Transactions of the American Philological Assocation 119 (1989) 219–231

THE POETICS OF EXCLUSION IN CALLIMACHUS' *HYMN TO APOLLO*

KAREN BASSI
University of California, Santa Cruz

Critics have long maintained that there is a disjunction between the mythic and cultic material which occupies the main body of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* and the literary contest at its end (105–13), in which Apollo strikes Phthonos with his foot and argues with him about what seems to be a poem's proper length. Wilamowitz remarks that the final lines "begin an entirely unconnected epilogue."[1] Bundy states, "The verses have little or no connection with what precedes, and this lack of connection seems unnatural on any interpretation thus far advanced."[2] We can include among those interpretations which Bundy might think "unnatural" that of Frederick Williams who, in his recent commentary, suggests that the preceding Pythoktonia episode introduces the literary contest by "providing a test case, a specimen of Callimachus' novel style of representing traditional themes."[3] For the literary contest itself, even according to William's own discussion, does not seem to be about Callimachus' "novel style of representing traditional themes" but rather about poetic quality vs. quantity. Köhnken suggests that the final lines do not represent a response to any particular segment of the poem, as does Williams, but that they serve as a commentary on the entire hymn.[4] For him, the encounter between Apollo and Envy is a "fitting epilogue to this particular hymn" since "in the eyes of Phthonos (as he appears on Callimachus' stage) the hymn is too short." If the final lines do represent a kind of detached commentary on the length of the poem, however, it

[1] *Hellenistische Dichtung*, 3rd ed. (Berlin 1973) 82.

[2] E. L. Bundy, "The Quarrel Between Kallimachos and Apollonios": Part I: "The Epilogue of Kallimachos' *Hymn to Apollo*," *California Studies in Classical Philology* 5 (1972) 42. Bundy favors a formal approach and argues that the final lines represent a conventional "epilogic pattern."

[3] Frederick Williams, *Callimachus, Hymn to Apollo* (Oxford 1978) 82.

[4] Adolf Köhnken, "Apollo's Retort to Envy's Criticism," *AJP* 102 (1981) 417. See also Francis Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet in Rome* (Cambridge 1979) 125–26 who speaks of the "tangential ending" of *Hymn* 2 which (126) "achieves a final discontiniuity typical of dramatic poetry." He cites other such "typical" endings on p. 125 n. 25, all of which are found in Roman authors believed to model themselves on "Hellenistic prototypes." Like Bundy, Cairns makes a formal argument which allows him to assert that, "An ending tangential on one level may be integral on another [formal level] (125 n. 25)." Emile Cahen, *Les Hymnes de Callimaque* (Paris 1930) 50, 81, 84–85, argues that there are two "conclusions" to the hymn, one (vv. 97–104) which concludes the ritual material, and one (vv. 105–13; he labels these lines a σφραγίς; cf. Wilamowitz, *Hellenistiche Dichtung* 77) which is a culmination of the poet's personal (i.e., biographical) statements. See also W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom*, Hermes Einzelschriften 16 (1960) 64–70.

still must be admitted that their explicit literary focus is not satisfactorily linked to the drama of the hymn—except insofar as Apollo's epiphany seems complete. They would still represent, in Bundy's words, "a conventional break-off or epilogic pattern." In this paper, I will reject the assertion (made explicitly or implicitly by these critics) that the literary precepts set forth by Apollo and Phthonos in the literary contest must address some particular aspect of the hymn proper if it is to be connected to it. Rather, I will argue, the hymn's many agonistic references to the exclusive and privileged status of the speaker are implicitly literary in their focus and that it is not *what* the contestants say in the final literary battle but the contest *qua* contest which is intrinsically connected with the drama of the god's epiphany. The hymn's unifying motif is the polemic which informs Callimachean poetics here and elsewhere.

If we ask what in general constitutes the Callimachean aesthetic enterprise, the answer is found in two related themes: rejection of the common crowd of poets and common taste, coupled with an insistence on the special or exclusive position of the poet.[5] Fritz Wehrli, in his 1944 article on Horace and Callimachus, stated, "What can be considered Callimachean is an exclusivity which is clothed in the cultic image of the exclusion of the profane."[6] This Callimachean exclusivity is not only suggestive of narrative or stylistic similarities between *Odes* 3.1 and, for example, *Epigram* 28. Wehrli's understanding of what is 'Callimachaean' (kallimacheisch) rightly emphasizes Callimachus' candid rejection of literary rivals and 'poetry as usual' as an essential element in his poetics. As the literary enactment of a ritual celebration in praise of the god of poetry, the *Hymn to Apollo* takes on Wehrli's "cultic clothing" and overtly dramatizes the implicitly aesthetic motifs of rejection and privilege which are the hallmarks of Callimachean aesthetics.[7]

[5] In the *Aitia* prologue, for example, Apollo comes to the narrator in person and tells the poet to "avoid the worn paths" of literary composition (*Aitia* 1.1.25–28). Apollo's epiphany here follows in the tradition of conscious and personal favoritism first established by Hesiod's encounter with the Muses (*Theog.* 22–34), although Callimachus does not name himself in the *Aitia* as Hesiod does in the Theogony (unless the lacuna before ἀοιδέ at *Aitia* 23 admits a personal epithet: Pfeiffer refers to the lacuna as *vestigia incertissima*). See also *Epigram* 28 (Pfeiffer), appropriately compared to Horace's *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (*Odes* 3.1.1) in which the metaphors of path and well express the poet's distaste for worn cyclical poems, and this distaste is linked to his disdain for common poets and common taste (πολλόυς and πάντα τὰ δημόσια). The topos is also adopted by Sappho who invokes Aphrodite as a σύμμαχος (Page 191.28). Latin poets are fond of this device: cf. Catullus 14; Horace, *Odes* 1.1.29–30 and 4.15.1 (in addition to 3.1.1–4); also, Horace, *Satires* 1.4.71–78; 2.6.13ff.; Propertius 3.3.13–24; Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 2.493–509. Cf. Cahen (above, note 4) 47; M. C. J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (Ithaca, NY 1986) 213–15; J. K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry,* Coll. Latomus Vol. 88 (1967) 48–50. Callimachus' polemical spirit is also attested to in the fragmentary *Iamb* 13 which, according to the Diegesis is directed against those who criticised Callimachus for the diversity (ἐπὶ τῇ πολυεδείᾳ) of his poetic output. All references to the text are from the edition of R. Pfeiffer (Oxford 1949, rpt. 1979).

[6] Fritz Wehrli, "Horaz und Kallimachos," *MH* 1 (1944) 377.

[7] The hymn refers explicitly to the god's traditional role as patron of singers and song (e.g., 18–19, 43–45). See Köhnken (above, note 4) 418 n. 36 on

The poem begins with an emphatic exclusionary admonition (2): ἐκὰς ἐκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός. On the dramatic or ritual level of the hymn, the admonition is addressed to the participant who is unfit to take part in the events leading up to Apollo's epiphany (cf. 9–11).[8] As Williams points out, an epiphany is often limited to "those who in moral or ritual terms are fit to receive it." But this pointed rejection of the unworthy participant is unique to *Hymn* 2.[9] In Callimachus' other two mimetic hymns (5 and 6), the opening apostrophes are *invitations* to the imagined participants to take part in the ritual at hand.

Hymn 5 (*The Bath of Pallas*) begins with the following enthusiastic invocation, in which the repetition of ἔξιτε can be contrasted to the repetition of ἐκάς in *Hymn* 2.2:

> Ὅσσαι λωτροχόοι τᾶς Παλλάδος ἔξιτε πᾶσαι,
> ἔξιτε·[10]

Hymn 6 (to Demeter) begins with a similar address: τῶ καλάθω κατιόντος ἐπιφθέγξασθε, γυναῖκες. *Hymn* 3 (to Artemis) does not begin with an invitation, but includes another example of the desired *in*clusion of those favored by the god: πότνια, τῶν εἴη μὲν ἐμοὶ φίλος ὅστις ἀληθής, / εἴην δ' αὐτός, ἄνασσα, μέλοι δὲ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδή.(136–37). Here ὅστις ἀληθής is in the same metrical position as ὅστις ἀλιτρός in *Hymn* 2.2.[11]

The agonistic apostrophe in *Hymn* 2 is not only unparalleled in Callimachus' hymns, but is, moreover, unusual within the entire tradition of the hymn form.[12] In the *Homeric Hymns*, as in Callimachus' *Hymns* 5 and 6, the

Callimachus' references to Apollo "in his most important capacity as patron-god of poetry." Also, Frederick Williams, *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo* (Oxford 1978) 3. Fr. 193 (Pfeiffer) also seems to indicate Apollo's kinship with the Muses.

[8] On line 9 (ὠπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται), and its antecedents in Homer, see Karl Kerényi, "Apollon-Epiphanien," *Eranos* 13 (1945) 27–28.

[9] Williams (above, note 3) 23. The passages cited by Williams are not strictly comparable to *Hymn* 2, since none are from the same genre: *Il.* 1.198; *Od.* 16.160–61; *Choephori* 1061; *Bacchae* 501-502; *Act. Ap.* 9.7.

[10] That τὰς Παλλάδος here refers to the statue of Athena is argued by A. W. Bullock, *Callimachus, The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge 1985) ad loc.: "ἡ Παλλάς (with the article) is the term used in Athenian ephebic inscriptions of the Palladion which was ritually bathed each year at Phaleron."

[11] See also *Hymn* 4.9-10, in which the narrator expresses the hope that he will be praised by Apollo Kynthios. The contrast between the tone of 2 and 3 (as between 2, 5 and 6) is obvious: the motif of exclusion is particular to the second hymn.

[12] Sappho, frr. 1 and 2 (Lobel and Page), although not formally hymns, are invocations to Aphrodite with hymnal elements. In these, too, there is no rejection of those unworthy to see the goddess (although Sappho, like Callimachus, is very aware of her inferior rivals; see. fr. 55). Pindar, whose language is used extensively by Callimachus, speaks of his ability both to praise and to blame (e.g., *Nem.* 8.39, where the blameworthy are called ἀλιτροί) and is aware of the perniciousness of envy. But, as is true of the *Homeric Hymns*, there seem to be no clear examples in the Epinicia of the direct exclusionary address under consideration here . In the *Bacchae*, the chorus cautions the citizens as Dionysus comes among them (69–70): μελάθροις ἔκτοπος ἔστω, στόμα τ' εὔφη- / μον ἅπας ἐξοσιούσθω. This may not be an exclusionary admonition, however.

possibility for a positive interaction between the god being addressed and the speaker is emphasized—rather than an admonition for the unworthy to keep away.[13] Although there is much variation, the usual practice in the *Homeric Hymns* is to address the god directly, specifically with the question, "How shall I sing of you?" (e.g., *Delian Apollo* 19, *Pythian Apollo* 207). Both the untraditional mimetic frame and the unusual language of rejection in Callimachus' hymn serve to emphasize the speaker's insistence that only a select few are allowed to witness this particular god's epiphany.

As the expectation of that epiphany provides the impetus for rejecting those who ought not participate in the ritual, so the realization of the epiphany provides the impetus for rejecting the literary precepts which Envy and, by implication, Blame, espouse. The polemical beginning of the poem (where the speaker tells those unfit to see the god of poetry to depart, 2) is thus similar to its ending scene (where the god rejects Phthonos' aesthetic preferences and the speaker tells both Blame and Envy to leave the scene, 113).[14] This similarity is both dramatic (in that each passage is overtly mimetic), and linguistic (in that each uses the language of exclusion and preference). We should recall that Callimachus rebuffs his literary rivals (called Telchines) in a similar fashion at *Aitia* 1.1.17: ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος. While the admonition ἐκὰς ἐκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός in the hymn is admittedly less pointed, there remains the immediate correspondence in the call for distance between the speaker and the party being addressed; the person who is ἀλιτρός and Callimachus' envious literary critics are both told to keep their distance. This correspondence, and the similarity of presentation between the opening and ending scenes of the hymn, suggest that the ἀλιτροί referred to in line 2, in addition to being those who are to be excluded from the ritual for religious reasons, are also those who, because of their ill-informed literary tastes, are to be prevented from hearing the hymn itself. For the hymn succeeds in dramatically realizing the god's epiphany, and therefore must be an example of the sort of poem which he favors—and not the sort of poem to be sung to an unsophisticated audience.[15] In addition to the

Against Elmsley, who translates, "Let him be withdrawn in his house," Dodds (ad loc.) believes that "the citizens are not prevented from watching,...they are meant to watch." He translates, "Let all, including those indoors, hush their tongues to reverence."

[13] Fear of a negative interaction with a god does occur in *Hymn* 4.7–8 (to Delos): ὡς Μοῦσαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃ μὴ Πίμπλειαν ἀείσῃ / ἔχθουσιν, τὼς Φοῖβος ὅτις Δήλοιο λάθηται. The implied answer to this admonition is, "Phoebus does not hate me because I am singing of Delos." Thus what appears to be a negative statement is, in fact, a positive one with respect to the speaker, while those singers who do not sing of Delos are indirectly attacked. The passage is not strictly comparable to the pointed second person address in *Hymn* 2, but is in keeping with the environment of conflict surrounding Apollo which is found there. As Bundy (above, note 2) points out, the *Homeric Hymns* do not in general (83) "display awareness of auditors other than the god."

[14] On the figures of Phthonos and Momos see Wimmel (above, note 4) 61–64.

[15] See K. Latte (cited by Williams), "Schuld und Sünde in der griechischen Religion," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaften* 20 (1920-1) 254-298 (= *Kleine Schriften* 3-35), who states (*Kleine Schriften* 5) that ἀλιτρός is "das eigentliche Wort der epischen Sprache für religiöse Vergehen." But the use of ἀλιτρός suggests that Callimachus may have in mind his literary rivals as well. In fr. 75.68, the Telchines, according to Pfeiffer's reading (after Hunt), are punished εἵνεκ'

suggestion that combativeness or exclusion operates as a 'Rahmenmotiv' in the hymn (supported, as well, by the image of Apollo's foot, to be discussed below), it seems clear that it operates on two levels—mimetic and aesthetic. In fact, these two complementary levels surface throughout the hymn, only to culminate in the final literary contest.

The speaker commands those listening to the song in praise of the god to observe ritual silence (εὐφημεῖτε, 17) since "even the sea is silent whenever the singers celebrate the cithara and the bow, the weapons (ἔντεα) of Lycoreian Apollo (18–19)."[16] The cithara and the bow, of course, are part of the iconography traditionally associated with Apollo; they are objects which attest to his beneficence and destructiveness, respectively.[17] But here they are both called weapons (ἔντεα). ἔντεα is used of musical instruments in two instances in Pindar (*Ol.* 7.12 and *Py.* 12.21), providing a precedent for Callimachus' use here.[18] The conflation of a musical instrument and a specified weapon into

ἀλιτρῆς ὕβριος (on account of their 'sinful' hubris). Although the dramatic context of fr. 75 is admittedly not literary and the uncertainty of the passage precludes any sure interpretation, if ἀλιτρῆς is correct, then the adjective here is applied (albeit indirectly) to those creatures (the Telchines) who are specifically Callimachus' literary enemies at Aitia 1.1.1: .....]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῇ . Αλιτρός as an attribute of the Telchines (and thus of literary incompetents) is also found in an epigram attributed to Philip of Thessalonica (*AP* 11.321 = Gow-Page, *Garland* 60, line 3039), where the Telchines, who represent the pedantic disciples of Zenodotus and Callimachus are called ἀλιτροί who are "forever chattering against others" (εἰς αἰῶνα κατατρύζοντες ἀλιτροί / ἄλλων). Philip, of course, is alluding to *Aitia* 1.1.1 (ἐπιτρύζω becomes κατατρύζω) and, we might assume, understands ἀλιτρός as a word particularly suited to persons of poor literary taste like those called the Telchines. Since he is attacking Callimachus' unworthy followers, it is fitting that he uses the master's own vocabulary.

[16] "Lycoreian," as Williams (above, note 3) ad loc. argues, denotes a place name of uncertain location and etymology. Whatever the etymology the word brings to mind Apollo's other epithet, Λύκιος, found in the *Aitia* prologue (1.1.22) where, after Callimachus attacks the Telchines, the god appears to him and gives him advice about the kind of poetry he should compose. One explanation for the epithet is preserved by Servius on Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.377 who relates that Apollo "in lupi habitu Telchinas occidit." It may be that Callimachus had this legend in mind when he used Λύκιος in the *Aitia* and that he also has it in mind here in the hymn, although he varies the epithet. The role of Apollo as the destroyer of the Telchines would be particularly apposite to the conflation of the bow and cithara, since, for Callimachus, it would stand for the destruction of the literary rivals referred to as "Telchines" at *Aitia* 1.1.

[17] See also *Aitia* 114, in which the statue of Apollo at Delos is described as holding the bow in his left hand and the Charities in his right.

[18] Callimachus refers to ἔντεα as musical instruments in fr. 761: Γάλλαι μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες, / αἷς ἔντεα παταγεῖται καὶ χάλκεα κρόταλα (The Galloi, the thyrsus loving followers of the mountain mother, are frantic and are beating "weapons" and bronze cymbals). The fragment is uncertainly attributed to Callimachus, however (see Pfeiffer ad loc.). That these Gallai (Galloi) are reputed to have castrated themselves at the climax of the celebration of the Great Mother may indicate that the ἔντεα they are beating are indeed weapons which are incidentally used to make noise. See W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. John Raffan (Cambridge, Mass. 1985) 179. Cahen (above, note

ἔντεα is noteworthy, however (cf. 43–44 where the two attributes are described separately and more traditionally), and suggests a fundamental similarity between the two.[19] But how is a bow like a cithara and, more important, how can we conceive of them both as weapons?[20] The bow, of course, presents no problem, but in what sense is the cithara a weapon?

In general terms, the cithara traditionally signifies Apollo's role as the patron of poetry and song; more specifically it represents the "healing hymn" by which Apollo's destructive power (represented by the bow) is assuaged.[21] But if the cithara is a metaphor for poetry then the question becomes, "How can poetry be conceived of as a weapon?" As Callimachus makes clear in the *Aitia* prologue, his poetry engenders envy and criticism which in turn necessitates a counter-attack against his critics; and the medium of this counter-attack is poetry. Invective is evident in the programmatic *Aitia* prologue, and is implicit in the hymn's exclusionary language and explicit in the literary contest at its end. Poetry *is* a weapon for Callimachus; it is the means (indeed, the most effective means) by which he can respond to and attack his "enemies" on the Hellenistic battlefield of literary persuasions. The Roman satirists, of course, are explicit about poetry as a weapon. Horace (*Satire* 2.1.40 and 43) compares his pen to a sword (*ensis*) and a weapon (*telum*), and Juvenal speaks of the sword (*ensis*) of Lucilius (*Satire* 1.1.165). Catullus, too, calls upon his hendecasyllables as military comrades-in-arms (42.1ff.).[22] In Callimachus' presentation, the allusion is more subtle but the conclusion is none the less

4) ad loc., notes: "Le mot ἔντεα rénunit ici les deux sens d' "armure" qu'il a chez Homère, K407, et d'instruments (de musique) qui se voit chez les lyriques (p. ex. Pind. *Pyth.* XII, 21)."

[19] When Pindar refers to the "arrows of the Muses" (e.g., *Ol.* 1.112, 2.83 and 90, 9.5-12; *Py.* 1.42-44; *Nem.* 9.55), he conflates the motifs of combat and poetry differently than does Callimachus. In the examples cited from the Olympian and Nemean Odes, these arrows are clearly associated with song but are perceived as "arrows of praise" and "shafts of delight" which, we can assume, are meant to strike Pindar's listeners and awaken them to the victor's praises. In other words, the "weapons" of song are used for positive purposes. At *Py.* 1.42-44 the javelin throw is used as a metaphor to express the poet's wish to stick to his subject (a desire often expressed by Pindar). But he also says that he wishes to "make a long cast" and to overcome his opponents (ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους). Since Pindar, like Callimachus, shunned the envy which his songs could inspire (e.g., at *Ol.* 8.55: μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος), the opponents envisioned in this metaphorical javelin throw may be those jealous enough to attack his poems.

[20] Heraclitus' familiar saying about the similarity of the bow to the lyre (λύρη)—that each exhibits a παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη (DK 22 B51)—is enigmatic, but seems to have to do with the physical properties by which they each make sound. Callimachus' conflation of the two is based on a different notion (that they are both weapons).

[21] See Burkert (above, note 18) 146, on the lyre or cithara as the symbol of Apollo's "healing hymn."

[22] Cf. 116 where, somewhat ironically, Catullus hopes to avert Gellius' attacks against him by sending him some *carmina Battiadae* (1-3). The poet sees that all is in vain, however, and vows to ward off Gellius' *tela* with his own.

convincing; Apollo's attributes are emblematic of an intrinsic link between poetry and combat.[23]

Apollo's combative nature is made more explicit in lines 25-27:[24]

κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν.
ὅς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο·
ὅστις ἐμῷ βασιλῆι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο.

The passage is a bridge between the story of Niobe (the δακρυόεις πέτρος of line 22), who did contend with one of the blessed (Leto), and the elaboration of Apollo's attributes and accomplishements which begins at line 28 and continues until the contest with Phthonos at 105ff. We cannot be certain about who this king may be, but it is clear that the speaker is suggesting a three tiered relationship between Apollo, his king, and himself (implied in the first person possessive pronoun) and that this relationship is centered upon reciprocity and cooperation in battle (ἐρίζω, μάχομαι). [25] But what kind of battle is envisioned?

The descriptions of the sufferings of Thetis and Niobe (20–24) can be categorized as 'bow' stories in which, even though we are not given the details of what caused their grief, we are expected to know that Apollo's bow was responsible for the deaths of their children. And although the healing power of song is part of these stories, it is the danger of contending with the god which is emphasized in the lines which follow (25–27). After the bridge comes a "lyre" passage in which Apollo's role as the judge of choral song is described (τὸν χορὸν ὠπόλλων, ὅ τι οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀείδει, / τιμήσει· δύναται γάρ, ἐπεὶ Διὶ δεξιὸς ἧσται, 28–29), as well as the proper performance of the chorus who sings of Apollo (30). The implication, of course, is that the chorus which

[23] For another interpretation, see Kerényi (above, note 8) 35.

[24] Cahen (above, note 4) 56, says that these lines introduce "l'idée de l'ἔρις." This "idea," as I have shown, is introduced at the very beginning of the hymn.

[25] These lines have long have long puzzled readers of the hymn, particularly those who want to determine with historical accuracy who the βασιλέυς is in lines 26 and 27. Cf. 68 where ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν clearly refers to the Battiad kings of Cyrene, although some commentators (and the scholiast) think that these kings refer to the Ptolemies as well. See Williams (above, note 3) ad loc. and the works cited there; also, J. A. E. Bethe, "Der Apollonhymnus des Kallimachos," Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig (Phil.-Hist. Klasse) 78 (1926) 10–12; and P. Von der Mühll, " Die Zeit des Apollonhymnus des Kallimachos," *MH* 15 (1958) esp. 1–6: both agree that the kings in line 68 are the Battiadai. Cahen (above, note 4) 47, 69–70, argues that ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν refers to the Battiadai and the Ptolemies (as the descendants of the Battiadai). It can also be argued that, even though the singular king in line 26 seems to be a contemporary ruler, Callimachus may have a king of Cyrene in mind; although the Battiads are no longer in power at the time of writing, his relationship to Cyrene and the Battiad house is not forgotten. See Cairns (above, note 4) 13 on the political nostalgia of Hellenistic poets. The scholiast (C) guesses that Ptolemy III Euergetes is meant in line 26 and adds, διά δὲ τὸ φιλόλογον αὐτὸν εἶναι, ὡς θεὸν τιμᾷ. He apparently saw Euergetes as a good choice because of his literary interests and saw the battle in terms of literary, rather than martial prowess. On this question, see also A. P. Smotrytsch, "Le allusione politiche nel II inno di Callimaco e la sua datazione," *Helikon* 1 (1961) 661-67.

does *not* sing as Apollo would like will *not* be honored and may, in fact, risk some greater punishment (implied in the closeness of Apollo to Zeus). The battles which Apollo is envisioned fighting in the intervening lines, then, can be construed as looking back to the 'bow' stories of Thetis and Niobe and forward to the choral/poetic contests alluded to in the lines which immediately follow.[26] When the speaker says that "it is evil to contend with the blessed" (Apollo, in particular), he has in mind not only the old mythological stories which end in physical combat between Apollo and mortals but also, and more significant, the more immediate kind of combat engendered by the very poetic performance in which he is engaged.

The mytho-historical center piece of the poem (the Cyrene section, 65–96) emphasizes the other side of Apollo's nature, that is, his beneficence. This lengthy passage directly attests to the exclusive and reciprocal relationship between the god and the speaker. The speaker's ties to Cyrene (called ἐμὴ πόλις, 65) are evidence of his ties to Apollo, since it is Apollo who initially points out the city to its founder Battus (65), who then apportions out or 'constructs'[27] more benefits for Cyrene than for any other city (94–95), and who receives from its citizens more honor than any other god (96). The benefits (ὀφέλσιμα, 94) which the city receives are not described in detail, but certainly the same notions of privilege and reciprocity which occur in lines 26–27 are evident here, in particular, in the repeated use of the first person :

> Φοῖβος καὶ βαθύγειον *ἐμὴν* πόλιν ἔφρασε Βάττῳ
> καὶ Λιβύην ἐσιόντι κόραξ ἡγήσατο λαῷ,
> δεξιὸς οἰκιστῆρι, καὶ ὤμοσε τείχεα δώσειν
> *ἡμετέροις* βασιλεῦσιν· ἀεὶ δ' εὔορκος Ἀπόλλων.
> ὤπολλον, πολλοί σε Βοηδρόμιον καλέουσι,
> πολλοὶ δὲ Κλάριον, πάντη δέ τοι οὔνομα πουλύ·
> αὐτὰρ *ἐγὼ* Καρνεῖον· *ἐμοὶ* πατρώιον οὕτω. (65–71)

These lines represent not only mythological and historical exposition;[28] they also exemplify the notion of favored status and the opposition of the one to the many which underlie Callimachean aesthetics (e.g., in *Aitia* 1.1.25–28 and *Epigram* 28). The present speech sets the speaker apart from others; in it he recognizes his own individuality in comparison with the many (ἐγώ as opposed to πολλοί) and his civic affiliation demonstrates his privileged status as a man whom Apollo himself favors. Cyrene is honored by the god of poetry more than

[26] Cf. Wimmel (above, note 4) 65: "Zu den Dingen, die den Schlußteil fördern sollen, gehören ferner die 'Leitmotive' von Apoll dem Sänger und Apoll dem Kämpfer und Strafer. Wir verfolgen diese klaren Linien nicht im einzelnen; die zweite gipfelt unmittelbar von dem Einsetzen der 'sphragis' in der Bezwingung des Pythodrachens V. 97ff. und schafft so den direkten Übergang zur Fußtritt Szene." Cf. Williams (above, note 3) on line 33 (where he is obviously following Wimmel). These 'Leitmotive,' however, are not separate, as Wimmel suggests, but are united by the polemical nature of Callimachean aesthetics.

[27] The generally accepted reading of line 94 is: οὐδὲ πόλει τόσ' ἔνειμεν ὀφέλσιμα, τόσσα Κυρήνῃ. Williams, however, prefers the manuscript reading ἔδειμεν for ἔνειμεν, since it continues the emphasis on Apollo's role in the construction of cities. Either reading gives an appropriate sense.

[28] The story of the founding of Cyrene is also recorded by Herodotus IV.150–58, and Pindar, *Py.* 4 and 5.

any other city (95–96), and, we are to assume, the poet from Cyrene is honored more than any other poet (cf. 28–29). Staehelin suggests the importance of the Cyrene section for the final dramatic scene of the poem, that is, for the literary contest, when he states that Callimachus can "point out to his opponents (represented by Phthonos) the special relationship which he, as a Cyrenean and a Battiad, had to the god."[29] We need not insist upon Staehelin's biographical reading to suggest that this exclusive relationship is determined not only by geography and lineage but also by implied aesthetic preferences.

As a bridge to the final section, the tale of the battle in which Apollo dispatches Pytho (100–104) appropriately reintroduces the god in his role as combatant. Like the passage which had described the sorrows of Thetis and Niobe (17–25), it is another bow passage which reaffirms the theme "it is evil to fight with the blessed" (25–27). In this mythological contest, Apollo slays the "dread snake with one swift arrow, shooting one after the other" (101–2), while the Delphian people cheer him on with the shout ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον subsequently heard at festivals in his honor. The point of this aition is that the god's victory is the impetus for song (104): τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κεῖθεν ἀείδῃ (ever since then you have been celebrated in song in this way because you killed the serpent).[30] The configuration of narrative events at the end of the hymn proper demonstrates that song and strife are inextricably linked together; Apollo's exploits with the bow inspire song (including the present hymn), but song, it is implied, invites Envy. We can only conclude (as Callimachus demonstrates in his other programmatic statements) that lurking behind every successful (i.e., Callimachean) poem is the envious monster called criticism.[31]

When we come, then, to the literary contest with which the hymn ends, we are less surprised than Wilamowitz, Bundy and others. The hymn's recurring motifs of exclusion and combativeness (and the opposite but complementary motifs of privilege and beneficence) suggest that such a contest is to be the expected result of Apollo's epiphany. The combativeness which was earlier presented as part of the poem's ritual, cultic and mythological foci—and which was implicitly aesthetic in focus—is now overtly enacted in terms of specific literary preferences. Indeed, the simultaneous appearance of Apollo and Phthonos most dramatically attests to the combative nature of Callimachean aesthetics; whenever Apollo appears in his role as patron of poets, Envy will be

[29] Heinrich Staehelin, *Die Religion des Kallimachos* (Basel 1934) 42. Cahen (above, note 4) 84, also mentions the importance of the Cyrene section for the final lines: "(Callimachus) invoque sa sauvegarde, comme il l'a fait dans le combat politique pour Cyrène, dans la lutte littéraire qu'il a soutenue tout au long de sa carrière." He does not, however, discuss the significance of the motif of "combat" throughout the poem.

[30] See Williams (above, note 3) ad loc., for the translation.

[31] See H. Erbse, "Zum Apollonhymnos des Kallimachos," in *Kallimachos*, ed. by A.D. Skiados, Wege der Forschung 296 (Darmstadt 1975) 291 for a different interpretation. For him the ritual shout "marks the point of highest religious intensity" and therefore signals the accomplishment of the epiphany. Dramatically the shout adds excitement, but Erbse does not give equal importance to Apollo's role as combatant in the Pythoktonia as a prelude to the literary combat which follows.

there too.[32] As the god of the bow and the cithara (signifying combat or criticism and poetic creation, respectively), Apollo's epiphany initiates an attack upon those envious literary rivals whom the present poetic performance (the successful hymn) has also brought on stage.[33] Apollo argues on behalf of the well-known Callimachean principles of brevity and fineness and strikes Phthonos with his foot.[34]

This kick is itself an example of the blending of aesthetic and dramatic exclusion and combativeness in the hymn. Two references to Apollo's kicking something appear in the poem. In the first (3), he is described as striking the doors of the temple with his foot; in the second we see him kicking Phthonos. Although mention of the god's feet is a regular feature of literary epiphanies, the act of kicking something is not. In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (188), for example, Demeter, at the moment of her epiphany, "steps upon the threshold with her feet." The word for feet (ποσί) appears in the same metrical position as does ποδί at line 3 in the hymn. Callimachus is perhaps playing on this scene in artful *variatio*; instead of simply stepping on the threshold, Apollo kicks the doors.

Several explanations for what Bethe calls Apollo's "highly unseemly act" (höchst unschicklich) in line 3 have been suggested.[35] Weinreich calls the kicking of the doors a "subjective expression of an acoustic phenomenon," that is, it

[32] Phthonos, as seems appropriate, begins his attack with a negative declaration about the type of poet he least admires (106): "οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει." Earlier in the poem the chorus leader had spoken of his admiration for his chorus (16): "ἠγασάμην τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπεὶ χέλυς οὐκέτ' ἀεργός." Although the language and contexts do not correspond exactly, each passage uses ἄγαμαι in the first person singular and in each case the object of the verb is an agent of song. The primary difference between the two locutions is that one is negative and the other positive; Envy voices disapproval while the chorus leader voices approval. The duty of the chorus leader is to praise the god and to encourage his chorus to perform well. Phthonos, on the other hand, quite naturally withholds praise (in particular, we can assume, from the kind of poetry we have been reading) and contends with the god. The positive and then negative use of ἄγαμαι, in addition to providing a formal verbal link between the beginning of the hymn and its end, suggest a fundamental opposition between the speaker and Phthonos and an opposite point of affinity between him and the god. The speaker praises Apollo and is rewarded; Phthonos fails to praise the poet whom Apollo favors and is kicked aside. K. J. McKay, *The Poet at Play: Kallimachos, The Bath of Pallas,* Mnemosyne Suppl. 6 (Leiden 1962) contends (16) that: "Apollo assuredly stands for Ptolemy" and that the poem is "an act of thanksgiving for royal protections." These are overstatements which undermine the hymn's literary focus.

[33] Rivals glossed by Hesychius at *Aitia* 1.1.1 as Βάσκανοι, γόητες, and φθονεροί.

[34] The precise meaning of the terms of the argument are controversial and do not concern me except as I have alluded to them above. It is enough to say that Apollo supports poetic quality over quantity. The water metaphors which form the literary distinctions in the contest have been discussed in some detail by Williams (above, note 3) ad loc. and in an Appendix. See also Erbse (above, note 31) 276–300, esp. 294ff.; Bundy (above, note 2) 48–49; Hans Herter, "Kallimachos," *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) 233–36, esp. 235; Köhnken (above, note 4) 412–18; and Cahen (above, note 4) 84ff.

[35] Bethe (above, note 25) 4.

adds the impression of noise to the description of the god's imminent arrival.[36] Kerenyi suggests that the god is too big to knock on the door in the usual manner: "Mit dem Fuß schlägt der Gott an die Tempelpforte, denn er müßte, wenn er mit der Hand an sie schlagen wollte, sich tief beugen."[37] Williams refers to the "everyday action of kicking on the door," and points out that the verb used in the hymn, ἀράσσω, is the common word in Attic and later Greek for knocking on the door.[38] In spite of these interpretations, we must still agree with Bethe that this common action is "unseemly" or at least uncommon for a god and that this un-godlike act attracts our attention. And if we are surprised by the first mention of Apollo's footwork, how much more surprised are we to hear of his kicking Phthonos with his foot at the poem's end? Yet the significance of this striking and repeated use of *variatio* has gone unnoticed.

When Apollo strikes at the doors of the temple he does so with his "beautiful foot" (καλῷ ποδί, 3). Such a description is not unusual, of course, but this explicit reference to the beauty of the god's foot is more than just praise of his anatomy. The reference to the swan who "sings beautifully" (καλὸν ἀείδει) two lines later suggests a connection between Apollo's foot and beautiful song by employing the same adjective (καλός) in what is explicitly a reference to song or poetry in close proximity to its use as a modifier of πούς.[39] We know that Aristophanes used πούς as a specific metaphor for poetry in another well known literary contest (*Frogs* 1323–24)[40] where the

[36] Otto Weinreich, *Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmid,* Tübinger Beiträge 5 (1929) 233 n. 64.

[37] Kerenyi (above, note 8) 25.

[38] Williams (above, note 3) 18. See also John Ferguson, *Callimachus* (Boston 1980) 112.

[39] Because καλός seems un-Homeric here, K. Kuiper, *Studia Callimachea* (Leiden 1896) i.193, interprets it as meaning "lucky" or "auspicious" rather than beautiful: "Atticorum spectat (Callimachus) dictionem, qui quam facile fausta "καλά" dixerint, monent "σφάγια καλά." Nonne autem haec est poetae sententia: Phoebum pulsare fores pede fausto?" Καλός connotes ritual correctness but its aesthetic meaning seems undeniable in context. See also Williams (above, note 3) ad loc.

[40] It may be that Callimachus is making a direct allusion to Aristophanes' use of πούς. In the *Frogs*, after parodying Euripides' lyrics (1323), Aeschylus asks Dionysus, "Do you see this foot?" (ὁρᾷς τὸν πόδα τοῦτον;). Where Apollo's foot is first mentioned in Callimachus' hymn (3), as in the exchange about the foot in the *Frogs*, a question about seeing is posed in the second person (οὐχ ὁράᾳς). Although this apostrophe is not unusual, it does constitute another similarity between the two passages. In general, there is evidence for Aristophanic parallels in Callimachus' work and it is worth noting that most of the parallels cited by Pfeiffer are from the *Frogs*, although these appear in the fragments and not in the *Hymns*. See Pfeiffer's *Index Rerum Notabilium*. Williams (above, note 3) passim cites some Aristophanic parallels, but only one in the *Frogs*—notably, 331 in which the foot of Iacchus is referred to in an epiphany episode. Georg Thiele, "Phädrus-Studien," *Hermes* 46 (1911) 376–92 finds direct connections between *Frogs* 1269 and 1272 and Callimachus' fourth *Iamb*, fr. 194.78. Commenting on Callimachus' vocabulary of literary criticism, Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the end of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 137, states, "The proper quality of a poem was to be λεπτόν 'subtle.' It has been rightly noticed that this key term and a few other ones had already occurred in Aristophanes' comedies, especially in the critical passages of the *Frogs*: τέχνη /

"foot" refers to both a dramatic gesture and to poetry (*Versfuß*)—specifically, the metrical ineptitude of Euripides' lyrics.[41] It is in both the metaphorical (literary) and literal sense, I suggest, that Apollo's foot is "beautiful" in Callimachus' hymn.[42] It is not the case, as Wimmel believes, that the kicking of the

[κρίνετε]...τὴ⌊ν⌋ σοφίην (Call. fr. 1.17f.) is almost a verbal quotation." Cf. *Frogs* 766, 779, 785. Cairns (above, note 4) 8-10, discusses in some detail the Aristophanic legacy of literary criticism adopted by Hellentistic poets, in particular, by Callimachus (8): "In that period [the Hellenistic period], in Aristophanes, *Frogs* 785–1481, the literary criticism and terminology later associated with Hellenistic writers and surviving most prominently in Callimachus, *Aitia* Fr. 1 (Pf.), is already found in a detailed if embryo form." See also Dee L. Clayman, "The Origins of Greek Literary Criticism and the *Aitia* Prologue," *WS* N.F. 11 (1977) 27–34, esp. 28–29; Wimmel, (above, note 4) 115: and J. D. Denniston, "Technical Terms in Aristophanes," *CQ* 21 (1927) 113–21. It cannot be conclusively proven that Callimachus' proposed metaphorical use of πούς in the hymn is a direct allusion to his comic predecessor. Given the implicit literary focus of the hymn, Callimachus' proven fondness for literary allusion, and his certain familiarity with the comedies of Aristophanes, however, it is possible that he had the literary contest in the *Frogs* in mind when composing the hymn, and that the simultaneous literal and literary reading of the "foot" found there seemed appropriate for the "foot" of Apollo. That the "foot" in the *Frogs* is ridiculed, while Apollo's foot is called beautiful, should not cause concern: *variatio* is Callimachus' specialty. The kind of exclusionary language found in the hymn (see above, pp. 223–24) is also found in the *Frogs*, where the chorus of mystai sing of those who are not to be included in their dances in honor of Iacchus and Demeter (369–71): τούτοις αὐδῶ καὖθις ἀπαυδῶ καὖθις τὸ τρίτον μάλ' ἀπαυδῶ / ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς· ὑμεῖς δ' ἀνεγείρετε μολπὴν / καὶ παννυχίδας τὰς ἡμετέρας αἳ τῇδε πρέπουσιν ἑορτῇ. See also *Frogs* 354 (cf. *Hymn to Apollo* 17–19): εὐφημεῖν χρὴ κἀξίστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροισι χοροῖσιν.

[41] Aeschylus' question to Dionysus about "seeing" the foot (see previous note) makes it clear that he is, in some, fashion, referring to an actual foot—perhaps, as Tucker, *The Frogs of Aristophanes* (London 1913) 247 suggests, the foot of Euripides' muse. M. van der Valk, "Aristophanes' *Ranae* 1249–1363," *Antichthon* 16 (1982) 69, suggests that the "foot" referred to in line 1324 is the phallus worn by the comic actor. This would obviate the pun, however (unless the comic phallus was sometimes called a "foot"). See also W. B. Stanford, *Aristophanes, The Frogs* (New York 1968) ad loc. and the articles cited there; also, L. Radermacher, *Aristophanes, Frösche, Einleitung, Text, und Kommentar* (Vienna 1921) 322–23; H. Lamar Crosby, "Aristophanes' *Frogs*, lines 1323–24," *CP* 20 (1925) 66–68; Theodor Kock, *Augewählte Komödien des Aristophanes: die Frösche* (Berlin 1898) 201.

[42] Evidence for the 'foot' as a technical poetic term before Callimachus is provided by Plato, *Rep.* 400a. Also Aristoxenus Musicus (late 4th c.), *Harmonica* 2.34.24: οἱ δὲ πόδες οἷς σημαινόμεθα τοὺς ῥυθμούς... A metaphorical understanding of πεζός ("on foot") occurs in the epilogue of the *Aitia* (4.112.9): αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν. According to Pfeiffer, *Hist. Class. Schol.* 138 (above, note 40), the phrase "indicates the *Musa pedestris* [cf. Horace, *Satire* 2.6.17] of the *Iambi* which followed the *Aitia* in the final edition arranged by the poet himself," and not that he had "turned from poetry to prose." The connection between music and the movement of the feet occurs often; e.g, *Od.* 8.253; Theog. 3-4; *Homeric Hymns* 3.514ff., 19.19ff.; and in the *Hymn to Apollo* itself (12) where ἴχνος appears. Cf. also the very Callimachean first poem

doors in line 3 has no "ernsthafte Gedankenverbindung" to the final scene in which Apollo kicks Phthonos.[43] The unique image of Apollo's foot serves the dual purpose of formally uniting the beginning of the hymn with its end, and of imagistically uniting the mimetic drama of the god's epiphany to the poem's programmatic agon. When Apollo finally strikes Phthonos (who represents literary rivals), his beautiful foot (rather than the bow) is an especially apt weapon on the poetic battlefield on which the Callimachean *ego* so often, as in this hymn, finds itself.[44]

of Ovid's *Amores*, in which Cupid, usurping Apollo's role as the god of poetry, snatches away a foot from Ovid's verse (4). *Pes* here is equivalent to *numerus* (27–30). Catullus 14.22 likewise uses *malum pedem* humorously for the foot and the verse of the "worst poet."

[43] Wimmel (above, note 4) 64, does recognize a "Bildverbindung." See also Williams (above, note 3) ad loc.

[44] I am very grateful to Michael C. J. Putnam, Seth Schein, Charles Segal, and two anonymous readers for their criticism and suggestions. A version of this paper was presented at the APA meeting in Houston, Dec. 1986.