

## **Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo***

Peter Bing  
*Emory University*

Towards the end of the Delian section of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, as the climactic event in his description of the great Ionian festival, the blind singer of Chios presents what he calls “a great wonder, whose fame shall never perish” (μέγα θαῦμα, ὅου κλέος οὔ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται, 156). This “wonder” is the chorus of Delian maidens, who sing hymns to Apollo, Leto and Artemis, followed by songs about “men and women of old.” What is truly wondrous about their performance, however, is their ability “to mimic the voices and sounds of all men. Each man,” claims the poet, “would say that he himself is speaking. So closely fitted [i.e. in its verisimilitude] is their beautiful song” (πάντων δ’ ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ κρεμβαλιαστὸν / μιμῆσθ’ ἴσασιν· φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος / φθέγγεσθ’· οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρηρεν ἀοιδή, 162-164).<sup>1</sup> The Deliades’ simulation is certainly an awe-inspiring feat. How, one might ask, could an individual listener find his voice reflected in the collective voice of the chorus, and a speaking voice, moreover, in a singing voice? Further, how could a multitude of listeners each think that he was speaking when the chorus sang its song?

The relationship between these voices—individual’s and chorus’, spectators’ and performer’s—was, I think, to intrigue Callimachus some two and a half centuries later.<sup>2</sup> The Hellenistic poet certainly recurred to this Homeric Hymn with remarkable insistence, mining it as a source.<sup>3</sup> And the multiplication of voice, with its concomitant effects on the listener—that μέγα θαῦμα, which brought the Deliades undying fame—is as striking a component of

---

<sup>1</sup>The difficulties to interpretation these verses present are notorious. See my appendix below for a discussion.

<sup>2</sup>For the date of the Homeric Hymn, cf. Burkert 59-62 and for Callimachus’ hymn, Williams 2, 36 (*ad* 26).

<sup>3</sup>See, for instance, its influence on Callimachus’ hymns to Artemis and Delos, cf. Bing 1988: ch.3 *passim*; Bing and Uhrmeister, forthcoming.

Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* as it was in its archaic counterpart. Callimachus seems to have taken the traditional monologic speech of hexameter hymn and invested it here with a veritable chorus of voices. In his hands it becomes a nexus of overlapping identities (cf. Winkler 203), whose components cannot easily be disentangled or even held distinct. Perhaps that "μέγα θαῦμα" of the Deliades challenged the poet to produce one of his own, a contemporary equivalent which might likewise secure him undying fame.

With his six hymns, Callimachus was apparently the first poet to make extensive use of the *Homeric Hymns* and to revive them as a genre. He did so, I think, because, first of all, they suited his aesthetic program: they were pleasing in their limited size and lack of epic bombast, yet could be viewed as genuinely "Homeric."<sup>4</sup> Their use as a model would permit Callimachus to turn the Homeric tradition to productive use *without* trying to rival it, for here he would find those aspects that were less known, atypical, unfaded. Hans Herter has aptly called this the desire to be, "in the footsteps of Homer, as un-Homeric as possible" (50=KS371). What is more, Callimachus conspicuously uncoupled the genre from its original task, and in so doing made what I consider a programmatic gesture. For whereas the evidence, both internal and external, suggests that such hymns previously functioned as *prooimia* (or preludes) to epic recitation and were unthinkable apart from epic performance (signalling in fact that the performance would shortly begin),<sup>5</sup> the Hellenistic poet—counter to those expectations—simply dropped the epic sequel as inconsistent with his aesthetic goals and made the hymn stand on its own, a self-contained and independent genre: "as un-Homeric as possible," though still "in the footsteps of Homer." Second, and even more important for the question of voice, these hymns provided the only "Homeric" model which permitted the unmediated involvement of the poet's persona apart from the formulaic first person of the opening and closing of the poem (cf. the blind singer of Chios, *h.Ap.*165ff., and Hesiod in his hymn to the Muses at the start of the *Theogony*).

The possibilities of first person voice in the hexameter hymn were clearly congenial to Callimachus, and his *Hymn to Apollo* puts them to breathtaking, if deliberately provocative, use.<sup>6</sup> The scene in this hymn is a temple-precinct of

<sup>4</sup>Thucydides (3.102) and Pindar (*Pae.* 7b=fr.52h Snell–Maehler) thought the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* genuinely Homeric (cf. Bing 1988: 104–105), and similar hymns were evidently part of the rhapsodic tradition of the Homeridai, who—as their name suggests—situated themselves squarely in the Homeric tradition as if they were his heirs.

<sup>5</sup>On the Homeric Hymns as *prooimia*, cf. Richardson 3–4 and Janko.

<sup>6</sup>On first person role-playing in Greek poetry generally, cf. the pioneering discussion of Dover 206–212.

Apollo; the occasion, a religious festival. But questions at once assail us. Which of the many festivals of Apollo are we to imagine? And where in the world is this temple set? For the time being we are simply left in the dark. The poem begins as follows:

Οἶον ὁ τῶπόλλωνος ἐσεΐσατο δάφνινος ὄρπηξ,  
οἶα δ' ὄλον τὸ μέλαθρον· ἐκάς ἐκάς ὅστις ἀλιτρός.  
καὶ δὴ που τὰ θύρετρα καλῶ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει·  
οὐχ ὀράας; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δῆλιος ἡδὺ τι φοῖνιξ  
ἔξαπίνης, ὃ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἡέρι καλὸν αἰεῖδει. 5  
αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων,  
αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακρὴν·  
οἱ δὲ νέοι μολπὴν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε.

How Apollo's laurel branch is shaking,  
how the whole house is. Away, away, you who are impious.  
Phoebus must now be kicking the doors with his beautiful foot.  
What! Don't you see? All of a sudden the Delian palm tree's nodding  
in joy, in the air the swan's singing sweetly.  
Fly apart yourselves, you bars of the gates,  
you bolts as well. The god is no longer far.  
Begin your singing and dancing, boys.

We are plunged *medias in res*, into an atmosphere of breathless anticipation. No device of third person narration distances us from the event. There is a documentary ("you are there") perspective: a speaker exclaims at the signs of the imminent arrival of the god, and issues orders to those who are present. The breathlessness of his excitement is conveyed by the massed "H" sounds in the first two lines (*hoion ho. . .horpex; hoia d' holon; hekas hekas hostis*). Paradoxically, the Hellenistic shift towards reading, and away from "live" performance as the primary means of encountering literature, actually *heightens* the vividness of the experience. For even as this age put unparalleled emphasis on the *written* aspect of the text (Bing 1988: ch. 1), it simultaneously maintained an appreciative ear for the play of sounds on the page. Consequently, active readers (as opposed to those merely listening) would themselves experience the very symptoms of breathlessness as, to a greater or lesser extent, they reproduced (and relished) those sounds in the act of reading.<sup>7</sup> We see, then,

<sup>7</sup>I do not mean to return to the old view that silent reading did not exist in antiquity. It clearly did, as Knox showed. It is just as clear, however, that reading out loud (whether to oneself or to others) remained entirely normal, even though the poets of the Hellenistic Age stressed the

how right from the start, the audience is unwittingly drawn out of its detached sense of self and into the scene, and how the speaker's voice insinuates itself—physiologically!—into that of the reader. This process, an unobtrusive penetration of the barriers between voices, is all the more astonishing for emanating from an inanimate object, the papyrus roll containing the hymn.<sup>8</sup>

Miraculous signs abound. The laurel shakes; the palm-tree nods; the doors are rattling: οὐχ ὁράας; “What! Don’t you see?” The urgent question is obviously addressed to an unspecified bystander, a fellow celebrant in the ritual (and one who, by his very presence, is clearly *not* ἀλιτρός ‘impious,’ cf. 2). But a reader might well do a double-take at this question, glancing uneasily over his shoulder as though to ask “Who, me?,” for the style of the hymn clearly coaxes the reader into the role of one of the worshippers, into identifying with the ritual community (cf. Koster 19; Albert 66 n. 189). But though the intensity of the voice is almost palpable, and though details of the scene seem to spring to life before our eyes—due, in part, to the extraordinary accumulation of definite articles in this section of the hymn (a conventional sign that something is actually present)<sup>9</sup>—we nonetheless observe that the wondrous happenings are notably generic.<sup>10</sup> The laurel, the palm, the swan, the shaking of the temple and eerie rattling of the doors, the bolts and bars that are to spring open by themselves at the god’s approach—all these are traditional features of temple lore, miracle-stories that will make the scene seem familiar while excluding no one with all-too-specific details. And who is the speaker? Indications are remarkably vague. Nevertheless, the imperatives in line 2, 6 and 8 suggest, I think, a person in a position of authority (one who could order the bars and bolts to fly apart themselves!). Perhaps, as in Hymns 5 and 6, we are meant to think of someone officiating: a master of ceremonies or priest perhaps (cf. Koster 18ff.).

With the following lines, the speaker introduces a new and important distinction within the ritual community:

---

purely visual aspects of the text as never before and elevated the book to the status of “literary theme.” On the general impact of reading aloud in Greek culture, cf. Svenbro.

<sup>8</sup>We will see below (p. 9) how another voice, too, that of the chorus, insinuates itself into that of the reader.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Svensson 60–63 with Williams *ad* 7, 28, 32. For this and other means of conveying the vividness of the experience, cf. Harder 389.

<sup>10</sup>Seeck 201ff. draws a similar contrast between intensely realistic details and what is generic in Theoc. 7.

ὁπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαίνεται, ἀλλ' ὅτις ἐσθλός·  
 ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὗτος, ὃς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκείνος. 10  
 ὁψόμεθ', ὦ Ἐκάεργε, καὶ ἐσσόμεθ' οὔποτε λιτοί.

Apollo doesn't appear to all, but only the noble;  
 he who sees him is great, he who hasn't seen, poor.  
 O god who works from afar, we will see you and we will never be poor.

As we recall, the impious had already been warned to keep away (2). But even among those remaining, i.e., even among the pious, not all will see Apollo. Those so favored are the *élite*.<sup>11</sup> And the prospect of such favor raises the speaker's feelings to such a pitch that it prompts, at verse 11, his first direct address of the god (ὦ Ἐκάεργε) as well as the first instance of first person speech. Significantly perhaps, it is first person *plural*. Who is the speaker including thereby? Surely, after the startling οὐχ ὁράας; ("What! Don't you see?") of verse four, we are justified in suspecting that this is not just the conventional poetic plural: *we* may be meant. Apollo may appear to *us*.

The speaker's attention now swings back to the chorus of youths. With Apollo at hand, he says, they must not keep silent. And evidently, the youths comply, for the speaker exclaims: "Well done, boys, since the lyre is no longer still" (ἡγασάμην τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπεὶ χέλυσ οὐκέτ' ἀεργός, 16). With music in the air, the worshippers are commanded εὐφημεῖτε, the traditional order for reverent silence during the ritual, here during the performance of the paean, Apollo's song.<sup>12</sup> But at this point we notice a telling detail, one whose full significance has not been grasped: even the sea, notes the speaker, maintains such silence when singers celebrate Apollo's implements, the lyre and the bow (εὐφημεῖ καὶ πόντος, ὅτε κλείουσιν αἰοῖδοι / ἢ κίθαριν ἢ τόξα, Λυκωρέος ἔντεα Φοίβου, 18-19). In his commentary on these lines, Frederick Williams

<sup>11</sup>Unlike the ἐσθλός who sees the god, and so becomes "great" (μέγας), a worshipper who does *not* see Apollo will be "poor" (λιτός), a term denoting ὁ πένης καὶ δημότης, according to the *Et. Magn.*, i.e., here precisely a *commoner* among the celebrants as opposed to one of the elect to whom the god will appear. Being thus "poor," one may not have the distinction within the group of an ἐσθλός, but that is a far cry from being "impious" (ἀλιτρός). The λιτοί can evidently *not* be equated with the ἀλιτροί, who were banished from the scene altogether in 2.

<sup>12</sup>That the "song for Apollo," which the worshippers are to listen to in silence (εὐφημεῖτ' αἶοντες ἐπ' Ἀπόλλωνος αἰοιδῇ), will indeed be a paean is first suggested by the mythical comparison of Thetis in 20-21, who stills her lament for Achilles ὀπρόθ' ἰὴ παιῶν ἰὴ παιῶν ἀκούσῃ, and is confirmed in 25 when the speaker calls for precisely this genre's ritual cry, ἰὴ ἰὴ φθέγγεσθε.

correctly points to the long-standing belief that “the natural world observes ritual silence at the god’s epiphany” (*ad* 18). And that is indeed what was traditionally thought to occur. But Williams misses the crucial point. For here the sea observes silence not for an epiphany in any conventional sense, but for *songs*, for songs *about* the god. That is, the evocation of the god in song is sufficient to produce the effects normally associated with epiphany. Or differently, the song itself apparently realizes that epiphany.

The implications of such a view for the interpretation of this hymn are substantial. It explains, I think, the vivid dramatic pose. For the choice of that pose accentuates the sense that the literary work is itself the sacrament, the hymn itself an epiphany in the process of being accomplished.<sup>13</sup> Consequently, the ritual community will actually embrace the community of readers, and these—or at least the ἐσθλοί—may indeed be able to experience not just a vivid representation, but the epiphany itself: will *we* be among them? The blurring of the lines between the audience *in* the poem and that outside it, then, is not mere play (though it is certainly that as well).

We now hear how the speaker commands the chorus to begin their song. “Sing hie hie,” he tells them (ἰὴ ἰὴ φθέγγεσθε, 25), the ritual cry that served as the paean’s refrain.<sup>14</sup> Such exhortations commonly signal the start of a cult-song.<sup>15</sup> Our expectations, therefore, are primed. Yet with these words, the stage is set for a new ambiguity of voice. There can be no doubt that a choral song occurs in the subsequent course of the hymn,<sup>16</sup> that it probably begins soon after the speaker’s command, and that it is evidently still in progress over

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Depew 328-329, who perceptively discusses Callimachus’ simulation of performative context in his Iambi as a function of their “essential textuality” (329).

<sup>14</sup>This may, of course, *also* be addressed to the celebrants at large. It would thus be an exhortation to join in the refrain of a paean which, one must presume, is already in progress or just beginning. The paean as a genre displays fair flexibility in its use of voice: though mainly sung by choruses (male *or* female), it could also be performed solo, and the refrain could be joined by members of the ritual community. Cf. Käppel 80-81.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard on 1.21.1 and Hopkinson on 1: “The opening hortatory imperative to choir or participants is standard in cult-hymns.”

<sup>16</sup>It had already been anticipated in 8 (οἱ δὲ νέοι μολπὴν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε), and 12-13 (μήτε σιωπηλὴν κίθαριν μήτ’ ἄψοφον ἵχνος / τοῦ Φοίβου τοὺς παῖδας ἔχειν ἐπιδημήσαντος). By 16, as we have seen, the instrumental accompaniment, at least, has begun (ἡγασάμην τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπεὶ χέλυς οὐκέτ’ ἀεργός). A sequence of events is thus dramatized, which moves from inactivity to action on the part of the chorus of youths (n.b. that they are praised at 16 because the lyre is *no longer* inactive, οὐκέτ’ ἀεργός). This makes very unlikely Cairns’ assertion that *Hymn 2 as a whole* “is a choric hymn imagined by Callimachus as sung at the Karneia by a chorus of boys or young men,” and that these are instances of “choric self-address and self-fulfilling injunction” (121).

70 lines later at 97, when the speaker says that he hears the refrain (ἢ ἢ παῖ-  
 ῆον ἀκούομεν). But in between these two more or less fixed points—i.e., be-  
 tween the injunction to sing at 25 and the reference to hearing the song at 97—  
 all is uncertainty. There are no introductory or closing formulae to set off  
 reported speech, nothing comparable to quotation marks which could help us  
 distinguish the voices.<sup>17</sup> Still, there is clearly a shift away from the poem's  
 vivid mimetic frame to a more conventional hymnic narrative, and that may  
 well be due to the chorus' song.

Concerning the precise location of this shift, however, there are con-  
 flicting signals. Verses 28-29 seem to suggest that the song is already in prog-  
 ress since we hear that Apollo will honor the chorus because it is singing (n.b.  
 the tense) in a pleasing fashion: τὸν χορὸν ὡπόλλων, ὅ τι οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν  
 αἰεῖδει,/ τιμήσει. With regard to content, however, the shift to the song would  
 seem to occur at line 32, where the god's appearance becomes the theme. Some  
 critics have accordingly settled on this as the start of "the hymn proper."<sup>18</sup>  
 Stylistically, on the other hand, the section is still of a piece with that preceding  
 it. There is still, as there had been from the start, that extraordinary accumu-  
 lation of definite articles—as we recall, a conventional sign for something  
 actually present before one's eyes, and one not characteristic of hymnic style.  
 Perhaps, therefore, we are still in the mimetic frame and the description refers  
 to a *cult-statue* (thus Williams *ad* 32). Other critics have placed the shift at 47,  
 the start of a section concerned with Apollo's various functions in the country  
 and in the city (e.g., Wifstrand 25 n. and Svennson 61). Here, the incidence of  
 the definite article drops precipitously until the clear return of the ritual frame  
 near the end of the poem.<sup>19</sup> Other scholars, such as Malten (45) and Cahen in  
 his Budé edition (221), have located the shift at still other places. And it may

<sup>17</sup>On this Hellenistic affectation, cf. Bing 1988: 76 n. 42; McLennan *ad* 7 and Appendix II, "Direct Speech in the Hymns of Callimachus," 146ff.

<sup>18</sup>Thus Williams 3 and *ad* 32-96. Similarly e.g., Wilamowitz II. 78, 83, 85 and Erbse 422 (= *WdF* 291). Somewhat more differentiated is the view of Albert 68-70. He too sees the start of the "eigentlicher Hymnus" (70) at 32, but would place a shift in speaker at 17, taking 1-16 as the words of the chorus-leader, 17-31 as the "Vorgesang" of the chorus itself, and 32ff. as its hymn. Cf. also Harder 391, who thinks that the voice in 32ff. might be either the speaker's or the chorus' voice, but that "in both cases...it is suggested by 30f. that the contents of the narrative/descriptive part are taken from a large range of existing songs and stories."

<sup>19</sup>From 47-104, Wifstrand calculates three instances in 58 lines. In the fifty-five verses of 1-46 and 105-113, by contrast, he finds no fewer than 33. Cf. Williams *ad* 7.

be that this confusion of critical voices reflects a deliberate ambiguity. We cannot find the seam; perhaps we were never meant to.<sup>20</sup>

We must still determine, however, how to construe the voicing of the verses falling roughly between the command to the chorus at 25 and the return to the frame at 97. Are they (i) the text of the chorus' song, (ii) the speaker's perception of that song, or (iii) simply the discourse of the speaker independent of the chorus?<sup>21</sup> This last possibility is in any case unlikely. For if verses 28-29 suggest that the chorus is already singing (τὸν χορὸν ὠπόλλων, ὃ τι οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν αἰδεῖ, / τιμήσει, see above), the next verses (30-31) invite—though they do not compel—us to view what follows as a reflection of that song, for they promise the chorus' continued celebration of Phoebus, who (we are told) makes a bounteous theme. And since the subsequent sections of the hymn actually go on to celebrate diverse aspects of the god, it appears that this promise is fulfilled.<sup>22</sup> Further, the presence of the refrain ἰὴ ἰὴ Καρνεῖε πολύλλιτε at 80, not filtered through an external source, but simply integrated into the narrative—as indeed it would be in a paean—clearly suggests a link in this part of the poem between the spoken hexameter discourse of the hymn and the chorus' song (*pace* Erbse).

Of the other two possibilities, one must say of the first that, if this is the text of the chorus' song, it is in any case at one remove from its source. For it is translated out of the singing meters conventionally used for the choral paean and into an individual's spoken verse, the form already identified in this poem

---

<sup>20</sup>In connection with the indeterminate nature of the voice, cf. Roland Barthes' description of the "plural text" in *S/Z* (New York 1974) 41: "The more indeterminate the origin of the statement, the more plural the text. In modern texts, the voices are so treated that any reference is possible: the discourse, or better, the language, speaks: nothing more. By contrast, in the classic text the majority of utterances are assigned an origin, we can identify their parentage, who is speaking ...; however, it may happen that in the classic text, always haunted by the appropriation of speech, the voice gets lost, as though it had leaked out through a hole in the discourse."

<sup>21</sup>Wilamowitz II. 78 pinpoints the problem: "man kann nicht anders denken, als dass es das Lied auf Apollon ist, das die Knaben 17 anstimmen wollten. Aber das scheint nicht möglich, denn in diesem Hymnus spricht ja der Dichter aus eigener Person. Da sitzt die Schwierigkeit."

<sup>22</sup>Here again, however, there is ambiguity: the interrogative pronoun τίς in the question τίς ἄν οὐ ῥέα Φοῖβον αἰίδοι; (31), which follows immediately upon the promise of the chorus' continued celebration of Phoebus in 30-31, may refer either to the chorus (the subject of the previous verse: οὐδ' ὁ χορὸς τὸν Φοῖβον ἐφ' ἑν μόνον ἡμαρ αἰείσει), or to a given poet such as—presumably—the speaker of our hymn. In other words, the subsequent sections may be viewed as instantiating either the ease with which the *chorus* can celebrate the god, or that with which an *individual* may do so.



with the voice of the speaker. Consequently, the simplest solution is the second, namely that we have before us the speaker's perception of the choral song.<sup>23</sup>

The melody will, of course, have been lost, as will the dance. But that loss enables the speaker to adopt the choral voice and fit it to his own. And not only to his own. That extended ritual community—each individual, wherever he may be in the inevitable “diaspora” of readership—can, in the private enactment of the poem through reading, experience the same.<sup>24</sup> “Each man,” to quote the Homeric Hymn, “might say that he himself is speaking. So closely fitted is their beautiful song” (163-164). May we suggest that this “fitting” of the choral voice to that of others in Callimachus specifically reflects his interpretation of the verb συνάρηεν ‘closely fitted’ in the phrase οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρηεν ἀοιδή at 164 of the Homeric Hymn?<sup>25</sup> The “great wonder” of the Delian Maidens is perhaps the more wondrous here for no longer being limited to those actually present at the performance on Delos. Perhaps Callimachus has capped his model by exploiting the unparalleled possibilities of dissemination inherent in the *written* text as opposed to traditional “live” performance.

It is the written form of the hymn that blurs the line between the voices in the poem and those of its audience. And it may be worth stressing here that it is also the written aspect of the poem that, as I am sure Callimachus was aware, occasions many of the ambiguities of voice with which we have been dealing

<sup>23</sup>Thus already Wilamowitz II. 79, followed by Erbse 422 (=WdF 291). A similar interpretation is proposed in an as yet unpublished paper entitled “Contrepoints de Callimaque” by Professor André Hurst of the University of Geneva.

<sup>24</sup>Speaking the poem out loud or to themselves, readers will tend to identify their voices to some extent with those within the text. Compared with earlier times, of course, the relatively greater prominence of silent, more purely visual, reading in the Hellenistic period offered readers greater latitude in deciding their *degree* of involvement with a text. For in their silence they might initially approach a text quite casually and non-committally: just trying its perspective on for size, while actually still withholding identification. In the more oral cultures of Archaic and Classical periods, by contrast, one may well speak, with Svenbro, of the reading voice having “to submit to the written word...” and of “a reader dispossessed of his own voice...” a reader who “in these circumstances...has but one means of resistance: he can refuse to read” (47).

<sup>25</sup>Another striking instance of Callimachus' elaboration of a brief (and difficult) passage from a Homeric Hymn into a major element in one of his own occurs in his *Hymn to Demeter*. In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, the goddess promises to care for Demophoon and keep him from harm: “For I know an antidote far stronger than the wood-cutter” (οἶδα γὰρ ἀντίτομον μέγα φέρτερον ὕλοτόμοιο, 229). I think that this baffling “woodcutter” (ὕλοτόμος), whose precise meaning is far from clear (cf. Richardson *ad* 228 and 229), intrigued Callimachus and influenced his shaping of the myth of the impious wood-cutter Erysichthon and his terrible punishment at the hands of Demeter. The same conclusion has been reached independently by Michael Haslam, “Callimachus' Hymns,” forthcoming in *Hellenistica Groningana* I (1993).



ὄππολλον, πολλοί σε Βοηδρόμιον καλέουσι,  
 πολλοὶ δὲ Κλάριον, πάντα δέ τοι οὔνομα πολὺ·  
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Καρνείον· ἐμοὶ πατρώιον οὔτω.

70

It was Phoebus, too, who told Battus of my fertile city,  
 and, as a raven, he led the people when they journeyed to Libya,  
 a favorable sign for the founder, and he swore he'd give walls  
 to our kings; and Apollo always keeps his word.  
 Oh Apollo, many men call you Boedromios,  
 many men Klarios; in every place you have many names.  
 But I call you Karneios, since that is the way of my ancestors.

After the striking lack of personal and geographical detail in the opening sections of the hymn, we are now confronted with two important particulars. First of all, it would seem that we may now plausibly locate the dramatic setting of the hymn in Cyrene.<sup>28</sup> Secondly, the voice suddenly reveals itself as being from Cyrene. But whose voice is it? Students of Greek lyric will point out that the use of the first person singular in no way prevents it from being the collective voice of the chorus (which, we recall, is just in the midst of its performance). Another possibility will of course be that it is the speaker's, but the speaker's identity itself acquires an added twist with the information about Cyrene. Callimachus was from Cyrene (*Ep.* 21 Pf.=29 G-P) and, what is more, he was a descendant of Battus, the city's founder mentioned at the start of the passage above (*Ep.* 35 Pf.=30 G-P).<sup>29</sup> Since this whole Cyrenaean section from 65 to 96 also concludes with the statement that the descendants of Battus honor no god more than Apollo (οὐδὲ μὲν αὐτοὶ / Βαττιάδαι Φοῖβοιο πλέον θεὸν ἄλλον ἔτισαν, 95-96), we may wonder—as a third-century B.C. audience certainly would have—whether these references are deliberately meant to tantalize; whether they are, in fact, biographical clues.<sup>30</sup> Though the hymn

<sup>28</sup>A passing reference at 15 to walls on ancient foundations visible at the site of the ritual (τὸ τεῖχος ἐπ' ἄρχαίοισι θεμέθλοις) had already suggested that the location was a city. Now the specific reference to Apollo's promise of walls to the Cyrenaean kings (ᾧμοσε τείχεα δώσειν / ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν, 67-68), as well as the Cyrenaean focus of the entire section from 65-96, strongly suggest that location. The god's role here in construction is productively analyzed by Calame, esp. the section "New semantic directions." Calame sees this theme as a leitmotif of the narrative section of the hymn, which proceeds from the "unconstructed space" of "pre-civilized nomadic life" in the Admetus episode (47-54), to the Delian Keraton, "the first civilized structure on a virgin territory" (55-64), to the construction of the city of Cyrene itself (65ff.).

<sup>29</sup>The "l'abità" between the voices of speaker, chorus, and poet has been well described by Falivene, esp. 116-117. Cf. also Calame.

<sup>30</sup>In this light, it is possible to read the reference to 'our kings' ἡμετέροις βασιλεῦσιν at 68 as meaning 'the kings of our family' (thus Williams *ad loc.*). The "lives" of the Greek poets

stubbornly resists an answer, we are impelled to ask what the relationship is between the first person voice and the poet? To what extent, if at all, has Callimachus been speaking all this time? And if there are now hints of an identification of sorts, of a retreat into the pose of “author,” what then are *we*, who had been coaxed into adopting the role of celebrants, in part because there had previously been no local or personal detail to exclude us? Perhaps . . . we are readers.

But then, without preparation or explanation, comes the ending:

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὐατα λάθριος εἶπεν· 105  
 οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν αἰοδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος αἰεῖδει.  
 τὸν Φθόνον Ἀπόλλων ποδὶ τ' ἤλασεν ὥδέ τ' εἶπεν·  
 Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ  
 λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει.  
 Διοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι, 110  
 ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει  
 πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.  
 χαῖρε, ἄναξ· ὁ δὲ Μῶμος, ἔνν' ὁ Φθόνος, ἐνθα νέοιτο.

Envy speaks furtively into Apollo's ear:  
 I don't like that poet who does not even sing as much as the sea.  
 Apollo drives Envy away with a kick and speaks as follows:  
 Great is the stream of the Assyrian river, but much  
 sludge of the earth and much rubbish it drags along on its waters.  
 The bees don't bring water to Deo from everywhere,  
 but that which gurgles up pure and unsullied  
 from the sacred spring, the tiny spray, the finest blossom.  
 Farewell, lord. And may Blame go to the same place as Envy.

It appears that an epiphany has occurred before us after all. And what does Apollo do when he appears? He takes, to our surprise, a stand on poetry. Responding to Envy's complaint that the hymn isn't long enough, he counters first with a vigorous kick, then with a pair of metaphors which illustrate the Callimachean ideal of the diminutive art-work: though lacking in size, perhaps,

---

became, in this period, the subject-matter not only of scholarly biography, but of poetry as well. For a discussion of some of the material, Bing 1993. Cf. also e.g., Callimachus' fr. 64 (the tomb of Simonides), Sotades 15 (on the deaths of great poets, p. 243 Powell), Hermesianax (on the beloveds of great poets, p. 98 Powell), Euphorion's "Hesiod" (fr. 22, 22b, p. 34 Powell), and the great wealth of biographical material in the epigrams collected by Gabathuler. Helmuth Krasser of the University of Tübingen has written a dissertation on "Dichterbiographie" as literary theme.

it avoids the usual trash associated with longer forms such as epic (Homer excluded, of course). For Callimachean poetry is not just small, it is pure.

In this epiphany, the play of voice that has spanned the poem seems to crystalize, even as the cultic and purely literary aspects merge. True to the speaker's fervent certainty at the start (11), we have seen Apollo and proven ourselves ἐσθλοί. Or *some* of us have, at least. For each reader must appraise his own experience of the poem and decide whether he may now answer "Yes" to that question οὐχ ὀράας; The verbs εἶπεν (105), ἤλασεν and ἔειπεν (107) permit us either response. If the poem's agitated "you are there" immediacy appeals to us, if the speaker's breathless excitement at Apollo's imminent arrival has swept us along, we may construe the forms as "instantaneous" aorists; the speaker is describing what has just that moment taken place before his eyes,<sup>31</sup> and, within the hymn's dramatic frame, what has taken place before our own as well. We see the god. Alternatively, if our imaginative involvement does not go that far, we construe them with greater detachment as "historical" aorists.<sup>32</sup> The text studiously avoids privileging the one or the other reading.<sup>33</sup> That "poetics of exclusion," as Karen Bassi has called it, which is applied with such force when the speaker bars the impious and Apollo expels Envy, turns out in our case at least to be self-selecting: whether we see the god or not *depends on us*.<sup>34</sup>

And if we *do* see the god, do we then belong to a *religious* or a *literary* élite? Our dual role as celebrants and readers, that of the speaker as cultic supervisor and author, arise from this uncertainty. For, as we saw, the evocation of the god in song was sufficient to produce the effects normally associated with epiphany; the religious encounter has been identified with the literary

<sup>31</sup>As, for example, in the aorists ἐσείσατο (1), ἐπένευσεν (4), and ἡγασάμην (16). Thus Williams *ad* 105 (εἶπεν), following Erbse 423 (=WdF 293).

<sup>32</sup>Thus Wilamowitz II 86, Koster 17ff., Albert 72 n. 211. In the same direction, Hunter acknowledges that the hymn seeks "to 'envision' narrative through a powerful mode of *enargeia*," but to the question οὐχ ὀράας; he feels "we are compelled to answer 'well, no'" (12-13).

<sup>33</sup>Likewise, although for the first time in the hymn there are conventional formulae introducing direct speech in the here and now (105, 107; the formula introducing the speech at 102 is different in as much as it is part of an *aition* dealing with an event in the distant past: Apollo's slaughter of the Python dragon), all indication of space is conspicuously absent. Envy (as so often) appears out of nowhere, as does Apollo. Nor do we know precisely where to imagine them in relation to the speaker or other celebrants. On both counts, however, I think that this lack of certainty can be taken as contributing to the mystery and force of the apparition.

<sup>34</sup>Callimachus plays with the possibilities of varying degrees of readerly involvement elsewhere in his works as well. For a discussion of this topic cf. P. Bing, "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus," (forthcoming).

encounter. But that would be only natural at a time when the *written* word assumed primacy in the experience of verse. With performance no longer a given, the performative setting, as well as all its attendant voices, could be collapsed into the confines of a microcosm: the book-roll. Perhaps it was the sound, at once perplexing and alluring, of so many previously discrete voices condensed within that space that prompted the skillful polyphonal play which we have seen in Callimachus. And it may be, as I have suggested, that the seeds of such play were discovered by the poet in the scholar's encounter with earlier poems as written texts, remote from their original site in performance.

I think we may assume that the deft use of narrative pluralism and equivocation would have been appreciated in Callimachus' working environment, that is among those in or near the ruling circles of the Ptolemaic court. Here, too, communicative acts must have been closely scrutinized as to the identity, reliability and self-awareness of the narrative voice. And the Ptolemies themselves, we may recall, adopted a plural stance in using two quite distinct voices to address their subjects: on the one hand, that of traditional Egyptian pharaohs in dealing with the native majority; among compatriots, on the other hand, that of Hellenic monarchs for whom the language of sovereign authority was impeccably Greek. In this century, scholars have debated the relationship of these voices with a passion.<sup>35</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

#### APPENDIX: THE SONG OF THE DELIAN MAIDENS

I have translated 162-164 of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo as follows: "they know how to mimic the voices and sounds of all men. Each man would say that he himself is speaking. So closely fitted [i.e. in its verisimilitude] is their beautiful song" (πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ κρεμβαλιαστὴν / μιμείσθ' ἴσασιν· φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος / φθέγγεσθ'· οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συν-ἄρην ἀοιδή, 162-164). It will be clear from this translation that I take the accomplishment of the Deliades *not* to be merely "that of singing in dialect," as Allen, Halliday & Sikes thought, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford 1936<sup>2</sup>) ad 163, and their view has been accepted by many recent critics, cf. F. de Martino, *AeR* n.s. 26 (1981) 41; S. West, in A. Heubeck, S. West, J. B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, vol. 1. Introduction and Books i-viii* (Ox-

---

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Bagnall 21-27 with bibliography and Zanker 91-99.

ford 1988) *ad Od.*4.279; A. M. Miller, *From Delos to Delphi. A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Leiden 1986) 59-60 with n. 147; B. Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore 1988) 51. Though by the time of Aeschylus φωνή *could* have this meaning, earlier instances are dubious at best. Cf. A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus Choephoroi* (Oxford 1986) *ad* 563-4 and G. O. Hutchinson, *Aeschylus Septem contra Thebas* (Oxford 1985) *ad* 170.

The linguistic milieu is, in fact, quite limited. The festival is explicitly *Ionian* (147); so too the individual listeners who, upon hearing the chorus, would say that they themselves were speaking. Their dialect, therefore, is broadly speaking identical, that is to say Ionic. And similarly, the claim to imitate πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνάς, though ostensibly sweeping, will come from an *Ionian* perspective and apply to *Ionians*: we too speak of the "World Champion" Toronto Blue Jays, though fully aware that this excludes the Yokohama Giants (not to mention the Havana All-Stars). This as opposed to G. Thalmann, *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore 1984) 208 n. 107, who entertains the possibility that "lines 162-64. . . imply an international gathering on Delos," and J. S. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns* (Princeton 1989) 50 n. 102, who asserts that "the festival described in the poem is a *Panhellenic* institution" (*italics mine*). Conversely, Gentili imagines the Deliades' song "as an imitation 'of the unintelligible tongues of men'—that is, as an artistic recreation of the voices and dialects of *others* before a *foreign* public, the assembly of Ionians" (*italics mine*). But if that was so, how would members of an Ionian audience think that they themselves were speaking? Did they all suddenly believe they had become fluent in unfamiliar languages or dialects? Is it, therefore, merely a question of the Deliades mastering various shades of *Ionic* dialect, so that each member of the audience would recognize his local patois? What, one might ask, would be so wondrous about that?

In order not simply to rationalize the "great wonder" in this way—and so, trivialize it—I think we must accept some sort of prodigy like that described in the fourth book of the *Odyssey* (278ff., cf. S. West). There, at a banquet for Telemachus, Menelaus tells how, in an effort to make the Greeks betray themselves, Helen called to the men within the Trojan horse by name, treacherously tempting each one of them by mimicking the voices of their various wives: ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους, / πάντων Ἀργείων φωνὴν ἴσκουσ' ἀλόχοισιν. Typically, the ancient commentaries (or scholia) react incredulously: "How did she know them all," they ask, "when she

imitates their voices? The imitation of the voices is utterly ridiculous and impossible. And how could the men believe that their wives were there?" (πόθεν γὰρ ὅλας ἤδει, ἵνα καὶ τὰς φωνὰς αὐτῶν μιμήσεται; πάνυ δὲ γελοῖος ἡ τῶν φωνῶν μίμησις καὶ ἀδύνατος. πῶς δ' ἂν ἐπίστευον, ὅτι πάρεσιν αὐτῶν αἱ γυναῖκες;) Yet it is precisely characteristic of the miraculous that it strains belief. And so with the Homeric Hymn, we should not dilute the μέγα θαῦμα just to make it more easily believable.

Incidentally, the meaning of the *hapax* κρεμβαλιαστύν is obscure. Κρέμβαλα are castanets (cf. Athen. 3.2, 2.137.7, cf. *PMG* 955), κρεμβαλίζω is to make a clacking sound with castanets. Accordingly, *LSJ* render κρεμβαλιαστύν as 'rattling with castanets, to give the time in dancing.' But this makes little sense with what immediately follows: φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος / φθέγγεσθ'. It is worth noting that κρόταλον (from κρόταλα 'castanets') and related terms could be used metaphorically of persons in the sense of 'rattler' or 'chatterer' (cf. R. Seaford, *Euripides Cyclops* [Oxford 1984] *ad* 104). And it may be that κρεμβαλιαστύν can bear a metaphorical interpretation as well, in which case it will mean 'chatter' (I very much doubt M. Lefkowitz' suggestion, 1985: 49, that it could mean 'humming an accompaniment'). The variant reading, βαμβαλιαστύν, likewise a *hapax*, would amount to much the same thing, as it comes from βαμβαίνω, to chatter with the teeth (*Il.*10.375), or simply to stammer (cf. Bion IX 9 Gow). On abstract nouns in -τύς, cf. Kühner-Blass II 272 #28.



## Works Cited

- Albert, W. 1988. *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike*. Frankfurt.
- Bagnall, R. S. 1988. "Greeks and Egyptians: Ethnicity, Status and Culture" in *Cleopatra's Egypt. Age of the Ptolemies, Catalogue of an Exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum 10/7/88-1/2/89*. Mainz.
- Bassi, K. 1989. "The Poetics of Exclusion in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*." *TAPA* 119: 219-231.
- Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. "The Bios and Poets' Lives as a Theme of Hellenistic Poetry" in *Nomodeiktēs, Festschr. M. Ostwald*, edd. R. Rosen & J. Farrell. Michigan. 619-631.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and V. Uhrmeister. 1994. "The Unity of Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*." *JHS* 114: forthcoming.
- Bremer, J. M. 1990. "Pindar's paradoxical ἐγώ and a recent controversy about the performance of his Epinicia" in *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric*, ed. S.R. Slings Amsterdam. 41-58.
- Burkert, W. 1979. "Kynaithos, Polycrates and the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo*" in *Arktouros, Festschr. B. M.W. Knox*. New York 1979. 59-62.
- Burnett, A. P. 1989. "Performing Pindar's odes." *CP* 84: 283-294.
- Cairns, F. 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.
- Calame, C. 1993. "Legendary Narration and Poetic Procedure in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*" in *Hellenistica Groningana I: Callimachus*, ed. M. A. Harder. Groningen. forthcoming.
- Carey, C. 1989. "The Performance of the Victory Ode." *AJPh* 110: 545-566.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. "The Victory Ode in Performance." *CP* 86: 192-200.
- Depew, M. 1992. "ἱαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν: Genre, Occasion, and Imitation in Callimachus, fr.191 and 203 Pf." *TAPA* 122: 313-330.
- Dover, K. J. 1964. "The Poetry of Archilochos" in *Archiloque*. Entretiens X Fond. Hardt. Geneva. 206-212.
- Erbse, H. 1955. "Zum Apollonhymnos des Kallimachos." *Hermes* 83: 411-428.
- Falivene, M. R. 1990. "La mimesi in Callimaco: Inni II, IV, V e VI." *QUCC* NS 36.3: 103-128.
- Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. Basel.
- Harder, M. A. 1992. "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus." *CQ* 42: 384-394.
- Heath, M. 1988. "Receiving the κῶμος." *AJPh* 109: 180-95.
- Herington, C. J. 1985. *Poetry into Drama*. Berkeley.
- Herter, H. 1929. "Kallimachos und Homer" in *Xenia Bonnensia. Festschrift zum 75jährigen Bestehen des Philologischen Vereins und Bonner Kreises*. Bonn. 50-105=Kleine Schriften. Munich 1975. 371-416.
- Hopkinson, N. 1984. *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. 1992. "Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus, *Hymn to Athena*." *Mat. e disc. per l' anal. d. testi classici* 29: 9-34.
- Janko, R. 1981. "The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre." *Hermes* 109: 9-24.
- Käppel, L. 1992. *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*. Berlin.
- Knox, B. M.W. 1968. "Silent Reading in Antiquity." *GRBS* 9: 421-435.
- Koster, S. 1983. "Kallimachos als Apollonpriester" in *Tessera. Sechs Beiträge zur Poesie und poetischen Theorie der Antike*. Erlangen. 9-21.

- Lefkowitz, M. 1985. "Pindar's *Pythian V*" in *Pindare*. Entretiens XXXI Fond. Hardt. Geneva. 33-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. "Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?" *AJP* 109: 1-12.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and M. Heath. 1991. "Epinician Performance." *CP* 86: 173-191.
- Malten, L. 1911. *Kyrene*. Berlin.
- McLennan, G. R. 1977. *Callimachus*. Hymn to Zeus. Rome.
- Nisbet, R. and M. Hubbard 1970. *A Commentary on Horace Odes* 1. Oxford.
- Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford 1974.
- Seeck, G. A. 1975. "Dichterische Technik in Theokrits 'Thalysien' und die Theorie der Hirtendichtung" in *ΔΩΦΗΜΑ*, Hans Diller z. 70. Geburtstag. Athens 1975. 195-209.
- Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia. An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca.
- Svennson, A. 1937. *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik*. Lund.
- Wifstrand, A. 1933. *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos*. Lund.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 vol. Berlin.
- Williams, F. 1978. *Callimachus*. Hymn to Apollo. Oxford.
- Winkler, J. J. 1985. *Auctor & Actor*. Berkeley.
- Zanker, G. 1989. "Current Trends in the Study of Hellenic Myth in Early Third-Century Alexandrian Poetry: The Case of Theocritus." *A&A* 35: 83-103.