

AESTHETICS AND RECALL: CALLIMACHUS FRS. 226–9 PF. RECONSIDERED

FOUR POEMS IN SEQUENCE

Callimachus frs. 226–9 Pf. follow the *Iambi* in Pfeiffer's 1949 edition of the poet's fragmentary works. The four poems have generally not received consideration as a group unto themselves, either in regard to their correspondences with one another or as a collection. Nor has the occasion of their 'collecting' been seriously considered. And therein perhaps lies the cause of their problematic character for Callimachean scholarship.

A few papyri preserve frs. 226–9.¹ One of these, *PMilan*. I.18, is a prose diegesis to a large collection of Callimachus' works. The extant diegesis encompasses the *Aetia* (beginning with fr. 67 *Acontius and Cydippe*), the *Iambi* (frs. 226–9), the *Hecale*, and the first two *Hymns*: at this point the text of *PMilan*. I.18 breaks off. The diegesis to the *Aetia* gives the first line of (apparently) each *aition*:² the diegesis to the *Iambi*, the *Hecale*, and *Hymns* 1–2 gives the first line of the poem. In all cases the diegesis provides a summary of the content of the individual poem (or *aition*): these vary in length. The order in the diegesis suggests that the diegete(s) is reading through papyrus rolls in a series apparently arranged by genre: elegy, polymetrics, hexameter works. This series of rolls, which invites a continuous reading in a particular order, we may term a multi-volume edition of Callimachus' poems.³ It is not certain that the diegesis began with the *Aetia*, but this is very likely. The frequent evocation of the opening of the *Aetia* in later literature suggests that this was recognized as the beginning of Callimachus, since opening poems of lyric collections came to be emblematic of the author and collection.⁴

Largely because the diegesis gives no separate title for frs. 226–9, some scholars have assumed that some, or all, of these four poems are the final poems of the *Iambi*.⁵ In fact the diegesis marks only one poem with a title, inset at X.18 'Εκάλης.⁶ With *Iambus* 1 the diegete begins a new column (VI.1): this is also true of fr. 226 (X.1). A marginal

¹ See R. Pfeiffer ad loc. E. A. Barber and P. Maas, 'Callimachea', *CQ* 44 (1950), 96, conjectured extensive restorations to fr. 229.2–12, many of which G. B. D'Alessio, *Callimaco: Inni, Epigrammi, Frammenti* (Milan, 1996), 670–2, includes in his edition of the text, which I follow here.

² Not fr. 112 (*Epilogue*): see P. E. Knox, 'The epilogue to the *Aetia*', *GRBS* 26 (1985), 59–65; id., 'The epilogue to the *Aetia*: an epilogue', *ZPE* 96 (1993), 175–78; A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 143–62.

³ There may be some indication of such a multi-volume edition of Simonides: see D. Obbink, 'The genre of Plataea: generic unity in the new Simonides', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider (edd.), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford, 2001), 66, n. 6. On the sequence *Aitia*–*Iambi* as a continuum, see A. Barchiesi, 'Proemi e Chiuse', in Orazio. *Enciclopedia Oraziana* 2 (Rome, 1997), 727; B. Acosta-Hughes, *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley, 2002), 3–4.

⁴ See A. Barchiesi, 'Rituals in ink: Horace on the Greek lyric tradition', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (edd.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), 171–3.

⁵ Fragment 229 is further associated with some of the *Iambi* in the first-/second-century papyrus fragments *PSI* 1216 + *POxy*.2171 + 2172, which justifies assuming that the *Iambi* and frs. 226–9 belonged to a single roll.

⁶ The inscription *KAAAIIMAXOY IAM[BOI* is from *POxy*. 1011, the largest of the papyri that preserve the *Iambi*.

note set high in the margin above column VI (the opening of the *Iambi*) marks the end of the diegesis to *Aetia* 1–4:⁷ the last of the diegesis summaries to the *Aetia* appear rather compressed at the foot of the preceding column. Scholarship on the *Iambi* has pursued a series of interrelated questions concerning these four poems that respond to this assumption that these four poems may be the last of the *Iambi*.⁸ This line of enquiry is clearly critical to an assessment of the evolution and sequence of the *Iambi* as a collection, and particularly for a reading of *Iambus* 13 as a poem of closure and recall. The same line of enquiry may, however, have also overshadowed other approaches that might more helpfully consider frs. 226–9 on their own terms.

I begin with a review of the four poems in terms of the following categories: metre, title, occasion, and outstanding correspondences. All four are composed in stichic, not strophic metres. The metres of frs. 226–7 are easily associated with iambs.⁹ The one extant line of fr. 226 is a phalaecian:¹⁰ Catullus significantly terms his poems in phalaecians *iambi* (36.5, 40.2, 54.6, fr. 3). The diegesis and the Berlin papyrus that preserves fr. 227 both have this as an epode with the first line a iambic dimeter.¹¹ *Iambi* 5–7 are epodes. The metres of frs. 228–9, however, archebuleans and catalectic choriambic pentameter, respectively, are not easily associated with iambs.

Fragments 227 and 229 are cited in other sources by title.¹² This suggests that these two poems circulated, at some stage, as individual works. With frs. 226 and 228 the issue of title is more complicated. Pfeiffer tentatively entitled fr. 226 *Πρὸς τοὺς ὠραίους*, *To Handsome Young Men*, following the opening of the diegete's summary. D'Alessio in his edition argues convincingly that this title is unlikely.¹³ The phrase *πρὸς τοὺς | ὠραίους φησὶν* occurs in the diegesis immediately following the lemma, an unlikely position for a title, and looks rather like a description of the poem's occasion. *φησὶν*, 'he says, speaks', is indicative here, as is *ἀπαντῶν φησιν*, 'in responding he says', at diegesis IX.35 (to *Iambus* 13) of the vividness of occasion portrayed in the poem.¹⁴

Pfeiffer also assumed the opening of the diegete's summary to fr. 228 to be the title of this poem (*Ἐκθέωσις Ἀρσίνοης*, *Deification of Arsinoe*). Here again the word occurs immediately following the lemma in the diegesis: this looks more like a description, even a categorization, of the poem, as is clearly the case with the word in the same position following the lemma in the diegesis to fr. 227: *παροίνιον*.¹⁵ The

⁷ ΤΩΝ Δ ΑΙΤΙΩΝ ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ.

⁸ C. M. Dawson, 'The *Iambi* of Callimachus: a Hellenistic poet's experimental laboratory', *YCS* 11 (1950), 132–3; D. L. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden, 1980), 4–7, 52–54; Cameron (n. 2), 163–73; A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford, 1999), 271–82; Acosta-Hughes (n. 3), 9–13.

⁹ M. Fantuzzi, *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* 1.1 (Rome, 1993), 56, n. 62, suggests that Callimachus himself would certainly have viewed frs. 226–7 as having a 'tenore iambico'.

¹⁰ The extant phalaecians of Phalaecus (3 G.-P.) and Theocritus (16 G.-P.) are sepulchral epigrams. Elsewhere in Callimachus phalaecians are also epigrammatic: *Ep.* 20. G.-P. (38 Pf.) and *Ep.* 66 G.-P. (fr. 395 Pf.). The metre appears originally to have been a lyric one (Caesius Bassus *GLK* 6.258.15 ascribes its origin to Sappho) which may be relevant here.

¹¹ Heph. p. 53, 10 C, whom Pfeiffer follows in his edition, cites fr. 227.1–2 as an example of a fourteen-syllable euripidean (a iambic dimeter followed by an ithyphallic).

¹² Ath. 15.668C: οὗ μνημονεύει Καλλίμαχος ἐν Παννυχίδι διὰ τούτων; Heph. p. 53, 10 C, whom Pfeiffer follows in his edition, cites fr. 227.1–2 as an example of a fourteen-syllable euripidean (a iambic dimeter followed by an ithyphallic).

¹³ D'Alessio (n. 1), 656, n. 2.

¹⁴ ἀπαντῶν φησιν at dieg. IX.35 is intriguing: conventionally translated 'in responding . . . he says', it may also capture something of the character of enacted dialogue of *Iambus* 13, a poem with marked allusions to Plato.

¹⁵ παροίνιον is Pfeiffer's conjecture for the papyrus' παροιμιον. Norsa and Vitelli in their

diegete's choice of substantive is rather meant to give a sense of the poems' occasion, which in this case is central: the poem celebrates the deification of Arsinoe II, and quite possibly the establishment of cult practice(s).

Athenaeus XV 668 C attests the title of fr. 227 (*Pannychis*): this suggests that the poem is known (at least to Athenaeus and his audience) as a discrete work.¹⁶ Hephaestion (c. ix *περὶ χοριαμβικοῦ*, 4, p. 30, 19C) supplies the title of fr. 229 (*Branchus*). The seer Branchus is also a figure at *Iambus* 4.28–31, where the laurel lists his purification of the Ionians with laurel in her own aretology. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v.8, 48, 2.359 St.) discusses this purification and refers to Callimachus' recollection of the episode: *μέμνηται τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν Ἰάμβοις*. This is conventionally thought to refer to the lines of *Iambus* 4 that detail the purification,¹⁷ although the purification also figures in the early extant lines of fr. 229 (2–4). The purification does not, interestingly, appear in the diegesis to fr. 229.

Pfeiffer, following the *Suda* entry on Callimachus' works, tentatively entitles these four poems collectively as the *μέλη*.¹⁸ However, none of these is ever cited as *ἐν μέλεσι* (as, for example, several of the *Iambi* are cited as *ἐν ἰάμβοις*). Conversely, none of *Iambi* 1–13 are cited by individual title.

Both frs. 227 and 228 purport to be occasional, although in different ways. Fragment 227 evokes a particular ritual, a *παννυχίς*. The poem has some of the mimetic features of *Hymns* 5 and 6:¹⁹ the speaker in the role of one of the celebrants, the role of perception and sound, and the prescriptive reference to one or more of the ritual's followers.²⁰ In contrast fr. 228 would seem to be, at least in its original version, a court set-piece, as are several of Callimachus' poems celebrating Ptolemaic queens. Two of these, at least, *SH* 254–268 C *Victory of Berenice* and fr. 110 Pf. *Lock of Berenice*, were subsequently incorporated into his *Aetia*;²¹ these thus testify to two levels of reception, as occasional individual celebratory poems and as the opening and closing poems of *Aetia* 3–4. Here theirs is a relationship of correspondence and recall, and they serve, as well, as the aesthetic parameter of the two papyrus rolls *Aetia* 3–4,

edition of *PMilan*. I.18 suggested *προοίμιον*, which is preferred by B. Bravo, *Pannychis e Simposio: Feste private di donne e uomini nei testi letterari e nel culto* (Pisa, 1997), 102–4. The contrast of *προοίμιον* and *ὑμνεῖ* in the diegesis to fr. 227 is then a vivid one. Fragment 229.12 οὐν[ο]μα γὰρ[ρ] τοι τόδ' ἐγὼ κατάρχω is an intriguing parallel here.

¹⁶ Cameron (n. 2), 164, suggests that *παννυχίς* at Athen. 15.668C could quite likely be a description rather than a title: cf. the preceding phrase at 15.688C *ἐν ταῖς παννυχίσιν* referring to the festivals.

¹⁷ The exact sense of *μέμνηται* in this passage of the *Stromateis* is enigmatic. It could simply mean 'makes mention of, i.e. refers to' rather than 'tells the story, narrates': *Iambus* 4.28–31 is then unremarkable as the referent of the verb. Cf., however, Cameron (n. 2), 170.

¹⁸ Pfeiffer ad loc. D'Alessio (n. 1), 30 suggests that some of the titles listed in the *Suda* may be shorter works later included in other collections, and particularly draws a parallel between *Ἄργους οἰκισμός* and the fragments concerned with the return of the Argo in *Aetia* 1 (frs. 7–21, *SH* 249A–251). Such an instance of poetic editorship of individual poems and collections would be an important paradigm for one possible scenario for the sequence of frs. 226–9. See below pp. 486–7.

¹⁹ As Clayman (n. 8), 52, notes with reference to *Hymn* 2. See also Bravo (n. 15), 106. Cf. esp. fr. 227.1–2 and *Hy.* 2.8.

²⁰ Cf. fr. 227.1–2 and *Hy.* 5.14, fr. 227.5 and *Hy.* 6.128–33. On mimetic characteristics of Callimachus' hymns, see M. Depew, 'Mimesis and aetiology in Callimachus' Hymns', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Callimachus*. Hellenistica Groningana 1 (Groningen, 1993), 57–77.

²¹ Whether fr. 392 Pf. (*Wedding of Arsinoe*) in fact belonged to an early book of the *Aetia* remains a tantalizing question.

the royal frame, as it were, in which the individual panels of these books are set.²² The reader, on coming to the end of the roll that contains *Aetia* 4, will have been reminded, by a second poem celebrating Berenice II, of the opening of *Aetia* 3 that celebrates the same royal figure. Fragment 228 similarly testifies to two levels of reception. Initially the poem was occasioned by the death and subsequent deification of Arsinoe II: the question we encounter is its subsequent position here.

Fragment 229 may have also been an occasional poem; it certainly evokes this form. The language and imagery of invocation, summoning the god to journey to Miletus, and the reference to the sacred laurel bough (line 11: κρην]έων δ[ιδύ]μων ἐγγύθι δάφνης κατὰ κλώνᾳ πῆξας), might all be meant to memorialize the Ptolemaic re-foundation of the shrine of Apollo at Didyma.²³ This would make the juxtaposition of frs. 228 and 229 the more impressive, each poem celebrating a Ptolemaic religious ‘foundation’. The Dioscuri occur in the diegeseis to frs. 227 and 228, a circumstance that may have led to the juxtaposition of the two poems.²⁴ Fragment 229 further draws a contrast between the Apolline cult sites Delphi and Delos that Callimachus evokes elsewhere, most notably, perhaps, in *Iambus* 4, where Branchus also figures.

The diegeseis to frs. 226–9 are markedly shorter than those to the *Iambi*, and than many of those to the *Aetia*. Three of the diegeseis foreground the ritual character of the poems: none make interpretive judgements on the poems (those to the *Iambi* do so occasionally).²⁵ The final line to the diegesis to fr. 226 (dieg. X.1–5) διόπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς | εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἀποβλέπετε, ‘wherefore do you also look to what may come’, is surely a quotation: changes from third person summary (line 2 φησὶν) to second person in other sections of the diegesis similarly suggest citation from the text itself.²⁶ Πρὸς τοὺς | ὥραίους in lines 1–2 of the diegesis to fr. 226 may indicate something of the sort of occasional (even choral) nature of, for example, fr. 227. If both of these poems were indeed cast as choral works, this might be one indication for their juxtaposition.²⁷ The language of the diegesis to fr. 227, παροίνιον, ὕμνῃ, παρακαλεῖ, προτροπή, seems to suggest something of the poem’s genre as well as to emphasize its ritual character. Religious imagery is also the central feature of the diegesis to the aetiological fr. 228. The term ἐκθέωσις, again, immediately following the lemma may be also an attempt at generic definition: cf. παροίνιον in the same place, the first word following the lemma, in the diegesis to fr. 227. Fragment 229 may, like fr. 228, be aetiological. This poem celebrates the founding of the shrine of Apollo at Didyma—cf. lines 1–2: Διδύ|μω[ν] γενάρχα: the diegesis captures the cultic character of the poem, as do the poem’s

²² P. J. Parsons, ‘Callimachus: Victoria Berenices’, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 48–49; J. Van Sickel, ‘The book-roll and some conventions of the poetic book’, *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 13–14; D’Alessio (n. 1), 37–43; M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Muse e Modelli: la Poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* (Rome and Bari, 2002), 64–6.

²³ I owe this suggestion especially to Cameron’s discussion (n. 2), 171–2.

²⁴ On the role of the Dioscuri in Ptolemaic ruler cult, see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 1.18–19, 207; A. Sens, *Theocritus: Dioscuri (Idyll 22)* (Göttingen, 1997), 23, 80, 215.

²⁵ For example, VI.2 (to *Iambus* 1) ‘Υποτίθεται φθιτὸν Ἰππώνακτα, VII.23 (to *Iambus* 5) ἐν ᾗθει εὐνοίας ἀπαγ[ο]ρεύων.

²⁶ For example, VI.21 (to *Iambus* 1) ἐ]ρρίξεσθε, VII.12 (to *Iambus* 4) πέπαυθε. D’Alessio (n. 1), 656, n. 2, compares lines 4–5 of the diegesis with *Ep.* 1.16 (54 G.-P.) οὕτω καὶ σύ, Δίω, τὴν κατὰ σαντὸν ἔλα, where see his note, 218, n. 3.

²⁷ Fragment 228.1–2 [Ἀ]γέτω θεός, οὐ γάρ ἔχω δίχ'α τῶνδ' ἀεῖδειν | [c. 20 spaces] π]ροποδεῖν Ἀπολλων’ also evokes the imagery of choral dance. Juxtaposed with fr. 229.12 οὐν[ο]μα γά[ρ] τοι τόδ' ἐγὼ κατάρχω, ‘I begin with this name’, the act of commencement is the more striking.

extant lines. The presence of two deities in this poem corresponding to the two deities in fr. 228 is very striking. Furthermore, Arsinoe in fr. 228 corresponds with Helen in fr. 227. And both 227 and 228 share the feature of sibling bond, the Dioscuri and Helen, Philotera and Arsinoe; in each case the apotheosis of the sibling(s) has occurred earlier.²⁸

Clearly the four poems share a series of correspondences with one another, and there is an internal logic to their ordering. Fragments 226 and 227 juxtapose erotic imagery and audiences: fr. 227.7 καὶ τῶν παρουσῶν ἦν θέλει, χῶν θέλει φιλήσει might suggest that both poems 226 and 227 are essentially addressed πρὸς τοὺς ὄραιοις.²⁹ Fragments 227 and 228 both feature the Dioscuri, 228 and 229 both feature divine journeys. This last pair is also juxtaposed in terms of gender; the central figures and voices of fr. 228, as we have it, are female, of 229 are male; *Hymns* 3 and 4 evince a similar juxtaposition. There may be more than one pattern of organization of the four poems. One is metrical: the juxtaposition of frs. 226 and 227 highlights the similar character of their metres, as does the juxtaposition of 228 and 229.³⁰ Fragments 226 and 227 are both erotic, possibly both symposiastic (note again the second-person plural address in the last lines of the diegesis to fr. 226). Fragments 228 and 229 are more formal, probably both with court associations. Fragments 227 and 228 (the internal pair) feature the Dioscuri, exemplars of sibling devotion (and thus a mythological paradigm for Philotera and Arsinoe). Fragments 226 and 229 (the external pair) both feature mythological narrative and pederastic love, and both have a paideutic element as well. All four poems share several other features, of which perhaps the most striking is the evocation of occasion (this is not a standard feature of the *Iambi*, although 8 and 12 are exceptions). Their ordering in sequence highlights moments of similarities and contrast in metre, theme, and imagery, and is itself an act of poetic aesthetics.

FOUR POEMS TOGETHER

The ordering of these four poems may also be informed by an external editorial factor, one that reflects another ordering of poetry in sequence. There are, of course, four books of the *Aetia*, as there are four poems at hand here. A closer reading of the sequence of the four poems suggests that the numerical parallel is intended, not coincidental, and that the sequence of the four poems frs. 226–9 is meant to recall the four books of the *Aetia*, specifically the early sections of the four books.

The subject of the untitled fr. 226, the Lemnian women, is one of the myths associated with the Argonautica legend. *Aetia* 1 is, in large part, concerned with the Argonauts. In Apollonius' narrative of their sojourn on Lemnos in *Argonautica* 1, Heracles plays a significant role; Heracles is also a prominent presence in the fragments

²⁸ There are comparable correspondences in the individual episodes of *Aetia* 1. The *Parian Graces* (frs. 3–7.18) and the *Rite at Anaphe* (frs. 7.19–21, *SH* 249A–251) both focus on the programmatically important figures of Apollo and the Charites; the *Rite at Anaphe* and the *Lindian Rite* (frs. 22–3) are scurrilous rituals; the *Lindian Rite* and *Theiodamas* feature Heracles and food.

²⁹ If, with Bravo (n. 15), 108, we assume a female, or partly female, chorus in fr. 227, then frs. 226 and 227 would also be juxtaposed in terms of gender, as are 228 and 229.

³⁰ Metrically, frs. 228–9 both end in short–long–long after an extended double-short opening; again, the similarity is heightened by juxtaposition. The *Iambi* show a similar use of juxtaposition to heighten metrical similarity and difference. A striking example are the three epodic poems (*Iambi* 5–7) that effect the transition from choliamb to trimeter.

of *Aetia* 1. Whether he figures at all in fr. 226 is unknown, but the association remains suggestive.³¹

The setting of fr. 227 is a festive night ritual. Fragment 43.12–17 (the first complete lines of *The Sicilian Cities*) also depict a nocturnal symposiastic setting. Further, if frs. 178–85 (*Ician Guest*) belong, as several scholars suggest,³² to the beginning of *Aetia* 2, the parallel in terms of setting, imagery of drinking, and festivity among *ἑταῖροι* is remarkable. The *Ician Guest* emphasizes moderation in drinking.³³ Fr. 227, with its exhortation to remain awake until the festival's culmination (line 5: *ὁ δ' ἀγρυπνήσας [συνεχές] μέχρι τῆς κο[ρῶνης]*) frames a different type of exhortation in drinking.

The opening poem of *Aetia* 3, the *Victory of Berenice*, celebrates Berenice II and the arrival of her Nemean victory in Egypt. Fragment 228 celebrates the corporeal departure of Arsinoe II from Egypt to heaven. The two works share not only these broader (if directionally opposed) thematic outlines, but also a similar poetic stratagem. The *Victory of Berenice* inscribes a Ptolemaic queen, a female figure, into the role of epinician celebrand and Pindaric imagery. The *Deification of Arsinoe* casts the dead queen, a female figure, in the role of lamented epic hero. The wealth of allusions to Andromache's recognition of Hector's death heroizes both Philotera and Arsinoe in literary as well as cultic terms.³⁴ In both poems Callimachus has located a Hellenistic queen in an earlier poetic tradition, and his use of features of that tradition, epinician in the one case and epic in the other, highlights the boldness of his act. The two poems share some remarkable parallels: the major one is the presence of Proteus and role of the island of Pharos in both, and the presence of Helen in the one and the Dioscuri in the other.³⁵ Revealing also is the poet's early address of both queens as *νύμφα* (fr. 383 + *SH* 254. 3, fr. 228.5). Callimachus would appear here, as he does elsewhere, to be citing himself and so marking the elevation of both female figures.³⁶ Fragment 228 is,

³¹ One of the earlier episodes of *Aetia* 1 is the *Rite at Anaphe*. In *Argonautica* 4 the story of Anaphe immediately precedes that of the clod of Euphemus, which metamorphoses into the island of Thera. The union of Euphemus and a Lemnian woman (Pind. *Pyth.* 4.252–4) is part of the foundation myth of Cyrene; one wonders whether fr. 226 also evoked the Anaphe episode. On the order of the first episodes of *Aetia* 1 and Apollonius' *Argonautica*, see M. A. Harder, 'Aspects of the structure of Callimachus' *Aetia*', in Harder et al. (n. 20), 103–10.

³² J. Zetzel, 'On the opening of Callimachus, *Aetia* II', *ZPE* 42 (1981), 31–33; Cameron (n. 2), 133–7; G. Massimilla (ed.), *Aitia Libri Primo e Secondo* (Pisa, 1996), 339–401. F. Nisetich, *The Poems of Callimachus* (Oxford, 2001), 86–88, includes his translation of frs. 178 and 184 at the opening of *Aitia* 2.

³³ Fragment 178.11–12: *καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θρηκίην μὲν ἀπέστυγε χανδὸν ἄμυσιν | ζωροποτεῖν, δλίγω δ' ἦδετο κισσυβίῳ*, 'For he too loathed to drink pure wine gaping at one gulp, and took pleasure in the small ivy cup.'

³⁴ Detailed discussion in V. di Benedetto, 'Callimaco di fronte al modello omerico: il fr. 228 Pf.', *RFIC* 122 (1994), 273–6, and D'Alessio (n. 1), 665, n. 26, 666, n. 29. H. J. Top, 'Arsinoe II's Ascent to Heaven', dissertation (Groningen, 1999), 16–17, observes that tragic vocabulary, e.g. lines 7, 9, and 12, and tragic irony, e.g. in 51–7, give fr. 228 a strong tragic character. The generic character of this poem is clearly variegated.

³⁵ Fragment 383 + *SH* 254.5–6: *εἰς Ἑλένη[ς νησιδ]α καὶ εἰς Παλληνέα μά[ντιν, | ποιμένα [φωκάων], χρύσειον ἦλθεν ἔπος*; fr. 228.39: *Πρωτῇ μὲν ὧδ' ἐτύμοι κατὰγο[ντο φάμαι*, 54–5: *ἐς δὲ Φάρου περίσαμο[ν ἀκτάν] ἔσκέφατο*.

³⁶ So D'Alessio (n. 1), 448, n. 3. Other examples of the poet's own intertextual movements include *Iambus* 4 and the *Hecale* (see Acosta-Hughes [n. 3], 202–3), *Iambus* 12 and *Hymn* 1 (see Acosta-Hughes [n. 3], 121–2). See also A. Ambühl, 'Theseus und Herakles als (un)freiwillig bescheidene Gäste: die *Hekale* und die *Victoria Berenices* als Diptychon', forthcoming in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Callimachus II. Hellenistica Groningana* 6 (Groningen, 2003).

surely, the earlier composition; its ordering in sequence here among these four poems (frs. 226–9) could easily rather depend on its relation to the later poem, the *Victory of Berenice*.

Perhaps the most striking of these correspondences is that of fr. 229 and the opening *aition* of *Aetia* 4 (frs. 87–9, *Daphnephoria Delphica*).³⁷ Both poems are foundation poems, both of cults of Apollo, and in each the poet commemorates a similar mythical configuration of purification and cult foundation. The role of the young figure (the young Apollo in the *Daphnephoria Delphica*; the young Branchus, beloved of Apollo, in the *Branchus*), of laurel, of purification, and of Delphi in both poems, is very revealing. The journey of Apollo Delphinus in fr. 229 specifically to Didyma via Delos (lines 12–13) is especially striking.³⁸ The *Daphnephoria* celebrated the purification of Apollo by Zeus following Apollo's slaying of the Python, the myth of Branchus told of the boy's consecration as a prophet at the hands of Apollo. The laurel's juxtaposition of the two myths in her own aretalogy at *Iambus* 4.26–31 reflects their correspondence. Their appearance at the beginning of the roll containing *Aetia* 4 and the end of that containing these four poems marks a strong instance of authorial (and reader) recall and comparison.

While the fragmentary nature of frs. 226–9 Pf. necessarily obscures many aspects of these four poems, it appears that the specific selection of the four poems, and their ordering in sequence, is informed by opening sections of the respective books of the *Aetia*. There are parallels in Callimachus' work itself that mark similar editorial stratagems, the most obvious of which is the location of the *Victory of Berenice* at the opening of *Aetia* 3 and of the *Lock of Berenice* at the end of *Aetia* 4. At fr. 112, the *Epilogue* to the *Aetia*, the poet himself declares that he will move to the *Iambi*.³⁹ In a parallel movement the poet himself, or a later editor, recalls the *Aetia*, and the order of its books, in four poems that in turn follow the *Iambi*. The placing of these four poems in sequence highlights several of their correspondences with one another and recalls another sequence, that of the four books of the *Aetia*. The four poems are then a panel of a larger artistic ordering: *Aetia*, *Iambi*, frs. 226–9.

Another poem of closure, *Iambus* 13, suggests, in its correspondence with *Iambus* 1, an additional reading of fr. 229 and its place in sequence.⁴⁰ The tale of the hero Branchus and the foundation of Apollo's cult at Didyma, the myth at the centre of fr. 229, is one of a god's love for a youth and an initiation.⁴¹ Apollo comes upon the boy in a sacred wood (cf. *dieg.* X.17 *ἱερὰ ὄλη*), kisses him (see Pfeiffer's note on line 16 *φιλήτωρ*), gives him a garland and a staff, and makes him a prophet. Branchus is

³⁷ The *aition* may have followed an initial *prooimion*: see D'Alessio (n. 1), 500, n. 1 on fr. 86. The parallel of this fragment with the opening of *Aetia* 3 (*SH* 254 + 383 Pf.) is compelling. The reader of the roll containing *Aetia* 4 will have been reminded of *Aetia* 3 in both the book's opening and closing (the *Lock of Berenice*).

³⁸ *χαῖρε δὲ Δελφίῳ* ἱνὶ ἄλ[υ]αξ, οὐν[ο]μα γάρ[ο]ι τοι τόδ' ἐγὼ κατάρχω, | εἵνεκεν Οἰκούσιον εἰς ἄ[σ]την σε δελφίς ἀπ' ἔβησε Δήλου. Fragment 88 Pf. (*Schol.* A.R. 11.705–711b) also includes the epithet Delphinus.

³⁹ Knox (n. 2, 1985), 59–60, draws attention, rightly, to the ordering strategies made easily possible by the codex. He sees in fr. 112.11, *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἐ]πιειμι νομόν*, 'but now I will go to the prosaic pasture of the Muses', a 'declaration of literary intent', not an editorial reference that evokes a multi-roll collection. The editorial stratagem I outline here *does* assume the possibility of reading rolls in sequence, and of editorial directives/reminders of this reading.

⁴⁰ On the correspondences of these two poems, see Acosta-Hughes (n. 3), 11–12 and 89–91.

⁴¹ The most complete sources for this are *Stat. Theb.* 8.198, *Conon*, *FGrH* 26 F 1.33.

presented as a shepherd. Apollo's initiation of the 'young' Callimachus in his art at the opening of *Aetia* 1 also evokes, through allusion to Hesiod's initiation, the imagery of shepherding.⁴²

In his 1995 discussion of this poem, 167–73, Cameron observes the role of the Didymean cult here and at *Iambus* 1, and suggests that Ptolemaic interest in the refoundation of the oracle is reflected in the prominent position of the cult in the two works. And this correspondence is of course heightened by the position of the respective poems at the beginning and the end of the roll. A further correspondence, with another beginning, is that of fr. 229 and *Aetia* 1, with its theme of poetic initiation, and imagery of youth and close bond of poet and Apollo. Fragment 229 has then a dual rapport with the *Aetia* and a dual role of recall. In its position as last of four poems recalling the four books of the *Aetia*, it recalls *Aetia* 4; in its position as last poem in the 'panel' *Aetia*, *Iambi*, frs. 226–9 it recalls the opening of the *Aetia*. The singer's statement at fr. 229.12 οὖν[ο]μα γὰρ[ρ] τοι τὸδ' ἐγὼ κατάρχω, 'with your name I begin', is then one of dual valence. At the same time, in its position at the end of its own roll, it recalls *Iambus* 1. Each correspondence is one of ordering and in each the place of fr. 229 is especially significant.⁴³

Callimachus, as editor of his own work, was concerned not only with the placement of individual poems within categories (for example, the *Iambi*), but also of poems in crucial positions in rolls. The *Victory of Berenice* and the *Lock of Berenice* at the beginning and end of *Aetia* 3 and 4, respectively, exemplify this artistic care. He was also concerned with the sequence of categories. The *Epilogue* to the *Aetia*, with its declarative move to the *Iambi* thus capturing the poetic rapport of elegy and iambic, is witness to this. Whether the poet himself arranged the sequence of the four poems frs. 226–9, and whether he caused them to follow the *Iambi*, we can only conjecture. The correspondences, even given the fragmentary state of the poems, with the openings of books of the *Aetia* are both remarkable and in some ways rather subtle (for example, the *Victory of Berenice* and the *Deification of Arsinoe* in their complex use of models).⁴⁴ This could, of course, be the work of a later editor/compiler, even the diegete, but it is certainly the work of someone with an acute eye for Callimachus' poetry. What this placement of poems *does* suggest is something of the importance of an 'aesthetics of ordering' in the Hellenistic poetry book.

THREE SCENARIOS

Ascertaining features that link these four poems, together and to the *Aetia-Iambi*, does not resolve a central problem. How do we, as readers, engage with these four

⁴² On the supplements suggested by Barber and Maas (n. 1) for fr. 229.4, esp. μῆλα δ' ὑπ' ἐϋ]ηπε[λ]ίης π[ι]λλ[ε]ίονα, see D'Alessio (n. 1), 671, n. 45.

⁴³ Branchus may also be the figure at fr. 114.3: παῖδός ἐπὶ προθύροις, 'at the boy's portico'. This fragment is now generally assigned to *Aetia* 3: see D'Alessio (n. 1), 546–7; id., 'Apollo Delio, i Cabiri Milesii e le Cavalie di Tracia. Osservazioni su Callimaco frs. 114–115 Pf.', *ZPE* 106 (1995), 5–8; P. Borgonovo and P. Cappelletto, 'Callimaco frs. 114 e 115 Pf.: Apollo "poligonale" e Apollo Delio', *ZPE* 103 (1994), 13–17. Assuming this identification, the intertextual relationship of frs. 228–9 and *Aetia* 3–4 is the richer. Fragment 228, reflecting the royal poems of cult foundation and extensive journeys (*Victory of Berenice*, *Lock of Berenice*) that frame *Aetia* 3 and 4 is then juxtaposed with fr. 229, in turn reflecting two Apolline poems, *Delian Apollo* and the *Daphnephoria Delphica*, that also bind *Aetia* 3 and 4.

⁴⁴ While it is of course true that the fragmentary state of *all* of the poems involved means that our selection and overview of the *Aetia* is also a fractured and perhaps misleading one, the correspondences remain nonetheless striking.

poems? What do we call them? What do we imagine to have been the occasion of their ordering following the *Iambi*, an order preserved by the diegesis and attested in some papyri? I am unsure whether one entirely satisfactory answer can be posited to these questions, but propose rather to consider the problem from different angles in three scenarios.

1. *There are (only) thirteen Iambi*

Scenario 1 would assume an original collection of thirteen *Iambi*, and that this collection itself occupies a roll. The *Iambi* are of course also fragmentary, and some (for example, *Iambi* 2 and 3) are quite short, but if we assume with Dawson⁴⁵ and Cameron⁴⁶ a length of c. 1,000 lines for the thirteen poems, this is itself a respectable poetry book.⁴⁷ There is no 'need' for the addition of other poems to 'fill out' the roll. Fragments 226–9 would then be from another roll encompassing a different collection of poems, and the diegete is reading and summarizing this collection. We further assume, based on the summaries of *Aetia* 3–4 and *Iambi* 1–13, that the diegete is summarizing this second roll completely and not selectively. He turns from this roll containing frs. 226–9 to the roll containing the *Hecale*; this poem, and this poem only, he marks in his summary with a title.⁴⁸

There is no indication at all of the length of frs. 226–7. *POxy.* 2172 preserves the concluding lines of fr. 229. Following fr. 229.23 there is a dash filling out that line of the papyrus; the small bit of papyrus below is empty. The fragmentary line given as line 23 in Pfeiffer's text is thus the end of the poem. The number of lines missing between line 1 (preserved by the Diegesis) and line 2 is unknown. Seventy-five lines are preserved of fr. 228 (seventy-six if we include the line assumed to be missing between lines 41 and 42).⁴⁹ Lines 42–75 detail the journey of Philotera, her mission to Charis, and Charis' report of Arsinoe's demise (her report is not complete when the poem breaks off). If the poem continued to narrate the assumption of Arsinoe by the Dioscuri and the foundation of her shrine, as given in the diegesis, this could be a work of some length.

Assuming that these four poems constituted a self-contained collection, and that this collection at one point occupied an individual papyrus roll, need not mean that they are the μέλη of the Suda.⁵⁰ That they have some features in common is clear. In particular, they appropriate characteristics of choral song and have a distinctly ritual cast. The short diegesis summaries of all four may also be indicative, if not necessarily of generic similarity, of a similarity in one reader's reception of these texts.

2. *There are thirteen Iambi + four poems*

Scenario 2 would assume an original collection of thirteen *Iambi* to which frs. 226–9 were added in the same roll, by the poet himself or by a later editor. Their corres-

⁴⁵ Dawson (n. 8), 133–6.

⁴⁶ Cameron (n. 2), 170.

⁴⁷ Van Sickle (n. 22), 7–8 posits a preferred limit in the Hellenistic period of 1,000–2,000 lines. It should be noted that 1,000 lines is a somewhat generous estimate for the *Iambi*.

⁴⁸ On the note that appears in the margin of dieg. VI, see above p. 479.

⁴⁹ See Pfeiffer ad loc.

⁵⁰ T. Fuhrer, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel and Kassel, 1992), 23, draws a distinction between Callimachus' use of choral form (his epinicians, two in elegiac and one in iambic meter) and his experimentation with lyric meters in frs. 226–9, poems, however, 'bestimmt nicht für den gesungenen Vortrag konzipiert' (n. 54).

pondences with the *Iambi* are then a result not (or not necessarily) of composition but of arrangement: the distinction may be a fine one, but it is important. The compositional strategy of the *Iambi* is one of fairly intricate contrast and recollection.⁵¹ The correspondence of, for example, Didyma in *Iambus* 1 and fr. 229 is then one heightened by arrangement, by their position at the beginning and end of the roll respectively.

The addition of miscellaneous poems to the last roll of a multi-roll collection (and Callimachus' own *Epilogue* to the *Aetia* (fr. 112 Pf.) may well envision the *Aetia* and the *Iambi* as a multi-roll ensemble) finds a partial parallel in Pindar's *Nemean Odes*. Pindar's Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh *Nemean Odes* do not in fact celebrate Nemean victories but are rather three miscellaneous poems, each with its own geographical setting (Sicyon, Argos, Tenedos), that were added to the original final roll of his *Epinicians*.⁵² As is the case with Callim. frs. 226–9, this association itself comes in turn to create filaments of contrast and recall for the reader who encounters these poems together in one roll; this is all the more true given the physical process of reading papyrus rolls.⁵³ In both cases the association of the miscellaneous poems with the collection itself obscures the lines of demarcation between the two; the additional poems effectively 'become' *Nemean* 9–11 and *Iambi* 14–17.⁵⁴ And so *Iambus* 13, even given its close correspondence with *Iambus* 1 and its language of closure, becomes the door to further experimentation in *polyeideia*.

The early Hellenistic poetry book may have favoured miscellaneous collection,⁵⁵ and poetic aesthetics may have rather encouraged the inclusion of additional text(s). The prevailing scholarly grounds for excluding frs. 226–9 from the *Iambi*, while addressing a real problem in Callimachean scholarship, may well be phrased in terms derived from a too rigid understanding of genre when it comes to collection.⁵⁶

3. *There are seventeen Iambi*

Scenario 3 would assume that Callimachus originally composed a collection of seventeen *Iambi*.⁵⁷ *Iambus* 13 then looks back to the earlier *Iambi*, but also forward to 'Iambi' 14–17. The choliambic metre of *Iambus* 13, following an evolution of metrical experimentation in *Iambi* 5–12, is then followed by further experimentation.⁵⁸ The *Branchus* then closes the *Iambi*. The *Iambi* open with one figure (here Hipponax)

⁵¹ Acosta-Hughes (n. 3), 7–9.

⁵² Cf. also the ὀσχοφορικὸν μέλος that seems to have come at the end of the *Isthmian Odes*. See I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford, 2001), 159; I. Rutherford and J. A. D. Irvine, 'The race in the Athenian oschophoria and an oschophoricon in Pindar', *ZPE* 72 (1988), 43–51.

⁵³ See Van Sickle (n. 22), 5–6.

⁵⁴ In a somewhat different vein see Barchiesi (n. 4), 173, on Horace's reaction to Hellenistic arrangement of lyric texts, particularly his observation on the artistic incentive brought about by arrangement itself: 'this very process of positioning and assembling creates and teaches new effects of artistic design' (italics are the author's).

⁵⁵ See K. A. Gutzwiller, 'The evidence for Theocritean poetry books', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Theocritus*. *Hellenistica Groningana* 2 (Groningen, 1996), 133.

⁵⁶ The new epigram collection attributed to Callimachus' near contemporary Posidippus (*PMilano*. Vogl. VIII.309) is a remarkable instance of the variety possible within an early poetry book.

⁵⁷ These would then be a possible model for Horace's seventeen *Epodes*. Cameron (n. 2), 170, n. 139, makes the very cogent point that *Aetia* 4 also consisted of seventeen poems. This in turn could easily have been a factor in the inclusion of frs. 226–9 with the *Iambi* (scenario 2).

⁵⁸ So D'Alessio (n. 1), 44.

journeying to the poet's contemporary world, and close with the evocation of another journey, here that of Apollo *Delphinus* to Didyma. The role of the shrine at Didyma in both poems would be one marked correspondence; another would be the use of a figure from the Greek cultural past to refound the cultural present. The evocation of Ionia is one feature shared by *Iambi* 1, 13, and the *Branchus*, as is the imagery of journeying.

Significant reasons for excluding frs. 226–9 from the *Iambi* are the following:

1. There are no other evocations of Ptolemaic élite in the extant *Iambi*; the inclusion of fr. 228 would markedly change this. The inclusion of fr. 228, a royal lament, compels us to a re-evaluation of the iambic genre. While the treatment of Ptolemaic figures in Hellenistic poetry allows for a wide range of variety in tone and setting, a poem on a royal death as a high point of a iambic poetry book raises real issues of taste and decorum. To put this another way, fr. 228 is not Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*.
2. Most of the *Iambi* can be rather generally characterized as eristic; in this regard they imitate the characteristics of their archaic models. Even *Iambus* 12 plays on *eris*; here the gods engage in γ]λυκεῖαν ἀλλήλοις ἔριν, 'sweet competition with one another' (line 45). Although the four poems are very fragmentary, it is less easy to see an eristic character of frs. 226, 228, and 229; we might make an exception for fr. 227.
3. The poet's evocation of setting, and of his own place within a given setting in frs. 227 and 229, finds parallels in the *Aetia* (for example, fr. 178 *Ician Guest*), not the *Iambi*.⁵⁹ The evocation of physical setting, especially that in the broken lines of fr. 229, rather suggests a borrowing from the vocabulary of lyric.
4. The prominent role of Didyma and Apollo's shrine aside, *Iambus* 1 and fr. 229 are not an unproblematic pair of poems for framing a collection. Apollo (let alone Ptolemy Philadelphus, if he indeed figured in fr. 229 as Cameron suggests⁶⁰) is an odd corresponding figure to Hipponax. A few features of language and imagery in fr. 229, such as line 12 οὐν[ο]μα γὰ[ρ] τοι τόδ' ἐγὼ κατάρχω, may be thought somewhat odd in a closing poem.

CONCLUSION

In whichever of these three (or indeed of other) scenarios the four poems preserved as frs. 226–9 Pf. came to be associated with the *Iambi*, they remain so associated now. Whether in terms of inclusion or exclusion, these four poems are now a measure by which scholars define Callimachus' *Iambi*. This fact is itself witness to the influence of arrangement on associative reading—poems are read in terms of one another. And poems are so arranged, both within rolls and within multi-roll editions. Callimachus and his fellow Alexandrians, as compilers and editors of earlier poetry, particularly lyric, instantiate these associations at several levels: in their arrangements of earlier poetry, in the arrangement of their own poems, and in the influence that these arrangements in turn have on later poets. The poetics of order becomes a central element in their aesthetics, and hence of Alexandrian poetry and its

⁵⁹ *Iambus* 1 perhaps proves the exception to this observation, but here the poet speaks in the guise of Hipponax, and the conceit of using a *persona loquens* is heightened by the outline of an anachronistic physical surrounding.

⁶⁰ Cameron (n. 2), 172,

polyvalent strategies of recall. An integral aspect of poetic ordering is the authorial and readership dynamics of the multi-roll, or multi-volume edition, whether one that encompassed one poem in several rolls (the *Aetia*), poems of one genre in several rolls (Pindar's *Epinicians*), or the *oeuvre* of one author, Callimachus, in multiple genres.⁶¹

University of Michigan

BENJAMIN ACOSTA-HUGHES

bacosta@umich.edu

⁶¹ The author thanks A. Barchiesi, L. Battezzato, G. B. D'Alessio, M. Fantuzzi, A. Harder, R. Hunter, P. Knox, N. Krevans, J. Reed, R. Scodel, A. Sens, and S. A. Stephens whose comments on this article have immeasurably improved it. Thanks are also due to the editors and an anonymous *CQ* referee for their helpful suggestions.