CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

HYMNS OF CALLIMACHUS.

By

GEORGE ROBERT McLENNAN, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

May, 1970.

MASTER OF ARTS (1970)
(Classics)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE : Critical Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus.

AUTHOR : George Robert McLennan, M.A. (St. Andrews)

SUPERVISOR : Dr. P. Kingston.

NUMBER OF PAGES : vii, 90.

SCOPE AND CONTENTS : This thesis examines the structure and contents of the Hymns of Callimachus in comparison with earlier hymns and in the light of influence from other genres of Greek literature.

Acknowledgements.

I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to Dr. P. Kingston for his assistance and encouragement in supervising this thesis. My thanks are also due to Dr. D.C.C. Young and Professor H.F. Guite for reading the thesis in manuscript and contributing valuable suggestions, and, in the case of the latter, helping with the final stages of writing.

G. R. McLennan.

Note.

The text of Callimachus used for this thesis is that of R. Pfeiffer, Callimachus, Oxford, Clarendon Press ; vol. I, Fragmenta, 1949, vol. II, Hymni et Epigrammata, 1953. For other ancient authors quoted the latest Oxford Classical Text has been used, except in the case of Hesiod, Herondas, Longinus and Cato, for whom the latest Teubner text has been used. Periodicals have generally been cited in full, but standard abbreviations have occasionally been used and can be checked in Marouzeau, L'Année Philologique.

Addenda.

Page 51, note 1 : this explanation of arsis and thesis refers to dactylic metre.

Page 54, line 2 : the digamma is mentioned by Trypho at Pass. 11, and referred to by Dionysius of Halicarnassus at I, 20.

Page 55, line 12 : it is not certain, however, that Apollonius has chronological precedence in this case.

Page 67, line 14 : good examples of Catullus' adherence to the Greek are found at lines 44, 47-8, 51-4 and 75-6, which resemble Callimachus, fr.110, lines 44, 47-8, 51-4, and 75-6 respectively.

INTRODUCTION.

This thesis attempts to determine the importance of the Hymns of Callimachus in Greek literature by considering them from several viewpoints. Callimachus wrote during the first half of the third century B.C., at a time when traditional religion was still considered an important stimulus to serious literature ; hence the Hymns concern the same Olympians who had presided over Greek literature for centuries. Callimachus, then, builds from a traditional base. In this thesis we shall see how he brought fresh interest to his theme by incorporating ideas from other sources, both contemporary and earlier. It is also possible to see the influence of elements from other parts of the Callimachean corpus ; the most important in this respect are his Epigrams, of which some sixty survive, his Aitia, an aetiological poem in four books of elegiacs, and his Iambics, of which thirteen survive more or less intact. Callimachus' attitude to his literary heritage can be seen from his famous phrase ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω (fr. 612). In this thesis we shall observe his advance from this standpoint.

Chapter One examines the influences of other genres of literature upon the Hymns. The role of tragedy is considered, and a possible Callimachean involvement is discussed. Two genres of literature which may be said to have reached their peak in the Hellenistic era are the epigram and the mime ; both are examined in relation to the Hymns.

Chapter Two deals with a comparison between the Homeric Hymns and the Hymns of Callimachus. The former provides a convenient title for the numerous hexameter hymns which were written in the pre-classical, classical and even Hellenistic ages. It will be seen that Callimachus has expanded the rather rigid framework of the Homeric hymn to include new elements ; he has also occasionally excluded earlier features. The results which Callimachus achieved were themselves adopted and adapted later in Latin literature.

Chapter Three is of more varied content. Metre and prosody are considered in relation to the Homeric background. A possible element of the evolution of the hexameter is discussed, and several phrases from the Hymns are examined which suggest that Callimachus was recalling this original element.[1] Dating the Hymns upon subjective grounds has been avoided, but an attempt is made to find a pattern of development with regard to Callimachus' use of certain metrical features. The influence of other aspects of Callimachus' style upon Catullus is also glanced at. Structural effects are then dealt with, and the arrangement of words within the hexameter is considered both in respect to earlier literature and to later Latin literature. The frequent use of anaphora is discussed, followed by an examination, in the fifth hymn, of a possible Callimachean re-modelling of the traditional Homeric epithet. Callimachus' use

---

[1]For further evidence of Callimachus' interest in gnomic sayings v. M.L.West, C.R., XIX, 2 (N.S.), June, 1969, p.142.

of two features common to early epic, the simile and tmesis, is examined. The chapter ends with a mention of alliteration, rhyme and other verbal points.

The fourth chapter consists of a brief conclusion which attempts to synthesise the various elements of the thesis in order to obtain a general picture of the poet and his work.

CHAPTER I

INFLUENCES OF OTHER GENRES.

The scholars of Alexandria, who were often creative literary figures, were renowned for their learning and range of knowledge. Callimachus, who practised both professions, was almost certainly the most famous scholar-poet of antiquity. During his lifetime he may be presumed to have read most of the Greek literature written up to that time, and if he were to catalogue such works correctly, he would require considerable powers of criticism.[1] This background will help us to understand the nature of the Hymns ; and we shall see how Callimachus made use of it to solve the problems which faced him.

The main problem was this : How was a third century poet to write something of originality and interest in a genre which had been exploited for centuries, elements of which enjoyed the fame of the divine bard Homer, and his age ? This chapter seeks to provide part of the answer. Callimachus seems to have exploited the possibilities of the hymn, to have led it in new directions, and to have bestowed a series of life-giving transfusions from other genres. His learning, his knowledge of earlier as well as contemporary literature thus becomes of great importance.

---

[1]He did not please all with his classification of a paean of Bacchylides, and the orator Prodicus, v. Pfeiffer, A History of Classical Scholarship, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968, pp. 130-31.

With the quest for novelty and originality came also that of variety. The variety of style and form in the six hymns cannot fail to impress the reader. Callimachus was probably making use of the different kinds of hymns known in antiquity - religious hymns, processional hymns, symposial hymns, etc..[1] These were written in a variety of metres by authors such as Eumelos, Terpander, Alcaeus, Alcman and Pindar.[2] There were also hymnal elements in carmina popularia as well as in the classical tragedians. This diversity must surely have become an asset to Callimachus.

Bearing in mind the reciprocal nature of Alexandrian poetry it is hardly surprising to find the Hymns of Callimachus showing the influence of other contemporary literature, such as the mime or pastoral poetry. But the influences of the classical period - of Pindar and the drama - are no less strong, although, perhaps, more problematic, and it will be worthwhile to consider the question in some detail.

Conflicting evidence awaits us when we examen the question of Callimachus and tragedy. Did he himself write any ? The question is of no mere academic interest. It has been suggested that the Hymns are works of considerable originality in form and content ; if Callimachus wrote tragedy, such qualities might again be expected to be present. Do the tragic elements in the Hymns, then, have this

---

[1] As well as the Homeric Hymns, which will be considered in detail in the next chapter.

[2] For detailed information v. Wunsch, R.-E., IX, s.v. Hymnos, particularly sub-section IV, pp.155-164.

hypothetical Callimachean flavour, or are they rather classical ? It would clearly be of great help if we knew that Callimachus wrote drama, and equally instructive if we knew for certain that he did not. The Souda is quite clear on this point. Callimachus wrote tragedy (as well as comedy). Apart from this, however, there is no mention in antiquity of Callimachean tragedy ; nor, of course, is there any extant. It is noticeable that Callimachus wrote no hymn to Dionysus, but this may not be too significant. It is one of the paradoxes of Greek literature that tragedy, although Dionysiac in origin and pretext, is nevertheless Apollonian in content, i.e. the intellectual element supersedes the irrational. Further evidence against any Callimachean tragedy may be provided by fr.215: ἥτις τραγῳδὸς μοῦσα ληκυθίζουσα.
This is almost certainly a reference to tragic bombast, and, unless humour is intended, it is hardly complimentary.[1] It may also be said that the style of Callimachus, his Μοῦσαν .... λεπταλέην (fr.1,24.) was unsuitable for the grandiloquence of tragedy. This view, however, may refer only to tragedy of the fifth century, especially Aeschylus ; we know little of subsequent tragedy. Propertius certainly seemed to see a distinction between the Aeschylean style of writing and the work of Callimachus, II ,xxxiv,41:

---

[1] It is not impossible that there may be a metrical reference to the lecythium. Although this term appears first in Hephaistion, it was based on a phrase of Aristophanes, Ra.1200 and subsequent lines - ληκύθιον ἀπώλεσεν , which Callimachus would presumably have known.

desine et Aeschyleo componere verba coturno.

where Lynceus is advised instead, (ll.31-2.):

tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philetan
et non inflati somnia Callimachi.

Against such points, however, there is still something to be said in favour of Callimachean tragedy. Ep. 8 is suggestive :

Μικρή τις, Διόνυσε, καλὰ πρήσσοντι ποιητῇ
ῥῆσις· ὁ μὲν 'νικῶ' φησὶ τὸ μακρότατον,
ᾧ δὲ σὺ μὴ πνεύσῃς ἐνδέξιος, ἤν τις ἔρηται
'πῶς ἔβαλες;' φησί· 'σκληρὰ τὰ γιγνόμενα.'
τῷ μερμηρίξαντι τὰ μὴ ἔνδικα τοῦτο γένοιτο
τοὔπος· ἐμοὶ δ', ὤναξ, ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη.

There is, of course, no certainty that Callimachus is referred to, but if he is, then the addressee suggests that drama is in question ; but it may equally well be a reference to sympotic poetry, during the course of which some kind of poetic contest was held. In this case the epigram might have been inscribed on a drinking vessel - Callimachus' own ? Ep. 7 is also relevant:

Ἦλθε Θεαίτητος καθαρὴν ὁδόν. εἰ δ'ἐπὶ κισσόν
τὸν τεὸν οὐχ αὕτη, Βάκχε, κέλευθος ἄγει,
ἄλλων μὲν κήρυκες ἐπὶ βραχὺν οὖνομα καιρόν
φθέγξονται, κείνου δ''Ελλὰς ἀεὶ σοφίην.

It seems that Callimachus is praising a tragedy, or perhaps a dithyramb, of Theaitetos. That its style should be acceptable to Callimachus suggests that tragedy may have altered since the fifth century as much as comedy did. Further evidence is provided by ep. 59:

Εὐδαίμων ὅτι τἄλλα μανεὶς ὠρχαῖος 'Ορέστας,
Λεύκαρε, τὰν λίαν οὐκ ἐμάνη μανίαν
οὐδ'ἔλαβ'ἐξέτασιν τῶ Φωκέος, ἅτις ἐλέγχει
τὸν φίλον· ἀλλ'αἰ χὴν δρᾶμ' ἐδίδαξε μόνον
ἦ τάχα κα τὸν ἑταῖρον ἀπώλεσε· τοῦτο ποήσας
κἠγὼ τὼς πολλὼς οὐκέτ'ἔχω Πυλάδας.

In this epigram Callimachus (assuming that κἠγὼ of l.6 refers to

Callimachus) seems to be saying that he lost his friends by producing a drama - whether his own or someone else's we are not not told. At the least, it shows a considerable interest in drama. Moreover, Callimachus justified his πολυείδεια (which may be a significant word in itself) by claiming in Iambus 13 to follow Ion of Chios, according to the diegesis.[1] Ion was a fifth century figure noted for his variety of composition, but his main claim to fame was as a tragedian, and the Alexandrians placed him in their "Canon" of tragic poets.[2] It is also interesting to note that Callimachus and Ion seem to be the only poets, or writers for that matter, to use the noun σάρον in a metaphorical sense. Ion, in his tragedy Ἀργεῖοι [3] wrote; 'ὡς παλαιὸν οἰκίας σάρον.'

Hesychius, who quotes this passage, adds: θέλει δὲ λέγειν ὅτι ἄχρηστοί εἰσι διὰ τὸ γῆρας. Ion has, in fact, by the apologetic ὡς, if it belongs to the quotation, (which it may not), produced what might be called a "metaphorical simile". Callimachus uses the noun in Iris' derogatory description of Delos (IV, 225.):

Ἀστερίη, πόντοιο κακὸν σάρον·

Did Callimachus derive this metaphorical usage of the word from Ion ? Phrynichus, who censures the incorrect use of this word[4] seems only to know of its literal sense. In either usage it is extremely rare.

---

[1] Pf. vol. 1, p. 205.

[2] R-E., IX, p. 1861.

[3] Fr. 9. (Nauck)

[4] Eclogae Nominum et Verborum Atticorum, ed. Lobeck, p. 83.

The style of Ion may have seemed less bombastic and grandiloquent to Callimachus than that of his tragic contemporaries, if we can trust "Longinus", who says of Ion (and Bacchylides):[1]

οἱ μὲν ἀδιάπτωτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντη κεκαλλιγραφημένοι....

– "They are without fault, and write with beauty and smoothness."

For these several reasons, then, we must consider the possibility that Callimachus wrote drama.[2] But even if that question cannot be answered with more satisfaction, there is no doubt of the influence of tragedy in the Hymns. It is, in the main, confined to the fifth and sixth hymns, although elsewhere the occasional word or phrase is found which recalls the fifth century tragedians[3]. But they tell us little about Callimachus' use of the structure and conception of tragedy as a genre. The fifth and sixth hymns, however, can be regarded as a study of νέμεσις and ὕβρις, which were fundamental concepts of Greek tragedy. It is true that they were also fundamental to Greek thought in general, but the emphasis which they receive here is absent from earlier hymns. The sixth hymn is concerned with the ὕβρις of Erysichthon, who deliberately and blatantly sets himself in conflict with a deity, Demeter, as Pentheus had done with Dionysus in the Bacchae. For this νέμεσις awaits him, and the goddess brings about his ruin, as Aphrodite

---

[1] 33, 5.

[2] Giannini (Dionysio XXXVII, 1963.) mentions a supposed reference to fellow tragedians in fr.486, but it is too uncertain for serious consideration.

[3] Lists are given by Kuiper, Studia Callimachea, Leyden, 1896, pp.226-7, and Giannini, op,cit. pp.52,3,6.

destroyed Hippolytus. Erysichthon's downfall by insatiable hunger, and his ignominious end as a beggar, do not, perhaps, equal the glorious fate of some tragic figures ; his punishment, however, is similar to that of Tantalus, food and hunger being esential elements. Tantalus, incidentally, was the subject of a tragedy by at least four fifth century tragedians - Aristarchus, Aristias, Phrynichus and Sophocles ; Callimachus had presumably read them. The tragic element is not a study of Erysichthon's character. This is probably due as much to the limited scope of the hymn as to the fact that Demeter is the main subject. The end of this sixth hymn also resembles a tragic epilogue. The speaker(s) pray(s) to Demeter to be spared the fate of Erysichthon, and to receive prosperity. We are reminded of the ending to the Suppliants of Aeschylus, where the chorus of the daughters of Danaus pray to be spared the fate of marriage with the men they hate, the sons of Aegyptus.

The fifth hymn, the Bath of Pallas, is slightly different. The offence of Teiresias can hardly be termed ὕβρις , since his action was involuntary - οὐκ ἐθέλων (l.78.). He had no intention of witnessing the bath of Athene ; it was his fate to do so, (ll.104-5):

....ἐπεὶ Μοιρᾶν ὧδ'ἐπένησα λίνα,
ἀνίκα τὸ πρᾶτόν νιν ἐγείναο ....

The tragic element in this is quite obvious. Oedipus, too, in his innocence, was led to enact τὰ μὴ θεμιτά .(l.78.). Both characters illustrate well the common Greek maxim παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω. Teiresias comes to wisdom through suffering,and fares considerably

better than Erysichthon. His punishment is tempered with mercy ; he is given the gift of prophecy to compensate for his blindness. Those who regard Callimachus as a propagandist and sycophant of the Ptolemies, because of certain elements in the fourth and other hymns, should observe that Teiresias does not make such flattering use of his newly acquired gift of prophecy. Indeed, he is a κωφὸν πρόσωπον - perhaps still awed by the presence of Athene - ἑστάκη δ'ἄφθογγος (l.83.) The role of Chariclo, mother of Teiresias, is not unlike that of some tragic choruses. Her words could well be those of a coryphaeus in a chorus heavily committed to the action, such as is found in the Bacchae of Euripides. Teiresias also figures in that play, and a comparison of his case with that of Actaeon is made there too.

In his fifth and sixth hymns Callimachus had displayed the divine vengeance on both the guilty and innocent. We also find that the impact of a deity upon the minds of mortals is reminiscent of similar themes in tragedy, although Callimachus does not develop the possibilities to any great extent. In the second hymn, to Apollo, the god enters into the minds of the chorus of youths ; they see and hear his presence, although others cannot. We are again reminded of the Bacchae, where the minds of the women are possessed by Dionysus. In this second hymn, and also in the sixth, the chorus are represented as initiates. In the latter case they they are worshippers of Demeter, and while the scene is a contemporary

one, the Eleusinian mysteries may well have been in the poet's mind.

It would also appear that Callimachus used the phraseology of such religious ceremonies to express a poetic ideal, as Horace did at the beginning of his third book of Odes. Certainly ἑκὰς ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός (II,2.) recalls Horace's :

Odi profanum volgus et arceo, (Carm.III,i,1.)

Callimachus instructs the young men to sing, (and most of the rest of the poem may be intended to represent his song for them) -

οἱ δὲ νέοι μολπήν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε. (II, 8).

Horace had similarly written : virginibus puerisque canto (Carm.III,i,4).

In general it would seem that Callimachus has made use of tragedy in its traditional classical form ; we have also seen that he praised the Hellenistic tragedy of Theaitetos. It appears likely, then that Callimachus had no complaint against tragedy as a genre, but rather against the bombast and pomposity which some writers applied to it.

Mime and epigram are two genres of literature which were of great importance in Hellenistic times. Now that we possess eight more or less complete mimes of Herondas we can perceive the influence which this type of literature had upon Callimachus. Strictly verbal coincidences between Herondas and Callimachus are few and inconclusive.[1]

---

[1] Instances are cited in the index to the edition of Herondas by Headlam and Knox, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1922.

But the mimes as a whole are certainly significant. In this respect hymns II, V and VI stand apart from the rest. Horowski,[1] indeed, calls them religious mimes; this, however, seems to anticipate the question of performance, which is at best a dubious issue.

We can certainly see that hymns II, V and VI differ radically from the others. They plunge immediately in medias res, which is a characteristic associated with the mime, but not generally with the hymn. It may be, however, that Callimachus derived this indifference to a formal setting from the epigram, which, because of its brevity, must dispense with such matters. Epigrams generally rely on the use of a telling word or pregnant phrase which reveal the setting and situation. The setting is, in fact, part of the action, and unfolds itself line by line. Callimachus himself gives us a fine example of this in ep.13 :

> Ἦ ῥ'ὑπὸ σοὶ Χαρίδας ἀναπαύεται; 'εἰ τὸν Ἀρίμμα
> τοῦ Κυρηναίου παίδα λέγεις, ὑπ'ἐμοί.'
> ὦ Χαρίδα, τί τὰ νέρθε; 'πολὺ σκότος.'αἱ δ'ἄνοδοι τί;
> 'ψεῦδος.'ὁ δὲ Πλούτων; 'μῦθος.'ἀπωλόμεθα.
> 'οὗτος ἐμὸς λόγος ὔμμιν ἀληθινός· εἰ δὲ τὸν ἡδύν
> βούλει, Πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας εἶν Ἀΐδη.'

What we are not told, but must deduce for ourselves, is that the first speaker is standing beside a gravestone. The second speaker is dead and is represented as replying from the world below. This is quite an unusual idea, as normally one had either to be addressed

---

[1] De Call. Hymnorum Colore Mimico, (Eos, LIV, 1964.) p.73.

by a ghost or descend to the underworld oneself. The idea is not, however, without precedent in earlier Greek epigram[1]; later the Roman poets further advanced the technique.[2]

We can see how this epigrammatic technique has been applied to the introduction and setting of the Hymn to Apollo:

> Οἷον ὁ τὠπόλλωνος ἐσείσατο δάφνινος ὄρπηξ,
> οἷά δ'ὅλον τὸ μέλαθρον· ἑκὰς ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός.
> καὶ δή που τὰ θύρετρα καλῷ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει·
> οὐχ ὁράᾳς; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δήλιος ἡδύ τι φοῖνιξ
> ἐξαπίνης, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἠέρι καλὸν ἀείδει.
> αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀναλίνασθε πυλάων,
> αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακρήν·
> οἱ δὲ νέοι μολπήν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε.

The speaker is in front of a building , which has a gate or door with bolts. Since Apollo is there, it must be his temple. A laurel branch and a palm tree are nearby ; a crowd of youths is in attendance. This information is not presented to us in a factual way ; the reader must fill in certain details, and a complete picture emerges only gradually.

The technique used by Callimachus here is not dissimilar to that used by Theocritus in the Adoniazousai, in which the influence of the mime can be clearly seen - in fact, it is a literary mime. This poem of Theocritus is on a slightly higher social level than most of the mimes of Herondas ; the three mimetic hymns of

---

[1] V. Friedlander and Hoffleit, Epigrammata, Univ. of California Press, 1948, no.139A.

[2] For instance v. Propertius, I, xxi, and IV, xi. Also Horace, Carm. I, xxviii.

Callimachus, however, are so far removed from contemporary reality that the plot is far from being a μίμησις βίου. Yet both Herondas and Callimachus would appear to have influenced each other. While the latter made use of the genre of mime, Herondas parodied and ridiculed the style of Callimachus. In his sixth mime Herondas makes the rather pointless introduction of two Kerdons, when it is really a third Kerdon who is meant. There seems to be no reason for the sudden brief mention of the first two. Herondas' words are (VI,48-9.):

.....ποῖος, εἰπέ μοι, Κέρδων;
δύ'εἰσὶ γὰρ Κέρδωνες, εἷς μὲν.....

This strongly resembles the opening of Callimachus' first hymn, to Zeus, where the author does not know which Zeus he is to sing of, for there are two,(I,4.): ...Δικταῖον ἀείσομεν ἢὲ Λυκαῖον;[1] If it is true that Herondas is parodying the opening of Callimachus' first hymn, then something further can be said about the relative chronology of the two authors and their works. It would also enable us to be more sympathetic to other claims of interdependence.

Such a claim has recently been made concerning the eighth mime of Herondas, the Dream.[2] The writer regards the old man who

---

[1]This motif in Callimachus is found again at the opening of the Homeric Hymn to Dionysus (I.), but the date of this work is uncertain and may well post-date Callimachus.

[2]By Smotrytsch,(Helikon,II,1962),pp.605 sqq.

appears late in the mime as a figure intended to represent Callimachus. There are good reasons to support this. Callimachus used the dream cliché to describe the acquisition of his poetic talents.[1] If Herondas' mime, the Dream, is a parody of this whole idea, then there is obviously more point to assuming a parody of his contemporary Callimachus than of, say, Hesiod. But before consideration of the other points, a brief outline of the mime is necessary. If, as would appear to be the case, this mime and perhaps others are literary creations, then Herondas is clearly contributing to the poetic theories of the time ; Callimachus is unlikely to have remained uninfluenced by this.

The speaker in this puzzling poem, presumably Herondas, narrates a dream which he had the previous night. Leading a goat through a glen he met some goatherds who became angry when his goat ate various twigs and shoots. They decide that the animal must be sacrificed ; the ceremony is supervised by a young man wearing fawn-skins and an ivy crown. After the sacrifice, the animal's skin is blown up into an inflated bag, upon which all the goatherds jump, hoping to land upon if twice in succession. But they invariably bounce off after one jump. The narrator, however, succeeds in landing upon it twice, whereupon an angry old man attempts to hit him with his stick. The narrator appeals to the

---

[1] Aitia, fr.2.

person clad in fawn-skins, who decides to put them both in stocks. There the dream ends. The narrator himself interprets most of the dream.[1] As his goat was attacked and killed, so his poetry will be attacked and abused. And as he alone could perform the jumping properly, so he will gain fame as a poet, in spite of the censure of others, and his Hipponactaean iambics will reign supreme. What the poet does not make clear, however, is the identity of his opponent, the old man. Smotrytsch[2] suggests that he is Callimachus ; Callimachus also wrote iambics, and claimed in Iambus 1 to be a Hipponax redivivus. Moreover, there may be a connection between this mime and Iambus 13 of Callimachus - both poets defending themselves and their poetry. Perhaps both felt that they were true disciples of Hipponax. In this poem, Iambus 13, Callimachus refers twice to the apparent accusation that he wrote choliambs without ever having visited Ephesus, the birthplace of Hipponax :

(11.11-12,) ...[οὔτ'] Ἴωσι συμμείξας
οὔτ' Ἔφεσον ἐλθών,....

and again (1.64.) οὔτ' Ἔφεσον ἐλθὼν οὔτ' Ἴωσι συμμείξας,

Herondas, at the end of his eighth mime, claims that the Muse encouraged him to sing to the Ionians :(1.79.)

τὰ κύλλ'ἀείδειν Ξουθίδαις ἐπείουσι.

---

[1] Philetas may also have referred to his own poetry in an allegorical way, if Cazzaniga (Riv.Fil.40,1962,pp.238 sqq.) is right in suggesting that fr.8D is a defence of his Demeter.

[2] Op.cit.

Since we are dealing with a Hellenistic poet, it is probably safer to take Ξουθίδαις as referring to Ionians, rather than the more obvious Athenians. If this is so, then there was clearly some rivalry between Herondas and Callimachus. This may have been due in part to the fact that Herondas was apparently excluded from the circle of court poets at Alexandria. Rivalry, however, did not prevent Callimachus from absorbing elements of the mime into his Hymns as we have seen. It has been suggested that the Doric of the fifth and sixth hymns is due to the fact that this was the dialect of the mime[1]. But it is doubtful if the influence of the mime could achieve such an important change ; there may be other reasons for the dialect.[2]

Theocritus has already been mentioned in connection with the mime. It is also possible to see the influence of pastoral poetry upon the Hymns of Callimachus. The passage in the fifth hymn describing the noon-day quiet probably owes something to this (V.72-4.): ...μεσαμβρινὰ δ'εἶχ'ὄρος ἀσυχία.
ἀμφότεραι λώοντο, μεσαμβριναὶ δ'ἔσαν ὧραι,
πολλὰ δ'ἀσυχία τῆνο κατεῖχεν ὄρος.

It is no doubt true that Callimachus wishes to stress the foreboding hour of noon, as McKay suggests[3], but the excellent way in which he has achieved the portrayal of the noon calmness of a Greek landscape

---

[1] Horowski, op.cit.p.72.

[2] V. infra, p.43.

[3] The Poet at Play, Leiden, 1962, pp.38-9.

suggests the influence of contemporary pastoral poetry. Much the same can be said of the description of Delos at the beginning of the hymn to Delos, where Callimachus is eager to retain, and even expand the Homeric description of the isle. Again, the descriptions of pre-historic Greece in the Hymn to Zeus display an interest in landscape as well as in ancient topography.

To return briefly to the epigram ; many epigrams end with what we may term a punch-line, often, but not necessarily, witty. Callimachus' ep.13, quoted earlier,[1] is a good example of this. The point comes at the end. Perhaps this factor influenced the end of the Hymn to Apollo. The last eight lines are presumably a defence of the poet's literary ideals ; their somewhat abrupt addition to the poem is puzzling to those who regard the work solely as a hymn to Apollo. If, however, they contain the point of the poem, then they can be regarded as the culmination of the work. This does not mean that the rest of the poem is insignificant compared to the finale ; Callimachus has extended, but also adapted to his own purpose, a basic element of the epigram.[2]

Callimachus shares with Herondas and Theocritus a liking for femimine proper names ending in -ω . This is presumably because they are Doric names. The Doric phrase ἦνθε Πολυξώ ,(V1,77.) is of some interest in this connection. This Polyxo appears nowhere

---

[1] P.10.

[2] For another view, v.infra p.26.

else in antiquity, although the name is not uncommon.[1] This does not necessarily mean that Callimachus invented the present character, but we can see how he has achieved authenticity by such attention to detail.

---

[1] V. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie, Leipzig, 1897-1909, Bd. III, p. 274.

CHAPTER II

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE HOMERIC HYMNS AND THE HYMNS OF CALLIMACHUS.

Something has been said above on the influences of other genres of literature upon the Hymns of Callimachus. The results have contributed to a basically different kind of hymn, which it will now be profitable to compare with its Homeric predecessors. We shall see how Callimachus has deliberately altered the traditional formula. There will be no need to stress the influence of the Homeric hymns, since this has been extensively discussed by earlier commentators.[1] Rather, the differences and innovations will concern us.

The Homeric Hymns, or at any rate those written in the sixth century and earlier, depict a world similar to that of the Iliad and Odyssey.[2] The characters in these hymns belong to pre-classical history or to mythology. A few allusions to the contemporary world can be gleaned from the poems - the Hymn to Demeter, for example, would seem to belong to a period of Eleusinian independence from Athens. The hymns of Callimachus were written three or four centuries later, and also show traces of this Hellenistic world. The Hymn to

---

[1] E.g. by Kuiper, op.cit., and by Cahen, Les Hymnes de Callimaque, Paris, 1930.

[2] For the problem of dating v. the edition of Allen, Halliday and Sikes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936.

Delos, for instance, contains a mention of the Celtic menace which threatened Greece in the third century B.C.. Moreover, as the world had changed considerably in those three or four hundred years, the position of the poet in society had also altered. Callimachus is more immediately dependent upon political circumstances than the author(s) of the Homeric Hymns. Without the favour of the Ptolemies, Callimachus might have written very little. It is not unreasonable to assume that such factors would influence the nature of his work ; this is a question which will be considered later in the chapter.

The purpose of the hexameter hymn in Homeric and pre-classical times was presumably to be recited at a festival or similar occasion, as a prelude to a longer poem from the epic cycle. Many of the Homeric hymns which we possess have a closing formula which reflects this purpose :

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ'ἀοιδῆς.

It might be objected that the longer hymns, to Demeter, Apollo and Hermes, which average over five hundred lines each, are perhaps too extensive for traditional προοίμια . But if the Iliad, for example, was to follow, they would seem short by comparison. Certainly, by the time of Callimachus, hymn-writing seems to have become an end in itself. It would be interesting to know whether the self-sufficiency of the hymns had any Homeric precedent ; more likely Callimachus was influenced by the hymns in lyric metres of Pindar and others, which did not serve as προοίμια . This difference

in purpose of the Hellenistic hymn is one factor which we can confidently assume regarding the difficult question of the Alexandrian view of the reason for, and the point of, hymn-writing.

There is no evidence that the Hymns of Callimachus represent devout religious belief on the author's part. Indeed, the humorous reference to Hades in ep.13 might be taken as evidence of cynicism. Lesky makes an important point when he says[1],

> The fact that the learned Callimachus stands far above the mythical tradition, while at the same time sensing the power and beauty it possesses constitutes the peculiar charm of his creations.

In their love of myth and religious ceremony his hymns re-echo Homer.

It is important to realise that Callimachus is not seeking to improve upon the Homeric hymns in the sense that he thought them inferior and wished to rewrite them. There is no evidence that Callimachus indulged in such Alexandrian pursuits, if indeed such pursuits existed.[2] The controversy over the alleged quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius has tended to obscure the fact that Callimachus had a high opinion of Homer - perhaps too high, if this explains his contempt for other cyclic epic. He calls Homer the θεῖον ἀοιδόν[3], a cliché perhaps, but hardly derogatory.

---

[1] A History of Greek Literature, trans. Willis and de Heer, New York, 1966, p.705.

[2] As Theocritus may have dealt with Apollonius, v. Gow, Theocritus, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1950, vol.II, p.231.

[3] Ep.6.

Did Callimachus consider the Homeric Hymns to be by Homer ? Some of the hymns in the present corpus may post-date Callimachus, so it is clear that his corpus would not be exactly that of our own. He may also have read many which are no longer extant. The earliest of them, at any rate, may have seemed contemporary with the Iliad and Odyssey. Lesky[1] assumes that the Alexandrians did not consider the Homeric Hymns to be the work of Homer, since they did not provide scholia for them. But this is far from conclusive.[2] However, Eustratius[3] tells us that Callimachus considered the epic poem Margites to have been composed by Homer.[4] Langerbeck[5] wished to connect this reference with fr. 587 of Callimachus :

ἑπτὰ σοφοὶ χαίροιτε - τὸν ὄγδοον, ὥστε Κόροιβον,
οὐ συναριθμέομεν -

suggesting that it was in this epigram (if such it is) that Callimachus made his statement about the Margites. His reason lies in the similarity of roles played by the two arch-fools Koroibos and Margites. Koroibos made a further epic appearance in the Ilias Parva[6]. If then Callimachus was prepared to accept

---

[1] Op. cit., p.85.

[2] Scholia were more likely to appear on the popular works. The surviving plays of the tragedians, for example, are presumably those which received special attention in antiquity, and were perhaps made into a collection.

[3] On Aristotle, Eth.Nic., VI, 7, 2.

[4] V. Pfeiffer, fr.397.

[5] Harv.Stud.Class.Philol., LXIII, 1958, p.44.

[6] Fr.16 (Allen).

the Margites as a work of Homer, he may well have thought likewise of some of the Homeric hymns. He certainly seems to have brought a critical approach to such problems ; ep. 6 shows how he attributed another epic work, the Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσις , to Creophylus.

It may be that Callimachus' main complaint was against the extreme length of contemporary epic poets, although Apollonius, at least, confined himself to four books. This perhaps explains why Callimachus was still prepared to write hymns which, in spite of other factors, have considerable epic flavour. For they are quite short pieces. In fact, the hymns of Callimachus stand in the same relationship to the Homeric hymns as the Argonautica of Apollonius does to the Iliad and Odyssey. Callimachus, imbued with a love for the glories of past epic, has recalled it in a way that is above all short.

Of the Homeric hymns which we possess there is only one which Callimachus has followed closely - the hymn to Apollo (first part). He makes extensive use of its content in his fourth hymn, to Delos. The traditional hymn, apart from the prologue and epilogue, dealt mainly with the γοναί , then the ἀρεταί of the god or goddess in question. Not all the Homeric hymns are exactly in this form, of course, but the earliest tend to be. Callimachus has, for the most part, discarded this rigid formula, but has retained individual elements of it. This novelty of construction will become clearer if we consider briefly each of the six hymns in turn.

In the hymn to Zeus, the poet begins by mentioning two of the alleged birthplaces of the god, Crete and Arcadia, and decides that the latter is correct. A description of Arcadia follows as Rheia, the mother of Zeus, wanders in search of water. Then Crete is introduced, and Zeus' infancy described. Then comes his rise to power ; Callimachus pauses to demolish the old idea that he cast lots with his brothers over the sea, sky and underworld ; rather, it was his power which advanced him. Zeus is the patron of kings, and Ptolemy has Zeus' qualities. The poet ends with a plea for prosperity. The hymn is therefore very selective in its treatment of Zeus.

In this hymn Callimachus clearly reflects the new character and purpose of the Alexandrian hymn. In ll.92-3 he says of Zeus :

...τεὰ δ'ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδοι;
οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ'ἀείσει;

This is partly a justification of the fact that Callimachus has not mentioned the ἔργματα of Zeus in the hymn. And it is partly a statement, or claim, that such elements are no longer necessary. The content of the hymn has changed considerably from the Homeric prototype. These lines of Callimachus recall the recusatio formula so common in the Augustan poets, in so far as Ptolemy is likened to Zeus. But Callimachus means what he says ; there is no true recusatio. The repeated use of ἔργματα in these lines is significant. It is a rather rare and unusual word, somewhat out of the ordinary, although it does in fact occur in the Homeric

hymn to Artemis.[1] Callimachus uses it of the deeds of Zeus, which are so out of the ordinary that they defy description, according to our poet. Callimachus uses a similar verbal device in ep. 28, which contains the words : σιηχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια. Callimachus' dislike of what is common is highlighted by the use of a very uncommon, erudite verb.

If the end of the poem represents a plea for patronage , then we have another element unknown to the Homeric hymn writers. This could well be the correct interpretation of ll.94-6, although Callimachus may have had a double reference in mind, :

> χαῖρε, πάτερ, χαῖρ'αὖθι· δίδου δ'ἀρετήν τ'ἄφενός τε.
> οὔτ'ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος ἐπίσταται ἄνδρας ἀέξειν
> οὔτ'ἀρετὴ ἀφένοιο· δίδου δ'ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον.

Δίδου δ'ἀρετήν τε και ὄλβον is found also in the Homeric hymn corpus,[2] and perhaps in an early epigram.[3] It would seem, then, to have been a convention. But as regards Callimachus' use of it, it is probably no coincidence that Theocritus has a similar ending in a poem addressed to Ptolemy, possibly also seeking patronage[4]. Callimachus has, of course, left the point somewhat vague, no doubt deliberately. It is part of the poet's art to be inexplicit, and in this case politically expedient also. What was a passing, conventional phrase

---

[1] XXVII, 20.

[2] XV, 9, and XX, 8.

[3] Friedlander and Hoffleit, op.cit., no.37.

[4] XVII.

in earlier times, :

πρόφρονες ἀντ'ὠδῆς βίοτον θυμήρε'ὄπαζε.[1]

has now assumed a more urgent significance.

The hymn to Apollo begins with an anticipation of the epiphany of the god ; only the righteous, however, will see him. Silence is requested, and a description of Apollo begins. Golden is his epithet, and he is an archer, prophet and healer. Cult names are mentioned, and his prowess as an architect is referred to. A few of his adventures are briefly mentioned, such as his slaying of the dragon at Pytho. The poem ends with a brief dialogue between Envy and Apollo, of an allegorical nature. Apollo apparently rejects Envy's wish for large-scale or bombastic poetry, praising instead brevity and purity.

This poem has quite an unusual form for a hexameter hymn. It has dispenced with both the γοναί and ἀρεταί in their traditional form, although a few references are made to various ἀρεταί towards the end of the hymn. This poem is therefore quite different from the Homeric hymn to Apollo. There has been much doubt in modern times as to whether this Homeric hymn was originally one complete hymn, or two or more separate hymns composed at different times. The most recent commentators,[2] who

---

[1] Homeric Hymn to Demeter, II, 494.

[2] Allen, Halliday and Sikes, op.cit..

summarise the various arguments, tend to the opinion that the poem is a unity. One of the problems concerns the apparent closing formula of the first (Delian) part of the hymn. In this passage[1] the poet reveals himself as a blind man from Chios, whose songs will be evermore supreme. This famous σφραγίς influenced many Homeric Vitae. It is therefore interesting to observe that Callimachus has also ended his hymn to Apollo with a σφραγίς element (ll.105-114), where he defends his poetry against Envy and Censure. It may be that Callimachus is deliberately drawing a parallel, and hinting that, in his opinion, line 178 marked the end of the Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo. To make a literary point in this fashion is very much in the Alexandrian style, and quite in harmony with a general theory of the hymn expressed earlier.

Some have regarded the final passage of this hymn as a later insertion[2], and it must be admitted that there is an abrupt transition after line 104. If this were so, it is not difficult to see why Callimachus should attach it to this particular hymn. Apollo was clearly the most important god to him - two out of six hymns concern him. Apollo was also the founder of Callimachus' native town Cyrene ; more important, he was the source of the poet's inspiration (fr.1,21-2.):

> καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
> γούνασιν, Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος·

---

[1] ll.166-177.

[2] E.g.Kuiper, op.cit., p.219.

In a sense this is traditional, Apollo being associated with learning and the arts. But Callimachus never tires of stressing it. So this would be the appropriate hymn for such a passage. Perhaps we can go further than this. If with Couat[1] we decide that this was the last of the hymns to be written, then the σφραγίς element may take on a new significance. For it would have been possible for Callimachus to attach it, as an apologia, to the end of his collection of six poems, although, of course, they would all have circulated separately beforehand. One is strongly reminded of Horace's final poem to his collection of the first three books of Odes, beginning :

> Exegi monumentum aere perennius
> regalique situ pyramidum altius,

It is not hard to establish a train of thought between the pyramids and Alexandria, and Horace may well have intended us to read the line on two levels. Propertius, who certainly invited comparison with Callimachus, has a strikingly similar passage[2], in which the pyramids also feature.

In this hymn of Callimachus it is also possible to see the influence of lyric poetry, particularly the Pindaric ode with its recurrent strophic structure. In Callimachus, of course, the response has been changed from a metrical one to a verbal one,

---

[1] La Poésie Alexandrine, Paris, 1882, p.235.

[2] III, ii, 17-26.

or to a repetition of ideas. This sort of structure is evident at line 47 : Φοῖβον καί.., line 55 : Φοίβῳ δ'ἑσπόμενοι..,line 65 : Φοῖβος καί... Other affinities with Pindar in the hymns will be noticed later.

The element of subjectivity which keeps recurring in Callimachus is worthy of mention. In general this is a feature which is not found in the Homeric hymns, apart from the famous σφραγίς referred to earlier. Often Callimachus speaks through the mouthpiece of the choir - another Pindaric touch - e.g.III, 137 :

εἴην δ'αὐτός, ἄνασσα, μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδή·

where he seems to be expressing a personal wish in addition to the request of the chorus. II, 65 :

Φοῖβος καὶ βαθύγειον ἐμὴν πόλιν ἔφρασε Βάττῳ

and II, 71 :

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Καρνεῖον· ἐμοὶ πατρώιον οὕτω.

also appear to be personal references, and any allusion to the choir must assume a chorus of Cyreneans.

The hymn to Artemis begins with a series of requests by the goddess from her father Zeus for a bow, a retinue of attendants, everlasting virginity etc.. Zeus laughingly grants her these, and more. Artemis proceeds to meet the Cyclopes on Lipare, and awaits fearlessly the making of her bow. Her hunting prowess is described, and her attack upon the cities of unjust men, whose lot becomes hard in consequence. Her shooting ability attracts the attention

of the glutton Heracles, who advises her to shoot cattle. Then follows a description of some places sacred to Artemis ; her role in the lives of Neleus, Agamemnon and the Amazons is glanced at ; she is also the protectress of Ephesus, and in this capacity repulsed the Cimmerian invasion. The hymn ends with a general warning against attempting to rival the goddess, but instead to duly observe her rites.

This is perhaps the most traditional of the hymns. Apart from the Homeric influences it also shows affinities with the lyric ode. No individual speaker is postulated, but a choir apparently recites the hymn (l.l.) :

> Ἄρτεμιν (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρον ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι)
> ὑμνέομεν,....

Moreover, χορός (l.3.), although it signifies Artemis' love of song and the dance, is probably also meant to have a relevance to the present occasion. Upon this basis are placed traditional elements of epic, slightly changed to suit the circumstances. Ἄρχμενοι ὡς (l.4.) is a common way to begin the narrative of a hymn. The end of the hymn also suggests Homeric precedent :

> χαῖρε μέγα, κρείουσα, καὶ εὐάντησον ἀοιδῇ.

The song referred to may be that which has just been sung - a retrospective usage - but it may well be that Callimachus is also looking forward, playing with the possibilities of the phrase. While this may have been in the poet's mind, it does not, of course, mean that

Callimachus actually envisaged this poem being used as a kind of προοίμιον on a specific occasion ; but he may have enjoyed a suggestive recalling of the old technique.

In this poem we can see that Callimachus has discarded the traditional γοναί while retaining the ἀρεταί , in contrast to the hymn to Zeus. We can also see how he has altered the traditional sequence of ideas ; if all the conventional elements were present, they would normally be in the following form : invocation to the god or goddess, γοναί, ἀρεταί, and finally a personal address in supplicatory form. Callimachus, however, has broken the series of ἀρεταί with invocations, plus epithets. These would normally come at the beginning or end. Thus we find (11.110, 225, 259) :

> Ἄρτεμι Παρθενίη Τιτυοκτόνε, χρύσεα μέν τοι
> πότνια πουλυμέλαθρε, πολύπτολι, χαῖρε, Χιτώνη
> πότνια Μουνιχίη λιμενοσκόπε, χαῖρε, Θεραίη.

It looks as if Callimachus wished to bring a little variety into a lengthy catalogue of ἀρεταί.It also brings the idea of a new beginning. This is not an uncommon device. Hesiod's Theogony has at least two distinct prologues ; the eighth Olympian ode of Pindar also has two distinct invocations in the first two stanzas. Perhaps this is part of the answer to the problem of the Homeric hymn to Apollo. Callimachus has used this device in a way which has suggestions of strophic structure, a phenomenon which we also noticed in the hymn to Apollo. It is a further example of the lyric element in Callimachus.

It is interesting to observe Artemis in this hymn adopting a role similar to that of the Muse. To her Callimachus says (l.186) :

εἰπέ, θεή, σὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐγὼ δ'ἑτέροισιν ἀείσω.

For the Muse to narrate the story via the poet is an idea as old as Greek poetry. Here Callimachus asks a set of questions, and the replies come immediately. Hesiod has a similar passage in the Theogony[1], where the Muses tell him to sing of themselves first and last, and of the gods, who must therefore occupy a central place. This arrangement is duly carried out. Callimachus alters the pattern slightly. The questions are (ll.183-5) :

τίς δὲ νύ τοι νήσων, ποῖον δ'ὄρος εὔαδε πλεῖστον,
τίς δὲ λιμήν, ποίη δὲ πόλις; τίνα δ'ἔξοχα νυμφέων
φίλαο καὶ ποίας ἡρωίδας ἔσχες ἑταίρας;

then come the replies (ll.187-9) :

νήσων μὲν Δολίχη, πολίων δέ τοι εὔαδε Πέργη,
Τηΰγετον δ'ὀρέων, λιμένες γε μὲν Εὐρίποιο.
ἔξοχα δ'ἀλλάων Γορτυνίδα φίλαο νύμφην,

The city of Perge is mentioned out of order in the response, and no heroines are introduced. The poet proceeds instead with a history of the nymph Britomartis, which leads to an aition. Apart from this episode, the possibilities raised by the questions are not exploited. The answers are of the briefest possible nature. There may be a good reason for this, since the stories connected with them may have been well known. Callimachus, in true Alexandrian style, passes them quickly by, and concentrates instead on a lesser known tale, which

---

[1] 11.33-4.

also allows him to incorporate an aition.

The hymn to Delos is by far the longest of the six hymns. It begins with a few lines in praise of the island and a description of its formation. It was formerly called Asterie, and roamed the sea at will. Callimachus then describes the wanderings of Leto just before the birth of Apollo. All the places which the goddess approaches turn in flight, from fear of Ares and Iris, whom Hera has set to watch Leto. The river Peneios finally decides to welcome her, but anxiety for his safety leads Leto to pass him by. The island of Cos is then approached, but Apollo, still in his mother's womb, bids her pass on, prophesying that one of the Ptolemies will be born there. A reference to the Celtic invasion of Greece follows, and the destruction of Ptolemy's rebellious mercenaries is described. Apollo then directs his mother to Asterie, which prompts Iris to inform Hera. In spite of this Apollo is born, which brings great joy to the island. Henceforth it will no longer be a floating isle. The rest of the poem deals with the honour paid to Delos by various figures of legend.

As has already been mentioned, this is the only hymn to follow a Homeric hymn with any fidelity. If Callimachus wished to emphasise the modernity and novelty of his technique, it would certainly be a good idea for him to invite close comparison with Homer, so that his radicalism and his own style might stand out more clearly. It is for this reason, no doubt, that the tragedians

did not hesitate to follow each other in the writing of plays on identical figures. However, there is no evidence that Callimachus is more radical in this hymn than in the others.

In this hymn to Delos Callimachus has used an interesting technique. The γοναί are presented in great detail ; the ἀρεταί, however, are narrated by Apollo himself while still in his mother's womb. Apollo, using his power of prophecy, foretells the ἀρεταί which he is to perform in the future. In the Homeric hymn to Apollo, the precocious god prophecies after his birth, and that only to declare his love of the lyre, bow, and prophecy. In Callimachus there are, in fact, two speeches from Apollo ὑποκόλπιος. The first, just mentioned, contains inter alia his ἀρεταί, while the second is a panegyric of Cos and Ptolemy Philadelphus, who is to be born there. This later speech helps to explain the first one. The reasoning must be somewhat as follows : Cos has to be mentioned in order to lead to praise of Ptolemy. But Apollo has really nothing to do with Cos ; the poem concerns his birth, and he was born on Delos. Callimachus, therefore, finds it convenient to mention Cos amidst the list of places which were on the point of receiving Leto. This all had to occur before he arrived at Delos, i.e. before his birth, so his references to these places must be as ὑποκόλπιος. In this same condition he has to speak of his ἀρεταί, in his earlier speech. It would, of course, have been possible for him to mention them after his birth, but this would have meant the removal of Cos and Ptolemy to a position after the Delos birth-scene. And

since this scene is the climax of the poem, Callimachus clearly did not wish to do this. Callimachus, then, probably had the idea of praising Ptolemy in his mind from the start ; and so all other elements in the hymn are adjusted accordingly, which thus explains the description of the ἀρεταί by the yet unborn Apollo. There is no need to invent other motives for the first speech.[1]

A further interesting feature which must not escape us is that the ἀρεταί are narrated in the midst of the γοναί. This disruption of the traditional order is, of course, a logical neccessity of pre-natal prophecy.

One strange aspect of this hymn is the sudden change of mind by Hera when told of the birth of Apollo. Instead of carrying out her threats of destruction, she merely remarks (ll.244-48) :

> Ἀστερίῃ δ'οὐδέν τι βαρύνομαι εἵνεκα τῆσδε
> ἀμπλακίης, οὐδ'ἔστιν ὅπως ἀποθύμια ῥέξω,
> τόσσα δέοι (μάλα γάρ τε κακῶς ἐχαρίσσατο Λητοῖ)
> ἀλλά μιν ἔκπαγλόν τι σεβίζομαι, οὕνεκ'ἐμεῖο
> δέμνιον οὐκ ἐπάτησε, Διὸς δ'ἀνθείλετο πόντον.

This worries McKay, who finds it unsatisfactory ; but his explanation[2] - that Apollo is mightier than Ares, and Callimachus is recalling the speech of Iris at line 227, is hardly sufficient. Character inconsistency is not confined to Hera in this hymn. Peneios also has a remarkable change of mind at line 128. After refusing to harbour Leto he suddenly says with great solemnity ἴτω πεπρωμένον ἦμαρ,

---

[1] As McKay does, Erysichthon, A Callimachean Comedy, Leyden, Brill,1962, pp.150 sqq.

[2] Op.cit. p.163.

and announces that he will endure for her sake. Perhaps this episode is intended to bring out the reality of the threat posed by Ares (the destruction of Peneios is already underway), and the magnanimity of Leto, who declines his offer. Hera's change of mind is less pleasing. The answer is probably that Callimachus, by his narrative earlier in the hymn, had got himself into such a position that this resolution became inevitable. In order to have a dramatic background which would, inter alia, indulge his topographical interests, Callimachus has made Hera threaten to destroy any place which Leto approaches. But Delos, of course, was never destroyed, so Hera's threat is futile. Homer, while referring to the wanderings of Leto and the fear of the islands, wisely makes no mention of a specific threat by Hera. Callimachus has brought Hera's sudden change upon himself. It may be, however, that her fickleness represents subtle characterisation by Callimachus. We are reminded of Apollonius' amusing portrayal of Hera (and Athene) on a visit to Aphrodite at the beginning of his third book.

The anger of Hera against Leto also evaporates rather surprisingly (1.259) :

οὐδ'"Ηρη νεμέσησεν, ἐπεὶ χόλον ἐξέλετο Ζεύς.

Thus the tragic deus ex machina is brought on to the stage to save the hymn. Homer had no such reconciliation between the goddesses. Why does Callimachus, and why does Delos make up the friendly trio ? It is partly because he had left himself no alternative ; but perhaps

the influence of New Comedy would have conditioned his audience slightly, so that they would be more ready to accept this happy ending here. Callimachus would have found very few of such comedies which did not effect some sort of reconciliation in the last act. If we can talk of subconscious influence, then this may be part of the answer.

The treatment of Delos in this hymn is also interesting. Before the birth of Apollo it is referred to as Asterie ; then the etymology of Delos is explained. This particular point is not found in the Homeric hymn to Apollo. Callimachus certainly had an interest in such subjects, as we can see from his Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετονομασίαι.[1] He certainly would appear to have done some research on Delos in prehistoric times. Pindar seems to connect the nymph Asterie with Delos[2], but otherwise, Callimachus is the first author to give a more or less factual account of the island and its earlier name. His research interests in this field are revealed in this hymn ; in line 49 he tells us that Parthenie was the earlier name of Samos. In his second hymn, line 59, Callimachus seems to refer to Delos as Ortygia, according to the scholiast. Antiquity knew of many places with this name[3] ; again Callimachus seems the first to make the identification, unless anticipated by Pindar.[4]

---

[1]Suidas, s.v. Καλλίμαχος.

[2]Paean V, 42.

[3]R.-E., XVIII,pp.1519-26.

[4]Paean VIIb, 12.

The author of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo seems to have specifically disassociated it from Delos[1]:

> χαῖρε, μάκαιρ' ὦ Λητοῖ, ἐπεὶ τέκες ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,
> Ἀπόλλωνά τ' ἄνακτα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν,
> τὴν μὲν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ, τὸν δὲ κραναῇ ἐνὶ Δήλῳ,

Perhaps he had Ephesus in mind. Callimachus may well have been making a mythological as well as a geographical point.[2] At any rate it is a good example of the blending of scholar and poet.

Although he owes so much to Homer in these hymns, Callimachus makes no mention of him. But an even earlier hymn writer is mentioned in IV, 304-5 :

> οἱ μὲν ὑπαείδουσι νόμον Λυκίοιο γέροντος,
> ὅν τοι ἀπὸ Ξάνθοιο θεοπρόπος ἤγαγεν Ὠλήν

Although nothing survives of Olen, Callimachus must surely have read him. He was generally considered one of the early hymn writers such as Pamphos, Musaeus and Orpheus, all of whom were generally regarded as pre-Homeric. Very little of their work remains, so we cannot tell if Callimachus made any use of them. The reference to Olen is not inappropriate here, as his Delian hymns were famous in antiquity, and may have inspired part of the Homeric hymn to Apollo.[3]

---

[1] III, 14-16.

[2] V. Roscher, op.cit., Bd.I, 655.

[3] V. R.-E., XVII, pp.2432-3.

One striking difference between the hymn to the Bath of Pallas and the Homeric hymns is the metre. Why this particular hymn should have been written in elegiacs is not immediately clear. However, Callimachus' claim to sing nothing previously unattested[1] suggests that he may have had a precedent somewhere. We must also remember that the hexameter was far from being the only metre in which hymns were written. Again, Philetas wrote his Demeter in elegiacs ; there is no evidence that it was a hymn, but its metre may have provided a stimulus.

The hymn begins with a procession of maidens called λωτροχόοι . They are assembled in honour of Athene, whose epiphany is anticipated. While they wait, the poet tells the story of the blinding of Teiresias. The narrative begins with a description of Chariclo, the mother of Teiresias. As she and Athene were bathing, Teiresias, plagued by thirst, approached their spring and unwittingly observed them. For this he was blinded, as Fate decreed, but given in return the gift of prophecy, and Athene tells of the honour he will gain. The hymn ends with advice to the maidens to receive the goddess kindly, and a plea to the goddess for her protection.

The Doric dialect of this hymn is at variance with Homeric precedent ; but there must have been many local hymns in Greece written in local dialects. Isyllos is no doubt typical of much

---

[1] Fr.612.

that has perished. This combination of Doric and elegy is interesting. A similar combination was used by sixth century writers such as Echembrotus ; their work has not survived, but what we know of it from other writers suggests that its main feature was a lament, and it was generally of a lugubrious nature. Much the same could be said of the Bath of Pallas with its tragic narrative. So perhaps sixth century Dorian elegy influenced Callimachus' choice of dialect and metre here.

The main part of this poem is taken up by the story of the blinding of Teiresias. In other words, one single action of Athene is selected and examined at some length. This is not the normal procedure in a hymn ; in fact the poem is hardly a hymn at all. What emerges is something close to an epyllion.[1] The Teiresias episode plays its part by providing the story within the story, which is an important part of many epyllia. The external story deals with an anticipated epiphany of Athene, a reference to her beauty and the judgement of Paris, and a mention of her cult in Argos. At the end there is a twelve-line epilogue greeting the goddess' arrival, and the usual prayer for prosperity. Between these two parts comes the story of Teiresias, the most extensive part of the poem. The general characteristics of the Alexandrian epyllion and its Roman development were dialogue, a speech, usually of some length, and a considerable heightening of emotion. All

---

[1] Recent criticism has tended to frown upon the use of this term, but it has a certain convenience which justifies its usage for the present.

these aspects are present in this hymn. The emotive content is stressed by Callimachus ; there is a pathetic dialogue between Chariclo and Athene. Then there is a lengthy speech by Athene in which she consoles Chariclo by revealing that the blinding of Teiresias was the will of Fate etc.,etc. Epyllia often contained a romantic element, and it is noticeable that Callimachus stresses the intimacy of Chariclo with Athene, (11.57-59) :

παῖδες, Ἀθαναίᾳ νύμφαν μίαν ἔν ποκὰ θήβαις
πουλύ τι καὶ πέρι δὴ φίλατο τᾶν ἑτερᾶν,
ματέρα Τειρεσίαο, καὶ οὔποκα χωρὶς ἔγεντο

Chariclo, we are told (11.65-67) rode on the goddess' chariot, and led the dances of nymphs for her. After the blinding Chariclo recalls the friendship (1.86.) : ...τοιαῦται, δαίμονες, ἔστε φίλαι; It is possible, of course, that this feature has been stressed by Callimachus to heighten the contrast with the ensuing event.

Although we can see the nature of the epyllion in this hymn, it is not wholly an epyllion. It is a hymn in honour of Athene, and there is a suggestion of the traditional ἀρεταί at the beginning, with the beauty contest and the Diomedes episode. Callimachus has retained the external situation of the hymn, and has made it the point of departure for a new feature. Unity is retained throughout in that the Teiresias episode concerns Athene, the recipient of the hymn. Thus we feel nothing odd about the traditional hymn element which recurs at the end.

To find Callimachus dabbling in the epyllion should come as no surprise. He used the form in his Hecale, and it is in

harmony with his apparent disinclination to write large-scale epic. The idea of the epyllion may well have derived from the Pindaric ode with its mythical narrative at the centre. The use of the elegiac metre for this purpose is, however, unusual, but the metre was imported into most genres, being found in tragedy[1], and, contemporary with Callimachus, in Theocritus[2]. Whether this experimental usage of the metre influenced Callimachus is impossible to tell. It may be significant that Callimachus stresses in passing, as is his wont, that the story is borrowed (1.56) :

...μῦθος δ'οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ'ἑτέρων.

Again he seems to be inviting comparison with the ἕτεροι, perhaps suggesting that he is offering an originality of <u>treatment and metre</u>.

In this hymn Chariclo addresses Athene in surprise after the blinding of her son, and laments his fate. In her reply the goddess tells Chariclo to restrain her anger. We are surprised. We had not previously been told of her anger. Her speech must be represented, then, as spoken in anger. Presumably Callimachus would have made this clear by his tone of voice when reading the poem to his audience. The effects possible by such means must have been important to the Hellenistic poets. There has always been some doubt as to what Callimachus meant by the ἀηδόνες of Heraclitus

---

[1] Euripides, <u>Andromache</u>, 103-116.

[2] VIII.

in his famous epigram on his dead friend.[1] As the present passage has shown, his voice or delivery as well as his poems themselves may have been important to Callimachus. At any rate, this is a touch of sophistication not found in the Homeric hymns, where emotions are generally well sign-posted in advance.

The sixth hymn, to Demeter, begins with an instruction to women initiates to greet the κάλαθος of Demeter as it passes by in a procession. In true Alexandrian style Callimachus ignores the content of the Homeric hymn to the goddess, which dealt with the rape of Persephone, and narrates instead the story of Erysichthon. Erysichthon, seized with a sudden madness, ordered his servants to assist him in felling Demeter's sacred grove. Demeter appears in the guise of Nikippe, her priestess, but is threatened by Erysichthon, who informs her that he needs the wood to build a banquet hall. The goddess then assumes her own form, and devises constant hunger as a punishment for Erysichthon. His gluttony becomes so great that his parents, in their shame, reject all invitations on his behalf. Eventually he eats everything which his parents possess, and is reduced to begging in public. Here the narrative ends, and the poet prays that the goddess will grant him and his audience abundance and prosperity.

In this hymn we can also see elements of the epyllion. In

---

[1] Ep. 2.

this case the ἔκφρασις is the story of Erysichthon ; the description of the procession in honour of Demeter encircles the inner story. But some formal elements of the epyllion are lacking ; it is not such a good example as the previous hymn.

This hymn to Demeter is also written in the Doric dialect. Various reasons have been suggested for this. The influence of the mime has already been mentioned. McKay[1] suggests that the long vowels of Doric are suitable to the sounds of lament contained in the Erysichthon (and Teiresias) stories ; Couat[2] connected it with Ptolemy's interest in the Doric islands of the Aegean, which were gradually incorporated into his empire. Ptolemy was born in Doric-speaking Cos ; Callimachus in Cyrene, also a Doric-speaking state.

This hymn has been dubbed a comedy by McKay. There is no evidence, however, that antiquity so regarded the poem. Different cultures have differing senses of humour ; we must beware of importing our own ideas. Plato seems to suggest that for true comedy a friendly character with whom the audience is in sympathy is essential[3]. While this is confirmed by the plays of Aristophanes, it does not seem to be the case with Erysichthon. There are certainly amusing elements in the hymns. The humorous contrast

---

[1] The Poet at Play, Leiden, Brill, 1962, p.82.

[2] Op.cit., pp.225-8.

[3] Philebus, 50b.

between the baby Artemis and her warlike requests, in the third hymn, is an obvious example. But again, what seems amusing to us may not necessarily have seemed so to the Greeks. The martial precocity of some infants was part of their tradition. Theocritus wrote a lengthy idyll based on the slaying by the infant Heracles of snakes sent by Hera.[1]

It is interesting to observe in this hymn the Homeric-type repetition of the line. Line 2 :

Δάματερ, μέγα χαῖρε, πολυτρόφε πουλυμέδιμνε.

is repeated exactly at line 119. It may be that this usage owes something to the refrain element which was making an appearance in contemporary pastoral poetry. Its tone of invocation suggests this. What prompted the development of the refrain ? The earliest examples of repeated lines occur in the Homeric poems ; it can hardly be called a refrain, yet it may well have been the germ of the chorus-refrain idea. Magic ritual may also have played an important part, as the second idyll of Theocritus suggests. Midway between the Homeric line repetition and the Alexandrian refrain lie the repeated ἐφύμνια of Aeschylus[2]. The religious background to such ἐφύμνια is clear from Callimachus(II, 97-8) :

ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον ἀκούομεν, οὕνεκα τοῦτο
Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον ἐφύμνιον εὕρετο λαός

---

[1] XXIV.

[2] Agamemnon, 1489-1496, and 1513-1520; Eumenides, 328-333, and 341-346.

There is, incidentally, a purely Homeric line repetition in the hymn to Artemis, line 14 :

πάσας εἰνέτεας, πάσας ἔτι παῖδας ἀμίτρους.

recurring again at line 43.

The most amusing part of this sixth hymn concerns the explanations invented by Erysichthon's parents to account for his refusal of invitations. There is no mention of this episode elsewhere, and it is quite likely that Callimachus devised it for the occasion. It may be possible to see what stimulated him. In the classical period lies and deceit were never an important part of literature, not even in Aristophanes, where it might be expected. But in New Comedy such matters became of great importance ; the lying slave and his deceitful behaviour represented an important part of the plot. Callimachus may have realised the significance of this motif and incorporated it into his narrative here.

An interesting aspect of the hymns, which is confined to no one hymn, is Callimachus' presentation of direct speech and the formulae associated with it ; we shall find that he often makes a complete break with epic technique. Whether or not direct speech was a part of literature since its inception, it is already well established in the earliest literature we possess, the epic corpus. That it had been present in pre-Homeric literature is suggested by the extensive stage of formality it had reached by, say, the eighth century B.C.. It is clear that a formulaic pattern

had been worked out and invariably adhered to. This applies particularly to the line(s) and words which introduce and follow direct speech.

Thus no speech is allowed to begin without a statement of its impending arrival, such as :

ὅ σφιν ἐὔφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν

We can refer to such introductory formulae as A. Likewise, speeches generally end with a formula such as ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας...
We may refer to these as B. There are, of course, many variations of those expressions, but they are generally both present in some form. Occasionally, in dialogue, we find the sequence A...A... without any intervening B, although its presence can be felt in a word such as ἀμειβόμενος.

Such factors are to be observed almost invariably in the Homeric Hymns. If there is any exception, it is at the end of a speech, where the B formula may be absent although there is no more direct speech to immediately follow. Such passages are at line 544 of the Homeric hymn to Apollo, lines 312 and 520 of the Homeric hymn to Hermes ; and of these, only the end to the Apollo hymn is of any significance, as the others are followed by a "B" clause which contains some kind of indirect comment on the previous speech.

Such factors belong to an elevated style which Callimachus seems to have wished to modify occasionally. Thus there is no B formula at the end of Demeter's speech (VI, 49). Nor is there

any B formula at the end of the speech of Triopas in the same hymn. This has led to some confusion as to where his speech ends, Wilamowitz ending it at line 106,[1] Pfeiffer at line 110. This is quite remarkable, since either could be right. There could never be any doubt in the Homeric hymns, nor in the whole epic corpus for that matter.

Another invariable feature of epic speech formulae is that direct speech always occupies whole hexameters ; there is no half line of direct speech followed by a half line of indirect narrative. Papyrus fragments with direct speech occupying half lines cannot, for this reason, belong to early epic.[2] The A and B formula never intrude into the direct speech. This is also a factor which gives a heroic, stilted, formulaic and unrealistic aspect to direct speech. Its parody in the Batrachomyomachia shows how ridiculous it could become. In addition, we never find a line shared by two or more speakers.

Against this stereotyped background the innovations introduced by Callimachus are very striking. Consider a couple of examples (V, 85, and VI, 53) :

ἁ νύμφα δ'ἐβόασε 'τί μοι τὸν κῶρον ἔρεξας
'χάζευ', ἔφα, 'μή τοι πέλεκυν μέγαν ἐν χροὶ πάξω.'

---

[1] Callimachi Hymni et Epigrammata, 4th ed., 1925

[2] V. D.L.Page, Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica, (Evelyn-White, Loeb), 1936, p.612.

From our brief survey of epic procedure it is clear that such lines could not have been written by Homer, nor by the writers of the earlier hexameter hymns, since they show direct speech occupying only half a line, and the introduction of an A formula 'ἔφα' into the midst of direct speech. Equally remarkable is a passage of the hymn to Demeter (76-86) with lines such as :

τέλθος ἀπαιτήσων ἑκατὸν βόας.' ἦνθε Πολυξώ,

and δαίνυεν εἰλαπίναν τις 'ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ 'Ερυσίχθων.'
ἄγετό τις νύμφαν ''Ερυσίχθονα δίσκος ἔτυψεν',
ἢ 'ἔπεσ'ἐξ ἵππων', ἢ 'ἐν Ὄθρυϊ ποίμνι'ἀμιθρεῖ.'

These are very unusual. The same hymn also has (line 41) :

εἶπε δὲ χωσαμένα 'τίς μοι καλὰ δένδρεα κόπτει;'

and stranger still is IV, 116 :

σήμερον ἐξαπίνης; ὁ δ'ἀνήκοος. ὦ ἐμὸν ἄχθος,

which reminds us of the use of ἀντιλαβή by the tragedians to achieve realism. It also has the effect of quickening the narrative, as is the case here ; at the beginning of the line Leto is still addressing Peneios, by the end of it she has turned to the unborn Apollo. The whole line surely cannot be spoken by Leto.

Was the use of such examples in epic situations an innovation by Callimachus, or was it a general Hellenistic phenomenon ? If the latter, then we might expect to find a certain difference between Apollonius and Homer in their treatment of direct speech. There is, however, no difference. Apollonius has, without exception, adopted the Homeric pattern.

Whence, then, did Callimachus derive his inspiration in these matters, and what meaning is to be placed upon them ? Clearly

it is yet another example of the influence of other genres of literature upon the hymns, perhaps the drama, but more probably the mime. The effect achieved is one of relative spontaneity ; the speeches and conversations appear more lifelike. Callimachus has brought the hymn more up to date. It is also quite likely that the technique of the epigram again influenced him. This can be seen from ep.13, quoted above[1], or even in the two-line ep.34 :

Τίν με, λεοντάγχ' ὄνα συοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον
θῆκε - 'τίς;' 'Αρχῖνος. 'ποῖος;' ὁ Κρής. 'δέχομαι.'

This is another example of the way in which Callimachus helped to mollify the rigidity of genre which was an important feature of earlier literature.

While Apollonius adhered strictly to the old rules, Theocritus showed some of the inventiveness of Callimachus. This is hardly surprising in the pastoral or mimetic poems ; and there is one example in epic (or epyllion) writing :

ἠνώγει· 'μηδ' εἴ τι θεοὶ νοέοντι πονηρόν,

which is a departure from tradition. But this is the only significant example. Even Catullus, for all his modernity, constructed poem 64, Peleus and Thetis, along epic lines in the matter of direct speech. Callimachus, despite his claim to use traditional forms, showed more inventiveness than his contemporaries or successors. This is

---

[1] P.10.

[2] XXIV, 68.

no doubt partly due to the vastly differing types of literature he himself wrote. This versatility is important. We have already, on several occasions, noticed the influence of Callimachus' other works upon the Hymns.

CHAPTER III

METRE AND STYLE.

One of the facilities which Greek poets enjoy is the freedom to lengthen a syllable for reasons which are often far from rational. In most cases the lengthening is in the arsis of the foot ; more rarely in the thesis.[1] Because of this, many words in Homer possess a syllaba anceps e.g. the first syllable of ἰμάς. More can be said about the irrational lengthenings of final syllables. There are at least thirteen such cases in the Hymns, as follows :

1) II, 2 : ἑκὰς ἑκάς
2) II, 19 : κίθαριν ἠΰ
3) II, 20 : Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα
4) III, 61 : ἐπὶ μέγα
5) III, 150 : μάλα μέγαν
6) IV, 83 : ἑτεὸν ἐγένοντο
7) IV, 193 : ἀνθέρικος ὣς
8) IV, 194 : νότος ἔνθ'
9) IV, 229 : Ἀρτέμιδος ἥτις
10) IV, 238 : αἰφνίδιον ἔπος

---

[1] These words are somewhat unfashionable today, but are still convenient provided that their meaning is clear. Arsis refers to the first half of the foot, a long syllable, thesis to the second half, which is either one long or two short syllables.

II) IV, 263 : βαθὺς Ἰνωπός

I2) VI, I5 : χαμάδις ἐκαθίσσαο

I3) VI, 2I : Τριπτόλεμος ἀγαθάν

There are other examples of lengthening before ῥ, a combination of mute and liquid, and φ[1]. These are inherited from Homer, where they are quite normal ; they need no further comment. Of the examples quoted, some can be explained by the force of the digamma, thus I) σϝενάς. 7) σϝώς. IO) ϝέπος. While these have Homeric authority they still raise the interesting question of the extent of Alexandrian knowledge of the digamma. They themselves never mention it, which is rather strange in view of the vast amount of research which was going on into earlier literature. It certainly cannot be proved that they knew of it, but while the three examples can also be explained by the theory of lengthening in arsis, we should not discard the question of the digamma. Callimachus may have liked the epic flavour which it brought to his lines, even if he did not understand it properly. Except in a few areas of Greece, the digamma had ceased to be effective by classical times. But it is not impossible that it may have lingered longer on some words than on others ; a common word like ἔπος for example, might have retained it longer. We can see this sort of thing happening in the case of reduplicated perfects in Latin ; presumably most verbs had a reduplicated perfect in the beginning, but only a few retained it

---

[1] V. Cahen, Callimaque et son Oeuvre Poétique, Paris, 1929, p.467.

into classical times. Peperci, for instance, kept its earlier form. But in the Empire parsi became the preferred form. With the desire for uniformity and analogical levelling of conjugations and declensions which accelerated in the Empire, peperci was felt as an odd form, and no doubt its nature was not properly understood. The case of the digamma may have been similar. In some words it may have survived into the classical age of much of Greece, at least as a conscious memory, though perhaps not understood. Callimachus may be reflecting this fact.

Modern French, and indeed English, illustrate this point quite well. The French still write an initial H although it is seldom pronounced. Its presence can sometimes be felt in conjunction with another word ; compare the pronunciations of les haches and les habits. In the latter case liaison takes place, as if there were no H. In the former case a hiatus must be observed, even though the H is still not pronounced. The digamma may have reached a similar stage at some point.

It would be surprising if the Alexandrians did not know of the digamma. Apart from early epic, it appeared in the poems of Sappho and Alcaeus, and, indeed, came to be considered as peculiarly Aeolic. And it lasted even longer on the Greek periphery, to the fourth century and beyond. Alexandria, of course, had no Greek history to speak of ; and the digamma has not been found on inscriptions from Cyrene and Thera, which apparently had identical

alphabets.[1] On the other hand, it was known in the first century B.C. Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the grammarian Trypho mention it, although they are of no assistance in the present problem. By this time, of course, the familiarity of contact with Rome and Latin might have provided linguistic assistance. It is harder to decide whether the Doric beta in place of the digamma[2] would have been a help or a hindrance to the awareness of the digamma.

Of the other examples mentioned earlier[3], some are possibly to be explained by the theory of lengthening in arsis. The first example quoted, ἑκᾶς ἑκάς, resembles the repetition κᾱλά....κἄλά...(I, 55) and ἰὴ ἴή (II, 103) in that each word occurs twice within the same line. This alone should be sufficient to suggest that Callimachus is making a point, and an examination may confirm this. The possible influence of the digamma in ἑκάς has already been noticed. Κᾱλός is, of course, Doric, while κἄλός is Attic, κᾱλός having the initial vowel long to compensate for the lost digamma of καλϝός . But this hardly shows that Callimachus was aware of the digamma ; he may simply have been playing with the dialects. Ἰὴ ἰή is slightly more complicated. In the same line Callimachus adds ἴει βέλος which suggests that he was indicating the derivation of ἰή from ἵημι. The etymology of this word is

---

[1] V. L.H.Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1961, pp.25 and 317.

[2] E.g. βεκάς (Hesych.)

[3] Pp.51-2.

uncertain, but Latin jacio suggests it may have been ἰίjημι. Most authorities agree on this[1]. The removal of the j sound after the iota may have resulted in a lengthening of the iota in certain dialects on the analogy of the digamma. Callimachus would then have had two forms of ἰή to use. This is not to say that he himself was aware of the earlier form of the verb ; he may have found a similar word-play in an earlier author, or he may have found both forms separately in earlier literature. Perhaps this was what led him to make a reconstruction of the original form and therefore associate ἰή with ἵημι. Other writers, whether they write ἵη or ἵε keep the iota short. In particular, Callimachus may have had in mind a line of Apollonius :[2]

θαρσύνεσκον ἕπεσσιν, 'ἵη ἵε' κεκληγυῖαι·

It is not clear from this exactly what Apollonius considered ἵη to mean ; he could be connecting it with ἰᾶσθαι, but not necessarily. If the original form of this verb was ἰσᾶσθαι as Boisacq affirms, we might expect an initial long vowel after the disappearance of the sigma. This is the case in Homer, although others have the iota short. At any rate, there is no doubt of the scansion of the line of Apollonius above ; there can be no long iota. So Callimachus may be making a metrical or etymological point against Apollonius.

To consider the matter of the digamma in the Hymns of

---

[1] E.g. Boisacq, Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue grecque, Paris, 1923.

[2] II, 712.

Callimachus we must also consider such matters as hiatus, elision, crasis and correption. Callimachus more or less follows Homer in these points ; that is to say, he is quite contradictory in his usage. It is true that he sometimes permits a hiatus where the presence of a digamma may have been felt, e.g. ὦ ἄνα (II, 79.) He also does this, however, with words which did not begin with a digamma e.g. γυνὴ ἐπιμίσγεται (I, 13). In the Hymns this feature appears most readily with the vowel eta ; there is another remarkable instance at VI, 86,[1] where both hiatus and correption occur with identical vowels. All the above cases differ from the abundant examples of correption, since the first of the two juxtaposed vowels is not shortened. Again, the digamma is often blatantly ignored e.g. ὦνα (I,33). Callimachus also feels quite free to elide before a digamma e.g. ὑπ'ἰσχύν (I, 75). He is very fond of epic correption ; departures from it are usually significant. We have just seen examples of a long vowel in hiatus remaining long before a short vowel. Perhaps the greater weight of the long vowel prevails. In the Hymns there are also four examples of a long vowel in hiatus remaining long before another long vowel. Two of these examples are identical : ὦ Εὐηρείδα, (V, 81 and 106). We may have to regard them as special cases, since a shortened omega before a vocative might have sounded odd, although we cannot be certain of the pronunciation in Callimachus'

---

[1] ἢ 'ἔπεσ'ἐξ ἵππων', ἢ 'ἐν Ὄθρυϊ ποίμνι'ἀμιθρεῖ'.
An example with different vowels is ἀειράμενοι ὑπέρ (III, 59).

day. Moreover, both examples occur at the beginning of a line, where a long syllable is obligatory. Perhaps this is why Callimachus put them there. It is interesting to observe that Theocritus has the same word in the same place in the line,[1] and since there is some doubt about the text at that point, the comparison with Callimachus has become more significant.

The other two examples are more interesting since they both occur with words which had a digamma : εὖ εἰδότας (I, 78) and μή οἵ (IV, 238). It is interesting that both the εὖ and the μή occur in thesis, which is slightly unexpected. As it stands εὖ εἰδότας apparently breaks Naeke's law which does not allow a fourth foot spondee before a bucolic diaeresis. When the phrase occurs in Homer the first part is generally written ἐὐ[2]; this could be done with Callimachus too, but would be unprecedented in the Hymns, and editors have avoided it. Alternatively, it may be said that there is no bucolic diaeresis, εὖ going sufficiently closely with εἰδότας for the phrase to be considered a unit. Another example of this point occurs at IV, 4 : εὔυμνοι Δῆλος δ'ἐθέλει τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι τα πρῶτα being considered as a unit ; this is perhaps easier to accept. The validity of Naeke's law, however, is questionable. It has been invoked at IV, 226-7 (mss. reading) :

> ἀλλὰ φίλη, δύνασαι γάρ, ἀμύνειν, πότνια, δούλοις
> ὑμετέροις, οἳ σεῖο πέδον πατέουσιν ἐφετμῇ.

---

[1] XXIV, 71.

[2] E.g. Iliad, II, 823.

which has found general acceptance in the reconstituted form of Maas :

ἀλλά, φίλη, δύνασαι γάρ, ἀμύνεο πότνια δούλους
ὑμετέρους, οἱ σεῖο πέδον πατέουσιν ἐφετμήν.

which gives a completely different, and perhaps unnecessary, sense.[1] Further violence has been done to the text by Maas[2] in connection with Callimachus' habit of following a third foot strong caesura (penthemimer) with a fourth foot strong caesura (hephthemimer) when there is no bucolic diaeresis. There are many examples of this in all the Hymns except the fourth, where there are only three, although it is by far the longest hymn. Maas' intention is to account for these three examples, which are :

τόφρα μὲν οὔπω τοι χρυσέη ἐπεμίσγετο Λητώ, (IV, 39)

εὔυμνοι Δῆλος δ'ἐθέλει τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι (IV, 4)

Παρθένιον, φεῦγεν δ'ὁ γέρων μετόπισθε Φενειός, (IV, 71)

Maas admits that IV, 39 cannot be altered ; in IV, 4, however, δὲ θέλει can be written in place of δ'ἐθέλει, resulting in a third foot feminine caesura. In IV, 71, ὁ is regarded by Maas as an unpoetic article ; δ'ὁ γέρων is therefore rewritten as δὲ γέρων, again giving a third foot feminine caesura. The article is presumably unpoetical because it occurs in a series of nouns which have no article. Yet exactly the same feature is found in this hymn at lines 138-9, where .... αἵ τε δυσαεῖς
ἐσχατιαὶ Πίνδοιο,....

appears amidst a series of nouns which have no article.

---

[1] Maas gives a rather biased summary of the points involved in his Textual Criticism, trans. B. Flower, Oxford Univ. Press, 1958, pp.28-30.

[2] In Festschrift Bruno Snell, Munich, 1956, pp.23-4.

It is possible, however, that the objection is to the article with a proper name. But elsewhere Callimachus writes ὠπόλλων (II, 9) and τὸν ἀβατὰν Ἀκταίονα (V, 109). Moreover, Maas' alterations require δέ to be taken as an enclitic, forming a unit with the previous word. This in itself is dubious. It has been remarked in this connection that δέ and words like it are neither enclitic nor proclitic, but something in between.[1] Callimachus may well have agreed with this. Consider his line at ep.6, 2 : δεξαμένου, κλείω δ'Εὔρυτον ὅσσ'ἔπαθεν,

From the stand-point of euphony it is surely better that the first hemiepes end after κλείω than after κλείω δ', although logic would be more likely to prefer the second alternative ; but something can be said for both cases. We should certainly not be surprised to see logic relegated to second place from time to time in poetry. All things considered, the question is not so simple as Maas assumes. Callimachus may have regarded the pentameter more as a unit than as a combination of two hemiepes, but the amount of internal rhyme in the pentameters of this hymn[2] suggests that he was aware of the importance of the main caesura.

The final example of hiatus with no correption -μή οἵ- also involves the digamma. This third person pronoun is apparently

---

[1] By O'Neill, Yale Classical Studies, VIII, pp. 108-9.

[2] V. infra, p.84.

different from other words with a digamma in that the force of the digamma is generally retained in literature.[1] It is therefore unlikely that Callimachus was making any special point on this particular occasion, especially since a similar scansion of occurs in Homer.[2]

It is not inappropriate that the force of the digamma should be felt in the Hymns. The settings depicted by Callimachus echo those of earlier hymns, although we cannot be certain that Callimachus had any particular occasion in mind when he wrote them. And although Callimachus has introduced much new material, he has been careful to retain the epic basis. Thus he does not forget to mention the stringed instrument used by the epic reciters, although its relevance to the external situation is restricted to the Hymn to Apollo, to whom, of course, it was of special importance. Thus at II, 12-13 we find : μήτε σιωπηλὴν κίθαριν μήτ'ἄφορον ἴχνος
τοῦ Φοίβου τοὺς παῖδας ἔχειν ἐπιδημήσαντος,

and again later at line 16 :

ἠγασάμην τοὺς παῖδας, ἐπεὶ χέλυς οὐκέτ'ἀεργός.

A chorus of youths is quite a different thing from an epic reciter as regards the use of a κίθαρις, but choral lyric provided ample precedent.

---

[1] V. Maas, Greek Metre, trans. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962, p.82.

[2] Odyssey, VI, 147.

In the Hymns of Callimachus we occasionally find elements which have been regarded as one of the earliest features of Greek poetry. This is the gnomic utterance, found in either prosodiac, paroemiac or enoplion metres (P.P.E.). The exact description of these metres has been disputed ; Snell classifies them as follows[1]:

Prosodiac : ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –

Paroemiac : – – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –

Enoplion : ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –

It will be observed that the prosodiac ends like a pentameter, while the other two end like a hexameter. Any phrase classified as a prosodiac, then, would not generally occur at the end of the hexameter. It has been suggested that the P.P.E. structure represents the kernel of the development of the hexameter.[2] It is indeed quite probable that the first poetic statements were of a proverbial nature, and there are many early examples of this in a P.P.E. structure. Again, the most gnomic of Greek poets, Phocylides, wrote in hexameters and elegiacs. The developed poetry of the epic which we possess has naturally expanded considerably from this element, but the P.P.E. structure still makes an occasional appearance, e.g. Hesiod's καιρὸς δ'ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος.[3] It may be that even at this early stage poets were adapting such elements to suit their

---

[1] Griechische Metrik, Göttingen, 1955.

[2] E.g. by Huxley, The Early Ionians, London, 1966, p.44.

[3] Works and Days, 694.

purpose.[1]

There are several examples of this basic structure in the Hymns of Callimachus, some clearer than others. Good examples are : κακὸν μακάρεσσιν ἐρίζειν (II, 25).

ἀεὶ δ'εὔορκος Ἀπόλλων (II, 68).

θεὸς δ'ἀεὶ ἀστυφέλικτος (IV, 26).

ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί (VI, II7).

Other examples are similar, but some lose their gnomic force, and reflect religious usage instead, e.g. :

σὺ δ'οὐ θάνες, ἐσσὶ γὰρ αἰεί (I, 9).

τί δ'οὐ κρατέοντος ὑπ'ἰσχύν; (I, 75).

δίδου δ'ἀρετήν τ'ἄφενός τε (I, 94).

δίδου δ'ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον (I, 96).

ἑκὰς ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός (II, 2).

μέλοι δέ μοι αἰὲν ἀοιδή (III, I37).

τί δὲ στιβαρώτερον ἔρκος; (IV, 24).

ἵτω πεπρωμένον ἦμαρ (IV, I28).

χάριτος δέ τοι ἔσσετ'ἀμοιβή (IV, I52).

ὃ δ'εἴσεται ἤθεα πατρός (IV, I70).

...κακὴν ὁδὸν ἄφρονι φύλῳ (IV, I84).

which recalls the style of Theognis, himself a very gnomic poet, and : τὸ δ'ἐντελές, ᾧ κ'ἐπινεύσῃ (V, I3I).

---

[1] οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη (Iliad, II, 204.) certainly sounds like a gnomic phrase, but only fits the P.P.E. structure (resolved) if the negative is removed. This may be an instance of Homeric adaptation of a phrase which had developed from an oligarchical society.

In early epic the presence of the P.P.E. structure is easy to explain ; it is presumably a living force of oral poetry, and so we expect it to feature in even the most refined style. With Callimachus the case is different. While the sentiments which he uses are quite common, we do not find them in this exact form elsewhere. He may have borrowed them from sources no longer extant, as he borrowed ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες (I, 79.) from Hesiod,[1] and so on. But to explain them all thus is a desperate expedient. It is more likely that Callimachus constructed them himself along the traditional lines. And the stimulus may not have been confined to epic, for some of the phrases remind us of maxims of Pindar, e.g. his σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος[2] . Callimachus presumably wished to insert an archaic flavour into his hexameters. It is the love of early epic which we have seen elsewhere. The presence of P.P.E. elements in the archaic language of a religious hymn is quite appropriate. It is clear from the structure of the Hymns in general that Callimachus is trying to avoid discarding the traditional framework, despite attempts to modernise. It may be significant that outwith the P.P.E. structure we find very few gnomic utterances.[3]

---

[1] Theogony, 96.

[2] P., 8, 95.

[3] Possible instances are I, 62-3 ; IV, 122 ; V, 100 and 135-6.

The presence or absence of the digamma in the Homeric Hymns prompted scholars to utilise such statistics for dating purposes. This clearly cannot be done with Callimachus, but there may be other statistics which are worth a brief glance. The presence of a spondaic fifth foot in the hexameter is an example ; such lines are a typically Hellenistic phenomenon. Their percentage in the Hymns is as follows : I : 14.6 ; II : 5.3 ; III : 10.8 ; IV : 3.1 ; VI : 4.4.[1] The elegiac fifth hymn has no such lines. We can perhaps regard such σπονδειάζοντες as something to which Hellenistic poets were more addicted than their predecessors, although there is no evidence that it was considered a fault until Cicero passed a biased judgement upon it. If, however, we regard a lower percentage as evidence of a mature and restrained style, then this would put the hymn to Zeus first, followed by the hymn to Artemis. But while this approach is suggestive, it cannot be wholly relied upon ; the low percentage of such lines in the hymn to Delos may simply reflect the fact that Callimachus has more closely followed a Homeric hymn, although the hymn in question, to (Delian) Apollo, has a percentage of 7.3.[2]

---

[1] These figures are calculated to the nearest decimal point. This also applies to some later figures ; for others the nearest whole number is sufficient.

[2] If every single case is counted, the figure is 9.5. The smaller figure results from ignoring more than one occurence of exactly the same form of the same word at the end of the Homeric spondaic hexameter. This sort of repetition is avoided without exception by Callimachus within each individual hymn, providing yet another example of his careful polish.

If these statistics are used along with other evidence, the result may be more significant. As regards its use in hexameter poems, the bucolic diaeresis is not a particularly Hellenistic phenomenon. It is only slightly less frequent in early epic than in the Hymns of Callimachus. It is more common in elegiac hexameters, however, and the Bath of Pallas has the highest percentage of the hymns, while in the epigrams of Callimachus it reaches a remarkable 92%.[1] In general then, the bucolic diaeresis might be regarded as more of a hexametric sine qua non for Callimachus than for Homer, although the differences are not very great. The percentages for Callimachus' hymns are : I : 73 ; II : 69 ; III : 69 ; IV : 60 ; V : 75 ; VI : 69. These percentages do not differ greatly, but it is interesting that they confirm in part the evidence of the spondaic lines. We can perhaps regard a high percentage as a slight indulgence without too much regard to stylistic effect ; this would then place the hymn to Zeus first (ignoring the Bath of Pallas for reasons just given), which agrees with the σπονδειάζοντες evidence. The hymn to Delos again has the lowest percentage, which may be further evidence of Callimachus' desire to write in a slightly more Homeric style in this hymn. It would certainly be unwise to regard such statistics as the product of chance. In the Hecale, for example, Callimachus constructs ca. 12% of the hexameters with a spondaic fifth foot. This seems more akin to the normal Hellenistic figure, for Apollonius

---

[1] According to Cahen, Callimaque et son Oeuvre Poétique, p.479.

also shows 12%.[1] But taking the Hymns as a whole (except the fifth, of course) the percentage is 7.6, which is clearly an attempt to play down the contemporary style in favour of that of early epic, which has 5.6%.[2] Although a spondaic fifth foot does not appear in the elegiac Bath of Pallas, this is not the case with the Aitia, which has at least nine examples in a total of just over two hundred complete hexameters - although this is still fairly low for a Hellenistic poet.

It is interesting to observe that such stylistic and metrical points in Greek verse did not escape notice at Rome. By the end of the first century B.C. Roman elegy had more or less established a regular ending for the pentameter ; in Ovid it had become almost obligatory. This was, of course, the disyllabic word ending. The Greek poets, however, had allowed themselves considerably more variety. Callimachus fluctuates somewhat in his usage of this feature, and since it does not seem to have been a conscious aspect of his style, we cannot use it for any relative dating. The evidence which we do have is conflicting. The percentage of disyllabic line endings for the pentameters of the Aitia is : I : 31.8 ; II : 42.8 ; III : 27 ; IV : 45.8. Book III clearly

---

[1] This figure is calculated from an examination of four hundred lines, one hundred selected at random from each of the four books. The specific passaged were I, 100-200 ; II, 700-800 ; III, 500-600 ; IV, 900-1000.

[2] See Maas, Greek Metre, p.59.

disrupts the orderly developement, but since we have no reason to assume that each book was composed at a certain time as a unit, we should go no further.

The percentage for the fifth hymn of Callimachus is considerably lower - 19.7. The general picture is that of a poet who was not particularly concerned with this stylistic point, if he was even aware of it. All Greek poets shared Callimachus' indifference. It is interesting to see signs of this in Catullus. Of his longer elegiac poems - 66, 67, 68, and 76 - three have quite a high percentage of disyllabic pentameter word endings ; 67 has 41.6%, 68 has 46.3%, and 76 has 53.8%.[1] 66, which is, of course, a translation of a poem of Callimachus, drops to 25.4%. This is presumably an attempt to capture the style of Callimachus to some extent. If we compare the two poems we find conscious verbal effect made by Catullus in this direction.

Another metrical effect more Greek than Latin is the feminine caesura (3w) in the hexameter. Catullus is no exception to the host of Latin writers who make almost exhaustive use of the masculine caesura (3s). In the elegiac Bath of Pallas almost half the hexameters have a third foot weak caesura ; a comparison with the longer elegiac poems of Catullus is again interesting. The figures for 3w are : 67 has 8.3%, 68 has 5% and 76 has 7.7%. 66, however, again stands out with 21.3%. This is all the more striking

---

[1] The average percentage of disyllabic word endings to the pentameters of Catullus' epigrams is 33.6. By these statistics at least, 76 is more of an elegy than an epigram.

when we consider the relative frequency of third foot dactyls and spondees in the Greek and Latin hexameter. A dactyl in this place is far commoner in Greek ; in Latin, a spondee is just as likely as a dactyl.[1] In the Bath of Pallas Callimachus has constructed 77% of his hexameters with a third foot dactyl, 23% with a third foot spondee. Catullus, on the other hand, has 34% of the hexameters in 66 with a third foot dactyl, and 66% with a third foot spondee. A feminine caesura demands a dactyl, of course ; Catullus has thus made his 3w caesuras an almost equivalent proportion of his third foot dactyls, as has Callimachus.

While it is true that there is not a great deal of material to examine, it seems clear that both the pentameters and hexameters of 66 unite in suggesting a conscious metrical and stylistic Ἑλληνισμός by Catullus.

As we read the lines of the Hymns it becomes clear how much effort and polish Callimachus has put into his work. This perfection is achieved in part by certain structural effects which reappear in varied form ; this variety serves both to retain the interest of the reader and to display the skill of the author. A common structural arrangement is I, 3 :

Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα, διηνεκέος Οὐρανίδησι

which can be represented as an a b b a form, with both grammar and

---

[1] See Platnauer, Latin Elegiac Verse, Cambridge, University Press, 1951, pp.36-7.

sense perfectly balanced. Callimachus has emphasised this by having only four words in the line, a factor which usually points to some stylistic feature. Other examples are not quite so perfect as this, but the form remains basically the same, e.g. II, 26 :

ὃς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο

and again at III, 108 :

Ἥρης ἐννεσίῃσιν, ἀέθλιον Ἡρακλῆι

another four word line, but without exact grammatical parallelism.

Another possible method of construction is an a b a b form. Callimachus is equally fond of this, e.g. I, 77 :

...Ἡφαίστοιο
τευχηστὰς δ'Ἄρηος, ἐπακτῆρας δὲ Χιτώνης
Ἀρτέμιδος,...

where a perfectly symmetrical line is enclosed within two genitive proper names. This same formula appears in II, 10, in a slightly more elaborate way :

ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὗτος, ὃς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκεῖνος.

which has almost perfect symmetry ; and at II, 12 :

μήτε σιωπηλὴν κίθαριν μήτ'ἄφοφον ἴχνος

Sometimes these basic formulae serve as a stimulus to lines of greater virtuosity, such as II, 59 :

καλῇ ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ περιηγέος ἐγγύθι λίμνης.

which might be classified as a b a a b a, and III, 215-16 :

... ποδορρώρην Ἀταλάντην
κούρην Ἰασίοιο συοκτόνον Ἀρκασίδαο

which is most easily described as an a a^1a^2b a^3b^1 formula, with the

second line again having only four words. It is clear then that Callimachus has advanced somewhat from the more simplified structure of the Homeric Hymns. These earlier hymns had retained the formulaic structure of early epic, with its recurrent pattern of line endings and extended epithets. Callimachus has, for the most part, discarded this ; the form and symmetry which we have just seen represent new possibilities.

Callimachus also has a fondness for encasing the hexameter within two words in agreement, usually a noun and its adjective, e.g. II, 37 : θηλείαις οὐδ'ὅσσον ἐπὶ χνόος ἦλθε παρειαῖς, or again II, 49 : ἠιθέου ὑπ'ἔρωτι κεκαυμένος Ἀδμήτοιο. another four word line.[1] This device is not uncommon in the Hymns. It is clearly the result of attention to detail and delicate construction - Alexandrianism in miniature. Similar to this is

IV, 79 : ἡ δ'ὑποδινηθεῖσα χοροῦ ἀπεπαύσατο νύμφη
αὐτόχθων Μελίη ...

but it can also be regarded as an imitation of the Homeric use of the article as a substantive with postponed noun, as :

ὣς ὁ μὲν ἔνθα καθεῦδε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς [2]

Another example from Callimachus is IV, 77 :

... ὁ δ'εἵπετο πολλὸν ὄπισθεν
Ἀσωπός...

This example illustrates an important aspect of the Hymns ;

---

[1] Whether we assume tmesis, or take the preposition with its noun as a unit.

[2] Odyssey, VI, 1.

Callimachus is in no way dominated by the stichic nature of the early hexameter. While Callimachus may be imitating features of early epic, this does not permit us to say that he must have understood their exact significance. He may simply have liked the archaic flavour of, say, the noun postponement. The problem is similar to that of the digamma. It may be, also, that Callimachus' fondness for encasing a hexameter within two words of agreement derived from the Homeric use of the postponed noun separated from a substantival article. But adaptation and expansion of Homeric technique may have begun not long after the composition of the early epic poems.[1]

This careful attention to the structure of the line was an element of Alexandrianism which stimulated the Neoterics and Augustans, resulting in constructions such as the golden hexameter, e.g. : devia puniceae velabant limina vittae.[2]
The Hymns do not have such a perfect example as this, but it is possible to see the germ of the golden line in II, 20 :

οὐδὲ Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα κινύρεται αἰλινα μήτηρ,

where a slight change -παῖδα for μήτηρ - would have produced the perfect result, unless, perhaps, objection be taken to the initial οὐδέ.

---

[1] There are obvious signs of this in the Theogony of Hesiod : v. Schwabl, Beobachtungen zur Poesie des Hesiod, Serta Philol. Aenipontana, 1962, pp.69-84.

[2] Prop.IV, ix, 27.

Another notable device used by Callimachus is anaphora. This phenomenon is as old as Greek literature, but receives a special prominence in the Hymns. Sometimes the anaphora is quite extensive e.g. at IV, 260-64, each line beginning χρύσεα... χρῦσῳ...χρύσειον...χρυσῳ...; or again the fivefold repetition of δός between III, 6-8. Sometimes anaphora is followed by anaphora, e.g. I, 6-9, where four succesive hexameters begin Ζεῦ..Ζεῦ.. Κρῆτες..Κρῆτες. Also striking is the double anaphora within the hexameter, as in the oracular lines IV, 84-5 :

'Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρύας ὄμβρος ἀέξει,
Νύμφαι δ'αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυσὶ μηκέτι φύλλα.'

There are also examples of the so-called bucolic anaphora, e.g. III, 44

χαῖρε δὲ Καίρατος ποταμὸς μέγα, χαῖρε δὲ Τηθύς,

and V, 45 : σάμερον, ὑδροφόροι, μὴ βάπτετε - σάμερον Ἄργος,

and V, 125 : πολλὰ δὲ Βοιωτοῖσι θεοπρόπα, πολλὰ δὲ Κάδμῳ.

Bucolic anaphora was generally a feature of the epigram, which may explain why two of the three examples in the Hymns (III, 256 is dubious) occur in the elegiac fifth hymn.

Occasionally anaphora is merged with a series of short cola, producing a tricolon or tetracolon with (usually weak) anaphora. Such constructions are common in early Latin in both literary and non-literary form. Very often the words involved are synonyms, or at least words with some relation in meaning to each other. This is well illustrated by quoting a few lines from an early

Latin carmen[1]:

Mars pater, te precor quaesoque,
ut sies volens propitius
mihi, domo, familiaeque nostrae,...
agrum, terram, fundumque meum .....

The first line contains a dicolon, while the third and fourth show tricolon crescendo. The poetry of Plautus also abounds with such expressions, e.g. Pseudolus, 19:

aut re aut opera aut consilio bono.

which is a tricolon crescendo with anaphora, although the repeated aut is not very striking. Callimachus has a surprisingly similar line at V, 139 : σύν τ'εὐαγορίᾳ σύν τ'εὔγμασι σύν τ'ὀλολυγαῖς. although there is no crescendo element. But this device of arithmetic progression appears at VI,5-6 :

μὴ παῖς μηδὲ γυνὰ μηδ'ἃ κατεχεύσατο χαίταν,
μηδ'ὅκ'ἀφ'αὐαλέων στομάτων πτύωμες ἅπαστοι.

which is a good example of a tetracolon crescendo. Such phenomena are not common in Greek literature ; their formulaic structure suggests archaic, possibly religious, usage. If so, they are quite appropriate to the Hymns.

It has already been observed that the recurrent pattern of line endings and extended epithets, found in early epic and the Homeric hymns, have more or less vanished from Callimachus.[2] The fifth hymn, however, has an interesting variation on the traditional formula. The word Ἀθαναία occurs eight times in this hymn, and

---

[1] Quoted by Cato, De Agri Cultura, 141.

[2] Supra, p.70.

on every occasion appears in the same place in the line - after the first trochee - whether in the hexameter or pentameter. In the form Ἀθαναίᾳ it occurs three times, again always after the first trochee. The genitive Ἀθαναίας occurs once, also after the first trochee.[1] There are no other instances of this tetrasyllabic form of the name. In its trisyllabic form the word appears thrice ; Ἀθάνα (l.79) comes at the end of a hexameter. The other two instances involve crasis ; ὠθάνα (l.35), τἀθάνᾳ (l.51) both occur at the beginning of a hexameter. All three share an aversion to beginning after the first trochee. As for the longer form of Athene's name, there is something Homeric about its recurrence in exactly the same part of the line, although this feature generally occurs in the latter half of the hexameter in early epic.[2] Athene is also referred to as Παλλάς in this hymn. The accusative (l.53), genitive (l.1) and dative (l.15) of this noun each occur once. On each occasion the word occupies the fourth foot of a hexameter. The nominative occurs once also (l.132), but at the beginning of a pentameter. Whether she is referred to as Athene or Pallas, the goddess tends to occupy fixed positions in the line. There is no metrical reason for this ; Callimachus is probably playing with the formulaic element of early epic.

---

[1] The specific instances are in Pfeiffer's index s.v. Ἀθηναίη.

[2] It may be for this reason that Weinreich, Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Alterumswissenschaft, II, 1947, pp.33-7, declares (according to the abstract in L'Année Philologique ; I have been unable to consult the article) that Callimachus is making a decisive break from Homeric custom.

It is also possible that Callimachus is trying to achieve something of a refrain, since the address to Athene occurs throughout the poem, although at irregular intervals. Slightly more Homeric is the repetition of the line-ending ἐξέτι κείνου (II, 47 : IV, 275) although it may have been accidental. But deliberate, surely, is the repetition of the line-ending οὐδὲ λοέσσα (VI, I2, I6).

An important feature of the Hymns of Callimachus is the variety of content and style which they display.[1] The Homeric hymns are far more rigid and conventional by comparison. A good example of this is Callimachus' use of the simile, particularly the lengthy, formal simile which extends over several lines. It is virtually a sine qua non of early epic, and of Hellenistic too, if we may use Apollonius as an example. Yet it has no significant place in the Hymns of Callimachus, although the Homeric hymns are full of them. Short similes, certainly, are found in Callimachus, as they are in every writer, e.g. VI, 91 :

ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιών, ὡς ἀελίῳ ἔνι πλαγγών,

but there is nothing particularly significant about this. The only example of a formal extended simile seems to be the description of the noise generated by the shield of Ares, likened to the rumblings of Etna ; it may well be that its appearance in the Hymn to Delos is significant, as this hymn is, of course, the most faithful to a Homeric antecedent. It extends over seven lines

---

[1] For more detailed information v. chapter II.

from IV, 141-47, :

> ὡς δ', ὁπότ'Αἰτναίου ὄρεος πυρὶ τυφομένοιο
> σείονται μυχὰ πάντα, κατουδαίοιο γίγαντος
> εἰς ἑτέρην Βριαρῆος ἐπωμίδα κινυμένοιο,
> θερμάστραι τε βρέμουσιν ὑφ'Ἡφαίστοιο πυράγρης
> ἔργα θ'ὁμοῦ, δεινὸν δὲ πυρίκμητοί τε λέβητες
> καὶ τρίποδες πίπτοντες ἐπ'ἀλλήλοις ἰαχεῦσιν,
> τῆμος ἔγεντ'ἄραβος σάκεος τόσος εὐκύκλοιο.

Although it is basically traditional in structure, it contains several typically Callimachean elements, such as the rhyme ending the first and last lines of the simile, reinforced also in the third line. Other points are worth a brief glance. τόσος (l.147) normally occurs at the beginning of a Homeric simile , and the sequence is generally τόσος...ὅσος. Here there is no ὅσος, and τόσος seems to refer to ὡς. It may be that τόσος is equivalent to ὅσος, as it is in Callimachus' hymn to Apollo, II, 94 :

> οὐδὲ πόλει τόσ'ἔνειμεν ὀφέλσιμα, τόσσα Κυρήνῃ,

which is very unusual. The position of τόσος is also odd, as it is normally found at the beginning of a line. The beginning of the line (147) is in fact occupied by τῆμος. This word is an odd answer to ὡς δ', ὁπότ'. This latter phrase often introduces a simile in Homer, but it never makes a temporal point. Indeed, LSJ remark that the ὅτε seems superfluous. It is the content of the clause which is the cause of comparison, not the idea of time. Consequently, Homer's correlative to ὡς ὅτε, or ὡς ὁπότε is ὥς, meaning <u>thus</u>. What Callimachus has done is to take τῆμος with ὁπότ', this latter

---

[1] <u>Iliad</u>, II, 528.

word being separated mentally from ὡς for the present purpose. τόσος, however, can only refer to ὡς δ', ὁπότ'as a whole, and to the content of the simile. Callimachus has confused, or perhaps rather merged two basic types of simile.

Σείονται μυχὰ πάντα is another interesting element in the simile. The neuter plural subject is found with a plural verb. This is quite common in Homer, but far less so in Hesiod and the Homeric hymns, hence the idea that it is the correct earlier form and the use of a singular verb a later idea. The examples from Hesiod and the Homeric hymns are, moreover, based on Homer for the main part.[1] At any rate, Callimachus seems to be the first person to use μυχά as the plural of μυχός . Homer's plural is μυχούς [2]. This, then, may have led Callimachus to use a plural verb, although it is not really expected even after the modification of the noun. Homer is somewhat ambiguous on this point. His heteroclite nouns take a plural verb when they appear in a masculine plural form ; this is to be expected, of course. When the same nouns appear in a neuter plural they do not seem to govern a verb.

To return to the simile, the alliteration of line 146 may be intended to represent the clatter of the tripods. This line also contains three dactyls interlocked with three spondees, perhaps

---

[1] V. Scott, Amer.Journal of Philol., L, 197, 1929, pp.71-6.

[2] Iliad, XXI, 23.

intended as a metrical illustration of tripods, although this formula does occur elsewhere in the Hymns.[1] It is clear, at any rate, that Callimachus has not accepted the Homeric simile without adding features of his own.

Elsewhere, (VI,50-2) Callimachus gives us a description which, although technically not a simile, has most of the characteristics of a simile :

> τὰν δ'ἄρ' ὑποβλέφας χαλεπώτερον ἢὲ κυναγόν
> ὤρεσιν ἐν Τμαρίοισιν ὑποβλέπει ἄνδρα λέαινα
> ὠμοτόκος, τᾶς φαντὶ πέλειν βλοσυρώτατον ὄμμα,

We are reminded of the description of Odysseus[2] who came forth like a lion to meet Nausicaa and her maidens. These lines of Callimachus make it clear that he did not completely accept the stereotyped nature of Homeric similes, but that he liked to recall them, and alter them to suit his own purpose. In the previous chapter we noticed a similar developement in his use of speech formula.

It is also possible to make a comparison between persons or things without resorting to a formal simile. Callimachus does so in a rather interesting way ; he uses the tangible (Ptolemy) to describe the intangible (Zeus) at I, 85-6 :

> ...ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι
> ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι...

A flattering description of Ptolemy follows. In epic similes the

---

[1] E.g. I, 26.

[2] Odyssey, VI, 96-8.

reverse is normally the case, and a mortal is likened to a god or hero when there is a desire to stress his merit. Thus Homer writes of Hector :

ὡς ἐπ''Αχαιοῖσιν σεῦε Τρῶας μεγαθύμους
"Εκτωρ Πριαμίδης, βροτολοιγῷ ἶσος "Αρηϊ. [1]

But let us return for a moment to the phrase of Callimachus just quoted. In writing ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι, he may have been influenced by arguments of probability (τὸ εἰκός), which were so common in Greek legal oratory of all periods.[2] What Callimachus means is that it is reasonable to assume that Zeus can be understood by taking Ptolemy as an initial point of comparison. Also, his use of τεκμήρασθαι to introduce the evidence may owe something to the methodical approach favoured by philosophy. We are reminded of Aristotle's constant use of the phrase τεκμήριον δέ. By this Aristotle means demonstrable proof, as opposed to τὸ εἰκός. Callimachus, however, has combined the two elements in an apparent paradox ; but he may have ignored the stricter interpretations. There is another example of this approach in his hymn to Apollo, II, 34-5 :

...πολύχρυσος γὰρ 'Απόλλων
καὶ πουλυκτέανος· Πυθῶνί κε τεκμήραιο.

It is possible that Callimachus was influenced in this by current

---

[1] Iliad, XI, 294-95. Many of the θεο- compounds also come under this category. A poet can refer in this way to other men without fear of Nemesis ; perhaps such men were indeed more like the gods. We are reminded of what Plato makes Socrates say of previous generations at Philebus 16 C, : οἱ μὲν παλαιοί, κρείττονες ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυτέρω θεῶν οἰκοῦντες.

[2] V. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, London, 1963, pp.30-1.

theories of theological rationalisation, notably those of Euhemerus, who, a few years earlier, had expounded his theory of the gods' origins as mortal men. Callimachus, however, derived his explanation of the divine from his own surroundings. This is a relatively sophisticated idea, but it does not necessarily imply a personal belief in the gods ; Callimachus' position under the Ptolemies no doubt made recognition of the official religions obligatory.

Since tmesis continued to be used by most Greek poets, it is perhaps wrong to consider it an epicism.[1] Callimachus, however, probably thought of it as giving an epic flavour to his poetry. There are examples of tmesis in each of the six hymns, ranging from at least nine instances in the hymn to Artemis, to apparently only one in the hymn to Apollo. The most common adverb or preposition involved is ἐπί (I, 49 ; II, 37 ; III, 58 ; III, 148 ; III, 252 ; IV, 234 ; VI, 96.) followed by ἀπό (I, 44 ; III, 174 ; III, 236 ; IV, 209 ; V, 31 ; VI, 75.) then ἐν(ί) (I, 17 ; I, 84 ; III, 112 ; IV, 265 ; VI, 20.) Other examples are with διά, πρός, ἐκ, περί, μετά and παρά. There is considerable variety in the use made of such tmesis. Sometimes the two words in question are separated by a very small word, e.g. ἐν δ'ἐβάλευ (III, 112), repeated at IV, 256, or ἐκ δ'ἔχευεν (I, 32). But we also find as many as three words

---

[1] It is probable, however, that only at the beginning of Greek literature was it a subconscious feature. Tmesis, of course, is the wrong word to use in this early period.

intervening, e.g. ἐπὶ δὲ γλυκὺ κηρίον ἔβρως. (I, 49) ; other examples at III, 148 and III, 252. They too involve ἐπί ; such a large separation seems to occur only with this word.

Most of the examples are found with the adverb or prefix preceding the verb or noun ; this is the normal method of tmesis. But there are at least two instances where the verb appears first ; I, 44 : τουτάκι τοι πέσε, δαῖμον, ἄπ' ὀμφαλός,...

and III, 181 : ἦλθε παρ''Ηέλιος καλὸν χορόν,...

In the latter case παρ' probably also goes with the following noun. While rare, these examples of retrospective tmesis are by no means unprecedented ; there is an example in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo[1]:

ἡμὲν ὅσοι Πελοπόννησον πίειραν ἔχουσιν
ἠδ' ὅσοι Εὐρώπην τε καὶ ἀμφιρύτας κατὰ νήσους,

There are also, as in Homer, cases where the adverb or prefix occurs in one line with the verb in the following line, e.g. III, 148 :

...θεοὶ δ' ἐπὶ πάντες ἐκείνῳ
ἄλληκτον γελόωσι,...

- here again ἐπί may also go with ἐκείνῳ - and III, 252 :

...ἐπὶ δὲ στρατὸν ἱππημολγῶν
ἦγαγε Κιμμερίων...

and again at V, 31 : ...ὡς ἀπὸ χαίταν
πέζηται,...

where the pentameter has the main verb.

It is possible to regard all the above instances as adverbial uses of the preposition, but since they are also to be

---

[1] III, 250-51.

taken with the verb or noun, the dubious term tmesis should be retained. Indeed the word may not be inappropriate in the case of Callimachus and other post-Homeric writers.

The division of a word like οὔπω, which occurs in the Hymns (e.g. III, 244) is too common to be significant. But tmesis, or division, of a noun is another matter. There may be an instance of this at IV, 66[1]: ἡ δ'ἐπὶ νησάων ἑτέρη σκοπὸς αἰπειάων
By uniting ἐπί with σκοπός we achieve a considerable improvement in the sense. The probability of the noun tmesis is perhaps strengthened by Ennius' cere comminuit brum ; this early Latin writer spoke Greek and had probably read Callimachus. On the other hand, equally good sense is retained by taking ἐπί with ἧστο which begins the next line.

The form νησάων at IV, 66 is very odd. Such a form of the genitive plural is permissible with nouns of the first declension but not of the second, of which this is the only instance in the Hymns. Giangrande has a rather erudite explanation for this.[2] Callimachus has in mind the Homeric phrase νήσων ἔπι θηλυτεράων which occurs twice in the Iliad[3]. It is the only example in Homer of νήσων, genitive case, with an adjective in agreement in the same line. Callimachus, for his present purpose, has regarded θηλυτεράων

---

[1] Suggested by Giangrande, Rheinisches Museum, CX, i, 1967, pp.153-55.

[2] Op.cit.

[3] XXI, 454 and XXII, 45. The variant νήσων ἔπι τηλεδαπάων appears in the O.C.T.

as meaning feminine, whereas Homer clearly intended it to mean fertile. The reader must then understand that this has influenced νῆσος, moving it temporarily from the second to the first declension. This may well be the correct explanation. It is simpler, however, to assume that Callimachus has made use of the fact that νῆσος is a feminine noun of the second declension, and has taken the liberty of grouping it with the feminine nouns of the first declension and treating it accordingly. We are reminded of his treatment of the noun μυχός.[I]

It is also interesting to observe in the Hymns elements such as alliteration, rhyme, and other verbal points. A good example of alliteration is IV, 88 :

Θήβη τίπτε τάλαινα τὸν αὐτίκα πότμον ἐλέγχεις;

where we can almost feel the anger of Apollo ; the fact that it is the opening line of his speech adds to the effect. Rhyme appears in many places ; normally the end of one line rhymes with the end of the next, as at I, 12-13 :

ἱερός, οὐδέ τί μιν κεχρημένον Εἰλειθυίης
ἕρπετὸν οὐδὲ γυνὴ ἐπιμίσγεται, ἀλλά ἑ Ῥείης

Occasionally it is the same word which is repeated, as at I, 87-8 :

ἑσπέριος κεῖνός γε τελεῖ τά κεν ἦρι νοήσῃ
ἑσπέριος τὰ μέγιστα, τὰ μείονα δ', εὖτε νοήσῃ.

The beginnings of these lines also rhyme, because of the anaphora.

---

[1] V. supra, p.77.

The same word is repeated again at the end of consecutive lines at II, 26-7 :

> ὃς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο·
> ὅστις ἐμῷ βασιλῆι, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο.

Rhyme generally does not involve more than two lines, but at II, 78-80 it extends over three :

> θῆκε τελεσφορίην ἐπετήσιον, ἣ ἔνι πολλοί
> ὑστάτιον πίπτουσιν ἐπ' ἰσχίον, ὦ ἄνα, ταῦροι.
> ἰὴ ἰὴ Καρνεῖε πολύλλιτε, σεῖο δὲ βωμοί

All the examples quoted involve only one syllable ; this is the case with most Greek rhyme. Callimachus, however, uses two syllables at VI, 79-80 :

> ἀμφότερον Τριόπαν τε καὶ υἱέα κικλήσκοισα.
> τὰν δὲ γυνὰ βαρύθυμος ἀμείβετο δακρύοισα

It is the fifth hymn, however, which makes the most consistent use of rhyme. The amount of internal rhyme within the pentameters is striking ; very often the rhyming is exact, as at line 12 :

> πάντα χαλινοφάγων ἀφρὸν ἀπὸ στομάτων.

At other times the result is almost a rhyme, not quite so exact as the previous example, as at line 26 :

> χρίματα, τᾶς ἰδίας ἔκγονα φυταλιᾶς,

If we include the instances of both these cases, we find that almost 24% of the pentameters in this fifth hymn have internal rhyme.[1] By any standards this is a high proportion. It would have been even higher if the hymn had not been written in Doric, as can be seen from

---

[1] The other examples occur at lines 8, 20, 22, 32, 36, 38, 50, 60, 64, 72, 86, 100, 102, 112 and 138.

the first pentameter of the hymn :

ἔξιτε τᾶν ἵππων ἄρτι φρυασσομενᾶν

Notable also for rhyme in the first half of the line are the oracular hexameters IV, 84-5 :

'Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρύας ὄμβρος ἀέξει,
Νύμφαι δ'αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυσὶ μηκέτι φύλλα.'

Other notable verbal effects are ὤπολλον, πολλοί (II, 69), χαῖρε δὲ Καίρατος (III, 44), ἱστίη...εὐέστιε (IV, 325) Κούρητες...κουρίζοντος (I, 52-4).

CHAPTER IV.

CONCLUSION.

From the points which have been raised and discussed in this thesis it is clear that Callimachus was a typical literary figure of his time in that his works display erudition and refined criticism rather than originality of inspiration. His skill lay in his ability to use the traditional art forms as a basis for his outpouring of research and scholarship in such a way that the fundamentals of Greek literature were never compromised. Indeed, a knowledge of the classical and pre-classical literature remains of supreme importance for the understanding of Alexandrian literature. Callimachus had much to say that was new, but novelty, as he well knew, is considerably enhanced by comparison and juxtaposition with traditional elements.

As we have seen, the influence of other genres - often contemporary - became important, and it is perhaps not surprising that an ad hominem approach occasionally appears. This is no doubt linked to the emergence of an age of scholar poets ; poetry could tolerate many varied strands and viewpoints in its production, but scholarship, postulating an attainable truth, could make far fewer concessions to individuality.

A question which must be raised with Callimachus, as with all Alexandrian poets, concerns the extent to which his linguistic and metrical subtleties would be appreciated by an audience. If we feel

a little uneasy about this, it is surely no more than we feel about the tragic choral ode or the Pindaric ode. When we remember that Callimachus wrote primarily for fellow-savants we must feel reassured. This does not exclude the possibility that Callimachus operated on more than one level, as Pindar obviously did. Callimachus certainly displayed the influence of the external world in his poetry ; elements of flattery remind us of Callimachus' favoured position under the Ptolemies. The festivals and processions which the Hymns purport to celebrate are certainly convenient excuses, but it seems likely that Callimachus regarded this public role, if indeed there was one, of little importance beside the permanence of his art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R. and Sikes, E. E. The Homeric Hymns. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936.

Boisacq, E. Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue grecque. Paris, 1923.

Cahen, E. Callimaque. Budé, 1961.

- - - - - Callimaque et son Oeuvre Poétique. Paris, 1929.

- - - - - Les Hymnes de Callimaque. Paris, 1930.

Cazzaniga, I. Un Epigramma di Fileta. Riv. Fil., 40, 1962, pp.238-48.

Couat, A. La Poésie Alexandrine. Paris, 1882.

Friedlander, P. and Hoffleit, H. B. Epigrammata. University of California Press, 1948.

Giangrande, G. Hellenistische Konjekturen. Rheinisches Museum, 110, 1, 1967, pp.151-57.

Giannini, A. Callimaco e la Tragedia. Dionysio, XXXVII, 1963, pp.48-73.

Gow, A. S. Theocritus. Cambridge University Press, 1950.

Headlam, W. and Knox, A.D. Herondas, the Mimes and Fragments. Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Horowski, J. De Callimachi Hymnorum Colore Mimico. Eos, LIV, 1964, pp.68-73.

Howald, E. Der Dichter Kallimachos von Kyrene. Zurich, 1943.

Huxley, G. The Early Ionians. London, 1966.

Jeffery, L. H. The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. Oxford, Calrendon Press, 1961.

Kennedy, G. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. London, 1963.

Korte, A. and Handel, P. Die Hellenistische Dichtung. Stuttgart, 1960.

Kuiper, K. Studia Callimachea. Leyden, 1896.

Langerbeck, H. Margites. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LXIII, 1958, pp.33-63.

Lesky, A. A History of Greek Literature. (Trans. Willis, J. and de Heer, C.) New York, 1966.

Maas, P. Greek Metre. (Trans. Lloyd-Jones, H.) Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962.

- - - - - Hephthemimeres im Hexameter des Kallimachos. Festschrift Bruno Snell, Munich, 1956, pp.23-4.

- - - - - Olen. R.-E., XVII, 2432-3.

- - - - - Textual Criticism. (Trans. Flower, B.) Oxford, University Press, 1958.

Mair, A. W. and Trypanis, C. A. Callimachus, Hymns and Epigrams. Loeb, 1955.

McKay, K. J. Erysichthon, a Callimachean Comedy. Leyden, 1962.

- - - - - The Poet at Play. Leyden, 1962.

O'Neill, E. G. The Localisation of Metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter : Homer, Hesiod and the Alexandrians. Yale Classical Studies, VIII, 1942, pp.103-178.

Page, D. E. and Evelyn-White, H. G. Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica. Loeb, 1936.

Pfeiffer, R. Callimachus. Oxford, University Press. Vol. I, 1949 ; Vol. II, 1953.

- - - - - A History of Classical Scholarship. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.

Platnauer, M. Latin Elegiac Verse. Cambridge University Press, 1951.

Roscher, W. H. Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie. Leipzig, 1897-1909.

Rostagni, A. Poeti Alessandrini. Turin, 1916.

Schmidt, J. Ortygia. R.-E., XVIII, 1519-26.

Schwabl, H. Beobachtungen zur Poesie des Hesiod. Serta Philologica Aenipontana, 1962, pp.69-84.

Scott, J. A. Plural Verbs with Neuter Plural Subjects in Homer. American Journal of Philology, L, 197, 1929, pp.71-6.

Smotrytsch, A. P. Eronda e il vecchio. Helikon, II, 1962, pp.605-14.

Snell, B. Griechische Metrik. Gottingen, 1955.

Susemihl, F. Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit. Leipzig, 1891.

Trypanis, C. A. Callimachus, Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Fragments. Loeb, 1958.

Webster, T. B. L. Hellenistic Poetry and Art. London, 1964.

Weinreich, O. Pallas Athene. Versgeschichtliches zu einem unhomerischen Deklinationsspiel im Pallashymnus des Kallimachos. Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Alterumswissenschaft, II, 1947, pp.33-7.

West, M. L. The Sayings of Democritus. Classical Review, XIX, 2. (N.S.), June 1969, p.142.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. Callimachi Hymni et Epigrammata.[4] Berlin, 1925.

- - - - - Hellenistische Dichtung. Berlin, 1924.

Wünsch, R. Hymnos. R.-E. IX, 140-83.