cult-hymns and the Homeric hymns also A. M. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi* (Mnem. Suppl. 93) (Leiden, 1986), pp. 1ff. A different view is taken by F. Cairns, *Tibullus* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 121ff. (with references to earlier publications), who regards the hymns as choric hymns with the speaker 'a mobile compound of chorus, chorus-leader and poet' (p. 121) as in Pindar.

³ See the references in n. 25.

⁴ For a definition of these terms see 2.

⁵ Diegetic: e.g. fr. 75 (with a strongly personified narrator; see M. A. Harder, 'Untrodden Paths: Where Do they Lead?', *HSCPh* 93 (1990), 287–309); mimetic: fr. 64, 97 (?), 110 (monologues of fictional characters fixed in time and space); fr. 114 (dialogue of fictional character with a statue; not located with certainty in a specific book of the *Aetia*, but likely to be from book 3; cf. R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, i (Oxford, 1949), p. 129).

monologue of the dead Hipponax, with narrative about the cup of Bathycles inserted) and fr. 194 (mimetic dialogue of birds inserted into the narrative of the olive-tree). In all these examples there can be little doubt that the fluctuations must be part of the design of the collection and/or the individual poems. Therefore it seems by analogy more likely that in the hymns too the variety provided by these fluctuations was part of the design of the collection as well as of the individual poems.

In this article I shall offer arguments for this supposition and for my view that in fact the varying patterns of the fluctuation between diegesis and mimesis give the collection a certain coherence⁶ because they draw attention to the way in which the 'singer' presents his narrative and/or descriptive material.⁷

2. DIEGETIC AND MIMETIC MODES

First of all it is necessary to define the use of the terms 'diegetic' and 'mimetic' in this article. According to a recent monograph on mimetic poetry in Greek and Latin literature by W. Albert ([n. 2], pp. 19ff.), the criterion for calling certain poems, which are not drama or epic, mimetic is not only the fact that the speaker is a fictional character fixed in time and space, but also that there is 'Szenerieveränderung':

Ein mimetisches Gedicht besteht in einer poetisch gestalteten zusammenhängenden Rede, die eine als Sprecher auftretende Person in einer Szenerie äussert und in der sie auf Vorgänge oder Geschehnisse Bezug nimmt, die sich während des Sprechens in der Szenerie ereignen und eine Szenerieveränderung bewirken (Albert [n. 2], p. 24).

That is, the speaker's words must indicate that there is some kind of change among the people around him or in his surroundings so that the situation at the end of the poem is different from the situation at the beginning: as long as the surrounding world is static and nothing 'happens' we may not speak of a mimetic poem, according to Albert. In this respect Albert seems to follow the view that dialogue in drama always implies action and leads to another dialogue implying another action.⁸ Albert's criterion has certain drawbacks, because it excludes a considerable number of poems which are related because they too are spoken by fictional characters fixed in time and space (e.g. B. fr. 18; Simon. *PMG* 543).⁹

I think it is more profitable to base one's definition on the communication-model used for distinguishing diegetic (narrative) and mimetic (dramatic) texts which we find in Pfister (n. 8), 20ff.:¹⁰

(1) I shall speak of a diegetic mode as long as a story or description is being transmitted to a 'reader', i.e. a fictional addressee within the text with whom the historical reader may identify himself;

⁶ I consider it as likely that Callimachus himself arranged the collection of the hymns in the order of our manuscript tradition. Cf. e.g. R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, ii (Oxford, 1953), p. liii; Hopkinson (n. 1), p. 13.

⁷ In a complex poet like Callimachus this is only one aspect of the treatment of mimetic elements in the hymns. Research as to the exact relation of the mimetic elements in Callimachus' hymns to the hints of mimesis in the Homeric hymns and the conventions of choral lyric could also be profitable, but I have left that out of account for the time being.

⁸ Cf. M. Pfister, *Das Drama* (Munich, 1988⁵), p. 24 on dramatic dialogue as 'gesprochene Handlung'.

⁹ For criticisms of Albert's theory see also the reviews of D. M. Schenkeveld, *Mnem.* IV 43 (1990), 460-2; A. Barchiesi, *RFIC* 118 (1990), 327-9.

¹⁰ I use the terms 'diegetic' and 'mimetic' rather than 'narrative' and 'dramatic' in order to prevent confusion when I speak about the 'narrative/descriptive parts' of the hymns. With both terms, diegesis and mimesis, I refer *only* to the communicative situation.

(2) in such cases the narrator may manifest himself in the text by various means to make the reader aware of his presence (e.g. comments, indication of sources etc.): when that happens I speak of a personified or self-conscious narrator;

(3) when there is no narrator transmitting a story or description to a reader, but the speaker is either addressing himself as a fictional character or addressing other fictional characters (which may include transmitting an embedded narrative or description to them), I regard the text or passage as mimetic. In this category we may include such cases where the address is merely implied because the occasion for the hymn is mentioned (this too presupposes an audience distinct from the historical reader).¹¹

The addressing of other fictional characters or of oneself implies a certain fixation in time and space. This fixation may get further emphasis through explicit references to it. Also the other characters may react to the speaker's words or their actions may be mentioned by him. These mimetic passages may, but need not, contain a change of scene (Albert's 'Szenerieveränderung') in the same way as dialogue or monologue in drama may either imply action or contain only information or comment.¹²

Starting from the definition offered in this chapter we may observe a great deal of fluctuation between diegetic and mimetic modes in the work of Callimachus, both within collections of poems and within single poems.

3. SOME ASPECTS OF MIMESIS IN THE *HYMNS*

Several aspects of mimesis in the hymns may be adduced in order to illustrate Callimachus' tendency to play with diegetic and mimetic modes and to establish its implications: (1) address by the speaker of a more or less well-defined fictional audience; (2) dialogues of the speaker with gods; (3) further indications of fixation of the speaker in time and space.

3.1 *Address of a fictional audience*

In *H.* 2, 5 and 6 Callimachus uses certain means in order to show that the speaker addresses a specific audience:¹³

(1) explicit address of an audience. So e.g. *H.* 2.2 ἐκὰς ἐκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός; 5.1 ὄσσα λωτροχόοι τὰς Παλλάδος ἔξιτε πάσαι; 6.1 τῷ καλᾷθω κατιόντος ἐπιφθέγγασθε, γυναῖκες;

(2) reference to reactions of the audience. So e.g. *H.* 2.16 ἡγαάμην τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπεὶ χέλυσ οὐκέτ' ἀεργός;¹⁴

(3) leaving unexplained several aspects of this specific setting: there is no exposition of the situation at the beginning of the hymns, obviously because the addressees were not supposed to need it. Also several details are left unexplained. So

¹¹ Cf. also F. K. Stanzel, *Die Theorie des Erzählens* (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 285f.

¹² Cf. Pfister (n. 8), pp. 190f. on 'Aktionale vs. nicht-aktionale Monologe'.

¹³ These audiences are not answering and remain rather indefinite, though we get some general idea as to their identity (in *H.* 5 and 6 they are women watching a procession; in *H.* 2 people present at a religious event).

¹⁴ 'Tragic aorist' of the emotion just conceived at the beginning of the music; cf. R. Kühner-B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, i (Hannover/Leipzig, 1898), pp. 163-5. A similar reference to the behaviour of the audience is found in Theoc. 2.59ff. where it can be inferred from the text that Thestylis has obeyed her mistress' orders and in *Ia.* fr. 191.32ff., where a member of the audience is behaving badly.

e.g. *H.* 6.7 πανίκα νεῖται (the subject becomes evident only in 8); *H.* 2.26f. ἐμῶι βασιλῆι (the king's identity is not explained); similarly 65 ἐμὴν πόλιν and 68 ἡμετέροις βασιλεύειν.

If we search for indications of a specific audience in *H.* 1, 3 and 4 the signs are less clear, but not entirely absent. In *H.* 1.1f. a symposium-setting would presuppose a specific audience (but see 3.3 for some reservations). The deliberations in *H.* 4.1ff. take the form of an internal monologue addressed to the speaker's own θυμός. In 28f.

εἰ δὲ λίην πολέες σε περιτροχόωσιν ἀοιδαί,
ποίηι ἐνιπλέξω σε; τί τοι θυμήρες ἀκούσαι;

he addresses Delos and asks her what she would like to hear, suggesting the tale of her 'fixation' in 30 with ἡ ὥς. Formally the whole story of Delos is part of this deliberation, as it begins with ἡ ὥς in 30.¹⁵ This means that *H.* 4 is in fact a monologue, not a text in which a narrator is transmitting a story to an addressee with whom the reader may identify himself, and in this respect we must consider *H.* 4 mimetic.

In *H.* 3.1f.

Ἄρτεμι (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρόν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι)
ὑμνέομεν

the narrator is briefly visible and the parenthesis in 1f. presupposes that the narrator is addressing an audience and anticipating a question from it ('why are you going to sing of Artemis?').¹⁶ This, however, need not be a specific audience: a narrator could thus explain his motives to a reader, and there are no indications of mimesis.

3.2 *Dialogues with gods*

When a narrator addresses a god or one of the characters of his narrative this is generally called 'apostrophe': the narrator briefly interrupts the communication with the reader. This device is as old as Homer¹⁷ and as long as there are no signs of a reaction from the part of those addressed it need not be considered mimetic. In the hymns of Callimachus, however, we see that in several instances the apostrophe is phrased as a question and followed by an 'answer' of the god who is addressed (either

¹⁵ Cf. also *hHom.* 3.25 ἡ ὥς σε πρῶτον Λητῶ τέκε and 214f. ἡ ὥς τὸ πρῶτον... κατὰ γαῖαν ἔβης ἑκατηβόλ' Ἀπολλόν; both in passages in which the narrator is also self-consciously wondering what to sing from a wide range of song about Apollo (cf. 19 πῶς γὰρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὐνυμον ἔόντα; and 207 πῶς τὰρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὐνυμον ἔόντα;). See further Miller (n. 2), pp. 22ff. on the 'dramatisation' of the singer's choice in these lines. The device of the *polymnia* of the object to which the song is devoted is also found in choral lyric (e.g. *Pi. H.* 1 fr. 29) and in *H.* 2 (see 4). For ὥς indicating a summary from an existing song cf. also *Od.* 8.76 ὥς ποτε... and W. Marg, *Homer über die Dichtung* (Orbis Antiquus 11) (Münster, 1957), pp. 11f.

¹⁶ For this use of γὰρ-clauses in the *Iliad* as part of the interaction between the narrator and his addressee see I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers* (Amsterdam, 1987), pp. 91ff. with notes. Cf. also *Pi. P.* 4.67ff. ἀπὸ δ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ Μοῖσαισι δώσω | καὶ τὸ πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ; μετὰ γὰρ | κείνῳ πλευσάντων Μινυῶν, where γὰρ is introducing a parenthesis explaining Pindar's choice of subject for this ode; cf. B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin/New York, 1988) *ad loc.*; J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954²), p. 65.

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. E. Block, 'The Narrator Speaks. Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil', *TAPhA* 112 (1982), 7–22; B. Korte, 'Das Du im Erzähltext', *Poetica* 19 (1987), 169–89 (esp. pp. 174ff.).

given in direct speech or implied). This kind of dialogue must be considered as mimetic according to the communication-model described in 2. It is striking that we do not find this in *H.* 2, 5 or 6, but that the three ‘non-mimetic’ hymns offer clear examples.

In *H.* 3 we find a series of questions addressed to Artemis in 113ff.

ποῦ δέ σε τὸ πρῶτον κερόεις ὄχος ἤρξατ’ αἰεῖρειν;
 Αἴμωι ἐπὶ Θρήικι, τόθεν βορέαο κατὰιξ
 ἔρχεται ἀχλαῖνοις δυσαεᾶ κρυμὸν ἄγουσα.
 ποῦ δ’ ἔταμες πεύκην, ἀπὸ δὲ φλογὸς ἤψαο ποίης;
 Μυῶι ἐν Οὐλύμπωι, φάεος δ’ ἐνέηκας αὐτμὴν
 ἄσβεστος, τό ῥα πατρός ἀποστάζουσι κερανοί.
 ποσσάκι δ’ ἀργυρέοιο, θεή, πειρήσαο τόξου;
 πρῶτον ἐπὶ πτελέην, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἦκας ἐπὶ δρυὼν
 etc.

The answers are not given in direct speech by the goddess, but are provided by the narrator, who continues to speak in ‘Du-Stil’ (cf. 117 and 120). In 183ff. the mimetic element is stronger:

τίς δὲ νύ τοι νήσων, ποῖον δ’ ὄρος εὐαδε πλείστον,
 τίς δὲ λιμὴν, ποίη δὲ πόλις; τίνα δ’ ἐξοχα νυμφεύω
 φίλαο καὶ ποίας ἡρώϊδας ἔσχεσ ἑταίρας;
 εἰπέ, θεή, σὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐχὼ δ’ ἐτέροισιν αἰείω.
 νήσων μὲν Δολίχῃ, πολίων δὲ τοι εὐαδε Πέργῃ
 etc.

Here we find after the questions an explicit request to the goddess for information which the narrator will pass on to ‘the others’.¹⁹ We see that the audience or readers are referred to in the third person plural and the narrator is talking about them to the subject of the hymn. Again the goddess is not allowed any direct speech, but in 186 the narrator creates the impression that he will receive an answer, which he ‘repeats’ in 187ff. *νήσων μὲν Δολίχῃ* etc., still addressing Artemis.

The aporia as to Zeus’ place of birth in *H.* 1.4ff. contains a comparable element of mimesis. After the speaker has expressed his doubts as to Zeus’ birthplace there is an urgent question to Zeus in 6f.

Ζεῦ, σὲ μὲν Ἰδαίοισιν ἐν οὐρεσί φασι γενέσθαι,
 Ζεῦ, σὲ δ’ ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ· πότεροι, πάτερ, ἐψεύσαντο;

This is followed by an answer (presumably Zeus’) in 8 “*Κρήτες αἰεὶ ψεύεται*”, with which the speaker agrees wholeheartedly in 8f.

καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σείω
 Κρήτες ἐτεκτῆναντο· σὺ δ’ οὐ θάνες, ἐσσι γὰρ αἰεὶ

That this is a piece of dialogue is shown by the fact that the answer follows the question without a connective particle, as answers usually do,¹⁹ and that it is followed by *καὶ γάρ*, which is often found in dialogue, marking the speaker’s assent while repeating one of the words of the previous speaker (*Κρήτες*).²⁰ As neither the answer nor the speaker’s reaction is preceded by a speech-introduction the effect is that of a mimetic interruption in the text.

¹⁸ On the idea that the poet is a mouthpiece of the Muses, which must be behind this passage, see e.g. F. Bornmann, *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam* (Florence, 1968), on *H.* 3.186; A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* (Cambridge, 1950), on 22.116ff. (more examples and lit.); on poetic inspiration in general see e.g. P. Murray, ‘Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece’, *JHS* 101 (1981), 87–100.

¹⁹ Cf. e.g. Braswell (n. 16), on Pi. *P.* 4.71 (e).

²⁰ Cf. Denniston (n. 16), pp. 109f.

A similar mimetic interruption in *H.* 4 is provided by the exchange with the Muses in 82ff.

ἐμαὶ θεαὶ εἶπατε Μοῦσαι,
ἦ ῥ' ἐτεὸν ἐγένοντο τότε δρύες ἥνικα Νύμφαι;
“Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρύας δμβρος ἀέξει,
Νύμφαι δ' αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυὶ μηκέτι φύλλα”.

Here the narrator interrupts his tale to ask the Muses about nymphs and trees and again their answer seems to be provided in direct speech, without any speech-introduction. That is, there appears a second voice in the hymn as in *H.* 1.8.

What these passages have in common is not only that they may be considered mimetic interruptions, but also that all of them are questions asked by a human narrator pretending to depend on the gods for accurate information about the subject of his poetry. That is, the mimetic interruptions help to account for the speaker's knowledge of his subject.

3.3 *Fixation of the speaker in time and space*

In *H.* 2, 5 and 6 the speakers are fictional characters supposedly present at a religious event, of which we are allowed to see glimpses through their eyes as they refer and react to it.²¹ Basically the structure of these scenes is: a god or procession is expected – people are waiting – a god or procession arrives. The means which are used to show the fixation of the speaker in a certain time and space are:

(1) familiarising articles indicating a certain place: this use of the article implies that the events are seen from the perspective of the speaker as 'erlebendes Ich'. So e.g. *H.* 2.1 ὁ τῷπόλλωνος... ὄρπηξ; 2 τὸ μέλαθρον; 3 τὰ θύρετρα; *H.* 5.2f. τᾶν... τᾶν; *H.* 6.1 τῷ καλάθῳ; 3 τὸν καλάθον etc.;²²

(2) deictic words indicating time. So e.g. *H.* 2.6 νῦν; 5.2 ἄρτι; 45 and 47 κάμερον; 55 μέεφα; 137 νῦν;

(3) use of present and future tense referring to the actual situation and the future of the speaker and his audience. So e.g. *H.* 2.3 ἀράσσει; 5 αἰίδει; 97 ἀκούομεν; 5.14 αἰώ; 50 ἥξει; 6.17 λέγωμεν and the 'tragic aorist' in *H.* 2.16 ἡγαγάμην (cf. n. 14);

(4) reactions to what is going on. So e.g. *H.* 2.1ff. οἶον ὁ τῷπόλλωνος ἐσεΐσατο δάφνιος ὄρπηξ etc.; 5.14 κυρίγων αἰώ φθόγγον ὑπαξόνιον; 6.120ff.

When we look at the other hymns we see that there are no dramatic settings comparable to those in *H.* 2, 5 and 6. Even so it is profitable to look for signs of a certain fixation in time and space of the speaker.

First of all we may point to *H.* 1.4, which contains a slight indication of a certain fixation in time: the future πῶς... ἀείσομεν seems at first sight conventional, like the future tense at the beginning of the Homeric hymns,²³ but may also be taken literally and contrasted with the present, in which there is a dilemma which has to be solved first (5ff. ἐν δοιῇ μάλα θυμός etc.; the solution of the dilemma involves a brief

²¹ These fictional characters are not altogether easy to define (and may be man or woman). Cf. e.g. K. J. McKay, *The Poet at Play* (Mnem. Suppl. 6) (Leiden, 1962), p. 51. In *H.* 2 we may suppose that the speaker is someone with special connections with Apollo and Cyrene; in *H.* 5 and 6 there are reasons to suppose the character is a woman (so McKay). We must not identify these characters simply with Callimachus (so still G. O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* [Oxford, 1988], pp. 67f. about *H.* 2).

²² Cf. Stanzel (n. 11), pp. 212f.; F. Williams, *Callimachus. Hymn to Apollo* (Oxford, 1978), on *H.* 2.7; Bulloch (n. 2) on *H.* 5.2; Hopkins (n. 1), on *H.* 6.1–4.

²³ E.g. *hHom.* 6.2 αἰσομαι.

exchange with another fictional character, i.e. is also mimetic [see 3.2]). In a comparable way *H.* 4.1–10 shows the singer of hymns considering that it is now time²⁴ to sing of Delos. He also expresses a motif for the song in 9f.

ὥς ἂν Ἀπόλλων
Κύνθιος αἰνήσῃ με φίλης ἀλέγοντα τιθήνης

and thus refers to his own future.

Secondly we may observe that in *H.* 1.1f.

Ζηγὸς ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδήσιν αἰδεῖν
λώϊον

there may be a hint of mimesis, as *παρὰ σπονδήσιν* could suggest a symposium-setting for the hymn and therefore a specific time and space.²⁵ The lack of a definite article with *σπονδήσιν*, however, makes it hard to decide (a comparable passage in *Pae. in Seleuc.* 1f. [p. 140 Powell] ὑμνεῖτε ἐπὶ σπονδαῖς Ἀπόλλωνος κυανοπλοκάμου | παῖδα Cέλευκον does not help, because of the fragmentary state of that poem).

Thus some slight hints of fixation in time and/or space may be detected in *H.* 1 and 4. In *H.* 3 I found no indications of this.

4. THE PRESENTATION OF THE NARRATIVE/DESCRIPTIVE PART OF THE HYMNS

Generally speaking we may say that in the works of Callimachus stories are always presented in such a way that the reader is repeatedly reminded of the fact that this is a story and that some effort is being made to tell it and – in several instances – also to document it. In order to achieve this effect Callimachus uses various devices.²⁶ The hymns are no exception to this rule: here too the narrative and/or descriptive parts are presented in ways which keep us aware of the fact that someone is making a certain effort in telling them and in gathering useful information. For this purpose Callimachus seems to exploit the fact that commensurate with the degree of his fixation in time and space the speaker's omniscience may become problematic and in need of an explanation.

Thus in *H.* 5 and 6 the same speaker, who had been looking at the ritual events from his own internal perspective as a participant fixed in time and space, is transmitting a narrative to the other spectators, but the stories are told from an external and omniscient perspective.²⁷ This omniscient presentation of the stories by

²⁴ Cf. *H.* 4.1 τίνα χρόνον... αἰεῖς and 9 Δήλωι νῦν οἴμης ἀποδάσσομαι. For a somewhat different interpretation see W. H. Mineur, *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos* (Mnem. Suppl. 83) (Leiden, 1984), *ad loc.*; Wilamowitz (n. 2), p. 62 n. 1 seems to suggest that *τίνα χρόνον* may refer to a specific festival, comparing *Pae.* 6.5 ἐν ζαθέω... χρόνῳ (referring to the Theoxenia; cf. S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* [Amsterdam, 1958], *ad loc.*).

²⁵ Cf. G. R. McLennan, *Callimachus. Hymn to Zeus* (Rome, 1977), *ad loc.*; N. Hopkinson, 'Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*', *CQ* 34 (1984), 139–48, esp. p. 139: 'The roles of both poet (author? 'declaimer'? 'master of ceremonies?') and reader ('audience'? 'participant?') are left ill defined by this slight hint of "mimesis"... There will be no further clue'. More outspoken is Wilamowitz (n. 2), p. 1: 'damit ist gleich gesagt, dass wir uns bei der Spende Διὸς Cωτήρος befinden, also bei einem Symposion'.

²⁶ Examples in the *Aetia* are e.g. the elaborate source-indication in fr. 75.53ff. and the device of the dialogue with the Muses in *Aetia* 1–2. See further M. A. Harder, 'Callimachus and the Muses: Some Aspects of Narrative Technique in *Aetia* 1–2', *Prometheus* 14 (1988), 1–14; Harder (n. 5), pp. 302f.

²⁷ A few examples may illustrate the narrator's perspective: (1) the narrator makes it clear at once that he is not confined to the time or place of the story. Cf. *H.* 5.57 ἐν ποκα Θήβαις; 6.24f.

a human speaker with a limited perspective calls for an explanation, and we see that in fact the narratives are carefully introduced in such a way that the omniscient perspective is made plausible. In this respect *H.* 5 is the most explicit: in *H.* 5.55f.

πότνι' Ἀθαναία, σὺ μὲν ἔξιθι· μέσφα δ' ἐγώ τι
ταῖσδ' ἐρέω· μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων

the speaker announces a tale, which he rather emphatically says to be not his own, and tells it to the women (who are addressed as *παῖδες* in 57), in order to make time pass more quickly. In *H.* 6.17ff. the speaker wonders, after rejecting the story of her search for Persephone, what is best to sing of Demeter. It is not clear whether a narrative is really being transmitted to the other characters, because formally the speaker is merely considering the possibilities: the thrice repeated *κάλλιον*, *ὥς* serves to suggest merely a number of possible subjects and we get the impression of a large range of already existing stories about Demeter of which the narrator is considering the relative merits. This is a device which also occurs in *H.* 4 (see below). *H.* 2 is more elusive, because the status of the narrative/descriptive section is not quite clear. In 30f.

οὐδ' ὁ χορὸς τὸν Φοῖβον ἐφ' ἐν μόνον ἡμᾶρ ἀείκει,
ἔστι γὰρ εὐνμος· τίς ἂν οὐ ρέα Φοῖβον ἀείδοι;

the speaker states that Apollo can be sung in many ways: it is possible that what follows is his own text, in which he 'proves' that Apollo is indeed *εὐνμος*²⁸ by giving examples, but we cannot exclude the possibility that the singer is to be identified with the chorus, whose singing has been ordered and announced from line 8 onwards. This would mean that there are two voices in the hymn. In both cases, however, it is suggested by 30f. that the contents of the narrative/descriptive part are taken from a large range of existing songs and stories as in *H.* 5 and 6.

Summarising we may say that in *H.* 2, 5 and 6 the narrative/descriptive parts are attributed to some kind of source, mentioned more or less explicitly, and are told almost without interference by the narrator (who, after all, is merely repeating or considering the stories told by others). This way of presenting the narratives seems to be a logical result of the fixation in time and space of the speaker, which would limit him to merely acting as a vehicle for the already existing tales of others.²⁹ In support of this explanation we may adduce, apart from the general idea of the poet or singer

ἔτι Δώτιον ἱρὸν ἔναιον|...Πελαγοί (in *H.* 5.137 the return to the dramatic framework is marked by the words *ἔρχετ' Ἀθαναία ἀτρεκές*, which seem to underline the distance between the ritual reality and the story just told; cf. Hutchinson [n. 21], 34; Bulloch [n. 2], *ad loc.*); (2) the narrator knows what goes on in the minds of the characters. Cf. e.g. *H.* 5.57–67 (Athena's feelings for Chariclo); 6.72f. (the shame of Erysichthon's parents); (3) the narrator can anticipate the future. Cf. e.g. *H.* 5.68 *ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τήν᾿ δάκρυα πόλλ' ἔμνε*.

²⁸ Williams (n. 22), *ad loc.* calls 32–96 'the hymn proper', but this is not very helpful: it may say something about the contents of the passage, but not about the form.

²⁹ For other examples of stories embedded in a dramatic monologue in Hellenistic poetry cf. Theoc. 2 (Simaetha's attempts to get her lover Delphis back are presented in a dramatic monologue, which contains the story of her love-affair with him; here the internal perspective is adhered to throughout, so that the transition to the actual story is easier than in Callimachus' hymns); Call. *1a* fr. 191.31ff. (the story of the cup of Bathycles is inserted into a dramatic monologue addressed by Hipponax *redivivus* to an audience of philologists). In Call. *ΠΑΝΝΥΧΙΣ* fr. 227 (a lyrical poem) we find a dramatic monologue, but there are no indications that this poem contained a narrative part, although the *Diegesis* leaves open the possibility that there was a story of Helen included. Cf. *Dieg.* 10.6–9 (1.217 Pfeiffer) *Παροίνιον εἰς τοὺς Διοσκοῦρους· καὶ Ἑλένην ὑμνεῖ, καὶ παρακαλεῖ τὴν θυσίαν δέξασθαι· καὶ προτροπὴ τοῖς συμπόταις εἰς τὸ ἀγρυπνεῖν*. It is conceivable that the tale of Helen was inserted between fr. 227.21–2 and 3ff., where an unknown amount of lines is lost (cf. Pfeiffer [n. 5], on 1f.).

as mouthpiece of the Muses (see n. 18), also *Od.* 8.487–98, where Odysseus asks Demodocus for a song about the capture of Troy, first accounting for Demodocus' superior ability and knowledge:

ἦ cé γε Μοῦς ἐδίδαξε, Διὸς πάις, ἦ cé γ' Ἀπόλλων,
λίην γάρ κατὰ κόσμον Ἀχαιῶν οἶτον αἰδεῖς,
ὅς' ἔρξαν τ' ἔπαθόν τε καὶ ὅς' ἐμόγησαν Ἀχαιοί,
ὥς τέ που ἦ αὐτὸς παρῶν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας (488–91)

and then promising to transmit Demodocus' story to others:

αἶ κεν δὴ μοι ταῦτα κατὰ μοῖραν καταλέξῃς,
αὐτίκ' ἐγὼ πᾶσιν μυθήσομαι ἀνθρώποιςιν
ὥς ἄρα τοι πρόφρων θεὸς ὦπασε θέσπιν ἀοιδὴν (496–8).

This passage implies an awareness of the difficulties of collecting information and transmitting stories to others, which goes beyond the comparatively straightforward requests for information to the Muses in the *Iliad*.³⁰ Callimachus may well have had this passage in mind.

If we look at *H.* 1, 3 and 4 we see that here both the personification of the narrator and the mimetic elements have the effect of creating a picture of 'the αἰοιδός at work'. Here too the degree of mimesis or personification seems to have implications for the way in which the information in the narrative/descriptive part is accounted for.

In *H.* 3 the narrator is personified as a singer of hymns (cf. *H.* 3.1f.), and we are constantly kept aware of his presence, through a variety of means.³¹ The mimetic element, however, is restricted to the questions to Artemis in 113ff. and 183ff. (see 3.2), and there is nothing to suggest that the narrator is fixed in a specific time or space. In accordance with this we see that the descriptive/narrative part begins with a scene which takes us to Olympus, where Zeus is carrying the young Artemis on his knees and answering her demands (4–40, with direct speech by Artemis in 6–25 and by Zeus in 29–39). This is told from an omniscient perspective, and the first lines of the hymn, which contain hardly more elements of personification than the Homeric hymns, make this perspective acceptable. In the rest of the hymn this omniscient perspective is adhered to, while the narrator follows Artemis on her travels and knows what is going on, mostly without indicating how he knows it.³²

In *H.* 1 too we see that all through the hymn the narrator is manifesting himself through various means.³³ But the suggestion of a mimetic framework in 1f. (see 3.3)

³⁰ Cf. also *Od.* 12.389f. ταῦτα δ' ἐγὼν ἤκουσα Καλυψοῦς ἡυκόμοιο·|ἦ δ' ἔφη Ἑρμείας διακτόρου αὐτῇ ἀκοῦσαι (Odysseus, in his tale to the Phaeacians, accounting for his knowledge of a dialogue between Zeus and Helios on Olympus in the much-disputed passage *Od.* 12.374–90) and W. Suerbaum, 'Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus', *Poetica* 2 (1968), 150–77, esp. pp. 157ff. On the new concepts of poets and poetry in the *Odyssey* as compared to the *Iliad* see also H. Fraenkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie* (Munich, 1962²), pp. 6ff.; H. Maehler, *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Hypomnemata 3) (Göttingen, 1963), pp. 21ff. On this passage and *Od.* 8.7.73ff. (the first song of Demodocus) see also Marg (n. 15), pp. 11f. A similar idea is present in Pl. *Ion* 534e–535a where a line of transmission from gods to poets to rhapsodes is mentioned.

³¹ Explanations (e.g. 47f. νῆσῳ ἐνὶ Λιπάρῃ |Λιπάρη νέον, ἀλλὰ τότ' ἔσκεν|οὔνομά οἱ Μελιγουνίς); first person (e.g. 136f. πότνια, τῶν εἴη μὲν ἐμοὶ φίλος ὅστις ἀληθὴς|εἴην δ' αὐτός, ἄνακτα, μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδῇ); time-indications (e.g. 77 εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν); references to spokesmen (e.g. 198f. ὅρος δ' ὅθεν ἤλατο νύμφη|Δικταῖον καλέουσιν); exclamation (255 ἄ δειλὸς βασιλέων, ὅσον ἤλιτεν).

³² So e.g. 44f. (pleasure of Kairotos and Tethys); 81ff. (Artemis' speech to the Cyclopes at Lipara); 103f. (Artemis addressing herself while hunting); 144ff. (Heracles waiting at Olympus for Artemis' spoils and urging her to hunt pigs and cows).

³³ Questions – some of them 'rhetorical' – (1ff., 4ff., 62f., 75, 92f.); references to sources (e.g. 13f. and 60f.); time-indications (e.g. 18ff.); first person singular or plural (e.g. 65). In the farewell

may account for some important differences with *H. 3*. *H. 1* differs from *H. 3* in having far less direct speech (only Rhea's cry for help in 29) and almost no references to what goes on in the characters' minds. The only exception in this respect is 57ff.

ἀλλ' ἔτι παιδὸς ἔων ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια·
τῷ τοι καὶ γνωτοὶ προτερηγενέες περ ἔοντες
οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιδαΐσιον οἶκον.

Here the narrator tells us the motivation of Zeus' brothers for leaving him the power in heaven. A human narrator (at a symposium?) would not be able to gather first-hand knowledge of the gods' thoughts, and in fact we see that this knowledge is carefully accounted for in the lines which follow:

δηναιοὶ δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθέες ἦσαν αἰδοί·
φάντο πάλον Κρονίδῃσι διάτρυχα δώματα νείμαι·
τίς δέ κ' ἐπ' Οὐλύμπῳ τε καὶ Ἄϊδι κλῆρον ἐρύσσα
ὅς μάλα μὴ νενίηλος; ἐπ' ἱσαίῃ γὰρ ἔοικε
πήλασθαι· τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσσον διὰ πλείστον ἔχουσι.
ψευδοίμην, αἰόντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκούην.
οὐ σέ θεῶν ἐσσηνα πάλοι θέσαν, ἔργα δὲ χειρῶν
σὴ τε βίη τό τε κάρτος (60ff.).

Having read this passage we can see that the narrator arrived at his view of the other gods' motives by careful reasoning and rejecting the illogical stories of older poets. Thus the apparent 'lapse' into knowledge of the minds of the gods is in fact just another illustration of the activities of the narrator and carefully adapted to the mimetic setting suggested by 1f.

Another way of presentation, comparable to that in *H. 6* and 2, can be observed in *H. 4*.28ff. In *H. 4*.30 ἢ ὥς implies that an existing story taken from a large range of songs about Delos is being considered and these considerations take the form of a possible answer to the question in 28f. (quoted in 3.1). This fits in with the extensive personification and mimetic setting: the narrator is a singer, who is considering an already existing tale and while considering it is repeating it, like the speaker in *H. 6*. Through this device it is possible to tell the story from an omniscient perspective,³⁴ while at the same time having a largely personified narrator. From 28 on we see that the speaker remains in evidence, because he regularly uses 'Du-Stil' (the central parts of the story are told in 'Du-Stil'³⁵) and apostrophe. That is, he shows his emotional involvement in the story, but carefully avoids the impression that it is his own. Even the mimetic interruption in 82ff. does not really concern the story of Leto: it is a request for some background information triggered by an element in the story (the worries of the nymph Melia about her tree), but it is not of vital importance for that story like the dialogue in *H. 1*.6ff.

As to the presentation of the narrative/descriptive parts a common characteristic of the collection of hymns is that Callimachus has taken great care to underline the artificiality of the narrative by emphasising its 'plausibility'. He either inserts 'already existing stories' reproduced by narrators who are personified and more or less fixed

at the end (91–6) a personal note has been detected (cf. McLennan [n. 25], *ad loc.*), though the phrasing is largely conventional and there is a great deal of play with the endings of the Homeric hymns.

³⁴ The omniscient perspective is essential for the story of Leto, which, like the career of Artemis in *H. 3*, involves a great deal of travelling and also a long speech of her unborn son from the womb (162–95).

³⁵ Cf. Mineur (n. 24), pp. 6f. The Du-Stil is proper to a hymn which is addressed to a god or goddess. It does, however, imply an unusual narrative situation, as the narrator is not addressing a reader. Cf. Korte (n. 17), *passim*.

in time and space or he gives us a picture of the 'singer at work' who is choosing his subject from an existing range of material or gathering information from various sources, including the gods he is singing about.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion we may say that all the hymns contain an element of playing with mimesis and diegesis and that this play is closely related to the way in which the narratives/descriptions are accounted for and underlines their artificiality.

Within the individual hymns we have seen that the hymns which have a subjective dramatic setting (*H.* 2, 5 and 6 and to a certain extent also *H.* 4), turned out to contain embedded narratives which are told from an external and omniscient perspective with little or no interference of the narrator, i.e. in an objective way. This omniscient perspective was accounted for by the fact that the narrator acts as a 'mouthpiece' for the tales of others. On the other hand, in the hymns in which the dramatic setting is less explicit (*H.* 1 and 4) or even absent (*H.* 3) we found a personified narrator, who draws attention to his own activities and interferes with his story, even to the extent of inserting mimetic interruptions to acquire information on his subject.

On a larger scale this play with the contrast between mimesis and diegesis is reflected within the collection of the hymns, where primarily mimetic (2, 5 and 6) and diegetic (3) hymns and hymns with large amount of personification verging on mimesis (1 and 4) seem to have been carefully arranged by Callimachus.

An important aspect of this play with mimesis and diegesis and a unifying factor in the whole collection of hymns is the fact that literary preoccupations play such an important part in it. We are constantly reminded that we are reading well-documented stories and/or descriptions instead of being allowed to witness events in the real world. Thus we see that while emphasising his trustworthiness Callimachus is at the same time underlining the artificial character of his poetry. This kind of play with diegetic and mimetic modes is also found in Callimachus' other works (see the examples mentioned in 1 and n. 26) and must be considered as an important aspect of his literary technique. As it also serves to illustrate the dependence on sources, it recalls – and may be thought to explain – the famous fr. 612 ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀεῖδω.³⁶

University of Groningen

M. ANNETTE HARDER

³⁶ This fragment is quoted in Σ' Dion. Per. 1 in a context which makes it clear that the scholiast believes that Dionysius refers to the Muses because he rejects τὸ ἀμάρτυρον and regards them as a guarantee of truth. The Muses are one of the means Callimachus uses to underline the truth of his stories, but he clearly uses many other means as well and may have said the words in relation to one of those (cf. also Pfeiffer [n. 5], *ad loc.*, who rightly says that the fragment need not be from the prologue of the *Aetia*).