

## ἱαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν: Genre, Occasion, and Imitation in Callimachus, frs. 191 and 203Pf.<sup>1</sup>

Mary Depew  
University of Iowa

When scholars discuss Hellenistic poetry in terms of genre, they usually employ the model of the *genus mixtum*: by sorting and editing the poetry collected in Philadelphus' Library, Hellenistic ποιηταὶ καὶ γραμματικοί made the boundaries that originally defined poetic kinds a matter of conscious reflection. These boundaries could then be 'crossed,' and new life could be breathed into moribund poetic traditions.<sup>2</sup> A basic premise of this model—now sorely in need of examination—is the tacit assumption that the makers of third-century taxonomies understood genre in class-inclusion terms. That is to say, if poetic genres are created by combining formal elements and subject matter, as the classificatory background suggests, a poem becomes an instance of a particular genre by exhibiting the set of conditions necessary and sufficient for membership in that class.<sup>3</sup> The *genus mixtum* would then be a natural development from third-century taxonomies, according to which the quest for poetic innovation might lead to the mixing of well-ordered generic elements.

---

<sup>1</sup>I use R. Pfeiffer's text of Callimachus throughout (Oxford 1985). Full references for works cited by author's last name are given at the end.

<sup>2</sup>For the formulation of this approach see W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924) 202–210. An influential article by L. E. Rossi explained this *Kreuzung der Gattungen* as a product of the literateness of the Hellenistic age ("I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche," *BICS* 18 [1971] 69–94). Other important discussions of the *genus mixtum* are M. Fantuzzi, "La Contaminazione dei Generi Letterari nelle Letteratura Greca Ellenistica: Rifiuto del Sistema o Evoluzione di un Sistema?," *L&S* 15 (1980) 440 ff.; E.–R. Schwinge, "Griechische Poesie und die Lehre von der Gattungstrinität in der Moderne," *AuA* 27 (1981) 130–62; Zanker 133–54. A few recent scholars have dismissed the claim that the *genus mixtum* approach to genre was new and revolutionary in Callimachus' generation and instead view the fourth century as formative in this as in so much else. See, for example, Hutchinson 16 n. 34, 83, 199–201; Bulloch 31 ff. Hutchinson cites such fourth-century poems as Arcestratus' parody of Hesiod (16–17). In his recent book, Zanker brings Auerbach's study of nineteenth-century realism to bear on the *genus mixtum*, which for him implies "the process (and the ancient thinking that lies behind it) whereby subject-matter which is normally depicted in a low genre, especially comedy, is depicted in a grand genre like epic or tragedy" (133–4).

<sup>3</sup>On the term εἶδος and the evidence for its use in the third and second centuries to refer to literary kinds see Pfeiffer 182–4; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* IIb (Oxford 1984) 666 n. 126, on *EM* 295, lines 52 ff. s.v. εἰδογράφος, and the description there of what is likely to have been Apollonius the Eidographer's classification of Pindar's odes.

This understanding of third-century attitudes to genre has important consequences. The class-inclusion model means that if a poem's function—to praise, exhort, blame, etc.—is tied to its generic identity, that function should be reproducible on demand at any time and place and by any writer. The successful imitation of formal elements such as meter and dialect will result in an actual *instance* of a particular genre. For example, a poem composed in hexameters and in the Ionic dialect of epos and in which the poet addresses and describes a god will be a hymn. It will function as a hymn must function: to praise and supplicate a god. This situation is not changed by the introduction of the *genus mixtum*. While poetic innovation might consist in the 'mixing' of generic elements, the very presence of such elements will suggest that the poem functions as its models functioned. The problem will be: which genre should predominate in naming the new poem? Callimachus' fr. 198Pf. is, for example, an epinician written in iambic trimeters and the Ionic dialect (*Dieg.* VIII 21–24). But is it an iambus? That Callimachus included it in his collection of *Iambi* suggests that it is. What were his criteria for such an identification?

Scholars attempting to solve such problems have depended upon the metaphors inherent in the notion of a *Kreuzung der Gattungen*. Boundaries divide genres. Sometimes these boundaries may be crossed; sometimes, presumably, they are impermeable. Another important metaphor in many analyses that depend upon the *genus mixtum* is hybridization.<sup>4</sup> For example, the terms 'literary drama' and 'mimetic hymn' have been used to describe those *Hymns* in which Callimachus 'frames' a traditional mythological narrative with what appears to be a vivid, first-person account of the sort of ritual activity in which a hymn might occur (Bulloch 6). The term 'mimetic hymn' describes the outcome of mixing traditionally discrete generic conventions, among them realistic dialogue, description and low ἥθος, elements which the poet would have borrowed from the Mime or New Comedy and combined with the formal conventions of venerable, if defunct genres badly in need of new life.<sup>5</sup> Some would argue that the addition of such vital stock is a means of appropriating out-of-date myths and other lore to the concerns of the present.<sup>6</sup> It is, in

<sup>4</sup>The metaphor is discussed in a paper delivered by A. Barchiesi, "(Ne)Fasti: Poetics and Augustan Discourse in Ovid," 8 ff.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. e.g. Zanker 23: "...in the case of Apollonius' *Argonautica*...the poet may on occasion use one or another of all the forms of realism that I have described to bring the saga into contact with contemporary experience of the world and thus breathe new life into it: here we have a poet apparently bent at certain junctures on satisfying a nostalgia for the hallowed Greek tradition, a πῶθος Ἑλλάδος, to use one of his own phrases (3.262)."

<sup>6</sup>Cf. e.g. Bing 75: "In part, the avid, at times extravagant cultivation and preservation of the heritage is like that familiar to us from immigrant communities throughout the ages: a desire to

effect, a way of reviving the genre and its function. The *genus mixtum* describes well how Hellenistic poets combined to great effect formal conventions which they perceived to be generically incompatible.<sup>7</sup> But by assuming that these poets were thereby concerned to produce actual hymns, iambi, or epinicians, i.e. poems whose primary functions were to praise or blame, the *genus mixtum* underestimates the irony and effect of such combinations.

What concerns me here are generic conventions that the *genus mixtum* model overlooks, conventions that were just as important to Hellenistic scholars as formal or thematic elements, and which may prove to have different consequences for understanding Hellenistic poetry and the attitudes of its makers to tradition. It is important to keep in mind that third-century notions of poetic genre were relatively *ad hoc*, and consequently more varied than the *Kreuzung* model suggests. In fact, Callimachus and his predecessors (Aristotle included) classified poetic texts according to a variety of criteria.<sup>8</sup> For example, following Aristotle's διδασκαλίαι, Callimachus' Πίναξ of the dramatic poets was arranged chronologically.<sup>9</sup> Hellenistic sorting of hymns, epinicia, paeans, dithyrambs, elegy, iambus and many other genres had in general less to do with the meters or dialects in which this poetry was composed than with conventions tied to the original purpose of its performance, that is, to the poem's function in a specific sort of situation. The book divisions in the Alexandrian editions of Pindar, for example, were made by appealing to conventions about who is speaking and who is listening, as well as by references to the sort of occasion that has brought the speaker and hearer together. Dithyrambs, for example, address Dionysus, paeans address Apollo,

---

be more Greek than the Greeks. Put somewhat differently, the underlying hope of these poets' allusiveness is meaningful continuity." Bing does go on to say that "...the very mastery that the Hellenistic poets are so zealous to establish and display is itself a sign of rupture."

<sup>7</sup>In the third century we need only think of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, the mixture of disparate levels in Callimachus' *Hecale* or *Victoria Berenikes*, or Theocritus' fifteenth *Idyll*, with its variant registers of dialect, subject matter, and tone, to see instances of what the *Kreuzung* model describes.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Pfeiffer 132. Authors would have been given individual treatment according to the contents of their work: Callimachus divided epinicia sometimes according to the type and sometimes according to the place of contest (cf. fr. 441, 450; Pfeiffer 183).

<sup>9</sup>The title of Callimachus' catalogue of the Library's holdings, transmitted in the Suda-Hesychius entry on Καλλίμαχος—Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμπάντων καὶ ὧν συνέγραψαν—along with fr. 430–5, 452/3, 442, 450, 451, 439 and 442, suggest a three-tiered classification: a preliminary sorting by broad categories of genre, then an alphabetical list by author, and within the latter category, by genre again (cf. fr. 436Pf.: ἐπικὸν δὲ τὸ ποίημα, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή). See Pfeiffer 126–134; 183.

epinicians address and praise outstanding men.<sup>10</sup> While most of Sappho's poetry was sorted into books by meter, her wedding songs were assembled in the last (ninth?) book of the Alexandrian edition with no regard for their varied meters.<sup>11</sup> This approach to genre had important, if unexamined, effects on the creation of new poetry. Moreover, it suggests a number of interesting questions. For example, what happens when occasion-defined poetry is taken out of its original context? Are these occasions and the cultural contexts in which they had meaning imitable in the same way formal poetic features are? What are the effects of imitating them: what possibilities are opened up to the poet who understands poetic kinds as bound to occasions and contexts no longer available to him? Will a new poem be able to function as its models functioned, or will its status as a self-conscious imitation of its exemplar's context make problematic both its identity and its function? These are some of the questions which concern me.

While assumptions inherent in third-century practices of sorting and editing texts provide one way of approaching Hellenistic attitudes to genre, the poetry written by these same scholars, taken together with the metapoetic statements we sometimes find in it, provides another. Along with other literary critical issues, genre plays an important role in Callimachus' *Aetia* prologue and in the 'sphragis' of his *Hymn to Apollo*. However, in the first and thirteenth *Iambi*, the two poems which will be the focus of this paper, the notion of genre not only plays an overt and programmatic role, but Callimachus describes it in two explicit and differing ways. Formal considerations such as meter and dialect are, as the *genus mixtum* suggests, important. But occasion will emerge from a close analysis of the thirteenth *Iambus* and its counterpart at the beginning of the collection of the *Iambi* as a more important criterion.

In fact, the same sorts of occasion-bound conventions that we now know characterized archaic iambography are represented centuries later in the first

---

<sup>10</sup>The *Vita Ambrosiana* refers to an Alexandrian edition of Pindar which was divided into seventeen books corresponding to various types of occasion: hymns, paeans, dithyrambs, parthenia, encomia, threnoi, etc. (Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* [Leipzig 1910] I, p. 3; cf. W. H. Race, "P. Oxy. 2438 and the Order of Pindar's Works," *RhM* 130 [1987] 407–10). On classical and hellenistic views of the occasionality of archaic genres, see C. Calame, "Réflexions sur les genres littéraires," *QUCC* 17 (1974) 117 ff.; G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer* [Baltimore 1990], 110 ff.). Cf. Harvey 158–61. On the Alexandrian classification of the iambus by occasion, see West 38.

<sup>11</sup>D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford 1955) 112–16. Stephanus' words *ad Alcmān* fr. 13 D, ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ δευτέρου τῶν παρθενίων ᾠμάτων, may imply the existence of a similar collection for that poet (cf. Harvey 158 and n. 2).

and thirteenth *Iambi*. As I will show in the paper's first section, Callimachus locates these two poems, and thereby the variegated collection they enclose, within the continuous tradition of the iambus conceived in terms of an occasional typology. References to a first-person narrator, to an audience, and to the situation in which the poet places them both characterized many archaic and early classical genres. But these conventions, as conventions, could themselves be imitated. This is particularly true and fruitful for the iambus, where the world the poet represents is as diverse as everyday reality itself. The *ψόγος* differs from praise poetry and its use of occasional conventions in that the blame poet characteristically disguises his own identity "beneath that of the *persona loquens* and [thus] avoid[s] the resentment his attack would otherwise provoke."<sup>12</sup> In his first and thirteenth *Iambi*, Callimachus imitates these conventions of occasionality. In the paper's second section, I show that an important model for Callimachus' imitation is to be found in Attic Comedy's conception of the genre.

In the final section of the paper I look at the thirteenth *Iambus* and at Callimachus' defense against his fellow scholars' charge that he composes in too many genres. There Callimachus invokes Plato's *Ion* and Socrates' horrified description of the skilled artist. Callimachus wryly takes up Socrates' challenge: εἰ περὶ ἑνὸς [οἱ ποιηταὶ] τέχνη καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν, κἄν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων (*Ion* 534c). The echoes of this dialogue in Callimachus' thirteenth *Iambus* have been noted, but their extent and importance remain unexamined. Callimachus develops precisely what Plato feared and rejected. To compose iambi has become for him a work of literary erudition and of τέχνη. Even poetic types once firmly bound to specific cultural settings may be imitated by the sufficiently skilled poet. What will need to be examined are the effects of such imitation. Callimachus' conceptualization of poetic genre in terms of occasion has, I will suggest, far-reaching implications for the understanding of his poetry.

### I. The context of fiction: Hipponax redivivus

Unlike some of the more experimental poems that they enclose, the first and thirteenth *Iambi* are composed in choliambics and a literary Ionic. They thus have a *prima facie* claim to be called iambic. But in the first *Iambus* Callimachus, as if realizing that these formal conditions are not enough to entitle him to engage in iambic invective himself, resurrects Hipponax to do it for him. 'Hipponax' announces his identity in the first line, Ἀκούσαθ'

<sup>12</sup>Gentili 109. For the occasionality and the inherent imitability of praise and blame poetry, see 110–11.

Ἰππώνακτος, and then places himself in the class iambic poets traditionally represent by boasting, οὐ γὰρ ἄλλ' ἤκω / ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύβου πιπρήσκουσιν, i.e. Hades, notorious for its bargains. This up-to-date Hipponax announces that he has not come to sing about his old target Bupalus (3–4), but to address a group of men (ὦ ἄνδρες, 6) whom the Diegesis identifies as φιλόλογοι—suitable ἐχθροί, it would seem, for a Callimachean occasion of blame.<sup>13</sup> He has made his anabasis ἱαμβος in hand (3), and he launches into it by summoning the crowd of φιλόλογοι to a temple where, he says, τὸν πάλαι Πάγχαιον ὁ πλάσας Ζᾶνα / γέρων λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει (10–11). In its reproduction of the self-righteous tone at home in the archaic iambus, this jibe at Euhemerus skillfully insults the scholars, who are, it seems, an impious crowd being led to an impious place.

When he has his crowd gathered, 'Hipponax' continues to insult them. By combining a low tone, Hipponactean vocabulary, and repeated reports of a contentious, interruptive audience, Callimachus produces a tone and a sense of occasion typical of his model's invective.

ὦ πολλον, ὦνδρες, ὥς παρ' αἰπόλῳ μυῖαι  
ἢ σφήκες ἐκ γῆς ἢ ἀπὸ θύματος Δελφοί,  
εἰληδὸν [ἐσ]μεύουσιν· ὦ Ἑκάτη πλήθεις.  
ὁ ψιλοκόρσης τὴν πνοὴν ἀναλώσει  
φυσέων ὅπως μὴ τὸν τρίβωνα γυμνώσῃ.  
σωπὴ γενέσθω...

30

O Apollo, the men swarm around in droves  
like flies about a goatherd, or wasps out of the  
gourd, or Delphians coming from a sacrifice! O Hecate,  
what a crowd! The bald man will lose his  
breath by blowing, so that he may not be  
left without his cloak. Silence!

There is such a crowd of these scholars milling about that 'Hipponax' swears, appropriately, by Hecate (28) and compares them to flies or wasps (26–7), characterizations familiar from Attic comedy that suggest, among other things, a noisy quarrelsomeness.<sup>14</sup> The second comparison, to Delphians at a feast

<sup>13</sup>Dieg. VI 2–4 (Ὑποτίθεται φθιτὸν Ἰππώνακτα συγκαλοῦν / τα τοὺς φιλολόγους εἰς τὸ Παρ- / μενίωνος καλούμενον Σαραπίδειον) and Pfeiffer *ad loc.* The Diegesis identifies the πρὸ τείχεος ἱδὸν (fr. 191.9) as the Sarapeum of Parmeniscus, which was built by Ptolemy III after 247/6 B. C. Because Euhemerus would have been dead by this time, Pfeiffer rejects the identification. Pfeiffer's conjecture ὦ ἄνδρες in line 6 is supported by the imperatives in 7 and 9 as well as in 1.

<sup>14</sup>A well-recognized trait, as Timon's famous description attests (*SH* 786). The Cynic Timon of Phlius, a contemporary of Callimachus, portrayed himself in his *Silloi* as descending to

(27), continues the insult by implying that the scholars are greedy as well as impious.<sup>15</sup>

Callimachus continues the invective by having ‘Hipponax’ tell the story of Bathycles’ cup. Fables are very much at home in the iambus, and ‘Hipponax’ even draws upon his own poetry for a tale well suited to the task at hand. We therefore conclude that it is still the resurrected archaic poet who is speaking. And yet this fiction is about to take an unexpected turn. The story as ‘Hipponax’ tells it makes a moral point. Bathycles means the cup as a prize for the wisest of men,<sup>16</sup> but it is refused by each of the seven candidates until it returns finally to Thales, its first recipient, who dedicates it to Didymaeon Apollo: *πάλιν τὸ δῶρον ἐς Θάλητ’ ἀνώλισθεν /.../ “Θάλης με τῷ μεδεῦντι Νείλεω δῆμου / δίδωσι, τοῦτο δις λαβὼν ἀριστῆιον”* (75–7). The φιλόλογοι would do well to imitate the sages’ humility, of which Thales is the preeminent example. But Callimachus’ choice of exemplum has another point. Reference to the account of Bathycles’ cup actually occurs in Hipponax’s poetry. In his version of the tale, the cup is given ultimately, on Apollo’s advice, to Myson (fr. 61 and 73 Diehl). Callimachus had a variety of earlier versions of the story from which to choose,<sup>17</sup> and if we expect him to refer to the poet whose voice he is borrowing, we will be disappointed. According to Diogenes Laertius, Callimachus’ source is instead Leandrius of Miletus, a writer of *Μιλησιακά*. Callimachus very often uses the accounts of local historians in his poetry, and in this instance the effect is to update this ‘Hipponax’ by having him utter a typically Alexandrian aetiology: it was simply because he received it *twice* that Thales dedicated the cup to Didymaeon Apollo.<sup>18</sup> With his reprimand learnedly capped, ‘Hipponax’ admonishes the scholars one last time and returns to the streams of Acheron. This ‘Hipponax’

---

Hades to question Xenophanes about deceased philosophers, a situation that mirrors Hipponax’s anabasis in *Iambus* 1. Cf. Bing 71–2. The Florentine Scholiast cites *Il.* 2.469: *μυιάων ἀδινάων ἔθνεα πολλά*.

<sup>15</sup>Reading, with Pfeiffer, *Δελφοί* (rather than *Δελφοῦ*, Hunt) in line 27. The Florentine Scholiast here explains that the Delphians killed Aesop for rebuking them for this practice of rapaciously grabbing for themselves portions of sacrificed animals. Both the insult and the implicit reference to Aesop are at home in the generic context. See Pfeiffer *ad loc.* for other sources, including Aristophanes.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. fr. 191.66 ff. and *Dieg.* VI.6–10.

<sup>17</sup>Each account varies to some extent either with respect to which sage the gift returned or to which god it was finally dedicated. Diogenes Laertius (I 28 = *Vorsokr.* I<sup>5</sup> 69, 10 ff. D.–K.) preserves several versions of the story of Bathycles’ cup (or, as in several of the versions, Bathycles’ tripod). The winner varies, and for the recipient we find besides Didymaeon Apollo also Apollo Pythius, Apollo Ismenius and even Heracles. Cf. Dawson 23–24.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. *Dieg.* VI. 18–19: *ὁ δὲ ἀνατίθη[σι] τῷ [Δ]ιδυμ[εῖ] / 'Απόλλ[ωνι] δις λαβ[ὼν] ἀριστε[ί]ον*.

is a speaker impossible to pin down.<sup>19</sup> The voices of the two poets are inseparable in this recreation of the iambic genre's inherently ambiguous *persona loquens*.

Several models for Callimachus' portrayal of the vitriolic blame poet have been suggested.<sup>20</sup> D. Clayman acknowledges that Callimachus borrows from the archaic iambus Hipponax's vivid, first person personality. But because we know of no iambographer who counted among his objects of abuse scholars, poets, or their styles, Clayman looks elsewhere for a more precise source of inspiration. She locates it in Aristophanes' parodies of literary style, especially the contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs*. She argues that these and other literary contests may have suggested to Callimachus the idea of resurrecting an eristic Hipponax to defend his own literary principles (50–1).

There are two difficulties with this approach. First, 'Hipponax' does not defend his literary principles in what remains of Callimachus' first *Iambus*.<sup>21</sup> While it is reasonable to conclude with the Diegete that the men he addresses are φιλόλογοι, we know nothing specific about their complaints until we have read the thirteenth *Iambus*, where Callimachus, presumably now in his own voice, responds to critics of his poetic practice. In this first poem of the collection, 'Hipponax' simply addresses a crowd of Alexandrian scholars and criticizes them for their envy and contentiousness. Their quarrel with Callimachus and his poetry will not be particularized until the final poem of the collection. Secondly, it is misleading to call *Iambi* 1 and 13 parodies.<sup>22</sup> As

<sup>19</sup>It is mistaken to call him, as for example Clayman does, Callimachus' 'reincarnation' (56–7). For the view that he is Callimachus' 'temporary spokesman', see Bing 66 n. 26.

<sup>20</sup>See especially E. Degani, 'Note sulla fortuna di Archiloco e di Ipponatte in epoca Ellenistica' in *Poeti greci giambici ed elegiaci* (ed. Degani, Milan 1977); Dawson 22–24. Hutchinson 49–52 sees in Callimachus' dramatization of Hipponax and the Alexandrian scholars a "cool, smiling, rational" ethos (49) which the poet himself may presumably employ to reply to his critics. Citing Aristophanes' revival of Aeschylus and Euripides in the *Frogs*, Bing (65–7 and 65 n. 23; cf. 71) reads Callimachus' 'revival' of Hipponax as an attempt to bridge the gulf ("while still acknowledging it") between his own work and the poetic past. Bing's analysis of Callimachus' portrayal of Hipponax is insightful. I disagree with it only in the degree to which I view Callimachus as attempting to bridge this gulf, or, indeed, to make Hipponax's voice his own (cf. 63).

<sup>21</sup>The fragmentary lines 12–25 are inconclusive. ἵαμβον, 21 and ἰάμετρα, 23 obviously imply that the topic of literary style and genre may figure in Hipponax's address to the scholars, but there is no reason to assume that Hipponax is here defending himself.

<sup>22</sup>The ancient conception of parody involved both imitation and ridicule, adapting and burlesquing. The mixture metaphor works well here: parody mixes incongruous form and content. This is what Clayman, depending upon the *genus mixtum* model, takes Callimachus to be doing in his *Iambi* (51; 63–5). Athenaeus 698b calls Hipponax the inventor of parody and



we shall see, Callimachus does not parody the iambic genre. He reproduces it by self-consciously appropriating and updating its history.

## II. Genealogy or Taxonomy? The archaic iambus, occasionality and mimesis

In the last twenty-five years, it has come to be generally accepted that the most important generic marker of the archaic iambus was not dialect, meter, or any other formal convention, but the type of occasion for which it was composed, its “social context.”<sup>23</sup> Like elegy, hymn or epinician,<sup>24</sup> the iambus assumes an oral communication, an actual situation to which the function and meaning of a particular poem will be closely tied.<sup>25</sup> The first person speaker of an iambus places his utterance in a particular situation and directs his blame at someone else, whom he describes, as he describes himself, in terms appropriate to the context of blame. Characteristic complaints about poverty or lack of drink, vulgar ravings about women, wine and gluttony, invective, αἰσχρολογία, or a preachy high-handedness typify the sort of speaker at home in an iambus (Dover 184–85; West 32–39). Conventions about the relationship between such a speaker and a more or less specified ἐχθρός possessing various undesirable qualities of his or her own, then, comprise the context-based conditions of the traditional ψόγος. By employing these conventions, the poet purports to produce an effect: someone is blamed, censured, mocked.

It is just because the context of the ψόγος often appears to be so specific and the injury so personal that scholars sometimes conclude that Archilochus’ insults of Lycambes or Hipponax’s of Bupalus refer to real quarrels and real injuries. And yet, as many have argued, what appears to be a habitually personal tone in archaic iambography may or may not reflect the poet’s own personal quarrels.<sup>26</sup> Rather, first-person reports, second-person address, and

---

quotes four hexameter lines in which the poet uses Homeric diction to curse a glutton. This resembles not at all what Callimachus is doing in his own iambi, especially in 1 and 13. On parody in antiquity, see F. Householder, “ΠΑΡΩΙΔΙΑ,” *CP* 39 (1944) 1–9; E. Degani, *Poesia parodica greca* (Bologna 1982) 12–33.

<sup>23</sup>K. J. Dover, *Hardt Entretien* X (1964), 189. Cf. West 22–39.

<sup>24</sup>But unlike the third-person narrative of epic, for example, which, while it certainly implies an occasion of performance, does not purport to directly praise someone or some god (excepting, of course, in its conventional, short invocation to the Muses). An iambus blames (or purports to blame) someone; an epic may describe someone blaming someone (e.g. Thersites).

<sup>25</sup>For the occasional character of the archaic iambus and for the wide range of situations it represents, see West 22–39; E. Pellizer, “Per una morfologia della poesia giambica arcaica” in *I Canoni Letterari; Storia e Dinamica* (Trieste 1981) 35–49; Gentili 109–10.

<sup>26</sup>For a clear, recent discussion of both sides of this argument, and its relevance to the poetry of Hipponax, see R. M. Rosen, “Hipponax, Bupalos, and the Conventions of the Psogos,” *TAPA* 118 (1988) 29–41.

reference to the occasion itself may be part and parcel of the genre and its contextualizing conventions. When Aristotle insists that the speaker and hearer of an iambus *have* to be low, he is describing the components of an occasion-based genre whose markers of occasion have become or are conventionalized (*Poetics* 1448b 25–7). That is to say, the performative contextuality that marks the identity of many archaic and early classical genres carries in itself the potential for imitating these same genres.

The same sorts of occasional conventions also define the genres of praise (Gentili 115–54). But in a world where discourse favors the praise given by highly placed persons and skilled poets over the blame they mete out to their inferiors, and *a fortiori* over the vulgar blaming in which lower persons presumably engage, there is a fundamental asymmetry between praise and blame. When an epinician is performed in the ceremonial context for which it was composed, it *actually* praises someone. On the other hand, while the archaic iambographer may contextualize his blame and may in fact blame some actual person, the iambus is, in a way that praise poetry is not, a second-order discourse. By this I mean that its speaker, perhaps concerned to avoid the resentment his attack would otherwise provoke, characteristically conceals his own identity beneath that of a *persona loquens*. This persona may be an actual individual, but he may just as well be totally fictitious, a general type at home in the scurrilous atmosphere of the iambus. Hipponax is especially skilled in manipulating these conventions. Archilochus may complain about poverty or his trials as a mercenary soldier, but for the purposes of the iambus Hipponax, a poet hypersensitive to lectional and stylistic nuance, skillfully adopts an enormously wide variety of low personae, and characteristically speaks to any number of equally disreputable ‘hearers.’ In this he is Callimachus’ clear model.

Insofar as the conventions that characterize the archaic iambus are stylized, if a poet had the requisite skill, he could fashion a literary representation of the genre. This is just what we find in the late fifth century, when the genre is no longer vital. In the course of arguing that comic poets from Cratinus on were aware of working in a literary tradition that had its antecedents in the archaic iambus, R. Rosen has analyzed the sorts of references these poets make to iambic poetry (84). His study suggests that comic poets very consciously conceived of the iambic genre in terms of context-dependent conventions and that they revived and made use of the genre’s conventional personalities and imagined situations. Unsurprisingly, this is especially evident when Aristophanes and his colleagues purport to be engaging in the activity proper to the iambus, blaming an apparently specific target.

A striking example of Aristophanes' awareness of comedy's iambic genealogy and the artistic use to which it could be put occurs at *Peace* 43–9. This is a passage which has long puzzled commentators, and by reading it as a joke that depends for its humor on the performative conventions of the iambus, Rosen has made good sense of it. A servant of Trygaeus, complaining about a dung-beetle which has been put under his charge, introduces an Ionian to explain the insect's presence. The Ionian says of the beetle, *δοκέω μὲν, ἐς Κλέωνα τοῦτ' αἰνίσσεται, / ὥς κείνος ἀναιδέως τὴν σπατίλῃν ἐσθίει* (47–8). The Athenian servant may be puzzled at the insect's presence, but the Ionian knows just what to make of it. The beetle is an αἶνος for (who else?) Cleon, who had become by this time a conventionalized target of abuse.<sup>27</sup> The scene's humor depends upon Aristophanes' and his audience's identification of the occasion-dependent conventions of the iambus. But what is even more interesting for our purposes is that the speaker is not the low-life persona we have come to expect in the genre. The unimpeachably 'authorized' speaker here is simply an Ionian, whose geographically specific skill Aristophanes highlights by having him speak in his own dialect.

In this passage and in others Rosen discusses,<sup>28</sup> Aristophanes reproduces the iambic genre within the context of his satire of social and political realities. By altering an element in the genre's occasional equation—an Ionian stands in the place of the requisite low-life speaker—Aristophanes draws attention to the contextual difference from his exemplar to the genre itself. The effect of this, as Rosen says, is to give the comic poet "greater freedom to remove his ψόγος to a fictional realm, thereby granting his polemics unlimited imaginative scope" (84). We are made aware of this 'iambus' as a purely literary phenomenon when, some lines later, the Ionian's interpretation of the beetle is simply abandoned: Trygaeus' master declares that the insect is 'really' on stage to carry him to heaven, a use for the creature he learned in one of Aesop's fables.<sup>29</sup> The robust connection to reality that an occasion-based genre implies through the use of the occasional conventions we have just discussed has given way to the freedom of complete fictionality.

<sup>27</sup>The play was produced in March 421; Cleon had died the year before in the fighting at Amphipolis. On the connotations of αἰνίσσεται (47) 'is a riddle for / alludes to' and its association with the Ionian αἶνος 'animal fable' see Rosen 30–1 and n. 77, 79 for bibliography.

<sup>28</sup>See especially 24–28, his treatment of *Ra*. 354–71 and 416–30.

<sup>29</sup>*Pax* 127–30. Since, as Rosen points out (31), the animal fable would have been represented in the fifth century by the distinctly Ionian Aesopic tradition, "it is especially appropriate at *Pax* 46 for an Ionian to see a fable allegory in the dung beetle."

### III. Occasion and imitation in Callimachus fr. 203Pf.

In Aristophanes' *Peace*, the poet introduces an Ionian as a speaker licensed to utter an iambus. Callimachus, for his part, appropriates the archaic poet whose voice is arguably the strongest voice in the genre's tradition.<sup>30</sup> As Aristophanes had done before him, Callimachus reproduces the components of an iambus conceived in terms of occasion. Can it then come as any real surprise that when we come to the thirteenth *Iambus* we find that the quarrel between Callimachus and his colleagues has to do not with literary style, but with the possibility and the consequences of reviving extinct literary genres?

In the thirteenth and final *Iambus*,<sup>31</sup> Callimachus again manipulates the variables inherent in an occasion of blame. But he reverses the situation of the collection's first poem, where Hipponax, as Callimachus' proxy, had criticized Alexandria's finest. In what remains of 13 the tables are turned as Callimachus himself becomes the recipient of an attack made by these same φιλόλογοι. This reversal of roles in 13 is accomplished by a number of verbal echoes of the first *Iambus* and by a manipulation of the same conventions of occasion that had marked the earlier poem as an iambus. In 13.17 λαλευσ[, with which the critic characterizes Callimachus' poetry, recalls 1.11, where the verb is applied to Euhemerus, who prattles his impious books: οὗ τὸν πάλαι Πάγχαιον ὁ πλάσας Ζᾶνα / γέρων λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει (10–11).<sup>32</sup> What Hipponax had said of Euhemerus and Callimachus of bad poets is now said by Callimachus' critics of *him*. His critics describe him as mad. If his friends had

<sup>30</sup>On Hellenistic perceptions of the virulence of Hipponax's invective, cf. Bing 63–65. It can hardly be the case, as Pfeiffer 146 implies, that "the aristocratic Callimachus...could not restrain his deep aversion to [Archilochus]" and therefore avoided imitating *his* verse. Frr. 380 and 543 do not imply disapproval of Archilochus (cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*); they simply characterize him and his work in terms appropriate to the iambus. In any case, the venom and inebriation to which these fragments allude are far more evident in Hipponax's poetry.

<sup>31</sup>Frr. 226–29 are normally classed separately from the *Iambi* (Pfeiffer identified them as Callimachus' *Mele*, which are cited by the Suda s.v. Καλλιμαχος = test. I, Pf. II, xcν). In his forthcoming *Callimachus and His Critics*, A. Cameron argues convincingly that there is no reason to doubt the Diegeseis in their claim that frr. 226–29 immediately followed *Iambus* 13 and were part of Callimachus' original collection of *iambi*. In form and content these poems depart still further from iambic norms, but frr. 226 and 227 are fundamentally iambic in meter, and, as Cameron points out, since we know very little about the content of the earlier *Iambi* it is rash to conclude that these later poems have nothing in common with them or with the traditionally wide-ranging archaic iambus. Cf. Clayman 4–7 for a history of the modern debate. It will become clear that their presence after *Iambus* 13 would not vitiate my thesis about Callimachus' understanding of the genre.

<sup>32</sup>In the second *Iambus*, which is closely related to the first in meter, dialect, theme and tone, Callimachus uses the same verb to criticize particularly verbose poets: οἱ δὲ πάντες ἄνθρωποι / καὶ πουλύμυθοι καὶ λάλοι πεφύκασιν / ἐκείθεν, ὠδρόνικε (13–15).

any sense, they would tie him up: οἱ φίλοι σε δῆσ[σουσι, / κ[ῆ]ν νοῦν ἔχουσιν (19–20). This exclamation recalls *Iamb.* 1.78–9, another description of a madman, apparently uttered by Hipponax in the context of his criticism of the φιλόλογοι: ἀλλ' ἦν ὁρῇ τις, “οὗτος Ἀλκμέων” φήσει / καὶ “φεῦγε· βάλλει· φεῦγ” ἐρεῖ “τὸν ἄνθρωπον.”

In the first *Iambus* ‘Hipponax’ blamed the Alexandrian scholars for their contentiousness. In 13 the scholars now turn their jealousy on Callimachus and blame him for two things. Both concern genre. First, he composes οὗτ’ Ἐφεσον ἐλθών, ἣτις ἐστι αἶμα [ / Ἐφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες / τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται (12–14). Unlike Aristophanes’ speaker, Callimachus has never even been to Ionia. How then can he be sanctioned, or indeed able, to utter an iambus? Moreover, as the accusing voice continues, he casually uses iambs, indiscriminately mixed with Ionic, Doric, or a mixture of dialects (εἵτ’ οὖν ἐπ...ἀρχαῖον εἵτ’ ἀπαι.[ / τοῦτ’ ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται καὶ λαλευσ[...].[ / Ἰαστὶ καὶ Δωριστὶ καὶ τὸ σύμμεικτον, 16–18). With the latter charge, the critic attacks what Callimachus has just done in the collection of *Iambi*: 1–5 and 13 are choliambic and largely Ionic; the others mix in various ways iambic meter with Doric or Ionic dialect coloring. These lines confirm, if it needed confirming, that the formal generic markers of meter and dialect have a place in Callimachus’ discrimination of poetic genres.<sup>33</sup>

At line 24, the beginning of the poet’s response to his critics, the tables are turned once again as the speaker begins to chastise those who have been criticizing him. Callimachus begins with the vocative (ὦ λῶστ’) and with it recalls ‘Hipponax’s’ patronizing λῶστε, addressed to the φιλόλογοι in 1.33.<sup>34</sup> If line 25 begins with an imperative, it will recall the very beginning of Hipponax’s attack on the philologists in the first *Iambus* (ἀκούσαθ’).<sup>35</sup> By reshuffling the conventions of occasionality that marked fr. 191 as iambic, here at the end of the collection of *Iambi* Callimachus transfers the generic entitlement of the archaic blame–poet to himself.

That the Diegesis takes Callimachus’ defense to be a response to the specific charge of πολυείδεια seems straightforward enough, and yet the term has suggested various interpretations. For example, Clayman understands πολυείδεια to refer to Callimachus’ mixture of disparate formal and thematic

<sup>33</sup>Cf. also lines 30–3, where Callimachus refers to the elegiac and hexameter meters.

<sup>34</sup>At Plato, *Gorgias* 467b Socrates uses the address with the same aloofness from the reproach just levelled at him.

<sup>35</sup>ἀκου...Lobel conjectured ἄκουσον, which Pfeiffer rejects as incompatible with the traces. 25–26 may repeat *Iamb.* 1.87 ff.; cf. Dawson, 124.

material within the *Iambi* (48). But when in verse 41 Callimachus asks what law there is (τεθμός) that says, “You must write elegy, you epic, or that you were allotted by the gods tragedy?” ( ὁ τεθμός οὗτος[ / ]υ[.]ν κα...ε.[ / ]οὐχὶ μοῦνον ἐξ.[ / ο]υς τραγῳδοὺς ἀλλὰ κα[.....].ν / π]εντάμετρον οὐχ ἄπαξ.[.έ]κρουσε...) and then introduces Ion of Chios as a precedent for his own practice, we may wonder if the issue is not more complex. A poet who composed in any number of genres, Ion produced a corpus that Callimachus approvingly characterizes as ἐντελής and τετ[ρ]άγωνον (48–9).<sup>36</sup> Why would Callimachus call such a mixed body of work ‘perfect’ and ‘foursquare,’ adjectives that were commonly used to describe moral rather than aesthetic qualities?<sup>37</sup> For that matter, why should Callimachus want to highlight the occasionality of the iambic genre? To answer these questions, we need to identify more precisely the challenge to which Callimachus purports to be responding.

In Plato’s *Ion* Socrates leads a self-confident rhapsode to understand that his success in reciting or discussing Homer comes from divine inspiration rather than skill (τέχνη). After Ion admits that he is proficient only in discussing Homer, Socrates explains that this is proof that his ability comes from inspiration rather than skill: if it came from skill, he would be able to discuss or recite any poet, and not just Homer (*Ion* 533c–534e). That the same restrictions would hold true for poets is a point which has important consequences for genre:

ἅτε οὖν οὐ τέχνη ποιοῦντες καὶ πολλὰ λέγοντες καὶ καλὰ περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, ὥσπερ σὺ περὶ Ὀμήρου, ἀλλὰ θεῖα μοῖρα, τοῦτο μόνον οἷός τε ἕκαστος ποιεῖν καλῶς, ἐφ’ ὃ ἡ Μοῦσα αὐτὸν ὥρμησεν ὁ μὲν διθυράμβους, ὁ δὲ ἐγκώμια, ὁ δὲ ὑπορχήματα, ὁ δ’ ἔπη, ὁ δ’ ἰάμβους· τὰ δ’ ἄλλα φαῦλος αὐτῶν ἕκαστος ἐστίν. οὐ γὰρ τέχνη ταῦτα λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ θεῖα δυνάμει, ἐπεὶ, εἰ περὶ ἐνὸς τέχνη καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν, κἂν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων.

So, because it is not art but divine dispensation that enables them to compose poetry and say many fine things about the world, as you do about Homer, every individual poet can only compose well what the Muse has set him to do—one dithyrambs, one encomia, one hyporchemata, one epic, one iambs. They are no good at anything else. This is because their utterances are the result not of art but of divine force. If they could utter on any one theme by art (τέχνη), they would also be able to do so on every other. (534c, trans. Russell)

<sup>36</sup>The Platonic coloring of the passage may make Lobel’s proposal of the latter term more likely.

<sup>37</sup>τετ[ρ]άγωνον, for example, recalls Simonides’ description of a man of civic virtue (fr. 4.3 D): τετράγωνον, ἀνευ νόγου τετυγμένον. Cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*

What worries Socrates is that poets, as mindless servants of the Muses and Apollo, will convey the irrationality of their divine possession to their audience. What is interesting for our purposes is what Socrates implies here about the—strictly hypothetical—poets who possesses τέχνη: “εἰ περὶ ἐνος τέχνῃ καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν, κἂν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων.” This is just what Callimachus claims that he can do and what he claims Ion *of Chios* has done. It is, of course, in the *Aetia* prologue that Callimachus cites τέχνη as the yardstick by which a poet should be judged (fr. 1.17–18). It is also there that Callimachus recalls Socrates’ description of the poet as a κοῦφον...χρήμα ...καὶ πτηνὸν καὶ ἱερόν.<sup>38</sup> The difference is, of course, that for Socrates the ‘light and winged’ poet is out of his mind; for Callimachus he is possessed of τέχνη. It is likely that Callimachus published the first two books of the *Aetia*, prefaced by the famous prologue, shortly before he published the *Iambi*.<sup>39</sup> The critical implications of the term would have been fresh in the minds of this poem’s audience.

In the last extant lines of the thirteenth *Iambus*, Callimachus repeats the critics’ language of 11–14 and ironically appropriates their first charge: αἰίδω / οὔτ’ Ἐφεσον ἐλθὼν οὔτ’ Ἴωσι συμμείξας, / Ἐφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες / τὰ χολὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται (“I do sing, neither having visited Ephesus nor mixed with the Ionians”). Line 64 combines, at the regular fifth position caesura, lines 11 and 12; lines 65–6 repeat verbatim lines 13–14. This is a defiant assertion, but of what? In the first *Iambus* Hipponax was introduced as a speaker with the entitlement to utter an iambus. In 13 the contemporary blame poet, imitating the context in which the iambic genre can occur, now speaks *in propria persona*. It is this learned (μὴ ἀμαθῶς, 14, repeated in 66) literary recreation of a performative context, and not only the combination of strictly formal elements, that allows Callimachus to confute his critics and to declare in the last extant lines of the poem that he is “singing iambi.” The challenge to the contemporary poet, who, as Callimachus implies, cannot possess the culture-specific authority to compose in traditional genres, is to possess sufficient τέχνη to recreate, self-consciously and fictionally, the conditions for their utterance.

<sup>38</sup>Ion 534b. Cf. Call. fr. 1.32: ἐγὼ δ’ εἶην οὐλ[α]χός, ὁ περόεις... Ion 534a–b, a comparison of inspired poets to bees culling their songs ἀπὸ κηρῶν μελιρρύτων ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων τινῶν καὶ ναπῶν presages the language Callimachus uses at *Hymn to Apollo* 105 ff. to describe the sort of poetry of which Apollo approves. The same terminology is, of course, to be found in Aristophanes’ characterization of Euripides’ poetry at, e.g. *Ra*. 1388, 892.

<sup>39</sup>See P. Knox, “The Epilogue to the *Aetia*,” *GRBS* 26 (1985) 59–65. A. Cameron develops this view in his forthcoming study of Callimachus’ poetry.

By appealing to the genre's contextualizing conventions, Aristophanes had fashioned an iambus within the broader context of his comedy. Callimachus highlights the invective of the first and thirteenth *Iambi* as an imitation which depends for its meaning on an exemplar, the very irreproducibility of which is emphasized by his use of the 'original article' as a stand-in. But by imitating the definitive components of an occasion-bound genre, these poems draw attention to the contextual difference between themselves and their exemplars. In this highly contextualized model of genre, speakers and audiences of certain kinds are very specifically presupposed, and if they are not literally available to the poet *in propria persona*, they are imitated, tongue-in-cheek to be sure. The nature of the poetic context has, therefore, been fundamentally altered. In these circumstances, why shouldn't anyone who is sufficiently learned and skilled in representing the occasion-bound conditions of historicized genres be able to compose in any genre whatsoever? As Callimachus asks his critics, τίς εἶπεν αὐτ[...]/ σὺ πεντάμετρα συντίθει, σὺ δ' ἡ[ρῶ]ν, / σὺ δὲ τραγῳδεῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκλήρωσας; / δοκέω μὲν οὐδεῖς... (*Iamb.* 13.30–3).

The first and thirteenth *Iambi*, taken together, recreate and update the iambic genre in terms of a performative, occasional typology. As we have seen, the nature of this recreation draws attention to the inherent ambiguity and artificiality involved in what has become a necessary act: labelling. For example, insofar as these two framing poems identify themselves as iambi, they identify the poems they enclose as iambi. And yet only 1–4 are relatively unproblematic instances of the genre. The later *Iambi* deviate more and more from what we or the Alexandrians might consider to be straightforward instances of the genre. Eight, for example, is an epinician composed in a stichic iambic meter; 9–13 experiment even more freely with metrical and thematic possibilities, and if fragments 226–29 formed part of the collection, the traditional boundaries of the genre will have been stretched almost beyond recognition.

It is not only in his *Iambi* that Callimachus imitates the conventions that traditionally tie a poem to its occasion. The function of the first-person narrator in Callimachus' so-called 'mimetic' hymns (2, 5 and 6) has often been attributed to the influence of mime (the mixture model again), to a sincerity of purpose heightened by realism, or to an attempted objectivity.<sup>40</sup> Though no

<sup>40</sup>Cf. e.g. Zanker 22; recently, J. Heath, "The Blessings of Epiphany in Callimachus' Bath of Pallas," *CA* 7 (1988) 90.



one any longer assumes that these are 'real' hymns,<sup>41</sup> surprisingly few critics would deny that they function as real hymns, that is, that their primary aim is to praise the gods whom they address and describe. We are drawn away from such conclusions by seeing the performative realism of Callimachus' mimetic hymns as a signal of his imitation of generic conventions about who can speak, on what occasion, and to what purpose. The φιλόλογοι are right: Callimachus is no more entitled to utter a hymn to Athena than he is to utter an iambus. But as he ironically implies, a 'master of ceremonies' present at the festival of her Plynteria does have the entitlement (*Hymn* 5). In both hymn and epinician, the first person narrator places his utterance in the present, directs it at someone else, whether a god or a victor, and very often actually refers to the occasion or context of his own poetic performance. Callimachus' second, fifth and sixth *Hymns* simulate the context of a hymn's performance and in so doing invite us to read them as hymns. But the occasion-bound conventions that characterize their frames also alert the reader to the text's awareness of its own fundamental artificiality, of its status as a self-conscious imitation of the genre's context. As in the *Iambi*, the genre's function is automatically compromised by the essential textuality (and inter-textuality) of the poet's recreation.

In arguing that Callimachus understands genre in terms of performative contexts, we cannot deny that in his own poetry he also juxtaposes formal elements to produce unexpected effects. But this 'mixing' looks very different when seen against a taxonomic model of genre than when we see it against a performative model. By drawing attention to its simulation of the contextual, occasion-bound conventions of its exemplars, this poetry explicitly acknowledges the loss of the model's original performance context. By adopting a notion of genre in which the context of performance is the decisive criterion, as it traditionally was, the very fact of textuality makes problematic any new poem's claim and ability to *do* what traditional examples of the genre do. It is often argued that one of the central concerns of Hellenistic poetry is the appropriation and updating of tradition, an attempt to make the past relevant to the present and thereby to grant it meaning. If we take an occasion-based notion of genre to be central to this poetry we must admit that it is created out of the effects of the realization that such connections are simply not possible. The awareness that the break between contemporary poetry and its models is entirely unbridgeable and the awareness of the loss of the community-sanctioned occasions that engendered poetic types are the

---

<sup>41</sup>That is, that they were meant to be performed at the ceremonies which they purport to describe. Fraser I (see n. 3) 652 ff., is perhaps alone among recent scholars in assuming that some of the hymns were commissioned by cities for recitation at the festival described.

conditions under which the concept of genre comes into existence—not by way of instantiating traditional kinds, but by imitating them.<sup>42</sup>

### Works Cited

- Bing, P. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Hypomnemata, Heft 90. Göttingen 1988.
- Bulloch, A. W. *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Clayman, D. L. *Callimachus' Iambi*, Mnemosyne Supplementum v. 59. Leiden 1980.
- Dawson, C. M. "The *Iambi* of Callimachus," *YCS* 11 (1950) 23–24.
- Gentili, B. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*, tr. A. T. Cole. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1988.
- Harvey, A. E. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry," *CQ* 5 (1955) 158–61.
- Hutchinson, G. O. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Pfeiffer, R. *History of Classical Scholarship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Rosen, R. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*, American Classical Studies 19. Atlanta 1988.
- West, M. L. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14. Berlin 1974.
- Zanker, G. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience*. Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1987.

---

<sup>42</sup>I gratefully acknowledge the debt this paper owes to the questions and suggestions of P. Bing, R. Ketterer, and *TAPA*'s referees. The acute comments of M. W. Haslam have especially benefitted its argument.